



3 3433 06823266 3



Google

James Chrystal.

Estate of Rev James Chrystal

April 8 '03

BOHN'S ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY.


HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

BY

SOZOMEN AND PHILOSTORGIUS.

ANNEX

SONNEN



1890

Not in A
2-7-1909
JK

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

SOZOMEN,

COMPRISING A

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,

FROM A. D. 324 TO A. D. 440.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK: WITH A MEMOIR
OF THE AUTHOR.

ALSO

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

PHILOSTORGIUS,

AS EPITOMISED BY

PHOTIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

TRANSLATED

BY EDWARD WALFORD, M.A.

LATE SCHOLAR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LONDON:

HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

MDCCCLV.

1855

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
474349
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1909

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, BUNGAY.

CONTENTS.

HISTORY OF SOZOMEN.

	Page
PREFATORY Remarks by Valesius concerning the Life and Writings of Sozomen	1 ✓
Memoir of Sozomen	5

BOOK I. *Pages 7—49.*

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
I. On the Jewish nation. Authorities whence the Author drew the materials of his history	7	XII. Manners and customs of the monks	27
II. Principal bishops during the reign of Constantine	12	XIII. Antony the Great, and St. Paul	30
III. Conversion of Constantine	13	XIV. Account of St. Ammon	32 †
IV. Standard of the cross borne in the army	14	XV. Origin and progress of the Arian heresy	35
V. Refutation of the assertion that the conversion of Constantine originated from the murder of Crispus	15	XVI. Efforts of Constantine to restore unanimity of opinion among the bishops	38 ✓
VI. Extension of the Christian religion under Constantius and Constantine	17	XVII. Council of Nicæa	39 ✓
VII. Dispute between Constantine and Licinius	18	XVIII. Conversion of two philosophers	41
VIII. The profession of Christianity authorized by Constantine	19	XIX. The emperor harangues the synod	43
IX. Laws enacted in favour of the clergy	23	XX. The Arians condemned to exile	44
X. Confessors of this period	24 ✓	XXI. Decrees of the council of Nicæa	45 ✓
XI. Account of St. Spyridion; his modesty and tranquillity	25	XXII. Acesis, bishop of the Novatians	46
		XXIII. Canons established by the council	47 ✓
		XXIV. Melitius and the enactments of the council	48
		XXV. Honour paid to the bishops by the emperor	49 ✓

BOOK II. *Pages 49—105.*

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
I. Discovery of the cross and holy nails	49	XX. Macarius succeeded by Maximus in the bishopric of Jerusalem	79
II. Helena, the mother of Constantine; her visit to Jerusalem	52	XXI. Relapse of Eusebius and Theognis into the errors of Arius	80
III. Sacred edifices erected by Constantine	53	XXII. Machinations of the Arians and Meletians against Athanasius	82
IV. Superstition abolished by Constantine	56	XXIII. Calumny respecting Athanasius and the hand of Arsenius	84
V. Demolition of Pagan temples	58	XXIV. Conversion of Indian nations	85
VI. Conversion of several distant nations	60	XXV. Council of Tyre. Deposition of Athanasius	88
VII. Conversion of the Iberians <i>ib.</i>	60	XXVI. Erection and dedication of a church in Jerusalem	92
VIII. Conversion of the Armenians and Persians	63	XXVII. Re-call of Arius from exile; his formulary of faith	93
IX. Persecution of Christians in Persia under Sapor	64	XXVIII. Letter of Constantine. Exile of Athanasius	95
X. Martyrdom of Christians under Sapor	67	XXIX. Refusal of Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, to admit Arius into communion. Death of Arius	97
XI. Continuation of the persecution	68	XXX. Account given by Athanasius of the death of Arius	99
XII. Martyrdom of Tarbula, the sister of Symeon	69	XXXI. Fresh troubles arise in the church of Alexandria. Letter of Constantine	100
XIII. Martyrdom of St. Acapsimus	70	XXXII. Law enacted by Constantine against heresy	101
XIV. Martyrdom of many bishops in Persia	71	XXXIII. Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra; his heresy and deposition	103
XV. Letter of Constantine to Sapor in behalf of the Christians	72	XXXIV. Death and burial of Constantine	104
XVI. Restoration of Eusebius and Theognis to their bishoprics	73		
XVII. Election of Athanasius to the bishopric of Alexandria	74		
XVIII. Refusal of Athanasius to admit Arius into communion	77		
XIX. Council of Antioch. Deposition of Eustathius	78		

BOOK III. *Pages 106—146.*

I. Renewal of the controversy concerning the doctrines established at Nicæa	106	II. Return of Athanasius from exile	107
		III. Paul, bishop of Constanti-	

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
nople. Heresy of Macedonius	108	flourished in Egypt at this period	125
IV. Sedition at the ordination of Paul	109	XV. Didymus the blind, and Aetius the heretic	132
V. Council of Antioch	110	XVI. Piety of St. Ephraim	134
VI. Bishopric of Alexandria refused by Eusebius and accepted by Gregory	112	XVII. Progress of Christianity	137
VII. Bishops of Rome and of Constantinople	114	XVIII. Religious sentiments of the sons of Constantine	138
VIII. Letter of Julius, bishop of Rome	116	XIX. Council of Ariminum	139
IX. Ejection of Paul and Athanasius	118	XX. Return of Athanasius to Alexandria	141
X. Dispute concerning Athanasius between the bishop of Rome and the Eastern bishops	119	XXI. Letter of Constantius in behalf of Athanasius	143
XI. Council of Sardica	120	XXII. Letter from the council of Jerusalem in favour of Athanasius	144
XII. Deposition of the Eastern by the Western bishops	122	XXIII. Innocence of Athanasius acknowledged by Valens and Ursacius	ib.
XIII. Schism between the churches of the East and of the West	124	XXIV. Letter written by Valens and Ursacius to Athanasius	146
XIV. Of the holy men who			

BOOK IV. *Pages 146—199.*

I. Death of the emperor Constantians	146	XII. Heresy of Aetius	161
II. Arianism favoured by Constantius	147	XIII. Letter of George, bishop of Laodicea	163
III. Martyrdom of Martyrius and Marcian	148	XIV. Letter of Constantius against Eudoxius	164
IV. Military expeditions of Constantius	ib.	XV. Return of Liberius to Rome	165
V. Appearance of the sign of the Cross in the heavens	149	XVI. Earthquake at Nicomedia	167
VI. Council of Sirmium. Three formularies of faith	150	XVII. Council of Ariminum	171
VII. Death of Magnentius, Silvanus, and Gallus	152	XVIII. Letter from the council to Constantius	173
VIII. Arrival of Constantius at Rome. Cabals of the Arians against Athanasius	154	XIX. Reply of the emperor. Second letter of the council	176
IX. Council of Milan. Banishment of Athanasius	155	XX. Persecution of those who held that the Son is consubstantial with the Father	178
X. Miraculous escape of Athanasius. Cruelty of George	157	XXI. Persecution of the Novatians in Paphlagonia. Translation of the body of Constantine	180
XI. Exile of Liberius, bishop of Rome	159	XXII. Council of Seleucia	181
		XXIII. The deputies of the	

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
		XXVII. Heresy of Macedonius defended by Marathonius . . .	194
		XXVIII. Exile of Meletius . . .	196
XXIV. Formulary of Ariminum approved by the partisans of Acacius . . .	188	XXIX. Fresh disturbances excited by the partisans of Acacius . . .	197
XXV. Deposition of Cyril, and consequent dissensions . . .	192	XXX. Cruelty of George, bishop of Alexandria. Bishops of Jerusalem . . .	198
XXVI. Death of Macedonius . . .	193		

BOOK V. *Pages 199—242.*

I. Apostasy of Julian. Death of Constantius . . .	199	XIV. Dispute between the partisans of Macedonius and of Acacius . . .	223
II. Education of Julian. His accession to the throne . . .	201	XV. Banishment of Athanasius. Ancestors of Sozomen . . .	224
III. Progress of the Christian religion impeded by Julian . . .	206	XVI. Paganism fostered by Julian. His letter to a Pagan priest . . .	227
IV. Inhabitants of Cæsarea cruelly persecuted by Julian . . .	208	XVII. Julian strives to destroy Christianity without having recourse to open persecution . . .	230
V. Julian affects to act with clemency and moderation. New form of persecution . . .	209	XVIII. Julian prohibits Christians from the study of literature. Works of Apollinarius . . .	232
VI. Return of Athanasius to Alexandria . . .	211	XIX. Book of Julian against the inhabitants of Antioch. Relics of Babylas . . .	234
VII. Death of George . . .	212	XX. Fortitude of Theodore the confessor. Conflagration of the temple of Apollo . . .	237
VIII. Death of Theodore. Death of Julian, the uncle of the emperor . . .	214	XXI. Statue of Jesus Christ. Fountain of Emmaus. Tree of Egypt . . .	238
IX. Martyrdom of Eusebius, Nestabis, and Zeno . . .	215	XXII. Permission granted by Julian to the Jews to rebuild their temple. Failure of the undertaking . . .	240
X. Character and miracles of Hilarion. Martyrdom of some holy virgins . . .	217		
XI. Martyrdom of several Christians . . .	219		
XII. Council of Alexandria . . .	221		
XIII. Dissensions between Paulinus and Meletius, Eusebius and Lucifer . . .	222		

BOOK VI. *Pages 242—312.*

I. Expedition of Julian against the Persians. His death . . .	242	IV. Council of Antioch. Letter from the council to Jovian . . .	249
II. Visions concerning the death of Julian . . .	245	V. Virtues of Athanasius recognised by Jovian . . .	251
III. Proclamation of Jovian . . .	248		

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
VI. Death of Jovian. Proclamation of Valentinian . . .	253	XXIII. Death of Liberius. Contest between Damasis and Ursinus . . .	275
VII. Council of Lampsacus . . .	254	XXIV. Election of Ambrose to the bishopric of Milan . . .	278
VIII. Revolt and death of Procopius . . .	256	XXV. Heresies propounded by Apollinarius . . .	280
IX. Persecution of those who adhered to the doctrines of Nicæa . . .	258	XXVI. Innovation concerning the rite of baptism introduced by Eunomius . . .	282
X. Persecution of the orthodox by Valens . . .	ib.	XXVII. Heresy of Eunomius condemned by the holy ascetics of this period . . .	285
XI. Formulary of faith drawn up by the Macedonians . . .	260	XXVIII. Account of the ascetics who flourished in Egypt . . .	287
XII. Persecution of the orthodox. Flight and return of Athanasius . . .	261	XXIX. Celebrated monks of Thebais . . .	289
XIII. Demophilus is elected to the bishopric of Constantinople by the Arians, and Evagrius by the orthodox . . .	264	XXX. Monks of Scetis . . .	294
XIV. Eighty priests put to death by order of Valens . . .	ib.	XXXI. Monasteries of Nitria . . .	296
XV. Dispute between Eusebius and Basil . . .	265	XXXII. Monks of Palestine . . .	297
XVI. Eusebius succeeded by Basil . . .	266	XXXIII. Celebrated ascetics of Syria . . .	299
XVII. Friendship between Basil and Gregory . . .	268	XXXIV. Account of the monks who dwelt near Edessa . . .	ib.
XVIII. Fidelity manifested by the citizens of Edessa in defence of the faith . . .	269	XXXV. Persecution of philosophers by Valens . . .	301
XIX. Death of Athanasius . . .	270	XXXVI. Death of Valentinian. Proclamation of Valentinian the younger . . .	303
XX. Persecution of monks in Egypt . . .	271	XXXVII. Christianity embraced by the Goths . . .	304
XXI. Firm adherence of the Scythians to the Christian faith . . .	273	XXXVIII. War between the Romans and Saracens. Conversion of the latter nation . . .	307
XXII. The Holy Ghost declared to be of the same substance as the Father and the Son . . .	274	XXXIX. Peter installed in the government of the churches of Egypt . . .	310
		XL. Death of Valens . . .	311

BOOK VII. Pages 312—359.

I. Assistance rendered to the Romans by the Saracens. Law of Gratian . . .	312	III. Dissension between the followers of Meletius and of Paulinus . . .	314
II. Elevation of Theodosius to the throne. Council of Antioch . . .	313	IV. Baptism of Theodosius. Law against diversity in religious opinions . . .	315

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
V. Expulsion of Demophilus, the Arian bishop, from Constantinople	316	sity prevailing in different churches on points of discipline	342
VI. Intrigues of the Arians. Eloquence of Eunomius	317	XX. Progress of Christianity. Demolition of Pagan temples. Inundation of the Nile	345
VII. Council of Constantinople	319	XXI. Discovery of the head of John the Baptist	346
VIII. Election of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople	321	XXII. Death of Valentinian the younger. Revolt of Eugenius	347
IX. Decrees of the council of Constantinople	322	XXIII. Sedition at Antioch. The wrath of the emperor appeased by Flavian	349
X. Humility of Martyrius. Translation of the body of Paul	324	XXIV. Victory of Theodosius over Eugenius	350
XI. Flavian ordained to the bishopric of Antioch	325	XXV. Massacre at Thessalonica. Intrepidity of Ambrose, bishop of Milan	351
XII. Attempt to establish uniformity in religion	326	XXVI. Miracles performed by Donatus and Theotimus	353
XIII. Tyranny of Maximus. The empress Justina and Ambrose. Death of Gratian	328	XXVII. Miracles of St. Epiphanius	355
XIV. Birth of Honorius	330	XXVIII. Exemplary conduct of Acacius, bishop of Bercæ, of Zeno, and of Ajax	357
XV. Demolition of Pagan temples, and consequent sedition	331	XXIX. Discovery of the relics of Habakkuk and Micah. Death of Theodosius	358
XVI. Regulations of Nectarius concerning Penance	334		
XVII. Errors of Eunomius, Theophrontius, and Eutychus	337		
XVIII. New heresy introduced by the Novatians. Feast of the Passover	339		
XIX. Digression on the diver-			

BOOK VIII. Pages 359—404.

I. Accession of Arcadius and Honorius	359	VIII. Ministry of John Chrysostom. Effects of his preaching	373
II. Account of John Chrysostom; his elevation to the see of Constantinople	362	IX. Advice given by John to Olympiade. Murmurs of the clergy against him	375
III. John establishes discipline among the clergy, and reconciles Flavian with the Pope	365	X. Dispute between Severian, bishop of Gabales, and John	376
IV. Death of Gaïnas	366	XI. Dispute in Egypt concerning the nature of the Deity	377
V. Eloquence of John. Miracle wrought by him	369	XII. Enmity of Theophilus against four monks, called the "Great Brothers"	378
VI. Asia and Phrygia visited by John	371	XIII. The monks appeal to John, bishop of Constantinople	380
VII. History and death of Eutropius	372	XIV. Books of Origen con-	

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
demned by Eugenius. He excites the people against John	381	XXIII. Arsacius obtains the bishopric of John. Persecution of the followers of John	395
XV. Conference between Epiphanius and the "Great Brothers"	383	XXIV. Cruelty perpetrated upon a reader, a priest, and a pious lady	397
XVI. Enmity of the empress against John	385	XXV. Troubles excited by Stilicho	399
XVII. Council held by Theophilus. Condemnation of John	386	XXVI. Letter of Innocent, bishop of Rome	<i>ib.</i>
XVIII. Sedition of the people. Recall of John	388	XXVII. Death of the empress Eudoxia. Death of Arsacius. Election of Atticus	402
XIX. Departure of Theophilus. Restoration of John	389	XXVIII. Efforts of Innocent to convene a council and obtain the restoration of John. Death of John	404
XX. Statue of the empress. Deposition of John	391		
XXI. Attempt against the life of John	392		
XXII. Departure of John	394		

BOOK IX. Pages 405-424.

I. Death of Arcadius, Accession of Theodosius the younger	405	XI. Defeat of tyrants in the West	418
II. Discovery of the relics of forty martyrs	407	XII. Constantine and Constans retire to Arles	419
III. Commendations on Pulcheria and her sisters	410	XIII. Maximus, at the instigation of Gerontius, accepts the insignia of imperial power	420
IV. Truce concluded with the Persians. Death of Stilicho	<i>ib.</i>	XIV. Defeat and death of Edovicus	421
V. Peace concluded with several nations, while others are dispersed	411	XV. Ordination of Constantine. His death	422
VI. Siege of Rome	412	XVI. Death of Honorius. His successors. Prosperity of the two empires	<i>ib.</i>
VII. Embassy despatched to Alaric	413	XVII. Discovery of the relics of Zechariah the prophet, and of Stephen the proto-martyr	423
VIII. Proclamation of Attalus. He yields to Honorius	414		
IX. Surrender of Rome	416		
X. Virtue of a Roman lady	417		

THE

HISTORY OF PHILOSTORGIUS.

BOOK I. *Pages 429—434.*

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
I. On the Maccabees . . .	429	VI. The conversion of Constantine . . .	432
II. Of Eusebius Pamphilus . . .	430	VII. Hosius of Cordova . . .	433
III. Election of a bishop at Alexandria . . .	431	VIII. The Nicæan council . . .	<i>ib.</i>
IV. Of Baucalis the presbyter . . .	<i>ib.</i>	IX. The Homoüsonian faith there defined . . .	<i>ib.</i>
V. The emperor Constantius	<i>ib.</i>	X. Secundus and Eusebius . . .	<i>ib.</i>

BOOK II. *Pages 434—442.*

I. Of Alexander and Arius . . .	434	X. Eusebius of Alexandria . . .	438
II. Arius composes songs . . .	<i>ib.</i>	XI. Ordination of Athanasius—his banishment . . .	<i>ib.</i>
III. Origin of the strange opinions of Arius	<i>ib.</i>	XII. The empress Helena . . .	440
IV. Death of Crispus	435	XIII. The martyr Lucian . . .	441
V. Urphilas, bishop of the Goths . . .	<i>ib.</i>	XIV. His disciples	<i>ib.</i>
VI. Indian converts to the Christian faith	437	XV. Their opinions and deeds	<i>ib.</i>
VII. Eusebius, Maris, and Theognis	<i>ib.</i>	XVI. Death of Constantine by poison	442
VIII. Agapetus, bishop of Synada	438	XVII. The Christians accused of idolatry	<i>ib.</i>
IX. Foundation of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>	XVIII. Return of Athanasius from exile	<i>ib.</i>

BOOK III. *Pages 443—462.*

I. Plots of Constans	443	IV. Constantius sends ambassadors to the Sabæans . . .	444
II. Piety of Constantine	<i>ib.</i>	V. Efforts of Theophilus	445
III. Constantius expels Athanasius	<i>ib.</i>	VI. His visit to the Auxumitæ . . .	446

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
VII. The Tigris	446	XIX. Aetius does not desire the episcopate	458
VIII. The Euphrates	447	XX. Visit of Eunomius to Aetius	<i>ib.</i>
IX. The sources of these rivers	448	XXI. He is praised by Philostorgius	<i>ib.</i>
X. The site of Paradise	449	XXII. Death of Constans	<i>ib.</i>
XI. Monsters of the South and East	450	XXIII. Sapor wages war against Rome	459
XII. Reaction in favour of Athanasius	453	XXIV. The Sucion and Julian Alps	<i>ib.</i>
XIII. Doxologies	454	XXV. Gallus sent into the East against Sapor	<i>ib.</i>
XIV. Communion of Arians with Catholics	<i>ib.</i>	XXVI. Victory of Constantius—sign of the cross seen	460
XV. Aetius and his history	455	XXVII. Gallus and Aetius	<i>ib.</i>
XVI. His discussions with Basil and Eustathius	457	XXVIII. Disgrace and death of Montius	461
XVII. Leontius	<i>ib.</i>		
XVIII. He deposes Flavian and Paulinus	458		

BOOK IV. *Pages 462—469.*

I. Death of Gallus	462	Basil discusses the faith before the emperor	465
II. Julian appointed Cæsar	463	IX. Prevalence of the Homoioussian doctrine	466
III. Liberius, bishop of Rome	<i>ib.</i>	X. An earthquake stops the synod at Nicomedia	<i>ib.</i>
IV. Eudoxius translated to Antioch	464	XI. Synod assembled at Seleucia	<i>ib.</i>
V. Eunomius	<i>ib.</i>	XII. And afterwards assembled at Constantinople	467
VI. Ambition of Basil of An-cyra	<i>ib.</i>		
VII. Theophilus recalled	<i>ib.</i>		
VIII. Theophilus banished			

BOOK V. *Pages 469—471.*

I. Deposition of Basil, Eustathius, and Macedonius	469	IV. Constantius is defeated by the Persians	471
II. Aetius removed to Ambdala	470	V. Banishment of Meletius, and consecration of Euzoios	<i>ib.</i>
III. Eunomius consecrated bishop	<i>ib.</i>		

BOOK VI. *Pages 471—474.*

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
I. Controversy at Constantinople	471	IV. He is accused before Constantius	473
II. Eunomius preaches against the virginity of the Virgin Mary	(472)	V. Rebellion of Julian and death of Constantius	474
III. Eunomius retires to Capadocia	473	VI. Julian enters Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
		VII. Julian recalls Aetius	<i>ib.</i>

BOOK VII. *Pages 474—484.*

I. Julian persecutes the Christians	474	IX. Julian attempts to rebuild Jerusalem	479
II. Tumult at Alexandria	<i>ib.</i>	X. Horrible deaths of three apostates	480
III. The miraculous image of our Saviour	475	XI. Jerusalem named Ælia	481
IV. Atrocities of the heathen. Persecutions of Julian	476	XII. Heathen oracles	<i>ib.</i>
V. Eudoxius and Aetius	477	XIII. Death of an apostate bishop	482
VI. The heretical party consecrate other bishops	<i>ib.</i>	XIV. Julian obliged to desist from rebuilding Jerusalem	<i>ib.</i>
VII. Valentinian the confessor	478	XV. His expedition against the Persians	483
VIII. The martyr Babylas	479		

BOOK VIII. *Pages 485—491.*

I. Jovian proclaimed emperor	485	XI. Basil, Gregory, and Apollinaris compared	490
II. Proceedings of Euzoios and his party	<i>ib.</i>	XII. Reply of Eunomius to Apollinaris	<i>ib.</i>
III. The bishop Theodosius	486	XIII. Calumny against Basil and Gregory	<i>ib.</i>
IV. Proceedings of Aetius and Eudoxius	487	XIV. Writings of Apollinaris	491
V. Jovian restores the churches	<i>ib.</i>	XV. Apollinaris and Novatus	<i>ib.</i>
VI. Candidus and Arrianus	488	XVI. Valens and Valentinian	<i>ib.</i>
VII. Eudoxius and Euzoios	<i>ib.</i>	XVII. Theodore and George	<i>ib.</i>
VIII. Death of the emperor Jovian	<i>ib.</i>	XVIII. Eunomius and Aetius compared	<i>ib.</i>
IX. Learning of Hypatia	489		
X. Philostorgius the physician	490		

BOOK IX. *Pages 491—500.*

I. Miracles wrought by heretics	491	III. Eudoxius and Euzoios	492
II. Moses	492	IV. Aetius retires to Lesbos	<i>ib.</i>
		V. Expedition of Valens against	

CONTENTS.

XV

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
the Persians	493	XIII. A bishop ordained at Cyzicus	496
VI. Death of Aetius	494	XIV. Demophilus and Doro- theus	497
VII. Eunomius banished by the clergy	495	XV. Heathen oracles	<i>ib.</i>
VIII. Recalled by the emperor	<i>ib.</i>	XVI. Death of the emperor Valentinian	498
IX. The family of Philostorgius	496	XVII. Death of Valens	<i>ib.</i>
X. Demophilus raised to the see of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>	XVIII. John ordained bishop of Palestine	499
XI. Eunomius banished to Naxos	<i>ib.</i>	XIX. Theodosius defeats the barbarians	<i>ib.</i>
XII. Cæsarea formerly called Mozoca	<i>ib.</i>		

BOOK X. *Pages 500—505.*

I. The Eunomians reviled	500	VIII. Theodosius and Valen- tinian defeat the usurper Maximus	503
II. Philostorgius accuses Arius of impiety	501	IX. Appearance of a star	<i>ib.</i>
III. Arian developments	<i>ib.</i>	X. Philostorgius writes against Porphyry	504
IV. Practices of the Eunomians	<i>ib.</i>	XI. Prodigies	<i>ib.</i>
V. Arcadius. Death of Gra- tian	502	XII. Fasts	505
VI. Praises of Eunomius	<i>ib.</i>		
VII. Theodosius marries Galla	503		

BOOK XI. *Pages 505—512.*

I. Murder of Valentinian the younger	505	V. His envy against Euno- mius	509
II. Death of his murderer Ar- bogastes	506	VI. Arcadius deposes Eutro- pius	<i>ib.</i>
III. Rufinus and Stilicho put to death	507	VII. Pestilences and other signs from heaven	510
IV. Concerning the eunuch Eu- tropius	508	VIII. Invasion of the Huns	511

BOOK XII. *Pages 513—521.*

I. Stilicho censured	513	VI. Rebellion of Jovian	516
II. Invasion of the East by Alaric	<i>ib.</i>	VII. Theodosius succeeds Ar- cadius	517
III. Alaric advances on Rome	514	VIII. Miraculous appearances	<i>ib.</i>
IV. The kingdoms of iron and clay	515	IX. Other prodigies	518
V. Rome enjoys a brief respite	516	X. These wonders wrought by God	<i>ib.</i>

Chap.	Page	Chap.	Page
XI. Lucian chosen as leader of the Eunomians	519	and succession of Valentin- ian	519
XII. Death of Constantius	<i>ib.</i>	XIV. Withdrawal of the bar- barian troops	520
XIII. Death of Honorius,			

FRAGMENTS.

I. Concerning Apollinaris, Ba- sil, and Gregory	521	V. Concerning Auxentius	524
II. Concerning Paneas and the Jordan	522	VI. ——— Eudoxius	525
III. Concerning Agapetus	<i>ib.</i>	VII. ——— Theophilus	<i>ib.</i>
IV. ——— Aetius	523	VIII. ——— Leontius	<i>ib.</i>
		IX. ——— Demophilus	527

PREFATORY REMARKS, BY VALESIUS,
CONCERNING THE
LIFE AND WRITINGS OF SOZOMEN.

HERMIAS SOZOMEN practised the law at Constantinople, at the same time with Socrates. His ancestors were not mean; they were originally natives of Palestine, being inhabitants of a village near Gaza, called Bethelia. This village was very populous in times past, and had most stately and ancient churches. But the most glorious structure of them all was the Pantheon, situated on an artificial hill, which was the tower as it were of Bethelia, as Sozomen relates in chap. xv. of his fifth book. The grandfather of Hermias Sozomen was born in that village, and first converted to the Christian faith by Hilarion the monk. For when Alaphion, an inhabitant of the same village, was possessed with a devil, and the Jews and physicians, attempting to cure him, could do him no good by their enchantments, Hilarion by a bare invocation of the name of God cast out the devil. Sozomen's grandfather, and Alaphion himself, amazed at this miracle, with their whole families embraced the Christian religion. The grandfather of Sozomen was eminent for his expositions of the Sacred Scriptures, being a person endowed with a polite wit, and an acuteness of understanding; and besides, he was well skilled in literature. Therefore he was highly esteemed by the Christians inhabiting Gaza, Ascalon, and the places adjacent, as being useful and necessary for the propagating of religion, and could easily unloose the knots of the Sacred Scriptures. But Alaphion's descendants excelled others in their sanctity of life, in kindness to the indigent, and in other virtues: and they were the first that built churches and monasteries there, as Sozomen says in the passage above cited, where he also adds, that some holy persons of Alaphion's family were surviving even in his own days, with whom he himself conversed when very young, and concerning whom he promises to speak more afterwards. Most probably he means Salamanes, Phusco, Malchio, and Crispio,
[SOZOMEN.]

brothers, concerning whom he speaks in chap. xxxii. of his sixth book. For he there says that these brethren, instructed in the monastic discipline by Hilarion, were, during the empire of Valens, eminent in the monasteries of Palestine ; that they lived near Bethelia, a village in the country of the Gazites, and were descendants of a noble family in those parts. He mentions the same persons in the 15th chapter of book viii., where he says that Crispio was Epiphanius's archdeacon. It is evident, therefore, that the brothers were of Alaphion's family. Alaphion, too, was related to Sozomen's grandfather, as we may conjecture : first, because the grandfather of Sozomen is said to have been converted (together with his whole family) to the Christian religion, upon account of Alaphion's wonderful cure, whom Hilarion had healed by calling on the name of Almighty God. Secondly, this conjecture is confirmed by what Sozomen relates, viz. that when he was very young, he conversed familiarly with the aged monks that were of Alaphion's family. And, lastly, from the fact that Sozomen took his name from those persons who were either the sons or grandchildren of Alaphion. For he was called Salamanes Hermias Sozomenus, (as Photius declares in his Bibliotheca,) from the name of that Salamanes who, as we observed before, was the brother of Phusco, Malchio, and Crispio. Wherefore Nicephorus, and others, are mistaken in supposing that Sozomen had the surname of Salaminus because he was born at Salamis, a city of Cyprus. But we have before shown from Sozomen's own testimony, that he was not born in Cyprus, but in Palestine. For his grandfather was not only a Palestinian, as is above said, but Sozomen himself was also educated in Palestine, in the bosom (so to say) of those monks who were of Alaphio's family. From this education Sozomen seems to have imbibed that most ardent love of a monastic life and discipline, which he declares in so many places of his history. Hence it is, that in his books he is not content to relate who were the fathers and founders of monastic philosophy ; but he also carefully relates their successors and disciples, who followed this way of life both in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, and also in Pontus, Armenia, and Osdroëna. Hence also it is, that in the twelfth chapter of the first book of his history, he has proposed to be read (in the beginning as it were) that gorgeous account of the monastic philosophy. For he supposed that he should have been ungrateful, had he not after this manner at least

made a return of thanks to those in whose familiarity he had lived, and from whom, when he was a youth, he had received such eminent examples of a good conversation, as he himself intimates, in the opening of his first book. It is inferred that Sozomen was educated at Gaza, not only from the passage above mentioned, but also from chap. xxviii. of his seventh book, where Sozomen says that he himself had seen Zeno, bishop of Majuma, for this Majuma is a sea-port belonging to the Gazites. After this Sozomen applied himself to the profession of the law. He was a student of the civil law at Berytus, a city of Phoenicia, not far distant from his own country, where there was a famous school of civil law. But he practised the law at Constantinople, as himself asserts, b. ii. chap. iii. And yet he seems not to have been very much employed in pleading of causes ; for at the same time that he was an advocate in Constantinople, he wrote his Ecclesiastical History ; as may be concluded from his own words in the last-mentioned passage. Before he wrote his nine books of Ecclesiastical History, Sozomen composed a Breviary of Ecclesiastical Affairs, from our Saviour's ascension to the deposition of Licinius. This work was comprised in two books, as himself bears witness in the opening of his first book ; but these two books are now lost.

In the composure of his History, Sozomen has made use of a style neither too low nor too high, but one between both, as is most agreeable to a writer of ecclesiastical affairs. Photius prefers Sozomen's style to that of Socrates, and we agree with him in his criticism. But though Sozomen is superior in the elegance of his expression, yet Socrates excels him in judgment. For Socrates judges incomparably well, both of men, and also of ecclesiastical business and affairs ; and there is nothing in his works but what is grave and serious, nothing that can be expunged as superfluous. But on the contrary, some passages occur in Sozomen that are trivial and childish. Of this sort is his digression in his first book concerning the building of the city Hemonia, and concerning the Argonauts, who carried the ship Argo on their shoulders some furlongs, and also his description of Daphne without the walls of the city Antioch, in chap. xix. of his sixth book ; to which we must add that observation of his, concerning the beauty of the body, where he treats of that virgin with whom the blessed Athanasius absconded a long while. Lastly, his ninth

book contains little else besides warlike events, which ought to have no place in an Ecclesiastical History. Sozomen's style, however, is not without its faults. For the periods of his sentences are only joined together by the particles δὲ and τὲ, than which there is nothing more troublesome. Should any one attentively read the epistle in which Sozomen dedicates his work to Theodosius junior, he will find it true that Sozomen was no great orator.

It remains, that we inquire which of these two authors, Socrates or Sozomen, wrote first, and which of them borrowed, or rather stole, from the other. Certainly, in regard both of them wrote almost the same things of the same transactions, inasmuch as they both began at the same beginning, and concluded their history at the same point, (both beginning from the reign of Constantine, and ending at the seventeenth consulate of Theodosius junior,) it must needs be true, that one of them robbed the other's desk. This sort of theft was committed by many of the Grecian writers. But which was the plagiarist, Socrates or Sozomen, it is hard to say, in regard both of them lived in the same times, and both wrote their history in the empire of Theodosius junior. Therefore, in the disquisition of this question, we must make use of conjecture. Let us therefore see upon which of them falls the suspicion of theft. Indeed this is my sentiment, I suppose that the inferior does frequently steal from the superior, and the junior from the senior. But Sozomen is in my judgment far inferior to Socrates; and he betook himself to writing his history when he was younger than Socrates. For he wrote it whilst he was yet an advocate, as I observed before. Now, the profession of the advocates amongst the Romans was not perpetual, but temporary. Lastly, he that adds something to the other, and sometimes amends the other, seems to have written last. But Sozomen now and then adds some passages to Socrates, and in some places dissents from him, as Photius has observed, and we have hinted in our annotations. Sozomen therefore seems to have written last. And this is the opinion of almost all modern writers, who place Socrates before Sozomen. So Belarmino in his book "De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis;" who is followed by Miræus, Labbæus, and Vossius. Amongst the ancients, Cassiodorus, Photius, and Nicephorus name Socrates in the first place. So also Theodorus Lector recounts them, in his epistle which he prefixed to his Tripartite History. Thus far concerning Sozomen.

MEMOIR OF SOZOMEN.

LITTLE more than cursory allusions to SOZOMEN occur in the works of contemporary writers ; and the materials for a memoir of his life are therefore at best but few and scanty. We should, in fact, be destitute of almost all knowledge as to his birth, education, mode of life, and private history, had not some information on these points been furnished by himself. In the work before us, the only one which has caused his name to be handed down to posterity, he draws aside the curtain which would otherwise have concealed his origin and parentage, and makes known to us a portion of his family history. He tells us (Book V. chap. xv.) that his grandfather was a native of Palestine, and of Pagan parentage ; that he, with all his family, was converted to Christianity on witnessing a miracle wrought by St. Hilarion ; and that, being possessed of great mental endowments, he afterwards became eminently useful to the men of Gaza and Ascalon, by his extraordinary power in expounding the most obscure passages of Holy Writ.

Our author himself seems to have been born about the beginning of the fifth century. He tells us that in his youth some of the founders of monasticism in Palestine were still living, although they had reached a very advanced period of life, and that he had enjoyed opportunities of intercourse with them. To this circumstance may probably be attributed the tone of reverential admiration in which Sozomen invariably speaks of the ascetic inhabitants of the desert.

The education of Sozomen was conducted with a view to the legal profession ; and he studied for some years at Berytus, then noted for its school of law. He afterwards established himself at Constantinople, and, it has been conjectured, held some office at the court of Theodosius the younger. He is reputed to have possessed some skill in the law, but it is certain that he never attained any eminence in his profession. It is

only in the character of an historian that he has rendered himself conspicuous. His first work was an abridgment of Ecclesiastical History, from the ascension of our Lord to the deposition of Licinius, (A. D. 324,) but this is not extant. The work before us seems to have been commenced about the year 443. It embraces a period of 117 years, namely, from A. D. 323 to A. D. 439. It is generally admitted to have suffered many alterations and mutilations; and this may, in some measure, serve to account for the frequent inaccuracies in point both of narrative and of chronology which pervade the nine books of which it is composed. It is evident, from the very abrupt termination of this history, that it is but a fragmentary portion of a larger work. The precise object of Sozomen in undertaking to write this history is not apparent, as exactly the same ground had previously been gone over by Socrates, if we except the ninth book of the former, which is almost entirely devoted to the political history of the times. The learned Photius prefers the style of Sozomen to that of Socrates; yet Sozomen frequently evinces great deficiency in point of judgment, and on many occasions enlarges upon details which are altogether omitted by Socrates, as unworthy of the dignity of Ecclesiastical History. To us, there is manifest advantage in possessing these separate chronicles of the same events. Facts which might perhaps have been doubted, if not rejected, had they rested upon the sole authority of a single writer, are admitted as unquestionable when authenticated by the combined testimony of Socrates, of Sozomen, and of Theodoret. And, indeed, the very discrepancies which, on several minor points, are discernible in the histories of these writers, are not without their use, inasmuch as they tend to the removal of all suspicion of connivance or collusion.

It should be added, that Sozomen is sometimes called Her-mias and Salamanes, and that it was thought by some writers that Sozomenus was not his name, but that of his father, and that he was a native of Salamis in Cyprus. For further information on the subject the reader may consult Schoell's *Geschichte der Griechischer Literatur*, vol. iii. p. 317, &c.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF
SOZOMEN.

BOOK I

CHAP. I.—CONCERNING THE JEWISH NATION.—AUTHORS TO
WHOM SOZOMEN WAS INDEBTED.

MY mind has been often exercised in inquiring how it is that other men are ready to believe in the word of God, while the Jews are so incredulous,¹ although it was to them that instruction concerning the things of God was, from the beginning, imparted by the prophets, who likewise made them acquainted with the events attendant upon the coming of Christ before they came to pass.² Besides, Abraham, the head of their nation and of the circumcision, was accounted worthy to be an eye-witness, and the host of the Son of God.³ And Isaac, his son, was honoured as the type of the sacrifice on the cross, for he was led bound to the altar by his father, and, as accurate students of the Sacred Scriptures affirm, the sufferings of Christ came to pass in like manner. Jacob predicted that the hope of the nations would be in Christ, which prediction is now accomplished; and he likewise foretold the time of Christ's appearance when he said, "The princes of the Hebrews of the tribe of Judah, the chiefs of the tribe shall

¹ *δύσπιστος*. On this word Valesius remarks that Sozomen was a great imitator of the style of Xenophon, and that he commences his work in almost the very words of the latter, in his *Cyropædia*.

² Comp. Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* b. i. ch. 4.

³ Alluding to the occasion on which Abraham entertained three angels, and interceded on behalf of Sodom and Gomorrah. See *Genesis* xviii., and especially verses 2 and 3.

fail.”¹ This clearly referred to the reign of Herod; for this king was, on his father’s side, an Idumean, and on his mother’s an Arabian, and the government of the Jewish nation was delivered to him by Augustus Cæsar and the Roman senate. And besides, among the other prophets, some declared beforehand the birth of Christ, his ineffable conception, his family, his country, and the continuance after his birth of his mother’s virginity;² some predicted his divine and wonderful actions, while others foretold his sufferings, his resurrection from the dead, his ascension into the heavens, and the signs by which each of these events was accompanied. But if any be ignorant of these facts, it is not difficult to obtain information by referring to the sacred books. Josephus, the son of Matthias,³ who was a priest, and moreover held in the highest repute by the Jews and Romans, may likewise be regarded as a notable witness to the truth concerning Christ;⁴ for impressed, no doubt, by the wonderful works wrought by our Lord, and the truthfulness of his doctrines, this writer evidently shrinks from calling him a man, but openly calls him Christ, and records that he was condemned to the death of the cross, and appeared alive again the third day. Nor was he ignorant of numberless other wonderful predictions accomplished in Christ, and uttered by the holy prophets. He further testifies that many, both Jews and Greeks, followed after Christ and continued in his love; and that the people who bear his name had never lost their corporate existence. It appears to me that, in bearing witness to these things, he loudly proclaims as the truth implied by the works, that Christ is God. It appears, too, that, being struck by the lustre of our Lord’s miracles, he was led to steer a middle course, and did not vilify those who believed in him, but, on the contrary, rather coincided in opinion with them.⁵ When I reflect on these things, I am

¹ Alluding to the dying words of Jacob, Gen. xlix. 10, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come.”

² Isaiah, vii. 14, foretells that “a virgin shall conceive and bear a son;” but he does not declare, in words, the perpetual virginity of the mother of God. The Roman Catholic Church, however, infers the doctrine from certain types in the Old Testament; such as that of “the bush which burnt with fire, and was not consumed.” (See Exod. iii. 2.)

³ Otherwise written Mattathias. ⁴ See Joseph. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 4.

⁵ See the observations prefixed to Whiston’s Josephus.

seized with profound astonishment at the fact that Christianity was not, in the first place, embraced by the Hebrews prior to its reception by any other nation. It is true, indeed, that the sibyl and certain oracles foretold what was about to happen to Christ;¹ yet all the Greeks must not on that account be accused of unbelief: these prophecies were, for the most part, written in verse, and were intelligible only to the few who by their erudition were able to understand more important truths than those commonly taught to the people. It was, as appears to me, by a Providence from above directing the harmonious sequence of events, that truth was declared, not by the prophets only, but also, in part, by men of other nations. It was, in fact, as if a musician, in order to elicit some rare melody, were to strike a supernumerary chord, or attach an additional chord to his instrument.

Having now shown that the Hebrews, although in the possession of numerous and most distinct prophecies concerning the coming of Christ, were less willing than the Greeks to embrace the faith that is in him, let what has been said on the subject suffice. Yet let it by no means be hence accounted contrary to reason that the church should have been mainly built up by the conversion of other nations; for, in the first place, it is evident that, in divine and great affairs, God delights to bring to pass changes in a marvellous manner; and then, be it remembered, it was by the exercise of no common virtues that those who, at the very beginning, were at the head of religious affairs, maintained their influence. If they did not, indeed, possess resplendent gifts of eloquence, nor the power of convincing their hearers by means of mathematical demonstration, yet they accomplished the work they had undertaken. They gave up their property, neglected their kindred, were stretched upon a cross, and, as if endowed with bodies not their own, suffered divers excruciating tortures;² neither seduced by the adulation of the rulers and people of any city, nor terrified by their menaces, they clearly evidenced by their conduct that they were supported in the struggle by the hope of a high reward. So that they,

¹ He alludes to the wide-spread belief in a coming Saviour or Conqueror, so prevalent during the reign of Augustus. See among other passages, Virgil. Ecl. iv.

² See Cave's Lives of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers, *passim*.

in fact, needed not to resort to verbal arguments; for without any effort on their part, their very deeds constrained the inhabitants of every city and of every house to give credit to their testimony, even before they knew wherein it consisted.

Since then so divine and marvellous a change has taken place in the circumstances of men, that ancient superstitions and national laws have fallen into contempt; since many of the most celebrated writers among the Greeks have tasked their powers of eloquence in describing the Calydonian boar, the bull of Marathon, and other similar prodigies which have had a real or imaginary existence, why should not I rise above myself, and write a History of the Church? For I am persuaded that, as the topic is not the achievements of men, it may appear almost incredible that such a history should be written by me; but, with God, nothing is impossible.

I at first felt strongly inclined to trace the course of events from the very commencement; but on reflecting that similar records of the past, up to their own time, had been compiled by the learned Clemens¹ and Hegesippus, successors of the apostles, by Africanus the historian, and by Eusebius surnamed Pamphilus,² a man intimately acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures and the writings of the Greek poets and historians, I merely drew up an epitome in two books of all that is recorded to have happened to the churches, from the ascension of Christ to the deposition of Licinius.³ Now, however, by the help of God, I will endeavour to relate the sequel of the history.

I shall record the transactions with which I have been connected, and also those concerning which I have been informed by persons who, from their own observation or otherwise, were well acquainted with them; and I shall embrace the history of our own and the preceding generation. But I

¹ Valesius considers this Clemens to have been the same Clement who was bishop of Rome, and the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians which bears his name, and of some books entitled Recognitiones, which were translated by Rufinus.

² See the Life of Eusebius prefixed to his Ecclesiastical History, and note on Socrates, b. i. ch. i.

³ See Memoir of Sozomen prefixed to this volume. These books are not now extant.

have sought for records of events of earlier date amongst the established laws appertaining to religion, amongst the proceedings of the synods of the period, amongst the novelties that arose, and in the epistles of kings and priests. Some of these documents are preserved in palaces and churches, and others are dispersed, and in the possession of the learned; I thought seriously, at one time, of transcribing the whole, but on further reflection I deemed it better, on account of the prolixity of the documents, to give merely a brief synopsis of their contents; yet whenever controverted topics are introduced, I will readily transcribe freely from any work that may tend to the elucidation of truth. If any one who is ignorant of past events should conclude my history to be false because he meets with conflicting statements in other writings, let him know that since the dogmas of Arius¹ and other more recent hypotheses have been broached, the rulers of the churches, differing in opinion among themselves, have transmitted in writing their own peculiar views, for the benefit of their respective followers; and further, be it remembered, these rulers convened councils and issued what decrees they pleased, often condemning unheard those whose creed was dissimilar to their own, and striving to their utmost to induce the reigning prince and nobles of the time to side with them. Intent upon maintaining the orthodoxy of their own dogmas, the partisans of each sect respectively formed a collection of such epistles as favoured their own heresy, omitting all documents of a contrary tendency. Such are the obstacles by which we are beset in our endeavours to arrive at a conclusion on this subject! Still, as it is requisite, in order to maintain historical accuracy, to pay the strictest attention to the means of eliciting truth, I felt myself bound to examine all writings of this class with great diligence.

Let not an impertinent or malignant spirit be imputed to me, for having dwelt upon the disputes of ecclesiastics among themselves, concerning the primacy and the pre-eminence of their own sect. In the first place, as I have already said, an historian ought to regard everything as secondary in importance to truth; and, moreover, the purity of the doctrine of the Catholic church is evidenced by the fact of its being the most powerful, for often has it been tested by the attacks of

¹ For an account of Arianism, see Socrates, b. i. ch. 5—9.

opinionists of antagonistic dogmas: yet, the disposal of the lot being of God, the Catholic church has maintained its own ascendancy, has re-assumed its own power, and has led all the churches and the people to the reception of its own truth.

I have had to deliberate whether I ought to confine myself to the recital of events connected with the church under the Roman government; but it seemed more advisable to include, as far as possible, the record of transactions relative to religion among the Persians and barbarians. Nor is it foreign to ecclesiastical history to introduce in this work an account of those who were the fathers and originators of what is denominated monachism, and of their immediate successors, whose celebrity is well known to us either by observation or report. For I would neither be considered ungracious,¹ and willing to consign their virtue to oblivion, nor yet be thought ignorant of their history; but I would wish to leave behind me such a record of their manner of life that others, led by their example, might attain to a blessed and happy end. As the work proceeds, these subjects shall, therefore, meet with due attention.

I now, in full reliance upon the help and propitiousness of God, proceed to the narrative of events; so here closes the introduction to the work.

CHAP. II.—OF THE BISHOPS OF THE LARGE TOWNS IN THE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE; AND HOW, FROM FEAR OF LICINIUS, CHRISTIANITY WAS PROFESSED IN SECRET IN THE EAST AS FAR AS LIBYA, WHILE IN THE WEST, THROUGH THE FAVOUR OF CONSTANTINE, IT WAS OPENLY PROFESSED.

A. D. 324.—DURING the consulate of Constantine Cæsar and Crispus Cæsar, Silvester governed the church of Rome, Alexander that of Alexandria, and Macarius that of Jerusalem. No one, since Romanus,² had been appointed over the church of Antioch on the Orontes, for the persecution, it appears,

¹ Valesius thinks that it is to be inferred from this passage that Sozomen was a monk himself.

² Who this Romanus was is uncertain, as his name does not occur in the catalogue of bishops of Antioch according to Hieronymus and Nicephorus. In one catalogue, however, in the Florentine Library, his name occurs next before that of Cyril.

had prevented the ceremony of ordination from taking place. The bishops assembled at Nicæa were, however, so sensible of the purity of the life and doctrines of Eustathius, that they adjudged him worthy to fill the apostolic throne; he was then bishop of Bercæa, a place in the neighbourhood; they, therefore, translated him to Antioch.¹

The Christians of the East, as far as Libya on the borders of Egypt, did not dare to meet openly as a church, for Licinius had withdrawn his favour from them; but the Christians of the West, the Greeks, the Macedonians, and the Illyrians, met for worship in safety through the protection of Constantine, who was then at the head of the Roman empire.²

CHAP. III.—BY THE VISION OF THE CROSS, AND BY THE APPEARANCE OF CHRIST, CONSTANTINE IS LED TO EMBRACE CHRISTIANITY.—HE RECEIVES RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION FROM OUR BRETHREN.

WE have been informed that Constantine was led to honour the Christian religion by the concurrence of several different events, particularly by the appearance of a sign from heaven. When he first formed the resolution of entering into a war against Maxentius, he was beset with doubts as to the means of carrying on his military operations, and as to the quarter whence he could look for assistance. In the midst of his perplexity, he saw, in a vision, the sight of the cross³ shining in heaven. He was amazed at the spectacle, but some holy angels, who were standing by, exclaimed, "O Constantine! by this, go forth to victory!" And Christ himself appeared to him, and showed him the symbol of the cross, and commanded him to construct one like unto it, and to retain it as his help in battle, as it would insure the victory. Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus,⁴ affirms that he heard the emperor declare with an oath that, as he was reclining, about the middle of the day, he and the soldiers who were with him saw in heaven the

¹ Compare Socrates, b. i. ch. 13, and 24.

² For an account of the treatment of the Christians by Licinius, and the war between Constantine and Licinius on their account, see Socrates, b. i. ch. 3, and 4.

³ With this chap. compare the parallel account in Socrates, b. i. ch. 2.

⁴ Compare Life of Constantine, b. i. ch. 28.

trophy of the cross composed of light, and encircled by the following words, "By this, go forth to victory." This sign met him by the way, when he was perplexed as to whither he should lead his army. While he was reflecting on what this could mean, night came on; and when he fell asleep, Christ appeared¹ with the sign which he had seen in heaven, and commanded him to construct a representation of the symbol, and to use it as his help in hostile encounters. There was nothing further to be elucidated, for the emperor clearly apprehended the necessity of serving God. At daybreak, he called together the priests of Christ, and questioned them concerning their doctrines. They opened the Sacred Scriptures, and expounded the truths relative to Christ, and showed him, from the prophets, how the things which had been predicted had been fulfilled. The sign which had appeared to him was the symbol, they said, of the victory over hell; for Christ came among men, was stretched upon the cross, died, and returned to life the third day. On this account, they said, there was hope that at the close of the present dispensation, there would be a general resurrection of the dead, and entrance upon immortality, when those who had led a good life would receive accordingly, and those who had done evil would be punished. Yet, continued they, the means of salvation and of purification from sin are provided; namely, for the uninitiated,² initiation according to the canons of the church; and, for the initiated, abstinence from renewed transgression. But as few, even among holy men, are capable of complying with this latter condition, another method of purification is set forth, namely, repentance; for God, in his love towards man, bestows forgiveness on those who have fallen into sin, on their repentance, and the confirmation of their repentance by good works.

CHAP. IV.—CONSTANTINE COMMANDS THE SIGN OF THE CROSS TO BE CARRIED BEFORE HIM IN BATTLE.

THE emperor, amazed at the prophecies concerning Christ which were expounded to him by the priests, sent for some

¹ Compare Life of Constantine, b. i. ch. 29.

² That is, for the unbaptized and catechumens; the baptized were called the "initiated" (οἱ μεμυημένοι) and "enlightened" (οἱ πεφωτισμένοι).

skilful artisans, and commanded them to remodel the standard called by the Romans *Labarum*,¹ to convert it into a representation of the cross, and to adorn it with gold and precious stones. This warlike trophy was valued beyond all others, for it was always carried before the emperor, and was worshipped by the soldiery. I think that Constantine changed the most honourable symbol of the Roman power into the sign of Christ, chiefly that by the habit of having it always in view, and of worshipping it, the soldiers might be induced to abandon their ancient forms of superstition, and to recognise the true God whom the emperor worshipped, as their leader, and their help in battle : for this symbol was always borne in front of the household legions, and was, at the command of the emperor, carried among the phalanxes in the thickest of the fight, by an illustrious band of spearmen, of whom each one in turn took the standard upon his shoulders, and paraded it through the ranks. It is said that on one occasion, on an unexpected movement of the hostile forces, the man who held the standard placed it in the hands of another, and fled ; when he got beyond the reach of the enemy's weapons, he suddenly received a wound and fell, while the man who had stood by the divine symbol remained unhurt, although many weapons were aimed at him ; for the missiles of the enemy, directed by Divine agency, lighted upon the standard, and the bearer thereof was preserved in the midst of danger. It is also asserted, that no soldier who bore this standard in battle was ever killed, wounded, or taken prisoner.

see !
}

CHAP. V.—REFUTATION OF THE ASSERTION THAT CONSTANTINE EMBRACED CHRISTIANITY IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE DEATH OF HIS SON CRISPUS.

I AM aware that it is reported by the Greeks that Constantine, after slaying some of his nearest relations, and particularly after assenting to the murder of his son Crispus, repented

¹ *Labarum* or *Laborum*. This was the name by which the standard was known to the Eastern Fathers. Gregory Nazianzen and others derive the term from "Labor." Valesius assents to this derivation, and supports it from the words of Sozomen below, adding "*Laborum dictum est, quod laboranti aciei præsidium sit salutare,*" and referring to Gretser, *de Cruce*, lib. ii.

of his evil deeds, and inquired of Sosipater,¹ the philosopher, who was then master of the school of Plotinus, concerning the means of purification from guilt. The philosopher (so the story goes) replied that such moral defilement could admit of no purification ; the emperor was grieved at this repulse, but happening to meet with some bishops who told him that he would be cleansed from sin on repentance and on submitting to baptism, he was delighted with their representations and doctrines, and became a Christian, and the leader of those who were converted to the same faith. It appears to me that this story was the invention of persons who desired to vilify the Christian religion. Crispus,² on whose account, it is said, Constantine required purification, did not die till the twentieth year of his father's reign ; he held the second place in the empire and bore the name of Cæsar, and many laws, framed with his sanction, in favour of Christianity, are still extant. That this was the case, can be proved by referring to the dates affixed to these laws, and to the lists of the legislators. It does not appear likely that Sosipater had any intercourse with Constantine, whose government was then centred in the regions near the ocean and the Rhine ; for his dispute with Maxentius, the governor of Italy, had created so much dissension in the Roman dominions, that it was then no easy matter to dwell in Gaul, in Britain, or in the neighbouring countries, in which, it is universally admitted, Constantine embraced the religion of the Christians, previous to his war with Maxentius, and prior to his return to Rome and Italy : and this is evidenced by the dates of the laws which he enacted in favour of religion. But even granting that Sosipater chanced to meet the emperor, or that he had epistolary correspondence with him, it cannot be imagined the philosopher was ignorant that Hercules, the son of Alcmena, obtained purification at Athens by the celebration of the mysteries of Ceres, after the murder of his children, and of Iphitus,³ his guest and friend. That the Greeks held that purification

¹ Or Sopater. A philosopher of Apamia in Syria, and an intimate friend of Constantine the Great, who however put him to death upon some pretext.

² Crispus was put to death by Constantine on account of a false accusation preferred against him by his step-mother Fausta. See St. Chrysostom, Hom. xv. in Philipp. Ammian. Marcellinus, xiv. 11.

³ See Sophocles Trachiniæ.

from guilt of this nature could be obtained, is obvious from the instance I have just alleged, and he is a false calumniator who represents that Sosipater taught the contrary. I cannot admit the possibility of the philosopher's having been ignorant of these facts ; for he was at that period esteemed the most learned man in Greece.

CHAP. VI.—CONSTANTINE THE GREAT CAUSES CHRISTIANITY
TO BE PREACHED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

UNDER the government of Constantine, the churches flourished, and increased in numbers, they were enriched by the benevolence and favour of the emperor, and God preserved them from the persecutions and troubles which they had previously encountered. When the churches were suffering from persecution in other parts of the world, Constantius alone, the father of Constantine, protected the Christians. I know of an extraordinary fact relating to him, which is worthy of being recorded. He wished to test the fidelity of certain Christians, excellent and good men, who were attached to his palace. He called them all together, and told them that if they would sacrifice to idols as well as serve God, they should remain in his service and retain their appointments ; but that if they refused compliance with his wishes, they should be sent from the palace, and should scarcely escape his vengeance. When difference of judgment had divided them into two parties, separating those who consented to abandon their religion from those who preferred the honour of God to their present welfare, the emperor determined upon retaining those who had adhered to their faith as his friends and counsellors ; but he turned away from the others, whom he regarded as unmanly impostors, and sent them from his presence, judging that they who had so readily betrayed their God, could not be faithful to their king. Hence, as Christians were deservedly retained in the service of Constantius, he was not willing that Christianity should be accounted unlawful in the countries beyond the confines of Italy, that is to say, in Gaul, in Britain, or in the region of the Pyrenean mountains as far as the Western Ocean. When Constantine succeeded to this government, the affairs of the churches became still more prosperous. And

[SOZOMEN.]

c

when Maxentius, the son of Herculus, was slain, the government of his provinces devolved upon Constantine; and the nations who dwelt by the river Tiber and the Eridanus, the people who were called the aborigines of Padua, those who dwelt by the Aquiline, whither, it is said, the ship of Argos was dragged, and the inhabitants of the coasts of the Tyrrhenian Sea, were permitted the exercise of their religion without molestation.

When the Argonauts fled from Æetes, they returned homewards by a different route, crossed the sea of Scythia, sailed up the mouth of some river, and so gained the shores of Italy, where they built a city, which they called Hemona.¹ The following summer, with the assistance of the people of the country, they dragged their ship, by means of machinery, the distance of four hundred stadia, and so reached the Aquiline, a river which falls into the Eridanus: the Eridanus itself falls into the Italian Sea.

After the battle of Cibalæ,² the Greeks and the Macedonians, the inhabitants of the banks of the Danube, of Achaia, and the whole nation of Illyria, became subject to Constantine.

CHAP. VII.—CONCERNING THE DISPUTE BETWEEN CONSTANTINE AND LICINIUS, HIS BROTHER-IN-LAW, ABOUT THE CHRISTIANS.—DEFEAT AND DEATH OF LICINIUS.

AFTER this battle, Licinius, who had previously respected the Christians, withdrew his favour from them, and ill-treated many of the priests who lived under his government; he also persecuted several other persons, but especially the soldiers. He was deeply incensed against the Christians on account of his disagreement with Constantine, and thought to wound him by their sufferings; and, besides, he suspected that they earnestly desired that Constantine alone should enjoy the sovereign rule. In addition to all this, we may mention that, when on the eve of another war with Constantine, Licinius, in order to prepare his mind for the event of the contest, had recourse to

¹ Or Hæmus. Compare Pliny, b. iii. ch. 18. It was situated near the Julian Alps, on the confines of Italy and Noricum.

² The battle in which Licinius was routed by Constantine, A. D. 314.

sacrifices and oracles, and that, deceived by promises of power, he returned to the religion of the Greeks. The Greeks themselves, too, relate that, about this period, he consulted the oracle of Apollo Didymus at Miletus, concerning the result of the war, and received an answer from the demon, couched in the following words of Homer :¹

Much, old man, do the youths distress thee, warring against thee!
Feeble thy strength has become, but thy old age yet shall be hardy.

It has often appeared to me that the Christian religion is supported, and its advancement secured, by the superintendence of Divine Providence ; but never was I more fully convinced of this truth, than by the circumstances which occurred at this period ; for, at the very moment that Licinius was about to persecute all the churches in his dominions, the war in Bithynia broke out, which ended in a war between him and Constantine, and in which Constantine was so strengthened by Divine assistance, that he was victorious by land and by sea. On the destruction of his fleet and army, Licinius retired to Nicomedia, and resided for some time at Thessalonica as a private individual, but was eventually killed. Such was the end of one who, at the beginning of his reign, had distinguished himself in war and in peace, and who had been honoured by receiving the sister of Constantine in marriage.

CHAP. VIII.—CONSTANTINE LEGALIZES THE PROFESSION OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, CONSTRUCTS RELIGIOUS EDIFICES, AND PERFORMS OTHER DEEDS FOR THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

As soon as the sole government of the Roman empire was vested in Constantine, he issued a decree² commanding all the people of the East to honour the Christian religion, to worship the Divine Being, and to recognise, as God alone, the one true God whose power endureth for ever and ever : for he delighteth to give all good things abundantly to those who zealously embrace the truth ; he prospers their undertakings and fulfils their desires, while misfortunes, whether in peace

¹ Iliad x. 132.

² *γράμμα δημόσιον*. The decree is given at full length by Eusebius. See Life of Constantine, b. ii. ch. 24.

or in war, whether in public or in private life, befall transgressors. Constantine then added, but without vain boasting, that, God having accounted him meet and worthy to reign, he had been led from the British seas to the Eastern provinces in order that the Christian religion might be extended, and that the worshippers of God, who had confessed His name and had remained faithful under sufferings, might be advanced to public honours. After making these statements, he entered upon other details connected with the interests of religion. He decreed that all acts and judgments passed by the persecutors of the church against Christianity should be revoked; and commanded that all those who, on account of their confession of Christ, had been sent to banishment—(either to the isles or elsewhere, contrary to their own inclination)—and all those who had been condemned to labour in the mines, the public works, the manufactures, or had been enrolled as public functionaries, should be restored to liberty. He removed the stigma of dishonour from those upon whom it had been cast, and permitted those who had been deprived of high appointments in the army, either to re-assume the command, or to remain in privacy, according to their own choice; and when he recalled them to the enjoyment of their former liberties and honours, he likewise restored their possessions. In the case of those who had been slain, and whose property had been confiscated, he enacted that the inheritance should be transferred to the next of kin, or, in default of heirs, to the church belonging to the locality where the estate was situated: and when the inheritance had passed into other hands, and had become either private or national property, he commanded it to be restored. He likewise promised to resort to the fittest and best possible arrangements when the property had been purchased by the Exchequer, or had been received therefrom by gift. These measures, as it has been said, having been enacted by the emperor, and ratified by law, were forthwith carried into execution. Christians were thus placed in almost all the principal posts of the Roman government; the worship of false gods was universally prohibited; and the arts of divination, the dedication of statues, and the celebration of Grecian festivals were interdicted. Many of the most ancient customs observed in the cities fell into disuse; and, among the Egyptians, the measure used to indicate the

increase of the waters of the Nile, was no longer borne into Grecian temples, but into churches. The combats of gladiators were then prohibited among the Romans,¹ and the custom which prevailed among the Phœnicians of Lebanon and Heliopolis, of prostituting virgins before marriage, was abolished.² As to the houses of prayer, the emperor repaired those which were of sufficient magnitude, enlarged and beautified others, and erected new edifices in places in which no building of the kind had existed previously. He furnished the requisite supplies from the imperial treasury, and wrote to the bishops of the cities and the governors of the provinces, desiring them to contribute whatever they wished, and enjoining submission and obedience to the hierarchy.

The prosperity of religion kept pace with the increased prosperity of the empire. After the war with Licinius, the emperor was successful in battle against foreign nations; he conquered the Sarmatians and the people called Goths, and concluded an advantageous treaty with them. These people dwelt beyond the Danube; and, as they were warlike, strong in numbers, and possessed of a large standing army, they kept the other tribes of barbarians in awe, and found antagonists in the Romans alone. It is said that, during this war, Constantine perceived clearly, by means of signs and visions, that the special protection of Divine Providence had been extended to him. Hence, when he had vanquished all those who rose up in battle against him, he evinced his thankfulness to Christ by zeal and attention to the concerns of religion, and exhorted the governors to recognise the one true faith and way of salvation. He enacted that part of the funds levied from tributary countries should be forwarded by the various cities to the bishops and clergy, wherever they might be domiciled, and commanded that the law enjoining this gift should be a statute for ever. In order to accustom the soldiers to worship God as he did, he had their weapons marked with the symbol of the cross, and he erected a house of prayer in the palace. When he engaged in war, he caused a tent to be

¹ A custom censured even by some of the heathens. See Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* b. ii. Compare Lactantius, *Inst. Div.* vi. ch. 20. This custom was forbidden in the East as early as 325 A. D.

² The same custom is mentioned by Herodotus (i. 94) as having prevailed in Lydia.

borne before him constructed in the shape of a church, so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship God, and participate in the mysteries.¹ Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the church. From that period the Roman legions, which now were called by their number, provided each its own tent, with attendant priests and deacons. He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's day,² which the Jews call the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicate to the sun, as likewise the day before the seventh, and commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on those days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications. He honoured the Lord's day, because on it Christ arose from the dead, and the day above mentioned, because on it he was crucified. He regarded the cross with peculiar reverence, on account both of the power which it conveyed to him in war, and also of the divine manner in which the symbol had appeared to him. He abolished the law which had prevailed among the Romans of putting criminals to death by crucifixion. He commanded that this divine symbol³ should be affixed to his image on coins and pictures; and this fact is evidenced by the relics of this kind which are still in existence. And indeed he strove in everything, particularly in the enactment of laws, to serve God. It appears, too, that he prohibited many flagitious and licentious connexions,⁴ which till that period had not been forbidden; and, in fact, made so many laws of this kind, that it would, it appears to me, be tedious to recount them, so that I shall now bring this subject to a close. I consider it necessary, however, to mention the laws enacted for the honour and consolidation of religion, as they constitute a considerable portion

¹ *Μυστηρίων*, that is to say the sacraments of the church.

² Several rescripts of the emperors Theodosius and Justinian ordain that on Sunday the law courts should be closed, as also that theatrical exhibitions should not take place. Compare Euseb. Life of Const. iv. ch. 18.

³ Namely, the cross.

⁴ He probably alludes to the law of Constantine, "de raptu virginum et viduarum." See Codex Theodos. lib. ix. tit. 24. Constantine was the first who punished the accessaries to a rape, and who disallowed the custom which permitted the ravisher to go unpunished, if he gained the woman's consent afterwards.

of Ecclesiastical History. I shall therefore proceed to the recital.

CHAP. IX.—CONSTANTINE ENACTS A LAW IN FAVOUR OF THE CLERGY AND OF THOSE WHO PRESERVE THEIR VIRGINITY.

THERE was an ancient Roman law, by which those who were unmarried at the age of twenty-five were not admitted to the same privileges as the married;¹ amongst other clauses in this law, it was specified that they were not to receive any bequests by testament, except² from their own relatives; and also, that those who were childless, were to be deprived of half of any property that might be bequeathed to them. The object of this ancient Roman law was to increase the population of Rome and the provinces, which had been much reduced in numbers by the civil wars. The emperor, perceiving that this enactment militated against the interests of those who continued in a state of celibacy and remained childless for the sake of God, and deeming it absurd to attempt the multiplication of the human species by the care and zeal of man—(nature always receiving increase or decrease according to the fiat from on high)—made a law enjoining that the unmarried and childless should have the same advantages as the married. He even bestowed peculiar privileges on those who embraced a life of continence and virginity, and permitted them, contrary to the usage which prevailed throughout the Roman empire, to make a will before they attained the age of puberty; for he believed that those who devoted themselves to the service of God and the cultivation of philosophy would, in all cases, judge aright. For a similar reason the ancient Romans permitted the vestal virgins to make a will as soon as they attained the age of six years, and the emperor was even more influenced by this example than by his reverence for religion.

Constantine likewise enacted a law in favour of the clergy, permitting judgment to be passed by the bishops when litigants preferred appealing to them rather than to the secular court,³

¹ The *Lex Poppæa*. See Tacit. Ann. b. iii.; Euseb. Life of Constant. b. iv. ch. 26.

² Epiphanius and others omit this word, "*except*." But, as Lipsius shows, there is good reason to retain it. See Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, art. *Lex Papia*.

³ Constantine makes mention of this law in his epistle to the bishops of

he enacted that their decree should be valid, and as far superior to that of other judges as if pronounced by the emperor himself; that the governors and subordinate military officers should see to the execution of these decrees; and that sentence, when passed by them, should be irreversible.

Having arrived at this point of my history, it would not be right to omit all mention of the laws passed in favour of those individuals in the churches who had received their freedom. Owing to the strictness of the laws and the unwillingness of masters, there were many difficulties in the way of the acquisition of freedom, that is to say, of the freedom of the city of Rome; Constantine, therefore, made three laws, enacting, that all those individuals whose freedom should be attested by the priests, should receive the freedom of Rome. The records of these pious regulations are still extant, it having been the custom to engrave on tablets all laws relating to manumission. Such were the enactments of Constantine; in everything he sought to promote the honour of religion: and religion was valued, not only for its own sake, but also on account of the virtue of those who then professed it.

CHAP. X.—CONCERNING THE GREAT CONFESSORS OF THE FAITH WHO FLOURISHED AT THIS PERIOD.

DURING this period of cessation from persecution, many excellent Christians, and many who had survived the recent troubles and had witnessed a good confession, adorned the churches; among these were Hosius,¹ bishop of Cordova, Amphion,² bishop of Epiphania in Cilicia, Maximus, who succeeded Macarius in the bishopric of Jerusalem, and Paphnutius,³ an Egyptian. It is said that by this latter God wrought many miracles, enabling him to expel demons and to heal divers kinds of sickness. This Paphnutius, and Maximus, whom we just mentioned, were among the number of confess-

Numidia. See also Baronius Ann. A. D. 316. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. x. ch. 7; Cod. Theodos. Tit. de Episc. leg. 2.

¹ For a further account of Hosius, comp. Socrates, b. i. ch. 7, and 13.

² Amphion is mentioned by Athanasius in his First Oration against the Arians.

³ See Socrates, b. i. ch. 8, and 11.

ors whom Maximinus condemned to the mines, after having deprived them of the right eye, and the use of the left leg.

CHAP. XI.—ACCOUNT OF ST. SPYRIDION; HIS MODESTY AND TRANQUILLITY.

SPYRIDION,¹ bishop of Trimithon in Cyprus, flourished at this period. His virtues are evidenced by the fame which still surrounds his name. The wonderful works which he wrought by Divine assistance are, it appears, generally known by those who dwell in the same region. I shall not conceal the records concerning him which have come to my knowledge.

He was a peasant, was married, and had children, yet was not, on this account, deficient in spiritual attainments. It is related that one night some wicked men entered his sheepfold, and were in the act of stealing his sheep, when they were suddenly bound, and yet no one bound them; the next day, when he went to the fold, he found them there, and released them from their invisible bonds: he reproved them for having come as thieves by night to steal the sheep, instead of having asked for them. He felt compassion towards them, and, desirous of affording them instruction, so as to induce them to lead a better life, he said to them, "Go, and take this ram with you; it is not just that all your labour should be in vain, or that you should return empty-handed after having watched all night." This action is well worthy admiration, but not less so is that which I shall now relate. An individual confided a deposit to the care of his daughter, who was a virgin, and was named Irene. For greater security, she buried it; and it so happened that she died soon after, without mentioning the circumstance to any one. The person to whom the deposit belonged came to ask for it; Spyridion knew not what answer to give him, so he searched the whole house for it; but not being able to find it, the man wept, tore his hair, and seemed ready to expire. Spyridion, touched with pity, went to the grave, and called the girl by name, and inquired where the deposit was concealed; after obtaining the information desired, he returned, found the treasure in the place that had been signified to him, and gave it to the owner. As I have

¹ Comp. Socrates, b. i. ch. 8, and 12.

entered upon this subject, it may not be amiss to mention another incident.

It was a custom with this Spyridion to give a certain portion of his fruits to the poor, and to lend another portion without interest; but neither in giving or receiving did he ever take the fruits in his own hands; he merely pointed out the storehouse, and told those who resorted to him to take as much as they needed, or to restore what they had borrowed. A certain man once came to return what had been lent to him, and Spyridion, as usual, desired him to replace it in the storehouse. The man determined to act unjustly, and, imagining that the matter would be concealed, did not liquidate the debt, but went away under pretence of having made restoration. This, however, could not be long concealed. After some time the man came back again to borrow, and was sent to the storehouse, with permission to measure out for himself as much as he required. Finding the storehouse empty, he went to acquaint Spyridion, and this latter said to him, "I wonder, O man, how it is that you alone have found the storehouse empty and unsupplied with the articles you require; reflect whether you do not now stand in need of the things which you did not restore; were it otherwise, what you seek would not be lacking. Go, trust, and you will find." The man felt the reproof and acknowledged his error.

The firmness of this divine man, and his excellent administration of ecclesiastical affairs, are worthy of admiration. It is said that on one occasion, the bishops of Cyprus met to consult on some particular emergency; Spyridion was present, as likewise Triphyllius,¹ bishop of Ledra, an eloquent and learned man, who had studied the law for many years at Berytus.² Having been requested to address the people, Triphyllius had occasion, in the middle of his discourse, to quote the text, "Take up thy bed and walk;"³ and he substituted the word "*couch*" (*σκιμπος*), for the word "*bed*" (*κράββατος*). Spyridion, indignant at this refinement upon the text, exclaimed, "Art thou greater than he who uttered the word '*bed*,' that

¹ This Triphyllius is mentioned by Hieronymus (de Scriptor. Eccles.) as the author of a commentary on the Canticle, or Song of Solomon.

² Berytus in Phœnicia was celebrated for its school of law, in which, among others, Gregory Thaumaturgus is said to have studied.

³ St. Matthew ix. 6.

thou art ashamed to use his words?" Then, turning from the throne of the priest, he looked towards the people, and said that such learning ought to be used with moderation, lest the pride of eloquence should arise. His age and honourable deeds excited respect, and he ranked high among the presbytery, not only on account of his age, but because he had been long in the priesthood.

The reception which Spyridion gave to strangers will appear from the following incident. When he was about eighty years of age, it happened that a traveller came to visit him at one of those periods of the year when it was his custom to fast, with his household,¹ on alternate days. Perceiving that the stranger was much fatigued, Spyridion desired his daughter to wash his feet and set meat before him. The virgin replying that there was neither bread nor meat in the house, for it would have been superfluous to provide such things at the time of the fast, Spyridion, after having prayed and asked forgiveness, desired her to cook some salt pork which chanced to be in the house. When it was prepared, he sat down to table with the stranger, partook of the meat, and told him to follow his example. But the stranger declining, under the plea of being a Christian, he said to him, "It is for that very reason that you ought not to decline partaking of the meat, for it is taught in the word of God, that to the pure all things are pure."² Such are the details which I had to relate concerning Spyridion.

CHAP. XII.—ON THE MANNERS AND CUSTOMS OF THE MONKS;
—THEIR ORIGIN AND FOUNDERS.

A. D. 324.—THOSE who at this period had embraced monasticism,³ manifested the glory of the church, and evidenced the truth of their doctrines, by their virtuous line of conduct. Indeed, the most useful thing that has been received by man from God is their philosophy.⁴ They neglected many branches of mathematics and the technicalities of dialects, because they regarded

¹ τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ευστάσεως. While it was Lent, and probably holy week. See Tertull. de Pat. ch. 13, and De Jejun. ch. 14.

² Acts x. 15, 28, and Tit. i. 15.

³ On the origin and growth of the monastic system, see Socrates, iv. ch. 23, and comp. Gibbon, Decl. and Fall, ch. 37, and Bingham's Christian Antiq. b. vii.

⁴ The word φιλοσοφεῖν is constantly used by the early Christian historians to signify the practice of asceticism.

such studies as superfluous, and as a useless expenditure of time, seeing that they contribute nothing towards the better regulation of life and conduct. They applied themselves exclusively to the cultivation of natural and useful science, in order that they might mitigate if not eradicate evil. They invariably refrained from accounting any action or principle as good which occupies a middle place between virtue and vice, for they delighted only in what is good and virtuous. They regarded every man as wicked, who, though he abstain from evil, does not do good. They practised virtue, not only in word but in deed, and sought not honour of man. They manfully subjugated the passions of the soul, yielding neither to the necessities of nature, nor to the weakness of the body. Being strengthened by Divine assistance, they lived in ceaseless contemplation of the Creator, night and day worshipping him, and offering up prayers and supplications. Pure in heart and blameless in conduct, they faithfully performed their religious duties, and despised such outward observances as lustrations and instruments of sprinkling, for they believed that sin alone requires purging. They lived above the reach of the external casualties to which we are liable, and held, as it were, all things under their control; and were not therefore diverted from the path they had selected by the accidents of life or by the force of necessity. They never revenged themselves when injured, nor complained when suffering from disease or privations, but rather rejoiced in such trials, and endured them with patience and meekness. They accustomed themselves to be content with little, and approximated as nearly to God as is possible to human nature. They regarded this life only as a journey, and were not therefore solicitous about acquiring wealth, or amassing more than necessity required. They admired the beauty and simplicity of nature, but their hope was placed in heaven and the blessedness of the future. Wholly absorbed in the worship of God, they revolted from obscene language; and as they had banished evil practices, so they would not allow such things to be even named. They limited, as far as possible, the demands of nature, and compelled the body to be satisfied with moderate supplies. They overcame intemperance by temperance, injustice by justice, and falsehood by truth, and attained the happy medium in all things. They dwelt in harmony and fellowship with their

neighbours. They provided for their friends and strangers, imparted to those who were in want, according to their need, and comforted the afflicted. As they were diligent in all things, and zealous in seeking the supreme good, their instructions, though clothed in modesty and prudence, and devoid of vain and meretricious eloquence, possessed power, like sovereign medicines, in healing the moral diseases of their audience; they spoke, too, with fear and reverence, and eschewed all strife, raillery, and anger. Indeed, it is but reasonable to suppress all irrational emotions, and to subdue carnal and natural passions. Elias the prophet and John the Baptist were the authors, as some say, of this sublime philosophy. Philo the Pythagorean¹ relates, that in his time the most virtuous of the Hebrews assembled from all parts of the world, and settled in a tract of country situated on a hill near Lake Mareotis, for the purpose of living as philosophers. He describes their dwellings, their regulations, and their customs, as similar to those which we now meet with among the monks of Egypt. He says that from the moment they began to apply to the study of philosophy, they gave up their property to their relatives, relinquished business and society, and, quitting the cities, dwelt in fields and in gardens. They had also, he informs us, sacred edifices which were called monasteries, in which they dwelt apart and alone, occupied in celebrating the holy mysteries, and in worshipping God with psalms and hymns. They never tasted food before sunset, and some only took food every third day, or even at longer intervals. Finally, he says that on certain days they lay on the ground and abstained from wine and the flesh of animals; that their food was bread, salt, and hyssop, and their drink, water; and that there were aged virgins among them, who, for the sake of philosophy, had refrained from marriage. In this narrative, Philo seems to describe² certain Jews who had embraced Christianity, and yet retained the customs of their nation, for no vestiges of this manner of life are to be found

¹ Valesius would prefer to read "the Platonist;" in accordance with the ancient proverb, which says "either Philo is a Platonist or Plato is a Philonist."

² Compare Euseb. Eccl. Hist. ii. ch. 17, where he attributes to the Christians what is said by Philo concerning the Therapeutæ, as these Jews were called. They were neither ascetic Christians nor yet Essenes.

elsewhere; and hence I conclude that this philosophy flourished in Egypt from this period. Others, however, assert that this mode of life originated from the persecutions for the sake of religion which arose from time to time, and by which many were compelled to flee to the mountains and deserts and forests, and adopt these customs.

CHAP. XIII.—ANTONY THE GREAT AND ST. PAUL.

WHETHER the Egyptians or others are to be regarded as the founders of this philosophy, it is universally admitted that it was carried to perfection by Antony,¹ an ascetic, virtuous, and renowned monk. His fame was so widely spread throughout the deserts of Egypt, that the emperor Constantine sought his friendship, entered into epistolary correspondence with him, and urged him to proffer any request that he might desire. He was an Egyptian by birth, and belonged to an illustrious family of Coma, a village situated near the town, called by the Egyptians Heraclea. He was but a youth when he lost his parents; he bestowed his paternal inheritance upon his fellow-villagers, sold the rest of his possessions, and distributed the proceeds among the needy; for he was aware that philosophy does not merely consist in the relinquishment of property, but in the proper distribution of it. He obtained the acquaintance of the most eminent men of his time, and strove to imitate all the virtues displayed by others. Believing that the practice of goodness would become delightful by habit, though arduous at the onset, he entered upon a course of rigid and increasing austerity, and day by day his zeal seemed to augment, just as if he were always re-commencing his undertaking. He subdued the voluptuousness of the body by labour, and restrained the passions of the mind by the aid of the Divine wisdom. His food was bread and salt, his drink water, and he never broke his fast till after sunset. He often remained two or more days without eating. He watched, so to speak, throughout the night, and continued in prayer till day-break. If at any time he indulged in sleep, it was but for a little while on a mat spread upon the ground, but generally he lay upon the ground itself. He rejected the practice of anointing with oil, and of

¹ Compare Socrates, b. i. ch. 21.

bathing, regarding such habits as likely to relax the body by moisture; and it is said that he never at any time saw himself naked. He neither possessed nor admired learning, but he valued a good understanding, as being prior to learning, and as being the origin and source of it. He was exceedingly meek and philanthropic, prudent and manly; cheerful in conversation and friendly in disputations, even when others used the controverted topics as occasion for strife. He possessed so much skill and sagacity, that he restored moderation, and stilled altercations at their very commencement, and tempered the ardour of those who conversed with him. Although, on account of his extraordinary virtues, he received the gift of foretelling future events, he never regarded this power as being superior to virtue, nor did he counsel others to seek this gift rashly, for he considered that no one would be punished or rewarded according to his ignorance or knowledge of futurity: for true blessedness consists in the service of God, and in obeying his commands. "But," said he, "if any man would know the future, let him seek spiritual purification, for then he will have power to walk in the light, and to foresee things that are to happen, for God will reveal the future to him." He never suffered himself to be idle, but exhorted all those who seemed disposed to lead a good life to diligence in labour, to self-examination and confession of sin before Him who created the day and the night; and when they erred, he urged them to record the transgression in writing, that so they might be ashamed of their sins, and be fearful lest they should come to the knowledge of others. He zealously defended those who were oppressed, and in their cause often resorted to the cities; for many came out to him, and compelled him to intercede for them with the rulers and men in power. All the people honoured him, listened with avidity to his discourses, and yielded assent to his arguments; but he preferred to remain unknown and concealed in the deserts. When compelled to visit a city, he never failed to return to the deserts as soon as he had accomplished the work he had undertaken; for he said, that as fishes are nourished in the water, so the desert is the world prepared for monks; and as fishes die when thrown upon dry land, so monks lose their gravity in the world. His deportment was polite and courteous towards all, and free from the very appearance of pride. I have given

this concise account of the manners of Antony, in order that an idea of his philosophy may be formed, by analogy, from the description of his conduct in the desert.

He had many renowned disciples, of whom some flourished in Egypt, and others in Libya, Palestine, Syria, and Arabia; like their master, they all dwelt in solitude, and subjugated themselves, and they instructed others in philosophy and virtue. But it would be difficult to find the disciples of Antony or their successors, for they sought concealment more earnestly than many ambitious men, by means of pomp and show, now seek popularity and renown.

We must relate, in chronological order, the history of the most celebrated disciples of Antony, and particularly that of Paul, surnamed the Simple. It is said that he dwelt in the country, and was married to a beautiful woman, and that, having surprised her in the act of adultery, he declared, with a smiling and placid countenance, that he would live with her no longer; that he left her with the adulterer, and went immediately to join Antony in the desert. It is further related, that he was exceedingly meek and patient; and that, being aged and unaccustomed to monastic severity, Antony put his strength to the proof by various trials; and that, having given evidence of perfect philosophy, he was sent to live alone, as no longer requiring a teacher. And God himself confirmed the testimony of Antony; for Paul manifested his illustrious character by his wonderful works and by his power in expelling demons, in which he even surpassed his teacher.

CHAP. XIV.—ACCOUNT OF ST. AMMON AND EUTYCHIUS OF OLYMPUS.

It was about this period that Ammon¹ the Egyptian embraced philosophy. It is said that he was compelled to marry by his family, but that his wife never knew him carnally; for on the day of their marriage, when they were alone, and when he as the bridegroom was leading her as the bride to his bed, he said to her, "Oh woman! our marriage has indeed taken place, but it is not consummated;" and then he showed her from the Holy Scriptures that it is good to remain a virgin,

¹ Compare Socrat. Eccles. Hist. b. iv. ch. 23.

and entreated that they might live apart. She was convinced by his arguments concerning virginity, but was much distressed by the thought of being separated from him; and therefore, though occupying a separate bed, he lived with her for eighteen years, during which time he did not neglect the monastic exercises. At the end of this period, the woman, whose emulation had been strongly excited by his virtues, became convinced that it was not just that such a man should, on her account, live in the domestic sphere; and she considered that it was necessary that each should, for the sake of philosophy, live apart from the other. The husband therefore took his departure, after having thanked God for the counsel of his wife, and said to her, "Do thou retain this house, and I will make another for myself." He retired to a desert place, south of the Mareotic Lake, between Scitis and the mountain called Nitria; and here, during two and twenty years, he devoted himself to philosophy, and visited his wife twice every year. This divine man founded monasteries in the regions where he dwelt, and gathered round him many disciples of note, whom we shall have occasion to mention hereafter. Many extraordinary events happened to him, which have been diligently recorded by the Egyptian monks, for they sought to hand down, in unbroken tradition, the record of the virtues of the ancient ascetics. I have here related a few such facts as have come to my knowledge.

Ammon and his disciple Theodore had once occasion to take a long journey, and on the road found it requisite to cross a watercourse called Lycus. Ammon ordered Theodore to pass over backwards, lest they should witness each other's nudity, and as he was likewise ashamed to see himself naked, he was suddenly, and by a divine impulse, seized and carried over, and landed on the opposite bank. When Theodore had crossed the water, he perceived that the clothes and feet of the elder were not wet, and inquired the reason; not receiving a reply, he expostulated strongly on the subject, and at length Ammon, after stipulating that it should not be mentioned during his lifetime, confessed the fact.

Here follows another miracle of the same nature. Some wicked people having brought to him their son, who had been bitten by a mad dog, and was nigh unto death, in order that

[SOZOMEN.]

D

he might heal him, he said to them : " Your son does not require my interposition ; restore to your masters the ox you have stolen, and he will be healed." And the result was even as had been predicted, for the ox was restored and the malady of the child removed. It is said that, when Ammon died, Antony saw his spirit ascending into heaven and surrounded by heavenly beings, singing hymns ; Antony regarded this wonderful spectacle with intense amazement, and on being questioned by his companions as to the cause of his evident astonishment, he did not conceal the matter from them. A short time after, certain persons came from Scitis, bringing the intelligence of Ammon's death ; and the hour in which they stated this event to have taken place was precisely that which had been indicated by Antony. Thus, as is testified by all good men, each of these holy persons was blessed in a special manner : the one, by being released from this life ; the other, by being accounted worthy of witnessing so miraculous a spectacle as that which God showed him, for Antony and Ammon lived at a distance of many days' journey from each other, and the above incident is corroborated by those who were personally acquainted with them both.

I am convinced that it was likewise during this reign that Eutychius¹ embraced philosophy. He fixed his residence in Bithynia, near Olympus. He belonged to the sect of the Novatians,² and was a partaker of divine grace ; he healed diseases, and wrought miracles, and the fame of his virtuous life induced Constantine to seek his intimacy and friendship. It so happened that, about this period, a certain person, who was suspected of plotting against the emperor, was apprehended near Olympus, and imprisoned. Eutychius was besought to intercede on his behalf with the emperor, and, in the meantime, to direct that the prisoner's chains might be loosened, lest he should perish beneath their weight. It is related that Eutychius accordingly sent to the officers who held the man in custody, desiring them to loosen the chains ; and that, on their refusal, he went himself to the prison, when the doors, though fastened, opened of their own accord, and the bonds of the prisoner fell

¹ Or Eutychianus. Comp. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 13.

² On the person of Novatus, see Euseb. Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 8, and Socrates, b. iv. ch. 28.

off. Eutychius afterwards repaired to the emperor, who was then residing at Byzantium, and easily obtained a pardon, for Constantine esteemed him too highly to refuse his requests.

I have now given in few words the history of the most illustrious professors of the monastic philosophy. If any one desires further or more exact information, he will find it in the numerous works on the subject which have been issued.

CHAP. XV.—THE ARIAN HERESY, ITS ORIGIN; ITS PROGRESS, AND THE CONTENTION WHICH IT OCCASIONED AMONG THE BISHOPS.

ALTHOUGH, as we have shown, religion was in a flourishing condition at this period, yet the Church was disturbed by sore contentions; for under the pretext of piety and of seeking the more perfect knowledge of God, certain questions were agitated, which had not, till then, been examined. Arius¹ was the originator of these disputations. He was an elder of the Church at Alexandria in Egypt, and was at first a zealous supporter of truth, yet upholding at the same time the innovations of Melitius. Eventually, however, he abandoned these opinions, and was ordained deacon by Peter, bishop of² Alexandria, who afterwards cast him out of the Church, because he reprehended the conduct of this prelate in preaching against the Meletians, and in rejecting their baptism. After the martyrdom of Peter, Arius asked forgiveness of Achillas, and was restored to his office as deacon, and afterwards elevated to the presbytery. Alexander, also, held him in high repute. He was a most expert logician, but perverted his talents to evil purposes, and had the audacity to preach what no one before him had ever suggested, namely, that the Son of God was made out of that which had no prior existence, that there was a period of time in which He existed not; that, as possessing

¹ See the parallel account of the rise and growth of Arianism in Socrates, b. i. ch. 5 to 9.

² In the Acta of Peter Martyr, (which are so ancient that they are quoted by Justinian,) it is asserted that Arius was excommunicated on account of his perverse opinions, and not, as Sozomen here says, because he sided with the Meletians. As Valesius remarks, it is somewhat strange that neither Alexander nor Athanasius make any mention of this excommunication of Arius by Peter.

free will, He was capable of virtue, or of vice ; and that He was created and made : to these, many other similar assertions were added in support of the argument. Those who heard these doctrines advanced, blamed Alexander for not opposing opinions which seemed at variance with the faith. But this bishop deemed it more advisable to leave each party to the free discussion of doubtful topics, so that by persuasion, rather than by force, unanimity might be restored ; hence he assembled some of his clergy around him, and sat down, as judge, to hear the statements of the contending parties. But it happened on this occasion, as is generally the case in a strife of words, that each party claimed the victory. Arius defended the assertions he had advanced against the Son, but the others contended that he was con-substantial and co-eternal with the Father. The council was convened a second time, and the same points contested, but they came to no agreement amongst themselves. During the debate, Alexander seemed to incline first to one party and then to the other ;¹ finally, however, he declared himself in favour of those who affirmed that the Son was con-substantial and co-eternal with the Father, and he commanded Arius to receive this doctrine, and to reject his former opinions. Arius, however, would not be persuaded to compliance, and many of the bishops and clergy considered his statement of doctrine to be correct. Alexander, therefore, ejected him, and the clergy who concurred with him in sentiment, from the Church. Those of Alexandria who had embraced his opinions were the presbyters Aithalas, Achilles, Carpon, Sarmates, and Arius,² and the deacons Euzoius, Marcarius, Julius, Minas, and Helladius. Many of the people, likewise, sided with them ; some, because they imagined their doctrines to be of God, others, as frequently happens in similar cases, because they believed them to have been ill-treated and unjustly excommunicated. Such being the state of affairs at Alexandria, the partizans of Arius deemed it prudent to seek the favour of the bishops of other cities ; accordingly, they sent a written statement of their doctrines to them, re-

¹ Valesius remarks that this statement is not supported by the testimony of any other of the Ecclesiastical writers, and accordingly rejects it.

² In Theodoret, (Eccl. Hist. b. i.) Arius alone is said to have been a presbyter, the rest of those mentioned there, according to Theodoret, were deacons.

questing them that, if they considered such sentiments to be of God, they would signify to Alexander that he ought not to molest them; but that, if they disapproved of the doctrines, they would do well to declare what opinions were necessary to be held on the points in question. This precaution was of no little advantage to Arius and his partizans, for their tenets became thus universally disseminated, and the questions they had started became matters of debate among all the bishops. Some wrote to Alexander, entreating him not to receive the partizans of Arius into communion unless they repudiated their opinions, while others wrote to urge a contrary line of conduct. When Alexander perceived that many who were eminent for their virtues, their piety, or their eloquence, held with the party of Arius, and particularly Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, a man of considerable learning, and held in high repute at the palace, he wrote to the bishops of every church, desiring them not to hold communion with them. This measure only served to increase the violence of the controversy, and, as might have been expected, the contest was carried on more acrimoniously than before. Eusebius and his partizans had often, though without success, entreated Alexander to continue in communion with them; and they considered themselves so much aggrieved by this measure, that they came to a stronger determination than before to support the doctrines of Arius. A synod having been convened in Bithynia, they wrote to all the bishops, desiring them to hold communion with the Arians, as with those making a true confession, and to require Alexander to hold communion with them likewise. As compliance could not be extorted from Alexander, Arius sent messengers to Paulinus bishop of Tyre, to Eusebius Pamphilus, who presided over the church of Cæsarea in Palestine, and to Patrophilus bishop of Scythopolis, soliciting permission for himself and for his adherents, as he had already attained the rank of presbyter, to form the people who were with them into a church. For it was the custom in Alexandria, as it still is in the present day, that all the churches should be under one bishop, but that each presbyter should have his own church, in which to assemble the people.¹ These three bishops, in concurrence with others

¹ Epiphanius says the same thing of Alexander, but he adds that, according to Dionysius Petavius, the same custom prevailed from a very

who were assembled in Palestine, granted the petition of Arius, and permitted him to assemble the people as before; but enjoined submission to Alexander, and commanded Arius to strive incessantly to be restored to peace and communion with him.

CHAP. XVI.—CONSTANTINE, HAVING HEARD OF THE STRIFE OF THE BISHOPS, AND THE DIFFERENCE OF OPINION CONCERNING THE PASSOVER, IS GREATLY TROUBLED, AND SENDS HOSIUS, A SPANIARD, BISHOP OF CORDOVA, TO ALEXANDRIA, TO SETTLE THESE DISPUTES.

AFTER there had been many synods held in Egypt, and the contest had still continued to increase in violence, the report of the dissension reached the palace, and Constantine was thereby greatly troubled; for just at this period, when religion was beginning to be more generally propagated, many were deterred by the difference in doctrines from embracing Christianity. The emperor openly charged Arius and Alexander with having originated this disturbance, and wrote to rebuke them for having made a controversy public which it was in their power to have concealed, and for having contentiously agitated a question which ought never to have been mooted, or upon which, at least, their opinion ought to have been quietly given. He told them that they ought not to have separated from others on account of difference of sentiment concerning certain points of doctrine, and that though they ought to entertain the same views of Divine Providence, yet, that any occasional variation of judgment on minor or doubtful topics ought to be concealed. He exhorted them, therefore, to be of one mind, and to refrain from contention; and added, that the dissension had grieved him so exceedingly, that he had renounced his intention of journeying to the East. It was in this strain that he wrote to Alexander and to Arius, reproving and exhorting them both.

Constantine was also deeply grieved at the diversity of opinion which prevailed concerning the celebration of the Passover; for some of the churches in the East, although they did

early time at Rome. In support of this assertion he quotes a passage from the epistle of Pope Innocent to Decennius. The passage is curious and valuable, as showing the early origin of the Parochial System.

not secede from communion with the others, kept the festival more according to the manner of the Jews,¹ and thus detracted from its glory. The emperor zealously endeavoured to remove both these causes of dissension from the church; and, with this view, deputed one who was honoured for his faith, his virtuous life, and his steadfast confession of truth, to put an end to the strife² which existed in Egypt on account of doctrine, and in the East on account of the Passover. This man was Hosius, bishop of Cordova.

CHAP. XVII.—OF THE COUNCIL CONVENED AT NICÆA ON ACCOUNT OF ARIUS.

WHEN it was found that the event did not answer the expectations of the emperor, but that, on the contrary, the breach was widened, so that he who had been sent to make peace, returned without having accomplished his mission, Constantine convened a synod at Nicæa, in Bithynia, and wrote to the most eminent men of the churches in every country, directing them to be there on an appointed day. Of those who occupied the apostolic thrones, the following were assembled at this council:—Macarius, of Jerusalem; Eustathius, who presided over the church of Antioch on the Orontes; and Alexander, of Alexandria on Lake Mareotis. Julius,³ bishop of Rome, was unable to attend on account of extreme old age; but his place was supplied by Vito and Vicentius, presbyters of his church. Many other pious and excellent men of the neighbouring provinces were congregated together, of whom some were celebrated for their learning, their eloquence, and their knowledge of literature, sacred and profane; some for

¹ They were called Quartodecimans, because they observed Easter on the 14th day after the new moon. See Socrat. Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 22, and Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 24.

² See the whole question fully discussed by Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* xx. ch. 5.

³ Valesius remarks that this is an error of Sozomen, and that for Julius we must read Sylvester, who was at that time bishop of Rome. Julius did not become a bishop until eleven years later. Cardinal Perronius proposed to read *πάλιος* (aged) instead of *Ἰούλιος*. But the word is not found in prose authors.

the virtuous tenor of their life,¹ and others for the combination of all these qualifications. About three hundred and twenty bishops were present, accompanied by a multitude of presbyters and deacons. There were, likewise, men present who were skilled in the art of disputation, and ready to assist in the discussions.² And, as was usually the case on such occasions, many priests resorted to the council for the purpose of transacting their own private affairs; for they considered this a favourable opportunity of effecting such alterations as they deemed desirable, and of presenting petitions to the emperor containing complaints against those by whom they considered themselves aggrieved. As this course was pursued day after day, the emperor set apart one certain day on which all complaints were to be brought before him. When the appointed day arrived, he took the memorials which had been presented to him, and said, "All these accusations will be brought forward at the great day of judgment, and will be judged by the Great Judge of all men; as to me, I am but a man, and it would be evil in me to take cognizance of such matters, seeing that the accuser and the accused are priests; and priests ought so to act as never to become amenable to the judgment of others. Imitate, therefore, the divine love and mercy of God, and be ye reconciled to one another; withdraw your accusations against each other, be ye of one mind, and devote your attention to those subjects connected with the faith on account of which we are assembled." After having thus urged them to cease from criminating each other, the emperor commanded the memorials to be burnt; and then appointed a day on which to commence the discussion of the questions which had brought them together. But before the appointed day arrived, the bishops assembled together, and having summoned Arius to attend, began to examine the disputed topics, each one amongst them advancing his own opinion. As might have been expected, however, many different questions started

¹ Sozomen here follows Eusebius. See his *Life of Constantine*, b. iii. ch. 9, and compare Socrates, b. i. ch. 8.

² Valesius thinks it more probable that they were drawn together for the sake of gratifying their curiosity, and quotes, in support of his view, Ruffinus, b. x. ch. 3. At the same time he admits that the opinion of Sozomen may be right, and quotes on his side the testimony of Nicephorus.

out of the investigation; some of the bishops spoke against the introduction of novelties contrary to the faith which had been delivered to them from the beginning; and those, especially, who had adhered to simplicity of doctrine, argued that the faith of God ought to be received without curious enquiries; others, however, contended that former opinions ought not to be retained without examination. Many of the bishops and of the inferior clergy attracted the notice of the emperor and the court by these disputations. Athanasius, who was then a deacon of Alexandria, and had accompanied the bishop Alexander, greatly distinguished himself at this juncture.¹

*Quoted in Strickland
225, Lives Sept. 9, 190*

CHAP. XVIII.—TWO PHILOSOPHERS ARE CONVERTED TO THE FAITH BY THE SIMPLICITY OF TWO OLD MEN WITH WHOM THEY HELD A DISPUTATION.

WHILE these disputations were being carried on, certain of the Pagan philosophers became desirous of taking part in them; some, because they wished for information as to the doctrine that was inculcated, and others, because, feeling incensed against the Christians on account of the recent suppression of the Pagan religion, they wished to stigmatize them with engaging in strife about words, and to introduce dissensions among them. It is related that one of these philosophers, priding himself on his acknowledged superiority of eloquence, began to ridicule the priests, and thereby roused the indignation of a simple old man, highly esteemed as a confessor, who, although unskilled in the arts of reasoning and debating, undertook to oppose him. The less serious of those who knew the confessor, raised a laugh² at his expense for engaging in such an undertaking, but the more thoughtful felt anxious lest, in opposing so eloquent a man, he should only render himself ridiculous; yet his influence was so great, and his reputation so high among them, that they could not forbid his engaging in the debate; and he accordingly delivered himself in the following terms. "In the

¹ The same testimony to the merit of Athanasius is borne also by Gregory Nazianzen.

² Valesius remarks that some of the details here are added by Sozomen to the plain story as it is to be found in Rufinus.

name of Jesus Christ, O philosopher, hearken to me. There is one God, the Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. He made all things by the power of the Word, and established them by the holiness of His Spirit. The Word, whom we call the Son of God, seeing that man was sunk in error and living like unto the beasts, pitied him, and vouchsafed to be born of a woman, to hold intercourse with men, and to die for them. And He will come again to judge each of us as to the deeds of this present life. We believe these things to be true with all simplicity. Do not, therefore, expend your labour in vain by striving to disprove facts which can only be understood by faith, or by scrutinizing the manner in which these things did or did not come to pass. Answer me, dost thou believe?" The philosopher, astonished at what had transpired, replied, "I believe;" and having thanked the old man for having overcome him in argument, he began to teach the same doctrines to others. He exhorted those who still held his former sentiments, to adopt the views he had embraced, assuring them on oath that he had been impelled to embrace Christianity by a certain inexplicable impulse.

It is said that a similar miracle was performed by Alexander, bishop of Constantinople. When Constantine returned to Byzantium, certain philosophers came to him to complain of the innovations in religion, and particularly of his having introduced a new form of worship into the empire, contrary to that followed by his forefathers, and by all who were formerly in power, whether among the Greeks or the Romans. They likewise desired to hold a disputation on the doctrine with Alexander the bishop; and he, although unaccustomed¹ to the art of debating, accepted the challenge at the command of the emperor; for he was a good and virtuous man, and was supported by the consciousness of his integrity. When the philosophers were assembled, and prepared to engage in the discussion, he requested that one might be chosen as spokesman, while the others were to remain silent. When one of the philosophers began to open the debate, Alexander said to him, "I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ not to speak."

¹ Valesius reads here ἀκριβής (*rudis*) in place of the old reading ἀκριβής (*accuratus*); before which, if that reading is to be maintained, the sense requires that we should insert the word μή.

The man was instantaneously silenced. Surely it is a greater miracle that a man, and that man a philosopher, should be struck dumb thus easily, than that a stone wall should be cleft by the power of a word, which miracle I have heard some attribute with pride to Julian, surnamed the Chaldean.¹

CHAP. XIX.—THE EMPEROR HARANGUES THE ASSEMBLED SYNOD.

THE bishops held long consultations; and after summoning Arius before them, inquired diligently into his doctrines, yet at the same time withholding their final decision. When at length the appointed day arrived on which the controversy was to be terminated, they assembled together² in the palace, because the emperor had signified his intention of taking part in the deliberations. On his entrance, the emperor passed through to the head of the council, and seated himself on the throne which had been prepared for him, and then motioned to the members of the synod to be seated: for seats had been arranged on either side along the walls of the palace, which was a very large and beautiful edifice.

After they were seated, Eusebius Pamphilus arose and delivered an oration³ in honour of the emperor, returning thanks to God on his account. When he had ceased speaking, and silence was restored, the emperor delivered himself in the following words:—"I give thanks to God for all things, but particularly, O friends, for being permitted to see you assembled here, for I desired most ardently to gather the priests of Christ into one place: now, it is my desire that you should be of one mind and hold the same opinions in fellowship of spirit, for dissension in the Church of God is the greatest of evils. I never experienced more poignant sorrow than when I heard that dissension had crept in among

¹ He flourished during the age of the Antonines. Suidas attests that his son Julian was so skilled in the magic art, that he called down rain from heaven, when the Roman soldiers were perishing from thirst. It should be observed that a miracle similar to the above is recorded of Attus Nævius by Livy, b. i. ch. 36.

² See Eusebius, *Life of Constant.* iii. 10.

³ Theodoret (*Eccles. Hist.* i. 8) places this oration in the mouth of Eustathius, bishop of Antioch.

you, for such an evil ought to have no existence among you who are the servants of God and the dispensers of peace. On this account it is, that I have called you together in a holy synod, and being both your emperor and your fellow-physician, I seek from you a favour which is acceptable to our common Lord; and as honourable for me to receive as for you to grant. The favour which I seek is, that you examine the causes of division, and bring the controversy to a close, and that you thus restore peace and unanimity among yourselves; so that I may triumph with you over our enemy the devil, who excited this internal strife because he was provoked to see our external enemies subdued and trampled upon beneath our feet." The emperor pronounced this discourse in Latin, and the interpretation was supplied by a bystander.

CHAP. XX.—AFTER GIVING AUDIENCE TO BOTH PARTIES, THE EMPEROR CONDEMNES THE FOLLOWERS OF ARIUS TO EXILE.

THE next debate turned upon the doctrinal controversy. The emperor gave patient attention to the speeches of both parties; he applauded those who spoke well, rebuked those who displayed a tendency to altercation, and, so far as he was able, addressed himself with kindness to all, for he was almost ignorant of the Greek language. At the close of the debate, all the priests came to the conclusion that the Son is consubstantial with the Father. At the commencement of the conference there were but seventeen who defended the opinions of Arius, but eventually the majority of these yielded assent to the decision of the council. To this judgment the emperor likewise deferred, for he regarded the unanimity which prevailed in the council to be of Divine appointment; and he ordained that any one who should be rebellious thereto, should be forthwith sent into banishment, as guilty of endeavouring to overthrow the Divine determination. I formerly deemed it necessary to transcribe the confession (or symbol, *συμβολον*) of faith drawn up by the unanimous consent of this council, in order that posterity might possess a public record of the truth; but subsequently, I was persuaded to the contrary by some godly and learned friends, who represented that such matters

ought to be kept secret, as being only requisite to be known by disciples and their instructors,¹ and it is probable that this volume will fall into the hands of the unlearned. I have not, however, entirely suppressed the information derived from my authorities, for I would not that my readers should be in total ignorance as to the decrees of the Council.

CHAP. XXI.—THE DECREES OF THE COUNCIL; THE CONDEMNATION OF ARIUS; HIS BOOKS ARE TO BE BURNED; CERTAIN OF THE ARCHIERARCHY DIFFER FROM THE SYNOD; THE PASS-OVER.

It ought to be known that the following points were settled by the synod; that the Son is con-substantial with the Father; and that those are to be excommunicated who assert that there was a time in which the Son existed not, and before which he was not, and that he was made from what had no existence, and that he is of another hypostasis and substance from the Father, and that he is subject to change and mutation. This decision was sanctioned by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; by Theognis, bishop of Nicæa; by Maris, bishop of Chalcedonia; by Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis; and by Secundus, bishop of Ptolemais in Egypt.² Eusebius Pamphilus, however, at first withheld his assent, but on further examination admitted the justice of the decree. The Council excommunicated Arius and his adherents, and prohibited his entering Alexandria.³ The words in which his opinions were couched were likewise condemned, as also a work entitled "Thalia," which he had written on the subject. I have not read this book, but have been told it is of a loose character, similar to the odes of

¹ *μυσται και μυσταγωγοί*. These were technical terms borrowed from the ceremonies of Grecian rites. See Dict. of Grecian and Roman Antiquities. Art. Eleusinia. The words of Valesius are, "Solebant antiqui, cum sacra suscipere vellent, amicos eligere iisdem sacris jam antea initiatos, qui ipsos initiandos deducerent ad Hierophantem seu Pontificem, qui sacra tradebat."

² Socrates (i. 8) asserts that these five bishops all refused to subscribe the decision of the Council of Nicæa; but the two accounts are easily reconciled; for at first indeed these five bishops withheld their assent from the Nicæan Creed, but were afterwards persuaded by the king to subscribe it. See the note on Socrates in loco.

³ He was banished into Illyricum.

Sotades. It ought to be known that although Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nicæa, assented to the exposition of faith set forth by the Council, they neither agreed nor subscribed to the deposition of Arius. The emperor sent Arius into exile, and despatched edicts to the bishops and people of every country, denouncing him and his adherents as ungodly, and commanding that their books should be destroyed, in order that no remembrance of him or of the doctrine which he had broached might remain; and the secretion of any of his writings was declared a capital crime.¹ The emperor wrote letters to every city against Arius and those who had received his doctrines, and commanded Eusebius and Theognis to quit the cities whereof they were bishops; he addressed himself in particular to the churches of Nicomedia and Nicæa, urging them to adhere to the faith which had been set forth by the Council, to elect orthodox bishops, and to let the past fall into oblivion; and he threatened those who should venture to speak well of the exiled bishops, or to adopt their sentiments. In these and in other letters, he expressed resentment against Eusebius, for having sided with the tyrant against him. In accordance with the imperial edicts, Eusebius and Theognis were banished, and Amphion was elected bishop of Nicomedia, and Chrestus of Nicæa. On the termination of the doctrinal controversy, the Council decided that the Paschal feast should be celebrated at the same time in every place.²

CHAP. XXII.—ACESIUS, BISHOP OF THE NOVATIANS, IS SUMMONED BY THE EMPEROR TO BE PRESENT AT THE FIRST SYNOD.

It is related, that the emperor, under the impulse of an ardent desire to see harmony re-established among Christians, summoned Acesius, bishop of the Novatians,³ to the Council, placed before him the exposition of the faith and of the feast, which had received the signature of the bishops, and asked

¹ *θάνατον καὶ τιμωρίας εἰς κεφαλὴν*. Valesius says that these two punishments are distinguished here by Sozomen; but he is doubtless mistaken. The figure of speech used is that known to grammarians as *Hendiadys*.

² See Euseb. *Life of Constant.* iii. 14, and *Socrat. Eccl. Hist.* i. 8, 9.

³ See above note on chap. 14.

whether he could agree thereto. Acesius answered that their exposition involved no new doctrine, and that he accorded in opinion with the synod, and that he had from the beginning held these sentiments with respect both to the faith and to the feast. "Why then," said the emperor, "do you keep aloof from communion with others, if you are of one mind with them?" He replied, that the dissension first broke out under Decius, between Novatius and Cornelius,¹ and that he considered such persons unworthy of communion who, after baptism, had fallen into those sins which the Scriptures declare to be unto death; for that the remission of those sins, he thought, depended on the will of God, and not on the priests. The emperor replied, by saying, "O Acesius, take a ladder, and ascend alone to heaven."² By this speech I do not imagine the emperor intended to praise Acesius, but rather to blame him, because, being but a man, he fancied himself exempt from sin.

CHAP. XXIII.—CANONS APPOINTED BY THE COUNCIL; PAPHNUTIUS, A CERTAIN CONFESSOR OF THE FAITH, RESTRAINS THE COUNCIL FROM FORMING A CANON ENJOINING CELIBACY TO ALL WHO WOULD HAVE THE PRIESTHOOD HONOURED.

WITH the view of reforming the life and conduct of those who were admitted into the churches, the synod enacted several laws which were called canons. Some thought that a law ought to be passed enacting that bishops and presbyters, deacons and subdeacons, should hold no intercourse with the wife they had espoused before they entered the priesthood; but Paphnutius, the confessor, stood up and testified against this proposition; he said that marriage was honourable and chaste, and advised the synod not to frame a law which would be difficult to observe, and which might serve as an occasion of incontinence to them and their wives; and he reminded them that, according to the ancient tradition³ of the church,

¹ See Euseb. Eccl. Hist. vi. 43—46.

² The same story is related by Socrates, i. 10.

³ Valesius says, that we must understand by this tradition, the custom according to which persons once enrolled among the clergy were separated "quoad torum," though not "quoad vinculum matrimonii." He asserts

those who were unmarried when they entered the communion of sacred orders were required to remain so, but that those who were married were not to put away their wives. Such was the advice of Paphnutius, although he was himself unmarried, and, in accordance with it, the synod refrained from enacting the proposed law, but left the matter to the decision of individual judgment. The synod, however, enacted other laws, regulating the government of the church; and these laws may easily be found, as they are in the possession of many individuals.

CHAP. XXIV.—CONCERNING MELITIUS, THE ORDINATIONS MADE BY HIM, AND THE JUST ENACTMENTS OF THE HOLY COUNCIL.

AFTER an investigation had been made into the conduct of Melitius when in Egypt, the synod sentenced him to reside in Lycus, and to retain only the name of bishop; and prohibited him from ordaining any one either in a city or a village. Those who had previously been ordained by him, were permitted by this law to remain in communion and in the ministry, but were to be accounted inferior in point of dignity to other clergy;¹ when by death an appointment became vacant, they were allowed to succeed to it, if deemed worthy by the vote of the multitude, but in this case were to be ordained by the bishop of Alexandria, for they were interdicted from exercising any power or influence in elections. This regulation appeared just to the synod, for Melitius and his followers had manifested great rashness and temerity in administering ordination. The synod also vindicated the honour of Peter, who had been ordained bishop of the church of Alexandria, but who was obliged to flee during the time of persecution, and had since received the crown of martyrdom.

that at this time the clergy all practised continency; and that therefore in all probability the whole story about Paphnutius is a fiction. Yet it is given in nearly the same terms by Socrates, i. 11.

¹ The Synodical Epistle of the Nicene Fathers speaks rather of bishops than of priests, when it forbids any one who had been ordained by Melitius from being appointed to a vacant see, unless elected by the vote of the people and confirmed by the metropolitan of Alexandria. See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* i. 9, and note in loco.

CHAP. XXV.—HONOUR PAID TO THE BISHOPS BY THE
EMPEROR.

At the very time that these decrees were passed by the council, the twentieth anniversary¹ of the reign of Constantine was celebrated: for it was a Roman custom to have a feast on the tenth year of every reign. The emperor, therefore, invited the bishops to the festival, and presented suitable gifts to them: and when they prepared to return home, he called them all together, and exhorted them to be of one mind and at peace among themselves, so that no dissensions might henceforth creep in among them. After many other similar exhortations, he concluded by commanding them to be diligent in prayer for himself, his children, and the empire, and then bade them farewell. He wrote to the churches in every city, in order that those who had not been present at the council might be informed of what had transpired; and addressing himself more particularly to the Alexandrians, he urged them to receive unanimously the exposition of faith which had been set forth by the council, and had been proved to be according to the Divine will by the fact that so many bishops, appointed by the Holy Spirit, had, after lengthened disputation and investigation, consented to it.

BOOK II.

CHAP. I.—THE DISCOVERY OF THE CROSS AND OF THE HOLY
NAILS.

WHEN the business at Nicæa had been transacted as above related, the priests returned home. The emperor rejoiced greatly at the restoration of unity of opinion in the church, and, desirous of expressing, in behalf of himself, his children, and the empire, the gratitude towards God which the unanimity of the bishops inspired, he directed that a house of prayer should be erected at Jerusalem, near the place called

¹ This feast, called *Vicennalia*, is mentioned by Eusebius. See *Life of Constantine*, iii. 14—16.

Calvary. At the same time his mother Helena repaired to that city, for the purpose of offering up prayer, and of visiting the sacred places. Her zeal for Christianity made her anxious to find the wood which had formed the adorable cross. But it was no easy matter to discover either this relic or the Lord's sepulchre, for the Greeks, who in former times had persecuted the church,¹ and who, at the first promulgation of Christianity, had had recourse to every artifice to exterminate it, had heaped up mounds of earth upon the holy places, and, the more effectually to conceal them, had enclosed the place of the resurrection and Mount Calvary within a wall, and had moreover ornamented the whole locality, and paved it with stone. A temple and statue dedicated to Venus had also been erected on the same spot by these people, for they imagined that those who repaired thither to worship Christ, would appear to bow the knee to Venus, and that thus the true cause of offering worship in that place would, in course of time, be forgotten; and that as Christians would be unable to frequent the place in safety, the temple and statue would come to be regarded as exclusively appertaining to the Greeks. At length, however, the secret was discovered and the fraud detected; some say that the facts were first disclosed by a Hebrew who dwelt in the East, and who derived his information from some documents which had come to him by paternal inheritance; but it seems more accordant with truth to believe that God revealed the fact by means of signs and dreams; for I do not think that human interposition is requisite when God has determined upon the manifestation of hidden things. When by command of the emperor the place was excavated, the cave² whence our Lord arose from the dead was discovered; and, at no great distance, three crosses were found and another separate piece of wood, on which were inscribed in white letters, in Hebrew, in Greek, and in Latin, the following words, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." These words, as the sacred book of the Gospels relates, were placed by command of Pilate, governor of Judæa, over the head of Christ. There yet, however, remained a difficulty in distinguishing the divine cross from the others, for the inscription had been wrenched

¹ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 17.

² Or sepulchre. The Greek word is *ἀντρον*.

from it, and thrown aside, and the cross itself had been cast aside with the others, without any distinction, when the bodies of the crucified were taken down. For, according to history, the soldiers found Jesus dead upon the cross, and they took him down, and gave him up to be buried; while, in order to accelerate the death of the two thieves who were crucified on either hand, they broke their legs, and then took down the crosses, and flung them out of the way. It was no concern of theirs to deposit the crosses in order, for it was growing late, and, as the men were dead, they cared not to remain to attend to the crosses. A more divine revelation than could be made by man was therefore necessary in order to distinguish the true cross from the others, and this revelation was given in the following manner. There was a certain lady of rank in Jerusalem who was afflicted with a grievous and incurable disease: Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, accompanied by the mother of the emperor and her attendants, repaired to her bed-side. After engaging in prayer, Macarius signified by signs to the spectators that the divine cross would be the one which, on being brought in contact with the invalid, should remove the disease. He approached her in turn with each of the crosses; but when two of the crosses were laid on her, it seemed but vanity and mockery to her, for she was at the gates of death. When, however, the third cross was in like manner brought to her, she immediately opened her eyes, regained her strength, and arose. It is said that a dead person was, in the same way, restored to life. The divine cross having been thus identified, the greater portion of it was deposited in a silver case, in which it is still preserved in Jerusalem: but the empress sent part of it to her son Constantine, together with the nails by which the body of Christ had been fastened. Of these, it is related, the emperor had a head-piece and bit make for his horse, according to the prophecy of Zechariah, who referred to this period when he said,—“That which shall be upon the bit of the horse shall be holy to the Lord Almighty.” (Zech. xiv.) These things indeed were formerly known to the sacred prophets, and predicted by them, and at length, in God’s own time, were confirmed by wonderful works. Nor does this appear so marvellous when it is remembered that, even among

the Greeks, it was confessed that the Sibyl had predicted that thus it should be,

“ Oh most blessed tree, on which our Lord was hung.”¹

Our most zealous adversaries cannot deny the truth of this fact, and it is hence evident that a pre-manifestation was made of the wood of the cross, and of the adoration (*στίβας*) it received.

The above incidents we have related precisely as they were delivered to us by men of great accuracy, by whom the information was derived by succession from father to son; and others have recorded the same events in writing for the benefit of posterity.

CHAP. II.—CONCERNING HELENA, THE MOTHER OF THE EMPEROR; SHE VISITED JERUSALEM, BUILT TEMPLES IN THAT CITY, AND PERFORMED OTHER GODLY WORKS: HER DEATH.

ABOUT this period, the emperor, having determined upon erecting a temple in honour of God, charged the governors to see that the work was executed in the most sumptuous and elaborate manner possible. His mother Helena also erected two temples,² the one at Bethlehem near the cave where Christ was born, the other near the top of the Mount of Olives, whence he ascended to heaven. Many other pious acts of hers are on record; among which the following is not the least remarkable. During her residence at Jerusalem, it is related that she assembled the sacred virgins at a feast, ministered to them at supper, presented them with food, poured water on their hands, and performed other similar services customary on such occasions. When she visited the cities of the East, she bestowed gifts on all the churches, enriched those individuals who had been deprived of their possessions, supplied the necessities of the poor, and restored to liberty those who had been long imprisoned, or condemned to exile or the mines. It seems to me that so many holy actions demanded a recompence; and, indeed, even in this life, she was raised to the summit of mag-

¹ On these oracles the reader may consult with advantage Beveridge's *Codex Canon. Eccl.* ch. 14, and the speech of Constantine “*ad sanctorum cœtum*,” ch. 18, usually appended to his *Life* by Eusebius.

² See Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. ch. 42, 43.

nificence and splendour ; she was proclaimed Augusta ; her image was stamped on golden coins, and she was invested by her son with unlimited authority over the imperial treasury. Her death too was glorious, for when, at the age of eighty, she quitted this life, she left her son and her descendants, (like her of the race of Cæsar,) masters of the Roman world. And if there be any advantage in being remembered after death, it is certain that her name will be transmitted to future generations, for two cities are named after her, the one in Bithynia, and the other in Palestine.¹ Such is the history of Helena.

CHAP. III.—TEMPLES BUILT BY CONSTANTINE:—THE CITY CALLED BY HIS NAME:—THE TEMPLE DEDICATED TO MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL.

THE emperor, always intent on the advancement of religion, erected magnificent temples to God in every place, particularly in metropolises, such as Nicomedia in Bithynia, Antioch on the river Orontes, and Byzantium. He greatly improved this latter city, and made it equal to Rome in power and influence ; for, when he had settled the affairs of the empire according to his own mind, and had freed himself from foreign foes, he resolved upon founding a city which should be called by his own name, and should be equal in celebrity to Rome. With this intention he repaired to a plain at the foot of Troy, near the Hellespont, above the tomb of Ajax, where, it is said, the Achæians intrenched themselves when besieging Troy ; and here he laid the plan of a large and beautiful city, and built the gates on an elevated spot of ground, whence they are still visible from the sea to mariners. But when he had advanced thus far, God appeared to him by night, and commanded him to seek another site for his city. Led by the hand of God, he arrived at Byzantium in Thrace, beyond Chalcedon in Bithynia, and here he was desired to build his city, and to render it worthy of the name of Constantine. In obedience to the command of God, he therefore enlarged the city formerly called Byzantium, and surrounded it with high walls ;² he also erected magnificent dwelling-houses, and being aware that the former

¹ See Procopius *Cæsariensis de Ædificiis*, p. 96.

² A. D. 325. Compare Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.* i. 16.

population was insufficient for so great a city, he peopled it with men of rank and their households, whom he summoned thither from Rome and from other countries. He imposed taxes¹ to cover the expenses of building and adorning the city, and of supplying its inhabitants with food. He erected all requisite edifices, a hippodrome, fountains, porticoes, and other beautiful embellishments. He named it Constantinople and New Rome, and constituted it the Roman capital for all the inhabitants of the North, the South, the East, and the shores of the Mediterranean, from the cities on the Danube, and from Epidamnus and the Ionian Gulf, to Cyrene and that part of Libya called Bonium.² He created another senate, which he endowed with the same honours and privileges as that of Rome, and he sought to render the city which bore his name equal in every respect to that of Rome in Italy: nor were his wishes thwarted, for, by the assistance of God, it became the most populous and wealthy of cities. I know of no cause to account for this extraordinary aggrandizement, unless it be the piety of the builder and of the inhabitants, and their compassion and liberality towards the poor. The zeal they manifested for Christianity was so great that many of the Jewish inhabitants, and most of the Greeks, were converted. As this city became the capital of the empire during the period of religious prosperity, it was not polluted by altars, Grecian temples, nor sacrifices; and although Julian authorized the introduction of idolatry for a short space of time, it soon afterwards became extinct. Constantine further honoured this new city of Christ by adorning it with numerous and magnificent houses of prayer, in which the Deity vouchsafed to bless the efforts of the emperor by giving sensible manifestations of His presence. According to the general opinion of foreigners and citizens, the most remarkable of these edifices was that built in a place called Hestiis, but since named Michaelius. This place lies to the right of those who navigate the Pontus to Constantinople, and is about thirty-five stadia distant from that city by

¹ φόροι. Valesius thinks that Sozomen is mistaken as to the first of these taxes.

² Valesius remarks that on this point too Sozomen is mistaken; for when Constantine transferred the imperial power from Rome to Byzantium, he made no alteration in the limits of the empire. It was his sons who afterwards divided the empire into East and West.

water, but if you make the circuit of the bay, the distance is seventy stadia and upwards. It is generally believed that Michael, the divine archangel, once appeared at this place, and hence its name. And I too can join my testimony to theirs who assert that the power of Michael was manifest in this place. This was evidenced by many wonderful works;¹ for those who had fallen into inevitable peril, those who were oppressed with heavy calamities, or who were suffering from disease and sorrow, there prayed to God, and met with immediate deliverance. I should be prolix were I to give details of these miraculous cures. But I cannot omit mentioning the case of Aquiline, who is an advocate in the same court of justice as that to which we belong,² and who is even at the present time residing with us. I shall relate what I saw myself, and what I heard from him concerning this occurrence. Being attacked with a severe fever, arising from disordered bile, the physicians administered an aperient medicine. This he vomited, and, by the effort of vomiting, diffused the bile, which tinged his countenance with its own colour. He had no power to retain his food, and continued a long time in this state; the skill of the physicians was utterly ineffectual. Finding that he was already half dead, he commanded his servant to carry him to the house of prayer; for he said, that there he would either die or be freed from his disease. While he was lying there, a Divine Power³ appeared to him by night, and commanded him to dip his foot in a confection made of honey, wine, and pepper. The man did so, and was freed from his complaint, although the prescription was contrary to the professional rules of the physicians, a confection of so very hot a nature being considered adverse to a bilious disorder. I have also heard that Probianus, one of the physicians of the palace, who was suffering greatly from a disease in the feet, likewise met with deliverance from sickness at this place, and was accounted worthy of being visited with a Divine and wonderful vision. He had formerly been attached to the Grecian superstitions, but afterwards became a Christian; yet, while he

¹ Valesius takes *ἄλλων* as masculine, and would understand it to mean "by many other persons."

² *ἀγορεύοντι*. This shows that Socrates was an advocate in the law courts at the very time of his writing this history.

³ *δύναμις*.

admitted the probability of the rest of our doctrines, he could not understand how, by the Divine cross, the salvation of all is effected. While his mind was in doubt on this subject, the symbol of the cross,¹ which lay on the altar of this church, was pointed out to him in the Divine vision, and he heard a voice openly declaring, that, as Christ had been crucified on the cross, the necessities of the human race, or of individuals, whatsoever they might be, could not be met by the ministration of angels or of good men; for that there was no power to help apart from the cross. I have only recorded a few of the incidents which I know to have taken place in this temple: I shall not now recount them all.

CHAP. IV.—CONSTANTINE THE GREAT ABOLISHES SUPERSTITION, AND BUILDS A TEMPLE.

I CONSIDER it necessary to detail the proceedings of Constantine in relation to what is called the Oak of Mamre.² This place is now called Terebinthus, and is about fifteen stadia distant from Hebron, which lies to the south, but is two hundred and fifty stadia distant from Jerusalem. It is recorded, that here the Son of God appeared to Abraham, with two angels, who had been sent against Sodom, and foretold the birth of his son. Here the inhabitants of the country, and of the regions round Palestine, the Phœnicians and the Arabians, assemble annually during the summer season to keep a feast;³ and many others, both buyers and sellers, resort thither on account of the fair. Indeed this feast is diligently frequented by all nations; by the Jews, because they boast of their descent from the patriarch Abraham; by the Greeks, because angels there appeared to men; and by Christians, because He who, for the salvation of mankind, was born of a virgin, there manifested himself to a godly man. This place was moreover honoured as the scene of divers religious exercises. Here some prayed to the God of all; some called upon the angels, poured out wine, burnt

¹ Moveable crosses of silver or gold were always erected on the altars of churches. See Gretser, de Cruce, lib. ii. ch. 13.

² See Euseb. Life of Const. iii. 51—53.

³ See Euseb. Life of Const. iii. 53, and the note of Valesius in loco

incense, or offered an ox, or he-goat, a sheep, or a cock : for they were all intent upon offering at this feast, for themselves and their neighbours, the most precious and beautiful sacrifices. And either from honour to the place, or from fear of Divine wrath, they all abstained from coming near their wives, although the women made their appearance at the feast, and were then more than ordinarily studious of their deportment and attire. Nor did they act imprudently in any other respect, although the tents were contiguous to each other, and they all lay promiscuously together. The place being under cultivation, contains no houses, with the exception of the buildings around Abraham's oak and well. No one during the time of the feast drew water from that well, for, according to Grecian superstition, some placed burning lamps near it ; some offered wine and libations ; and others, gold, myrrh, or incense : hence, as I suppose, the water was rendered useless by the variety of things cast into it. Whilst these proceedings were being carried on with usual solemnity by the Greeks, the mother-in-law of Constantine visited the place, and apprized the emperor of what was being done. On receiving this information, he rebuked the bishops of Palestine in no measured terms, because they had neglected their duty, and had permitted a holy place to be defiled by impure libations and sacrifices ; and he expressed his godly indignation in an epistle which he wrote on the subject to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, to Eusebius Pamphilus, and to the bishops of Palestine. He commanded these bishops to hold a conference on this subject with the Phœnician bishops, and to issue directions for the demolition of the altar, the destruction of the images by fire, and the erection of a church worthy of so ancient and so holy a place. The emperor finally enjoined that no libations or sacrifices should be offered on the spot, but that it should be exclusively devoted to the worship of God according to the law of the church ; and that if any attempt should be made to restore the former rites, the bishops were to inform against the delinquent, in order that he might be subjected to the greatest punishment. The governors and priests of Christ strictly enforced the injunctions contained in the emperor's letter.

CHAP. V.—CONSTANTINE DESTROYS THE PLACES DEDICATED TO THE IDOLS, AND PERSUADES THE PEOPLE TO EMBRACE CHRISTIANITY.

As many nations and cities throughout the empire retained a feeling of veneration and fear towards their vain idols, which led them to disregard the doctrines of the Christians, and to cling to their ancient customs, and the manners and feasts of their fathers, it appeared necessary to the emperor to teach the governors to suppress their superstitious rites of worship. He thought that this would be easily accomplished if he could get them to despise their temples and the images contained therein. To carry this project into execution, he did not require military aid; for Christian men belonging to the palace went from city to city, bearing letters from the emperor commanding obedience to the decrees. The people were induced to remain passive from the fear that, if they resisted these edicts, they, their wives, and their children, would be exposed to evil. The priests and those who had the charge of the temples, being unsupported by the multitude, brought out from the most secret places of concealment their most precious treasures, and the idols called *διοπερη*,¹ while recesses known only to the priests, and wherein the people were never admitted, were thrown open to all who desired to enter. Such of the images as were constructed of the precious metals, and whatever else was valuable, were purified by fire, and became public property. The brazen images which were skilfully wrought were carried to the city and named after the emperor, and placed there as objects of embellishment, where they may still be seen in public places, as in the Forum, the Hippodrome, and the palace. Amongst them was the statue of Apollo by which the Pythoness divined, and likewise the statues of the Muses from Helicon, the tripods from Delphos, and the much-extolled Pan,² which Pausanias the Lacedæmonian and the Grecian cities erected after the war against the

¹ i. e. "Sent down from heaven." Such were the Palladium of Troy; the Ancile at Rome; and "the image" of Diana "which fell down from Jupiter," mentioned in Acts xix. 35.

² Herodotus (ix. 81) tells us that after the battle at Plataea, B. C. 479, Pausanias and the other powers of Greece erected a Tripod in honour of Apollo; but neither he nor any of the Greek historians make any mention of Pan.

Medes. As to the temples, some were stripped of their doors, others of their roofs, and others were neglected, allowed to fall into ruin, or destroyed. The temple of *Æsculapius* in *Ægis*, a city of Cilicia, and that of *Venus* at *Aphaca*, near Mount Lebanon and the river *Adonis*, were uprooted from their foundations. Both of these temples were most highly honoured and revered by the ancients; in the former, it was said, the demon manifested himself by night, and healed the diseases of the sick. And at *Aphaca*, it was believed that on a certain prayer being uttered on a given day, a fire like a star descended from the top of Lebanon, and sunk into the neighbouring river; this phenomenon they sometimes called *Urania*, and sometimes *Venus*. The efforts of the emperor succeeded to the utmost of his anticipations; for, on beholding the objects of their former reverence and fear boldly cast down and stuffed with straw and hay, the people were led to despise what they had previously venerated, and to blame the erroneous opinion of their ancestors. Others, envious at the honour in which Christians were held by the emperor, deemed it necessary to conform to the imperial institutions. Others devoted themselves to an examination of Christianity, and by means of signs, of dreams, or of conferences with monks and bishops, were led to a conviction of its truth. From this period, nations and citizens spontaneously renounced their former superstitions. A port of *Gaza*, called *Majuna*, wherein idolatry and ancient ceremonies had been hitherto upheld, was now distinguished by the alacrity with which its inhabitants suddenly and universally embraced Christianity; the emperor, in honour of their piety, raised their town to the rank of a city, a distinction which it had not formerly enjoyed, and, because of its godliness, bestowed upon it the name of *Constantia*, after one of his children who was more beloved by him than the others. On the same account, also, *Constantine* in *Phœnicia* is known to have received its name from the emperor. But it would not be convenient to record every instance of this kind, as the inhabitants of many cities about this time embraced Christianity spontaneously, without any edict being issued to that effect by the emperor, overturned the adjacent temples and statues, and erected houses of prayer.

CHAP. VI.—UNDER CONSTANTINE THE NAME OF CHRIST IS
SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

THE church having been in this manner spread throughout the whole Roman world, religion was introduced even among the barbarians themselves. The tribes on both sides of the Rhine had embraced Christianity, as likewise the Celts and the Gauls who dwelt upon the most distant shores of the ocean; the Goths, too, and the tribes who formerly dwelt on both sides of the Danube, had long been converted to Christianity, and were distinguished by their superiority in manners and customs. All the barbarians had professed to hold the Christian doctrines in honour, from the time of the wars between the Romans and foreign tribes, under the government of Gallus and the emperors who succeeded him.¹ For when a multitude collected out of various nations passed over from Thrace into Asia, and when other barbarians colonized the boundaries of the Roman empire, many priests of Christ who had been taken captive dwelt among these tribes; and during their residence among them healed the sick, and cleansed those who were possessed of demons, by the name of Christ, and by calling on the Son of God; moreover they led a holy and blameless life, and excited envy by their virtues. The barbarians, amazed at the exemplary conduct and wonderful works of these holy men, thought that it would be prudent on their part, and pleasing to the Deity, if they imitated their example: and accordingly, like them, they rendered homage to the Supreme Being. After having been thus practically taught, they received further instruction, were baptized, and admitted into the church.

CHAP. VII.—HOW THE IBERIANS RECEIVED THE FAITH OF
CHRIST.

It is said that during this reign the Iberians,² a large and

¹ It is clear that the Christian faith was very widely spread among the barbarians even at an earlier period than that which is here mentioned. See Justin Martyr's Dialogue cum Tryphone, and Tertullian, Apol. ch. 37, and Adv. Jud. ch. 7, 8.

² By the Iberians we are to understand, not the people of Spain, (for they had a church among them as early as the time of Irenæus. See Adv. Hæres. i. 3,) but the people of that name in Asia. Comp. Socrates, i. 20.

warlike barbarian nation, were converted to Christianity. They dwelt to the north, beyond Armenia. A Christian woman, who had been taken captive, induced them to renounce the religion of their fathers. She was very faithful and godly, and did not, amongst foreigners, remit her accustomed routine of religious duty. To fast, to pray night and day, and to praise God, constituted her delight. The barbarians inquired as to the motives of her self-denial: she simply answered, that it was necessary in this way to worship the Son of God: but the name of him who was to be worshipped, and the manner of worshipping, appeared strange to them. It happened that a boy of the country was taken ill, and his mother, according to the custom of the Iberians, took him from house to house, in hope that some one might be found capable of curing the disease, and of removing it easily and expeditiously. As no one capable of healing him could be found, the boy was brought to the captive, and she said, "As to medicines, I have neither experience nor knowledge, nor am I acquainted with the mode of applying ointments or plaisters; but, O woman, I believe that Christ whom I worship, the true and great God, is the Saviour of thy child." Then she prayed for him, and freed him from the disease, although just before it was believed that he was about to die. A little while after, the wife of the governor of the nation was, by an incurable disease, brought nigh unto death, yet she too was saved in the same manner; and thus did this captive make known Christ as the Dispenser of health, and as the Lord of life, of power, and of all things. The governor's wife, convinced by her own personal experience, believed the words of the captive, held her in much honour, and embraced the Christian religion. The king, astonished at the celerity of the cure and the power of faith, sought an explanation of the occurrence from his wife, and commanded that the captive should be rewarded with gifts. "Of gifts," said the queen, "her estimate is very low, whatever may be their value; nothing is valuable in her eyes, but the services she renders to God. Therefore if we wish to gratify her, or desire to do what is safe and right, let us also worship God, who is mighty and a Saviour, and who, at his will, gives continuance unto kings, casts down the high, renders the illustrious abject, and delivers the oppressed from evil." The queen continued to

argue in this excellent manner, but the sovereign of Iberia remained in doubt and unconvinced, for he was not only prejudiced against the doctrines, on account of their novelty, but was also attached to the religion of his fathers. A little while after, he went into the woods with his attendants, on a hunting excursion; all of a sudden thick clouds arose, which dispersed themselves through the air, and concealed the heavens and the sun: profound darkness like unto night pervaded the wood. Each of the hunters, alarmed for his own safety, sought refuge in a different direction. The king, while thus wandering alone, thought of Christ, as men are wont to do in times of danger. He determined that if he should be delivered from his present emergency, he would walk before God and worship him. At the very instant that these thoughts were upon his mind, the darkness was dissipated, the air became serene, the rays of the sun penetrated into the wood, and the king went out in safety. He informed his wife of the event that had befallen him, sent for the captive, and commanded her to teach him in what way he ought to worship Christ. After having received her instructions, he called together his subjects, and declared to them plainly the divine mercies which had been vouchsafed to himself and to his wife, and, although uninitiated, he declared to the rulers the doctrines of Christ. The whole nation was persuaded to embrace Christianity, the men being convinced by the representations of the king, and the women by those of the queen and the captive. The erection of a church was immediately commenced with the joyful consent of the whole nation. When the external walls were completed, machines were brought to raise up the columns, and fix them upon their pedestals. It is related, that when the first and second columns had been elevated by these means, great difficulty was found in fixing the third column, neither art nor physical strength being of any avail, although many were assembled to render assistance. When evening came on, the female captive remained alone on the spot, and she continued there throughout the night, interceding with God that the erection of the columns might be easily accomplished. The king and all the assistants had taken their departure, for they were distressed at the failure of their attempt; the column was only half raised, and one end of it was so imbedded in the earth that it was impossible to move it. It

was God's will that by this, as well as by the preceding miracle, the Iberians should be still further confirmed in the truth concerning himself. Early in the morning, when they re-assembled at the church, they beheld a wonderful spectacle, which seemed to them as a dream. The column, which before had been immoveable, was now erect, and elevated a small space above its proper place. All present were struck with admiration, and confessed, with one consent, that Christ alone is the true God. Whilst they were all looking on, the column descended, and became fixed, as by machinery, on its proper foundation. The other columns were then erected with ease, and the Iberians completed the structure with great alacrity. The church having been thus speedily built, the Iberians, at the recommendation of the captive, sent ambassadors to the emperor Constantine, bearing proposals for fellowship and friendship, and requesting that priests might be sent to their nation. On their arrival, the ambassadors related the events that had transpired, by which the whole nation had been led to worship Christ. The emperor of the Romans was delighted with the embassy, and after acceding to every request that was proffered, dismissed the ambassadors. Thus did the Iberians receive the knowledge of Christ, which they faithfully retain to the present day.

CHAP. VIII.—HOW THE ARMENIANS AND PERSIANS EMBRACED CHRISTIANITY.

SUBSEQUENTLY, the Christian religion became known to the neighbouring tribes, and was very greatly disseminated.¹ The Armenians were the first to embrace Christianity. It is said, that Tiridates, the sovereign of that nation, was converted by means of a miracle which was wrought in his own house; and that he issued commands to all the rulers, by a herald, to adopt the same religion.² I think that the introduction of Christianity among the Persians³ was owing to

¹ This paragraph is regarded by Valesius as spurious.

² Here follows in the Greek text a repetition, word for word, of the first two lines of this chapter, which seems to be superfluous, if we do not reject the paragraph above.

³ It is certain from Eusebius, (Eccl. Hist. iii. 23,) that the Christian faith was planted in Persia as early as the Apostolic age.

the intercourse which these people held with the Osdroenians and Armenians; for it is likely that by associating with such divine men they were stimulated to imitate their virtues.

CHAP. IX.—SAPOR, KING OF PERSIA, IS EXCITED AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS. SYMEON, BISHOP OF PERSIA, AND USTHAZANES, A EUNUCH, SUFFER THE AGONY OF MARTYRDOM.

WHEN, in course of time, the Christians increased in number, assembled as churches, and appointed priests and deacons, the Magi, who had from time immemorial acted as priests of the Persian religion, became deeply incensed against them. The Jews, who, through envy, are in some way naturally opposed to the Christian religion, were likewise offended. They therefore brought accusations before Sapor, the reigning sovereign, against Symeon, who was then archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, royal cities of Persia, and charged him with being a friend of the Cæsar of the Romans, and with communicating the affairs of the Persians to him. Sapor believed these accusations, and at first imposed intolerably oppressive taxes upon the Christians, although he knew that the generality of them had voluntarily embraced poverty. He appointed cruel men to exact these taxes, hoping that, by the want of necessaries, and the atrocity of the tax-gatherers, they might be compelled to abjure their religion; for this was his aim. Afterwards, however, he commanded that the priests and ministers of God should be slain with the sword. The churches were demolished, their vessels were deposited in the treasury, and Symeon was arrested as a traitor to the kingdom and the religion of the Persians. Thus the Magi, with the co-operation of the Jews, quickly destroyed the houses of prayer. Symeon, on his apprehension, was bound with chains and brought before the king. There he evinced the excellence and firmness of his character; for when Sapor commanded that he should be led away to the torture, he did not fear, and would not prostrate himself. The king, greatly exasperated, demanded why he did not prostrate himself as he had done formerly. Symeon replied, that formerly he was not led away bound, in order that he might abjure the truth of God, and therefore did not then object to pay the customary

respect to royalty ; but that on the present occasion it would not be proper for him to do so : for he stood there in defence of godliness and of the one true faith. When he ceased speaking, the king commanded him to worship the sun, promising, as an inducement, to bestow gifts upon him, and to raise him to honour ; but on the other hand, threatening, in case of non-compliance, to visit him and the whole body of Christians with destruction. When the king found that promises and menaces were alike unavailing, and that Symeon firmly refused to worship the sun, or to betray his religion, he remanded him to prison, probably imagining that, if kept for a time in bonds, he would change his mind.

When Symeon was being conducted to prison, Usthazanes, an aged eunuch, the foster-father of Sapor, and superintendent of the palace, who happened to be sitting at the gates of the palace, arose to do him reverence. Symeon reproachfully forbade him, in a loud and haughty voice, averted his countenance, and passed by ; for the eunuch had been formerly a Christian, but had recently yielded to authority and worshipped the sun. This conduct so affected the eunuch, that he wept aloud, laid aside the white garment with which he was robed, and clothed himself, as a mourner, in black ; he then seated himself in front of the palace, crying and groaning, and saying, "Woe is me ! what must not await me ? for I have denied God, and on this account Symeon, formerly my familiar friend, does not think me worthy of being spoken to, but turns away and hastens from me." When Sapor heard of what had occurred, he called the eunuch to him, and inquired into the cause of his grief, and asked him whether any calamity had befallen his family. Usthazanes replied and said, "O king, nothing has occurred to my family, but I would rather have suffered any other affliction whatsoever than that which has befallen me. Now I mourn because I am alive, and ought to have been dead long ago ; yet I still see the sun which, not voluntarily, but to please thee, I professed to worship. Therefore, on both accounts, it is just that I should die, for I have been a betrayer of Christ, and a deceiver of thee." He then swore by the Maker of heaven and earth, that he would never swerve from his convictions. Sapor, astonished at the wonderful conversion of the eunuch, was still more enraged against the Christians, as if they had effected it by enchantments. Still,

[SOZOMEN.]

F

he compassionated the old man, and strove by alternate gentleness and severity to bring him over to his own sentiments. But finding that his efforts were useless, and that Usthazanes persisted in declaring that he would never have the folly to worship the creature instead of the Creator, he became inflamed with passion, and commanded that the eunuch's head should be struck off with a sword. When the executioners came forward to perform their office, Usthazanes requested them to wait a little, that he might communicate something to the king. He then called upon a certain faithful eunuch to convey the following address to Sapor: "From my youth until now I have been well affected, O king, to your house, and have ministered with care and diligence to your father and yourself. I need no witnesses to corroborate my statements, these facts are well established. For all the matters wherein at divers times I have gladly served you, grant me this reward; let it not be imagined by those who are ignorant of the circumstances, that I have incurred this punishment by acts of unfaithfulness against the state, or by the commission of any other crime; but let it be published and proclaimed abroad by a herald that Usthazanes loses his head for no crime that he has ever committed in the palace, but for being a Christian, and for refusing to obey the king in denying his own God." The eunuch delivered this message, and Sapor, according to the request of Usthazanes, commanded a herald to make the desired proclamation. The king imagined that others would be easily deterred from embracing Christianity, by reflecting that he who sacrificed his aged foster-father and esteemed household servant would assuredly spare no other Christian. Usthazanes, however, believed that as, by his timidity in consenting to worship the sun, he had caused many Christians to fear, so now, by the diligent proclamation of the cause of his sufferings, many might be edified by learning that he died for the sake of religion, and so become imitators of his fortitude.

CHAP. X.—CHRISTIANS SLAIN BY SAPOR IN PERSIA.

IN this manner the honourable life¹ of Usthazanes was terminated, and when the intelligence was brought to Symeon in the prison, he offered thanksgiving to God on his account. The following day, which happened to be the sixth day of the week, and likewise the day on which, as immediately preceding the festival of the resurrection, the annual memorial of the passion of the Saviour is celebrated, the king issued orders for the decapitation of Symeon; for he had been again conducted to the palace from the prison, had reasoned most boldly with Sapor on points of doctrine, and had expressed a determination never to worship either the king or the sun. On the same day a hundred other prisoners were ordered to be slain. Symeon beheld their execution, and last of all he was put to death. Amongst these victims were bishops, presbyters, and other clergy of different grades. As they were being led out to execution, the chief of the Magi approached them, and asked them whether they would preserve their lives by conforming to the religion of the king and by worshipping the sun. As none of them would comply with this condition, they were conducted to the place of execution, and the executioners applied themselves to the task of slaying these martyrs. Symeon exhorted them to constancy, and reasoned concerning death, and the resurrection, and piety, and showed them from the Sacred Scriptures that a death like theirs is true life; whereas to live, and through fear to deny God, is as truly death. He told them, too, that even if no one were to slay them, death would inevitably overtake them, for our death is a natural consequence of our birth, and that, after this short and transitory life, an account must be rendered of our actions; after which, we enter upon another life, wherein virtue receives eternal rewards, and vice is visited with endless punishment. He likewise told them that the most glorious of good actions is to die for the cause of God. The martyrs gladly listened to this discourse of Symeon's, and went forward with alacrity to meet their death. After the execution of three hundred martyrs, Symeon himself was

¹ Valesius remarks that his death, rather than his life, is to be regarded as glorious.

slain; and Abdechalaas and Ananise, two presbyters of his own church, who had been his fellow-prisoners, suffered with him.¹

CHAP. XI.—PUSICIUS, SUPERINTENDANT OF THE ARTISANS OF SAPOR.

PUSICIUS, the superintendent of the king's artisans, was present at the execution; perceiving that Ananias trembled as the necessary preparations for his death were being made, he said to him,—“Oh, old man, close your eyes and be of good courage, for you will soon behold the light of Christ.” No sooner had he uttered these words, than he was arrested and conducted before the king; and as he frankly avowed himself a Christian, and spoke with great boldness concerning the truth of his religion and the innocence of the martyrs, he was condemned to a most extraordinary and cruel death. The executioners pierced the muscles of his neck in such a manner as to extract his tongue. At the same time his daughter, who had devoted herself to a life of holy virginity, was arraigned and executed. The following year, on the day on which the Passion of Christ was commemorated, and when preparations were being made for the celebration of the festival commemorative of his Resurrection from the dead, Sapor issued a most cruel edict throughout Persia, condemning to death all those who should confess themselves to be Christians; and it is said that an immense number of Christians suffered by the sword. The Magi sought diligently in the cities and villages for those who had concealed themselves; and many voluntarily surrendered themselves, lest they should appear, by their silence, to deny Christ. Of the Christians who were thus unsparingly sacrificed, many who were attached to the palace were slain, and amongst these was Azadas, a eunuch, who was especially beloved by the king. On hearing of his death Sapor was overwhelmed with grief, and put a stop to the indiscriminate slaughter of the Christians; and he directed that the teachers of religion should alone be slain.

¹ Some however say that the martyrdom of Symeon and his companions took place in April, A. D. 349.

CHAP. XII.—MARTYRDOM OF TARBULA, THE SISTER OF SYMEON.

ABOUT the same period, the queen was attacked with a disease, and Tarbula, the sister of Symeon the bishop, a holy virgin,¹ was arrested, as likewise her sister, who was a widow and had abjured a second marriage, and her servant, who, like her, had devoted herself to a religious life. The cause of their arrest was the calumny of the Jews, who reported that they had injured the queen by their enchantments, in revenge for the death of Symeon. As invalids easily give credit to the most frightful representations, the queen believed the calumny, and especially because it emanated from the Jews, for she had great confidence in their veracity and in their attachment for herself; she had embraced their sentiments, and lived in the observance of the Jewish rites. The Magi having seized Tarbula and her companions, condemned them to death; and, after having sawn them asunder, fastened them up to posts, advising the queen to pass through the place of execution, that the charm might be dissolved and the disease removed. It is said that Tarbula was extremely beautiful, and that one of the Magi having become deeply enamoured with her, sent some money secretly to her, and promised to save her and her companions if she would accede to his desires. But, instead of listening to his proposals, she rebuked his licentiousness, and joyfully prepared for death, for she preferred to die rather than to lose her virginity.

As it was ordained by the edict of Sapor, which we mentioned above, that the Christians should not be slaughtered indiscriminately, but that the priests and teachers of religion should be slain, the Magi and Arch-magi traversed the whole country of Persia in search of the bishops and presbyters. They sought them especially in the country of the Adiabeni-ans, a part of the Persian dominions in which many Christians were located.

¹ i. e. consecrated to religion.

CHAP. XIII.—MARTYRDOM OF ST. ACEPSIMUS AND OF HIS COMPANIONS.

ABOUT this period they arrested Aepsimus the bishop, and many of his clergy. After having taken counsel together, they despoiled the clergy and then dismissed them. James, however, who was one of the presbyters, voluntarily followed Aepsimus, obtained permission from the Magi to share his prison, and joyfully ministered to him and dressed his wounds; for the Magi had cruelly scourged him in order to compel him to worship the sun, and on his refusal to do so, had remanded him to prison. Two priests, named Aithalas and James, and two deacons, by name Azadanus and Abdiesus, were castigated and imprisoned in the same manner by the Magi, on account of their adherence to the doctrines of Christ. After a long time had elapsed, the great Arch-magi inquired of the king what was his pleasure concerning them: and having received permission to deal with them as he pleased, unless they would consent to worship the sun, he made known this decision of Sapor's to the prisoners. They replied that they would never betray the cause of Christ nor worship the sun, and were immediately subjected to the most excruciating tortures. Aepsimus persevered in the manly confession of his faith till death put an end to his torments. Certain Armenians, whom the Persians retained as hostages, secretly carried away his body and buried it. The other prisoners were severely scourged, but did not expire beneath the blows, and as they would not renounce their sentiments, were again consigned to prison. Aithalas was one of those who experienced this treatment; both his arms were broken when preparations were being made for the scourging; and he afterwards lost the use of his hands so completely that he was obliged to depend upon others to convey the food to his mouth. Subsequently, a multitude of presbyters, deacons, monks, holy virgins, ministers of the church, and labourers in word and doctrine, terminated their lives by martyrdom. The following are the names of the bishops, so far as I have been able to ascertain: Barbasymes, Paul, Gadiabes, Sabinus, Mareas, Mocius, John, Hormisdas, Papas, James, Romas, Maares, Agas, Bochres, Abdas, Abdiesus, John, Abraham, Agdelas, Sapor, Isaac, and Dausas.

The latter had been made prisoner by the Persians, and brought from a place named Zabdæus:¹ he died about this time in defence of the Christian doctrine; and Mareabdes Chorepiscopus, and about two hundred and fifty of his clergy, who had also been captured by the Persians, suffered with him.

CHAP. XIV.—CONDUCT AND MARTYRDOM OF MILLES THE BISHOP; MULTITUDE OF BISHOPS SLAIN IN PERSIA BY SAPOR, BESIDES OBSCURE INDIVIDUALS.

ABOUT this period Milles suffered martyrdom. He originally served the Persians in a military capacity, but afterwards abandoned that vocation in order to embrace the apostolical mode of life. It is related that he was ordained bishop over a Persian city, where he underwent a variety of sufferings; and that, failing in his efforts to convert the inhabitants to Christianity, he uttered imprecations against the city and departed. Not long after, some of the principal citizens incurred the anger of the king, and an army with three hundred elephants was sent against them; the city was utterly demolished, and corn was sown on its site. Milles, taking with him nothing but the holy Book of the Gospels, repaired to Jerusalem to worship; thence he proceeded to Egypt in order to see the monks. The extraordinary and admirable works which he accomplished are attested by the Syrians, who have written an account of his life and actions. For my own part, I think that I have said enough of him and of the other martyrs who suffered in Persia during the reign of Sapor. It would be difficult to relate in detail every circumstance respecting them, such as their names, their country, the mode of their martyrdom, and the species of torture to which they were subjected.² I shall briefly state that the number of men and women whose names have been ascertained, and who were martyred at this period, has been computed to be upwards of sixteen thousand, while the multitude of martyrs whose names are unknown was so great

¹ Otherwise spelt Zaudæus. It was on the banks of the river Tigris, and had been in the hands of the Romans since the reign of Galerius.

² The ingenuity of the Persians in devising tortures is mentioned by Plutarch in his *Life of Artaxerxes*.

that the Persians, the Syrians, and the inhabitants of Edessa, have failed in all their efforts to compute the number.

CHAP. XV.—CONSTANTINE WRITES TO SAPOR TO STAY THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIANS.

CONSTANTINE, the Roman emperor, was vividly affected when he heard of the sufferings to which the Christians were exposed in Persia. He desired most anxiously to render them assistance, yet knew not in what way to effect this object. About this time some ambassadors from the Persian king arrived at his court, and after granting their requests and dismissing them, he thought it would be a favourable opportunity to address Sapor in behalf of the Christians in Persia, and wrote to him to that effect.¹ "There is nothing in their religion," said he, "of a reprehensible nature; by prayers alone do they offer supplication to God, for he delighteth not in the blood of sacrifices, but taketh pleasure only in a pure soul devoted to virtue and to religion; so that they who believe these things are worthy of commendation." The emperor then assured Sapor that God would be propitious to him if he treated the Christians with lenity, and adduced his own example and that of Valerian in proof thereof. He had himself, by faith in Christ, and by the aid of Divine power, come forth from the shores of the Western Ocean, and reduced to obedience the whole of the Roman world, and had terminated many wars against foreigners and usurpers; and yet had never had recourse to sacrifices or divinations, but had merely offered up a holy prayer, and carried the symbol of the cross at the head of his army. The reign of Valerian was prosperous so long as he refrained from persecuting the Church; but he afterwards commenced a persecution against the Christians, and was delivered by Divine vengeance into the hands of the Persians, who took him prisoner, and put him to a cruel death.

It was in this strain that Constantine wrote to Sapor,

¹ The letter of Constantine to which Sozomen here alludes is extant in Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 9. But Sozomen is mistaken about its date; as it was written before Sapor had commenced his persecution of the Christians.

urging him to protect the professors of religion ; for the emperor extended his watchful care over all the Christians of every region, whether Roman or foreign.

CHAP. XVI.—EUSEBIUS AND THEOGNIS, WHO, AT THE COUNCIL OF NICE, HAD ASSENTED TO THE WRITINGS OF ARIUS, ARE REINSTATED IN THEIR OWN BISHOPRICS.

A. D. 328.—NOT long after the council of Nice, Arius was recalled from exile ;¹ but the prohibition to enter Alexandria was unrevoked. It shall be related in the proper place, how he strove to obtain permission to return to Egypt. Not long after, Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nicæa, regained possession of their bishoprics, after expelling Amphion and Chrestes, who had been ordained in their stead. They owed their restoration to a document which they had presented to the bishops, containing a retraction² of their sentiments, and couched in the following terms :—“ Although we have been condemned without a trial by your piety, we deemed it right to remain silent concerning the judgment passed against us. But as it would be absurd to remain longer silent, when silence is regarded as a proof of the truth of calumny, we now declare to you that we hold the same faith that you do ; that, after a diligent examination of the word “ consubstantial,” we are wholly intent upon preserving peace ; and that we are seduced by no heresy. Having proposed for the safety of the church such suggestions³ as occurred to us, and having certified what we deemed requisite, we signed the confession of faith. We did not certainly sign the anathemas,⁴

¹ Valesius shows that in this matter Sozomen has followed Socrates (i. 10) in an error, as to the date of the recall of Arius, which he fixes very shortly after the synod of Nicæa.

² This retraction is given also by Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 14.

³ The facts (as we learn from the Epistle of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which is given also by Socrates and Theodoret,) are as follows. The bishops who demurred to the term *ὁμοούσιον* as defined in the Nicene symbol, proposed another form to the synod. But the Nicene fathers rejected this form, and refused to depart from their own definition. Eusebius and his party then signed the catholic and orthodox creed, for fear of the emperor.

⁴ We are not to suppose from this, that a separate signature was appended to the anathemas from that which was affixed to the creed ; for they both compose one document. It is probable that they added a note to their

*Chap. 16, referred to this 10, 2, 88
in Eusebius of Cæsarea and Nicæa.*

See p. 73, margin.

but this was not because we impugned the confession of faith, but because we did not believe the accused to be what he was represented to us; the letters we had received from him, and the discourses he had delivered in our presence, compelling us to entertain a contrary opinion of him. So far from opposing any of the decrees enacted in your holy synod, we assent to all of them, and, by this document, attest our assent thereto: and this is not because we are wearied of exile, but because we wish to avert all suspicion of heresy. If you will condescend to admit us into your presence, you will find us in all points of the same sentiments as yourselves, and willing to defer to your decisions. The accused having justified himself, and having been recalled from exile, it would be absurd were we by our silence to confirm the reports that calumny had spread against us. We beseech you then, by the love that you bear to Christ, that you make our supplications known to our most godly emperor, and that you immediately direct us to act according to your will." It was by these means that Eusebius and Theognis, after their change of sentiment, were reinstated in their churches.

CHAP. XVII.—ON THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, ATHANASIUS IS ELECTED IN HIS STEAD; DETAILS CONCERNING HIS YOUTH AND EDUCATION, AND HIS FRIEND ANTONY THE GREAT.

ABOUT this period,¹ Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, conscious of approaching death, named Athanasius as his successor, in accordance, I am convinced, with the Divine will. It is said that Athanasius at first sought to avoid the honour by flight, but that he was afterwards constrained by Alexander to accept the bishopric. This is testified by Apollinarius, the Syrian, in the following terms:—"In all these matters much disturbance was excited by impiety, but its first effects were felt by the blessed teacher to whom this man was subject as a son would be to his father. Afterwards this holy man himself underwent the same experience, for when appointed to the

subscription to the effect that they did not coincide in the anathemas. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 9.

¹ About five months after the council of Nicæa, according to a statement of Athanasius in his second apology.

episcopal succession, he fled to escape the honour, but he was discovered in his place of concealment by the help of God, who had revealed to his blessed predecessor that the succession was to devolve upon him. For when Alexander was on the point of death, he called upon Athanasius, who was then absent. One who bore the same name, and who happened to be present, on hearing him call this way, answered him ; but Alexander spoke not to him, but continued calling upon him who was absent. Moreover, the blessed Alexander prophetically exclaimed, " O Athanasius, thou thinkest to escape, but thou wilt not escape ;" meaning that Athanasius would most certainly be called to the conflict. Such is the account given by Apollinarius respecting Athanasius.

The Arians assert, that after the death of Alexander, the respective followers of that bishop and of Meletius held communion together, and fifty-four bishops from Thebes, and other parts of Egypt, assembled together, and agreed by oath to elect a bishop of Alexandria according to their common consent : but that seven¹ of the bishops, in violation of their oath and of the wishes of the other bishops, secretly ordained Athanasius ; and that, on this account, many of the people and of the Egyptian clergy seceded from communion with him. For my part, I am convinced that it was by Divine appointment that Athanasius succeeded to the bishopric, for he was eloquent and intelligent, and capable of opposing the machinations of his enemies, and, in fact, well suited to the times in which he lived. He displayed great aptitude in the exercise of the ecclesiastical functions, and in the instruction of the people, and was, so to speak, self-taught in these respects. It is said that the following incident occurred to him in his youth. It was the custom of the Alexandrians to celebrate with great pomp an annual festival in honour of one of their bishops, named Peter, who had suffered martyrdom. Alexander, who was then bishop, engaged in the celebration of this festival, and, after having offered up divine service, he remained on the spot, awaiting the arrival of some guests whom he expected to dinner. In the mean time, he chanced to cast his eyes towards the sea, and perceived some children playing on the shore, and amus-

¹ See the synodical epistle of the bishops of Egypt addressed to all catholic bishops, as cited by Athanasius in his second Apology against the Arians, where he refutes this calumny.

ing themselves by imitating the ceremonies of the church; at first he considered the amusement as innocent, and took pleasure in witnessing it, but on finding that the most secret of the mysteries were among their imitation, he became troubled, and communicated the matter to the chief of the clergy. The children were called together, and questioned as to the game at which they were playing, and as to what they did and said, when engaged in this amusement. At first they refused to reply, but on being further pressed by Alexander, they confessed that Athanasius was their bishop and leader, and that many children who had not been initiated had been baptized by him. Alexander carefully inquired what the bishop of their games was in the habit of saying or doing, and what he taught them. On finding that the exact routine of the church had been accurately observed, he consulted the priests around him on the subject, and decided that it would be unnecessary to rebaptize¹ those who, in their simplicity, had been judged worthy of Divine grace. He therefore merely performed for them such offices as are inseparably connected with priestly ministration. He then took Athanasius, and the other children, who had playfully acted as presbyters and deacons, to their own relations, that they might be brought up for the church, and qualified for the exercise of those functions which they had imitated. Not long after, he took Athanasius into his service, and employed him as his secretary. He had been well educated, was versed in grammar and rhetoric, and gave evident proofs of learning and wisdom before his election to the bishopric. But when, on the death of Alexander, the succession devolved upon him, his reputation was greatly increased, and was sustained by his own private virtues and by the testimony of the monk, Antony the Great. This monk repaired to him when he requested his presence, visited the cities, accompanied him to the churches, and agreed with him in opinion concerning the Godhead. He evinced unlimited friendship towards him, and avoided the society of his enemies and opponents.

¹ See Socrates, Eccles. Hist. i. 15. It is right to add that the entire story is very much suspected by learned writers to be without foundation.

CHAP. XVIII.—THE ARIANS AND MELETIANS CONFER CELEBRITY ON ATHANASIVS; CONCERNING EUSEBIUS, AND HIS REQUEST TO ADMIT THE ARIANS TO COMMUNION; CONCERNING THE TERM CON-SUBSTANTIAL. CONTEST BETWEEN EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS AND EUSTATHIVS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH.

THE reputation of Athanasius was, however, increased by the Arians and Meletians; for whatever stratagems they resorted to, they could never succeed in entangling him in their meshes. In the first place, Eusebius wrote to urge him to receive the Arians into communion, and threatened, should he refuse to do so, to ill-treat him. But as Athanasius would not yield to his representation, but maintained that those who had devised a heresy in opposition to truth, and who had been condemned by the council of Nice, ought not to be received into the church, Eusebius contrived to interest the emperor in favour of Arius, and so procured his recall from exile. I shall state a little further on how all these events came to pass.

At this period, the bishops had another dispute among themselves, concerning the precise meaning of the term "consubstantial." Some thought that this term could not be admitted without blasphemy; that it implied the non-existence of the Son of God; and that it involved the error of Montanus and Sabellius.¹ Those, on the other hand, who defended the term, regarded their opponents as Greeks, (or Pagans,) and considered that their sentiments led to a plurality of gods. Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus, and Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, took the lead in this dispute. They both confessed the Son of God has an existence (hypostasis) of his own, and yet they contended together as if they had misunderstood each other. Eustathius accused Eusebius of altering the doctrines ratified by the council of Nice, while the latter declared that he approved of all the Nicæan doctrines, and accused Eustathius of cleaving to the heresy of Sabellius.

¹ For the reason why the names of these two heretics are joined together, see Valesius, notes on Socrat. Eccl. Hist. i. 23.

CHAP. XIX.—SYNOD OF ANTIOCH; UNJUST DEPOSITION OF EUSTATHIUS; EUPHRONIUS ELECTED IN HIS STEAD; CONSTANTINE THE GREAT WRITES TO THE SYNOD AND TO EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS, WHO REFUSES THE BISHOPRIC OF ANTIOCH.

A SYNOD having been convened at Antioch, Eustathius was deprived of the bishopric of that city. It was most generally believed that he was merely deposed on account of his adherence to the faith of the council of Nice, and on account of his having accused Eusebius, Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, and Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, (whose sentiments were adopted by the Eastern priests,) of favouring the heresy of Arius. The pretext resorted to for his deposition, however, was, that he had defiled the priesthood by unholy deeds. His deposition excited so great a sedition at Antioch, that the people were on the point of taking up arms, and the whole city was in a state of commotion. This greatly injured him in the opinion of the emperor, who regarded him with suspicion as the author of the tumult. The emperor, however, sent an officer of his palace, invested with full authority, to calm the populace, and put an end to the disturbance, without having recourse to violence or severity.

Those who had deposed Eustathius, imagining that their sentiments would be universally received if they could succeed in placing over the church of Antioch one of their own sect, who was known to the emperor, and held in repute for learning and eloquence, fixed their thoughts upon Eusebius Pamphilus. They wrote to the emperor upon this subject, and stated that Eusebius was greatly beloved by the people. He had, in fact, been sought by all the clergy and laity who were inimical to Eustathius. Eusebius, however, wrote to the emperor to refuse the dignity. The emperor approved of his refusal; for there was an ecclesiastical law prohibiting the removal of a bishop from one bishopric to another. He wrote to Eusebius¹ to express his concurrence in his sentiments, and said that he considered him happy in being deemed worthy to hold the bishopric not only of one single city, but of the world. The emperor also wrote to the people of the

¹ The letter of the emperor is extant in Eusebius Vit. Const. b. iv. ch. 7.

church of Antioch concerning oneness of faith, and told them that they ought not to desire the bishops of other regions, even as they ought not to covet the possessions of others. He despatched another epistle on the same subjects to the synod, and commended Eusebius for having refused the bishopric; and having been informed that Euphronius, a presbyter of Cappadocia, and George, of Arethusa, were men of orthodox faith, he commanded the bishops to consecrate one or other of them, or whoever they might judge worthy of the honour, and to ordain a bishop over the church of Antioch. On the receipt of these letters from the emperor, Euphronius was ordained.¹ I have heard that Eustathius bore this unjust calumny and condemnation with great calmness. He was a man, who, besides his virtues and excellent qualities, was justly admired on account of his extraordinary eloquence, as is evidenced by his works, which are remarkable for classic purity of expression, weighty sentiments, and elegance and clearness of language.

CHAP. XX.—CONCERNING MAXIMUS, WHO SUCCEEDED MACARIUS IN THE BISHOPRIC OF JERUSALEM.

ABOUT this time Mark, who had succeeded Silvester, and who had held the episcopal sway during a short period, died, and Julius was raised to the see of Rome. Maximus succeeded Macarius in the bishopric of Jerusalem. It is said that Macarius had ordained him bishop over the church of Diospolis, but that the members of the church of Jerusalem insisted on his remaining among them. His confession of faith and great virtue had so excited the approbation of the people, that they were desirous that he should, on the death of Macarius, succeed to the bishopric.¹ The dread of offending the people and exciting an insurrection led to the election of another bishop over Diospolis, and Maximus remained in Jeru-

¹ After the deposition of Eustathius, Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, was translated to the see of Antioch. Dying six months afterwards, he was succeeded by Eulalius, after whom came Euphronius. See Valesius' notes on Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. ch. 24.

² The phrase in the text is *ὑποψήφιος ἦν εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπήν*. The nearest translation of the word is perhaps "designate." The same term occurs in Socrat. Eccl. Hist. v. 5.

salem, and exercised the priestly functions conjointly with Macarius; and, after the death of this latter, he succeeded to the government of the church. It is, however, well known to those who are accurately acquainted with these circumstances, that Macarius concurred with the people in their desire to retain Maximus, for it is said that he regretted¹ the ordination of Maximus, and thought that he should rather have appointed him his own successor, on account of the orthodoxy of his faith and the firmness of his confession, which had so endeared him to the people. He likewise feared that, at his death, the adherents of Eusebius and Patrophilus, who had embraced Arianism, would place one of their own sect in his bishopric, for even during his administration they had attempted to introduce some innovations, and tranquillity was not restored until he had excommunicated them.

CHAP. XXI.—THE MELETIANS AND ARIANS AGREE IN SENTIMENT; EUSEBIUS AND THEOGNIS RELAPSE INTO THE ERRORS OF ARIUS.

IN the mean time the contention which had arisen among the Egyptians could not be quelled. The heresy of Arius had been positively condemned by the council of Nice, while the followers of Meletius had been admitted into communion under the stipulations above stated. When Alexander returned to Egypt, Meletius delivered up to him the churches whose government he had unlawfully usurped, and returned to Lycus. Not long after, finding his end approaching, he nominated John, one of his most intimate friends, as his successor, contrary to the decree of the Nicæan council, and thus plunged

¹ *μεταμεληθῆναι*. This is the correct meaning of the term, it was restored by Valesius, instead of the old rendering, "was anxious about." It should be observed that several matters here are done contrary to the ancient discipline and canons of the church, by a dispensation. For first, Maximus is translated from Diospolis; next, a coadjutor bishop is assigned to Macarius in his life-time, as Alexander had been appointed coadjutor to Narcissus. (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 52.) And lastly, Maximus is said to have been consecrated by the bishop of Jerusalem against the will of the metropolitan, in defiance of the seventh canon of the Council of Nicæa, which reserves to the bishops of Jerusalem the rank which they had from early times, saving the authority of the metropolitan, the bishop of Cæsarea.

the churches into fresh troubles. When the Arians perceived that the Meletians were introducing innovations, they also attempted to involve the churches in trouble. For, as frequently occurs in similar contests, some applauded the dogmas of Arius, while others contended that those who had been ordained by Meletius ought to govern the churches. These two bodies of sectarians had hitherto been opposed to each other, but, on perceiving that the clergy of the Catholic church were followed by the multitude, they, from motives of jealousy, formed an alliance together, regarding the clergy of Alexandria as their common enemies. Their measures of attack and defence were so long carried on in concert, that, in process of time, the Meletians were generally called Arians in Egypt, although they only dissent on questions of supreme rule and church government,¹ while the Arians hold the same opinions concerning God as Arius. But although their sentiments were thus at variance,² they had recourse to dissimulation, in order to carry on conjointly their schemes against the Catholics. From this period, however, it seems, the Meletians began to examine the contested topics, and were led to receive the Arian doctrines, and to hold the same opinions as Arius concerning God. This revived the original controversy concerning Arius, and some of the clergy and laity seceded from communion with the others. The dispute concerning the doctrines of Arius was renewed at Constantinople and other cities, and particularly in the provinces of Bithynia and the Hellespont. In short, it is said that Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nicæa, bribed the notary to whom the emperor had intrusted the custody of the documents of the Nicæan council, effaced their signatures, and openly taught that the Son is not to be considered consubstantial with the Father. Eusebius was accused of these irregularities before the emperor, and he replied with great boldness. "If this robe," said he, "had been cut asunder in my presence, I could not affirm the fragments to be all of the same substance." The emperor was much grieved at these disputes, for he had believed that questions of this nature had been finally decided by the council of Nice. He

¹ Christopherson is mistaken in rendering these words "de Ecclesiarum primatu."

² *ἰδίᾳ τὰ παρ' ἀλλήλων ἀναιρόμενοι*, scil. *δόγματα*.

[SOZOMEN.]

more especially regretted that Eusebius and Theognis had received certain Alexandrians into communion,¹ although the synod had recommended them to repent on account of their heterodox opinions, and although he had himself condemned them to banishment from their native land, as being the excitors of sedition.² It is asserted by some, that it was for the above reasons that the emperor exiled Eusebius and Theognis; but, as I have already stated,³ I have derived my information from those who are intimately acquainted with these matters.

CHAP. XXII.—MACHINATIONS OF THE ARIANS AND MELETIANs AGAINST ST. ATHANASIUS.

THE various calamities which befell St. Athanasius were primarily occasioned by Eusebius and Theognis. As they possessed great influence over the emperor, they obtained the recall of Arius, with whom they were on terms of concord and friendship, to Alexandria, and at the same time the expulsion of Athanasius, who was opposed to them. They accused him before Constantine of being the author of all the seditions and troubles that agitated the church, and of excluding those who were desirous of joining the church; and alleged that unanimity would be restored were he alone to be removed. The calumnies were substantiated by many bishops and clergy who were with John, and who sedulously obtained access to the emperor; they pretended to great orthodoxy, and imputed to Athanasius and the bishops of his party all the bloodshed, imprisonments, conflagrations of churches, and deeds of violence and lawlessness which had been perpetrated. But when Athanasius wrote to the emperor and proved the illegality of the ordination of John's adherents, showing that they had altered the decrees of the Nicæan council, that their faith was not sound, and that they persecuted and calumniated the

¹ Sozomen has taken this from the epistle of Constantine to the Nicomedians, as given by Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 9.

² These excitors of sedition, according to Baronius, were the Meletian party; but Valesius is inclined to believe that they were Arians; and he confirms his opinion by referring to the synodical epistle of the bishops of Egypt, as given by Athanasius in his second Apolog. contr. Arianos.

³ See above, chap. 16 of this book.

orthodox, Constantine was at a loss to know whom to believe. As he was much chagrined by the mutual and constant accusations of both parties, and desired most earnestly the restoration of unanimity of sentiment among the people, he wrote to Athanasius, desiring him to exclude no one from the church, and threatening to visit any act of disobedience to this command with instant expulsion from Alexandria. If any one should desire to see this letter of the emperor's, he will here find the portion of it relating to this affair. It is as follows: "As you are now acquainted with my will, which is that all who desire to enter the church should be permitted to do so, you must not forbid any from entering. For should I hear that any who are willing to join the church have been debarred or hindered therefrom by you, I shall send and depose you by my decree, and shall have you conveyed to some other place." Athanasius, however, wrote to the emperor and convinced him that the Arians ought not to be received into communion by the Catholic church; and Eusebius, perceiving that his schemes could never be carried into execution while exposed to the opposition of Athanasius, determined to resort to any means in order to get rid of him. But as he could not find any pretext for effecting this design, he promised the Meletians to interest the emperor and those in power in their favour, if they would bring an accusation against Athanasius. Accordingly, they first accused him of having obliged the Egyptians to pay a tax on linen tunics, and the accusers affirmed that the tax had been exacted from them. Apis and Macarius, presbyters of the church of Athanasius, who then happened to be at court, endeavoured to expose the calumny. On being summoned to answer for the offence, Athanasius was further accused of having conspired against the emperor, and of having sent, for this purpose, a casket of gold to one Philumen. The emperor detected the calumny, sent Athanasius back to his bishopric, and wrote to the people of Alexandria to testify that their bishop possessed great moderation and orthodoxy, that he had gladly received him, and recognised him to be a man of God, and that, as envy had been the sole cause of his accusation, he had triumphed over his accusers; and having heard that the Arian and Meletian sectarians had excited dissensions in Egypt, the emperor, in the same epistle, conjured the people to look to God, to take heed unto His

judgments, to live in peace one with another, and to expel those who excited discord. Thus the emperor wrote to the people, exhorting them all to oneness of mind, and striving to prevent divisions in the church.

CHAP. XXIII. — CALUMNY RESPECTING ST. ATHANASIUS AND THE HAND OF ARSENIUS.

THE Meletians, on the failure of their first attempts, devised other accusations against Athanasius. On the one hand, they charged him with breaking a sacred vase; and on the other, with having slain one Arsenius,¹ and with having cut off his arm for the purpose of using it in sorcery. It is said that this Arsenius was one of the clergy;² but that, having committed some crime, he fled to a place of concealment for fear of being convicted and punished by his bishop. The enemies of Athanasius thence devised the most odious calumny. They sought Arsenius with great diligence, and having at length discovered the place of his retreat, they showed him great kindness, assured him of their good-will towards him, and of his own safety, and conducted him secretly to Prines, a presbyter of a monastery,³ who was one of his friends, and of the same sentiments as themselves. After having thus carefully concealed him, they diligently spread the report in the market-places and public assemblies, that he had been slain by Athanasius. They also bribed John, a monk, to corroborate the calumny. As this evil report was universally circulated, and had even reached the ears of the emperor, Athanasius became apprehensive that it would be difficult to defend his cause before judges whose minds were prejudiced by such false rumours, and resorted to stratagems akin to those of his adversaries. He did everything in his power to prevent truth from being obscured by calumny, but the multitude could not be convinced, on account of the non-appearance of Arsenius. Reflecting, therefore, that the suspicion which rested upon him could not be removed except by proving that Arsenius, who was said to be

¹ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 27, 29.

² He was bishop of Hypsele, as Valesius remarks in his notes on Socrates.

³ Valesius sees reason to doubt this fact, and considers that Sozomen has misunderstood the term *μονή* as it occurs in the apology of Athanasius, whence he derived his story.

dead, was still alive, he sent a faithful deacon in quest of him. The deacon went to Thebes, and ascertained from some monks that the object of his search had been concealed by Prines; on repairing thither, however, he found that Arsenius was not there; for, on the first intelligence of the arrival of the deacon, he had been conveyed to Lower Egypt. The deacon arrested Prines and conducted him to Alexandria, as also Elias, one of his associates, who was said to have been the person who conveyed Arsenius elsewhere. He delivered them both to the commander of the Egyptian forces, and they confessed that Arsenius was still alive, that he had been secretly concealed in their house, and that he was then in Egypt. Athanasius took care that all these facts should be reported to Constantine. The emperor wrote back to him, desiring him to attend to the due performance of the priestly functions, and the maintenance of order and piety among the people, and not to be disquieted by the machinations of the Meletians, it being evident that envy alone was the cause of the false accusations which were circulated against him, to the disturbance of the peace of the churches. The emperor added that, for the future, he should not permit the circulation of such reports; and that, unless the calumniators preserved the peace, he should certainly subject them to the rigour of the laws, and let justice have its course, as they had not only unjustly plotted against the innocent, but had also infringed upon the order of the church and religion. Such was the strain of the emperor's letter to Athanasius; and he further commanded that it should be read aloud before all the people, in order that they might all be made acquainted with his intentions. The Meletians were alarmed at these menaces, and became more guarded in their conduct. The churches throughout Egypt enjoyed profound peace under the sway of this great bishop, and were daily increased in numbers by the conversion of multitudes of Pagans and heretics.

CHAP. XXIV.—SOME INDIAN NATIONS ARE CONVERTED TO CHRISTIANITY THROUGH THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF TWO CAPTIVES, FRUMENTIUS AND EDESIUS.

WE have heard that about this period some of the most distant of the nations that we call Indian, to whom the preaching

of Bartholomew was unknown, were converted¹ to Christianity by Frumentius, a priest.² The wonderful circumstances attending the arrival of this priest in India, and the cause of his ordination, are necessary to be known to show that Christianity is not of man, as is falsely represented by those who are prejudiced against the doctrines of religion. The most celebrated philosophers among the Greeks³ took pleasure in exploring unknown cities and regions. Plato, the friend of Socrates, dwelt for a time among the Egyptians, in order to acquaint himself with their manners and customs. He likewise sailed to Sicily to examine its craters, whence, as from fountains, spontaneously issued streams of fire, which, by inundating the neighbouring regions, rendered them so sterile that, as at Sodom, no seed could be sown there nor trees planted. These craters were likewise explored by Empedocles, a man highly celebrated for philosophy among the Greeks, and who has expounded his doctrines in heroic verse. He was engaged in prosecuting inquiries as to the cause and origin of these eruptions, when either because he thought such a mode of death preferable to any other, or because, to say the truth, he knew not wherefore he should seek to terminate his life in this manner, he threw himself into the crater and perished. Democritus of Coos⁴ relates that he visited many cities and countries and nations, and that eighty years of his life were spent in travelling through foreign lands. Besides these philosophers, thousands of wise men among the Greeks, ancient and modern, habituated themselves to travel. Desirous of imitating their example, Merope, a philosopher and native of Tyre in Phœnicia, travelled as far as India. He was accompanied by two youths, named Frumentius and Edesius; they were his relatives, and he had the charge of their education. After accomplishing a journey through India, he determined upon returning home, and embarked in a vessel

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 19.

² These were the Æthiopians, who were called Indi in a loose sense. Pantænus at an earlier time had converted some of them to Christianity, (see Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 10.) but having left no successors behind him, Frumentius began the work of conversion again, and so may be called the Apostle of the Indians.

³ Thus Solon was on his travels, when he came to the court of Croesus. See Herod. b. i. ch. 29.

⁴ Or more properly of Abdera, as Valesius suggests.

which was on the point of sailing for Egypt. It happened that, from want of water or some other necessary, the vessel was obliged to stop at some port, and the Indians rushed upon it, and murdered Merope and the crew. These Indians had just thrown off their alliance with the Romans; they took pity, however, on the youth of the two lads, and conducted them to their king. He appointed the younger one his cup-bearer, and, recognising at once the fidelity and prudence of Frumentius, constituted him his treasurer. These youths served the king usefully and faithfully during a long course of years, and when he felt his end approaching he rewarded their services by giving them their liberty, with permission to go where they pleased. They were anxious to return to Tyre, where their relatives resided, but the king's son and successor being a minor, the mother of the young sovereign besought them to remain and take charge of public affairs, until her son reached the years of manhood. They yielded to her entreaties, and directed the affairs of the kingdom and of the Indian government. Frumentius was impelled by some Divine impulse, or by the promptings of his own mind and the assistance of God, to inquire whether there were any Christians or Roman merchants in India. Having succeeded in finding the objects of his inquiry, he summoned them into his presence, treated them with great kindness and benevolence, and commanded the erection of houses of prayer, that there worship might be offered, and the Roman ecclesiastical routine observed.

When the king's son attained the age of manhood, Frumentius and Edesius besought him and the queen to permit them to resign their appointments and return to the Roman dominions, and they obtained a reluctant assent. Edesius went to Tyre to see his relatives, and was soon after advanced to the dignity of presbyter. Frumentius, however, instead of returning to Phœnicia, repaired to Alexandria, for with him patriotism and filial piety were subordinate to religious zeal. He conferred with Athanasius, the head of the Alexandrian church, described to him the state of religion in India, and the necessity of appointing a bishop over the Christians located in that country. Athanasius assembled the clergy of his diocese, and consulted with them on the subject: they were all of opinion that Frumentius was peculiarly qualified to hold the office of bishop of India, as it was by him

that the name of Christian was first made manifest in that country, and that the first seeds of the Word were sown.¹ Frumentius therefore returned to India, and, it is said, discharged the priestly functions so admirably that he became an object of universal admiration, and was revered as an apostle. God highly honoured him, enabling him to perform many wonderful cures, and to work signs and wonders. Such was the origin of the Indian bishopric.

CHAP. XXV.—COUNCIL OF TYRE. ILLEGAL DEPOSITION OF ST. ATHANASIOUS.

THE malignity of the enemies of St. Athanasius involved him in fresh troubles, excited the hatred of the emperor against him, and stirred up a multitude of calumniators. Wearied by their importunity, the emperor convened a council at Cæsarea in Palestine. Athanasius was summoned thither; but, fearing the artifices of Eusebius, bishop of the city, of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and of their party, he refused to attend, and for thirty months, in spite of all remonstrances, persisted in his refusal. At the end of that period, however, he was compelled to repair to Tyre, where a great number of the bishops of the East were assembled.² They required him to reply to the accusations framed by John, and brought against him by Callinicus, a bishop, and a certain Ischurias. These accusations were, that he had broken a vase used in the celebration of the mysteries; that he had thrown down the episcopal chair; that he had often caused Ischurias, although he was a presbyter, to be loaded with chains; and that, by falsely accusing him before Hygenus, governor of Egypt, of casting stones at the statues of the emperor, he had occasioned his being thrown into prison; that he had deposed Callinicus, bishop³ of the Catholic church at Pelusium, and had debarred him from communion until he could remove certain suspicions concerning his having broken a sacred vase; that he had com-

¹ The region over which Frumentius was appointed bishop was, as nearly as can be ascertained, that which is now called Abyssinia.

² For the acts of this synod, see Socrates, Eccles. Hist. i. 28; Theodoret, i. 29.

³ In order to avoid making Sozomen inconsistent with his own statements elsewhere, Valesius proposes to insert *ὡς* before *ἐπίσκοπον*, which would mean, "conducting himself as bishop."

mitted the bishopric of Pelusium to Mark, a deposed presbyter; and that he had placed Callinicus under the custody of soldiers, and had put him to the torture. Other calumnies were brought against him by Euplus, Pachomius, Isaac, Achilles,¹ and Hermeon, bishops of John's party. They all concurred in maintaining that he obtained the episcopal dignity by means of the perjury of certain individuals, it having been decreed that no one should receive ordination who could not clear himself of any crime laid to his charge. They further alleged, that having been deceived by him, they had separated themselves from communion with him, and that, so far from satisfying their scruples, he had treated them with violence and thrown them into prison.

The accusers then proceeded to renew the calumny concerning Arsenius; and, as generally happens in plots of this nature, many of the reputed friends of the accused joined the ranks of his calumniators. A document was then read, containing complaints from the people of Alexandria, and purporting to convey a refusal to join the ecclesiastical assemblies. Athanasius, having been urged to justify himself, presented himself repeatedly before the tribunal; successfully repelled some of the accusations, and requested permission to delay replying to the others. He was exceedingly perplexed when he reflected on the favour in which his accusers were held by his judges, on the number of witnesses belonging to the sects of Arius and Meletius who appeared against him, and on the indulgence that was manifested towards his accusers after their calumnies had been detected. As, for instance, when he was charged with having cut off the arm of Arsenius for purposes of sorcery, and with having seduced a certain female by bribery. Both these charges were proved to be false and absurd. When this female made the deposition before the bishops, Timothy, a presbyter of Alexandria, who stood by Athanasius, approached her according to a plan he had secretly concerted, and said to her, "Did I then, O woman, violate your chastity?"² She replied, "But didst thou not?" and mentioned the place and attendant circum-

¹ It is thought by Valesius that Achilles and Hermeon were bishops respectively of Cusæ and Cynopolis.

² It is the opinion of Valesius that this story is taken by Sozomen out of Rufinus.

stances. He likewise led Arsenius into the midst of them, showed both his hands to the judges, and requested them to make the accusers account for the arm which they had exhibited. For it happened that Arsenius, either acting under Divine inspiration, or grieved at hearing that Athanasius was accused of having slain him, escaped by night from the place of his concealment, and arrived at Tyre the day before trial. Both these accusations having been thus summarily dismissed, no mention of the first was made in the Acts of the Council; most probably, I think, because the whole affair was considered too indecorous and absurd for insertion. As to the second, the accusers strove to justify themselves by saying, that a bishop named Plusian¹ had, at the command of Athanasius, burnt the house of Arsenius, fastened him to a column, and scourged him cruelly, and then imprisoned him in a cell. They further stated, that Arsenius escaped from the cell through a window, and remained for a time in concealment; that, as he did not appear, they naturally supposed him to be dead; that the reputation he had acquired by his manly confession of the faith had endeared him to the bishops of John's party, and that they sought for him, and applied on his behalf to the magistrates. Athanasius was filled with apprehension when he reflected on these subjects, and began to suspect that his enemies were secretly scheming to effect his ruin. After several sessions, when the synod was filled with tumult and confusion, and the accusers and a multitude of persons around the tribunal were crying aloud that Athanasius ought to be deposed as a sorcerer and a ruffian, and as being utterly unworthy the priesthood, the officers who had been appointed by the emperor to maintain order in the synod compelled the accused to quit the judgment-hall secretly; for they feared that he might be torn to pieces by the mob. On finding that he could not remain in Tyre without peril of his life, and that there was no hope of obtaining justice against his numerous accusers from judges who were inimical to him, he fled to Constantinople. The synod condemned him during his absence, deposed him from the bishopric, and prohibited his residing at Alexandria, lest, they said, he should excite sedi-

¹ Mention is made of a bishop of this name in the epistle of Arsenius to Athanasius, which is preserved in the second Apology of the latter against the Arians.

tions and disturbances. John and all his adherents were restored to communion, as if they had been illegally excommunicated, and were reinstated in the clerical appointments of which they had been deprived. The bishops then gave an account of their proceedings to the emperor, and wrote to the bishops of all regions, enjoining them not to receive Athanasius into communion, and not to write to him nor receive letters from him, as they had convicted him in several instances, and had reason to believe, from the manner of his flight, that he was guilty of many crimes of which they had not taken public cognizance. They likewise declared, in this epistle, that they had been obliged to pass such a condemnation upon him, because, when commanded by the emperor the preceding year to repair to the bishops of the East, who were assembled at Cæsarea, he disobeyed the injunction, kept the bishops waiting for him, and set at nought the commands of the emperor. They also deposed that when the bishops had assembled at Tyre, he went to that city, attended by a large retinue, for the purpose of exciting seditions and disturbances in the synod; that when there, he sometimes refused to reply to the charges preferred against him; sometimes insulted the bishops; and at other times would not defer to their decisions. They specified in the same letter, that he was manifestly guilty of having broken a vase used in the celebration of the sacred mysteries, and that this fact was attested by Theognis, bishop of Nicæa; by Maris, bishop of Chalcedonia; by Theodore, bishop of Heraclea; by Valentinus and Ursacius; and by Macedonius, who had been sent to the village in Egypt where the vase was said to have been broken, in order to ascertain the truth. Thus did the bishops detail successively each point of accusation against Athanasius, with the same art to which sophists resort when they desire to heighten the effect of their calumnies. Many of the clergy, however, who were present at the trial, perceived the injustice of the accusation. It is related that Paphnutius, the confessor,¹ who had taken his

¹ Valesius says that Sozomen has taken this from Rufinus. A certain Paphnutius was an Egyptian bishop, and one of that name is said by Athanasius to have come with Athanasius to the synod of Tyre. He is to be distinguished from another Paphnutius, an anchorite of the Meletian faction, who joined John and Callinicus in accusing Athanasius at Tyre. Valesius thinks that Rufinus has confounded this Paphnutius with Po-

place among the synod, arose, and took the hand of Maximus, the bishop of Jerusalem, to lead him away, as if those who had made a confession of the faith, and had been maimed and blinded for the sake of religion, ought not to remain in an assembly of wicked men.

CHAP. XXVI.—ERECTION OF A TEMPLE BY CONSTANTINE THE GREAT AT GOLGOTHA, IN JERUSALEM. ITS DEDICATION.

THE temple, called the "Great Martyr," which was built in the place of the skull at Jerusalem, was completed about the thirtieth year of the reign of Constantine; and Marius, a man employed at the palace in the capacity of a secretary, was forthwith despatched to the bishops who were assembled at Tyre, with a letter from the emperor, commanding them to repair quickly to Jerusalem, in order to consecrate the temple. But before they entered upon this duty, the emperor deemed it necessary that the disputes which prevailed among the bishops who had been convened at Tyre should be adjusted, and that they should cast aside all cause of discord and trouble when they consecrated the temple. When the bishops arrived at Jerusalem the temple was therefore consecrated, as likewise numerous ornaments and gifts, which were sent by the emperor, and are still preserved in the sacred edifice; their magnificence and costliness is such that they cannot be looked upon without exciting wonder. Since that period the anniversary of the consecration has been celebrated with great pomp by the church of Jerusalem; the festival continues eight days, baptism¹ is administered, and people from every region under the sun resort to Jerusalem during this festival, and visit the sacred places.

tamo, who was also present at Tyre, and that Sozomen has followed him in his mistake. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 8.

¹ Literally, *μύησις*, i. e. initiation.

CHAP. XXVII.—CONCERNING THE PRESBYTER BY WHOM CONSTANTINE WAS PERSUADED TO RECALL ARIUS AND EUZOIUS FROM EXILE; THE WRITTEN CONFESSION OF FAITH PROPOUNDED BY ARIUS, AND THE RECEPTION OF THIS LATTER BY THE SYNOD ASSEMBLED AT JERUSALEM.

THE bishops who had embraced the sentiments of Arius found a favourable opportunity of restoring him and Euzoius to communion, by convening a council in the city of Jerusalem. They effected their design in the following manner:—A certain priest,¹ who was a great admirer of the Arian doctrines, was on terms of intimacy with the emperor's sister. At first he concealed his sentiments; but as he frequently visited and became by degrees more familiar with Constantia, for such was the name of the emperor's sister, he took courage to represent to her that Arius was unjustly exiled from his country, and cast out from the church, through the jealousy and personal enmity of Alexander, bishop of the Alexandrian church. He said that his jealousy had been excited by the esteem which the people manifested towards Arius. Constantia believed these representations to be true, yet took no steps in opposition to the decrees of the council of Nice. Being attacked with a disease which threatened to terminate in death, she besought her brother, who went to visit her, to grant what she was about to ask, as her dying request: this request was, to receive the above-mentioned priest on terms of intimacy, and to rely upon him as a man of orthodox faith. "For my part," she added, "I am drawing nigh to death, and am no longer interested in the concerns of this life; the only apprehension I now feel arises from dread lest you should incur the wrath of God, and suffer any calamity, or the loss of your empire, since you have been induced to condemn good men to perpetual banishment." From that period, the emperor received the priest into favour, and after frequently permitting him to converse with him on the same topics on which he had conversed with his sister, deemed it necessary to subject the case of Arius to a fresh examination: it is probable that, in forming this decision, the emperor was either influenced by a belief in the credibility of the priest's calumnies, or by the desire of acceding to the wishes of his sister. It was not long

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 25.

before he recalled Arius from exile, and demanded of him a written exposition of his faith concerning the Godhead. Arius avoided making use of the new terms which he had previously devised, and couched his sentiments in the most simple phraseology, frequently introducing the words used in Scripture ; he declared upon oath, that he held the doctrines set forth in this exposition, and that there was no other meaning attached to the words than that which met the eye. It was as follows :—

“Arius and Euzoios, presbyters, to Constantine, our most religious and best beloved emperor.

“According to your pious command, O Sovereign Lord, we here furnish a written statement of our faith, and we protest before God that we, and all those who are with us, believe what is here set forth.

“We believe¹ in one God, the Father Almighty, and in His Son the Lord Jesus Christ, who proceeded from Him before all ages, being God the Word, by whom all things were made, whether things in heaven or things on earth ; He took upon Him flesh, suffered and rose again, and ascended into Heaven, whence he will again come to judge the quick and the dead. We believe in the Holy Ghost, in the resurrection of the body, in the life to come, in the Kingdom of Heaven, and in one Catholic Church of God, established throughout the earth. We have received this faith from the Holy Gospels, in which the Lord says to His disciples, ‘Go forth and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ If we do not believe these truths, and if we do not truly receive the doctrines concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as they are taught by the whole Catholic Church and by the Sacred Scriptures, let God be our judge, both in this life and in that which is to come. Wherefore we appeal to your piety, O our best beloved emperor, and beseech you that, as we are enrolled among the members of the clergy, and as we hold the faith and doctrines of the Church and of the Sacred Scriptures, you will effect a reconciliation between us and the Church, which is our Mother ; so that useless questions and disputes may be cast aside, and that we and the Church may dwell together in peace, and join together in prayer for the prosperity of your empire and the welfare of your family.”

¹ The same form is extant in Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. 26.

Many considered this declaration of faith as an artful compilation, and as bearing an appearance of opposition to the Arian tenets, while, in reality, it supported them; the terms in which it was couched being so vague that it was susceptible of divers interpretations. The emperor imagined that Arius and Euzoius were of the same sentiments as the bishops of the council of Nicæa, and was delighted at the supposed discovery. He did not, however, attempt to restore them to communion without the sanction and co-operation of those who are, by the law of the church, judges of doctrine. He therefore sent them to the bishops who were then assembled at Jerusalem, and wrote to those bishops, desiring them to examine the declaration of faith submitted by Arius and Euzoius, and so to influence the decision of the synod that, whether they found that their doctrine was orthodox, and that the jealousy of their enemies had been the sole cause of their condemnation, or that, without having reason to blame those who had condemned them, they had subsequently embraced other sentiments, a favourable judgment might, in either case, be accorded them. Those who had long desired the restoration of Arius to communion were pleased by the opportunity afforded by the emperor's letter for effecting their purpose. They wrote immediately to the emperor himself, to the church of Alexandria, and to the bishops and clergy of Egypt, of Thebes, and of Libya, to beseech them to receive Arius and Euzoius¹ into communion, since the emperor bore witness to the orthodoxy of their faith, in one of his own epistles, and since the judgment of the emperor had been confirmed by the decree of the synod.

These were the subjects which were zealously discussed by the synod of Jerusalem.

CHAP. XXVIII.—LETTER FROM THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE TO THE SYNOD OF TYRE. EXILE OF ST. ATHANASIUS THROUGH THE MACHINATIONS OF THE ARIAN FACTION.

ATHANASIUS, after having fled from Tyre, repaired to Constantinople, and complained to the emperor Constantine of the injustice of his condemnation, and besought him to

¹ Concerning the restoration of these persons to the communion of the church, see Valesius, notes on Socrates, b. i. ch. 33.

permit the decrees of the council of Tyre to be submitted to examination in his presence. Constantine regarded this request as reasonable, and wrote in the following terms¹ to the bishops assembled at Tyre :—

“I know not what has been enacted in confusion and disorder by your synod ; but it appears that, from some disturbance or other, decrees which are not in conformity with truth have been enacted, and that your constant disputations among yourselves have prevented you from considering what is pleasing to God. But it will be the work of Divine Providence to terminate these disputes, and to manifest to us whether you have been actuated by a desire to maintain the truth, and whether you have not been misled in your judgment by motives of private friendship or aversion. I therefore command that you all come here to me without delay, in order that we may receive an exact account of your transactions. I will explain to you the cause of my writing to you in this strain. As I was returning on horseback to that city which bears my name, and which I regard as my country, Athanasius, the bishop, presented himself so unexpectedly in the middle of the highway, with certain individuals who accompanied him, that I felt exceedingly surprised at beholding him. God who sees all things is my witness, that at first I did not know who he was, but that some of my attendants, having ascertained this point, and the subject on which he had come to proffer his complaint, gave me the necessary information. I did not on this occasion grant him an interview. He, however, persevered in requesting an audience ; and although I refused him, and was on the point of commanding that he should be removed from my presence, he told me with greater boldness than he had previously manifested, that he sought no other favour of me than that I should summon you hither, in order that he might, in your presence, complain of the injustice that had been evinced towards him. As this request appears reasonable and timely, I deemed it right to address you in this strain, and to command all of you who were convened at the synod of Tyre to repair to us, so that the equity of your decrees may be judged by me, whom you cannot refuse to acknowledge as a faithful servant of God. By my zeal in his service peace has been established through-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 34.

out the world, and the name of God is praised among the barbarians,¹ who, till now, were in ignorance of the truth; and it is evident, that whoever is ignorant of the truth knows not God. Notwithstanding, as is above stated, the barbarians have, through my instrumentality, learnt to know and to worship God; for they perceived that everywhere, and on all occasions, his protection rested on me; and they reverence God the more deeply, because they fear my power. But we who have to announce the mysteries of his clemency, (for I will not say that we keep them,) we, I say, ought not to do anything that can tend to dissension or hatred, or, to speak plainly, to the destruction of the human race. Come then to us, as I have said, with all diligence, and be assured that I shall do everything in my power to preserve the inviolability of the law of God, and to expose those enemies of the law who, under the name of holiness, endeavour to introduce various blasphemies.”

This letter of the emperor so excited the fears of some of the bishops that they set off on their journey homewards. But Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and his partisans, went to the emperor, and represented that the synod of Tyre had enacted no decrees against Athanasius but what were founded on justice. They brought forward as witnesses, Theognis, Maris, Theodore, Valens, and Ursacius, and deposed that he had broken the sacred vase,² and their calumnies were finally triumphant. The emperor, either believing their statements to be true, or imagining that unanimity would be restored among the bishops if Athanasius were removed, exiled him to Treves,³ a city of Gaul; and thither, therefore, he was conducted.

CHAP. XXIX.—ALEXANDER, BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE; HIS REFUSAL TO ADMIT ARIUS INTO COMMUNION; DEATH OF ARIUS.

AFTER the synod of Jerusalem Arius went to Egypt, but

¹ He alludes to the Iberians, who have been already mentioned by Sozomen. See above, b. i. ch. 7.

² This however is at variance with the account given by Athanasius. See his Apology against the Arians, p. 132, and the Benedictine Life of A., p. 27.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccles. Hist. b. i. ch. 35.

[SOZOMEN.]

as he could not obtain permission to hold communion with the church of Alexandria he returned to Constantinople. As all those who had embraced his sentiments, and those who were attached to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, had assembled in that city for the purpose of holding a council,¹ Alexander, who was then at the head of the church of Constantinople, used every effort to prevent a council from being convened. But as his endeavours were frustrated, he refused all communion with Arius, affirming that it was neither just, nor according to ecclesiastical canons, that the decrees of the bishops who had been assembled at Nicæa from every region under the sun should be reversed. When the partisans of Eusebius perceived that their arguments produced no effect on Alexander, they had recourse to contumely, and threatened, that unless he would receive Arius into communion on a stated day, he should be expelled from the church, and that another should be elected in his place, who would be willing to hold communion with Arius. They then separated, the partisans of Eusebius to await the time they had fixed for carrying their menaces into execution, and Alexander to pray that Eusebius might be prevented from acting as they had said.² His chief source of sorrow arose from the fact that the emperor had been led away by the persuasions of his enemies. On the day before the appointed day he prostrated himself before the altar,³ and continued all the night in prayer to God that his enemies might be prevented from carrying their schemes into execution against him. On the evening of the same day, Arius, being seized with pain in the stomach, was compelled to repair to the public place set apart for emergencies of this nature. As some time passed away without his coming out, some persons, who were waiting for him outside, entered, and found him dead and still sitting upon the seat. When his death became known, all people did not view the occurrence under the same aspect. Some believed that he died of disease of the heart, induced by extreme joy at the success which had attended his undertakings; others imagined that this mode of death was inflicted on him in judgment, on account of his

¹ Valesius interprets this to mean that they held private meetings in order to agitate the question of holding another council.

² Compare Socrates, Eccles. Hist. b. i. sub finem.

³ See Rufinus, Eccles. Hist. x. 12.

impiety. Those who held his sentiments were of opinion that his death was brought about by magical arts. It will not be out of place to quote what Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, stated on the subject. The following is his narrative :—

CHAP. XXX.—ACCOUNT GIVEN BY THE GREAT ATHANASIUS
OF THE DEATH OF ARIUS.

“ARIUS, the author of the heresy and the associate of Eusebius, having been summoned before the most blessed Constantine Augustus, at the solicitation of the partisans of Eusebius, was desired to give in writing an exposition of his faith; he drew up this document with great artfulness, and, like the devil, concealed his impious assertions beneath the simple words of Scripture. The most blessed Constantine said to him, ‘If you hold any other doctrines than those which are here set forth, render testimony to the truth;¹ but if you perjure yourself, the Lord will punish you,’ and the wretched man swore that he held no sentiments except those specified in the document; soon after he went out,² and judgment was visited upon him, for he bent forwards and burst in the middle. With all men life terminates in death. We must not blame a man, even if he be an enemy, merely because he died, for it is uncertain whether we shall live till the evening. But the end of Arius was so singular that it seems worthy of some remark. The partisans of Eusebius threatened to reinstate him in the church, and Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, opposed their intention; Arius placed his confidence in the power and menaces of Eusebius. It was Saturday, and he expected the next day to be re-admitted into the church. The dispute ran high; the partisans of Eusebius were loud in their menaces, while Alexander had recourse to prayer. The Lord

¹ *μάρτυρα τὴν ἀλήθειαν δός*, i. e. swear by the truth: a common formula among the early Christians. So St. Paul in his Epistles frequently exclaims, “I speak in the truth, I lie not.” *Vales.*

² Athanasius gives an account of the end of Arius in his Epistle to Serapion: but it differs in some slight particulars from that which Sozomen and Socrates have given after Rufinus. Valesius considers that Arius died in a state of excommunication, and that the Arius who was received into communion by the synod at Jerusalem was not the same individual with the heresiarch.

was the judge, and declared himself against the unjust. A little before sunset Arius was compelled by a want of nature to enter the place appointed for such emergencies, and here he lost at once both restoration to communion and his life. The most blessed Constantine was amazed when he heard of this occurrence, and regarded it as the punishment of perjury. It then became evident to every one that the menaces of Eusebius were absolutely futile, and that the expectations of Arius were vain and foolish. It also became manifest that the Arian heresy had met with condemnation from the Saviour as well as from the pristine church. Is it not then astonishing that some are still found who seek to exculpate him whom the Lord has condemned, and to defend a heresy of which the author was not permitted by our Lord to be rejoined to the church? We have been duly informed that this was the mode of the death of Arius. It is said that for a long period subsequently no one would make use of the seat on which he died. Those who were compelled by necessities of nature to visit the public place, always avoided with horror the precise spot on which the impiety of Arius had been visited with judgment. At a later epoch a certain rich and powerful man, who had embraced the Arian tenets, bought the place of the public, and built a house on the spot, in order that the occurrence might fall into oblivion, and that there might be no perpetual memorial of the death of Arius."

CHAP. XXXI.—EVENTS WHICH TRANSPIRED IN ALEXANDRIA AFTER THE DEATH OF ARIUS. LETTER OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

THE death of Arius did not terminate the doctrinal dispute which he had originated. Those who adhered to his sentiments did not cease from plotting against those who maintained opposite opinions. The people of Alexandria loudly complained of the exile of Athanasius, and offered up supplications for his return, and Antony, the celebrated monk, wrote frequently to the emperor to entreat him to attach no credit to the insinuations of the Meletians, but to reject their accusations as calumnies; yet the emperor was not convinced by these arguments, and wrote to the Alexandrians, accusing

them of folly and of disorderly conduct. He commanded the clergy and the holy virgins to remain quiet, and declared that he would not change his mind nor recall Athanasius, whom, he said, he regarded as an exciter of sedition, justly condemned by the judgment of the church. He replied to Antony by stating that he ought not to overlook the decree of the synod; for even if some few of the bishops, he said, were actuated by ill-will or the desire to oblige others, it scarcely seems credible that so many prudent and excellent bishops could have been impelled by such motives; and, he added, that Athanasius was contumelious and arrogant, and the author of divisions and seditious. The enemies of Athanasius accused him the more especially of these crimes, because they knew that the emperor regarded them with peculiar aversion. When he heard that the church was split into two factions, of which one supported Athanasius and the other John, he was transported with indignation, and exiled John. This John had succeeded Meletius, and had, with those who held the same sentiments as himself, been restored to communion and re-established in the clerical functions by the synod of Tyre. His banishment was contrary to the wishes of the enemies of Athanasius, nor could it be revoked by the decrees of the synod of Tyre, for the emperor was inexorable against those who introduced sedition and dissension among the Christians.

CHAP. XXXII.—CONSTANTINE ENACTS A LAW AGAINST ALL HERESIES, AND PROHIBITS THE PEOPLE FROM ASSEMBLING IN ANY PLACE BUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND THUS THE GREATER NUMBER OF HERESIES DISAPPEAR.

ALTHOUGH the doctrine of Arius was zealously supported by many persons in disputations, a party had not as yet been formed¹ to whom the name of Arians could be applied as a distinctive appellation; for all assembled together as a church and held communion with each other, with the exception of the Novatians, those called Phrygians, the Valentinians, and some few others who adhered to ancient heresies. The emperor, however, enacted a law,² by which they were forbidden

¹ This would seem to be at variance with the assertion of Alexander, in Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. i. 4.

² This law is extant in Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 64.

to assemble in their own houses of prayer, in private houses, or in public places, but were compelled to enter into communion with the Catholic church. By means of this law, almost all the heresies, I believe, disappeared. During the reign of preceding emperors, all those who followed Christ, however they might have differed from each other in opinion, received the same treatment from the Greeks, (Pagans,) and were persecuted with equal cruelty. These common calamities, to which they were all equally liable, prevented them from prosecuting any close inquiries as to the differences of opinion which existed among themselves; the members of each party assembled themselves together, and, however few they might have been in number, did not lose their corporate existence. But after this law was passed they could not assemble in public, because it was forbidden; nor could they hold their assemblies in secret, for they were watched by the bishops and clergy of their city. Hence the greater number of these sectarians were led, by fear of consequences, to join themselves to the Catholic church. Those who adhered to their original sentiments did not, at their death, leave any disciples to propagate their heresy, for, owing to the restrictions to which they were subjected, they were prevented from teaching their doctrines.

On account either of the absurdity of the heretical dogmas, or of the utter ignorance of those who devised and taught them, the respective followers of each heresy were, from the beginning, very few in number. The Novatians alone, who had obtained good leaders, and who entertained the same opinions respecting the Divinity as the Catholic church, formed a large sect from the beginning, and were not decreased in point of numbers by means of this law; the emperor, I believe, relaxed the rigour of the enactment in their favour, for he only desired to strike terror into the minds of his subjects, and had no intention of persecuting them. Acesius, who was then the bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople, was much esteemed by the emperor on account of his virtuous life; and it is probable that it was for his sake that the church which he governed met with protection. The Phrygians suffered the same treatment as the other heretics in all the Roman provinces except Phrygia and the neighbouring regions, for here they had, since the time of Montanus, existed in great numbers, and they are to the present day to be found in that locality.

About this time the partisans of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and of Theognis, bishop of Nicæa, began to combat in writing the confession of faith, which had been set forth by the Nicæan council. They did not venture to reject openly the assertion that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, because this assertion was maintained by the emperor; but they drew up another formula of belief, and signified to the Eastern bishops that, with certain modifications, they had received the Nicæan confession of faith. They thus renewed disputes and the agitation of questions which had almost sunk into oblivion.

CHAP. XXVIII.—MARCELLUS, BISHOP OF ANCYRA; HIS
HERESY AND DEPOSITION.

At the same period, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, was deposed by the bishops assembled at Constantinople, because he had introduced some new doctrines, whereby he taught that the existence of the Son of God commenced when He was born of Mary, and that His reign would have an end; he had, moreover, drawn up a written document wherein these views were propounded. Basil, a man of great learning and eloquence, was invested by the bishops with the government of the church of Galatia. They also wrote to the churches in the neighbouring regions, to desire them to search for the copies of the book¹ written by Marcellus, and to destroy them, and to lead back those who had embraced his sentiments to the Catholic faith. They stated that the work was too voluminous to admit of their transcribing the whole in their epistle, but that they inserted quotations of certain passages in order to prove that the doctrines which they had condemned were there advocated. Some persons, however, maintained that Marcellus had merely propounded a few questions which had been misconstrued by the adherents of Eusebius, and represented to the emperor as formal propositions. Eusebius and his partisans were irritated against Marcellus, because he had not consented to their decrees at the council of Tyre, nor to the regulations which had been made in favour of Arius at

¹ The title of this book is said by Valesius to have been "de Subjectione Filii Dei."

*The rest of the
21st, 22nd, 23rd on Nicæa*

with

*All this page and
23 all referred to this
not contents of text.*

Jerusalem; and had likewise refused to attend at the consecration of the church called the Great Martyr, in order to avoid communion with them. In their letter to the emperor, they dwelt largely upon this latter circumstance, alleging that it was a personal insult to him to refuse attendance at the consecration of the temple which he had constructed at Jerusalem. The motive by which Marcellus was induced to write this work was, that Asterius, who was a sophist and a native of Cappadocia, had written a treatise in defence of the Arian doctrines, and had read it in various cities, and to the bishops, and likewise at several synods where he had attended. Marcellus undertook to refute his arguments, and while thus engaged, he, either deliberately or unintentionally, fell into the errors of Paul of Samosata. He was afterwards, however, reinstated in his bishopric by the council of Sardis, after having proved that he did not hold the doctrines which had been imputed to him.

CHAP. XXXIV.—DEATH OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT: HE RECEIVES THE RITE OF BAPTISM IN HIS LAST MOMENTS, AND IS BURIED IN THE TEMPLE OF THE HOLY APOSTLES.

THE emperor divided the empire among his sons, who were styled Cæsars.¹ To Constantine and Constans he awarded the Western regions; and to Constantius, the Eastern; and, as he was indisposed, and required to have recourse to bathing, he repaired for that purpose to Helenopolis, a city of Bithynia. His malady, however, increased, and he went to Nicomedia, and received the rite of holy baptism² in one of the suburbs of that city. After the ceremony he was filled with joy, and returned thanks to God. He then confirmed the division of the empire among his sons, according to his former allotment, and bestowed certain privileges on Old and on New Rome. He placed his testament in the hands of the priest who constantly extolled Arius, and who had been recommended to him as a man of virtuous life by his sister Constantia in her last moments, and commanded him to deliver it to Constantius on

¹ With this chapter the reader will do well to compare Euseb. Vit. Constant. iv. 61, &c., and Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 39, 40.

² ἐμύθηθη. See above, note on chap. 26.

his return, for neither Constantius nor the other Cæsars were with their dying father. After making these arrangements, Constantine survived but a few days; he died in the sixty-fifth year of his age, and the thirty-first of his reign. He was a powerful protector of the Christian religion, and was the first of the emperors who manifested zeal in the extension of the church. He was more successful than any other sovereign in all his undertakings; for he formed no design, I am convinced, without God. He was victorious in his wars against the Goths and Sarmatians, and, indeed, in all his military enterprises; and he changed the form of government according to his own mind with so much ease that he created another senate and another capital city, to which he gave his own name. He utterly subverted the Grecian religion, which had prevailed for ages among the princes and the people.

After the death of Constantine, his body was placed in a golden coffin, conveyed to Constantinople, and deposited in the palace; and the same honours were rendered to the body by those who were in the palace, as if the emperor had been still alive. On hearing of his father's death, Constantius, who was then in the East, hastened to Constantinople, and interred the royal remains with the utmost magnificence, and deposited them in the tomb which had been constructed by order of the deceased in the Church of the Apostles. From this period it became the custom to deposit the remains of subsequent Christian emperors in the same place of interment; and here bishops, likewise, were buried, for the hierarchial dignity is not only equal in honour¹ to imperial power, but, in sacred places, even takes the ascendancy.

¹ ὁμότιμος. Valesius remarks that the former of these two assertions may be doubted, since both the sacerdotal and the imperial power have their own separate province and limits. And further, he adds, the reader must be warned that Sozomen here speaks concerning, not the authority, but the dignity, of the priesthood. The former of which does not extend beyond the limits of the church, though the case is otherwise with the sacerdotal dignity, which, however, in the opinion of Valesius, falls short of regal dignity.

BOOK III.

CHAP. I.—AFTER THE DEATH OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT
THE ADHERENTS OF EUSEBIUS AND THEOGNIS RENEW THE
CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE FAITH ESTABLISHED AT NICÆA.

WE have now seen what events transpired in the churches during the reign of Constantine.¹ On his death, the doctrine which had been set forth at Nicæa was subjected to renewed examination. Although this doctrine was not universally approved, no one, during the life of Constantine, had dared to reject it openly. At his death, however, many renounced this faith, especially those who had previously been suspected of treachery. Eusebius and Theognis, bishops of provinces in Bithynia, did everything in their power to give predominance to the tenets of Arius. They believed that this object would be easily accomplished by retaining Athanasius in exile, and by giving the government of the Egyptian churches to a bishop of their own sect. They found an efficient coadjutor in the priest who had obtained from Constantine the recall of Arius. He was held in high esteem by the emperor Constantius, on account of the service he had rendered in delivering to him the testament of his father; he had, in fact, constant liberty of access to the empress, and was on terms of intimacy with the eunuchs of the court. At this period Eusebius was appointed to superintend the concerns of the royal household, and, being zealously attached to Arianism, he induced the empress and many of the persons belonging to the court to adopt the same sentiments. Hence disputations concerning doctrines again became prevalent, both in public and in private, and mutual revilings and virulent animosities were renewed. This state of things was in accordance with the views of Theognis and his partisans.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 2.

CHAP. II.—RETURN OF THE GREAT ATHANASIUS FROM EXILE ;
LETTER OF CONSTANTINE CÆSAR, SON OF CONSTANTINE THE
GREAT ; MACHINATIONS OF THE ARIANS AGAINST ATHANASIUS ;
ACACIUS ; WAR BETWEEN CONSTANTINE AND CONSTANS.

At this period Athanasius returned from the West of Gaul to Alexandria. It is said that Constantine intended to have recalled him, and that in his testament he even gave orders to that effect. But as he was prevented by death from performing his intention, his son, who bore his name, and who was then commanding in Western Gaul, recalled Athanasius, and wrote a letter on the subject to the people of Alexandria. Having met with a copy of this letter translated from the Latin into Greek, I shall insert it precisely as I found it. It is as follows :—

“Constantine Cæsar, to the people of the Catholic Church of Alexandria.¹

“You cannot, I believe, be unacquainted with the fact that Athanasius, the venerable interpreter of the law, was sent for a time into Gaul, lest he should fall a sacrifice to the sanguinary designs of his enemies, who sought his destruction. In order to shield him from the dangers which menaced him, he was desired to remain in the country which is under my sway, and means were taken, in every city wherein he abode, to supply all his wants ; but he is endowed with such exalted and extraordinary virtue, that, by the aid of the grace of God, he sets at nought all the necessities of nature. Our lord and my father, Constantine Augustus, of most blessed memory, intended to have reinstated this bishop in his diocese, and thus to have restored him to your piety ; but as he was prevented by death from fulfilling his intention, it devolves upon me, as his heir, to carry his design into execution. Athanasius will inform you in person of the respect which I have manifested towards him. Nor is it surprising that I should have acted as I have done towards him, for I was impelled by the desire of gratifying your wish of seeing him again, and by the feeling of esteem which was excited in my mind by the virtue of so holy a man. May Divine Providence watch over you, my beloved brethren.”

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 3

In consequence of this letter from the emperor, Athanasius returned from exile, and resumed the government of the Egyptian churches. Those who were attached to the Arian doctrines viewed his return with consternation; they excited fresh seditions, and had recourse to other machinations against him. The partisans of Eusebius accused him before the emperor of being a seditious person, and of having reversed the decree of exile, contrary to the laws of the church, and without the consent of the bishops. I shall presently relate in the proper place, how, by their intrigues, Athanasius was again expelled from Alexandria.

Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus, died¹ about this period, and Acacius was appointed to the bishopric of Cæsarea in Palestine. He had been instructed by Eusebius in the interpretation of Holy Writ; he possessed some learning and eloquence; and had written several works. Not long after,² the emperor Constantine declared war against his brother Constans, and was slain by his own generals. The Roman empire was divided between the surviving brothers; the East fell to the lot of Constantius, and the West to Constans.

CHAP. III.—PAUL, BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE; HERESY OF MACEDONIUS.

ALEXANDER died³ about this time, and Paul obtained the bishopric of Constantinople. The followers of Arius and Macedonius assert that he took possession of this office without the concurrence of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; or of Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, in Thrace; upon whom, as being the nearest bishops,⁴ the right of conferring ordination devolved. Many, however, maintain, on the testimony of Alexander whom he succeeded, that he was ordained by the bishops who were then assembled at Constantinople. For

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 4.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 5.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 6.

⁴ Valesius does not acquiesce in the truth of this statement, so far as concerns the bishop of Nicomedia, a city of a different province: and the right of ordination belonged only to bishops of the same province. The case may have been different with Heraclea, which was formerly the metropolitan see to Constantinople.

when Alexander, who was eighty-nine years of age, and who had held the episcopal office for twenty-three years, was at the point of death, his clergy asked him whom he wished to succeed him in the government of his church. "If," replied he, "you seek a good man, and one who is apt to teach you, have Paul. But if you desire one who is conversant with public affairs, and able to confer with rulers, Macedonius is, in these respects, more qualified than Paul." The Macedonians themselves admit that this testimony was given by Alexander; but they say that Paul was the more skilled of the two in the transaction of business and the art of eloquence, and that Macedonius was celebrated on account of the purity of his life and conduct; and they accuse Paul of having been addicted to luxury and licentiousness.¹ It appears, however, from their own acknowledgment, that Paul was a man of great eloquence, and highly renowned on account of his skill in teaching the church. Events proved that he was not competent to combat the casualties of life, or to hold intercourse with those in power. He was never successful in subverting the machinations of his enemies, like those who are adroit in the management of such affairs. Although he was greatly beloved by the people, he suffered severely from the artifices of those who rejected the doctrines established by the council of Nicæa. In the first place, he was expelled from the church of Constantinople, as if some accusation had been established against him.² He was then sent into banishment, and finally, it is said, fell a victim to the devices of his enemies, and was strangled. But these latter events took place at a subsequent period.

CHAP. IV.—A SEDITION WAS EXCITED ON THE ORDINATION OF PAUL.

THE ordination of Paul occasioned a great commotion in the church of Constantinople. During the life of Alexander, the Arians did not venture to excite any insurrection, for the

¹ ἀδιάφορος βίος, literally "an indifferent life." St. Basil and others of the Christian Fathers use the word in the same sense.

² He had been originally accused by the presbyter Macedonius. The accusation, according to Theodoret, was that of sedition. See Athanasius, Ep. ad Solit.

people were implicitly obedient to their bishop, and attached to his sway, and, moreover, regarded the extraordinary and unexpected death of Arius as a manifest indication of divine wrath, drawn down upon him, so to speak, by the prayers and virtues of Alexander. After the death of this bishop, however, the people became divided into two parties, and disputes and contests concerning doctrines were openly carried on. The adherents of Arius desired the ordination of Macedonius, while those who maintained that the Son is consubstantial with the Father wished to have Paul as their bishop; and this latter party prevailed. After the ordination of Paul the emperor returned to Constantinople, and manifested as much displeasure at what had taken place as if Paul had been unworthy of the bishopric. Through the machinations of the enemies of Paul a synod was convened, and he was expelled from the church. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was installed in the bishopric of Constantinople.

CHAP. V.—COUNCIL OF ANTIOCH; DEPOSITION OF ATHANASIOUS; INSTALLATION OF GREGORY; TWO FORMULARIES OF FAITH.

SOON after these occurrences, the emperor went to Antioch, a city of Syria. Here a large and beautiful church had been founded by the late emperor Constantine; and as the structure had been just completed by his son Constantius, it was deemed a favourable opportunity by the partisans of Eusebius to convene a council. They, therefore, with those from various regions who held their sentiments, met together in Antioch; their bishops were about ninety-seven in number. Their professed object was the consecration of the new church; but they intended nothing else than the abolition of the decrees of the Nicæan council, and this was fully proved by the sequel. The church of Antioch was then governed by¹ Flacillus, who had succeeded Euphronius. The death of Constantine the Great had taken place about five years prior to this period. When all the bishops had assembled in the presence of the emperor Constantius, the majority expressed great indignation against Athanasius for having contemned the sacerdotal regulation

¹ Πλάκηνος. Placitus or Flacillus. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 8.

which they had enacted,¹ and taken possession of the bishopric of Alexandria without first obtaining the sanction of a council. They also deposed that he was the cause of the death of several persons who fell in a sedition excited by his return ; and that many others had on the same occasion been arrested, and delivered up to the judicial tribunals. By these accusations they contrived to cast odium on Athanasius, and it was decreed that Gregory should be invested with the government of the church of Alexandria. They then turned to the discussion of doctrinal questions, and found no fault with the decrees of the council of Nice. They despatched letters to the bishops of every city, in which they declared that, as they were bishops themselves, they had not followed Arius. "For how," said they, "could we have been followers of him, when he was but a presbyter, and we were placed above him?" They affirmed that they received the faith which had, from the beginning, been handed down by tradition. This they further explained at the bottom of their letter, but without alluding to the substance of the Father or the Son, or to the term consubstantial. They resorted, in fact, to such ambiguity of expression, that neither the Arians nor the followers of the decrees of the Nicæan council could call their assertions into question, or affirm that they departed from the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. They purposely avoided all forms of expression which were rejected by either party, and only made use of those which were universally admitted. They confessed that the Son is with the Father, that he is the only begotten One, and that he is God, and existed before all things ; and that he took flesh upon him, and fulfilled the will of his Father. They admitted these and similar truths, but neither affirmed nor denied the doctrine of the Son being co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father. They subsequently disapproved, it appears, of this formulary, and issued another, which, I think, very nearly resembles that

¹ The canon here alluded to (the twelfth of the council of Nicæa) forbade a priest or deacon, when deposed by a synod, to seek restoration from the emperor, but enjoined him to appeal in such a case to a larger and fuller synod of bishops. There seems to be good ground for believing that this canon was aimed at Athanasius, when he had been restored to Alexandria by a proclamation of the emperor. Hence St. Chrysostom, on a somewhat similar occasion, declares that the canon quoted above is one of the Arians, and not of the Catholic church. See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 18.

of the council of Nice, unless, indeed, some secret meaning be attached to the words which is not apparent to me. Although they refrained, I know not from what motive, from saying that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, they confessed that he is immutable, that his Divinity is not susceptible of change, that he is the perfect image of the substance, and counsel, and power, and glory of the Father, and that he is the first-born of every creature. They stated that they had found this formulary of faith, and that it was written by Lucinius,¹ who was martyred in Nicomedia, and who was a man of great celebrity and remarkably conversant with the Sacred Scriptures. I know not whether this statement was really true, or whether they merely advanced it in order to give weight to their own document, by connecting with it the name of an illustrious martyr. Not only was Eusebius (who, on the expulsion of Paul, had been transferred from the bishopric of Nicomedia to that of Constantinople) present at this council, but likewise Acacius, the successor of Eusebius Pamphilus, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, formerly called Perinthus, Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, who succeeded Macedonius in the government of the Church of Constantinople, and Gregory, who had been appointed bishop of the church of Alexandria. It was universally acknowledged that all these bishops held the same sentiments. Dianius,² bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, George, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, and many other metropolitan bishops and primates of renowned churches were also present at this council.

CHAP. VI.—EUSEBIUS, SURNAMED EMESIUS; GREGORY ACCEPTS THE BISHOPRIC OF ALEXANDRIA; ATHANASIUS SEEKS REFUGE IN ROME.

EUSEBIUS, surnamed Emesius, likewise attended the council. He sprang from a noble family of Edessa, a city of Osdroëna. According to the custom of his country, he had,

¹ This person was a presbyter of Antioch. This symbol or formulary of faith may be seen in Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 10. He was suspected of Arianism; but this imputation has been removed from his name by the learned Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. s. ii. cap. 13, n. 4.

² He is also called Dianæus.

from his youth upwards, been instructed in the knowledge of Sacred Scripture, and was afterwards made acquainted with the learning of the Greeks by the doctors who then frequented his native city. He subsequently acquired a more intimate knowledge of sacred literature, under the guidance of Eusebius Pamphilus and Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis. He went to Antioch at the time that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus, and lived with Euphronius, his successor, on terms of intimacy. He fled to escape being invested with the priestly dignity, went to Alexandria, and frequented the schools of the philosophers. After acquainting himself with their mode of discipline, he returned to Antioch, and dwelt with Flacillus, the successor of Euphronius. During the time that the council was held in that city, Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, entreated him to accept the bishopric of Alexandria; for it was thought that, by his great reputation for sanctity and consummate eloquence, he would easily supplant Athanasius in the esteem of the Egyptians. He, however, refused the bishopric, on the plea that he could otherwise only incur the hatred of the Alexandrians, who would have no other bishop but Athanasius. Gregory was, therefore, appointed bishop of Alexandria, and Eusebius was ordained over the church of Emessa.

A sedition was excited on the inauguration of Eusebius; the people accused him of being addicted to the practice of judicial astronomy, and, being obliged to seek safety by flight, he repaired to Laodicea, and dwelt with George, bishop of that city, who was his particular friend. He afterwards accompanied this bishop to Antioch, and obtained permission from the bishops Flacillus and Narcissus to return to Emessa. He was much esteemed by the emperor Constantine, and attended him in his military expeditions against the Persians. It is said that God wrought miracles through his instrumentality, as is testified by George of Laodicea, who has related many instances of this nature besides those which I have recorded.

But although he was endowed with so many exalted qualities, he could not escape the jealousy of those who are irritated by witnessing the virtues of others. It was insinuated that he had embraced the doctrines of Sabellius. At the same time, however, he voted with the bishops who had been con-

[SOZOMEN.]

vened at Antioch. It is said that Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, kept aloof from this council, because he repented having unawares consented to the deposition of Athanasius.¹ The bishop of Rome, and the bishops of other parts of Italy, and of the remoter provinces of the empire, also absented themselves from this council. At the same period of time, the Franks devastated Western Gaul; and the provinces of the East, and more particularly Antioch, were visited by a tremendous earthquake. Gregory repaired to Alexandria with a large body of soldiers, in order to obtain a safe and undisputed entrance into the city; the Arians also, who were anxious for the expulsion of Athanasius, sided with him. Athanasius, fearful lest the people should be exposed to sufferings on his account,² assembled them by night in the church, and when the soldiers came to take possession of the church,³ prayers having been concluded, he caused a psalm to be sung. During the chaunting of this psalm, the soldiers remained without, and quietly awaited its conclusion, and in the mean time Athanasius secretly made his escape, and fled to Rome. In this manner Gregory possessed himself of the bishopric of Alexandria. The indignation of the people was aroused, and they burnt the church which bore the name of Dionysius, one of the former bishops of their city.

CHAP. VII.—BISHOPS OF ROME AND OF CONSTANTINOPLE;
RESTORATION OF PAUL AFTER THE DEATH OF EUSEBIUS.
DEATH OF HERMOGENES, A GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

THUS were the schemes of those who upheld various heresies in opposition to truth successfully carried into execution; and thus did they depose those bishops who strenuously maintained throughout the East the supremacy of the doctrines of the Nicæan council. These heretics had taken possession of the most important bishoprics, such as Alexandria in Egypt, Antioch in Syria, and the capital city of the Hellespont, and they held all the neighbouring bishops in

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 8.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 11.

³ Valesius reminds us that this occurred not on the arrival of Gregory, but at his enthronization. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 10.

subjection. The bishop of Rome and all the clergy of the West were offended at these proceedings, and religiously maintained the faith of the council of Nicæa, which they had embraced from the beginning. On the arrival of Athanasius, they received him kindly, and proposed to pass judgment on his case. Irritated at this interference, Eusebius wrote to Julius, exhorting him to constitute himself a judge of the decrees that had been enacted against Athanasius by the council of Tyre. But before he had been able to ascertain the sentiments of Julius, and, indeed, soon after the council of Antioch, Eusebius died. Immediately upon this event, those citizens of Constantinople who maintained the doctrines of the Nicæan council conducted Paul to the church. At the same time, the adherents of Theognis, bishop of Nicæa, of Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, and others of the same party, aided by the Arians, assembled at Constantinople, and ordained Macedonius bishop of Constantinople. This excited a sedition in the city, which assumed all the appearance of a war, for the people rose up against each other, and many fell in the encounter. The city was filled with tumult, so that the emperor, who was then at Antioch, on hearing of what had occurred, was filled with indignation, and issued a decree for the expulsion of Paul. Hermogenes, general of the cavalry, endeavoured to put this edict of the emperor's into execution, for, having been sent to Thraee, he had, on the journey, to pass by Constantinople, and he thought, by means of his army, to eject Paul from the church. But the people, instead of yielding, met him with open resistance, and while the soldiers, in obedience to the orders they had received, were engaged in violent assault on the city, the populace¹ entered the house of Hermogenes, set fire to it, killed him, and attaching to his body a cord, dragged it through the city. The emperor had no sooner received this intelligence than he took horse to Constantinople, in order to punish the people. They, however, went to meet him with tears and supplications, and induced him to desist from his purpose. He deprived them of about half of the corn which his father, Constantine, had granted them annually from the tributes of Egypt: probably from the idea that luxury and great abundance rendered them easily

¹ We have adopted here the emendation of Valesius, who reads *στασι-
ῶται* for *σπαρῶται*.

disposed to sedition. He turned all his anger against Paul, and commanded his expulsion from the city. He manifested great displeasure against Macedonius, because he had taken part in the murder of the general and of other individuals; and, also, because he had been ordained without first obtaining his sanction. He, however, returned to Antioch, without having either confirmed or dissolved his ordination. The Arians soon after deposed Gregory, because he had shown little zeal in the support of their doctrines, and had moreover incurred the enmity of the Alexandrians on account of the calamities which had marked the commencement of his authority, especially the conflagration of the church. They elected George, a native of Cappadocia, in his stead;¹ this new bishop was admired on account of his activity, and his zeal in support of the Arian dogmas.

CHAP. VIII.—ARRIVAL OF THE EASTERN ARCHBISHOPS AT ROME; LETTER OF JULIUS, BISHOP OF ROME. BY MEANS OF THE LETTERS OF JULIUS, PAUL AND ATHANASIUS ARE REINSTATED IN THEIR OWN BISHOPRICS; LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOPS OF THE EAST TO JULIUS.

ATHANASIUS, on leaving Alexandria, fled to Rome.² Paul, bishop of Constantinople, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, repaired thither at the same time. Asclepas, who was strongly opposed to the Arians, had been accused by them of having thrown down an altar,³ and Quintian had been appointed in his stead over the church of Gaza. Lucius, also, bishop of Adrianople, who had on some accusation been deposed from his office, was dwelling at this period in Rome. The Roman bishop, on learning the cause of their condemnation, and on finding that they held the same sentiments as himself, and adhered to the Nicæan doctrines, admitted them to communion; and as, by the dignity of his seat, the charge of watching over the orthodox devolved upon him, he restored them all to their own churches. He wrote to the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 14.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 15, 16.

³ The same accusation is made against him in the epistle of the Eastern bishops at Sardica.

bishops of the East, and rebuked them for having judged these bishops unjustly, and for having disturbed the peace of the church by abandoning the Nicæan doctrines. He summoned a few among them to appear before him on an appointed day, in order to account to him for the sentence they had passed, and threatened to bear with them no longer should they introduce any further innovations. Athanasius and Paul were reinstated in their bishoprics, and forwarded the letter of Julius to the bishops of the East. The bishops were highly indignant at this letter; and they assembled together at Antioch, and framed a reply to Julius, replete with elegance¹ and the graces of rhetoric, but couched in a tone of irony and defiance. They confessed, in this epistle, that the church of Rome was entitled to universal honour,² because it had been founded by the apostles, and had enjoyed the rank of a metropolitan church from the first preaching of religion, although those who first propagated a knowledge of Christian doctrines in this city came from the East. They added, that the second place in point of honour ought not to be assigned to them, merely on account of the smallness of their city and of their numerical inferiority, for that, with respect to zeal and firmness, they surpassed others. They called Julius to account for having admitted Athanasius into communion, and expressed their indignation against him for having insulted their synod, and abrogated their decrees; and they reprehended his conduct, because, they said, it was opposed to justice and to the canons of the church. After these complaints and protestations, they proceeded to state, that they were willing to continue on terms of amity and communion with Julius, provided that he would sanction the deposition of the bishops whom they had expelled, and the ordination of those whom they had elected in their stead: but that, unless he would accede to these terms, they should have recourse to hostility. They added, that the bishops who had preceded them in the government of the Eastern churches had offered no opposition to the deposition of Novatian by the church of Rome. They

¹ *κεκαλλιεπημένην*. Compare Athanasius, 2 Apologet. adv. Arianos, where Julius complains that the letter of the bishops is written in a proud and arrogant tone, and for the sake of displaying their eloquence (*φιλοτιμίας ἐνεκα*).

² Valesius renders *φιλοτιμίαν φέρειν*, "ambitiosè se jactare."

made no allusion in their letter to any deviations they had manifested from the doctrines of the council of Nice, but merely stated they had various reasons to allege in justification of the course they had pursued, and that they considered it unnecessary to enter at that time upon any defence of their conduct, as they were suspected of having violated justice in every respect.

CHAP. IX.—EJECTION OF PAUL AND ATHANASIUS; MACEDONIUS IS INVESTED WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

AFTER having written in this strain to Julius, the bishops of the East brought accusations against those whom they had deposed before the emperor Constantius. Accordingly, the emperor, who was then at Antioch, wrote to Philip, the prefect¹ of Constantinople, commanding him to reinstate Macedonius in the government of the church, and to expel Paul from the city. The prefect, fearing lest the execution of this order should give rise to a sedition among the people, kept the whole matter a profound secret. He repaired to the public bath which is called Zeuxippus, a large and beautiful structure, and having sent for Paul, as if he wished to converse with him on some affairs of general interest, showed him, on his arrival, the edict of the emperor. Paul was immediately and secretly conveyed through the palace, which is contiguous to the bath, to the sea-side, and was placed on board a vessel, and conducted to Thessalonica, whence, it is said, his ancestors originally came. He was strictly prohibited from approaching the Eastern regions, but was not forbidden to visit Illyria and the remoter provinces.

On quitting the prætorium, Philip, accompanied by Macedonius, proceeded to the church. The people, who had in the mean time been assembling together, quickly filled the church, and the two parties into which they were divided, namely, the Arians and the followers of Paul, respectively strove to take possession of the church. When the prefect and Macedonius arrived at the gates of the church, the soldiers endeavoured to force back the people, but, as they were so crowded

¹ τῷ ὑπάρχῳ. Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 16.

together, it was impossible for them to recede or make way; the soldiers, under the impression that they were met to resist the imperial authority, drew their swords and killed many persons, and several others were slain in the crowd. The edict of the emperor was thus accomplished, and Macedonius reinstated in the government of the church, while Paul, contrary to all previous expectation, was ejected from the church.

Athanasius in the mean time had fled, and concealed himself, dreading to be put to death, according to the menaces of the emperor Constantius; for the heterodox had made the emperor believe that he was a seditious person, and that he had, on his return to the bishopric, occasioned the death of several persons. But the anger of the emperor had been chiefly excited by the representation that Athanasius had sold the wheat which the emperor Constantine had bestowed on the poor of Alexandria, and had appropriated the price.

CHAP. X.—THE BISHOP OF ROME WRITES TO THE BISHOPS OF THE EAST IN FAVOUR OF ATHANASIUS, AND THEY SEND A DEPUTATION TO ROME TO JUSTIFY THEIR PROCEEDINGS. THIS DEPUTATION IS DISMISSED BY CONSTANS CÆSAR.

THE bishop of Egypt having sent a declaration in writing that these allegations were false, and Julius having been apprized that Athanasius was far from being in safety in Egypt, sent for him to his own city. He replied at the same time to the letter of the bishops who were convened at Antioch, and accused them of having clandestinely introduced innovations contrary to the edicts of the Nicæan council, and of having violated the laws of the church, by neglecting to invite him to join their synod; for there is a sacerdotal canon¹ which declares, that whatever is enacted without the sanction of the bishop of Rome is null and void. He also reproached them for having deviated from justice in all their proceedings against Athanasius, both at Tyre and Mareota, and stated that the decrees enacted at the former city had been annulled on account of the calumny concerning the hand of Arsenius,

¹ νόμος ιερατικός. Comp. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. ii. 17. The canon referred to is known as the 6th canon of Nicæa, and the 28th of Chalcedon.

and, at the latter city, on account of the absence of Athanasius. Last of all he reprehended the arrogant style of their epistle.

Julius was induced by all these reasons to undertake the defence of Athanasius and of Paul ; the latter had arrived in Italy not long previously, and had complained bitterly of the calamities to which he had been exposed. When Julius perceived that what he had written to those who held the sacerdotal dignity in the East was of no avail, he made the matter known to Constans the emperor. Accordingly, Constans wrote to his brother Constantius, requesting him to send some of the bishops of the East, that they might assign a reason for the edicts of deposition which they had passed. Three bishops were selected for this purpose, namely, Narcissus, bishop of Irenopolis, in Cilicia ; Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, in Thrace ; and Mark, bishop of Arethusa, in Syria. On their arrival in Italy, they strove to justify their enactments, and to persuade the emperor that the sentence passed by the Eastern synod was just. Being required to produce a statement of their belief, they withheld the formulary they had drawn up at Antioch, and presented another which was equally at variance with the doctrines established at the council of Nicæa. Constans perceived that they had unjustly entrapped the two bishops, and had ejected them from communion, not, as was stated in the sentence of deposition, on account of immorality of life, but simply on account of differences in doctrine ; and he accordingly dismissed the deputation without giving any credit to their representations.

CHAP. XI.—THE LONG FORMULARY AND THE ENACTMENTS ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL OF SARDICA. JULIUS, BISHOP OF ROME, AND HOSIUS, BISHOP OF SPAIN, DEPOSED BY THE BISHOPS OF THE EAST.

THREE years afterwards the bishops of the East sent to those of the West a formulary of faith, which, on account of its great length and copiousness, has been commonly termed *μακρόστιλος ἔκθεσις*. In this formulary no allusion is made to the substance of God, and those are excommunicated who maintain that the Son arose out of what had no previous ex-

istence, or that he is of another hypostasis and not of God, or that there was a time or an age in which he existed not. Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, Martyrius, and Macedonius presented this document, but it was rejected by the Western clergy, who declared that they felt fully satisfied with the doctrines established at Nicæa, and were not disposed to inquire further into contested matters.

After the emperor Constans had requested his brother to reinstate Athanasius in his bishopric, and had found his application to be unavailing on account of the opposition of heretics who were hostile to this restoration ; and when, moreover, Athanasius and Paul entreated Constans to assemble a council on account of the machinations which had been set on foot against orthodox doctrines ; both the emperors were of opinion that the bishops of the East and of the West should be convened on a certain day at Sardica, a city of Illyria. The bishops of the East, who had previously assembled at Philippopolis, a city of Thrace, wrote to the bishops of the West, who had repaired to Sardica, that they would not join them, unless they would eject Athanasius from their assembly and from communion with them, he having, they said, been legally deposed. They afterwards went to Sardica, but declared they would not enter the church while those who had been deposed were admitted thither. The bishops of the West replied, that they never had ejected them, and that they would not do so now, particularly as Julius, bishop of Rome, after having investigated the case, had not condemned them, and as, besides, they were present and ready to justify themselves a second time of the offences imputed to them. These declarations, however, were of no avail, and served only to increase the mutual dissatisfaction of the two parties ; and when at length the time they had appointed for the adjustment of their differences had expired, they assembled separately, and issued edicts of condemnation against each other. The Eastern bishops confirmed the sentences they had enacted against Athanasius, Paul, Marcellus, and Asclepas, and deposed Julius, bishop of Rome, because he had been the first to admit those who had been condemned into communion ; and Hosius, the confessor, was also deposed, partly for the same reason, and partly because he was the friend of Paulinus¹ and Eustathius, bishops of

¹ Valesius doubts who this Paulinus was ; but is inclined to believe him

Referat on Nicæa A. D. 325.
this 2, 18, 88, on the East senten

Antioch. Maximus, bishop of Treves, was deposed, because he had been among the first who had received¹ Paul into communion, and had been the cause of his returning to Constantinople, and because he had excluded from communion the Eastern bishops who had repaired to Gaul. Besides the above, they likewise deposed Protogenes, bishop of Sardica, and Gaudentius;² the one because he favoured Marcellus, although he had previously condemned him, and the other because he had adopted a different line of conduct from that of Cyriacus, his predecessor, and had supported many individuals whom the former had deposed. After issuing these sentences, they made known to the bishops of every region, that they were not to hold communion with those who were deposed, and that they were not to write to them, nor to receive letters from them. They likewise commanded them to believe what was said concerning God in the formulary which they subjoined to their letter, and in which no mention was made of the term "consubstantial," but in which those were excommunicated who said there are three Gods, or that Christ is not God, or that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost form but one and the same Person, or that the Son is unbegotten, or that there was a time or an age in which he existed not.

CHAP. XII.—DEPOSITION IN THEIR TURN OF THE EASTERN BISHOPS BY THE BISHOPS OF THE WEST, WHO COMPILE A FORMULARY OF FAITH.

THE adherents of Hosius, in the mean time, assembled together, and declared that Athanasius was innocent, and that unjust machinations had been carried on against him by those who had been convened at Tyre. They likewise attested the innocence of Marcellus, who deposed that he did not hold the opinions which were attributed to him; of Asclepas, who proved by authentic documents that he had been re-established in his diocese by the decree of Eusebius Pamphilus, and of

to have been the immediate successor of Philogonius in that see, and to have been soon afterwards expelled.

¹ Valesius remarks that these words are taken from the decree of the Eastern bishops at Sardica.

² He was bishop of Naisus, in Dacia.

many other bishops; and lastly, of Lucius, whose accusers had fled. They wrote to the people of each of their churches, commanding them to receive and to recognise their bishops. They stated that Gregory had not been appointed by them bishop of Alexandria; nor Basil, bishop of Ancyra; nor Quintin, bishop of Gaza; and that they had not received these men into communion, and did not even account them Christians. They deposed Theodore, bishop of Thrace; Narcissus, bishop of Irenopolis; Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine; Menophantes, bishop of Ephesus; Ursacius, bishop of Sigidon, in Mæsia; Valens, bishop of Mursia, in Pannonia; and George, bishop of Laodicea, although this latter had not attended the synod with the Eastern bishops. They ejected the above-named individuals from the priesthood and from communion, because they separated the Son from the substance of the Father, and had received those who had been deposed on account of their holding the Arian heresy, and had, moreover, promoted them to the highest offices in the service of God. They afterwards wrote to the bishops of every nation, commanding them to confirm these decrees, and to be of one mind on doctrinal subjects with themselves. They likewise compiled another formulary of faith,¹ which was more copious than that of Nicæa, although the same signification was carefully preserved, and the precise terms, in many cases, retained. Hosius and Protogenes, who held the first rank among the Western bishops assembled at Sardica, fearing lest they should be suspected of making any innovations upon the doctrines of the Nicæan council, wrote² to Julius, and testified that they were firmly attached to these doctrines, but that they had endeavoured to convey their precise signification in more perspicuous language, in order that the Arians might not take advantage of the brevity of the original document, and affix some absurd meaning to the words in which it was couched.

When what I have related had been transacted by each party, the synod was dissolved, and the members returned to their respective homes. This synod was held during the consulate of Rufinus and Eusebius, and about eleven years after

¹ This formulary is extant, appended to the synodal epistle of the council of Chalcedon, in Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. ii. Baronius, however, maintains that the formulary itself is spurious.

² This epistle is nowhere extant.

the death of Constantine. There were about three hundred¹ bishops of cities in the West, and upwards of seventy Eastern bishops, among whom was Ischyron, who had been appointed bishop of Mareota by the enemies of Athanasius.

CHAP. XIII.—AFTER THE COUNCIL, A SEPARATION TAKES PLACE BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND THE WESTERN CHURCHES; THE CHURCH OF THE WEST ADHERES TO THE FAITH OF THE NICÆAN COUNCIL, WHILE THAT OF THE EAST IS DISTURBED BY DOCTRINAL DISPUTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

AFTER this council, the Eastern and the Western churches ceased to maintain the intercourse which usually exists among people of the same faith, and refrained from holding communion with each other.² The Christians of the West held no further communion with the regions beyond Thrace; nor those of the East, with the nations beyond Illyria. This divided state of the churches gave rise, as might be supposed, to dissension and calumny. Although they had previously differed on doctrinal subjects, yet the evil had attained no great height, for they had still held communion together. The church throughout the West adhered to the doctrines of the Fathers, and kept aloof from all contentions and disputations. Although Auxentius, bishop of Milan, and Valens and Ursacius, bishops of Pannonia, had endeavoured to introduce the Arian doctrines in the West, their efforts had been frustrated by the zeal of the bishop of Rome and of other priests, who crushed the heresy in its commencement. As to the Eastern church, although it had been racked by dissension since the time of the council of Antioch, and although it greatly departed from the Nicæan form of belief, yet I still believe that the majority of those who composed it confessed the Son to be of the substance of the Father. There were some, however, who obstinately rejected the term “consubstantial,” because they had refused to admit it at the beginning, and were ashamed to defer to the opinion of others, or to avow them-

¹ This mistake Sozomen has borrowed from Socrates, who in his turn derived it from Athanasius. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 20, and Valesius' notes in loco.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 22.

selves in fault. Others were finally convinced, after long disputation, of the truth of the doctrines concerning God, and ever afterwards continued firmly attached to them. Others again, being aware that contentions ought not to arise, adopted the sentiments of their friends or of the more powerful party, or were swayed by the various causes which often induce men to embrace what they ought to reject, and to dissimulate what they ought boldly to avow. Many others, accounting it absurd to consume their time in altercations about words, quietly adopted the sentiments inculcated by the council of Nicæa. Paul, bishop of Constantinople, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, a multitude of monks, Anthony the Great, his disciples, and a great number of Egyptians and of other nations within the Roman territories, firmly and openly maintained the doctrines of the Nicæan council throughout the other regions of the East. As I have been led to allude to the monks, I shall briefly mention those who flourished during the reign of Constantius.

CHAP. XIV.—OF THE HOLY MEN WHO FLOURISHED ABOUT THIS TIME IN EGYPT, NAMELY, ANTONY, THE TWO MACARIUSES, HERACLIUS, CRONIUS, PAPHNUTIUS, PUTUBASTES, ARSISIUS, SERAPION, PITURION, PACHOMIUS, APOLLONIUS, ANUPHUS, HILARION, AND MANY OTHERS.

I SHALL commence my recital with Egypt and the two men named Macarius, who were the celebrated chiefs of Scetis and of the neighbouring mountain; the one was a native of Egypt, the other was called *Politicus*, which means a citizen, and was of Alexandrian origin. They were both so wonderfully endowed with divine knowledge and philosophy, that the demons regarded them with terror, and they wrought many extraordinary works and miraculous cures. The Egyptian, it is said, restored a dead man to life, in order to convince a heretic of the truth of the resurrection from the dead. He lived about ninety years, sixty of which he passed in the deserts. When in his youth he commenced the study of philosophy, he progressed so rapidly that the monks surnamed him "*old child*," and at the age of forty he was ordained priest. The other Macarius became a priest at a later period of his life; he was

proficient in all the exercises of asceticism, some of which he devised himself: his abstinence was so great that his skin dried up, and the hairs of his beard ceased to grow. Pambonius, Heraclius, Cronius, Paphnutius, Putubastes, Arsisius, Serapion the Great, Piturion, who dwelt near Thebes, and Pachomius, the founder of the monks called the Tabennesians,¹ flourished at the same place and period. The attire and customs of this sect differed in some respects from those of other monks. Its members were, however, devoted to virtue, they contemned the things of the earth, excited the soul to heavenly contemplation, and prepared it to quit the body with joy. They were clothed in skins in remembrance of Elias, it appears to me, because they thought that the virtue of the prophet would be thus retained in their memory, and that they would be enabled like him to resist manfully the seductions of pleasure, to be influenced by similar zeal, and be incited to the practice of sobriety, by the hope of an equal reward. It is said that the peculiar vestments of these Egyptian monks had reference to some secret connected with their philosophy, and did not differ from those of others without some adequate cause. They wore their tunics without sleeves, in order to teach that the hands ought not to be ready to do evil. They wore a covering on their heads called a cowl, to show that they ought to live with the same innocence and purity as infants who are nourished with milk, and wear a covering of the same form. Their girdle, and a species of scarf,² which they wear across the back, shoulders, and arms, admonish them that they ought to be always ready in the service of God. I am aware that other reasons have been assigned for their peculiarity of attire, but what I have said appears to me to be sufficient. It is said that Pachomius at first dwelt alone in a cave, but that a holy angel appeared to him, and commanded him to assemble some young monks, to instruct them in the practice of philosophy, and to inculcate the laws which were about to be delivered to him. A tablet was then given to him, which is still carefully preserved. Upon this tablet were inscribed injunctions by which he was bound to permit every one to eat, to drink, to work, and to fast, according to

¹ So called from the nome of the Thebais which was called Tabennesus, according to the analogy of Proconnesus and other terms.

² ἀναβολεύς. Compare Cassian, Institut. b. i. ch. 6.

his capabilities of so doing : those who ate heartily were to be subjected to arduous labour, and the ascetic were to have more easy tasks assigned them ; he was commanded to have many cells erected, in each of which three monks were to dwell, who were to take their meals at a common refectory in silence, and with a veil thrown over the head and face, so that they might not be able to see each other or anything but what was on or under the table : they were not to admit strangers to eat with them, with the exception of travellers, to whom they were to show hospitality ; those who desired to live with them were first to undergo a probation of three years, during which time the most laborious and painful tasks were to be imposed upon them. They were to clothe themselves in skins, and to wear woollen tiaras adorned with purple nails, and linen tunics and girdles. They were to sleep in their tunics and garments of skin, reclining on long chairs closed on each side, which were to serve as couches. On the first and last days of the week they were to approach the altar and partake of the communion of the holy mysteries, and were then to unloose their girdles, and throw off their robes of skin. They were to pray twelve times¹ every day, and as often during the evening, and were to offer up the same number of prayers during the night. At the ninth hour they were to pray thrice, and when about to partake of food they were to sing a psalm before each prayer. The whole congregation was to be divided into twenty-four classes, each of which was to be distinguished by one of the letters of the Greek alphabet ; thus, the name of Iota was given to the most simple, and that of Zeta or of Xi to the most erudite, and the names of the other letters were, according to the same principle, bestowed on the other classes.

These were the laws by which Pachomius ruled his own disciples. He was a man of great philanthropy and piety ; he could foresee future events, and was frequently admitted to intercourse with the holy angels. He resided at Tabennis in Thebais, and hence the name Tabennesians, used to designate those who lived according to the same rules ; they subsequently attained great renown ; and in process of time became so numerous that they numbered upwards of seven thousand

¹ δωδεκάκις. Valesius prefers this emendation of Nicephorus. Compare Cassian, Institut. b. ii. ch. 4, &c.

men. About thirteen of them dwelt with Pachomius in the island Tabennis; the others were dispersed throughout Egypt and Thebais.¹ They all observed one and the same rule of life, and possessed everything in common. They regarded the congregation established in the island Tabennis as their mother, and the rulers of it as their fathers and their princes.

About the same period Apollonius became celebrated by his profession of monastic philosophy. It is said that from the age of fifteen he devoted himself to philosophy in the solitudes of the deserts, and that when he attained the age of forty, he went, according to a Divine command he then received, to dwell in regions inhabited by men. He likewise dwelt in Thebais. He was greatly beloved of God, and was endowed with the power of performing miraculous cures and notable works. He was exact in the observance of duty, and instructed others in philosophy with great goodness and kindness. He invariably obtained from God whatever he asked in prayer, but he was so wise that he always proffered prudent requests and such as the Divine Being is ever ready to grant.

I believe that Anuphus the divine lived about this period. I have been informed that from the time of the persecution, when he first avowed his attachment to Christianity, he never uttered a falsehood, nor desired the things of the earth. All his prayers and supplications to God were duly answered, and he was instructed by a holy angel in every virtue. Let, however, what we have said of the Egyptian monks suffice. The same species of philosophy was about this time cultivated in Palestine, whither it had been transported from Egypt, and Hilarion the divine acquired great celebrity. He was a native of Tanata, a village situated near the town of Gaza, towards the south, and near a torrent which falls into the sea, and is known by the same name as the village. When he was studying grammar at Alexandria, he went out into the desert to see Antony, the divine and celebrated monk, and discoursed with him concerning his mode of life and philosophy. A very short time afterwards, he fixed his residence with him, but did not enjoy the quietude he had anticipated, on account of the multi-

¹ Cassian speaks of all the monks in the Thebais as constituting only one religious house. It is probable that he does so, because they were all subject to one rule of life, and to one abbot or archimandrite.

tudes who flocked around Antony. He, therefore, soon returned to his own country, and finding his parents dead, he distributed his patrimony among his brethren and the poor, without reserving anything for himself. He then went to dwell in a desert situated near the sea, and about twenty stadia from his native village. His cell was constructed of planks, broken tiles, and straw, and was of such a height and length that no one could stand in it without bending the head, or lie down in it without drawing back the legs: for in everything he strove to accustom himself to hardship and to the subjugation of sensuality. The practice of temperance was never carried to a greater height than by him; he endured cold and heat, hunger and thirst, and other sufferings, and resisted the desires of the mind and of the body. He was irreproachable in conduct, grave in discourse, and diligent in the study of sacred writ. He was so beloved by God, that even now many diseases are healed and demons expelled at his tomb. It is remarkable that he was first interred¹ in the island of Cyprus, but that his remains are now deposited in Palestine; for it so happened that he died during his residence in Cyprus, and was buried by the inhabitants with great honour and respect. But Hesychius, one of the most renowned of his disciples, stole the body, conveyed it to Palestine, and interred it in his own monastery. From that period an annual festival was celebrated in honour of his memory, for it is the custom in Palestine to bestow this honour on those who have attained renown by their sanctity, such as Aurelius, Antedon, Alexion, a native of Bethagatonia, and Alaphion, a native of Asalia, who, during the reign of Constantius, lived so religiously and so virtuously in the practice of philosophy, that many Pagans were led by their example to embrace Christianity.

About the same period, Julian pursued a course of such rigid austerity at Edessa, that he might be said to live as if he were incorporeal, for he seemed to be freed from flesh, and to possess nothing but skin and bones. Ephraim, the Syrian, has written an account of his life.² God himself confirmed the high opinion which men had formed of him, for he bestowed on him the power of expelling demons and of healing all

¹ We have retained the obvious emendation of *ἐτάφη* for *ἐτάφη*.

² Concerning Julian and Ephraim, see below, b. vi. 34.

[SOZOMEN.]

K

kinds of diseases, without having recourse to the remedies of the physician, but simply by prayer.

Besides the above, many other ecclesiastical philosophers flourished in the territories of Edessa and of Amida, and in the regions around the mountain Gangalion: among these were Daniel and Simeon.¹ But I shall now say nothing further of the Syrian monks. I shall at some future time, if God will, describe them more fully.² It is said that Eustathius,³ bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, founded a society of monks in Armenia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus, and imposed upon them a rule of life, containing directions as to what meats they were to partake of or to avoid, what garments they were to wear, and what customs they were to adopt. Some assert that he was the author of the ascetic writings commonly attributed to Basil of Cappadocia. It is said that his great austerity led him into certain extravagancies which were contrary to the laws of the church. Many persons, however, justify him from this accusation, and throw the blame upon some of his disciples, who condemned marriage, refused to pray to God in the houses of married persons, despised married priests, fasted on Lord's days, held their assemblies in private houses, contemned those who partook of animal food, clothed themselves in peculiar garments, different from those of others, and introduced many other strange customs and innovations. Many women were deluded by them and left their husbands, but, not being able to practise continence, they fell into adultery. Other women, under the pretext of religion, cut off their hair, and arrayed themselves in men's apparel. The bishops of the neighbourhood of Gangris, the metropolis of Paphlagonia, assembled themselves together, and declared that all those who imbibed these opinions should be cut off from the Catholic Church, unless they would renounce them. It is said that, from that time, Eustathius refrained from his former peculiarity of attire, and habited himself like other priests, thus proving that he had not been influenced by motives of selfish arrogance, but by the desire of attaining to divine asceticism.

¹ Valesius considers that this Simeon, or Symeon, is the same person mentioned by Theodoret in his Philotheus.

² See below, ch. 16.

³ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 42. Eustathius is said by Epiphanius and Basil to have died in the Arian heresy.

He was as renowned for the sanctity of his discourse as for the purity of his life. To confess the truth, he was not eloquent, nor had he ever studied the art of eloquence, yet he possessed naturally such strong powers of persuasion that he induced several men and women, who were living in fornication and adultery, to enter upon a chaste course of life. It is related that a certain man and woman, who, according to the custom of the church, had devoted themselves to a life of virginity, were accused of holding illicit intercourse with each other; finding that his remonstrances produced no effect upon them, he sighed deeply and said, that a woman who had been legally married had on one occasion heard him discourse on the advantage of continence, and was thereby so deeply affected that she voluntarily abstained from legitimate intercourse with her own husband; and that the weakness of his powers of conviction was, on the other hand, attested by the fact, that the parties above mentioned persisted in their illegal course. Such were the men who originated the practice of monastic discipline in the regions above mentioned. *see*

Although the Thracians, the Illyrians, and the other European nations possessed no congregations of monks, yet there were many men devoted to Christian philosophy among them. Of these, Martin, the descendant of a noble family of Sabaria in Pannonia, was the most illustrious. He was originally a noted warrior, and the commander of armies; but, accounting the service of God to be a more honourable profession, he embraced a life of philosophy, and retired, in the first place, to Illyria. Here he zealously defended the orthodox doctrines against the attacks of the Arian bishops, and was in consequence persecuted and driven from the country. He then went to Milan, and dwelt alone. He was soon, however, obliged to quit his place of retreat on account of the machinations of Auxentius, bishop of that region, who was opposed to the Nicene faith, and he went to an island called Gallinaria, where he remained for some time, subsisting solely upon roots. Gallinaria is a small and desert island lying in the Tyrrhenian Sea. Martin was afterwards appointed bishop of Tours.¹ He was so richly endowed with miraculous gifts that he restored a dead man to life, and performed other signs as wonderful as those wrought by the *see*

¹ He became bishop of Tours, A. D. 375, and was afterwards canonized on account of the miracles which were said to have been performed by him.

apostles. We have heard that Hilarion, a man noted for the sanctity of his life and conversation, lived about the same time, and in the same country : like Martin, he was obliged to flee from his place of abode, on account of his zeal in defence of the faith. I have now related what I have been able to ascertain concerning the individuals who were celebrated about this period for their piety and philosophy. There were many others who were noted in the church about the same period on account of their great eloquence, and among these the most distinguished were, Eusebius, bishop of Emessa ; Titus, bishop of Bostra ; Serapion, bishop of Thmuis ; Basil, bishop of Ancyra ; Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia ; Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea ; and Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem. The numerous and excellent writings which they have bequeathed to posterity demonstrate the truth of what I have asserted.

CHAP. XV.—DIDYMUS THE BLIND, AND AETIUS THE HERETIC.

DIDYMUS, an ecclesiastical historian and a professor of sacred literature at Alexandria, flourished about the same period. He was acquainted with every branch of science, and was conversant with poetry and rhetoric, with astronomy and geometry, with arithmetic, and with the various theories of philosophy. He had acquired all this knowledge by the efforts of his own mind, aided by the sense of hearing, for he lost his sight in early childhood. From his youth he manifested an ardent desire to acquire learning, and for this purpose he frequented the schools, where he made such rapid progress that, by means of the sense of hearing alone, he speedily comprehended the most difficult mathematical theorems. It is said that he learnt the letters of the alphabet by means of wooden tablets on which they were sculptured, and which he felt with his fingers, and that he made himself acquainted with syllables and words by the force of attention and memory, and by listening attentively to the sounds. His was a very extraordinary case ; and many persons resorted to Alexandria for the express purpose of hearing or, at least, of seeing him. His firmness in defending the doctrines of the Nicæan council was extremely displeasing to the Arians. He carried conviction to the minds of his audience by persuasion rather than by power of reason-

ing, and submitted his arguments to the investigation of their judgment. He was esteemed and beloved by the members of the Catholic church, by the monks of Egypt, and by Antony the Great. It is related that when Antony left the desert and repaired to Alexandria to give his testimony in favour of the doctrines of Athanasius, he said to Didymus, "It is not a great misfortune, O Didymus, to be deprived of the organs of sight which are possessed by rats, mice, and the lowest animals; but it is a great blessing to possess eyes like angels, whereby you can contemplate the Divine Being and attain to true knowledge." In Italy and its territories, Eusebius and Hilarion, whom I have already mentioned, acquired great fame by their eloquence and their writings¹ against the heterodox. Lucifer, the founder of a heresy which bears his name,² also flourished at this period. Aetius³ was likewise held in high estimation among the heterodox; he was an expert logician, and proficient in the art of disputation. He reasoned so boldly concerning the nature of God, that many persons gave him the name of "Atheist." It is said that he was originally a physician⁴ of Antioch in Syria, and that, as he frequently attended meetings of the church for the examination of the Sacred Scriptures, he became acquainted with Gallus, who was then Cæsar, and who honoured religion and cherished its professors. It seems likely that, as Aetius obtained the esteem of Cæsar by means of these disputations, he devoted himself the more assiduously to these pursuits, in order to progress in the favour of the emperor. It is said that he was versed in the philosophy of Aristotle, and frequented the schools in which it was taught at Alexandria.

Besides the individuals above specified, there were many others in the churches who were capable of instructing the people, and of reasoning concerning the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. It would be too great a task to attempt to name them all. Let it not be accounted strange, if I have bestowed commendation upon the leaders of the above-mentioned heresies.

¹ He alludes to the treatises of Hilary against the Arians and Auxentius.

² That, namely, of the Luciferians. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 9.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 35.

⁴ The same is asserted by Gregory of Nyssa, in his first book contra Eunomium.

I admire their eloquence, and their powers of reasoning. I leave their doctrines to be judged by those who are in authority. Judgment does not devolve upon me in my character of historian; I have only to give an account of events as they happened. I have now related what I have heard, concerning those individuals among the Romans and the Greeks who were celebrated for their learning and their eloquence.

CHAP. XVI.—CONCERNING THE PIETY OF ST. EPHRAIM.

EPHRAIM the Syrian¹ was entitled to the highest honours, and was the greatest ornament of the church. He was a native of Nisibis, or of the neighbouring territory. He devoted his life to monastic philosophy; and although he received no instruction, he became, contrary to all expectation, so proficient in the learning and language of the Syrians, that he comprehended with ease the most abstruse theorems of philosophy. His style of writing was so replete with splendid oratory and sublimity of thought that he surpassed all the writers of Greece. If the works of these writers were to be translated into Syriac, or any other language, and divested, as it were, of the beauties of the Greek language, they would retain little of their original elegance and value. The productions of Ephraim have not this disadvantage: they were translated into Greek during his life, and translations are even now being made, and yet they preserve much of their original force and power, so that his works are not less admired when read in Greek than when read in Syriac. Basil, who was subsequently bishop of the metropolis of Cappadocia, was a great admirer of Ephraim, and was astonished at his erudition. The opinion of Basil, who was the most learned and eloquent man of his age, is a stronger testimony, I think, to the merit of Ephraim, than anything that could be indited in his praise. It is said that he wrote three hundred thousand verses,² and that he had many disciples who were zealously attached to his doctrines. The most celebrated of his disciples were Abbas, Zenobius,

¹ See below, b. vi. 34.

² *μυριάδας ἔπων*. The words *ἔπη* and *στίχοι* were constantly used for verses. Thus Origen says that there are nearly 10,000 *ἔπη* in the Book of Job.

Abraham, Maras, and Simeon, whom the most learned men of Syria regard as the glory of their country. Paulanas and Aranad are likewise generally included in their number; for they were renowned as men of great eloquence, although reported to have deviated from sound doctrine.

I am not ignorant that there were some very learned men who flourished in Osroene, as, for instance, Bardasañes, who originated a heresy designated by his name,¹ and Harmonius his son. It is related that this latter was deeply versed in Grecian erudition, and was the first to compose verses in his vernacular language; those verses he delivered to the choirs, and even now the Syrians frequently sing, not the precise verses written by Harmonius, but others of the same metre. For as Harmonius was not altogether free from the errors of his father, and entertained various opinions concerning the soul, the generation and destruction of the body, and the doctrine of transmigration, which are taught by the Greek philosophers, he introduced some of these sentiments in the lyrical songs which he composed. When Ephraim perceived that the Syrians were charmed with the elegant diction and melodious versification of Harmonius, he became apprehensive, lest they should imbibe the same opinions; and therefore, although he was ignorant of Grecian learning, he applied himself to the study of the metres of Harmonius, and composed similar poems in accordance with the doctrines of the church, and sacred hymns in praise of holy men. From that period the Syrians sang the odes of Ephraim, according to the method indicated by Harmonius. The execution of this work is alone sufficient to attest the natural endowments of Ephraim. He was as celebrated for the good actions he performed as for the rigid course of discipline he pursued. He was particularly fond of tranquillity. He was so serious, and so careful to avoid giving occasion to calumny, that he refrained from looking upon woman. It is related that a female of licentious character, who was either desirous of tempting him, or who had been bribed for the purpose, contrived on one occasion to meet him face to face, and fixed her eyes intently on him; he rebuked her, and commanded her to look down upon the ground. "Wherefore should I obey your injunction," replied the woman; "for I was born not of the

¹ Compare Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iv. 30.

earth, but of you? It would be more just if you were to look down upon the earth whence you sprang, while I look upon you, as I was born of you." Ephraim, astonished at the language of the woman, recorded the whole transaction in a book, which most Syrians regard as one of the best of his productions. It is also said of him, that, although he was naturally prone to passion, he never exhibited angry feeling towards any one from the period of his embracing a monastic life. It once happened that after he had, according to custom, been fasting several days, his attendant, in presenting some food to him, let fall the dish on which it was placed. Ephraim, perceiving that he was overwhelmed with shame and terror, said to him, "Take courage; we will go to the food as the food does not come to us;" and he immediately seated himself beside the fragments of the dish, and ate his supper. What I am about to relate will suffice to show that he was totally exempt from the love of vain-glory. He was appointed bishop of some town, and attempts were made to convey him away for the purpose of ordaining him. As soon as he became aware of what was intended, he ran to the market-place, exhibited himself in an indecorous manner, and ate in public. Those who had come to carry him away to be their bishop, on seeing him in this state, believed that he was out of his mind, and departed: and he, meeting with an opportunity for effecting his escape, remained in concealment until another had been ordained in his place. What I have now said concerning Ephraim must suffice, although his own countrymen relate many other anecdotes of him. Yet his conduct on one occasion, shortly before his death, appears to me so worthy of remembrance that I shall record it here. The city of Edessa being severely visited by famine, he quitted the solitary cell in which he dwelt, and rebuked the rich for permitting the poor to die around them, instead of imparting to them of their superfluities; and he represented to them that the wealth which they were treasuring up so carefully would turn to their own condemnation, and to the ruin of the soul, which is of more value than all the riches of the earth. The rich men, convinced by his arguments, replied, "We are not intent upon hoarding our wealth, but we know of no one to whom we can confide the distribution of our goods, for all are prone to seek after lucre, and to betray the trust placed in

them." "What think you of me?" asked Ephraim. On their admitting that they considered him an excellent and just man, and worthy of confidence, he offered to undertake the distribution of their alms. As soon as he received their money he had about three hundred beds fitted up in the public galleries, and here he tended those who were ill and suffering from the effects of the famine, whether they were foreigners or natives of the surrounding country. On the cessation of the famine he returned to the cell in which he had previously dwelt; and, after the lapse of a few days, he expired. He attained no higher clerical degree than that of deacon, although his attainments in virtue rendered him equal in reputation to those who rose to the highest sacerdotal dignity, while his holy life and erudition made him an object of universal admiration. I have now given some account of the virtue of Ephraim. It would require a more experienced hand than mine, to furnish a full description of his character and that of the other illustrious men, who, about the same period, had devoted themselves to a life of philosophy; and it is to be regretted that Ephraim did not enter upon this undertaking. The attempt is beyond my powers, for I possess but little knowledge of these great men, or of their exploits. Some of them concealed themselves in the deserts. Others, who lived in populous places, strove to preserve a mean appearance, and to seem as if they differed in no respect from the multitude, that their virtue might be unknown, and that they might so avoid the praises of others. For as they were intent upon the enjoyment of future blessedness, they desired no other testimony to their virtue than that of God, and sought not outward glory.

CHAP. XVII.—TRANSACTIONS OF THAT PERIOD, AND PROGRESS OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE THROUGH THE JOINT EFFORTS OF EMPERORS AND ARCHBISHOPS.

THOSE who presided over the churches at this period were noted for purity of life, and, as might be expected, the people whom they governed were earnestly attached to the service of Christ: religion daily progressed, and the zeal, virtue, and wonderful works of the priests, and of the ecclesiastical phi-

losophers, attracted the attention of the Greeks, and led them to renounce their superstitions. The emperors who then occupied the throne were as zealous as was their father in protecting the churches; and they granted honours and privileges to the clergy, their children, and their slaves. They confirmed the laws enacted by their father, and enforced new ones, prohibiting the offering of sacrifice and the observance of other Pagan ceremonies. They commanded that all temples, whether in cities, or in the country, should be closed. Some of these temples were presented to the churches, when they required either the ground they stood on or the materials for building. The greatest possible care was bestowed upon the houses of prayer; those which had been defaced by time were repaired, and others were erected in a style of extraordinary magnificence. The church of Edessa is one of the most beautiful and remarkable of these structures. The Jews were strictly forbidden to purchase a slave belonging to any other heresy than their own. If they transgressed this law, the slave was confiscated¹ to the public; but if they administered to him the Jewish rite of circumcision, the penalties were death and total confiscation of property. For, as the emperors were desirous of promoting by every means the spread of Christianity, they deemed it necessary to prevent the Jews from proselyting those whose ancestors were of another religion, and who were, therefore, carefully reserved for the service of the church; for it was by conversion from the Pagan multitudes that the professors of the Christian religion increased in number.

CHAP. XVIII.—CONCERNING THE DOCTRINES HELD BY THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TERMS “HOMOUSIAN” AND “HOMŒOUSIAN.” CONSTANTIUS IS LED TO ABANDON THE TRUE FAITH.

THE emperors had, from the beginning, adopted the same religious ceremonies as had been held by their father; for

¹ *δημόσιον εἶναι*. The early interpreters understood these words as referring to the Jewish offender, and not to the slave. But the law itself is extant in b. xvi. of the Theodosian Code. The terms are as follows, “Si aliquis Judæorum, mancipium sectæ alterius seu nationis crediderit comparandum, *mancipium* fisco protinus vindicetur.”

they both followed the Nicene form of belief. Constans maintained these opinions till his death; Constantius, however, renounced his former sentiments when he discovered that the term "consubstantial" was a subject of debate and attack. Yet he always confessed that the Son is of like substance with the Father. Eusebius, and other holy and learned bishops of the East, made a distinction between the term "consubstantial" (*homousian*) and the expression "of like substance," which latter they designated by the term "*homœousian*."¹ They say that the term "consubstantial" (*homousian*) properly belongs to corporeal beings, such as men and other animals, trees and plants, which are of the same substance as things like unto themselves whereby they are generated. And that the term "*homœousian*" appertains exclusively to incorporeal beings, such as God and the angels, of each one of whom a conception is formed according to his own peculiar substance. The emperor Constantius was deceived by this distinction; and although I am certain that he retained the same doctrines as those held by his father and brother, yet he adopted a change of phraseology, and, instead of using the term "*homousian*," made use of the term "*homœousian*." The teachers to whom we have alluded maintained that it was necessary to be thus precise in the use of terms, and that otherwise we should be in danger of conceiving that to be a body which is incorporeal. Many, however, regard this distinction as an absurdity, "for," say they, "the things which are conceived by the mind can be designated only by names derived from things which are seen; and there is no danger in the use of words, provided only that the meaning be clearly understood."

CHAP. XIX.—FURTHER PARTICULARS CONCERNING THE TERM
"CONSUBSTANTIAL." COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM.

It is not surprising that the emperor Constantius was induced to adopt the use of the term "*homœousian*," for it was admitted by many priests who conformed to the doctrines established by the Nicæan council.² Many use the two words

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 45, and notes.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 2.

indifferently, to convey the same meaning. Hence it appears to me, that the Arians departed greatly from truth when they affirmed that, after the council of Nicæa, many of the priests, among whom were Eusebius and Theognis, refused to admit that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, and that Constantine was in consequence so indignant, that he condemned them to banishment. They say that it was afterwards revealed to his sister by a vision, during sleep or otherwise, that these bishops held orthodox doctrines, and had been unjustly condemned; and that the emperor thereupon recalled them, and demanded of them, wherefore they had departed from the Nicene doctrines, to which they had formerly subscribed; and that they urged in reply that they had not assented to those doctrines from conviction, but from the fear that, if the disputes then existing were prolonged, the emperor, who was then just beginning to embrace Christianity, and who was yet unbaptized, might be impelled to return to Paganism, and to persecute the church. They assert that Constantine was pleased with this reply, and determined upon convening another council; but that, being prevented by death from carrying his scheme into execution, the task devolved upon his eldest son, Constantius, to whom he represented that it would avail him nothing to be possessed of imperial power, unless he could establish uniformity of worship throughout his empire; and Constantius, they say, at the instigation of his father, convened a council at Ariminum.¹ This story is easily seen to be a gross fabrication, for the council was convened during the consulate of Hypatius and Eusebius, and twenty-two years after Constantius had, on the death of his father, succeeded to the empire. Now, during this interval of twenty-two years, many councils were held, in which debates were carried on concerning the terms "homousian" and "homœousian." No one, it appears, ventured to deny that the Son is of like substance with the Father,² until Aetius, by starting a contrary opinion, so offended the emperor that, in order to arrest the course of the heresy, he commanded the priests to assemble themselves together at Ariminum and at Seleucia. Thus the true cause of this council being convened, was not the command of Con-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 16.

² The text, which was corrupt here, has been much simplified by Valsius, and we have retained his emendations.

stantine, but the question agitated by Aetius. And this will become still more apparent by what we shall hereafter relate.

CHAP. XX.—RETURN AND RE-INSTALLATION OF ATHANASIUS.
ARCHBISHOPS OF ANTIOCH. QUESTION PUT BY CONSTANTIUS
TO ATHANASIUS. HYMNS OF PRAISE TO GOD.

WHEN Constans was apprized of what had been enacted at Sardica, he wrote¹ to his brother to request him to restore Paul and Athanasius to their own churches. As Constantius seemed to hesitate, he wrote again, and threatened him with war, unless he would consent to receive the bishops. Constantius, after conferring on the subject with the bishops of the East, judged that it would be foolish to excite on this account the horrors of civil war. He, therefore, recalled Athanasius from Italy, and sent public carriages to convey him on his return homewards, and wrote several letters requesting his speedy return. Athanasius, who was then residing at Aquileia, on receiving the letters of Constantius, repaired to Rome to take leave of Julius. This latter parted with him with great demonstrations of friendship, and gave him a letter addressed to the clergy and people of Alexandria, in which he spoke of him as a wonderful man, deserving of renown by the numerous trials he had undergone, and congratulated the church of Alexandria on the return of so good a priest, and exhorted them to follow his doctrines.

He then proceeded to Antioch in Syria, where the emperor was then residing. Leontius presided over the churches of that region; for, on the exile of Eustathius, those who held heretical sentiments had seized the government of the church of Antioch. The first bishop they appointed was Euphronius; to him succeeded Flacillus; and afterwards, Stephen. This latter was deposed as being unworthy of the dignity,² and Leontius³ obtained the bishopric. Athanasius avoided him as a heretic, and met for worship in a private house with those who were called Eustathians.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 23.

² Compare Athanasius, Hist. of the Arians; Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. ii. 8, 9; and Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 22.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 26.

Constantius received him with great kindness and benignity, and Athanasius requested to be restored to his church. The emperor, at the instigation of the heterodox, replied as follows: "I am ready to perform all that I promised when I recalled you; but it is just that you should in return grant me a favour, and that is, that you yield one of the numerous churches which are under your sway to those who are averse to holding communion with you." Athanasius replied, "What you have promised, O emperor, is so just and so necessary, that I can offer no opposition to it. But as in the city of Antioch there are many of us who eschew communion with the heterodox, I also entreat that one church may be conceded to us, whither we may resort in safety." As the request of Athanasius appeared reasonable to the emperor, the heterodox deemed it more politic to take no further steps; for they reflected that their peculiar opinions could never gain any ground in Alexandria, on account of Athanasius, who was able both to retain those who held the same sentiments as himself, and to attract and lead those of contrary opinions; and that, moreover, if they gave up one of the churches of Antioch, the Eustathians, who were very numerous, would assemble together, and probably introduce innovations without incurring the danger of detaching any of their adherents. Besides, the heterodox perceived that, although the government of the churches was in their hands, all the clergy and people did not conform to their doctrines. When they sang hymns to God they were, according to custom, divided into choirs; and, at the end of the hymns, each one declared what were his own peculiar sentiments. Some offered praise to "the Father *and* the Son," regarding them as co-equal in glory; others glorified "the Father *by*¹ the Son," to denote that they considered the Son to be inferior to the Father. Leontius, the bishop of the opposite faction, who then presided over the church of Antioch, did not dare to prohibit the singing of hymns to God which were in accordance with the Nicene doctrines, for he feared to excite an insurrection of the people. It is related, however, that he once raised his hand to his head, the hairs of which were quite white, and said, "When this snow is dissolved, there will be plenty of mud." By this he intended to signify that, after his death, the different modes of singing

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. 21.

hymns would give rise to great seditions, and that his successors would not show the same consideration to the people which he had manifested.

CHAP. XXI.—LETTER OF CONSTANTIUS TO THE EGYPTIANS IN BEHALF OF ATHANASIUS. SYNOD OF JERUSALEM.

THE emperor, on sending back¹ Athanasius to Egypt, wrote in his favour to the bishops and presbyters of that country, and to the people of the church of Alexandria, commended the integrity and virtue of his conduct, and exhorted them to be of one mind, and to unite in prayer and service to God under his guidance. He added, that, if any evil-disposed persons should excite disturbances, they should receive the punishment awarded by the laws for such offences. He also commanded that the former decrees he had enacted against Athanasius, and those who were in communion with him, should be effaced from the public registers, and that his clergy should be admitted to the same privileges they had previously enjoyed; and edicts to this effect were despatched to the governors of Egypt and Libya.

Immediately on his arrival in Egypt, Athanasius displaced those priests who were attached to Arianism, and placed the government of the church in the hands of those who held his sentiments, and whom he specially exhorted to cleave to the Nicene doctrines. It was said at that time, that, when he was travelling through other countries, he effected the same change in churches which were not under his administration when he found the Arians in power. He was certainly accused of having performed the ceremony of ordination in cities where he had no right to do so. But after he was recalled from exile in spite of the machinations of his enemies, and was honoured with the friendship of the emperor Constantius, he was regarded with greater consideration than before. Many bishops, who had previously been at enmity with him, received him into communion, particularly those of Palestine. When he visited these latter, they received him kindly: they held a synod at Jerusalem, and Maximus and the others wrote the following letter in his favour.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 23.

CHAP. XXII.—EPISTLE WRITTEN BY THE SYNOD OF JERUSALEM
IN FAVOUR OF ATHANASIUS.

“The holy synod assembled at Jerusalem, to the priests, deacons, and people of Egypt, Libya, and Alexandria, our most beloved and cherished brethren; greeting in the Lord.¹

“WE can never, O beloved, return adequate thanks to God, the Creator of all things, for the wonderful works he has now accomplished, particularly for the blessings he has conferred on your churches by the restoration of Athanasius, your lord and pastor, and our fellow minister. Who could have hoped to have seen this effected? God heard your prayers; He had compassion on His church; He hearkened to your groans and tears, and granted your supplications. You were scattered abroad like sheep without a pastor. The true Shepherd, who from heaven watches over his own flock, restored to you him whom you desired. Behold, we do all things for the peace of the church, and are influenced by love like yours; therefore we received and embraced your pastor, and despatch by him this letter of congratulation² to you on his return, whereby you may know that we are knit together with you in love for him. It is right that you should pray for the pious emperors, who, having perceived your anxiety for his return, and recognised his innocence, restored him to you with great honour. Receive him then joyfully, and offer on his behalf due praises to God; and let us ever rejoice in Him, and glorify Him in Christ Jesus our Lord, by whom be glory to the Father throughout all ages, Amen.”

CHAP. XXIII.—VALENS AND URSACIUS, WHO BELONGED TO
THE ARIAN FACTION, CONFESS TO THE BISHOP OF ROME THAT
ATHANASIUS HAD BEEN UNJUSTLY DEPOSED.

SUCH was the letter written by the synod convened in Palestine.³ Some time after Athanasius had the satisfaction

¹ This Epistle is extant in the second Apology of Athanasius against the Arians, p. 175.

² *εὐχαρίστικοι ἐπὶ χαι.*

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 24.

of seeing the injustice of the sentence enacted against him by the council of Tyre publicly recognised. Valens and Ursacius, who had been sent with Theognis and his followers to obtain information in Mareota, as we before mentioned, concerning the chalice which Ischyriion had accused Athanasius of having broken, wrote the following retractation to Julius, bishop of Rome.

“Ursacius and Valens, to Julius the most blessed Lord and Pope.

“As, in our former letters to you, we lodged divers insinuations against Athanasius, the bishop, and omitted to comply with the injunctions contained in yours, we now confess to your Reverence,¹ in the presence of all the presbyters, our brethren, that all that you have heard concerning the aforesaid Athanasius is utterly false. For this reason, we joyfully enter into communion with him, particularly as you, with your natural benevolence, have granted forgiveness to us for our past error. Moreover, we declare unto you that if the bishops of the East, or even Athanasius himself, should at any time summon us to judgment, we will in no wise appear before them without your consent and sanction. We now and ever shall anathematize, as we formerly did in the memorial which we presented at Milan,² the heretic Arius and his followers, who say that there was a time in which the Son existed not, and that Christ is from that which had no existence, and who deny that Christ was God³ and the Son of God before all ages. We again protest, in our own handwriting, that we shall ever condemn the aforesaid Arian heresy, and its originators. I, Ursacius, sign this confession with my own signature, as does likewise Valens.”⁴

This was the confession which they sent to Julius. It is

¹ τῆς σῆς χορηγόρητος. Valesius understands them to refer to the letters of Julius to Eusebius and the other adversaries of Athanasius, in which he summoned them to answer for their conduct towards him.

² There is some doubt among authorities, as to whether the synod of Milan was held in A. D. 347. The present letter Valesius assigns to the year A. D. 356.

³ The allusion is here to the heresy of Photinus.

⁴ These events are referred to the year A. D. 349, by the authors of the Benedictine Life of Athanasius.

[SOZOMEN.]

also necessary to append to it their letter to Athanasius : it is as follows.

CHAP. XXIV.—LETTER OF CONCILIATION FROM VALENS AND URSACIUS TO THE GREAT ATHANASIUS. RESTORATION OF THE OTHER EASTERN BISHOPS. EJECTION OF MACEDONIUS AND ACCESSION OF PAUL.

“The bishops Ursacius and Valens, to Athanasius our beloved brother in the Lord.

“WE take the opportunity of the departure of Museus, our brother and fellow presbyter, to write by him to you, O beloved brother, and hope that our letter will find you in good health. You will afford us great encouragement if you will write us a reply to this letter. Know that we are at peace, and in ecclesiastical communion with you.”

When Athanasius had returned from the West to Egypt, Paul,¹ Marcellus, Asclepas, and Lucius, who had been recalled by the emperor from exile, were reinstated in their churches. Immediately on the return of Paul to Constantinople, Macedonius retired from public life, and held private assemblies. There was a great tumult at Ancyra on the deposition of Basil and the reinstatement of Marcellus. The other bishops were reinstated in their churches without difficulty.

BOOK IV.

CHAP. I.—DEATH OF CONSTANS CÆSAR. OCCURRENCES WHICH TOOK PLACE IN ROME.

FOUR years after the council of Sardica, Constans was killed in Gaul.² Magnentius, who had plotted his death, took possession of his dominions. In the mean time, Vetricianus was

¹ Valesius observes that this cannot be true of Paul, as no mention is made of his name in the decrees of the council of Sardica, and Theodoret (Eccl. Hist. b. ii.) expressly states that he was in quiet possession of his see at the time when that council was held.

² Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 25.

proclaimed emperor at Sirmio, by the Illyrian troops. Nepotian, the son of the late emperor's sister, aided by a body of gladiators, likewise claimed the imperial power, and ancient Rome suffered severely from these usurpations. Nepotian, however, was put to death by the soldiers of Magnentius. Constantius, finding himself the sole master of the empire, and invested with the title of emperor, prepared to depose the tyrants. In the mean time, Athanasius, having arrived in Alexandria, called together the Egyptian bishops, and had the enactments confirmed which had been passed at Sardica, and in Palestine, in his favour.

CHAP. II.—CONSTANTIUS AGAIN EJECTS ATHANASIOUS, AND BANISHES THE HOMOUSIANS. DEATH OF PAUL, BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE. MACEDONIUS, HIS USURPATION AND EVIL DEEDS.

THE emperor,¹ deceived by the calumnies of the heterodox, changed his mind, and, in opposition to the decrees of the council of Sardica, exiled the bishops whom he had previously restored. Marcellus was again deposed, and Basil re-acquired possession of the bishopric of Ancyra. Lucius was thrown into prison, and died there. Paul was condemned to perpetual banishment, and was conveyed to Cucusum, in Armenia, where he died. I have never, however, been able to ascertain whether or not he died a natural death. It is still reported, that he was strangled by the adherents of Macedonius. As soon as he was sent into exile, Macedonius seized the government of his church; and, being aided by several orders of monks whom he had incorporated at Constantinople, and by many of the neighbouring bishops, he commenced, it is said, a persecution against those who held the sentiments of Paul. He ejected them in the first place from the church, and then compelled them to enter into communion with himself. Many perished from wounds received in the struggle; some were deprived of their possessions, some of the rights of citizenship, and others were branded on the forehead with an iron instrument. The emperor was displeased when he heard of these transactions, and imputed the blame of them to Macedonius and his adherents.²

¹ Namely, Constantius. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 26, 27.

² The last clause of the chapter, as it stands in the majority of editions, is rejected by Valesius as spurious and interpolated.

CHAP. III.—MARTYRDOM OF THE HOLY MARTYRIUS AND MARCIAN.

THE persecution increased in violence, and led to deeds of blood. Martyrius and Marcian were among those who were slain. They had been the servants¹ of Paul, and were delivered up by Macedonius to the governor, as having been guilty of the murder of Hermogenes, and of exciting the former sedition against him.² Martyrius was a sub-deacon, and Marcian a singer, and a reader of Holy Scripture. Their tomb is situated opposite to the walls of Constantinople, and within the precincts of a house of prayer, which was commenced by John and completed by Sisinius, two bishops of the church of Constantinople. These men, who were so highly honoured of God, judged rightly that they would not be deprived of the honours attending martyrdom; for the place where their tomb was erected had been anciently used as a receptacle for the heads of criminals who had been executed, and had been in consequence deserted, on account of the spectral apparitions which were said to be frequent on the spot; but the spectres were dispersed at their tomb, and many other notable miracles were wrought there. These are the particulars which I have heard concerning Martyrius and Marcian. If what I have related appears to be scarcely credible, it is easy to apply for further information to those who are more accurately acquainted with the circumstances; and, indeed, far more wonderful things are recorded concerning them than those which I have detailed.

CHAP. IV.—MILITARY ENTERPRISES OF CONSTANTIUS IN ILLYRIA, AND DETAILS CONCERNING VETRANIO AND MAGNENTIUS. GALLUS RECEIVES THE TITLE OF CÆSAR, AND IS SENT TO THE EAST.

ON the expulsion of Athanasius, which took place about this period, George persecuted³ all those throughout Egypt

¹ Nicephorus (b. ix. ch. 20) adds that they were his notaries. The memory of these martyrs is celebrated in the Greek church under the name of the Notaries, on the 25th of October.

² Valesius is of opinion, that the clause expunged by him from the end of the preceding chapter, ought to be inserted here. The terms of it are as follows, "and after this of the deposition of Macedonius himself, when they deprived him of the see of Constantinople.

³ *κακῶς ἐποίησι*. Sozomen is, however, mistaken as to George, for George had not yet been intruded into the see of Athanasius.

who refused to conform to his sentiments. The emperor marched into Illyria, and entered Sirmium, whither Vetranio had repaired by appointment. The soldiers¹ who had proclaimed him emperor suddenly changed their mind, and saluted Constantius as sole sovereign, and as Augustus. Vetranio, perceiving that he was betrayed, threw himself as a suppliant at the feet of Constantius. Constantius stripped him of the purple and the emblems of the imperial dignity, obliged him to return to private life, liberally provided for his wants out of the public treasury, and told him that at his advanced age he ought to live in quietude, without striving to burden himself with the cares of government. After terminating these arrangements in favour of Vetranio, Constantius sent a large army into Italy against Magnentius. He then conferred the title of Cæsar on his cousin Gallus, and sent him into Syria to defend the provinces of the East.

CHAP. V.—CYRIL SUCCEEDS MAXIMUS IN THE SACERDOTAL OFFICE; AND THE SIGN OF THE CROSS, SURPASSING THE SUN IN SPLENDOUR, AGAIN APPEARS IN THE HEAVENS, AND IS VISIBLE DURING SEVERAL DAYS.

AT the time that Cyril succeeded Maximus in the government of the church of Jerusalem, the sign of the cross appeared in the heavens;² its radiance was not feeble and divergent like that of comets, but splendid and concentrated. Its length was about fifteen stadia from Calvary to the Mount of Olives, and its breadth was in proportion to its length. So extraordinary a phenomenon excited universal terror. Men, women, and children left their houses, the market-place, or their respective employments, and ran to the church, where they sang hymns to Christ together, and voluntarily confessed their belief in God. The intelligence was quickly transmitted throughout our dominions, and was conveyed, so to speak, throughout the earth by those who had witnessed the wonderful spectacle at Jerusalem. The emperor was made acquainted with the occurrence, partly by the numerous reports concerning it which were then current, and partly by

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 25, 28.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 28, and Valesius' notes in loco.

a letter from Cyril¹ the bishop. It was said that this prodigy was the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy contained in the Holy Scriptures. It was the means of the conversion of many Greeks and Jews to Christianity.

CHAP. VI.—PHOTINUS, BISHOP OF SIRMIMUM, HIS HERESY, AND THE COUNCIL CONVENED AT SIRMIMUM IN OPPOSITION THERETO. THREE FORMULARIES OF FAITH.

ABOUT this time,² Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, laid before the emperor, who was then staying at that city, a heresy which he had originated some time previously. His natural ease of utterance and powers of persuasion enabled him to lead many into his own way of thinking. He acknowledged that there was one God Almighty, by whose word all things were created, but would not admit that the generation and existence of the Son was before all ages; on the contrary, he alleged that Christ derived his existence from Mary. As soon as this opinion was divulged, it excited the indignation of the Eastern and of the Western bishops, and was rejected as contrary to the faith: and it was equally opposed by those who maintained the doctrines of the Nicene council, and by those who favoured the tenets of Arius. The emperor also regarded the heresy with aversion, and convened a council at Sirmium, where he was then residing. Of the Eastern bishops, George, bishop of Alexandria, Basil, bishop of Ancyra, and Mark, bishop of Arethusa, were present at this council; and among the Western bishops were Valens bishop of Mursa, and Hosius the Confessor. This latter, who had attended the council of Nicæa, had not long previously been condemned to banishment through the machinations of the Arians; he was summoned to the council of Sirmium by the command of the emperor, extorted by the Arians, who believed that their party would be strengthened, if they could gain over, either by force or persuasion, a man held in universal admiration and esteem, as was Hosius. The period at which the council was convened at Sirmium, was the year

¹ The letter here alluded to by Sozomen was addressed by Cyril to Constantius, and is extant among his Works, p. 305, ed. Oxon. 1703.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 29.

after the expiration of the consulate of Sergius and Nigrinian; and during this year there were no consuls either in the East or the West, owing to the insurrections excited by the tyrants. Photinus was deposed by this council, because he was accused of countenancing the errors of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata. The council then proceeded to draw up three formularies of faith, of which one was written in Greek, and the others in Latin. But they did not agree with each other, nor with any other of the former expositions of doctrine, either in word or import. It is not said in the Greek formulary, that the Son is consubstantial, or of like substance, with the Father; but it is there declared, that those who maintain that the Son had no commencement, or that he proceeded from an expansion of the substance of the Father, or that he is united to the Father without being subject to him, are excommunicated. In one of the Roman formularies, it is forbidden to say, of the substance of the Godhead, that the Son is either consubstantial, or of like substance with the Father, as such statements do not occur in the Holy Scriptures, and are beyond the reach of the understanding and knowledge of men. It is said, that the Father must be recognised as superior to the Son in honour, in dignity, in divinity, and in the relationship in which he stands as Father; and that it must be confessed that the Son, like all created beings, is subject to the Father, that the Father had no commencement, and that the generation of the Son is unknown to all save the Father. It is related, that when this formulary was completed, the bishops became aware of the errors it contained, and endeavoured to withdraw it from the public, and to correct it; and that the emperor threatened to punish those who should retain or conceal any of the copies that had been made of it. But having been once published, no efforts were adequate to suppress it altogether.

The third formulary is of the same import as the others. It prohibits the use of the term "substance," and assigns the following reason for the prohibition. "The term 'substance' having been used with too much simplicity by the Fathers, and having been a cause of offence to many of the unlearned multitude, we have deemed it right totally to reject the use of it: and we would enjoin the omission of all mention of the term in allusion to the Godhead, for it is nowhere said in the Holy Scriptures, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are of

the same substance.¹ But we say, in conformity with the Holy Scriptures, that the Son is like unto the Father.”

Such was the decision arrived at in the presence of the emperor concerning the faith. Hosius at first refused to assent to it. Compulsion, however, was resorted to; and, being extremely old, he sunk, so to speak, beneath the blows that were inflicted on him, and yielded his consent and signature.²

The bishops strove to entice Photinus, by the promise of re-establishment in his bishopric, to reject his former sentiments and sign their formulary; but, far from yielding to them, he challenged them to hold a disputation with him. On the day appointed for this purpose, the bishops, therefore, assembled with the judges who had been appointed by the emperor to preside at their meetings, and who, in point of eloquence and dignity, held the first rank in the palace. Basil, bishop of Ancyra, was selected to commence the disputation against Photinus. The conflict lasted a long time, on account of the numerous questions started and the answers given by each party, and which were immediately taken down in writing; but finally the victory declared itself in favour of Basil. Photinus was banished, but remained firm in his original sentiments. He wrote many works in Greek and Latin, in which he endeavoured to show that all opinions except his own were erroneous. I have now concluded all that I had to say concerning Photinus and the heresy to which his name was affixed.

CHAP. VII.—DEATH OF THE TYRANTS MAGNENTIUS AND SILVANUS. SEDITION OF THE JEWS IN PALESTINE. GALLUS CÆSAR IS SLAIN.

In the mean time³ Magnentius made himself master of ancient Rome, and put numbers of the senators and of the people to death. Hearing that the troops of Constantius were

¹ Valesius remarks that there is a discrepancy between the account given here and as it stands in the treatise of Athanasius de Synodis, and in Socrates' narrative of the synod of Ariminum, Eccl. Hist. ii. 37.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 13, and notes in loco.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 32.

approaching, he retired into Gaul, and here the two parties had frequent encounters, in which sometimes the one and sometimes the other was victorious. At length, however, Magnentius was defeated, and fled to Mursa, which is the fortress of Gaul,¹ and here he strove to revive the courage of his soldiers, who were much dispirited by their defeat. But although they received Magnentius with the honours usually paid to emperors, and rendered him the customary demonstrations of respect, they proclaimed Constantius emperor. Magnentius, concluding, from this circumstance, that he was not destined by God to hold the reins of empire, endeavoured to retreat from the fortress to some distant place. But he was pursued by the troops of Constantius, and being overtaken at a spot called Mount Seleucus, he escaped alone from the encounter, and fled to Lugduna. On his arrival there he slew his own mother and his brother, whom he had named Cæsar, and lastly he killed himself. Not long after, Decentius, another of his brothers, put an end to his own existence. Still the public tumults were not quelled; for not long after, Silvanus assumed the supreme authority in Gaul: but he was put to death by the generals of Constantius.

The Jews of Diocæsarea also took up arms and invaded Palestine and the neighbouring territories, with the design of shaking off the Roman yoke.² On hearing of their insurrection, Gallus Cæsar, who was then at Antioch, sent troops against them, defeated them, and destroyed Diocæsarea. Gallus, intoxicated with success, aspired to the supreme power, and he slew Magnus the treasurer, and Domitian, the prefect of the East, because they apprized the emperor of his designs. The anger of Constantius was excited; and he summoned him to his presence. Gallus did not dare to refuse obedience, and set out on his journey. When, however, he reached the island Havonius, he was killed by the emperor's order; this event occurred in the third year of his consulate, and in the seventh year of the reign of Constantius.

¹ The fortress of Mursa was not in Gaul, but Pannonia. Socrates has made the same mistake as Sozomen. See Spanheim's Observations on the Emperor Julian's Orat. i. p. 230.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 33, 34.

CHAP. VIII.—ARRIVAL OF CONSTANTIUS AT ROME. A COUNCIL HELD IN ITALY. ACCOUNT OF WHAT HAPPENED TO ATHANASIUS THE GREAT THROUGH THE MACHINATIONS OF THE ARIANS.

ON the death of the tyrants, Constantius anticipated the restoration of peace and cessation of tumults, and quitted Sirmium in order to return to ancient Rome, and to enjoy the honour of a triumph after his victory over the tyrants. He likewise intended to bring the Eastern and the Western bishops, if possible, to one mind concerning doctrine, by convening a council in Italy. Julius died about this period,¹ after having governed the church of Rome during twenty-five years; and Liberius succeeded him. Those who were opposed to the doctrines of the Nicene council thought this a favourable opportunity to calumniate the bishops whom they had deposed, and to procure their ejection from the church as abettors of false doctrine, and as disturbers of the public peace; and to accuse them of having sought, during the life of Constans, to excite a misunderstanding between the emperors; and it was true, as we related above,² that Constans menaced his brother with war unless he would consent to receive the orthodox bishops. Their efforts were principally directed against Athanasius, towards whom they entertained so great an aversion that, even when he was protected by Constans, and enjoyed the friendship of Constantius, they could not conceal their enmity. Narcissus, bishop of Cilicia, Theodore, bishop of Thrace, Eugenius,³ bishop of Nicæa, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Menophantes, bishop of Ephesus, and other bishops, to the number of thirty, assembled themselves in Antioch,⁴ and wrote a letter to all the bishops of every region, in which they stated that Athanasius had returned to his bishopric in violation of the rules of the

¹ Sozomen is mistaken here, for Pope Julius died A. D. 352, after having held the pontificate not 25 years, (as Sozomen says,) but 15 only.

² See above, b. iii. ch. 20.

³ For Eugenius, Theogonius is substituted by Epiphanius, though incorrectly. Leontius, bishop of Antioch, and George of Laodicea, were also present, according to Valesius.

⁴ Sozomen is the only historian who makes mention of this synod at Antioch in Syria, and he has placed it a year too early in the opinion of Valesius.

church, that he had not justified himself in any council, and that he was only supported by some of his own faction; and they exhorted them not to hold communion with him, nor to write to him, but to enter into communion with George, who had been ordained to succeed him. Athanasius only contemned these proceedings; but he was about to undergo greater trials than any he had yet experienced. Immediately on the death of Magnentius, and as soon as Constantius found himself sole master of the Roman empire, he directed all his efforts to induce the bishops of the West to admit¹ that the Son is of like substance with the Father. In carrying out this scheme, however, he did not, in the first place, resort to compulsion, but endeavoured by persuasion to obtain the concurrence of the other bishops in the decrees of the Eastern bishops against Athanasius; for he thought that if he could bring them to be of one mind on this point, it would be easy for him to regulate aright the affairs connected with religion.

CHAP. IX.—COUNCIL OF MILAN. BANISHMENT OF ATHANASIUS.

THE emperor² was extremely urgent to convene a council in Milan, yet few of the Eastern bishops repaired thither; some, it appears, excused themselves from attendance under the plea of illness; others, on account of the length and difficulties of the journey. There were, however, upwards of three hundred of the Western bishops at the council. The Eastern bishops insisted that Athanasius should be condemned to banishment, and expelled from Alexandria; and the others, either from fear, fraud, or ignorance, assented to the measure. Dionysius, bishop of Alba, the metropolis of Italy, Eusebius, bishop of Vercella in Liguria, Paulinus, bishop of Treves, Rhodanus³ and Lucifer, were the only bishops who protested against this decision; and they declared that Athanasius ought not to be condemned on such slight pretexts; and that

¹ *συνανεῖν*. This word we have adopted into our text at the suggestion of Valesius, instead of the received reading *συνεῖναι*. It is also quite clear from the whole history of the period that we must read *ὁμοούσιον*, and not *ὁμοούσιον*.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 36.

³ Or, as he is sometimes called, Rhodanius. He is thought to have been bishop of Toulouse.

the evil would not cease with his condemnation ; but that the orthodox doctrines concerning the Godhead would be forthwith attacked and endangered. They represented that the whole measure was a scheme concerted by the emperor and the Arians with the view of suppressing the Nicene faith. Their boldness was punished by an edict of immediate banishment, and Hilarius was exiled with them. The result too plainly showed for what purpose the council of Milan had been convened. For the councils which were held shortly after at Ariminum and Seleucia were evidently designed to change the doctrines established by the Nicene council, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show.

Athanasius, being apprized that plots had been formed against him at court, deemed it prudent not to repair to the emperor himself, as he knew that his life would be thereby endangered. He, however, selected five of the Egyptian bishops, among whom was Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, a prelate distinguished by the wonderful sanctity of his life and the power of his eloquence, and sent them with three presbyters of the church to the emperor, who was then in the West. They were directed to attempt, if possible; to conciliate the emperor ; to reply, if requisite, to the calumnies of the hostile party ; and to take such measures as they deemed most advisable for the welfare of Athanasius and of the church. Shortly after they had embarked on their voyage, Athanasius received some letters from the emperor, summoning him to the palace.¹ Athanasius and all the people of the church were greatly troubled at this command, for they considered that no safety could be enjoyed when acting either in obedience or in disobedience to an emperor of heterodox sentiments. It was, however, determined that he should remain at Alexandria, and the bearer of the letters quitted the city without having effected anything. The following summer, another messenger from the emperor arrived with the governors of the provinces, and he was charged to urge the departure of Athanasius from the city, and to act with hostility against the clergy. When he perceived, however, that the people of the church were full of courage, and ready to take up arms, he also departed from the city without accomplishing his mission. Not long after, troops, called the Roman legions, which were quartered in Egypt and

¹ Dr. Cave, in his *Life of Athanasius*, disputes the correctness.

Libya, marched into Alexandria. As it was reported that Athanasius was concealed in the church known by the name "*Theona*," the commander of the troops and Hilarius,¹ whom the emperor had again intrusted with the transaction of this affair, caused the doors of the church to be burst open, and thus effected their entrance ;² but they did not find Athanasius within the walls, although they sought for him everywhere. It is said that he escaped this and many other perils by the special interposition of God ; for, just as he had been warned of God, and had effected his exit, the soldiers entered the church.

CHAP. X.—DIVERS MACHINATIONS OF THE ARIANS AGAINST ATHANASIUS, AND HIS ESCAPE FROM VARIOUS DANGERS THROUGH DIVINE INTERPOSITION. EVIL DEEDS PERPETRATED BY GEORGE IN EGYPT AFTER THE EXPULSION OF ATHANASIUS.

THERE is no doubt but that Athanasius was beloved of God, and endowed with the gift of foreseeing the future. More wonderful facts than those which we have related might be adduced to prove his intimate acquaintance with futurity. It happened that during the life of Constans, the emperor Constantius was once determined upon ill-treating this holy man ; but he made his escape and concealed himself for a long time in a subterraneous place which had been used as a reservoir for water.³ No one knew where he was concealed except a woman, who had been intrusted with the secret, and who waited upon him. As the heterodox, however, were anxiously intent upon taking Athanasius alive, it appears that, by means of gifts or promises, they at length succeeded in corrupting the woman. But Athanasius was forewarned by God of her treachery, and effected his escape from the place. The woman was punished for having made a false deposition against her masters, while they, on their part, fled the country ; for it was accounted no venial crime by the heterodox to receive or to conceal Athanasius, but was, on the contrary, regarded as an act of disobedience against the express commands of the em-

¹ He was notary to the emperor Constantius, and was sent by him to expel Athanasius from Alexandria.

² Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 11.

³ Valesius remarks, that these particulars cannot be relied upon, and that they are probably mere fables taken out of the writings of Rufinus.

peror, and as a crime against the empire, and was visited as such by the civil tribunals. Athanasius was saved on another occasion in a similar manner. He was again obliged to flee for his life, and he set sail up the Nile¹ with the design of retreating to the further districts of Egypt, but his enemies received intelligence of his intention and pursued him. Being forewarned of God that he would be pursued, he returned back to Alexandria, the tide being in his favour, whereas his enemies had to steer against the current of the river. He reached Alexandria in safety, and effectually concealed himself in the midst of its dense population. His success in avoiding these and many other perils led to his being accused of sorcery by the Greek and the heterodox. It is reported, that once, as he was passing through the city, a crow was heard to caw, and that a number of Pagans who happened to be on the spot, asked him in derision what the crow was saying. He replied, smiling, "It utters the sound *cras*, the meaning of which in the Latin language is '*to-morrow*,' and it has hereby announced to you that the morrow will not be propitious to you; for it indicates that you will be forbidden by the Roman emperor to celebrate your festival to-morrow." Although this prediction of Athanasius appeared to be absurd, it was fulfilled; for the following day edicts were transmitted to the governors from the emperor, by which it was commanded that the Greeks (Pagans) were not to be permitted to assemble in the temples to perform their usual ceremonies, nor to celebrate their festival; and thus was abolished the most solemn feast which the Pagans had retained. What I have said is sufficient to show that this holy man was endowed with the gift of prophecy.

After Athanasius had escaped, in the manner we have described, from those who sought to arrest him, his clergy and people remained for some time in possession of the churches: but eventually, the governor of Egypt and the commander of the army forcibly ejected all those who maintained the sentiments of Athanasius, in order to deliver up the government of the churches to George, whose arrival was then expected. Not long after, he reached the city, and the churches were placed under his authority. He ruled by force rather than by priestly moderation; and as he strove to strike terror into

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 14.

the minds of the people, and carried on a cruel persecution against the followers of Athanasius, and, moreover, imprisoned and maimed many men and women, he was accounted a tyrant, and became an object of universal hatred. The people were so deeply incensed at his conduct, that they rushed into the church, and would have torn him to pieces, had he not escaped from them, and fled to the emperor. Those who held the sentiments of Athanasius, then took possession of the churches. But they did not long retain possession of them; for the commander of the troops, when he returned to Alexandria, restored them to the partisans of George. A secretary of the emperor's was afterwards sent to punish the leaders of the sedition, and he treated many of the citizens with the utmost rigour and cruelty. When George returned, he was more formidable, it appears, than ever, and was regarded with greater aversion than before, for he instigated the emperor to the perpetration of many evil deeds; and besides, the monks of Egypt openly declared him to be perfidious and inflated with arrogance. The opinions of these monks were always adopted by the people, and their testimony was universally received, because they were noted for their virtue and the philosophical tenor of their lives.

CHAP: XI.—LIBERIUS, BISHOP OF ROME, AND THE CAUSE OF HIS BEING EXILED BY CONSTANTIUS. FELIX, HIS SUCCESSOR.

ALTHOUGH what I have recorded did not occur at the same period of time after the death of Constans to Athanasius and the church of Alexandria, yet I deemed it right, for the sake of greater clearness, to relate all these events in consecutive order. The council of Milan was dissolved without any business having been transacted, and the emperor condemned to banishment all those who had opposed the designs of the enemies of Athanasius. As Constantius wished to establish uniformity of doctrine throughout the church, and to unite the priesthood in the maintenance of the same sentiments, he formed a plan to convene the bishops of every religion to a council, to be held in the West. He was aware of the difficulty of carrying this scheme into execution, arising from the vast extent of land and seas which some of the bishops would

have to traverse, yet he did not altogether despair of success. While this project was occupying his mind, and before he prepared to make his triumphal entrance into Rome, he sent for Liberius, the bishop of Rome, and strove to persuade him to conformity of sentiment with priests by whom he was attended, and amongst whom was Eudoxius. As Liberius, however, refused compliance, and protested that he would never yield on this point, the emperor banished him to Bercea, in Thrace. It is alleged, that another reason of the banishment of Liberius was, that he would not withdraw from communion with Athanasius, but manfully opposed the emperor, who insisted that Athanasius had injured the church, had occasioned the death of his elder brother,¹ and had sown the seeds of enmity between Constans and himself. As the emperor revived all the decrees which had been enacted against Athanasius by various councils, and particularly by that of Tyre, Liberius told him that no regard ought to be paid to edicts which were issued from motives of hatred, of favour, or of fear. He desired that the bishops of every region should be made to sign the formulary of faith compiled at Nicæa, and that those bishops who had been exiled on account of their adherence to it should be recalled. He suggested that all the bishops should, at their own expense, and without being furnished either with money or conveyances by the public, proceed to Alexandria, and endeavour to ascertain the truth by inquiries, which could be more easily instituted at that city than elsewhere, as the injured and those who had inflicted injury dwelt there. He then exhibited the letter written by Valens and Ursacius to Julius, his predecessor in the Roman bishopric, in which they solicited his forgiveness, and acknowledged that the depositions brought against Athanasius, at Mareota, were false; and he besought the emperor not to condemn Athanasius during his absence, nor to give credit to enactments which were evidently obtained by the machinations of his enemies. With respect to the alleged injuries which had been inflicted on his brothers, he entreated the emperor not to revenge himself by the hands of priests who had been set apart by God, not for the execution of vengeance, but for sanctification, and the performance of just and benevolent

¹ The interrogation of Liberius by the emperor on this charge is extant in Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. ii. 16.

actions. The emperor, perceiving that Liberius was not disposed to comply with his mandate, commanded that he should be conveyed to Thrace, unless he would change his mind within two days. "To me, O emperor," replied Liberius, "deliberation is of no avail; my resolution has long been formed, and I am ready to go forth to exile." It is said, that when he was being conducted to banishment, the emperor sent him five hundred pieces of gold; he, however, refused to receive them, and said to the messenger who brought them; "Go, and tell him who sent this gold, to give it to the flatterers and hypocrites¹ who surround him, for their insatiable cupidity plunges them into a state of perpetual want which can never be relieved. Christ, who is, in all respects, like unto his Father, supplies us with food and with all good things."

Liberius having, for the above reasons, been deposed from the government of the Roman church, his bishopric was transferred to Felix,² a deacon of the same church. It is said that Felix always continued in adherence to the Nicene faith; and that, with respect to his conduct in religious matters, he was blameless. The only thing alleged against him was, that, prior to his ordination, he held communion with the heterodox. When the emperor entered Rome, the people loudly demanded Liberius; after consulting with the bishops who were with him, he replied, that he would recall Liberius and restore him to the people, if he would consent to embrace the same sentiments as those held by the priests of the court.

CHAP. XII.—AETIUS, THE SYRIAN, AND EUDOXIUS, THE SUCCESSOR OF LEONTIUS IN THE BISHOPRIC OF ANTIOCH. CONCERNING THE TERM "CONSUBSTANTIAL."

ABOUT this time,³ Aetius broached his peculiar opinions concerning the Godhead. He was then deacon of the church of Antioch, and had been ordained by Leontius.⁴ He maintained, like Arius, that the Son is a created being, that he was created out of nothing, and that he is dissimilar from the Father.

¹ He means the Arian bishops.

² Comp. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. ii. 37.

³ Comp. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. ii. 35.

⁴ So also says Socrates. But Epiphanius asserts that he was ordained by George of Alexandria.

[SOZOMEN.]

As he was extremely addicted to contention, very bold in his assertions on theological subjects, and prone to have recourse to a very subtle mode of argumentation, he was accounted a heretic even by those who held the same sentiments as himself. When he had been, for this reason, excommunicated by the heterodox, he feigned a refusal to hold communion with them, because they had unjustly admitted Arius into communion after he had perjured himself by declaring to the emperor Constantine that he maintained the doctrines of the council of Nicæa. Such is the account given of Aetius.

While the emperor was in the West, intelligence arrived of the death of Leontius, bishop of Antioch. Eudoxius requested permission of the emperor to return to Syria, that he might superintend the affairs of that church. On permission being granted, he repaired with all speed to Antioch, and installed himself as bishop of that city without the sanction of George, bishop of Laodicea, of Mark, bishop of Arethusa, of the other Syrian bishops, or of any other bishops to whom the right of conferring ordination pertained. It was reported that he acted with the concurrence of the emperor, and of the eunuchs belonging to the palace, who, like Eudoxius, favoured the doctrines of Aetius, and believed that the Son is dissimilar from the Father. When Eudoxius found himself in possession of the church of Antioch, he ventured to uphold this heresy openly. He assembled in Antioch all those who held the same opinions as himself, among whom were Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, and Uranius, bishop of Tyre, and rejected the terms, "of like substance" and "consubstantial," under the pretext that they had been denounced by the Western bishops. Hosius had certainly, with the view of arresting the contention excited by Valens, Ursacius, and Germanius,¹ consented, though by compulsion,² with some other bishops at Sirmium, to refrain from the use of the terms "consubstantial" and "of like substance," because such terms do not occur in the Holy Scriptures, and are beyond the understanding of men.³ Eudoxius wrote to the bishops as if they all upheld what Hosius

¹ Otherwise called Germinius. He was afterwards promoted to the bishopric of Sirmium.

² See above, chap. 6, sub finem.

³ Athanasius also excuses the lapse of Hosius, on the ground that he acted under compulsion.

had admitted, and congratulated Valens, and Ursacius, and Germanius, for having been instrumental in the introduction of orthodox doctrines into the West.

CHAP. XIII.—INNOVATIONS OF EUDOXIUS CENSURED IN A LETTER WRITTEN BY GEORGE, BISHOP OF LAODICEA. DEPUTATION FROM THE COUNCIL OF ANCYRA TO CONSTANTIUS.

AFTER Eudoxius had introduced these new doctrines, many members of the church of Antioch, who were opposed to them, were excommunicated. George, bishop of Laodicea, gave them a letter to take to the bishops who had been invited from the neighbouring towns to Ancyra in Galatia by Basil, for the purpose of consecrating a church which he had erected. This letter was as follows.

“George, to his most honoured lords Macedonius, Basil, Cecopius, and Eugenius, sends greeting in the Lord.

“Nearly the whole city has suffered from the shipwreck of Aetius. The disciples of this wicked man whom you contemned have been encouraged by Eudoxius, and promoted by him to clerical appointments, and Aetius himself has been raised to the highest honour. Go, then, to the assistance of this great city, lest by its shipwreck the whole world should be submerged. Assemble yourselves together, and solicit the signatures of other bishops, that Aetius may be ejected from the church of Antioch, and that his disciples who have been ordained by Eudoxius may be cut off from the priesthood. If Eudoxius persist in affirming that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and in preferring those who uphold this dogma to those who reject it, the city of Antioch is lost to you.” Such was the strain of George’s letter.

The bishops who were assembled at Ancyra clearly perceived by the enactments of Eudoxius at Antioch, that he contemplated the introduction of innovations in doctrine; they apprized the emperor of this fact, and besought him that the doctrine established at Sardica, at Sirmium,¹ and at other

¹ We are not to understand the Catholic council of Sirmium, but one of the Oriental bishops alone, in which Photinus was deposed, and in which a formula of faith was drawn up by Mark, bishop of Arethusa, of which

councils, might be protected and confirmed, and especially the dogma that the Son is of like substance with the Father. In order to proffer this request to the emperor, they sent to him a deputation composed of the following bishops: Basil, bishop of Ancyra; Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste; Eleusius, bishop of Cyzica; and Leontius, who, from being an attendant on the emperor, had been promoted to the priesthood. On their arrival at the palace, they found that Asphalius, a priest of Antioch, and a zealot of the Aetian heresy, was on the point of taking his departure, after having terminated the business for which he undertook the journey and obtained a letter from the emperor. On receiving, however, the intelligence concerning the heresy conveyed by the deputation from Ancyra, Constantius retracted his decision respecting Eudoxius, withdrew the letter he had confided to Asphalius, and wrote the following one.

CHAP. XIV.—LETTER OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTIUS AGAINST EUDOXIUS AND HIS PARTISANS.

“Constantius Augustus the Conqueror, to the holy Church in Antioch.

“EUDOXIUS went to you without our permission, and we by no means regard such persons with favour. If they have recourse to deceit in transactions like this, they give evidence that they mock at God. What can be expected of people who, actuated by insatiable cupidity, go boldly from city to city, hither and thither, with the view of enriching themselves? It is reported that there are among these people certain sophists and impostors, whose very names are scarcely to be tolerated, and whose deeds are evil and impious. You all know to what set of people I allude; for you are all acquainted with the doctrines of Aetius and the heresy which he originated. He and his followers have devoted themselves exclusively to the task of corrupting the people, and have had the audacity to publish that we approved of their ordination. Such is the report they circulate; but it is not true, and, indeed, far removed from the truth. Recall to your recollection the formulary Sozomen makes no mention, though it is given by Epiphanius and Hilary.

words of which we made use when we first made a declaration of our belief, for we confessed that our Saviour is the Son of God, and of like substance with the Father. But these people, who have the audacity to set forth whatever enters their imagination concerning the Godhead, are not far removed from atheism; and they strive moreover to propagate their opinions among others. I am convinced that their iniquitous proceedings will fall back upon their own heads. In the mean time, it is sufficient to eject them from communion and from the synod; for I will not now allude to the chastisements which must hereafter overtake them, unless they will desist from their audacious and furious deeds. How great is the evil they perpetrate, when they collect together the leaders of heresies and the most wicked persons, and invest them with sacred orders, thereby debasing¹ the priesthood, as if they were empowered to plunder the whole church at will! Who can bear with people who fill the cities with impiety, who sow corruption in the most distant regions, and who delight in nothing but in injuring the righteous? Now is the time for those who have imbibed the truth to come forward, for the artifices of these evil men have been so accurately detected, that it is impossible for them to remain concealed. It is the duty of good men to retain the faith of the Fathers, and, so to speak, to augment it, without busying themselves with other matters. I earnestly exhort those who have escaped though but recently from the precipice of this heresy, to assent to the decrees of the other bishops."

Thus we see that the heresy usually denominated Anomian, was very likely to have become predominant at this period.

CHAP. XV.—THE EMPEROR CONSTANTIUS REPAIRS TO SIRMIMUM, RECALLS LIBERIUS, AND RESTORÉS HIM TO THE CHURCH OF ROME. FELIX IS ASSOCIATED WITH HIM IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THAT CHURCH.

NOT long after these events, the emperor returned to Sirmium from Rome, received a deputation from the Western

¹ κίβδηλεύοντας. The metaphor is taken from the debasing of coin with inferior alloy, and is very common in classical writers. The word, doubtless, is pointed at Eudoxius, who used to ordain bad and improper persons.

bishops, and recalled Liberius from Beroëa. Constantius urged him, in the presence of the deputies of the Eastern bishops, and of the other priests who were at the court, to confess that the Son is not of the same substance as the Father. He was instigated to this measure by Basil, Eustathius, and Eusebius, who possessed great influence over him. They had formed a compilation, in one document,¹ of the decrees enacted at the council of Sirmium against Paul of Samosata, and Photinus; to which they subjoined a formulary of faith drawn up at Antioch at the consecration of the church, as if certain persons had, under the pretext of the term "consubstantial," attempted to establish a heresy of their own. Liberius, Athanasius, Alexander, Severianus, and Crescens, bishops of Africa, were induced to assent to this document; as were likewise Ursacius, Germanius, bishop of Sirmium, Valens, bishop of Mursa, and all the other Eastern bishops who were present. They likewise approved of a confession of faith drawn up by Liberius, in which he declared that those who affirm that the Son is not like unto the Father in substance and in all other respects, are excommunicated. For when Eudoxius and his partisans at Antioch, who favoured the heresy of Aetius, received the letter of Hosius, they circulated a report that Liberius had renounced the term "consubstantial," and had admitted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father. After these enactments had been made by the Western bishops, the emperor permitted Liberius to return to Rome. The bishops who were then convened at Sirmium wrote to Felix who governed the Roman church, and to the other bishops, desiring them to receive Liberius; they directed that Felix and Liberius should share the apostolical throne and be associated together, without dissension, in the discharge of the ministerial functions, and that whatever illegalities might have occurred in the ordination of the one, or the banishment of the other, might be buried in oblivion. The people of Rome regarded Liberius as a good man, and esteemed him highly on account of the courage he had evinced in opposing the emperor, so that they had even excited seditions on

¹ Either the formula adopted at the council of Ancyra, or the new formula of faith which Hilary calls the heresy drawn up at Sirmium. Valens inclines to the latter opinion. There were in all four synods of Sirmium, they were held in the years 349, 351, 357, 358.

his account, and had gone so far as to shed blood. Felix survived but a short time; and Liberius found himself in sole possession of the church. This event was, no doubt, ordained by God, that the seat of Peter might not be dishonoured by the occupancy of two bishops;¹ for such an arrangement, being contrary to ecclesiastical law, would certainly have been a source of discord.

CHAP. XVI.—THE EMPEROR PURPOSED, ON ACCOUNT OF THE HERESY OF AETIUS, TO CONVENE A COUNCIL AT NICOMEDIA: BUT AS AN EARTHQUAKE TOOK PLACE IN THAT CITY, THE COUNCIL WAS FIRST CONVENEED AT NICÆA, AND AFTERWARDS AT ARIMINUM AND SELEUCIA. ACCOUNT OF ARSACIUS, THE CONFESSOR.

SUCH were the events which transpired at Sirmium. It seemed at this period as if, from the fear of displeasing the emperor, the Eastern and Western churches had united in the profession of the same doctrine. The emperor had determined upon convening a council at Nicæa to take into consideration the innovations introduced at Antioch, and the heresy of Aetius. As Basil, however, and his party were averse to the council being held in this city, because doctrinal questions had previously been agitated there, it was determined to hold the council at Nicomedia in Bithynia; and edicts were issued, summoning the most learned and eloquent bishops of every nation to repair thither punctually on an appointed day. The greater number of these bishops had commenced their journey when it was reported that Nicomedia had been visited by an earthquake, and that the whole city was destroyed.² This report prevented the bishops from continuing their journey; for, as is usual in such cases, far more was rumoured than what had actually occurred. It was reported that Nicæa, Perinthus, and the neighbouring cities, even Constantinople, had been involved in the same catastrophe. The orthodox bishops were immoderately grieved at this occurrence, for the enemies of

¹ See Dr. Beveridge on the 8th canon of the council of Nicæa; and his quotations from St. Cyprian, St. Pacian, and other ancient authorities on the subject.

² Compare Socrat. Eccl. Hist. ii. 38.

religion took occasion, on the destruction of a magnificent church, to represent to the emperor that a multitude of bishops, men, women, and children, fled to the church in the hope of there finding safety; and that they all perished. This report was not true. The earthquake occurred at the second hour of the day, at which hour there was no assembly in the church. The only bishops who were killed, were Ceropius, bishop of Nicomedia, and a bishop from the Bosphorus, and they were at a distance from the church when the fatal accident happened. The earthquake occupied but an instant of time, so that the people had not the power, even if they had the wish, to seek safety by flight: at the first shock they were either preserved, or they perished on the spot where they were standing.

It is said that this calamity was predicted by Arsacius. He was a Persian, and was originally employed in tending the emperor's lions; but during the reign of Licinius he made a noble confession of Christianity, and left his former employment. He then went to Nicomedia, and led the life of a monastic philosopher within its walls. Here a vision from heaven appeared to him, and he was commanded to quit the city immediately, that he might be saved from the calamity about to happen. He ran with the utmost earnestness to the church, and besought the clergy to offer supplications to God that his anger might be turned away. But finding that, far from being believed by them, he was regarded with ridicule, he returned, to his tower, and prostrated himself on the ground in prayer. Just at this moment the earthquake occurred, and many perished. Those who were spared fled into the country and the desert. And as in this great and opulent city there were fires on the hearth of every house, and in the baths, and in the furnaces of mechanics, it so happened that combustible materials, coming in contact with these fires, excited a general conflagration. The flames spread in all directions, until the city became, so to speak, one mass of fire. It being impossible to obtain access to the houses, those who had been saved from the earthquake fled to the citadel. Arsacius was found dead in the tower, and prostrated on the ground, in the same posture in which he had begun to pray. It was said that he had supplicated God to permit him to die, because he preferred death to beholding the destruction of a city in which he had first known Christ, and practised monastical philosophy. As I have

been led to speak of this good man, it is well to mention that he was endowed by God with the power of exorcising¹ demons. A man possessed with a demon once ran through the market-place with a naked sword in his hand. The people fled from him, and the whole city was in confusion. Arsacius went out to meet him, and called upon the name of Christ, and at that name the demon was expelled, and the man restored to sanity. Besides the above, Arsacius performed many other actions beyond the power of man. There was a dragon or some other species of reptile which had intrenched itself in a cavity of the road-side, and which destroyed those who passed by with its breath. Arsacius went to the spot and engaged in prayer, and the serpent voluntarily crept forth from its hole, dashed its head against the ground, and killed itself. All these details I have obtained from persons who heard them stated by those who had seen Arsacius.

As the bishops were deterred from continuing their journey by the intelligence of the calamity which had occurred at Nicomedia, some awaited the further commands of the emperor, and others declared their opinions concerning the faith in letters which they wrote on the subject. The emperor hesitated as to what measures ought to be adopted, and wrote to consult Basil as to whether a council ought to be convened. In his reply, it appears, Basil commended his piety, and tried to console him for the destruction of Nicomedia by examples drawn from the Holy Scriptures; he exhorted him, for the sake of religion, not to relinquish his design of convening a council, and not to dismiss the priests who had already set forth upon the journey, until some business had been transacted. He also suggested that the council might be held at Nicæa instead of Nicomedia, so that the disputed points might be finally decided on the very spot where they had been first called into question. Basil, in writing to this effect, believed that the emperor would be pleased with this proposition, as he had himself originally suggested the propriety of holding the council at Nicæa. On receiving this epistle from Basil, the emperor commanded that, at the commencement of summer, the bishops should assemble together in Nicæa, with the exception of those who were labouring under bodily infirmity; and these latter were to depute priests and deacons to make

¹ καθάρειν. See Valesius' notes on Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. v. 7.

known their sentiments, so that they might consult together on contested points of doctrine, and arrive at the same decision. He ordained that ten delegates should be selected from the Western churches, and as many from the Eastern, to take cognizance of the enactments that might be issued, and to decide whether they were in accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and also to exercise a general superintendence over the transactions of the council. After further consultation, the emperor enacted that the bishops should remain in their churches, or wherever they might be residing, until it had been decided where the council was to be held, and until they received notice to repair thither. He then wrote to Basil, and directed him to inquire of the Eastern bishops where they would advise the council to be held, so that a public announcement might be made at the commencement of spring; for the emperor was of opinion that it was not advisable to convene the council at Nicæa, on account of the earthquake which had recently occurred in the province. Basil wrote to the bishops of every province, urging them to deliberate together, and to decide quickly upon the locality in which it would be most expedient to hold the council, and he prefixed a copy of the emperor's letter to his epistle. As is frequently the case in similar circumstances, the bishops were divided in opinion on the subject, and Basil repaired to the emperor, who was then at Sirmium. He found several bishops at that city, who had gone thither on their own private affairs; and among them were Mark, bishop of Arethusa, and George, bishop of Alexandria. When, at length, it was decided that the council should be held in Seleucia, a city of Isauria, by the adherents of Valens, and by the bishops who were at Sirmium, those who favoured the Anomian heresy took occasion to have a formulary of the faith signed by the bishops of the court, which had been prepared for the purpose, and in which there was no mention of the term "substance." But while preparations were being zealously made for convening the council, Eudoxius and Acacius, Ursacius and Valens, reflected that, while many of the bishops were attached to the Nicene faith, and others favoured the formulary drawn up at the consecration of the church of Antioch, yet that both parties retained the use of the term "substance," and maintained that the Son was, in every respect, like unto the Father; and being aware that, if

both parties assembled together in one place, they would condemn the doctrines of Aetius, as being contrary to their respective creeds; they so contrived matters, that the bishops of the West were convened at Ariminum, and those of the East at Seleucia. As it is easier to convince a few than a great many individuals, they conceived that they might possibly lead both parties to favour their sentiments by dealing with them separately, or that they might, at any rate, succeed with one; so that their heresy might not incur universal condemnation. Eusebius, a eunuch and attendant of the emperor's, was on terms of friendship with Eudoxius, and upheld the same doctrines; and it was by his influence, aided by those who were attached to him, that this measure was carried into execution.

CHAP. XVII.—PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM.

THE emperor¹ was persuaded that it would not be desirable for the public, on account of the expense, nor advantageous to the bishops, on account of the length of the journey, to convene them all to the same place for the purpose of holding a council. He therefore wrote to the bishops who were then at Ariminum, as well as to those who were then at Seleucia, and directed them to enter upon an investigation of contested points concerning the faith, and then to turn their attention to the complaints of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, and of other bishops who had remonstrated against the injustice of decrees of deposition and banishment which had been issued against them, and to examine the legality of various sentences which had been enacted against other bishops. There were, in fact, several accusations pending against different bishops. George was accused by the Egyptians of rapine and violence. Finally, the emperor commanded that ten deputies should be sent to him from each council, to inform him of their respective proceedings.

In accordance with this edict, the bishops assembled at the appointed cities. The synod at Ariminum first commenced proceedings; it consisted of above four hundred members. Those who regarded Athanasius with the greatest enmity, were of opinion that there was nothing further to be decreed

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 37.

against him. When they had entered upon the investigation of doctrinal questions, Valens and Ursacius, supported by Germanius, Auxentius, Caius, and Demophilus, advanced into the middle of the assembly, and demanded that all the formularies of faith which had been previously compiled should be suppressed, and that the formulary which they had but a short time previously set forth in the Latin language at Sirmium should be alone retained. In this formulary, it was taught, according to Scripture, that the Son is like unto the Father; but no mention was made of the substance of God. They declared that this formulary had been approved by the emperor, and that it was incumbent upon the council to adopt it, instead of consulting too scrupulously the individual opinions of every member of the council, because too close an investigation of mere words could only lead to dispute and contention. They added, that it was better to establish orthodox doctrines concerning the Godhead, than, by aiming at too great a refinement of terms, to introduce the use of neological expressions. By these representations, they designed to denounce the use of the term "consubstantial," because they said it was not found in the Holy Scriptures, and was obscure to the multitude; and, instead of this term, they wished to substitute the expression that "the Son is like unto the Father in all things," which is borne out by the Sacred Scriptures. After they had read their formulary containing the above representations, many of the bishops told them that no new formulary of the faith ought to be set forth, that those which had been previously compiled were quite sufficient for all purposes, and that they were met together for the express purpose of preventing all innovations. These bishops then urged those who had compiled and read the formulary to declare publicly their condemnation of the Arian doctrine, as the cause of all the troubles which had agitated the churches of every region. Ursacius and Valens, Germanius and Auxentius, Demophilus and Caius, having protested against this protestation, the council commanded that the formularies compiled by other parties should be read, and likewise that set forth at Nicæa: so that those formularies which favoured divers heresies might be condemned, and those which were in accordance with the Nicene doctrines might be approved, in order that there might be no further ground for dispute, and no future neces-

sity for councils, but that a final and efficient decision might be formed. They remarked that it was absurd to compose so many formularies, as if they had but just commenced to become acquainted with the faith, and as if they wished to slight the ancient traditions of the church, by which the churches had been governed by themselves, and by their predecessors, many of whom had witnessed a good confession, and had received the crown of martyrdom. Such were the arguments adduced by these bishops, to prove that no innovations ought to be attempted. As Valens and Ursacius and their partisans refused to be convinced by these arguments, but persisted in advocating the adoption of their own formulary, they were deposed, and it was decided that their formulary should be rejected. It was remarked that the declaration at the commencement of this formulary, of its having been compiled at Sirmium, in the presence of Constantius, "the eternal Augustus," and during the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius, was an absurdity. Athanasius made the same remark, in a letter addressed to one of his friends,¹ and said that it was ridiculous to term Constantius the eternal emperor, and yet to shrink from acknowledging the Son of God to be eternal; he also ridiculed the date affixed to the formulary, as though condemnation were meant to be thrown on the faith of former ages, as well as on those who had, before that period, been initiated in the faith.

After these events had transpired at Ariminum, Valens and Ursacius, irritated at their deposition, repaired with all haste to the emperor.

CHAP. XVIII.—LETTER FROM THE COUNCIL CONVENED AT ARIMINUM TO THE EMPEROR CONSTANTIUS.

THE synod selected twenty bishops, and sent them on an embassy to the emperor, with the following letter, which has been translated from Latin into Greek:²—

"We believe that it is by the will of God, as well as by your pious arrangements, that we have been led from all the

¹ The remark occurs in his book on the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia.

² The letter is extant also in Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 37. See the notes of Valesius in loco.

cities of the West, to assemble at Ariminum, for the purpose of declaring the faith of the Catholic church, and of detecting those who have set forth heresies in opposition to it. After a close and lengthened investigation, we have come to the conclusion that it is best to preserve the faith which has been handed down from antiquity, and which was preached by the prophets, the evangelists, the apostles, and by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Protector of your empire. It would have been absurd, as well as illegal, to have introduced any change in the doctrines which were so rightly and so justly propounded by the bishops at Nicæa, with the concurrence of Constantine your father, of glorious memory. These doctrines have been preached to all men, and tend to the utter subversion of the Arian, and, indeed, of all other heresies. There is great danger in adding to, or in taking away from, these doctrines; nor can the slightest alteration be made in any one of them, without giving an opportunity to the adversaries to do what they list. Ursacius and Valens, after having been long suspected of having imbibed the Arian doctrine, were cut off from communion with us.¹ In the hope of being restored to communion, they confessed their error, and obtained forgiveness, as their own writings testify. The occasion on which the edict of forgiveness was conceded, was at the council of Milan, in the presence of the deputies of the Roman church.

“The formulary of the faith set forth at Nicæa, having been compiled with the greatest possible care and accuracy, in the presence of Constantine, who maintained it throughout his life, and at his baptism, and when he departed to enjoy the rest and peace of heaven, we judge that it would be absurd to attempt any alteration in it. We hold that it is necessary to retain the doctrines which were professed by so many holy confessors and martyrs, and which they maintained, in accordance with the ancient decrees of the church. God has transmitted the knowledge of their faith to the time in which you live, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom you

¹ Ursacius and Valens were first excommunicated A. D. 342 by a synod held at Rome: four years later they were received back into communion at Milan (346); in the following year, (347,) having again openly joined the Arian party, they were condemned at Sardica; but they were again received into communion by Julius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 349.

reign, and rule the world. These wretched men, who can only be regarded as objects of compassion, have had the audacity to publish certain impious doctrines, which are in opposition to the truth. After we had received your letters, in which you charged us to enter upon the investigation of doctrinal questions, the aforesaid disturbers of the church, aided by Germanius, Auxentius, and Caius, laid a new formulary before us, replete with pernicious doctrine. When they perceived that this document would inevitably be rejected, they desired to effect some alterations in it. They have but too often been successful in proposing these alterations; but, to preserve the church from further trouble arising from this source, we decided that it was requisite to preserve the inviolability of the ancient canons, and to eject the aforesaid persons from communion with us. We have, for this reason, sent our deputies to you, and have furnished them with letters, declaratory of the sentiments of the council. These deputies have been especially charged by us to maintain the truths which were set forth of old by the Christians of antiquity, and to prove to your Holiness the falsity of the assertion of Valens and Ursacius, that a few changes would produce peace in the church. For how can peace be restored by those who destroy peace? They would be more likely to introduce contention and disturbance into Rome and the other cities, rather than peace. We therefore entreat your Clemency to listen to our deputies, and to regard them favourably, and not to allow the dead to be dishonoured by the introduction of alterations and novelties. We pray you to preserve the tradition which we received from our ancestors, who were all wise and prudent, and who, we have reason to believe, were led by the Spirit of God. For these innovations not only lead believers to infidelity, but also delude unbelievers. We likewise entreat you to command that the bishops who are now absent from their churches, and of whom some are labouring under the infirmities of old age, and others under the privations of poverty, may be furnished with the means of returning to their own homes, in order that the churches may not be longer deprived of their ministry.

“ Again, we beseech you that nothing be taken away from, or added to, the faith; let it remain unchanged, even as it has continued from the reign of your father to the present time;

so that we may not, in future, be compelled to leave our churches, and undertake long journeys, but that bishops and people may dwell together in peace, and be able to devote themselves to prayer and supplication for your own personal welfare, and for the continual peace of your empire.

“ Our deputies will show you the signatures of the bishops ; and some of them will offer instruction to your Holiness out of the Sacred Scriptures.”

CHAP. XIX.—CONCERNING THE DEPUTIES OF THE COUNCIL AND THE EMPEROR'S LETTER; MACHINATIONS OF URSACIUS AND VALENS; EXILE OF THE ARCHBISHOPS. CONCERNING THE SYNOD AT NICÆA.

WE have now transcribed the letter of the council of Ariminum. Ursacius and Valens, anticipating the arrival of the deputies of the council, read their formulary of faith to the emperor, and calumniated the members of the council. The emperor was displeased at the rejection of this formulary, as it had been accepted in his presence at Sirmium, and he therefore treated Ursacius and Valens with honour ; while, on the other hand, he manifested great contempt towards the deputies, and even delayed granting them an audience. At length, however, he wrote to the synod, and informed them that an expedition which he was compelled to undertake against the barbarians, prevented him from conferring with the deputies ; and that he had, therefore, commanded them to remain at Adrianople until his return, in order that, when other business had been dismissed, his mind might be at liberty to attend to the representations of the deputies : “ for it is right,” he said, “ to bring to the investigation of Divine subjects, a mind unfettered by other cares.” Such was the strain of his letter.

The bishops replied, that they could never depart from the decision they had formed, as they had before declared in writing, and had charged their deputies to declare ; and they besought him to regard them with favour, to give audience to their deputies, and to read their letter. They told him that it must appear grievous to him that so many churches should be deprived of their bishops ; and that, if agreeable to him, they would return to their churches before the winter. After

writing this letter, which was full of supplications and entreaties, the bishops waited for a time for a reply ; but, as no answer was granted them, they afterwards returned to their own cities.

What I have above stated clearly proves, that the bishops who were convened at Ariminum confirmed the decrees which had of old been set forth at Nicæa. Let us now consider how it was that they eventually assented to the formulary of faith compiled by Valens and Ursacius. Various accounts have been given me of this transaction. Some say that the emperor was offended at the bishops having departed from Ariminum without his permission, and allowed Valens and his partisans to govern the churches of the West according to their own will, to set forth their own formulary, to eject those who refused to sign it from the churches, and to ordain others in their place ; they say that, taking advantage of this power, Valens compelled some of the bishops to sign the formulary, and that he drove Liberius¹ and many others, who refused compliance, from their churches. It is further asserted, that Valens and his adherents acted in the same manner in Italy, and persecuted the bishops of the East in the same manner. As these persecutors were passing through Thrace, they stopped, it is said, at Nicæa, a city of that province ; they there convened a council and read the formulary of Ariminum which they had translated into the Greek language, and by representing that it had been approved by a general council, they obtained its adoption at Nicæa ; they then cunningly denominated² it the Nicæan formulary of faith, in order, by the resemblance of names, to deceive the simple, and cause it to be mistaken for the ancient formulary set forth by the Nicæan council. Such is the account given by some parties. Others say that the bishops, who were convened at the council of Ariminum, were wearied by their detention in that city, as the emperor neither honoured them with a reply to their letter, nor granted them permission to return to their own churches ; and that, at this juncture, those who had espoused the opposite heresy, represented to them that it was not right that divisions should

¹ This is probably a mistake ; for Liberius had been banished and again recalled some time before the council of Rimini.

² *ἑκτερομνησθῆσαι*. The word is used in the same sense by Sozomen below, chap. 22.

[SOZOMEN.]

exist between the priests of the whole world for the sake of one word, and that it was only requisite to admit that the Son is like unto the Father in order to put an end to all disputes; for that the bishops of the East would never rest until the term "substance" was rejected. By these representations, it is said, the members of the council were at length persuaded to assent to the formulary which Ursacius had so sedulously pressed upon them. Ursacius and his partisans, being apprehensive lest the deputies sent by the council to the emperor should declare what firmness was in the first place evinced by the Western bishops, and should expose the true cause of the rejection of the term "consubstantial," detained these deputies at Nicæa in Thrace throughout the winter, under the pretext that no public conveyances could be then obtained, and that the roads were in a bad state for travelling; and they then induced them, it is said, to translate the formulary they had accepted, from Latin into Greek, and to send it to the Eastern bishops. By this means, they anticipated that the formulary would produce the impression they intended without the fraud being detected; for there was no one to testify that the members of the council of Ariminum had not voluntarily rejected the term "substance" from deference to the Eastern bishops, who were averse to the use of that word. But this was evidently a false account; for all the members of the council, with the exception of a few, maintained strenuously that the Son is like unto the Father in substance, and the only differences of opinion existing between them were, that some said that the Son is of the same substance as the Father, while others asserted that he is of like substance with the Father. We have now given both the accounts which have been handed down of this transaction.

CHAP. XX.—EVENTS WHICH TOOK PLACE IN THE EASTERN CHURCHES: MARATHONIUS, ELEUSIUS OF CYZICUS, AND MACR-
DONIUS EXPEL THOSE WHO MAINTAIN THE TERM "CONSUB-
STANTIAL." CONCERNING THE CHURCH OF THE NOVATIANS;
THE NOVATIANS ENTER INTO COMMUNION WITH THE ORTHO-
DOX.

WHILE the events I have above related were taking place in Italy, the East was, even before the council of Seleucia, the

theatre of great disturbances.¹ The adherents of Acacius and Patrophilus, having ejected Maximus, gave the government of the church of Jerusalem to Cyril. Macedonius was, by his severity, the cause of great troubles in Constantinople and the neighbouring cities;² he was abetted by Eleusius and Marathonius. This latter was originally a deacon in his own church, and was a zealous superintendent of the poor and of the monastical dwellings inhabited by each sex, and Macedonius raised him to the bishopric of Nicomedia. Eleusius, who was formerly attached to the military service of the palace, had been ordained bishop of Cyzicus. It is said that Eleusius and Marathonius were both good men, but that they were zealous in persecuting those who maintained that the Son is of the same substance as the Father, although they never manifested so much cruelty as Macedonius, who not only expelled those who refused to hold communion with him, but imprisoned some, and dragged others before the tribunals. In many cases he had recourse to compulsion, and extorted compliance to his will. He seized women and children who had not been initiated (i. e. baptized) and initiated them, and destroyed many churches in different places, under the pretext that the emperor had commanded the demolition of all houses of prayer in which the Son was recognised to be of the same substance as the Father.

Under this pretext, the church of the Novatians at Constantinople, situated in that part of the city called Pelargus, was destroyed. It is related that these heretics performed a courageous action with the aid of the members of the Catholic church, with whom they made common cause. When those who were employed to destroy the church were about to commence the work of demolition, the Novatians assembled themselves together, and conveyed the materials to a suburb of the city called Sycea. They quickly achieved this task, for men, women, and children engaged in it, and gave their labour as an offering to God. By the exercise of this zeal, the church was soon re-erected, and received the name of Anastasia. After the death of Constantius, Julian, his successor, granted to the No-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 38.

² In the generally received editions here follow the words *ὡς ἤρξατο χειροτονεῖν ὁ Μακάριος*; but they are rejected by Valesius as foreign to the text, interrupting the sense, and involving several difficulties.

vatians the ground which they had previously possessed, and permitted them to rebuild their church. The people joyfully took advantage of this permission, and transported the identical materials of the former edifice from Sycea. But this happened at a later period of time than that which we are now reviewing. At this period a union was nearly effected between the Novatian and Catholic churches, for as they held the same opinions concerning the Godhead, and were subjected to a common persecution, the members of both churches assembled and prayed together. The Catholics then possessed no houses of prayer, for the Arians had wrested them from them. It appears too, that from the frequent intercourse between the members of each church, they began to reflect that no solid reason could be adduced for their separation. A reconciliation would certainly have been effected, had not the desire of the multitude been frustrated by the envy of a few individuals, who asserted that there was an ancient law prohibiting the union of the churches.

CHAP. XXI.—PROCEEDINGS OF MACEDONIUS IN MANTINIA. REMOVAL OF THE REMAINS OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT. JULIAN BECOMES CÆSAR.

ABOUT the same time Eleusius demolished the church of the Novatians in Cyzicus.¹ The inhabitants of other parts of Paphlagonia, and particularly of Mantinia, were subjected to similar persecutions. Macedonius, having been apprized that the majority of these people were followers of Novatian, and that the ecclesiastical² power was not of itself sufficiently strong to expel them, persuaded the emperor to send four cohorts against them. For he imagined that men who are unaccustomed to the use of military weapons, would, on the first appearance of armed soldiers, be seized with terror, and conform to his sentiments. But it happened otherwise, for the people of Mantinia armed themselves with whatever weapons came first to hand, and marched against the military. A sanguinary conflict ensued, and many of the Paphlagonians fell, but all the soldiers were slain. Many of the friends of Macedonius

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 38.

² He means the clergy of the orthodox party.

blamed him for having occasioned so much bloodshed, and the emperor was displeased, and regarded him with less favour than before. Inimical feelings were engendered still more strongly by another occurrence. Macedonius contemplated the removal of the remains of the emperor Constantine, as the sepulchre in which they had been deposited was falling into ruin. The people were divided in opinion on this subject: some concurred in the design, and others opposed it, deeming it impious to open the sepulchre. Those who maintained the Nicene doctrines were of the latter sentiment, and insisted that no indignity should be offered to the body of Constantine, as that emperor had held the same doctrines as themselves. They were besides, I can readily imagine, eager to oppose the projects of Macedonius. However, without further delay, Macedonius caused the coffin to be conveyed to the same church in which the tomb of Acacius, the martyr, is placed. The people, divided into two factions, the one approving, the other condemning, the deed, rushed upon each other in the church, and so much carnage ensued that the sacred edifice was filled with blood and slaughtered bodies. The emperor, who was then in the West, was deeply incensed on hearing of this occurrence; and he blamed Macedonius as the cause of the indignity offered to his father, and of the slaughter of the people.

The emperor was then preparing to return to the East; he conferred the title of Cæsar on his cousin Julian, and sent him to Gaul.¹

CHAP. XXII.—COUNCIL OF SELEUCIA.

ABOUT the same period the Eastern bishops assembled,² to the number of about one hundred and sixty, in Seleucia, a city of Isauria. This was during the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius. Leonas, who held one of the most important offices at the palace, repaired to this council at the command of Constantius, as likewise Laurentius, the military governor of the province, to discharge the duties devolving upon them. At the first session of this council, several of the bishops were absent, and among others, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis;

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 34. It should be added that Sozomen is wrong in placing these events subsequent to the council at Rimini.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 39.

Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople; and Basil, bishop of Ancyra. They resorted to divers pretexts in justification of their non-attendance. Patrophilus alleged in excuse a complaint in the eyes, and Macedonius pleaded indisposition; but it was suspected they had absented themselves from the fear that various accusations would be brought against them. As the other bishops refused to enter upon the investigation of disputed points during their absence, Leonas commanded them to proceed at once to the examination of the questions that had been agitated. Then some were of opinion that it was necessary to commence with the discussion of doctrinal topics, while others maintained that inquiries ought to be first instituted into the conduct of those among them against whom accusations had been laid, as had been the case with Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and others. The ambiguity of the emperor's letters, which sometimes prescribed one course and sometimes another, gave rise to this dispute. The contention arising from this source became so fierce, that all union was destroyed between them, and they became divided into two parties. However, the advice of those who wished to commence with the examination of doctrine, prevailed. When they proceeded to the investigation of terms, some desired to reject the use of the term "*substance*," and appealed to the authority of the formulary of faith which had not long previously been compiled by Mark¹ at Sirmium, and had been received by the bishops who were at the court, among whom was Basil,² bishop of Ancyra. Many others were anxious for the adoption of the formulary of faith drawn up at the consecration of the church of Antioch. To the first of these parties belonged Eudoxius, Acacius, Patrophilus; George, bishop of Alexandria; Uranius, bishop of Tyre; and thirty-two other bishops. The latter party was supported by George, bishop of Laodicea in Syria; by Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus; by Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia; and by the majority of the prelates. It was suspected, and with reason, that Acacius and his partisans absented themselves on account of the difference between their sentiments and those of the aforesaid bishops, and also because they desired to evade the investiga-

¹ See above, note on chapter 13.

² See above, chapter 16.

tion of certain accusations which had been brought against them: for, although they had previously acknowledged in writing to Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, that the Son is in all respects like unto the Father, and of the same substance, yet they had had the hardihood to retract this admission. After prolonged disputations and contention, Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, declared in a loud and peremptory tone, that no other formulary of faith ought to be received but that which had been set forth at Antioch. As this proposition was repugnant to the followers of Acacius, they withdrew, and the other bishops read the formulary of Antioch. The following day these bishops assembled in the church, closed the doors, and privately confirmed this formulary. Acacius condemned this proceeding, and laid the formulary which he advocated before Leonas and Laurentius. Three days afterwards, the same bishops re-assembled, and were joined by Macedonius and Basil, who had been previously absent. Acacius and his partisans declared that they would take no part in the proceedings of the council until those who had been deposed and accused had quitted the assembly. His demand was complied with; for the bishops of the opposite party were determined that he should have no pretext for dissolving the council, which was evidently his object, in order to prevent the examination of the heresy of Aetius, and of the accusations which had been brought against himself and his partisans. When all the members were assembled, Leonas stated that he held a document which had been handed to him by the partisans of Acacius: it was their formulary of faith, with introductory remarks. None of the other bishops knew anything about it; for Leonas, who was of the same sentiments as Acacius, had kept the whole matter a secret. When this document was read, the whole assembly was filled with tumult: for some of the statements it contained were to the effect that, though the emperor had prohibited the introduction of any term into the formularies of faith which was not found in the Sacred Scriptures, yet that bishops who had been deposed, having been brought from various provinces to the assembly, with others who had been illegally ordained, the council had been thrown into confusion, and that some of the members had been insulted, and others prevented from speaking. It was added,

that Acacius and his partisans did not reject the formulary which had been compiled at Antioch, although those who had assembled in that city had drawn it up for the express purpose of meeting the difficulty which had just then arisen; but that, as the terms "consubstantial" and "of similar substance" had grieved some individuals, and that, as it had been recently asserted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, it was necessary, on this account, to reject the terms "consubstantial" and "of similar substance," which do not occur in Scripture, to condemn the term "dissimilar," and to confess clearly that the Son is like unto the Father; for he is, as St. Paul somewhere says, "the image of the invisible God." These prefatory observations were followed by a formulary, which was neither conformable with that of Nicæa, nor with that of Antioch, and which was so artfully worded that the followers of Arius and of Aetius could receive it without deviating from their respective creeds. In this formulary, the words used by the bishops of the council of Nicæa, in condemnation of the Arian doctrine, were omitted, and the declarations of the council of Antioch, concerning the immutability of the Divinity of the Son, and concerning his being the perfect image of the substance, the counsel, and the power of the Father, were passed over in silence, and belief was simply expressed in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost: and after bestowing some vulgar epithets on a few individuals who had never entered into any doctrinal contention on one side or the other, all those who entertained any other opinions than those set forth in this formulary were declared to be excommunicated. Such were the contents of the document presented by Leonas, and which had been signed by Acacius,¹ and by those who had adopted his sentiments. After it had been read, Sophronius, a bishop of Paphlagonia, exclaimed, "If we daily receive the opinions of individuals as canons of the faith, we shall only fail in arriving at truth." Acacius having retorted that it was not forbidden to compile new formularies, as that of Nicæa had been frequently and greatly altered, Eleusius replied as follows:—"But the council has not met for the purpose of learning what is already known, or

¹ Valesius observes that this form of faith, put out by Acacius, is reckoned by Epiphanius in the heresy of the Semiarians, and that he adds the names of the bishops who submitted to it.

of accepting any other formulary than that which was set forth by the bishops who assembled at Antioch; and, moreover, we will adhere to this formulary unto death." The dispute have taken this turn, they entered upon another subject, and asked the partisans of Acacius, in what they considered the Son to be like unto the Father. They replied that the Son is similar in will, but not in substance; and the others thereupon insisted that he is similar in substance, and convicted Acacius, by a work which he had formerly written, that he had once been of their opinion. Acacius replied, that he ought not to be judged from his own writings; and the dispute had continued for some time, when Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, spoke as follows:—"It matters little to the council whether Mark or Basil have transgressed in any way, or whether they or the adherents of Acacius have any accusation to bring against each other; neither does the trouble devolve upon the council of examining whether their formulary be commendable or otherwise: it is enough to maintain the formulary which has been already confirmed at Antioch by ninety-seven priests; and if any one desire to introduce any doctrine which is not contained therein, he ought to be ejected from the church." Those who were of his sentiments applauded his speech; and the assembly arose and separated. The following day, the partisans of Acacius and of George refused to attend the council; and Leonas, who had now openly declared himself to be of their sentiments, likewise refused, in spite of all entreaties, to repair thither. Those who were deputed to request his attendance found the partisans of Acacius in his house; and he declined their invitation, under the plea that too much discord prevailed in the council, and that he had only been commanded by the emperor to attend the council in case of unanimity among the members. Much time was consumed in this way; and the partisans of Acacius were frequently solicited by the other bishops to attend the assemblies; but they sometimes demanded a special conference in the house of Leonas, and sometimes alleged that they had been commissioned by the emperor to judge those who had been accused; for they would not receive the creed¹ adopted by the other bishops, nor justify themselves of the crimes of which they had been

¹ This is spoken of the party of Acacius; so, at least, it is understood by Nicephorus and Valesius.

accused; neither would they examine the case of Cyril, whom they had deposed; and there was no one to compel them to do so. The council, however, eventually deposed George, bishop of Alexandria; Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea; Uranius, bishop of Tyre; Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis; Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch; and several other prelates. Many persons were likewise put out of communion until they could vindicate themselves of the crimes imputed to them. The bishops of every church were informed, in writing, of the transactions of the council. Adrian, a presbyter of Antioch, was ordained bishop over that church, in room of Eudoxius; but the partisans of Acacius arrested him, and delivered him over to Leonas and Laurentius. They committed him into the custody of the soldiers, but afterwards sent him into exile.

We have now given a brief account of the termination of the council of Seleucia. Those who desire more detailed information must seek it in the acts of the council, which have been transcribed by notaries.

CHAP. XXIII.—ACACIUS AND AETIUS; AND HOW THE DEPUTIES OF THE TWO COUNCILS OF ARIMINUM AND OF SELEUCIA WERE LED BY THE EMPEROR TO ACCEPT THE SAME DOCTRINES.

IMMEDIATELY after the above transactions, the adherents of Acacius repaired to the emperor; but the other bishops returned to their respective homes. The ten bishops, who had been unanimously chosen as deputies to the emperor, met, on their arrival at the court, the ten deputies of the council of Ariminum, and likewise the partisans of Acacius. These latter had gained over to their cause the chief men attached to the palace, and, through their influence, had secured the favour of the emperor. It was reported that some of these proselytes had espoused the sentiments of Acacius at some previous period; that some were bribed by means of the wealth belonging to the churches; and that others were seduced by the subtilty of the arguments presented to them, and yielded to the power which the Acacians had obtained over their minds. Acacius was, in fact, no common character: by nature he was gifted with great powers of intellect and

eloquence, and he exhibited no want of skill or of address in the accomplishment of his schemes. He was the bishop of a great and illustrious church, and could boast of having been the disciple, as well as the successor, of Eusebius Pamphilus, in whose literary fame he participated. Endowed with all these advantages, he succeeded with ease in whatever he undertook.

As there were, at this period, ten deputies from each council at Constantinople, besides many other bishops, who, from various motives, had repaired to the city, Honoratus,¹ whom the emperor, before his departure from the East, had constituted chief governor of Constantinople, received directions to examine, in conjunction with some senators, the reports circulated concerning Aetius and his heresy. Constantius, with some of the rulers, eventually undertook the investigation of this case; and as it was proved that Aetius had introduced dogmas essentially opposed to the faith, the indignation of the emperor and of the other judges was strongly excited. It is said that the partisans of Acacius at first feigned ignorance of this heresy, for the purpose of inducing the emperor and those around him to take cognizance of it; for they imagined that the eloquence of Aetius would be irresistible; that he would infallibly succeed in convincing his auditory; and that his heresy would be triumphant. When, however, the result proved the futility of their expectations, they demanded that the formulary of faith accepted by the council of Ariminum should receive the sanction of the deputies from the council of Seleucia. As these latter protested that they would never renounce the use of the term "substance," the Acacians declared to them upon oath, that they did not hold the Son to be, in substance, dissimilar from the Father; but that, on the contrary, they were ready to denounce this opinion as heresy. They added, that they esteemed the formulary compiled by the Western bishops at Ariminum the more highly, because the word "substance" had been unexpectedly expunged from it; because, they said, if this formulary were to be received, there would be no further mention, either of the word "substance" or of the term "consubstantial," to which many of the West-

¹ Concerning this Honoratus, see the *Fasti* of Idatius, under the consulship of Eusebius and Hypatius.

ern priests were, from their reverence for the Nicæan council, peculiarly attached.

It was for these reasons that the emperor approved of the formulary; and when he recalled to mind the great number of bishops who had been convened at Ariminum, and reflected that there is no error in saying either that "the Son is like unto the Father," or "of the same substance as the Father;"¹ and when he further considered that no difference in signification would ensue, if, for terms which do not occur in Scripture, other equivalent and uncontrovertible expressions were to be substituted, (such, for instance, as the word "similar,") he determined upon giving his sanction to the formulary. Such being his own sentiments, he commanded the bishops to accept the formulary. The next day preparations were made for the pompous ceremony of proclaiming him consul, which, according to the Roman custom, took place in the beginning of the month of January, and the whole of that day and part of the ensuing night the emperor spent with the bishops, and at length succeeded in persuading the deputies of the council of Seleucia to receive the formulary of the council of Ariminum.

CHAP. XXIV.—FORMULARY OF THE COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM, APPROVED BY THE ACACIANS. LIST OF THE DEPOSED ARCHBISHOPS, AND THE CAUSES OF THEIR CONDEMNATION.

THE partisans of Acacius² remained some time at Constantinople, and invited thither several bishops of Bithynia, among whom were Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, and Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths. These prelates having assembled together, in number about fifty, they confirmed the formulary read at the council of Ariminum, adding this provision, that the terms "substance" and "hypostasis" should never again be used in reference to God. They also declared that all other formularies set forth in times past, as likewise those that might be compiled at any future period, should be condemned. They then deposed Aetius from his office of deacon, because he had written works full of contention, and of a species of vain

¹ Valesius is of opinion that this passage is probably corrupt. His proposed emendation, however, is far from satisfactory.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 41.

knowledge opposed to the ecclesiastical vocation ; because he had used in writing and in disputation several impious expressions ; and because he had been the cause of troubles and seditions in the church. It was alleged by many that they did not depose him willingly, but merely because they wished to remove all suspicion from the mind of the emperor that they favoured his doctrines. Those who held these sentiments took advantage of the resentment with which, for reasons above mentioned, the emperor regarded Macedonius, and they accordingly deposed him, and likewise Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus ; Basil, bishop of Ancyra ; Heortasius, bishop of Sardis ; and Dracontius, bishop of Pergamus. Although they differed in opinion from these prelates, yet they did not assign dissimilarity of religious sentiment as the cause of their deposition, but merely stated, in general terms, that they had disturbed the peace and violated the laws of the church. They specified, in particular, that when the presbyter Diogenes was travelling from Alexandria to Ancyra, Basil seized his papers, and struck him ; they also deposed that Basil had unjustly delivered over many of the clergy from Antioch, from the banks of the Euphrates, and from Cilicia, Galatia, and Asia, to the rulers of the provinces, to be exiled and subjected to cruel punishments ; so that many had been loaded with chains, and compelled to bribe the soldiers who held them in custody not to ill-use them. They added that, on one occasion, when the emperor had commanded Aetius and some of his followers to be conducted before Cecropius, that they might answer to him for various accusations laid to their charge, Basil recommended the person who was intrusted with the execution of this edict to act according to the dictates of his own judgment. They said that he wrote directions to Hermogenes,¹ the prefect and governor of Syria, stating who were to be banished, and whither they were to be sent ; and that, when the exiles were recalled by the emperor, he would not consent to their return, but opposed himself to the wishes of the rulers and of the priests. They further deposed that Basil had excited the clergy of Sirmium against Germanius ; and that, although he stated in writing that he had admitted Germanius, Valens, and Ursacius into communion, he had placed them as criminals before the tribu-

¹ Further mention is made of this Hermogenes by Ammianus Marcellinus, b. xix.

nal of the African bishops ; and that, when taxed with this deed, he had denied it, and perjured himself ; and that, when he was afterwards convicted, he strove to screen himself by sophistical reasoning. They added, that he had been the cause of contention and of sedition in Illyria, Italy, Africa, and in the Roman church ; that he had thrown a servant into prison to compel her to bear false witness against her mistress ; that he had baptized a man of loose life, who lived in illicit intercourse with a woman, and had promoted him to be a deacon ; that he had neglected to excommunicate a quack-doctor¹ who had occasioned the death of several persons ; and that he and some of the clergy had bound themselves by oath before the holy altar, not to bring accusations against each other. This, they said, was an artifice adopted by the clergy to shield themselves from the condemnation they deserved. In short, such were the reasons they specified for the deposition of Basil. Eustathius, they said, was deposed because, when a presbyter, he had been condemned, and put away from the communion of prayers by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia ; and, also, because he had been excommunicated by a council held at Neocæsarea, a city of Pontus, and deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had devolved upon him. He had also been deprived of his bishopric by the council of Gangres on account of his having believed, taught, and acted contrary to sound doctrine. He had been convicted of perjury by the council of Antioch.² He had likewise endeavoured to reverse the decrees of the bishops convened at Melitina ; and, although he was guilty of many crimes, had the assurance to aspire to be judge over the others, and to stigmatize them as heretics. They deposed Eleusius because he had raised one Heraclius, a native of Tyre, to be a deacon ; this man had been a priest of Hercules at Tyre, had been accused of sorcery, and had retired to Cyzicus, and feigned conversion to Christianity ; and moreover, Eleusius, after having been apprized of these circumstances, had not excommunicated him. He had also

¹ περιουδευτήν. Lat. "circumforaneum," an empiric.

² Of this council Valesius remarks, "mihi prorsus ignota est." The council at Melitina, a few lines below, is mentioned by Basil, Epistle 79, ad Occident. In this synod, most probably, Eustathius was deposed.

rashly ordained certain individuals who had been condemned by Maris, bishop of Chalcedonia, who was present at this council. Heortasius was deposed because he had been ordained bishop of Sardis without the sanction of the bishops of Lydia. They deposed Dracontius, bishop of Pergamus, because he had previously held another bishopric in Galatia, and because, they stated, he had on both occasions been unlawfully ordained. After these transactions, a second assembly of the council was held, and Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, Elpidus, bishop of Satalis, and Neonas, bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, were deposed. The reason they assigned for the deposition of Silvanus was, that he had constituted himself the leader of a party, and had deceived many in Seleucia and Constantinople: he had, besides, bestowed the bishopric of Castabalis on Theophilus, who had been previously ordained bishop of Eleutheropolis by the bishops of Palestine, and who had promised upon oath that he would never accept any other bishopric without their permission. Sophronius was deposed on account of his avarice, and on account of his having sold some of the offerings presented to the church, for his own profit; besides, after he had received three commands to appear before the council, he could, at last, be scarcely induced to make his appearance, and then, instead of replying to the accusations brought against him, he appealed to other judges. Neonas was deposed for having resorted to violence in his endeavours to procure the ordination in his own church of Annian, who had been appointed bishop of Antioch,¹ and for having ordained as bishops certain individuals who had previously been decemviri, and who were utterly ignorant of the Holy Scriptures and of ecclesiastical canons, and who, after their ordination, preferred the enjoyment of their property to that of the priestly dignity, and declared in writing that they would rather take charge of their own possessions, than devote themselves exclusively to episcopal duties. Elpidus was deposed because he had participated in the mal-practices of Basil, and had occasioned great disorders, and because he had, contrary to the decrees of the council of Melitina, restored to his former rank in the presbytery a man named Eusebius, who had been desposed for having created Nectaria a deaconess, after

¹ Namely, upon the deposition of Eudoxius.

she had been excommunicated on account of perjury; and to confer this honour upon her was clearly contrary to the laws of the church.

CHAP. XXV.—CAUSES OF THE DEPOSITION OF CYRIL, BISHOP OF JERUSALEM. MUTUAL DISSENSIONS AMONG THE BISHOPS. MELETIUS IS ORDAINED BY THE ARIANS, AND SUPPLANTS EUSTATHIUS IN THE BISHOPRIC OF SEBASTE.

BESIDES the prelates above mentioned, Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, was deposed,¹ because he had admitted Eustathius and Elpidus into communion after they had opposed the decrees enacted by the bishops at Melitina, among whom was Cyril himself; and because he had also received Basil, and George, bishop of Laodicea, into communion after their deposition in Palestine. When Cyril was first installed in the bishopric of Jerusalem, he had a dispute with Acacius,² bishop of Cæsarea, concerning his right to the title of a Metropolitan, which he claimed on the ground of his bishopric being an apostolical see. This dispute excited feelings of enmity between the two bishops, and they mutually accused each other of unsoundness of doctrine concerning the Godhead. In fact, they had both been suspected, the one, that is, Acacius, of favouring the heresy of Arius, and the other, of siding with those who maintain that the Son is in substance like unto the Father. Acacius being thus inimically disposed towards Cyril, and finding himself supported by the bishops of Palestine, who were of the same sentiments as himself, contrived to depose Cyril under the following pretext. Jerusalem and the neighbouring country was at one time visited with a famine, and the poor appealed in great multitudes to Cyril, as their bishop, for food. As he had no money to purchase the requisite provisions, he sold for this purpose the veil and sacred ornaments of the church. It is said, that a man having recognised an offering which he had presented at the altar, as forming part of the costume of an actress, made it his business to inquire whence it was procured, and ascertained that a merchant had sold it

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 40.

² Acacius grounded his claims as metropolitan over Jerusalem, on ancient custom, and the 7th canon of the council of Nicæa, which ordained that Jerusalem should be subject to Cæsarea.

to the actress, and that the bishop had sold it to the merchant. It was under this pretext, I understand, that Acacius deposed Cyril. It is said that the Acacians then expelled all the bishops who had been deposed from Constantinople. Ten bishops of their own party, who had refused to subscribe to these edicts of deposition, were separated from the others, and were interdicted from performing the functions of the ministry or ruling their churches until they consented to give their signatures. It was enacted that unless they complied within six months, and yielded their assent to all the decrees of the council, they should be deposed, and that the bishops of every province should be summoned to elect other bishops in their stead. Letters were then sent to all the bishops and clergy, detailing the transactions of the council, and exhorting them to observe and obey his decrees. Soon afterwards a fresh election of bishops took place, in the room of those who had been deposed. Eudoxius took possession of the bishopric of Macedonius; Athanasius was placed over the church of Basil; and Eunomius, who was subsequently the leader of a faction, and the originator of a heresy which bears his name, was appointed to the bishopric of Sebaste, instead of Meletius.

CHAP. XXVI.—DEATH OF MACEDONIUS, BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE. EUDOXIUS AND ACACIUS STRENUOUSLY SEEK THE ABOLITION OF THE FORMULARIES OF FAITH SET FORTH AT NICÆA AND AT ARIMINUM; TROUBLES WHICH THENCE AROSE IN THE CHURCH.

MACEDONIUS,¹ on his expulsion from the church of Constantinople, retired to one of the suburbs of the city, where he died. Eudoxius took possession of his church in the tenth year of the consulate of Constantius, and the third of Julian, surnamed Cæsar. It is related that, at the consecration of the great church called "Sophia," when he arose to teach the people, he commenced his discourse with the following proposition: "The Father is impious, the Son is pious;" and that, as these words excited a great commotion among the people, he added, "Be calm; the Father is impious, because he worships no one; the Son is pious, because he worships the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 43.

Father." This explanation excited laughter among the audience.

Eudoxius and Acacius exerted themselves to the utmost in endeavouring to cause the edicts of the Nicene council to fall into disuse and oblivion. They sent the formulary read at Ariminum, with various alterations and additions of their own, to every province of the empire, and procured from the emperor an edict for the banishment of all who should refuse to subscribe to it. But this undertaking, which appeared to them so easy of execution, was the source of the greatest calamities, excited commotions throughout the empire, and entailed upon the church in every region a persecution more grievous than those which it had suffered under the Pagan emperors. For, if this persecution did not occasion such tortures and punishments to the body as preceding ones, it appeared more grievous to all who reflected aright, on account of its disgraceful nature; for both the persecutors and the persecuted belonged to the church: and men of the same religion treated their fellows with a degree of cruelty which the ecclesiastical laws prohibit to be manifested towards enemies and strangers.

CHAP. XXVII.—MACEDONIUS, AFTER HIS REJECTION FROM HIS BISHOPRIC, BLASPHEMES AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST; PROPAGATION OF HIS HERESY THROUGH THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF MARATHONIUS AND OTHERS.

WHEN the spirit of innovation becomes regarded with popular favour,¹ it is scarcely possible to arrest its progress: inflated as it always is with arrogance, it contemns the institutions of the Fathers, and enacts laws of its own. It even despises the theological doctrines of antiquity, and seeks out zealously a new form of religion of its own devising. After Macedonius had been deposed from the church of Constantinople, he renounced the tenets of Acacius and Eudoxius. He began to teach that the Son is God, and that he is in all respects and in substance like unto the Father. But he affirmed that the Holy Ghost is inferior in dignity, and designated him a minister and a servant, and applied to him whatever could, without error, be said of the holy angels.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 45.

This doctrine was embraced by Eleusius, Eustathius, and by all the other bishops who had been deposed at Constantinople by the partisans of the opposite heresy. Their example was quickly followed by the people of Constantinople, Thrace, Bithynia, the Hellespont, and of the neighbouring provinces. For their manners and mode of life were calculated to produce a great impression on the multitude. They assumed great gravity of demeanour and austerity of life, while their style of conversation was pleasing and persuasive. It is said that all these qualifications were united in Marathonius. He originally held a public appointment in the army under the command of the prefects;¹ after amassing some money in this employment, he undertook the superintendence of the hospitals for the relief of the sick and the destitute. Afterwards, at the suggestion of Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, he embraced an ascetic mode of life, and founded a monastical institution in Constantinople which exists to the present day. He brought so much zeal and wealth to the support of the aforesaid heresy, that the Macedonians were by many termed Marathonians, and it seems to me, not without reason; for it appears that without the efforts of Marathonius, the heresy would soon have become extinct. In fact, after the deposition of Macedonius, the Macedonians possessed neither churches nor bishops² until the reign of Arcadius. The Arians, who excommunicated and rigorously persecuted all who held different sentiments from themselves, deprived them of all these privileges.

It would be no easy task to enumerate the names of the priests who were at this period ejected from their cities; for I believe that no province of the empire was exempted from these depositions.

¹ Id est, ex numerario officii præfectorum prætorio. Conf. Amm. Marcell. xv. p. 84. *Vales*.

² That is, as Valesius remarks, at Constantinople. Compare Baronius Annal. A. D. 360, ch. 19.

CHAP. XXVIII.—THE ARIANS, UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT THE HOLY MELETIUS UPHELD THEIR SENTIMENTS, TRANSLATE HIM FROM SEBASTE TO ANTIOCH. ON HIS PREACHING THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINES, HE IS DEPOSED, AND HIS BISHOPRIC TRANSFERRED TO EUZOIUS.

AT the period that Eudoxius obtained the government of the church of Constantinople,¹ there were many aspirants to the bishopric of Antioch; and, as is frequently the case under such circumstances, discord and contention divided the clergy and the people of that church. Each party was anxious to commit the government of the church to a bishop of its own persuasion; for interminable disputes concerning doctrine were rampant among them, and they could not agree as to the mode of singing psalms; and, as has been before stated, psalms were sung by each individual, in conformity with his own peculiar creed. Such being the state of the church of Antioch, the partisans of Eudoxius thought that it would be well to intrust the bishopric of that city to Meletius, then bishop of Sebaste, he being possessed of great and persuasive eloquence, of eminent virtue, and above all, as they imagined, being firmly attached to their tenets. They believed that his fame would attract the inhabitants of Antioch and of the neighbouring cities to conform to their heresy; particularly the sectarians called Eustathians, who had invariably adhered to the Nicene doctrines. But their expectations were utterly frustrated. It is said that, on his first arrival in Antioch, an immense multitude, composed of Arians, and of those who were in communion with Paulinus, flocked around him. Some were drawn by curiosity, desiring to know whether his merits were equivalent to the great reputation he enjoyed; others were anxious to hear what he had to say, and to ascertain the nature of his opinions; for a report had been spread abroad, which was afterwards proved to be true, that he maintained the doctrines of the council of Nicæa. In his first discourses, he confined himself to instructing the people in what we call ethics; afterwards, however, he openly declared that the Son is of the same substance as the Father. It is said that, at these words, the archdeacon of the church stretched out his hand, and covered

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 44.

the mouth of the preacher, but that he continued to explain his sentiments more clearly by means of his fingers than he could by language. He extended three fingers towards the people, closed them, and then allowed only one finger to remain extended, and thus expressed by signs what he was prevented from uttering. As the archdeacon freed his mouth, in order to seize his hand, he unfolded his doctrine with still greater perspicuity than before, and exhorted his auditors to adhere to the tenets of the council of Nicæa, assuring them that they would deviate from the truth if they followed any other doctrines. As he persisted in the enunciation of the same sentiments, either by word of mouth, or by means of signs when the archdeacon closed his mouth, the followers of Eustathius testified their joy by loud acclamations, while the Arians gave evident proofs of dissatisfaction. Eudoxius and his partisans were transported with indignation at this discourse, and contrived by their machinations to expel Meletius from Antioch. Soon afterwards, however, they recalled him; for they fancied that he had renounced his former sentiments, and had espoused theirs. As, however, it soon became apparent that his devotion to the Nicene doctrines was firm and unalterable, he was ejected from the church, and banished by order of the emperor, and his bishopric was conferred on Euzoius, who had formerly been banished with Arius. The followers of Meletius separated themselves from the Arians, and held their assemblies apart; for those who had, from the beginning, maintained that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, refused to admit them into communion, because Meletius had been ordained by Arian bishops, and because his followers had been baptized by Arian priests. For these reasons, although united by the reception of one creed, they did not hold communion together.

The emperor, having been informed that an insurrection was about to arise in Persia, repaired to Antioch.

CHAP. XXIX.—THE PARTISANS OF ACACIUS EXCITE FRESH COMMOTIONS, STRIVE TO ABOLISH THE TERM "CONSUBSTANTIAL," AND FAVOUR THE HERESY OF ARIUS.

THE partisans of Acacius were not able to remain in tranquillity; and they therefore assembled in Antioch, and con-

demned the decrees which they had themselves enacted. They erased the term "similar" from the formulary which had been read at Ariminum and at Constantinople, and affirmed that in all respects, in substance and in will, the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and that he proceeded from what had no previous existence, even as Arius had taught from the commencement. They were joined by the partisans of Aetius, who had been the first after Arius to venture upon the profession of these opinions, and who had hence obtained the name of atheists: the disciples of Arius were sometimes called Anomians and Exucontians.¹ When those who maintained the Nicene doctrines demanded of the Acacians how they could say that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and that he proceeded out of nothing, when it was affirmed in their own formulary that he is "God of God," they replied that the apostle Paul had declared that "All things are of God,"² and that the Son is included in the term "all things;" and that it was in this sense, and in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures, that the expressions in their formulary were to be understood. Such were the equivocations and sophistry to which they had recourse. At length, finding that they could advance no efficient argument to justify themselves in the opinion of those who pressed them on this point, they withdrew from the assembly, after the formulary of Constantinople had been read a second time, and returned to their own cities.

CHAP. XXX.—GEORGE, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH, AND THE BISHOP OF JERUSALEM. AFTER THE DEPOSITION OF CYRIL, THREE BISHOPS SUCCESSIVELY SUCCEEDED TO HIS BISHOPRIC: RESTORATION OF CYRIL TO THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM.

DURING this period, Athanasius was obliged to remain in concealment,³ and George returned to Alexandria, and commenced a cruel persecution against the Pagans, and against the Christians who differed from him in opinion. He compelled both parties to offer worship in the mode he indicated, and where opposition was made he enforced obedience by com-

¹ The same statement is made by Athanasius in his book *de Synodis Arimini et Seleuciæ*.

² 1 Cor. xi. 12.

³ Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 28, and iii. 2.

pulsion. He was hated by the rulers on account of his assumption and arrogance; and the multitude detested him on account of his tyranny and power. The Pagans regarded him with even greater aversion than the Christians, because he prohibited them from offering sacrifices, and from celebrating their ancient festivals, and because he had on one occasion introduced the governor of Egypt¹ and armed soldiery into the city, and despoiled their temples. This was, in fact, as we shall hereafter see, the cause of his death.

On the deposition of Cyril, Herennius obtained the bishopric of Jerusalem;² he was succeeded by Heraclius, and to Heraclius succeeded Hilarius; but on the accession of the emperor Theodosius, Cyril was again installed in his bishopric.

BOOK V.

CHAP. I.—APOSTASY OF JULIAN. DEATH OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTIUS.

WE have now described³ the transactions which took place in the Eastern churches. About the period we have been passing under review, Julian attacked and conquered the barbarians who dwelt on the banks of the Nile; many fell in battle; and the others he took prisoners. As this victory added greatly to his fame, and as his moderation and gentleness had endeared him to the troops, they proclaimed him emperor. Far from seeking to obtain the consent of Constantius to this nomination, he displaced the officers by whom he had been elected, and industriously circulated letters wherein Constantius had solicited the barbarians to enter the Roman territories, and aid him against Magnentius. He then suddenly changed his religion; and, although he had previously professed Christianity, he declared himself high priest, frequented the Pagan temples, offered sacrifices, and invited his subjects to adopt his own

¹ Namely, Artemius, who was afterwards martyred under Julian.

² Compare Socrates, *ibid.* iv. 25. Epiphanius places another Cyril after Herennius.

³ With this chapter compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. last chapter, and iii. 1.

form of worship. As an invasion by the Persians was expected, and as Constantius had on this account repaired to Syria, Julian conceived that he might easily render himself master of Illyria; he therefore set out on his journey to this province, under pretence that he intended to present an apology to Constantius for having, without his sanction, received the symbols of imperial power. It is said, that when he arrived on the borders of Illyria, he found the vines loaded with green grapes, although the time of the vintage was past, and the Pleiades had sunk to the West; and that there fell upon him and his followers a kind of dew, of which each drop bore the sign of the cross. He and those with him regarded the grapes as a favourable omen, and attributed the phenomenon of the dew to chance. Others thought that the green grapes signified that Julian would die prematurely after a very short reign, and that the crosses formed by the drops of dew indicated that the Christian religion is from heaven, and that all persons, whoever they may be, ought to receive the sign of the cross. I am, for my own part, convinced that those who regarded these two phenomena as unfavourable omens for Julian, were not mistaken; and events proved the accuracy of their opinion.

When Constantius heard that Julian was marching against him at the head of an army, he abandoned his intended expedition against the Persians, and departed for Constantinople; but he died on the journey, when he had arrived as far as Mopsucrenes, which lies near Taurus, between Cilicia and Cappadocia. He died in the forty-fifth year of his age, after reigning thirteen years conjointly with Constantine his father, and twenty-five years after the death of that emperor.

Immediately on the decease of Constantius, Julian, who had already made himself master of Thrace, entered Constantinople, and was proclaimed emperor. Pagans assert that diviners and demons had predicted the death of Constantius, and his consequent elevation, before his departure for Gaul, and had advised him to undertake the expedition. This might have been regarded as a true prediction, had not the life of Julian been terminated so shortly afterwards, and when he had only enjoyed the imperial power as in a dream. But it appears to me absurd to believe that, after he had heard the death of Constantius predicted, and had been warned that

it would be his own fate to fall in battle by the hands of the Persians, he should have marched voluntarily to meet his own death,—particularly as no advantage could accrue to him, and as his name would only be handed down to posterity as that of an inexperienced emperor, utterly unacquainted with the art of war,—and who, had he lived, would probably have suffered the greater part of the Roman territories to fall under the Persian yoke. This observation, however, is only inserted lest I should be blamed for omitting it. I leave every one to form his own opinion on the subject.

CHAP. II.—EDUCATION AND LIFE OF JULIAN, AND HIS
ACCESSION TO THE EMPIRE.

IMMEDIATELY after the death of Constantius, the dread of a persecution arose in the church, and Christians suffered more anguish from the anticipation of this calamity than they would have experienced from its actual occurrence. This state of feeling proceeded from the long peace they had enjoyed, from the remembrance of the cruelties which had been exercised by the tyrants upon their fathers, and from their knowledge of the hatred with which Julian regarded their doctrines. It is said that he renounced the faith of Christ with the utmost profanity, and had recourse to sacrifices and sanguinary expiations to efface his baptism, and wipe away from himself the sacrament of the church. From that period he employed himself in auguries, and in the celebration of the Pagan rites, both publicly and privately. It is related, that one day, as he was inspecting the entrails of a victim, he beheld among them a cross encompassed with a crown. This appearance terrified those who were assisting in the ceremony; for they judged that it indicated the triumph of religion, and the eternal duration of the doctrines of Christianity; they considered that the crown is in itself the symbol of victory, and that, as it encircled the cross, and returned as it were into itself without beginning or end, it typified eternity. The chief augur, however, tried to re-assure the emperor, by insisting that no unfavourable omens were indicated by the appearance of the entrails;¹ but that, on the contrary, it

¹ Valesius observes that this and the following story are recorded also by Gregory Nazianzenus, in his *Invective against Julian*.

might be thence inferred that the Christian sect would be confined within very narrow limits, beyond which all extension would be impossible. I have also heard, that one day Julian descended into a noted and terrific cavern, either for the purpose of participating in some ceremony, or of consulting an oracle, and that, by means of machinery, or of enchantment, such frightful spectres appeared before him, that, losing all reflection and presence of mind, he thoughtlessly made the sign of the cross, according to the custom of Christians in time of danger. Immediately the spectres disappeared, and the ceremony was arrested. The officiating priest was at first surprised at the disappearance of the spectres, but when apprized of the cause, he declared that it was a profanation, and after exhorting the emperor not to fear, or to have recourse to anything connected with the Christian religion, he re-commenced the ceremony.

The extravagant attachment which Julian evinced towards the Pagan rites was extremely displeasing to the Christians, more especially on account of his having been himself formerly a Christian. He was born of pious parents, had been baptized in infancy according to the custom of the church, and had been brought up in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures under the guidance of priests and bishops.¹ He and Gallus were the sons of Constantius, the brother of Constantine the emperor, and of Dalmatius. Dalmatius had a son of the same name, who was declared Cæsar, and was slain by the soldiery after the death of Constantius. His fate would have been shared by Gallus and Julian, who were then orphans, had not Gallus been spared on account of a disease under which he was labouring, and which appeared to be hopeless; and Julian, on account of his extreme youth, for he was but eight years of age. After this wonderful preservation, a residence was assigned to the two brothers in a palace called Macella, situated in Cappadocia, near Mount Argeus, and not far from Cæsarea; it was a magnificent edifice, and adorned with gardens, baths, and fountains. Here they were educated in a manner corresponding to the dignity of their birth; they were taught the sciences and bodily exercises be-

¹ Julian was brought up at Nicomedia under Eusebius, bishop of that see, who was also nearly related to him by blood. See Amm. Marcell. xvii. p. 219.

fitting their age, and had masters to instruct them in sacred and in profane literature. Such was their progress, that they were enrolled among the clergy, and permitted to read the ecclesiastical books to the people. Their habits and mode of life indicated no dereliction from piety. They respected the clergy and other good and zealous persons, they repaired regularly to church, and rendered due homage to the tombs of the martyrs. It is said that they undertook to deposit the tomb of St. Mammias¹ the martyr in a large edifice, and to perform all the labour themselves, and that while they were, in emulation of the martyr, labouring to surpass him in piety, an event occurred which was so astonishing that it would indeed be utterly incredible, were it not for the testimony of many who are still among us, and who were eye-witnesses of the transaction. The part of the edifice upon which Gallus laboured advanced rapidly, as might have been expected, towards completion; but the portion upon which Julian laboured fell into ruin; in one part the stones were detached from the foundations, and in another the foundations themselves were forced from the earth, as if ejected by some secret power. This was universally regarded as a prodigy. The people, however, drew no conclusion from it till subsequent events had manifested its import. There were a few who, from that moment, doubted the reality of Julian's religion, and suspected that he only made an outward profession of religion for fear of displeasing the emperor, and that he concealed his own sentiments because it was not safe to divulge them. It is asserted that he was first led to renounce the religion of his fathers by his intimacy and intercourse with diviners; for when the resentment of Constantius against the two brothers was abated, Gallus went to Asia, and took up his residence in Ephesus, where the greater part of his property was situated, and Julian repaired to Constantinople, and frequented the schools, where his natural abilities and great acquirements did not remain concealed. He appeared in public

¹ The name of this saint is held in high repute in the Eastern church, but very little is known of the facts of his life. He is said by Gregory Nazian. (Orat. 43) and by Basil (Hom. 26) to have been a shepherd and also a martyr. The miraculous story here related is given also by Gregory Nazian. in his third Oration against Julian, though he does not mention the martyr's name. It is probable that he suffered about A. D. 274.

in the garb of a private individual, and was sociable and easy of access: but because he was related to the emperor, and was capable of holding the reins of empire, and because many expected him to succeed to the imperial dignity, and publicly expressed their wishes to this effect, he was commanded to leave this populous city, and retire to Nicomedia. Here he became acquainted with Maximus, an Ephesian philosopher, who instructed him in philosophy, and inspired him with hatred towards the Christian religion; and, moreover, assured him that he would one day attain to empire, whither his own hopes and the wishes of the people already tended. Julian was gratified and cheered, in the midst of his adverse circumstances, by this announcement, and contracted an intimate friendship with Maximus. As these occurrences reached the ears of Constantius, Julian became apprehensive of receiving ill-treatment, and accordingly shaved himself, and adopted externally the monkish mode of life, while he secretly abandoned himself to Pagan superstitions. When he arrived at the age of manhood, his infatuation for Paganism increased; and admiring the art (if there be such an art) of predicting the future, he endeavoured to make himself acquainted with it, and in his researches had recourse to experiments from which Christians are prohibited. From this period, he manifested great regard towards those who held Pagan sentiments; and after his arrival in Egypt he addicted himself with incredible ardour to superstitious observances.

When Gallus, his brother, who had been surnamed Cæsar, was put to death on account of certain innovations which he designed to introduce into the empire, Julian incurred the suspicion of Constantius, who imagined that he was aiming at the possession of imperial power, and therefore put him under the custody of guards. Eusebia, the wife of Constantius, obtained for him permission to retire to Athens, and he accordingly repaired thither, and, under pretence of receiving instruction from the philosophers, he consulted diviners concerning his future prospects. Constantius recalled him shortly afterwards, proclaimed him Cæsar, promised him his sister Constantia¹ in marriage, and sent him to Gaul, where the barbarians, whose aid had been implored by Constantius

¹ Sozomen is mistaken here; as Constantia was married to Gallus Cæsar, the brother of Julian. We ought to read Helena.

against Magnentius, finding that their services were not required, had fixed their residence. As Julian was very young, generals, in whom the chief responsibility was vested, were sent with him; but as these generals abandoned themselves to indolence and inaction, Julian assumed the entire conduct of the expedition, used every means to animate the courage of his soldiers, and encouraged them more especially by promising a reward to all who should slay a barbarian. After he had thus secured the affections of the soldiery, he wrote to Constantius, acquainting him with the misconduct of the generals; and when at his request, other generals were sent to take their place, he attacked the barbarians, and obtained the victory. They sent to beg for peace, and showed the letter in which Constantius had requested them to enter the Roman dominions; but instead of dismissing the ambassador, Julian detained him, and, seizing a favourable opportunity for giving battle, he gained another victory.

Some have imagined that Constantius sent Julian on this expedition for the express purpose of exposing him to danger; but this does not appear probable to me. For, as it rested with Constantius alone to nominate him Cæsar, why did he confer that title upon him, if he intended to take his life? or, why did he promise him his sister in marriage, or receive his complaints against the inefficiency of his generals, and send others to displace them? No doubt he was actuated by feelings of regard towards Julian, and by the desire that he should be successful in his expedition. It seems to me that he conferred on him the title of Cæsar from motives of attachment; but that, after Julian had, without his sanction, been proclaimed emperor, he was not averse to exposing him to the perils of the war against the barbarians who had possessed themselves of the banks of the Rhine; and this, I think, resulted from the dread that Julian would seek revenge for the ill-treatment he and his brother Gallus had experienced during their youth, as well as from the apprehension that he would aspire to participation in the government of the empire. But many various opinions are entertained on this subject.

CHAP. III.—JULIAN, ON HIS ACCESSION TO THE THRONE, SOUGHT TO SUPPRESS CHRISTIANITY, AND TO PROMOTE PAGANISM.

WHEN Julian found himself sole possessor of the empire, he commanded that all the Pagan temples should be re-opened throughout the East, that those which had been neglected should be repaired, that those which had fallen into ruins should be rebuilt, and that the altars should be restored. He assigned money¹ for this purpose; he restored the customs of antiquity, and the practice of offering sacrifice. He himself offered libations and sacrifices in the temples, bestowed honours on those who were zealous in the performance of these ceremonies, re-established the priests² and ministers³ of idols in the enjoyment of their former privileges, and exempted them from the payment of public taxes; he revived the pensions formerly granted to those who guarded the temples, and commanded them to abstain from certain meats, and from whatever the Pagans represented as inimical to purity. He also commanded that the admeasurements of the Nile and the symbols⁴ should be conveyed according to ancient usage to the temple of Serapis, instead of being deposited, according to the regulations established by Constantine, in the church.⁵ He wrote frequently to the inhabitants of those cities in which the observance of Pagan rites was retained, and urged them to proffer any request that they might desire. Towards the Christians, on the contrary, he openly manifested his aversion, refusing to honour them with his presence, to give audience to their deputies, or to listen to their complaints. When the inhabitants of Nisibis sent to implore his aid against the Persians, who were on the point of invading the Roman territories, he refused to assist them because they would neither re-open

¹ φόρους, regular payments: not new taxes.

² μύσται καὶ ἱερεῖς. The former word, however, is generally used by classical writers for all who were initiated. The term *μυσταγωγός* would be more accurate. See Valesius' notes on Euseb. Vit. Const. i. 32.

³ ζοάνων θεραπευταί. Those who clothed the statues of the idols, and other attendants. They were also called *ἱεροστολισταί*.

⁴ σύμβολα. There is great doubt as to what is meant by this word here. Valesius takes it as equivalent to idols (*εἰδωλα*). Lowth would render it "charters." Var. Sac. Par. ii. p. 395.

⁵ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 18, and the note of Valesius in loco.

their temples, nor resort to the priests; he would not receive their embassy, and threatened that he would never visit their city until they returned to Paganism. He likewise accused the inhabitants of Constantius in Palestine of attachment to Christianity, and rendered their city tributary to that of Gaza. Constantius was formerly called *Majuma*, and was used as a harbour for the vessels of Gaza; but, on hearing that the majority of its inhabitants were Christians, Constantine conferred on it the name of his own son, and a separate form of government; for he considered that it ought not to be dependent on Gaza, a city addicted to Pagan rites. On the accession of Julian, the citizens of Gaza went to law against those of Constantius. The emperor decided in favour of Gaza, and commanded that Constantius should be an appendage to that city, although it was situated at a distance of twenty stadia. It has since been denominated the maritime region of Gaza. The two cities have now merged into one, under the same magistrates, chiefs,¹ and public regulations. With respect to ecclesiastical concerns, however, they may still be regarded as two cities. They have each their own bishop and their own clergy; they celebrate festivals in honour of their respective martyrs, and in memory of the priests who successively ruled them; and the boundaries by which the jurisdiction of the bishops are divided are still preserved. It happened within our own remembrance that an attempt was made by the bishop of Gaza, on the death of the bishop of *Majuma*, to unite the clergy of that town with those under his own jurisdiction, and the plea he advanced was, that two bishops were not required to rule over one city. The inhabitants of *Majuma* opposed this scheme, and the council of the province took cognizance of the dispute, and ordained another bishop. The council proceeded upon the assumption that it would be unjust to set aside the ecclesiastical privileges of a city which had been deprived of its civil rights by the edict of a Pagan emperor, merely on account of its adherence to the laws of the church. But these events occurred at a later period than that now under review.

¹ *στρατηγοί*, probably the same as the municipal magistrates called *duumviri*.

CHAP. IV.—JULIAN PERSECUTES THE INHABITANTS OF CÆSAREA.
BOLD FIDELITY OF MARIS, BISHOP OF CHALCEDON.

ABOUT the same time, the emperor erased Cæsarea, the large and wealthy metropolis of Cappadocia, situated near Mount Argeus,¹ from the catalogue of cities, and even deprived it of the name of Cæsarea, which had been conferred upon it during the reign of Claudius Cæsar, its former name having been Mazaca.² He had long regarded the inhabitants of this city with extreme aversion, because they were zealously attached to Christianity, and had formerly destroyed the temple of Apollo and that of Jupiter, the tutelar deity of the city. The temple dedicated to Fortune,³ the only one remaining in the city, was destroyed after his accession; and on hearing of the deed, his anger against the Christians exceeded all bounds. He also blamed the Pagans, who were few in number, but who ought, he said, to have hastened to the temple, and to have risked everything in its defence. He caused all property belonging to the churches of the city and suburbs of Cæsarea to be rigorously sought and carried away: about three hundred pounds of gold, obtained from this source, were conveyed to the public treasury. He also commanded that all the clergy should be enrolled among the troops under the governor of the province, which is accounted the most arduous and least honourable service among the Romans.⁴ He ordered the Christian populace to be numbered, women and children inclusive, and imposed taxes upon them as onerous as those to which villages are subjected. He further threatened that, unless their temples were speedily re-erected, his wrath would not be appeased, but would be visited on the city, until none of the Galileans remained in existence, for this was the name which, in derision, he gave to the Christians. There is no doubt but that his

¹ The highest mountain of the country: it lies between Cappadocia and Galatia.

² Valesius remarks that this was the original Syrian name of the town.

³ τὸ τῆς Τύχης. Scil. ἱερὸν. These were called *Tυχαια*, Tychæa. Gregory Nazianzen, in his first Oration against Julian, speaks of the temple dedicated to the genius of this city.

⁴ There were three kinds of service among the Romans; they were called *Palatina*, *Castrensis*, and *Cohortalis*. The latter ranked as inferior to the other two, and Valesius remarks that it was very profitable. The word *δανηπρόν* must clearly be rendered "arduous," not "expensive."

menaces would have been fully executed, had not death intervened. It was not from any feeling of compassion towards the Christians that he treated them at first with greater humanity than had been evinced by former persecutors, but because he had discovered that the Pagans had derived no advantage from their cruelty, while Christianity had been honoured by the fortitude of those who died in defence of the faith. It was simply from envy of their glory, that instead of employing fire and the sword against them like former persecutors, and instead of casting them into the sea, or burying them alive, in order to compel them to renounce their sentiments, he had recourse to argument and persuasion, and sought by these means to seduce them to Paganism; and he expected to gain his ends more easily by abandoning all violent measures, and by the manifestation of unexpected benevolence. It is said that on one occasion, when he was sacrificing in the temple of Fortune at Constantinople, Maris,¹ bishop of Chalcedon, presented himself before him, and publicly rebuked him as an irreligious man, an atheist, and an apostate. Julian had nothing in return to reproach him with except his blindness, for his sight was impaired by old age, and he was led by a child. According to his usual custom of uttering blasphemies against Christ, Julian afterwards added, in derision, "The Galilean, thy God, will not cure thee." Maris replied, "I thank God for my blindness, since it prevents me from beholding one who has apostatized from religion." Julian passed on without giving a reply; for he considered that Paganism would be advanced by the exhibition of greater lenity and mildness towards Christians than could in ordinary circumstances be expected.

CHAP. V.—JULIAN RESTORES LIBERTY TO THE CHRISTIANS, IN ORDER TO EXCITE FURTHER TROUBLES IN THE CHURCH. HIS EVIL TREATMENT OF CHRISTIANS.

It was from these motives that Julian recalled from exile all Christians who, during the reign of Constantius, had been banished on account of their religious sentiments, and restored to them their property that had been confiscated. He charged the people not to commit any act of injustice against the Christians, not to insult them, and not to constrain them to offer sa-

¹ Concerning this Maris, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 12.

[SOZOMEN.]

P

crifice. He commanded that if they should, of their own accord, desire to draw near the altars, they were first to appease the wrath of the demons, whom the Pagans regard as capable of averting evil, and to purify themselves by the customary course of expiations. He deprived the clergy of the immunities, honours, and revenues which Constantine had conferred;¹ repealed the laws which had been enacted in their favour, and re-enforced their civil liabilities. He even compelled the virgins and widows, who, on account of their poverty, were reckoned among the clergy, to refund the provision which had been assigned them from public sources. For, when Constantine adjusted the temporal concerns of the church, he devoted a portion of the taxes raised upon every city to the support of the clergy; and, to insure the stability of this arrangement, he enacted a law which has continued in force from the death of Julian to the present day. These exactions were very cruel and rigorous, as appears by the receipts given by the receivers of the money to those from whom it had been extorted, and which were designed to show that the property received in accordance with the law of Constantine had been refunded. Nothing, however, could diminish the enmity of the emperor against religion. In his hatred against the faith, he seized every opportunity to ruin the church. He deprived it of its property, ornaments, and sacred vessels, and condemned those who had demolished temples during the reign of Constantine and Constantius, to rebuild them, or to defray the expenses of their re-erection. On this ground, and because they were unable to pay the sums, many of the bishops, clergy, and other Christians, were cruelly tortured and cast into prison.²

It may be concluded from what has been said, that if Julian shed less blood than preceding persecutors, and that if he devised fewer punishments for the torture of the body, yet that he was equally averse to the church, and equally intent upon injuring it. He certainly recalled the priests who had been banished by Constantius, but he was actuated by the desire of introducing division into the church, and of

¹ See Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, ii. 36—41.

² Valesius remarks that they were tortured and imprisoned, not only on this account, but also because they would not deliver up the sacred vessels presented by Constantine to their churches.

increasing the existing disputes. He also contemplated the condemnation of Constantius, whose memory he thought to render odious to all his subjects by favouring the Pagans who were of the same sentiments as himself, and by showing compassion to those Christians who had been unjustly persecuted during the preceding reign. He expelled the eunuchs from the court, because the late emperor had been well-affected towards them. He condemned Eusebius, the governor of the palace, to death, from a suspicion he entertained that it was at his suggestion that Gallus his brother had been slain. He recalled Aetius from the region whither Constantius had banished him on account of suspicions which had been excited against him by the friendship formerly existing between him and Gallus; and to him Julian sent letters full of benignity, and furnished him with public conveyances to expedite his return. For a similar reason he condemned Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, under heavy penalties, to rebuild, within two months, and at his own expense, a church belonging to the Novatians which he had destroyed. Many other things might be mentioned which he did himself, or which, from hatred to his predecessor, he permitted to be done.

CHAP. VI.—ATHANASIUS, AFTER HAVING BEEN SEVEN YEARS CONCEALED IN THE HOUSE OF A HOLY VIRGIN, RE-APPEARS IN PUBLIC, AND ENTERS THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA.

AT this period, Athanasius, who had long remained in concealment, having heard of the death of Constantius, appeared by night in the church at Alexandria. His unexpected appearance excited the greatest astonishment. He had escaped falling into the hands of the governor of Egypt, who, at the command of the emperor, and at the request of the friends of George, had formed plans to arrest him, and had concealed himself in the house of a holy virgin, in Alexandria. It is said that she was endowed with such extraordinary beauty, that those who beheld her regarded her as a phenomenon of nature, and that men of gravity and reflection kept aloof from her, for fear of giving rise to slander, or of exciting disadvantageous reports. She possessed in the flower of youth such modesty and such wisdom as would have conferred

beauty on an individual who had not received that gift from nature. For it is not true, as some assert, that, "as is the body, so is the soul." On the contrary, the body is the index of the mind, and by it our thoughts and affections are reflected and indicated. This is a truth admitted by all who have accurately investigated the subject. It is related that Athanasius sought refuge in the house of this holy virgin by the revelation of God, who designed to save him in this manner. When I reflect on the result which ensued, I cannot doubt but that all the events were directed by Providence. The friends and relatives of Athanasius would thus have been preserved from danger had search been made for him among them, and had they been compelled to swear that he was not concealed with them. There was nothing to excite suspicion of a bishop being concealed in the house of so lovely a virgin. However, she had the courage to receive him, and sufficient prudence to preserve his life. She alone ministered to him and supplied him with what nature requires. She washed his feet, brought him food, provided him with the books he wanted, and acted so prudently that, during the whole time¹ of his residence with her, none of the inhabitants of Alexandria suspected the place of his retreat.²

CHAP. VII.—VIOLENT DEATH OF GEORGE, THE RESULT OF CERTAIN OCCURRENCES IN THE TEMPLE OF MITHRA. LETTER OF JULIAN ON THE SUBJECT.

AFTER Athanasius had escaped all danger, and thus presented himself suddenly in the church, no one knew whence he came. The people of Alexandria, however, rejoiced at his return, and restored his churches to him. The Arians, being thus expelled from the churches, were compelled to hold their assemblies in private houses, under the guidance of Lucius, who had succeeded George as their bishop. George had been slain a short time previously: for when the magistrates had announced to the public the decease of Constantius, and the

¹ Athanasius was in retreat for six or seven years; but Valesius is of opinion that he spent them in the retirement of some Egyptian monastery.

² The same story is related by Nicephorus, vi. 10. Valesius thinks the remarks of Sozomen here beneath the dignity of an ecclesiastical historian.

accession of Julian, the Pagans of Alexandria rose up in sedition. They attacked George with such violence that it was expected he would have been torn to pieces; but they merely, for the time being, committed him to prison. The following day, however, they repaired early in the morning to the prison, killed him, flung the corpse upon a camel, and after exposing it to every insult during the day, burnt it at night-fall. I am not ignorant that the Arians assert that George received this cruel treatment from the followers of Athanasius; but it seems to me more probable that the perpetrators of these deeds were the Pagans; for they had more cause than any other body of men to hate him, on account of his having destroyed their temples and their gods, and having, moreover, prohibited them from sacrificing, or performing the other rites of their religion according to the custom of their fathers. Besides, the extraordinary influence he had acquired over the emperor rendered him an object of popular odium; for the people, who generally look with suspicion on those in power, regarded him with uncontrollable aversion. A calamity had also taken place at a spot called Mithra.¹ It was originally a desert, and Constantius had bestowed it on the church of Alexandria. George having given orders to clear the ground, in order to erect a house of prayer, an adytum was discovered during the process of digging. In it were idols, and instruments formerly used in Pagan ceremonies, which were of a very strange and ludicrous appearance. The Christians caused them to be publicly exhibited, in order to humiliate the Pagans; but this affront was more than the Pagans could bear, and they rushed to attack the Christians, after arming themselves with swords, stones, and whatever weapon came first to hand. They slew many of the Christians, and, in derision of their religion, crucified others. This led to the abandonment of the work that had been commenced by the Christians, and to the murder of George by the Pagans, as soon as they had heard of the accession of Julian. This fact is admitted by Julian himself, which would not have been the case had it not been fully established; for he would rather have thrown the blame of the murder on the Christians, whoever they were,² than on the

¹ Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 2.

² *ἰουσοδῆπορε*. He means whether they were of the orthodox or heretical party.

Pagans. He expressed great indignation, in a letter which he wrote on the subject to the inhabitants of Alexandria,¹ and threatened to take vengeance on them: but he forgave them out of consideration to Serapis, their tutelary divinity, to Alexander their founder, and to Julian his uncle, formerly governor of Egypt and of the Alexandrians. This latter was so bigoted to Paganism, and so prejudiced against Christianity, that, contrary to the wishes of the emperors, he persecuted the Christians unto death.

CHAP. VIII.—CONCERNING THEODORE, THE KEEPER OF THE SACRED VASES OF ANTIOCH. HOW JULIAN, THE UNCLE OF THE EMPEROR, HAVING VIOLATED THE SACRED VASES, FALLS A PREY TO WORMS AND CORRUPTION.

JULIAN, the uncle of the emperor, having determined upon removing the treasures and most precious ornaments of the church of Antioch to the imperial treasury, closed the places of prayer; for all the clergy had fled. One presbyter, by name Theodore, alone remained in the city; and it was to him that the charge of these ornaments and treasures had been confided. Julian, the governor of Egypt, commanded him to be slain after he had subjected him to the most cruel tortures, in the vain endeavour to make him reply to his questions, and refrain from the confession of his faith. Julian then proceeded to the sacrilege of the sacred vases, which he flung upon the ground and sat upon, at the same time uttering incredible blasphemies against Christ: but his impious course was suddenly arrested; for certain parts of his body were turned into corruption, and generated enormous quantities of worms. The physicians confessed that the disease was beyond the reach of their art, but, from fear and reverence towards the emperor, they tried all the resources of medicine. They procured the most costly and the fattest birds, and applied them to the corrupted part, in the hope that the worms might be thereby attracted to the surface; but this was of no effect; for, in proportion as some of the worms were thus drawn out, others were generated in the flesh, by which he was ceaselessly de-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 3.

voured until they put an end to his life.¹ Many believed that this disease was an infliction of Divine wrath, visited upon him in consequence of his impiety; and this supposition appears the more probable from the fact, that the treasurer² of the emperor, and other of the chief officers of the court who had persecuted the church, died in an extraordinary and dreadful manner, as if Divine wrath had been visited upon them.

CHAP. IX.—MARTYRDOM OF THE SAINTS, EUSEBIUS, NESTABIS, AND ZENO, IN THE CITY OF GAZA.

As I have advanced thus far in my history, and have given an account of the death of George and of Theodore,³ I deem it right to relate some particulars concerning the death of the three brethren, Eusebius, Nestabis, and Zeno. The inhabitants of Gaza, being inflamed with rage against them, dragged them from their house, in which they had concealed themselves, and cast them into prison, after having beaten them with unexampled cruelty. They then assembled in the theatre, and cried out loudly against them, declaring that they had committed sacrilege in their temple, and had used the power with which they were formerly invested to the injury and destruction of Paganism. By these declamations the general excitement was increased to such a pitch that they ran to the prison, and with unparalleled fury drew forth their victims, and dashed them on the ground; and in this position, sometimes with the face and sometimes with the back upon the ground, the victims were dragged through the streets of the city, and were afterwards stoned and beaten. I have been told that even women quitted their work to add to their sufferings by personal inflictions, and that the cooks left their employment to pour boiling water on them, and to wound them with their culinary utensils. When the martyrs had been literally torn to pieces, and their brains scattered on the ground,

¹ Concerning the death of Julian, the reader will do well to compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. iii. 25, and St. John Chrysost. Orat. ii. contr. Gentiles.

² He means Felix, or Helpidius. Compare the account given of their deaths by Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. iii. 13.

³ Nicephorus and Epiphanius call him by the name of Theodoretus.

their bodies were dragged out of the city, and flung on the spot generally used as a receptacle for the bodies of beasts; then a large fire was lighted, and their bones mixed with those of asses and camels, so that it might be difficult to distinguish them: but they were not long concealed, for a Christian woman, who was an inhabitant, though not a native, of the city, collected the bones at night, by the inspiration of God, and conveyed them in a vessel to Zeno, their cousin, even as God had commanded her in a dream; for she was previously unacquainted with Zeno, and he had narrowly escaped being arrested; but he had effected his escape while the people were occupied in the murder of his cousins, and had fled to Anthona, a maritime city, about twenty stadia from Gaza, wholly addicted to superstition and idolatry. When the inhabitants of this city discovered that he was a Christian, they beat him violently, and drove him away. He then fled to Gaza, and concealed himself; and here the woman found him, and gave him the remains. He kept them carefully in his house until the reign of Theodore, when he was ordained bishop; and he erected a church beyond the walls of the city, and deposited the bones on the altar, near those of Nestor, the Confessor. Nestor had been on terms of intimacy with his cousins, and was seized with them by the people of Gaza, scourged, and imprisoned. But those who dragged him through the city were affected by his personal beauty, and, struck with compassion, they cast him, before he was quite dead, out of the city. Some persons found him, and carried him to the house of Zeno, where he expired during the dressing of his wounds. When the inhabitants of Gaza began to reflect on the enormity of their crime, they trembled lest the emperor should take vengeance on them. It was reported that the emperor was filled with indignation, and had determined upon beheading them: but this report was false, and had no foundation but the fears and self-accusations of the criminals. Julian, far from evincing as much anger against them as he had manifested against the Alexandrians on the murder of George, did not even write to rebuke their conduct. On the contrary, he deposed the governor of the province, and represented that clemency alone prevented his being put to death. The crime imputed to him was, that of having arrested some of the inhabitants of Gaza who had been guilty of sedition and murder, and of having

imprisoned them until judgment could be passed upon them in accordance with the laws. "For what right had he," asked the emperor, "to arrest the citizens merely for retaliating on a few Galileans the injuries that had been inflicted by them and by their gods." Thus, it is said, the affair was passed over.

CHAP. X.—CONCERNING ST. HILARION AND THE VIRGINS OF HELIOPOLIS. MARTYRDOM OF MARK, BISHOP OF ARETHUSA.

At the same period the inhabitants of Gaza sought for the monk Hilarion; but, aware of their sanguinary designs, he fled to Sicily.¹ Here he employed himself in collecting wood in the deserts and on the mountains, which he carried on his shoulders for sale in the cities, and by these means obtained sufficient food for the support of the body. But as he was at length recognised by a man of quality whom he had dispossessed of a demon,² he retired to Dalmatia, where, by the power of God, he performed numerous miracles, and through prayer repressed an inundation of the sea,³ and restored the waves to their proper bounds. No sooner, however, had these miracles excited the reverence of the people, than he quitted the country, in order that he might live unknown, and free from the praises and applauses of men. He sailed for the island of Cyprus, but touched at Paphos, and, at the entreaty of the bishop of Cyprus, fixed his residence at a place in that island called Charburis. Here he only escaped martyrdom by flight; for he fled in compliance with the Divine precept which commands us not to expose ourselves to persecution; but that, if we fall into the hands of persecutors, to overcome by our own fortitude the violence of our oppressors.

The inhabitants of Gaza and of Alexandria were not the only citizens who exercised such atrocities against the Christians as those I have described. The inhabitants of Heliopolis, near Mount Libanus, and of Arethusa in Syria, perpetrated deeds of still greater cruelty. The former were guilty of an act of barbarity which could scarcely be credited, had it

¹ Valesius considers that Sozomen is mistaken here, and that Hilarion's refuge was the Oasis in Africa.

² Compare Hieronymus, *Vita Hilarionis*, cap. 31.

³ See the *Life of Hilarion* by Hieronymus.

not been corroborated by the testimony of those who witnessed it. They stripped the holy virgins, who had never been looked upon by the multitude, of their garments, and exposed them in a state of nudity, as public objects of insult and derision. After numerous other inflictions, they shaved them, ripped them open, and placed inside them the food usually given to pigs; and the animals thus devoured these human entrails in conjunction with their ordinary food. I am convinced that the citizens perpetrated this barbarity against the holy virgins from motives of revenge, on account of the abolition of the ancient custom of yielding up virgins to prostitution, when on the eve of marriage to those to whom they had been betrothed. This custom was prohibited by a law enacted by Constantine, after he had destroyed the temple of Venus at Heliopolis, and erected a church upon its ruins.¹

Mark, bishop of Arethusa, an aged and virtuous prelate, was put to a very cruel death by the inhabitants of that city, who had long entertained inimical feelings against him, because he had, during the reign of Constantine, resorted to violence rather than to persuasion in his attempts to lead them from Paganism to Christianity, and had demolished a costly and magnificent temple. On the accession of Julian, an edict was issued, commanding the bishop either to rebuild the temple, or to defray the expenses of its re-erection. Perceiving that the people had risen up against him, and reflecting that he had no means to pay for the re-erection of the temple, and that such an act was not lawful for a Christian, and still less for a bishop, he fled from the city. On hearing, however, that many were suffering on his account, that some were dragged before the tribunals and others tortured, he returned, and offered to suffer whatever the multitude might choose to inflict upon him. The people, instead of admiring this noble deed, conceived that he was actuated by contempt towards them, and rushed upon him, dragged him through the streets, and covered him with blows. People of each sex and of all ages joined with alacrity and fury in this atrocious proceeding. Some pierced his ears; the young men who frequented the schools made game of him, throwing him from one to the other; and they lacerated him cruelly with their knives. When his whole body was covered with wounds,

¹ See Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, iii. 56—59.

they anointed him with honey, and, placing him in a basket of rushes, raised him up on an eminence. It is said that while he was in this position, and suffering from the attacks of bees and wasps, he told the inhabitants of Arethusa that he was raised up above them, and could look down upon them below him, and that this reminded him of the difference that would exist between them in the life to come. It is also related that the prefect,¹ who, although a Pagan, was held in such estimation that his memory is still honoured in that country, admired the fortitude of Mark, and boldly uttered reproaches against the emperor for allowing himself to be vanquished by an old man, exposed to innumerable tortures, and he added, that such proceedings reflected ridicule on the emperor, while the names of the persecuted were at the same time rendered illustrious. Thus did Mark² endure all the torments inflicted upon him by the inhabitants of Gaza with such unshaken fortitude, that even the Pagans were struck with admiration.

CHAP. XI.—MARTYRDOM OF MACEDONIUS, OF THEODULIS, OF TATIAN, OF BUSIRIS, OF BASIL, AND OF EUPSYCHUS.

ABOUT the same period,³ Macedonius, Theodulis, and Tatian, who were Phrygians by birth, courageously endured martyrdom. A temple of Meros, a city of Phrygia, having been re-opened by the governor of the province, after it had been closed many years, these martyrs entered therein by night and destroyed the idolatrous images. As other individuals were arrested, and were on the point of being punished for the deed, they delivered themselves up, and avowed themselves the actors in the transaction. They might have escaped all further punishment by offering sacrifices to idols; but the governor could not persuade them to accept acquittal on these terms. His persuasions being ineffectual, he subjected them to a variety of tortures, and finally extended them on a grid-iron, beneath which a fire had been lighted. While they

¹ He means Sallustius, who was at this time *præfectus prætoris*.

² This Mark, as Valesius observes, must be carefully distinguished from another Mark of Arethusa, who was one of the leaders of the Arian faction from the time of Constantine.

³ Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 15.

were being consumed, they said to the governor, "Amachus, (for that was his name,) give orders that our bodies may be turned on the fire, if you do not desire to be served with meat cooked only on one side." Thus did they die courageously, in the midst of torments.

It is said that Busiris also obtained renown at Ancyra, a city of Galatia, by his noble confession of the faith. He belonged to the sect denominated Eucrates, and it was reported to the governor of the province that he had ridiculed the Pagans. The governor, in consequence, commanded that he should be put to the torture. Busiris raised his hands to his head so as to leave his sides exposed, and told the governor that it would be useless for the executioners to take the trouble of attaching him to the instrument of torture, as he was ready to receive on his sides as many blows as might be adjudged him. The governor was surprised at this proposition; but his astonishment was increased by what followed, for Busiris remained firm and immoveable, with his hands on his head, while his sides were being torn with nails, according to the governor's direction. Immediately afterwards Busiris was consigned to prison, but was released not long subsequently, on the announcement of the death of Julian. He lived till the reign of Theodosius, renounced his former heresy, and joined the Catholic church.

It is said that about this period, Basil, presbyter of the church of Ancyra, and Eupsyclus, a native of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who had but just taken to himself a wife, terminated their lives by martyrdom. I believe that Eupsyclus was condemned in consequence of the demolition of the temple of Fortune, which, as I have already stated,¹ excited the anger of the emperor against all the inhabitants of Cæsarea. Indeed all the actors in this transaction were condemned, some to death, and others to banishment.

Basil had long manifested great zeal in defence of the faith, and had opposed the Arians during the reign of Constantius; hence the partisans of Eudoxius had prohibited him from holding public assemblies.² On the accession of Julian, however,

¹ See above, chap. 4.

² *ἐκκλησιάζειν*. Valesius remarks, that as Eudoxius was at this time bishop of Constantinople, and had jurisdiction over Galatia, he had a right thus to forbid Basil, who was a presbyter of Ancyra in Galatia, to hold

he travelled hither and thither, publicly and openly exhorting the Christians to cleave to their own doctrines, and to refrain from defiling themselves with Pagan sacrifices and libations: he urged them to account as nothing the honours which the emperor might bestow upon them, such honours being but of short duration, and leading to eternal infamy. His zeal had already rendered him an object of suspicion and of hatred to the Pagans, when one day he chanced to pass by and see them offering sacrifice; he sighed deeply, and uttered a prayer to the effect that no Christian might be suffered to fall into similar delusion. He was seized on the spot, and conveyed to the governor of the province; many tortures were inflicted on him, and in the manly endurance of this anguish, he received the crown of martyrdom.

Although these cruelties were perpetrated contrary to the will of the emperor, yet they serve to prove that his reign was signalized by many martyrdoms. For the sake of clearness, I have related all these occurrences in consecutive order, although the martyrdoms really occurred at different periods.

CHAP. XII.—CONCERNING LUCIFER AND EUSEBIUS, BISHOPS OF THE WEST. EUSEBIUS WITH ATHANASIUS THE GREAT AND OTHER BISHOPS HOLD A COUNCIL AT ALEXANDRIA, AND CONFIRM THE FAITH ESTABLISHED AT NICÆA.

AFTER the return of Athanasius from banishment, Lucifer,¹ bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, and Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, a city of Liguria in Italy, returned from Thebais. They had been condemned by Constantius to perpetual exile in that country. They conferred together concerning the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs; and it was unanimously agreed that Eusebius should repair to Alexandria, and there, in concert with Athanasius, hold a council for the purpose of confirming the Nicene doctrines. Lucifer sent a deacon with Eusebius to take his place in the council, and went himself to Antioch, where the church was torn by factions. A schism had been excited by the Arians, then under the guidance of Euzoios, and

assemblies. The word is used in this sense by Sozomen below, chap. 15, where he distinguishes it from *διδάσκειν*.

¹ For an account of the heresy of Lucifer, see above, note on b. iii. ch. 15, and compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 5, 9.

by the followers of Meletius, who, as I have above stated, were at variance even with those who held the same opinions as themselves. As Meletius had not then returned from exile, Lucifer ordained Paulinus bishop.¹

In the mean time, the bishops of many cities had assembled in Alexandria with Athanasius and Eusebius, and had confirmed the Nicene doctrines. They confessed that the Holy Ghost is of the same substance as the Father and the Son, and they made use of the term "Trinity." They declared that the human nature assumed by God the Word is to be regarded as consisting of a perfect soul as well as of a perfect body, even as was taught by the ancient Christian philosophers. As the church had been agitated by questions concerning the terms "substance" and "hypostasis," they decreed, and, as I think, wisely, that these terms should not henceforth be lightly used in reference to God, except in refutation of the Sabellian heresy; in discourses of this nature the use of such words was to be permitted, lest from the apparent paucity of terms, there might seem any difficulty in conveying distinctness of idea. These were the decrees passed by the bishops convened at Alexandria. Athanasius read in the council the document he had written in his own justification, detailing the reasons of his flight.

CHAP. XIII.—CONCERNING PAULINUS AND MELETIUS, ARCHBISHOPS OF ANTIOCH. DISPUTE BETWEEN EUSEBIUS AND LUCIFER; EUSEBIUS AND HILARIUS DEFEND THE NICENE FAITH.

ON the termination of the council, Eusebius repaired to Antioch and found dissension prevailing among the people.² Those who were attached to Meletius would not join Paulinus, but held their assemblies apart. Eusebius was much grieved at the state of affairs; for the ordination ought not to have taken place without the unanimous consent of the people, yet, from respect towards Lucifer, he did not openly express his dissatisfaction. He refused to hold communion with either party, but promised to redress their respective grievances by means of a council. While he was thus striving

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 6.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 9.

to restore concord and unanimity, Meletius returned from exile, and, finding that those who held his sentiments had seceded from the other party, he held meetings with them beyond the walls of the city. Paulinus in the mean time assembled his own party within the city, for his mildness, his virtuous life, and his advanced age, had so far won the respect of Euzoius, the Arian bishop, that, instead of being expelled from the city, a church had been assigned him for his own use. Eusebius, on finding all his endeavours for the restoration of concord frustrated, quitted Antioch. Lucifer fancied himself injured by him because he had refused to approve the ordination of Paulinus, and, in displeasure, seceded from communion with him. As if purely from the desire of contention, Lucifer then began to cast aspersions on the enactments of the council of Alexandria; and in this way he seems to have originated the heresy which has been distinguished by his name. Those who espoused his cause, seceded from the church; but although he was deeply chagrined at the aspect affairs had taken, yet, because he had deputed a deacon to accompany Eusebius in lieu of himself, he yielded to the decrees of the council of Alexandria, and conformed to the doctrines of the Catholic church. About this period he repaired to Sardinia. In the mean time Eusebius traversed the Eastern provinces, restored those who had declined from the faith, and taught them what it was necessary to believe. After passing through Illyria, he went to Italy, and there he met with Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers¹ in Aquitania. Hilarius had returned from exile before Eusebius, and had taught the Italians and the Gauls what doctrines they had to receive, and what to reject: he expressed himself with great eloquence in the Latin tongue, and wrote many admirable works, it is said, in refutation of the Arian dogmas. Thus did Hilarius and Eusebius maintain the doctrines of the Nicæan council in the regions of the West.

CHAP. XIV.—DISSENSION BETWEEN THE PARTISANS OF
MACEDONIUS AND THOSE OF ACACIUS.

AT this period, the adherents of Macedonius, among whom were Eleusius, Eustathius, and Sophronius, who now began

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 10.

to be called Macedonians, as constituting a distinct sect, adopted the bold measure, on the death of Constantius, of calling together those of their own sentiments who had been convened at Seleucia, and of holding several councils. They condemned the partisans of Acacius, and the faith which had been established at Ariminum, and confirmed the doctrines which had been set forth at Antioch, and afterwards approved at Seleucia. When interrogated as to the cause of their dispute with the partisans of Acacius, with whom, as being of the same sentiments as themselves, they had formerly held communion, they replied, by the mouth of Sophronius, a bishop of Paphlagonia, that while the Christians in the West maintained the use of the term "consubstantial," the followers of Aetius in the East, upheld the dogma of dissimilarity as to substance; that the former party confounded the persons of the Father and of the Son, by their use of the term "consubstantial," and that the latter party represented too great a difference as existing between the hypostases of the Father and of the Son; but that they themselves preserved the mean between the two extremes, and avoided both errors, by religiously maintaining that, in hypothesis, the Son is like unto the Father. It was by such representations as these that the Macedonians vindicated themselves from blame.

CHAP. XV.—ATHANASIVS IS AGAIN BANISHED; CONCERNING ELEUSIVS, BISHOP OF CYZICVS, AND TITVS, BISHOP OF BOSTRA. ANCESTORS OF THE AUTHOR.

THE emperor,¹ on being informed that Athanasius held meetings in the church of Alexandria, taught the people boldly, and converted many Pagans to Christianity, commanded him, under the severest penalties, to depart from Alexandria.² The pretext made use of for enforcing this edict, was that Athanasius, after having been banished by Constantius, had re-assumed his episcopal administration without the sanction of the reigning emperor: for Julian declared that he had never contemplated restoring the bishops

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 14.

² The edict of Julian is still extant. It is numbered 26 among his Letters.

who had been exiled by Constantius to their ecclesiastical functions, when he recalled them to their native land. On the announcement of the command enjoining his immediate departure, Athanasius said to the Christian multitudes who stood weeping around him, "Be of good courage; it is but a cloud which will speedily be dispersed." He then committed the care of the church to the most zealous of his friends, and quitted Alexandria.

About the same period, the inhabitants of Cyzicus sent an embassy to the emperor, to lay before him some of their private affairs, and particularly to entreat the restoration of the Pagan temples. He applauded their zeal, and promised to grant all their requests. He expelled Eleusius, the bishop of their city, because he had destroyed some temples, provided for the support of widows, erected edifices as dwelling-places for holy virgins, and induced many Pagans to abandon their ancient superstition. The emperor prohibited some foreign Christians, who had accompanied him, from entering the city of Cyzicus, from the apprehension, it appears, that they would, in conjunction with the Christians within the city, excite a sedition on account of religion. There were, in fact, great numbers of artisans engaged in the woollen manufacture, and in the coinage of money; they were divided into two bands,¹ and had received permission from preceding emperors to dwell, with their wives and possessions, in Cyzicus, provided that they annually handed over to the public treasury a supply of clothes for the soldiery, and of newly-coined money. Although Julian was anxious to advance, by every means, the Pagan religion, yet he deemed it the height of imprudence to employ force or intimidation against those who refused to sacrifice. Besides, there were so many Christians in every city, that it would have been no easy task for the rulers even to number them. He did not even forbid them to assemble together for worship; as he was aware that, when freedom of the will is called into question, constraint is utterly useless. He expelled the clergy and bishops from all the cities, in order to put an end to these assemblies, imagining that, when there would be no longer teaching or administration of the sacraments,² religion itself would, in course of

¹ *τάγματα*. *Classes vel ordines*.

² See above, note on chap. 11.

time, fall into oblivion. The pretext which he advanced for these proceedings was, that the clergy were the leaders of sedition among the people. Under this plea, he expelled Eleusius and his friends from Cyzicus, although there was not even a symptom of sedition in that city. He also publicly called upon the citizens of Bostra¹ to expel Titus their bishop. It appears that the emperor had threatened to impeach Titus and the other clergy as the authors of any sedition that might arise among the people, and that Titus had thereupon written to him, stating that, although the Christians were more in number than the Pagans, yet that, in accordance with his exhortations, they were disposed to remain quiet, and were not likely to rise up in sedition. Julian, with the view of exciting the enmity of the inhabitants of Bostra against Titus, represented, in a letter which he addressed to them, that their bishop had advanced a calumny against them, by stating that it was in accordance with his exhortations, rather than with their own inclination, that they refrained from sedition; and Julian exhorted them to expel him from their city, as a public enemy. It appears that the Christians were subjected to similar injustice in other places; sometimes by the command of the emperor, and sometimes by the wrath and impetuosity of the populace. The blame of these transactions may be justly imputed to the emperor; for, out of his hatred to the Christian religion, he only visited the perpetrators of such deeds with verbal rebukes, while, by his actions, he urged them on in the same course. Hence, although not absolutely persecuted by the emperor, the Christians were obliged to flee from city to city. My grandfather and many of my ancestors were compelled to flee in this manner. My grandfather was of Pagan parentage; and, with his own family and that of Alaphion, had been the first to embrace Christianity in Bethelia, a populous town near Gaza, in which there are temples highly revered by the people of the country, on account of their extreme antiquity. The most celebrated of these temples is the Pantheon, built on an artificial eminence commanding a view of the whole town. It is conjectured that the original name given to this temple was in the Syriac language, and that this name was afterwards rendered into Greek, and expressed by a word which signifies

¹ This edict is extant as the 52nd among the Epistles of Julian.

that the temple is the residence of all the gods. It is said that the above-mentioned families were converted through the instrumentality of the monk Hilarion. Alaphion, it appears, was possessed of a devil; and neither the Pagans nor the Jews could, by any of their enchantments, deliver him from this affliction; but Hilarion, by simply calling upon the name of Christ, expelled the demon, and Alaphion, with his whole family, immediately embraced the faith. My grandfather was endowed with great natural ability, which he applied with success to the explanation of the Sacred Scriptures; he had made some attainments in general knowledge, and was not ignorant of arithmetic. He was much beloved by the Christians of Ascalon, of Gaza, and of the surrounding country; and was regarded as necessary to religion, on account of his gift in expounding Scripture. No one can speak in adequate terms of the virtues of the other¹ family. The first churches and monasteries erected in that country were founded by members of this family, and supported by their liberality and humanity. Some good men belonging to this family have flourished even in our own days; and, in my youth, I saw some of them, but they were then very aged. I shall have occasion to say more concerning them in the course of my history.²

CHAP. XVI.—EFFORTS OF JULIAN TO ESTABLISH PAGANISM,
AND ABOLISH CHRISTIANITY. HIS EPISTLE TO SOME OF THE
PAGAN HIGH PRIESTS.

THE emperor was deeply grieved at finding that all his efforts to secure the predominance of Paganism were utterly ineffectual: for, although the gates of the temples were kept open, although sacrifices were offered, and the observance of ancient festivals restored in all the cities, yet he was far from being satisfied; for he could plainly foresee that, on the withdrawal of his influence, a change in the whole aspect of affairs

¹ He probably means that of Alaphion. The reader will observe the notice of Sozomen's family by himself, and compare the memoir prefixed to this volume.

² He means Salamanes, Phusco, Malchio, and Crispo, whom he mentions below, b. vi. chap. 32. See prefatory remarks by Valesius.

would speedily take place. He was particularly chagrined on discovering that the wives, children, and servants of many of the Pagan priests had been converted to Christianity. On reflecting that one main support of the Christian religion was the virtuous course of life of its professors, he determined to introduce into the Pagan temples the order and discipline of Christianity, to institute various orders and degrees of ministry, to appoint readers and teachers to give instruction in Pagan doctrines, and to command that prayers should be offered on certain days at stated hours. He, moreover, resolved to found monasteries for the accommodation of men and women who desired to live in philosophical retirement, as likewise hospitals for the relief of strangers and of the poor, and for other philanthropical purposes. He wished to introduce among the Pagans the Christian system of penance for voluntary and involuntary transgressions: but the point of ecclesiastical discipline which he chiefly admired, and desired to establish among the Pagans, was the custom of the bishops to give letters of recommendation¹ to those who travelled to foreign lands, wherein they commended them to the hospitality and kindness of other bishops, in all places, and under all contingencies. In this way did Julian strive to ingraft the customs of Christianity upon Paganism. But if what I have stated appears to be incredible, I need not go far in search of proofs to corroborate my assertions; for I can produce a letter, written by the emperor himself on the subject. He writes as follows:—

“ To Arsacius, High Priest of Galatia.

“Paganism has not yet reached the degree of prosperity that might be desired, owing to the conduct of its votaries. The worship of the gods, however, is conducted on the grandest and most magnificent scale, so far exceeding our very hopes and expectations, that no one could have dared to look for so surprising a change as that which we have witnessed within a very short space of time. But are we to rest satisfied with what has been already effected? Ought we not rather to consider that the progress of Christianity has been principally owing to the humanity evinced by Christians towards strangers, to the

¹ *τα συνθήματα*. “Literæ formatæ.” On these commendatory letters, see Bingham’s *Christian Antiq.* b. ii. 4, and xvii. 3.

reverence they have manifested towards the dead, and to the delusive gravity which they have assumed in their conduct and deportment. It is requisite that each of us should be diligent in the discharge of duty : I do not refer to you alone, as that would not suffice, but to all the priests of Galatia. You must either put them to shame, or try the power of persuasion, or else deprive them of their sacerdotal offices, if they do not, with their wives, their children, and their servants, join in the service of the gods, or if they permit their wives or their sons to disregard the gods, and to prefer impiety to piety. Exhort them not to frequent theatres, not to drink at taverns, and not to engage in any trade, or practise any nefarious art. Honour those who yield to your remonstrances, and expel those who disregard them. Establish hospitals in every city, so that strangers from neighbouring and foreign countries may reap the benefit of our philanthropy, according to their respective need. I have provided means to meet the necessary expenditure, and have issued directions throughout the whole of Galatia, that you should be furnished annually with thirty thousand bushels of corn, and sixty thousand measures of wine, of which the fifth part is to be devoted to the support of the poor who attend upon the priests ; and the rest to be distributed among strangers and our own poor. For, while there are no persons in need among the Jews, and while even the impious Galileans provide not only for those of their own party who are in want, but also for those who hold with us, it would indeed be disgraceful if we were to allow our own people to suffer from poverty. Teach the Pagans to co-operate in this work of benevolence, and let the first-fruits of the towns be offered to the gods. Habituate them to the exercise of this liberality, by showing them how such conduct is sanctioned by the practice of remote antiquity ; for Homer¹ represents Eumæus as saying,—

‘ It never was our guise,
To slight the poor, or aught humane despise ;
For Jove unfolds our hospitable door,—
’Tis Jove that sends the stranger and the poor.’

“ Let us not permit others to excel us in piety ; let us not dishonour ourselves, nor the service of the gods, by our negli-

¹ Odyss. *Æ.* 56.

gence. If I hear that you act according to my directions, I shall rejoice exceedingly. Do not often visit the governors at their own houses, but write to them frequently. When they enter the city, let no priest go to meet them; and let not the priest accompany them further than the vestibule when they repair to the temple of the gods: neither let any soldiers march before them on such occasions; but let those follow them who will. As soon as they have entered within the gates of the temple, they are but private individuals; for there it is your duty, as you well know, to preside, according to the divine decree. Those who humbly conform to this law manifest that they possess true religion; whereas those who contemn it are proud and vain-glorious. I am ready to render assistance to the inhabitants of Pessena, provided that they will propitiate the mother of the gods; but, if they neglect this duty, they will incur my utmost displeasure.

‘It is not right for me to show compassion
Towards those with whom the immortal gods are at enmity.’

“Convince them, therefore, that if they desire my assistance, they must offer up supplications to the mother of the gods.”

CHAP. XVII.—JULIAN RESORTS TO ARTIFICE, RATHER THAN TO OPEN VIOLENCE, AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS. THE SIGN OF THE CROSS CEASES TO BE USED AS A STANDARD; THE SOLDIERY INVITED TO OFFER SACRIFICE.

WHEN Julian acted and wrote in the manner aforesaid, he expected that he would, by these means, easily induce his subjects to change their religious opinions. Although he earnestly desired to abolish the Christian religion, yet he refrained from employing violent measures, lest he should be accounted tyrannical. He used every means, however, that could possibly be devised to lead his subjects back to Paganism; and he was more especially urgent with the soldiery, whom he sometimes addressed individually, and sometimes through the medium of their officers. To habituate them in all things to the worship of the gods, he restored the ancient form of the standard of the Roman armies, which, as we have already stated, Constantine had, at the command of God, con-

verted into the sign of the cross. Julian also caused to be painted, in juxta-position with his own figure, on the public pictures, a representation either of Jupiter coming out of heaven and presenting to him the symbols of imperial power, a crown or a purple robe, or else of Mars, or of Mercury, with their eyes intently fixed upon him, as if to express their admiration of his eloquence and military skill. He placed the pictures of the gods in juxta-position with his own, in order that the people might be led to worship them under the pretext of rendering due honour to him; and might thus, under the cloak of ancient usages, be induced to offer religious homage. He considered that, if they would yield obedience on this point, they would be the more ready to obey him on every other occasion; but that, if they ventured to refuse obedience, he would have reason to punish them, as infringers of the Roman customs and offenders against the emperor and the state. There were but very few (and the law had its course against them) who, seeing through his designs, refused to render the customary homage to his pictures; but the multitude, through ignorance or simplicity, conformed as usual to the ancient regulation, and thoughtlessly paid homage to his image. The emperor derived but little advantage from this artifice; yet he did not cease from his efforts to effect a change in religion. The next machination to which he had recourse, was less subtle and more violent than the former one; and the fortitude of many soldiers attached to the court was thereby tested. When the stated day came round for giving money to the troops, which day generally fell upon the anniversary of some festival among the Romans, such as that of the birth of the emperor, or the foundation of some royal city, Julian reflected that soldiers are naturally thoughtless and simple, and disposed to be covetous of money, and therefore concluded that it would be a favourable opportunity to seduce them to the worship of the gods. Accordingly, as each soldier approached to receive the money, he was commanded to offer sacrifice, fire and incense having previously been placed for this purpose near the emperor, according to an ancient Roman custom. Some of the soldiers had the courage to refuse to offer sacrifice and receive the gold; others were so habituated to the observance of the ancient custom, that they conformed to it without imagining that they were committing sin.

Others, again, deluded by the lustre of the gold, complied with the Pagan rite, and suffered themselves to fall into the temptation from which they ought to have fled. It is related¹ that as some of them who had ignorantly fallen into sin were seated at table, and drinking to each other, one among them happened to mention the name of Christ. Another of the guests immediately exclaimed, "It is extraordinary that you should call upon Christ, when, but a short time ago, you denied him for the sake of the emperor's gift, by throwing incense into the fire." On hearing this observation, they all became suddenly conscious of the sin they had committed; they rose from table and rushed into the public streets, where they screamed and wept, and called upon all men to witness that they were Christians, and that they had offered incense unawares, and with the hand alone, and not with the assent of the judgment. They then presented themselves before the emperor, threw back his gold, and besought him to put them to death, protesting that they would never renounce their sentiments, whatever torments might, in consequence of the sin committed by their hand, be inflicted on the other parts of their body for the sake of Christ. Whatever displeasure the emperor might have felt against them, he refrained from slaying them, lest they should enjoy the honour of martyrdom: he therefore merely deprived them of their military commission, and dismissed them from the court.

CHAP. XVIII.—CHRISTIANS PROHIBITED BY THE EMPEROR FROM STUDYING POLITE LITERATURE. RESISTANCE OF BASIL THE GREAT, GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, AND APOLLINARIUS, TO THIS DECREE.

JULIAN entertained the same sentiments as those above described towards all Christians, as he manifested whenever an opportunity was offered. Those who refused to sacrifice to the gods, although perfectly blameless in other respects, were deprived of the rights of citizenship, and of the privilege of

¹ Sozomen probably took this story from Gregory Nazianzen's first Oration against Julian. Valesius here remarks on the antiquity of the custom of invoking the name of Christ at the commencement of every meal.

joining assemblies and of holding public offices. He forbade the children of Christians from frequenting the public schools, and from being instructed in the writings of the Greek poets and orators.¹ He entertained great resentment against Apollinarius, the Syrian, a man of extraordinary erudition; against Basil and Gregory, natives of Cappadocia, the most celebrated orators of the time; and against other learned and eloquent men, of whom some were attached to the Nicene doctrines, and others to the dogmas of Arius. His sole motive for excluding the children of Christian parents from instruction in the learning of the Greeks, was because he considered such studies conducive to the acquisition of argumentative and persuasive power. Apollinarius, therefore, employed his great learning and ingenuity, in which he even surpassed Homer, in the production of a work in heroic verse, on the antiquities of the Hebrews from the creation to the reign of Saul. He divided this work into twenty-four parts, to each of which he appended the name of one of the letters of the Greek alphabet. He also wrote comedies in imitation of Menander, tragedies resembling those of Euripides, and odes on the model of Pindar. In short, he produced within a very brief space of time a numerous set of works, which, in point of excellence of composition and beauty of diction, may vie with the most celebrated writings of Greece. Were it not for the extreme partiality with which the productions of antiquity are regarded, I doubt not but that the writings of Apollinarius would be held in as much estimation as those of the ancients. The comprehensiveness of his intellect is more especially to be admired; for he excelled in every branch of literature, whereas ancient writers were proficient only in one. He wrote a very remarkable work, entitled "The Truth,"² against the emperor and the Pagan philosophers, in which he clearly proved, without any appeal to the authority of Scripture, that they were far from having attained right opinions of God. The emperor, for the purpose of casting ridicule on works of this nature, wrote to the bishops in the following words; "I have read, I have understood, and I have condemned." To this they sent the following reply; "You have

¹ Compare the statement of Socrates, b. iii. ch. 16.

² Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, also wrote a treatise with the same name. See Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iv. 27.

Quoted in Eph. Chris. m. 4, 85.

read, but you have not understood; for, had you understood, you would not have condemned." Some have attributed this reply to Basil, bishop of Cappadocia, and, perhaps, not without reason; but, whether dictated by him or by another, it fully displays the magnanimity and learning of the writer.

CHAP. XIX.—WORK WRITTEN BY JULIAN, ENTITLED "AVERSION TO BEARDS." DAPHNE, A SUBURB OF ANTIOCH. TRANSLATION OF THE REMAINS OF BABYLAS, THE PRIESTLY MARTYR.

JULIAN,¹ having determined upon undertaking a war against Persia, repaired to Antioch in Syria. The people loudly complained, that, although provisions were very abundant, the price affixed to them was very high. Accordingly the emperor, from liberality, as I believe, towards the people, reduced the price of provisions to so low a scale that the vendors fled the city. A scarcity in consequence ensued, for which the people blamed the emperor; and their resentment found vent in ridiculing the length of his beard, and the bulls which he had had stamped upon his coins; and they satirically remarked that he upset the world in the same way that his priests, when offering sacrifice, threw down the victims. At first his displeasure was excited, and he threatened to punish them, and prepared to depart for Tarsus. Afterwards, however, he suppressed his feelings of indignation, and repaid their ridicule by words alone; he composed a very elegant work under the title of "Aversion to Beards," which he sent to them. He treated the Christians of the city precisely in the same manner as at other places, and endeavoured, as far as possible, to promote the extension of Paganism.

I shall here recount some of the details connected with the tomb of Babylas, the martyr, and certain occurrences which took place about this period in the temple of Apollo at Daphne. Daphne is a suburb of Antioch, and is planted with cypresses and other trees, beneath which all kinds of flowers flourish in their season. The branches of these trees are so thick and interlaced that they may be said to form a roof rather than merely to afford shade, and the rays of the sun can never pierce through them to the soil beneath. The purity and the softness of the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 17.

air, and the great quantity of limpid streams which water the earth, render this spot one of the most delightful places in the world. The Greeks pretend that Daphne, the daughter of the river Ladon, was here changed into a tree which bears her name, while she was fleeing from Arcadia to evade the pursuit of Apollo, by whom she was beloved. The passion of Apollo was not diminished, they say, by this transformation; he embraced the tree, and made a crown of its leaves. He afterwards often fixed his residence on this spot, as being dearer to him than any other place. Men of grave temperament, however, considered it disgraceful to approach this suburb; for the air and aspect of the place seemed to excite voluptuous feelings; the fable, too, connected with the locality, appeared to add fresh fuel to the ardour of the passions of youth. The example of the gods had so debasing an influence, that the young people of this place seemed incapable of being continent themselves, or of enduring the presence of those who were continent. Any one who dwelt at Daphne without a mistress was regarded as callous and ungracious, and was shunned accordingly. The Pagans likewise manifested great reverence for this place on account of a statue of Apollo which stood here, as also a magnificent temple, supposed to have been built by Seleucus, the father of Antiochus, who gave his name to the city of Antioch. Those who attach credit to fables of this kind, believe that a stream flows from the fountain Castalia, which confers the power of predicting the future, and which is similar in its effects to the fountain of Delphi. It is related that Adrian here received intimation of his future greatness when he was but a private individual; and that he dipped a leaf of the laurel in the water, and found written thereon an account of his destiny. When he became emperor, it is said, he commanded the fountain to be closed, in order that no one might be enabled to pry into the knowledge of the future. But I leave this subject to those who are more accurately acquainted with mythology than I am. When Gallus, the brother of Julian, had been declared Cæsar by Constantius, and had fixed his residence at Antioch, his zeal for the Christian religion and his veneration for the memory of the martyrs prompted him to the removal of the abominations which had arisen in Daphne. He considered that the readiest method of effecting this object would be to

erect a house of prayer opposite to the temple, and to transfer thither the tomb of Babylas, the martyr, who had, with great reputation to himself, presided over the church of Antioch. It is said that from the time of this translation, the demon ceased to utter oracles. This silence was at first attributed to the neglect into which his service was allowed to fall, and to the omission of the usual sacrifices; but results proved that it was occasioned solely by the presence of the holy martyr. The silence continued unbroken even after the accession of Julian, although libations, incense, and victims were offered in abundance to the demon. The emperor himself entered the temple for the purpose of consulting the oracle, and offering up gifts and sacrifices with entreaties to grant a reply. The demon did not openly admit that the hinderance was occasioned by the tomb of Babylas, the martyr, but he stated that the place was filled with dead bodies, and that this prevented the oracle from speaking. Although many interments had taken place at Daphne, the emperor perceived that it was the presence of Babylas, the martyr, alone which had silenced the oracle; and he commanded his tomb to be removed. The Christians, therefore, assembled together and conveyed the relics to the city, which was about forty stadia distant, and deposited them in the place where they are still preserved, and to which the name of the martyr has been given. It is said that old men and maidens, young men and children, took part in the task of translating the remains; and that they sang psalms as they went along the road, apparently for the purpose of lightening their labour, but, in truth, because they were transported by zeal for their religion, which the emperor opposed. The best singers sang first, and the multitude replied in chorus, and the following was the burden of their song: "Confounded are all they who worship graven images, who boast themselves in idols."

See 1

See 1

CHAP. XX.—IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE TRANSLATION OF THESE RELICS, MANY OF THE CHRISTIANS ARE ILL-TREATED. THEODORE THE CONFESSOR. TEMPLE OF APOLLO AT DAPHNE DESTROYED BY FIRE FROM HEAVEN.

THE transaction above related¹ excited the indignation of the emperor as much as if an insult had been offered him, and he determined upon punishing the Christians; but Sallust, a prætorian prefect, although a Pagan, tried to dissuade him from this measure. The emperor, however, could not be appeased; and Sallust was compelled to execute his mandate, and arrest and imprison many Christians. One of the first whom he arrested was a young man named Theodore, who was immediately stretched upon the rack: but although his flesh was lacerated by the application of the iron nails, he addressed no supplication to Sallust, nor did he implore a diminution of his torments; on the contrary, he seemed as insensible to pain as if he had been merely a spectator of the sufferings of another; and he sang the same psalm which he had joined in singing the day before, to show that he did not repent of the act for which he had been condemned. The prefect, struck with admiration at his fortitude, went to the emperor, and told him, that unless he would desist from the measure he had undertaken, he and his party would be exposed to ridicule, while the Christians would acquire glory and reputation. This representation produced its effect, and the Christians who had been arrested were set at liberty. It is said that Theodore was afterwards asked, whether he had been sensible of any pain while on the rack; and that he replied, that he had not been entirely free from suffering, but had felt himself greatly refreshed and his torments assuaged by the attentions of a young man who had stood by him, and who had wiped off the perspiration, and supplied him with water. I am convinced that no man, whatever magnanimity he may possess, is capable, without the special assistance of Divine Power, of manifesting such entire indifference about the body.

The body of the martyr Babylas was, for the reasons aforesaid, removed to Daphne, and was subsequently conveyed elsewhere. Soon after it had been taken away, fire suddenly

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 19.

fell upon the temple of Apollo at Daphne, the roof and the statue of the god were burnt, and the naked walls, with the columns on which the portico and the back part of the edifice had rested, alone escaped the conflagration. The Christians believed that the prayers of the martyr had drawn down fire from heaven upon the demon; but the Pagans suspected the Christians of having set fire to the place. This suspicion gained ground; and the priest of Apollo was brought before the tribunal of justice to render up the names of those who had perpetrated the deed: but though bound, and subjected to the most cruel tortures, he did not name any one. Hence the Christians were more fully convinced than before, that it was not by the deed of man, but by the wrath of God, that fire was poured down from heaven upon the temple. Such were the occurrences which then took place. The emperor, as I conjecture, on hearing that the calamity at Daphne had been occasioned by the martyr Babylas, and on being further informed that the honoured remains of martyrs were preserved in several houses of prayer near the temple of Apollo Didymus, which is situated close to the city of Miletus, wrote to the governor of Caria, commanding him to destroy with fire all such edifices as were furnished with a roof and an altar, and to throw down, from their very foundations, the houses of prayer which were incomplete in these respects.

CHAP. XXI.—OF THE STATUE OF CHRIST IN THE CITY OF PANEADES. FOUNTAIN OF EMMAUS IN WHICH CHRIST WASHED HIS FEET. CONCERNING THE TREE WHICH WORSHIPPED CHRIST IN EGYPT.

AMONG so many remarkable events which occurred during the reign of Julian, I must not omit to mention one which affords a manifest proof of the power of Christ, and of the Divine wrath against the emperor. Having heard that at Cæsarea Philippi, otherwise called Paneades, a city of Phœnicia, there was a celebrated statue of Christ, which had been erected by a woman whom the Lord had cured of a flow of blood,¹ Julian commanded it to be taken down, and a statue of himself erected in its place; but fire from heaven was

¹ Compare Euseb. Eccl. Hist. vii. 18.

poured down upon it, the head and breast were broken, and it was transixed to the ground with the face downwards: it is still to be seen on the spot where it fell, blackened by the effects of the thunder. The statue of Christ was dragged round the city and mutilated by the Pagans; but the Christians recovered the fragments, and deposited the statue in the church in which it is still preserved. Eusebius relates, that at the base of this statue grew a herb which was unknown to the physicians and empirics, but was efficacious in the cure of all disorders. It does not appear a matter of astonishment to me, that, after God has vouchsafed to dwell with men, he should condescend to bestow benefits upon them. It appears that innumerable other miracles were wrought, of which accounts have been handed down to the people of the country, and with which they only are acquainted: one instance may be cited in proof. There is a city, now called Nicopolis, in Palestine, which was formerly only a village, and which was mentioned by the holy evangelists¹ under the name of Emmaus. The name of Nicopolis was given to this place by the Romans, in consequence of the conquest of Jerusalem and the victory over the Jews.² Just beyond the city, where three roads meet, is the spot where Christ, after his resurrection, said farewell to Cleophas and his companions, as if he were going to another village; and here is the fountain in which the Saviour washed his feet, and which has ever since possessed the property of removing every species of disease from man and other animals. At Ermopolis in Thebais is a tree called Persea, of which the branches, the leaves, and the least portion of the bark, are said to heal disease when touched by the sick: for it is related by the Egyptians, that when Joseph fled with Christ and Mary the holy Mother from the wrath of Herod, they went to Ermopolis; and as they were entering the city, this tree bent down and worshipped Christ. I relate precisely what I have heard from many sources concerning this tree. I think that this phenomenon was a sign of the presence of God in the city; or, perhaps, as seems most probable, it may have arisen from the fear of the demon, who had been worshipped in this large and beautiful tree by the people

¹ St. Luke xxiv. 13.

² This was done in the reign of Hadrian, when Cælia was built on the site of Jerusalem.

of the countr: for at the presence of Christ, the idols of Egypt wereshaken, even as Isaiah¹ the prophet had foretold. On the epulsion of the demon, the tree was permitted to remain a monument of what had occurred, and was endued with the property of healing those who believed. The inhabitants of Egypt and of Palestine testify to the truth of these events, which took place among themselves.

CHAP. XXII.—FROM AVERSION TO THE CHRISTIANS, JULIAN GRANTS PERMISSION TO THE JEWS TO REBUILD THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM; THEIR ATTEMPT IS FRUSTRATED BY FIRE FROM HEAVEN, AND BY THE APPEARANCE OF THE SIGN OF THE CROSS ON THEIR GARMENTS.

THOUGH the emperor² hated and oppressed the Christians, he manifested benevolence and humanity towards the Jews. He wrote³ to the Jewish patriarchs and leaders, as well as to the people, requesting them to pray for him, and for the prosperity of the empire. In taking this step he was not actuated, I am convinced, by any respect for their religion: for he was aware that it is, so to speak, the mother of the Christian religion, and he knew that both religions rest upon the authority of the patriarchs and the prophets; but he thought to grieve the Christians by favouring the Jews, who are their most inveterate enemies. He also calculated upon persuading the Jews to embrace Paganism: for they were only acquainted with the mere letter of Scripture, and could not, like the Christians and a few of the wisest among their own nation, discern the hidden meaning. Events proved that this was his real motive: for he sent for some of their chiefs, and exhorted them to return to the observance of the laws of Moses and the customs of their fathers. On their replying, that they were permitted to offer up sacrifices only at the temple of Jerusalem, he commanded them to rebuild the temple, and gave them money for that purpose. The Jews entered upon the undertaking, without reflecting that, according to the prediction of

¹ Chap. xix. 1.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 20.

³ The letter is still extant as the 25th Epistle of Julian; but its genuineness has been questioned. Valesius admits it as original.

the holy prophets, it could not be accomplished. They sought for the most skilful artisans, collected materials, cleared the ground, and entered so earnestly upon the task, that even the women carried heaps of earth, and sold their ornaments towards defraying the expense. The emperor, the other Pagans, and all the Jews, regarded every other undertaking as secondary in importance to this. Although the Pagans were not well-disposed towards the Jews, yet they assisted them in this enterprise, because they reckoned upon its ultimate success, and hoped by this means to falsify the prophecies of Christ. Besides this motive, the Jews themselves were impelled by the consideration, that the time had arrived for rebuilding their temple. When they had removed the ruins of the former building, and had cleared the ground for the purpose of laying the foundations of the new edifice, an earthquake occurred, and stones were thrown up from the earth, by which those who were engaged in the work were wounded, as likewise those who were merely looking on. The houses and public porticoes near the site of the temple were thrown down; many people lost their lives, and others were horribly mutilated. On the cessation of the earthquake, the workmen returned to their task, partly because such was the edict of the emperor, and partly because they were themselves interested in the undertaking. Men often, in endeavouring to gratify their own passions, seek what is injurious to them, reject what would be truly advantageous, and are deluded by the idea that nothing is really useful except what is agreeable to them. When once led astray by this error, they are no longer able to act in a manner conducive to their own interests, or to take warning by the calamities which are visited upon them. The Jews, I believe, were just in this state: for, instead of regarding this unexpected earthquake as a manifest indication that God was opposed to the re-erection of their temple, they proceeded to re-commence the work. But all parties relate, that they had scarcely returned to the undertaking, when fire burst from the foundations of the temple, and consumed several of the workmen. This fact is fearlessly stated, and believed by all; the only discrepancy in the narrative is, that some maintain that fire burst from the interior of the temple, as the workmen were striving to force an entrance; while others say that the fire proceeded direct from the bowels of the earth. In whichever

[SOZOMEN.]

R

way the phenomenon might have occurred, it is equally wonderful. A more tangible and still more extraordinary prodigy ensued: suddenly the sign of the cross appeared on the garments of the persons engaged in the undertaking. These crosses were disposed like stars, and appeared the work of art. Many were hence led to confess that Christ is God, and that the rebuilding of the temple was not pleasing to him; others presented themselves in the church, were baptized, and besought Christ, with tears and supplications, to pardon their transgression. If any one does not feel disposed to believe my narrative, let him go and be convinced by those who heard the facts I have related from the eye-witnesses of them, for they are still alive. Let him inquire, also, of the Jews and Pagans who left the work in an incomplete state, or who, to speak more accurately, were not able to commence it.

BOOK VI.

CHAP. I.—EXPEDITION OF JULIAN AGAINST THE PERSIANS, AND HIS MISERABLE END. LETTER WRITTEN BY LIBANUS, DESCRIBING HIS DEATH.

I HAVE narrated, in the preceding book, the occurrences which took place in the church, during the reign of Julian.¹ This emperor, having determined to carry on the war with Persia, made a rapid transit across the Euphrates, in the beginning of spring, and, passing by Edessa from hatred to the inhabitants, who had long professed Christianity, he went on to Carias, where there was a temple of Jupiter, in which he offered up sacrifice and prayer. He then selected twenty thousand armed men from among his troops, and sent them towards the Tigris, in order that they might guard those regions, and also be ready to join him, in case he should require their assistance. He then wrote to Arsacius, king of Armenia, one of the Roman allies, to bespeak his aid in the war. In this letter, Julian manifested the most unbounded arrogance: he boasted of the high qualities which had, he said, rendered

¹ Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 21.

him worthy of the empire, and acceptable to the gods; he reviled Constantius, his predecessor, as an effeminate and impious emperor, and directed his aspersions against Christianity. He told Arsacius that, unless he acted according to his directions, the God in whom he trusted would not be able to defend him from his vengeance. When he considered that all his arrangements had been duly made, he led his army through Assyria. He took a great many towns and fortresses, either through treachery or by force, and thoughtlessly proceeded onwards, without reflecting that he would have to return by the same route. He pillaged every place he approached, and destroyed and burnt the granaries and storehouses. As he was journeying up the Euphrates, he arrived at Ctesiphon, a very large city, whither the Persian monarchs have now transferred their residence from Babylon. The Tigris flows near the spot. As he was prevented from reaching the city, by a part of the land which separated it from the river, he judged that he must either pursue his journey by water, or quit his ships, and go to Ctesiphon by land; and he interrogated the prisoners on the subject. Having ascertained from them, that there was a canal which had been blocked up by the course of time, he caused it to be cleared out, and, having thus effected a communication between the Tigris and the Euphrates, he proceeded towards the city, his ships floating along by the side of his army. But the Persians appeared on the banks, with a formidable display of troops, of elephants, and of horses; and Julian became conscious that his army was enclosed between two great rivers, and was in danger of perishing, either by remaining in its present position, or by retreating through the country which he had so utterly devastated that no provisions were attainable. To divert the minds of the soldiers, he proposed horse-races,¹ and promised rewards to all who would enter the lists. In the mean time, he commanded the officers to throw the provisions and baggage from the ships; so that the soldiers, being driven to extremity by the want of

¹ κέλησιν ἄθλα προσθείς. Valesius observes that the Greek writers use the word κέλης both of the "horse" and the "rider," but that the word is here equivalent to the Latin Eques. The Roman order of Equites are spoken of by Polybius as κέλητες; and the verb κεληγίζειν is used by Horner, Od. O., in the sense of leaping down from horseback. See Harpocration in voce ἄμιπποι, and compare the Latin "Desultor."

necessaries, might engage in the conflict with greater courage and ardour. After supper, he sent for the tribunes and chiefs, and commanded the embarkation of the troops. They passed along the Tigris during the night; but their departure was perceived by some of the Persians, who prepared to oppose them. They found a few Persians asleep on the opposite bank, but they were readily overcome. At day-break, the two armies engaged in battle; and, after much bloodshed on both sides, the Romans returned by the river, and encamped near Ctesiphon. The emperor, being no longer desirous of proceeding further, burnt his vessels, as he considered that they required too many soldiers to guard them; and he then commenced his retreat along the Tigris, which was to his left. The prisoners, who acted as guides to the Romans, led them to a fertile country, where they found abundance of provisions. Soon after, an old man who had resolved to die for the liberty of Persia, allowed himself to be taken prisoner, and was brought before the emperor. On being questioned as to the route, he offered to guide the army, by the nearest road, to the Roman frontiers; he observed that, for the space of three or four days' journey, this road would offer many difficulties and impediments, and that it would be necessary to carry provisions during that time, as the surrounding country was sterile. The emperor was deceived by the discourse of this wise old man, and gave orders to follow the route he indicated. After the lapse of three days, however, it was found that the whole armament had been led astray into a barren and inhospitable region. The old man was put to the torture. But he had exposed himself to death for the sake of his country, and was therefore prepared to endure any sufferings that could be inflicted on him.

The Roman troops were now worn out by the length of the journey and the scarcity of provisions, and the Persians chose this moment to attack them. In the heat of the conflict which ensued, a violent wind arose, and the sky and the sun were totally concealed by the clouds, while the air was at the same time filled with dust. During the darkness which was thus produced, a horseman riding at full gallop directed his lance against the emperor and wounded him mortally; he then rode from the field, and no one knew whither he went. Some conjectured that he was a Persian; others, that he was a Saracén; others assert that he who struck the blow was a

Roman soldier, who was indignant at the imprudence and temerity which the emperor had manifested in exposing his army to such extreme peril. Libanius¹ the sophist, a native of Syria, the most intimate friend of Julian, expressed himself in the following terms concerning the person who had committed the deed:—"You desire to know by whom the emperor was slain. I know not his name. We have a proof, however, that the murderer was not one of the enemies: for no one came forward to claim the reward, although the king of Persia caused proclamation to be made, by a herald, of the honours to be awarded to him who had performed the deed. We are surely beholden to the enemy for not arrogating to themselves the glory of the action, but for leaving it to us to seek the slayer among ourselves. Those who sought his death were those who lived in habitual transgression of the laws, and who had formerly conspired against him; and who therefore perpetrated the deed as soon as they could find an opportunity. They were impelled by the desire of obtaining a greater degree of freedom from all control than they could enjoy under his government; and they were, perhaps, mainly stimulated by their indignation at the attachment of the emperor to the service of the gods, to which they were averse."

CHAP. II.—VISIONS OF THE EMPEROR'S DEATH SEEN BY VARIOUS INDIVIDUALS. CALAMITIES WHICH JULIAN ENTAILED UPON THE ROMANS.

IN the document above quoted, Libanius clearly states that the emperor fell by the hand of a Christian; and this, probably, was the truth. It is not unlikely that some of the soldiers who then served in the Roman army might have conceived the idea of acting like the ancient slayers of tyrants, who exposed themselves to death in the cause of liberty, and fought in defence of their country, their families, and their friends, and whose names are held in universal admiration. Still less is he deserving of blame, who, for the sake of God

¹ The passage referred to is extant in the funeral oration on the praises of Julian, Works, vol. ii. p. 323. Another oration of the same Libanius, addressed to the emperor Theodosius, is extant, according to Valesius.

and of religion, performed so bold a deed.¹ But I know nothing further concerning the death of Julian besides what I have narrated. All men, however, concur in receiving the account which has been handed down to us, and which evidences his death to have been the result of Divine wrath. It appears that one of his friends had a vision, which I shall now proceed to describe. He had, it is related, travelled into Persia, with the intention of joining the emperor. While on the road, he found himself so far from any habitation that he was obliged, on one night, to sleep in a church. He saw, during that night, either in a dream or a vision, all the apostles and prophets assembled together, and complaining of the injuries which the emperor had inflicted on the church, and consulting concerning the best measures to be adopted. After much deliberation, two individuals arose in the midst of the assembly, desired the others to be of good cheer, and departed, as if to deprive Julian of the imperial power. He who saw this vision did not attempt to pursue his journey, but awaited, in horrible suspense, the conclusion of the revelation. He laid himself down to sleep again, in the same place, and again he saw the same assembly: the two individuals who had appeared to depart the preceding night to effect their purpose against Julian, returned and announced his death to the others.

On the same day, a vision was sent to Didymus, an ecclesiastical philosopher, who dwelt at Alexandria; and who, being deeply grieved at the apostasy of Julian and his persecution of the churches, fasted and offered up supplications to God continually on this account. From the effects of extreme vigilance and want of food he fell asleep in his chair. Then being, as it were, in an ecstasy, he beheld white horses traversing the air, and heard a voice saying to those who were riding thereon—"Go, and tell Didymus that Julian has just been slain; and let him arise and eat, and communicate this intelligence to Athanasius the bishop." I have been credibly

¹ The Holy Scriptures, on the contrary, are most severe in their condemnation of the principle here mentioned by implication: and it is scarcely probable that the Greeks would have praised any one who killed his general, after having bound himself to him by the military oath. *Variorum Annot.*

informed that the friend of Julian and the philosopher beheld those things. Results proved that neither of them were far from having witnessed the truth. But if these instances do not suffice to prove that the death of Julian was the effect of Divine wrath on account of his persecution of the church, let the prediction of one of the ecclesiastics be recalled to mind. When Julian was preparing to enter upon the war against the Persians, he boasted that, on the termination of the war, he would treat the Christians with so much severity, that the Son of the Carpenter would be unable to aid them: the ecclesiastic above-mentioned thereupon rejoined, that the Son of the Carpenter was then preparing him a coffin. Julian himself was well aware whence the mortal stroke proceeded, and what was the cause of its infliction: for, when he was wounded, he took some of the blood that flowed from the wound, and threw it up into the air, as if he had seen Jesus Christ, and intended to throw it at him, in order to reproach him with his death. Others say, that he was angry with the sun, because it had favoured the Persians, and had not rescued him, although, according to the doctrine of the astronomers, it had presided at his birth; and that it was to express his indignation against this luminary that he took blood in his hand, and flung it upwards in the air. I know not whether, on the approach of death, and while his soul was in the act of being separated from the body, he might have become invested with superhuman powers, and so have beheld Christ. Few allusions have been made to this subject, and yet I dare not reject this hypothesis as absolutely false; for God often suffers still more improbable and astonishing events to take place, in order to prove that the Christian religion rests not on the wisdom or the power of man. It is, however, very obvious that, throughout the reign of this emperor, God gave manifest tokens of his displeasure, and permitted many calamities to befall several of the provinces of the Roman empire. He visited the earth with such fearful earthquakes, that the buildings were shaken, and no more safety could be found within the houses than in the open air. From what I have heard, I conjecture that it was during the reign of this emperor, or, at least, when he occupied the second place in the government, that a great calamity occurred near Alexandria in Egypt—namely, an inundation of the sea, of such violence

that the land was completely overflowed ; and afterwards, on the retreat of the waters, boats were found lodged on the roofs of the houses.¹ The anniversary of this inundation, which is regarded as the effect of an earthquake, is still commemorated at Alexandria by a yearly festival ;² a general illumination is made throughout the city ; the rites of religion are celebrated in the most solemn and pompous manner ; and the Alexandrians return thanks to God for their deliverance. An excessive drought also occurred during this reign ; the plants perished, and the air was corrupted ; and, for want of proper sustenance, men were obliged to have recourse to the food usually eaten by other animals. To the famine succeeded a pestilence, by which many lives were lost. Such was the state of the empire during the administration of Julian.

CHAP. III.—ACCESSION OF THE EMPEROR JOVIAN.

AFTER the decease of Julian, the government of the empire was, by the unanimous consent of the troops, tendered to Jovian.³ He, at first, refused the symbols of imperial power, alleging that he was a Christian ; but when the soldiers discovered the cause of his refusal, they loudly proclaimed that they were themselves Christians. The critical condition in which affairs had been left by Julian, and the sufferings of the army from famine in an enemy's country, compelled Jovian to conclude a peace with the Persians, and to cede to them some territories which had been formerly tributary to the Romans.⁴ Having learned from experience that the impiety of his predecessor had excited the wrath of God, and given rise to public calamities, he wrote without delay to the governors of the provinces, directing that the people should assemble together in the churches, that they should serve God

¹ Valesius remarks that these inundations occurred two years after the death of Julian ; and he refers to the testimony of Hieronymus, Vita Hilarionis, cap. 33.

² Called *γενέσιαι*, or Dies Natalis ; though, as Valesius remarks, the term *ἀνάμνησις* would have been more appropriate. See Ammian. Marcell. xxvi.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 22.

⁴ Valesius remarks on the error of Christopherson, who rendered this passage as if it referred to tribute, and not to territorial possessions.

with reverence, and that they should receive the Christian faith as the only true religion. He restored to the churches and the clergy, to the widows and the virgins, the same privileges that had been granted by Constantius and his sons, and afterwards withdrawn by Julian. He commanded¹ Secundus, who was then a prætorian prefect, to constitute it a capital crime to marry or to carry off any of the holy virgins, or even to regard them with unchaste desires. He enacted this law² on account of the wickedness which had prevailed during the reign of Julian; for many men had taken wives from among the holy virgins, and, either by force or guile, had completely corrupted them; and thence had proceeded those breaches of morality which always occur when religion is contemned and licentiousness tolerated.

CHAP. IV.—TROUBLES AGAIN ARISE IN THE CHURCHES;
COUNCIL OF ANTIOCH, IN WHICH THE NICENE FAITH IS CONFIRMED;
LETTER OF THE COUNCIL TO JOVIAN.

THE rulers of the churches now resumed the agitation of doctrinal questions.³ They had remained quiet during the reign of Julian, when Christianity itself was endangered, and had unanimously offered up their supplications for the favour and protection of God. It is thus that men, when attacked by foreign enemies, remain at peace among themselves; but, when external troubles are removed, then internal dissensions creep in: this, however, is not a proper place for the citation of the numerous examples which history affords of this fact.

At this period, Basil, bishop of Ancyra, Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis, and others of their party who regarded the heresy of the Anómians with the utmost aversion, and received the term "similar as

¹ προσεφώνησε. This was the technical term.

² This Constitution of Jovian is extant in the Theodosian Code, b. ix. tit. 25, de raptu, vel matrimonio sanctimonialium. It is worded as follows: "Si quis non dicam rapere, sed vel attentare matrimonii jungendi causâ, sacratas virgines vel *invitas* ausus fuerit, capitali sententiâ ferietur." Sozomen seems to have read *intueri* for *invitas*; but Valesius suggests that the correct reading is probably *viduas*; for widows as well as virgins were found in the cloister.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iii. 25.

to substance," instead of the term "consubstantial," wrote to the emperor; and, after expressing their thankfulness to God for his accession to the empire, besought him to confirm the decrees issued at Ariminum and Seleucia, and to annul what had been established merely by the zeal and power of certain individuals. They also entreated that, if discussion¹ should still prevail in the churches, the bishops from every region might be convened alone² in some place indicated by the emperor, and not be permitted to assemble elsewhere and issue decrees at variance with each other, as had been done during the reign of Constantius. They added, that they had not gone to visit him at his camp, because they were fearful of being burdensome to him; but that, if he desired to see them, they would gladly repair to him, and defray all expenses attendant on the journey themselves.

At this juncture, a council was convened at Antioch in Syria; the form of belief established by the council of Nicæa was confirmed; and it was decided that the Son is incontrovertibly of the same substance as the Father. Meletius, who was then bishop of Antioch, Eusebius, bishop of Samosata, Pelagius, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, Irenius, bishop of Gaza, and Athanasius, bishop of Ancyra, took part in this council. On the termination of the council they acquainted the emperor with the transactions that had taken place, by despatching the following letter—

“To the most religious and beloved Lord Jovian Augustus the Conqueror, from the bishops assembled from divers regions, at Antioch.

“We know, O emperor, well-beloved of God, that your piety is fully³ intent upon maintaining peace and concord in the church; neither are we ignorant that you have embraced the true and orthodox faith, which is the source of all unity. Lest, therefore, we should be reckoned among those who assail these

¹ *σχίσματος*. We here adopt the reading suggested by Valesius for the original *σχήματος*, which hardly makes sense.

² *μηδενός ἄλλου κοινωνοῦντος*. To the exclusion of the inferior clergy and laity.

³ *πρώτη*, i. e. principally. Or, perhaps, (as Valesius suggests,) we may take the word as literally implying that the emperor endeavoured to re-establish peace in the church, before he took any measures with reference to the pacification of the state.

doctrines of truth, we declare and testify, that we receive and maintain the form of belief which was anciently set forth by the holy council of Nicæa. Now, although the term 'consubstantial' appears strange to some persons, yet it was safely interpreted by the Fathers, and signifies that the Son was begotten of the substance of the Father, and that he is of like substance with the Father. This term does not convey the idea of unbroken generation; neither does it coincide with the use which the Greeks make of the word 'substance,' but it is calculated to withstand the impious allegation of Arius, that the Son proceeded from what had had no previous existence. The Anomians have still the impudence and rashness to maintain this same audacious dogma; and they thereby most grievously disturb the peace and unanimity of the churches.

"We subjoin to this letter a copy of the formulary of faith adopted by the bishops assembled at Nicæa, which we also receive and cherish."

Such were the decisions formed by the bishops convened at Antioch; and they appended to their letter a copy of the Nicene formulary of faith.

CHAP. V.—THE GREAT ATHANASIUS OBTAINS THE FAVOUR OF THE EMPEROR, AND IS RE-APPOINTED OVER THE CHURCHES OF EGYPT. VISION OF THE GREAT ANTONY.

At this period, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, and some of his friends, deemed it requisite, as the emperor was a Christian, to repair to his court. Accordingly Athanasius went to Antioch, and laid such matters before the emperor as he considered expedient. Others, however, say that the emperor sent for him, in order to consult him concerning the affairs relative to religion and the true faith. When the business of the church had been transacted, Athanasius began to think of returning. Euzoius, bishop of the Arian heresy in Antioch, endeavoured to instal Probatius,¹ a eunuch who held the same sentiments as himself, in the bishopric of Alexandria. The

¹ Athanasius does not say that Euzoius studied to get Probatius made bishop of Alexandria on the flight of Athanasius, but only that the Arian party, under cover of the emperor's name, used every effort to get Athanasius expelled, and another bishop substituted in his room; and that they were most anxious to bring about the election of Lucius.

whole party of Euzoius conspired with him to effect this design; and Lucius, a citizen of Alexandria, who had been ordained priest by George, endeavoured to prejudice the emperor against Athanasius, by representing¹ that he had been accused of divers crimes, and had been condemned to perpetual banishment by preceding emperors, as the author of the dissensions and troubles of the church. Lucius likewise besought Jovian to appoint another bishop over the church of Alexandria. The emperor saw through the artifice, attached no credit to the calumny, and dismissed Lucius with suitable admonitions: he also commanded Probatius, and the other eunuchs belonging to his palace, whom he regarded as the originators of this contention, to act more advisedly for the future.² From that period, Jovian manifested the greatest friendship towards Athanasius, and sent him back to Egypt, with directions to govern the churches and people of that country as he might think fit. It is also said that he passed commendations on the virtue of the bishop, on the purity of his life, his intellectual endowments, and his great eloquence. Thus, after having been exposed to great opposition, was the Nicene faith fully re-established; but further opposition awaited it within a very short period. For the whole of the prediction of Antony the Monk was not fulfilled by the occurrences which befell the church during the reign of Constantius: part thereof was not accomplished till the reign of Valens. It is said that, before the Arians took possession of the churches during the reign of Constantius, Antony had a dream, in which he saw mules encompassing the altar, and trampling it beneath their feet. On awaking, he predicted that the church would be troubled by the introduction of false and impure doctrines, and by the rebellion of the heterodox. The truth of this prediction was evidenced by the events which occurred before and after the period now under review.

¹ The accusations made by Lucius against Athanasius are extant in the 2nd vol. of that Father's collected works, as Valesius remarks.

² *σωφρονισθῆναι*. Valesius, however, renders the term *castigare*, and such is its technical signification in the best writers. See Thucyd. vi. 78. Eurip. Antiop. 8. It is curious that the word "chastise" in English has the same double meaning.

CHAP. VI.—DEATH OF JOVIAN, ACCESSION OF VALENTINIAN, AND ASSOCIATION OF HIS BROTHER VALENS IN THE GOVERNMENT.

AFTER Jovian had reigned about eight months, he died suddenly at Dadastanis, a town of Bithynia, while on his road to Constantinople. Some say that his death was occasioned by eating too plentiful a supper: others attribute it to the dampness of the chamber in which he slept; for it was of very recent construction, and quantities of coals had been burnt in it during the winter for the purpose of drying the walls. On the arrival of the troops at Nicæa in Bithynia, they proclaimed Valentinian emperor. He was a good man, and capable of holding the reins of the empire. He had not long returned from banishment: for it is said that Julian, immediately on his accession to the empire, erased the name of Valentinian from the Jovian legions, as they were called, and condemned him to perpetual banishment, under the pretext that he had failed in his duty of leading out the soldiers under his command against the enemy. The true reason of his condemnation, however, was the following. When Julian was in Gaul, he went one day to a temple to offer incense. Valentinian accompanied him, according to an ancient Roman law, which still prevails, and which enacted that the Jovians and the Herculeans (that is to say, the legions of soldiers who have received this appellation in honour of Jupiter and of Hercules) should always attend the emperor as his body guard. When they were about to enter the temple, the priest, in accordance with the Pagan custom,¹ sprinkled water upon them with the branch of a tree. A drop fell upon the robe of Valentinian, who was a Christian: his indignation arose, and he rebuked the priest with great rudeness; it is even said that he tore off, in the presence of the emperor, the portion of the garment on which the water had fallen, and flung it from him. From that moment Julian entertained inimical feelings against him, and soon after banished him to Melitine in Armenia, under the plea of misconduct in military affairs: for he would not have religion regarded as the cause of the

¹ νόμῳ Ἑλληνικῷ. Comp. Herod. i. 51. Æschines, 4. 2, and 79. 2. Aristoph. Lysistr. 1130.

decree, lest Valentinian should be accounted a martyr or a confessor. Julian treated other Christians, as we have already stated, in the same manner; for he perceived that persecution only added to the lustre of their reputation, and tended to the consolidation of their religion. As soon as Jovian succeeded to the throne, Valentinian was recalled from banishment: but the death of the emperor in the mean time took place; and Valentinian, by the unanimous consent of the troops and the chiefs, was appointed his successor. When he was invested with the symbols of imperial power, the soldiers cried out that it was necessary to elect some one to share the burden of government. To this proposition Valentinian made the following reply: "It depended on you alone, O soldiers, to proclaim me emperor; but now that you have elected me, it depends not upon you, but upon me, to perform what you demand: remain quiet, as subjects ought to do, and leave me to act as an emperor." Not long after this refusal to comply with the demand of the soldiery, he repaired to Constantinople, and proclaimed his brother emperor: he gave him the East as his share of the government; and reserved to himself the regions along the Western Ocean, from Illyria to the furthest coasts of Libya. Both the brothers were Christians, but they differed in opinion and disposition. Valens, having been baptized by Eudoxius when he officiated as bishop, was zealously attached to the doctrines of Arius, and would readily have compelled all mankind by force to yield to them: Valentinian, on the other hand, maintained the faith of the council of Nicæa, and favoured those who upheld the same sentiments, without molesting those who entertained other opinions.

CHAP. VII.—TROUBLES AGAIN ARISE IN THE CHURCHES, AND THE COUNCIL OF LAMPSACUS IS HELD. MELETIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH, AND OTHER ORTHODOX BISHOPS, ARE EJECTED FROM THEIR CHURCHES BY THE ARIANS.

WHEN Valentinian was journeying from Constantinople to Rome,¹ he had to pass through Thrace; and the bishops of the Hellespont and of Bithynia, with others, who maintained

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 4.

that the Son is consubstantial¹ with the Father, despatched Hypatian, bishop of Heraclea in Perinthæ, to meet him, and to request permission to assemble themselves together for deliberation on questions of doctrine. When Hypatian had delivered the message with which he was intrusted, Valentinian made the following reply: "I am but one of the laity, and have therefore no right to interfere in these transactions: let the bishops, to whom such matters appertain, assemble where they please." On receiving this answer, through Hypatian, their deputy, the bishops assembled at Lampsacus. After having conferred together for the space of two months, they annulled all that had been decreed at Constantinople through the machinations of the partisans of Eudoxius and Acacius. They likewise declared null and void the formulary of faith which had been circulated under the false assertion that it was the compilation of the Western bishops, and to which the signatures of many bishops had been obtained, by the promise that the dogma of dissimilarity as to substance should be condemned—a promise which had never been performed. They decreed that the doctrine of the Son being in substance like unto the Father should have the ascendancy; for they said that it was necessary to resort to the use of the term "*like*," as indicative of the hypostases of the Godhead. They agreed that the form of belief which had been adopted at Seleucia, and set forth at the dedication of the church of Antioch, should be maintained by all the churches. They directed that all the bishops who had been deposed by those who hold that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, should forthwith be reinstated in their churches, as having been unjustly ejected. They declared, that if any wished to bring accusations against them, they would be permitted to do so, but under the penalty of incurring the same punishment as that due to the alleged crime, should the accusation prove to be false. The bishops of the province and of the neighbouring countries were to preside as judges, and to assemble in the church, with the witnesses who were to make the depositions.

¹ Baronius censures Sozomen for holding that the bishops who assembled at Lampsacus were Homœusians, for placing that synod before A. D. 364, and for stating that legates from that synod met Valens at Heraclea. But Valesius shows good reasons for considering that the censure of Baronius is undeserved.

After making these arrangements, the bishops summoned the partisans of Eudoxius, and exhorted them to repentance; but, as they would give no heed to these remonstrances, the decrees enacted by the council were sent to all the churches. Judging that Eudoxius would endeavour to persuade the emperor to side with him, and would calumniate them, they determined to be beforehand with him, and to send an account of their proceedings to the court. Their deputies met the emperor Valens as he was returning to Heraclea from Thrace, where he had been travelling in company with his brother, who had gone on to Old Rome. Eudoxius, however, had previously gained over the emperor and his courtiers to his own sentiments; so that, when the deputies of the council of Lamp-sacus presented themselves before Valens, he merely exhorted them not to be at variance with Eudoxius. The deputies replied by reminding him of the artifices to which Eudoxius had resorted at Constantinople, and of his machinations to annul the decrees of the council of Seleucia; and these representations kindled the wrath of Valens to such a pitch, that he condemned the deputies to banishment, and made over the churches to the partisans of Eudoxius. He then passed over into Syria, for he feared lest the Persians should break the truce which they had concluded with Jovian for thirty years. On finding, however, that the Persians were not disposed to insurrection, he fixed his residence at Antioch. He sent Meletius into banishment, but spared Paul, because he admired the sanctity of his life. Those who were not in communion with Euzoios were either ejected from the churches, or fined and punished in some other manner.

CHAP. VIII.—REVOLT AND EXTRAORDINARY DEATH OF PROCOPIUS. ELEUSIUS, BISHOP OF CYZICUS, AND EUNOMIUS, THE HERETIC.

It is probable that a severe persecution might have ensued at this juncture, had not Procopius commenced a civil war.¹ As he possessed the chief authority at Constantinople, he soon collected a large army, and marched against Valens. The latter quitted Syria, and met Procopius near Nacolia, a city

¹ Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 5—7.

of Phrygia, and captured him alive through the treachery of Agilonius and Gomoarius, two of his generals. Valens put them all to a cruel death, and although he had sworn to show favour to the two generals, he caused them to be sawn asunder. He commanded Procopius to be fastened by the legs to two trees which had been bent together by the application of a great force; so that on the sudden removal of the force, when the trees were left to resume their natural position, the victim was torn in twain.

On the termination of this war, Valens retired to Nicæa; and, finding himself in possession of profound tranquillity, he again began to molest those who differed from him in opinion concerning the Divine nature. His anger was unbounded against the bishops of the council of Lampsacus, because they had condemned the Arian bishops and the formulary of faith set forth at Ariminum. While under the influence of these resentful feelings, he summoned Eleusius from Syria; and, having called together a synod of bishops who held his own sentiments, he endeavoured to compel him to assent to their doctrines. Eleusius, at first, manfully refused compliance. But afterwards, from the dread of being ejected from his church and deprived of his property, as was threatened by the emperor, he yielded to the mandate. He soon repented of his weakness, and, on his return to Cyzicus, he made a public confession of his fault in the church, and urged the people to choose another bishop, for, he said, that he could not discharge the duties of the priesthood after having denied his own faith. The citizens esteemed and honoured Eleusius too highly to proceed to the election of another bishop. Eudoxius, bishop of the Arians in Constantinople, however, ordained Eunomius as bishop of Cyzicus; for he expected that by his great powers of eloquence Eunomius would easily draw the people of Cyzicus over to his own sentiments. On his arrival at that city, he expelled Eleusius; for he was furnished with an imperial edict to that effect, and took possession of the church himself. The followers of Eleusius built a house of prayer without the walls of the city, and here they held their assemblies. I shall soon again have occasion to revert to Eunomius and the heresy which bears his name.

CHAP. IX.—SUFFERINGS OF THOSE WHO MAINTAINED THE NICENE FAITH. AGELIUS, BISHOP OF THE NOVATIANS.

THE Christians who adhered to the Nicene doctrines, and the followers of the Novatian heresy,¹ were treated with equal severity in the city of Constantinople. They were all ultimately expelled from the city; and the churches of the Novatians were closed by order of the emperor. The other party had no churches to be closed, having been deprived of them all during the reign of Constantius. At this period, Agelius, who from the time of Constantius had governed the church of the Novatians at Constantinople, was condemned to banishment. It is said that he was noted for his accurate and implicit observance of the ecclesiastical laws. With respect to his mode of life, he had attained to the highest degree of philosophy, namely, freedom from worldly possessions: this was evidenced by his daily conduct; he had but one coat, and always walked barefooted. Not long after his banishment he was recalled and restored to his church through the influence of Marcion, a man of extraordinary virtue and eloquence, who had formerly been enrolled among the troops of the palace, but was at this period a presbyter of the Novatians, and the teacher of grammar to Anastasia and Carosa,² the daughters of the emperor. There are still baths at Constantinople which bear the names of these princesses. It was for the sake of Marcion alone that the privilege above-mentioned was conceded to the Novatians.

CHAP. X.—CONCERNING VALENTINIAN THE YOUNGER, AND GRATIAN. PERSECUTION EXCITED BY VALENS. THE HOMOOU-SIANS, BEING PERSECUTED BY THE ARIANS AND MACEDONIANS, SEND AN EMBASSY TO ROME.³

ABOUT this period, a son was born to Valentinian in the West, to whom the emperor gave his own name. Not long

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 9.

² See the notes of Valesius on Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 8.

³ Valesius remarks that the title of this chapter is incorrect, and that it was the Macedonians, and not the orthodox Christians, who sent the embassy to Rome.

after, he proclaimed his son Gratian emperor ; this prince was born before his father succeeded to the throne.

In the mean time, although hailstones of extraordinary magnitude fell in various places, and although many cities, particularly Nicæa in Bithynia, were shaken by earthquakes, yet Valens the emperor, and Eudoxius the bishop, paused not in their career, but continued to persecute all Christians who differed from them in opinion. They succeeded to the utmost of their expectations in their machinations against those who adhered to the Nicene doctrines, for throughout many of the more distant provinces, and particularly in Thrace, Bithynia, and the Hellespont, these Christians were, during the greater part of the reign of Valens, deprived of their churches and of their priests. Valens and Eudoxius then directed their resentment against the Macedonians, who were more in number than the Christians above-mentioned in that reign, and persecuted them without mercy. The Macedonians, in apprehension of further sufferings, sent deputies to various cities, and finally agreed to have recourse to Valentinian and to Liberius, bishop of Rome, rather than conform to the doctrines of Eudoxius and Valens. In prosecution of this design, they selected three of their own number, namely, Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, and Theophilus, bishop of Castabalis, and sent them to the emperor Valentinian ; they likewise intrusted them with a letter, addressed to Liberius, bishop of Rome, and to the other bishops of the West, in which they entreated them, as prelates who had undeviatingly adhered to the faith of the apostles, and who were peculiarly called upon to watch over the purity of religion, to receive their deputies favourably, and to confer with them concerning the re-establishment of order in the church. When the deputies arrived in Italy, they found that the emperor was in Gaul, engaged in a war against the barbarians. As they considered that it would be perilous to visit the seat of war in Gaul, they delivered their letter to Liberius.¹ After having conferred with him concerning the objects of their embassy, they condemned Arius and those who held and taught his doctrines ; they renounced all heresies opposed to the faith established at Nicæa ; and received the term "consubstantial," as being a word that conveys the same

¹ Socrates (Eccl. Hist. iv. 12) places this mission A. D. 368. But Baronius would place it two, or even three, years earlier.

signification as the expression "like in substance." When they had presented a confession of faith analogous to the above to Liberius, he received them into communion with himself, and wrote to the bishops of the East, commending the orthodoxy of their faith, and detailing what had passed in the conference he had held with them. The confession of faith made by Eustathius and his companions was as follows.

CHAP. XI.—THE CONFESSION OF EUSTATHIUS, SILVANUS, AND THEOPHILUS, THE DEPUTIES OF THE MACEDONIANS, TO LIBERIUS, BISHOP OF ROME.

"To Liberius, our Lord and Brother, and Fellow Minister—Eustathius, Silvanus, and Theophilus, send greeting in the Lord.¹

"THE desire of suppressing the absurd dogmas which heretics are perpetually broaching, to the scandal of the Catholic churches, has impelled us to assent to the decrees enacted at Lampsacus, at Smyrna, and at councils in other places, by the orthodox bishops. Having been sent on an embassy to your Holiness, as likewise to all the other bishops of Italy, and of the West, we hereby attest and declare that we adhere to the Catholic faith which was established at the holy council of Nicæa, by the blessed Constantine and three hundred and eighteen inspired fathers. This form of belief has ever since remained inviolate; and it most justly admits the term 'consubstantial,' in testimony against the errors of Arius. We attest, by these our signatures, that we have always held this faith, that we still hold it, and that we shall adhere to it to the last. We condemn Arius, his impious dogmas, and his disciples. We also condemn the heresies of Patropassius, of Sabellius, of Marcion, of Marcellus, of Paul of Samosata, and all who maintain such doctrines, as well as the doctrines themselves. We anathematize all heresies opposed to the holy faith established by the saintly fathers at Nicæa. We anathematize Arius, and condemn all such decrees as were enacted at Ariminum, in opposition to the faith established by the holy council of Nicæa. We were formerly deluded by the guile

¹ Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 12.

and perjury of certain parties, and subscribed to these decrees when they were transmitted to Constantinople, from Nicæa, a city of Thrace."

At the conclusion of this document, they subjoined a copy of the entire formulary of Nicæa, and, having received from Liberius a written account of all that they had transacted, they embarked on board a ship then sailing from Sicily.

CHAP. XII.—COUNCILS OF SICILY AND OF TYANE. RENEWED PERSECUTION OF THE ORTHODOX. EXILE AND RETURN OF ATHANASIUS.

A COUNCIL was convened in Sicily; and, after the same doctrines had been confirmed as those set forth in the confession of the deputies, the assembly was dissolved. At the same time, a council was held at Tyane;¹ and Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Athanasius, bishop of Ancyra, Pelagius, bishop of Laodicea, Zeno, bishop of Tyre, Paul, bishop of Emesa, Otreius,² bishop of Melitine, and Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, were present, with many other prelates who, during the reign of Jovian, had assembled at Antioch, and determined to maintain the doctrine of the Son being consubstantial with the Father. The letter of Liberius and that addressed to the Western bishops were read at this council. These letters afforded high satisfaction to the members of the council; and they wrote to all the churches, desiring them to peruse the decrees of the Western bishops, and the documents written by Liberius and the bishops of Italy, of Africa, of Gaul, and of Sicily, which had been intrusted to the deputies of the council of Lampascus. They urged them to reflect on the great number of prelates by whom these documents had been drawn up, and who were far more in number than the members of the council of Ariminum, and exhorted them to be of one mind, and to enter into communion with them, to signify the same by writing, and finally to assemble together at Tarsus in Cilicia, before the end of the spring. On the approach of the appointed day, when these bishops were accordingly on the point of repairing to Tarsus, about thirty-four of the Asiatic bishops assembled

¹ This council was held probably A. D. 367, or early in 368.

² He is mentioned by Basil the Great in his 316th Epistle.

in Caria,¹ commended the design of establishing uniformity of belief in the church, but objected to the term "consubstantial," and insisted that the formularies of faith set forth by the councils of Antioch and Seleucia, and maintained by Lucian the martyr, and by many of their predecessors, in the midst of great tribulations, ought to obtain the ascendancy over all others. The emperor, at the instigation of Eudoxius, prevented the council from being convened in Cilicia, and even prohibited it under severe penalties. He also wrote to the governors of the provinces, commanding them to eject all bishops from their churches who had been banished by Constantine and recalled by Julian. Those who were at the head of the government of Egypt were anxious to deprive Athanasius of his bishopric, and expel him from the city: for, according to the edict of the emperor, pecuniary and other punishments were to be visited upon all magistrates and officers who neglected the execution of the mandate. The Christians of the city, however, assembled, and besought the governor not to banish Athanasius without further consideration of the terms of the mandate, which merely specified all bishops who had been banished by Constantine and recalled by Julian; and it was manifest that Athanasius was not of this number, inasmuch as he had been recalled by Constantius, and banished by Julian at the very time that all the other bishops had been recalled, and had been finally recalled by Jovian. The governor was by no means convinced by these arguments; but, perceiving that Athanasius could only be conveyed away by force, as the people assembled in crowds, and as commotion and perturbation prevailed throughout the city, he began to apprehend an insurrection, and therefore wrote to the emperor, without making any attempt against the bishop. Some days afterwards, when the popular excitement had abated, Athanasius secretly quitted the city at dusk, and concealed himself. The very same night, the governor of Egypt and the military chiefs took possession of the church in which Athanasius generally dwelt, and sought him in every part of the edifice, and even on the roof, but in vain; for they had calculated upon seizing the moment when the popular commo-

¹ It is probable that we should read here Antioch for Caria, as Valesius suggests. Another synod held at Antioch in Caria is mentioned by Sozomen below, vii. 2.

tion had partially subsided, and when the whole city was wrapt in sleep, to execute the mandate of the emperor, and to transport Athanasius quietly from the city. The disappearance of Athanasius excited universal astonishment: some attributed his escape to a special revelation from above; others, to the advice of some of his followers; but more than human prudence seems to have been requisite to foresee and to avoid such imminent danger. Some say, that as soon as the people gave indications of being disposed to sedition, he concealed himself among the tombs of his ancestors, being apprehensive lest he should be regarded as the cause of any disturbances that might ensue: and that he afterwards retreated to some other place of concealment. The emperor Valens soon after granted permission for him to return to his church. It is very doubtful whether, in making this concession, Valens acted according to his own inclination. I rather imagine that, on reflecting on the esteem in which Athanasius was universally held, he feared to excite the displeasure of the emperor Valentinian, who was well known to be attached to the Nicene doctrines, if he proceeded to violent measures against the prelate; or, perhaps, he might have been apprehensive lest the people, who were much attached to their bishop, should be impelled to a line of conduct prejudicial to the interests of the empire. I also believe that the Arian bishops did not, on this occasion, plead very vehemently against Athanasius; for they considered that, if he were ejected from his church, he would probably repair to the emperor, and might possibly succeed in persuading Valens to adopt his own sentiments, and in arousing the anger of Valentinian against themselves. They were greatly troubled by the evidences of the virtue and courage of Athanasius, which had been afforded by the events which transpired during the reign of Constantius. He had, in fact, so skilfully evaded the plots of his enemies, that they had been constrained to consent to his re-installation in the government of the churches of Egypt; and yet he could be scarcely induced to return from Italy, although letters had been despatched by Constantius to that effect. I am convinced that it was solely from these reasons that Athanasius was not expelled from his church like the other bishops, who were subjected to as cruel a persecution as was ever inflicted by Pagans. Those who would not change their doctrinal tenets were banished;

their houses of prayer were taken from them, and placed in the possession of those who held opposite sentiments. Egypt alone was, during the life of Athanasius, exempted from this persecution.

CHAP. XIII.—DEMOPHILUS ELECTED BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE ARIANS, AND EVAGRIUS BY THE ORTHODOX. ACCOUNT OF THE PERSECUTION WHICH ENSUED.

ABOUT this time the emperor Valens went to Antioch; and during his absence Eudoxius died, after having governed the church of Constantinople during the space of eleven years.¹ Demophilus was immediately ordained as his successor by the Arian bishops. The followers of the Nicene doctrines, believing that the course of events was in their power, elected Evagrius as their bishop. He had been ordained by Eustathius, who had formerly governed the church of Antioch in Syria, and who, having been recalled from banishment by Jovian, lived in a private manner at Constantinople, and devoted himself to the instruction of those who held his sentiments, exhorting them to perseverance. The Arians were deeply incensed at this ordination, and commenced a violent persecution against those by whom it had been effected. The emperor Valens, who was then at Nicomedia, on being apprized of the occurrences that had taken place in Constantinople since the death of Eudoxius, was fearful lest an insurrection should arise in the city, and therefore sent thither as many troops as he thought requisite to preserve tranquillity. Eustathius was arrested by his command and banished to Bizya,² a city of Thrace, and Evagrius was exiled to some other region.

CHAP. XIV.—EIGHTY ORTHODOX PRIESTS³ PUT TO DEATH BY VALENS.

THE prosperity of the Arians greatly added to their arrogance, and they persecuted unmercifully all Christians whose

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 14, 15.

² We have adopted Valesius' suggestion here. The town is mentioned by Socrates in the place referred to above.

³ Πρεσβυτέρων. Christopherson renders the word "Legati."

religious sentiments were opposed to their own.¹ These Christians, being exposed to personal injuries, accusations, and imprisonment, and finding themselves moreover gradually impoverished by the fines and extortions of the Arians, were at length compelled to appeal for redress to the emperor. They deputed to him for this purpose an embassy consisting of eighty ecclesiastics, under the direction of Urbanus, Theodore, and Menedemes. When they arrived at Nicomedia, they presented a memorial of their grievances to the emperor. Although transported with rage, the emperor did not openly manifest any displeasure, but secretly commanded the prefect to slay the whole deputation. But the prefect, being apprehensive that a popular insurrection would be excited if he were to put so many good and religious men to death without any of the forms of justice, pretended that they were to be sent into exile, and under this pretext compelled them to embark on board a ship, to which they assented with the most perfect resignation. When they had sailed to about the centre of the bay, which was called Astacenes, the sailors, according to the orders they had received, set fire to the vessel, and leaped into the boat. A wind arising, the ship was blown along to Dacibiza, a port of Bithynia; but no sooner had it neared the shore, than it was utterly consumed with all the men on board.

CHAP. XV.—DISPUTES BETWEEN EUSEBIUS, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA, AND BASIL THE GREAT, CONCERNING THE CHURCH OF CÆSAREA.

WHEN Valens quitted Nicomedia, he went on to Antioch; and in passing through Cappadocia he did all in his power, according to custom, to injure the orthodox, and to deliver up the churches to the Arians. He thought to accomplish his designs the more easily on account of a dispute² which was then pending between Basil and Eusebius who governed the church of Cæsarea. This dissension had been the cause of Basil's departing from Pontus, where he lived in retirement

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 16.

² Concerning this difference, see Gregory Nazianzen, in his Funeral Oration on the praises of Basil.

with some monks. The people and some of the most powerful and of the wisest men in the city began to regard Eusebius with suspicion, particularly as they considered him the cause of the withdrawal of one who was equally celebrated for his eloquence and his piety; and they accordingly began to meditate a secession from communion with Eusebius. In the mean time, Basil, fearing to be a source of further trouble to the church, which was already rent by the dissensions of heretics, remained in retirement at Pontus. The emperor, and the Arian bishops who were always attached to his suite, regarded the absence of Basil and the hatred of the people towards Eusebius, as circumstances that would tend greatly to the success of their designs. But their expectations were utterly frustrated. On the first intelligence of the intention of the emperor to pass through Cappadocia, Basil quitted Pontus¹ and returned to Cæsarea, where he effected a reconciliation with Eusebius, and by his eloquence greatly promoted the interests of the church. The projects of Valens were thus defeated, and he returned with his bishops without having accomplished any of his designs.

CHAP. XVI.—BASIL SUCCEEDS EUSEBIUS IN THE BISHOPRIC OF CAPPADOCIA, AND SPEAKS WITH GREAT FREEDOM IN THE PRESENCE OF VALENS.

SOME time after the emperor again visited Cappadocia, and found that Eusebius was dead, and that the bishopric had been transferred to Basil. He thought of expelling him from this office, but was compelled to abandon his intention. It is said that the night after he had formed his plans, his wife was disturbed by a frightful dream, and that his only son Galates was about the same time cut off by a rapid disease. The death of this prince was universally attributed to the wrath of God on account of the machinations that had been carried on against Basil. Valens himself was of this opinion, and after the death of his son, offered no further molestation to the bishop. When the prince was sinking under the disease, and at the point of death, the emperor sent for Basil, and requested him to pray to God for his son's recovery. For as soon as Valens had ar-

¹ A. D. 370. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 26.

rived at Cæsarea, the prefect had sent for Basil, and commanded him to embrace the religious sentiments of the emperor, menacing him with death in case of non-compliance. Basil replied, that it would be great gain to him to be delivered from the bondage of the body, and that he should consider himself under obligation to whoever would free him from that bondage. The prefect gave him the rest of that day and the approaching night for deliberation, and advised him not to rush imprudently into obvious and imminent danger. "I do not require to deliberate," replied Basil. "My determination will be the same to-morrow as it is to-day. Never will I worship the creature, or recognise the creature as God; neither will I conform to your religion, nor to that of the emperor. Although your power may be great, and although you have the honour of ruling no inconsiderable a portion of the empire, yet I ought not on these accounts to seek to please men, and at the same time deviate from that Divine faith which neither exile, proscription, nor death have ever impelled me to abjure. Infections of this nature have never excited in my mind one pang of sorrow. I possess nothing but a cloak and a few books.¹ I dwell on the earth as a traveller. As to bodily tortures, the weakness of my constitution is such, that I should triumph over them on the first application of the rack." The prefect admired the courage evinced in this bold reply, and communicated the circumstance to the emperor. On the festival of the Epiphany, the emperor repaired to the church, with the rulers and his guards, presented gifts at the altar, and held a conference with Basil, whose wisdom and gravity of deportment strongly excited his admiration. Not long after, however, the calumny of his enemies prevailed, and Basil was condemned to banishment. On the night previous to the execution of the edict, the son of the emperor fell ill with a dangerous and malignant fever. The father prostrated himself on the earth, and wept over the calamity; and not knowing what other measures to take towards effecting the recovery of his son, he despatched some of his attendants to Basil, whom he feared to summon himself, on account of the injustice he had manifested towards him. Immediately on the arrival of Basil, the prince began to rally; so that many maintain that his recovery would have been complete, had not some heretics been summoned to

¹ See notes of Valesius on Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 26.

pray with Basil for his restoration. It is said that the prefect, likewise, fell ill; but that on his repentance, and on prayer being offered to God, he was restored to health. The instances above adduced are quite inadequate to convey an idea of the wonderful endowments of Basil: his austerity of life and astonishing powers of eloquence attracted great celebrity.

CHAP. XVII.—FRIENDSHIP OF BASIL AND OF GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN; THEY MAINTAIN THE NICENE DOCTRINES.

GREGORY, who, it is said, was equally noted for the same attainments as Basil,¹ flourished about the same period. They had both studied in their youth at Athens, under Himerius and Proæresius, the most celebrated sophists of the age; and afterwards at Antioch, under Libanius, the Syrian. But as they subsequently conceived a contempt for sophistry and the study of the law, they determined to devote themselves to the practice and study of Christian philosophy according to the canons of the church. After having spent some time in the pursuit of Pagan science, they entered upon the study of the commentaries which Origen and the authors who lived before and after his time have written in explanation of the Sacred Scriptures. They rendered great assistance to those who, like themselves, maintained the Nicene doctrines, and manfully opposed the dogmas of the Arians, proving that these heretics did not rightly understand the data upon which they proceeded, nor even the Commentaries of Origen, upon which they mainly depended. These two holy men divided the perils of their undertaking, either by mutual agreement, or, as I have been informed, by lot. The cities in the neighbourhood of Pontus fell to the lot of Basil; and here he founded numerous monasteries, and confirmed the people in the belief of the doctrines which he maintained. After the death of his father, Gregory obtained the bishopric of the small city of Nazianzum;² and he was hence obliged to remain for some time at Constantinople and other places. Not long after, he was called by the people to the dignity of the metropolitan

¹ See St. Chrysostom, de Sacerdotio, i. 1.

² He had been for some little time coadjutor bishop during his father's life-time.

see: for there was then neither bishop nor church in Constantinople, and the doctrines of the council of Nicæa were almost extinct.

CHAP. XVIII.—PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS AT ANTIOCH, ON THE ORONTES. THE PEOPLE ASSEMBLE NEAR THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTLE THOMAS AT EDESSA.

THE emperor went to Antioch, and ejected from the churches of that city and of the neighbouring towns all those who adhered to the Nicene doctrines:¹ moreover, he persecuted them with extreme cruelty, putting many of them to death in various ways, and causing others to be drowned in the river Orontes. Having heard that there was a magnificent church at Edessa, named after the apostle Thomas, he went to see it. On approaching the edifice, he saw the members of the Catholic church assembled for worship without the walls of the city; for they had been deprived of their churches. It is said that the emperor was so indignant with the prefect for permitting these assemblies, that he struck him. Modestus, (for this was the name of the prefect,) although he was himself a heretic, secretly warned the people of Edessa not to meet for prayer on the same spot the next day; for he had received orders from the emperor to punish all who resorted thither: but the people, totally disregarding the threat, assembled, with more than their customary zeal, at the usual place of meeting. Modestus, on being apprized of their proceedings, was undecided as to what measures ought to be adopted, and repaired to the place where they had assembled. A woman, leading a child by the hand, forced her way through the ranks of the army, as if bent upon some affair of importance. Modestus remarked her conduct, ordered her to be stopped, and summoned her into his presence, to inquire the cause of her anxiety. She replied, that she was hastening to the spot where the members of the Catholic church were assembled. "Know you not," replied Modestus, "that the prefect is on his way thither, for the purpose of condemning to death all who are found on the spot?" "I have heard so," replied she, "and this is the very reason of my haste; for I am fearful of arriving too late, and thus losing the honour of

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 18.

martyrdom." The governor having asked her why she took her child with her, she replied, "In order that he may share in the sufferings of the others, and participate in the same reward." Modestus, struck with astonishment at the courage of this woman, went to the emperor, and, acquainting him with what had occurred, persuaded him to renounce a design which was neither beneficial nor creditable. Thus was the Christian faith confessed by the whole city of Edessa.

CHAP. XIX.—DEATH OF THE GREAT ATHANASIUS; HIS BISHOPRIC TRANSFERRED TO LUCIUS THE ARIAN. PETER, THE SUCCESSOR OF ATHANASIUS, SEEKS REFUGE IN ROME.

ATHANASIUS, bishop of Alexandria, died about this period, after having governed the church during the space of forty-six years.¹ The Arians having received early intelligence of his death, Euzoius, bishop of the Arians at Antioch, and Magnus, the chief treasurer, lost no time in seizing and imprisoning Peter, whom Athanasius had appointed to succeed him in the bishopric; and they forthwith transferred the government of the church to Lucius. Thence resulted a cruel persecution in Egypt: for as soon as Lucius presented himself in Alexandria, and attempted to take possession of the churches, he met with opposition from the people; and the clergy and holy virgins were accused as the originators of the sedition. Some made their escape, as if the city had fallen into the hands of an enemy; others were seized and imprisoned. Some of the prisoners were afterwards dragged from the dungeons to be torn with iron nails, while others were burnt by means of flaming torches. It seemed wonderful how they could possibly survive the tortures to which they were subjected. Banishment, or even death itself, would have been preferable to such sufferings. Peter, the bishop, made his escape from prison; and, embarking on board a ship, proceeded to Rome, the bishop of which church held the same sentiments as himself. Thus the Arians, although not many in number, remained in possession of the churches. At the same time, an edict was issued by the emperor, enacting that as many of the followers of the Nicene

¹ With this chapter compare the parallel accounts of Socrates, book iv. ch. 20, and Theodoret, book iv. ch. 20.

doctrines should be ejected from Alexandria and the rest of Egypt, as might be directed by Lucius. Euzoius, having thus accomplished all his designs, returned to Antioch.

CHAP. XX.—PERSECUTION OF THE EGYPTIAN MONKS, AND OF THE DISCIPLES OF ST. ANTONY. MIRACLES WROUGHT BY THEM.

LUCIUS went with the governor of Egypt and a band of soldiers against the monks in the desert;¹ for he imagined that, if he could overcome their opposition by interrupting the tranquillity which they loved, he would meet with fewer obstacles in drawing over to his party the Christians who inhabited the cities. The monasteries of this country were governed by several individuals of eminent sanctity, who were strenuously opposed to the heresy of Arius. The people, who were neither able nor willing to enter upon the investigation of doctrinal questions, received their opinions from them, and thought with them; for they were persuaded that men whose virtue was manifested by their deeds were in possession of truth. We have heard that the leaders of these Egyptian ascetics were two men of the name of Macarius, of whom mention has been already made,² Pambonius and Heraclides, and other disciples of Antony. On reflecting that the Arians could never succeed in establishing an ascendancy over the Catholic church, unless the monks could be drawn over to their party, Lucius determined to have recourse to force to compel the monks to side with him, all gentler measures having been attended with signal failure; but here again his schemes were frustrated; for the monks were prepared to fall by the sword rather than to swerve from the Nicene doctrines. It is related that, at the very time that the soldiers were about to attack them, a man whose limbs were withered, and who was unable to stand, was carried to them; and that, when they had annointed him with oil, and commanded him (in the name of Christ whom Lucius persecuted) to arise and go to his house, he was immediately restored to health and strength. This miraculous cure manifested the necessity of adopting the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 24.

² See above, iii. 14.

sentiments of those whose prayers were heard and answered by God, in opposition to the dogmas of Lucius: but the persecutors of the monks were not led to repentance by this miracle; on the contrary, they arrested these holy men, and conveyed them by night to an island of Egypt, lying in the midst of swamps and marshes. The inhabitants of this island had never heard of the Christian faith, and were devoted to the service of demons: the island contained many temples of great antiquity used for idolatrous purposes. It is said that, when the monks landed on the island, the daughter of the priest, who was possessed of a devil, went to meet them. The girl ran screaming towards them; and the people of the island, astonished at her strange conduct, followed in crowds. When she drew near the ship in which were the holy priests, she flung herself upon the ground, and exclaimed in a loud voice, "Wherefore are you come to us, O servants of the great God? for we have long dwelt in this island without giving trouble to any one. Unknown to men, we have concealed ourselves here, and shut up ourselves within these marshes. If, however, it please you, accept our possessions, and fix your abode here; we will quit the island." Macarius and his companions exorcised the demon, and the girl was restored. Her father and all her house, with the inhabitants of the island, immediately embraced Christianity, and demolished their temple for the purpose of erecting a church. On these occurrences being reported at Alexandria, Lucius was overcome by immoderate grief; and fearing lest he should incur the hatred of his own partisans, and be accused of warring against God, and not against man, he sent secret orders for Macarius and his companions to be re-conveyed to their own dwellings in the wilderness. Thus did Lucius occasion troubles and commotions in Egypt. About the same period, Didymus the philosopher and several other illustrious men acquired great renown. Struck by their virtue, and by that of the monks, the people followed their doctrines, and opposed those of the partisans of Lucius. The Arians, though not so strong in point of numbers as the other party, grievously persecuted the church of Egypt.

CHAP. XXI.—LIST OF THE PLACES IN WHICH THE NICENE DOCTRINES WERE PREACHED. FAITH MANIFESTED BY THE SCYTHIANS.

ARIANISM met with similar opposition at the same period in Osröene and Cappadocia. Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, and Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, were held in high admiration and esteem throughout these regions. Syria and the neighbouring provinces, and more especially the city of Antioch, were plunged in confusion and disorder; for the Arians were very numerous in these parts, and had possession of the churches. The members of the Catholic church were not, however, few in number. They were called Eustathians and Paulinists, and were under the guidance of Paulinus and Meletius, as has been before stated. It was through their instrumentality that the church of Antioch was preserved from the encroachments of the Arians, and enabled to resist the power of Valens, and of those who acted under his directions. Indeed, it appears that all the churches which were governed by men who were firmly attached to the faith did not deviate from the form of doctrine they had originally embraced. It is said that this was the cause of the firmness with which the Scythians adhered to their religion. There are in this country a great number of cities, of towns, and of fortresses. The metropolis is called Tomis; it is a large and opulent city, and lies to the left of the Euxine. According to an ancient custom which still prevails, all the churches of the whole country are under the sway of one bishop.¹ Vetricio ruled over these churches at the period that the emperor visited Tomis. Valens repaired to the church, and strove, according to his usual custom, to gain over the bishop to the heresy of Arius; but this latter manfully opposed his arguments; and, after a courageous defence of the Nicene doctrines, quitted the emperor, and proceeded to another church, whither he was followed by the people. All the citizens had crowded to see the emperor; for they expected that something extraordinary would result from this interview with the bishop. Valens was extremely offended at being left alone in the church with his attendants; and, in resentment, condemned Vetricio to banishment. Not long after, however, he recalled him, because, I

¹ Sozomen repeats this below, b. vii. 19, where he recounts the various local customs prevailing in the ecclesiastical system.

[SOZOMEN.]

believe, he apprehended an insurrection; for the Scythians openly deplored the absence of their bishop. He well knew that the Scythians were a courageous nation, and that their country possessed many natural advantages, which rendered it necessary to the Roman empire; for it served as a barrier to ward off the invasions of the barbarians. Thus were the designs of the emperor frustrated by Vetrico. The Scythians themselves testify to the virtues of this bishop, and to his eminent sanctity of life. The resentment of the emperor at the defeat of his schemes was visited upon all the clergy except those of the Western churches; for Valentinian, who reigned over the Western regions, was attached to the Nicene doctrines, and was imbued with so much reverence for religion, that he never imposed any commands upon the priests, nor ever attempted to introduce any alteration in ecclesiastical regulations. Whatever might have been his capabilities for guiding the reins of the empire, (as, indeed, was evidenced by his deeds,) he considered that ecclesiastical matters were beyond the range of his jurisdiction.

CHAP. XXII.—DEBATE CONCERNING THE NATURE OF THE HOLY GHOST. IT IS DECIDED THAT HE IS TO BE CONSIDERED CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER AND THE SON.

A QUESTION was renewed at this juncture which had previously excited much inquiry,¹ namely—whether the Holy Ghost is or is not to be considered consubstantial with the Father and the Son. Lengthened debates ensued on this subject, similar to those which had been held concerning the nature of God the Word. Those who asserted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and those who insisted that he is similar in substance to the Father, came to one common opinion concerning the Holy Ghost; for both parties maintained that the Holy Ghost differs in substance from the other two Persons of the Trinity, and that he is but the Minister, and the third Person of the Trinity in point of dignity and order. Those, on the contrary, who believed that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, believed also that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. This doctrine was zealously maintained in Syria by Apollinarius, bishop of Laodicea;

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 45.

in Egypt, by Athanasius,¹ the bishop; and, in Cappadocia and in Pontus, by Basil and Gregory. The bishop of Rome, on hearing that this question was agitated with great acrimony, and that the contention seemed daily to increase, wrote to the churches of the East, and urged them to receive the doctrine upheld by the Western clergy, namely—that the three Persons of the Trinity are of the same substance, and of equal dignity. The question having been thus decided by the Roman churches, peace was restored, and an end was put to the debate.

CHAP. XXIII.—DEATH OF LIBERIUS, BISHOP OF ROME. HE IS SUCCEEDED BY DAMASUS AND URSINUS. ORTHODOX DOCTRINES PREVAIL THROUGHOUT THE WEST, EXCEPT AT MILAN. SYNOD HELD AT ROME, BY WHICH AUXENTIUS IS DEPOSED.

ABOUT this period Liberius died,² and Damasus succeeded to the bishopric of Rome. A deacon named Ursinus,³ having obtained some votes in his favour, caused himself to be clandestinely ordained by some bishops of little note, and endeavoured to create a division among the people, so as to form separate assemblies. He succeeded in effecting this division, and some of the people followed him, while the rest adhered to Damasus. This gave rise to many disputes, and to much contention, which at length proceeded to murder and bloodshed. The prefect of Rome was obliged to interfere, and to punish many of the clergy and people; and he put an end to the usurpation of Ursinus. With respect to doctrine, however, no dissension arose either at Rome or in any other of the Western churches. The people unanimously adhered to the form of belief established at Nicæa, and regarded the three Persons of the Trinity as equal in dignity and in power. Auxentius alone differed from the others in opinion; he was then bishop of Milan, and, in conjunction with a few partisans, was intent upon the introduction of innovations, and the maintenance of the Arian dogma of the dissimilarity of the Son and of the

¹ Or, more probably, Peter; for Athanasius was recently dead. But Sozomen (as Valesius remarks) is careless in observing the proper order of time.

² Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 29.

³ Or Ursicius. Concerning his quarrel with Damasus, bishop of Rome, see Baronius, Annal. A. D. 367.

Holy Ghost, in opposition to the unanimous decision of the Western priests. The bishops of Gaul and of Venice,¹ having reported that similar attempts to disturb the peace of the church were being made by others, the bishops of several provinces assembled not long after at Rome, and decreed that Auxentius and those who held his sentiments should be excluded from communion. They confirmed the faith established by the council of Nicæa, and annulled all the decrees that had been issued at Ariminum contrary to that faith, under the plea that these decrees had not received the assent of the bishop of Rome, nor of other bishops, and that they were disapproved by many who had been present at the synod, and had assisted in their enactment. That such was the decision really formed by the synod is testified by the epistle² addressed by Damasus, the Roman bishop, and the rest of the assembly, to the bishops of Illyria. It is as follows:—

“Damasus, Valerius,³ and the other bishops of the holy assembly at Rome, to the dearly beloved brethren the bishops of Illyria, greeting in the Lord.

“We believe that you uphold and teach to the people our holy faith, which is founded on the doctrines of the apostles. This faith differs in no respect from that inculcated by the Fathers; neither is it permitted to the priests of God, who are, by the right of their office, the instructors of the wise, to entertain any other sentiment. We have, however, been informed by some of our brethren of Gaul and of Venice, that certain individuals are bent upon the introduction of heresy. All bishops should diligently guard against this evil, lest some of their flock should be led by inexperience, and others by simplicity, to deviate from our own authorized interpretations. Those who devise strange doctrines ought not to be followed, but the opinions of our fathers ought to be retained, whatever may be the diversity of judgment around us. Hence Auxentius, bishop of Milan, has been condemned, and with justice. It is, therefore, right that all the teachers of the Roman empire should be of one mind, and not pollute the faith by divers

¹ See the synodical epistle below.

² This epistle is extant in Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. ii. 22. The synod by which it was written was probably held A. D. 369, and 93 bishops were present at its deliberations.

³ He was bishop of Aquileia.

conflicting doctrines. For, when the evil of heresy first began to develop itself, even as the blasphemy of the Arians is now exhibited, our fathers, to the number of three hundred and eighteen, assembled together at Nicæa, erected a wall of defence against the weapons of the devil, and prepared an antidote to the poison of corrupt doctrine. This antidote consists in the belief, that the Father and the Son have one Godhead, one virtue, and one substance (*χρημα*). It is also requisite to believe that the Holy Ghost is of the same hypostasis as the Father and the Son. We have decreed, that those who hold any other doctrines are to be excluded from communion with us. Some have attempted to reverse this useful regulation and adorable decision; but the persons by whom this attempt was made at the council of Ariminum have since, in some measure, atoned for their presumption by confessing that they were deceived by certain specious arguments, which did not appear to them to be contrary to the principles laid down by our fathers at Nicæa. The number of individuals congregated at the council of Ariminum proves nothing in prejudice of orthodox doctrines, for the council was held without the sanction of the bishops of Rome, who ought to have been in the first place consulted, and without the assent either of Vincent, who during a very long series of years enjoyed the episcopal dignity, or of many other bishops who held the same sentiments as those last mentioned. Besides, as has been before stated, those persons who were deceived and induced to deviate from orthodox doctrines, testified their disapprobation of their own proceedings as soon as they made use of their own judgment. Is it not, therefore, manifest to you that the one true faith is that which was established at Nicæa upon the authority of the apostles, and which must ever be retained inviolate, and that all bishops, whether of the East or of the West, who profess the Catholic religion, ought to consider it an honour to be in communion with us. We believe that it will not be long before those who maintain other sentiments will be excluded from communion, and deprived of the name and dignity of bishop; so that the people who are now oppressed by the yoke of those pernicious and deceitful principles, may have liberty to breathe. For it is not in the power of these bishops to undeceive the people, inasmuch as they are themselves deceived. Be then of one mind with all the

priests of God; we believe that you adhere firmly to the faith, but that we may be more fully assured on this point, convince us of the same by your letters."

CHAP. XXIV.—CONCERNING ST. AMBROSE AND HIS ELEVATION TO AN ARCHBISHOPRIC. THE NOVATIANS OF PHRYGIA AND THE PASSOVER.

THE clergy of the West, having thus anticipated the designs of those who sought to introduce innovations among them,¹ carefully continued to preserve the inviolability of the faith which had from the beginning been handed down to them. With the solitary exception of Auxentius and his partisans, there were no individuals among them who entertained heterodox opinions. Auxentius, however, did not live long after this period. At his death, a sedition arose among the people of Milan concerning the appointment of a successor, and the city seemed in danger of a general insurrection. Those who had aspired to the bishopric, and been defeated in their expectations, were loud in their menaces, as is usual on such occasions. Ambrosius, who was then the governor of the province, being fearful lest further tumult should arise, went to the church and exhorted the people to cease from contention, to re-establish peace and concord, and to respect the laws. Before he had ceased speaking, all his auditors suppressed the angry feelings by which they had been mutually agitated against each other, and declared that he who was exhorting them to concord should be their bishop, and receive the rite of baptism, for he had never been baptized. After Ambrosius had repeatedly refused the proffered dignity, and even quitted the place that it might not be forced upon him, the people still persisted in their choice, and declared that the disputes would never be appeased unless he would accede to their wishes; and at length intelligence of these transactions was conveyed to court.² It is said that the emperor Valentinian prayed and returned thanks to God, that the very man whom he had appointed governor, had been chosen to fill a priestly office. When he was informed of the earnest desires of the people and the refusal of Ambrosius, he inferred that

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 30.

² See below, vii. 8, and the note there given.

events had been so ordered by God for the purpose of restoring peace to the church of Milan, and commanded that Ambrosius should be ordained as quickly as possible. He was baptized and ordained at the same time, and forthwith proceeded to bring the church under his sway to unanimity of opinion concerning the Divine nature; for, while under the guidance of Auxentius, it had been long rent by dissensions on this subject. We shall hereafter have occasion to speak of the conduct of Ambrosius after his ordination, and of the admirable and holy manner in which he discharged the functions of the priesthood.

About this period, the Novatians of Phrygia, contrary to their ancient custom, began to celebrate the festival of the passover (τὸ Πάσχα) on the same day as the Jews. Novatius, the originator of their heresy, refused to receive those who repented of their sins into communion, and it was in this respect alone that he innovated upon established doctrines. But he and those who succeeded him celebrated the feast of the passover after the vernal equinox, according to the custom of the Roman church. Some Novatian bishops, however, assembled about this time at Pazi, a town of Phrygia, near the source of the river Sangarus, and agreeing not to follow, in this point of discipline, the practice of those who differed in doctrine from them, established a new regulation for their own observance; they determined upon keeping the feast of unleavened bread, and upon celebrating the passover on the same days as the Jews. Agelius, the bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, and the bishops of the Novatians at Nicæa, Nicomedia, and Cotua,¹ a noted town of Phrygia, did not take part in this synod, although they acted as chiefs and presidents, so to speak, in all the meetings and transactions of their sect. Dissension was introduced, which led to the formation of two distinct parties in this sect, as I shall presently require to show.

¹ Or Cotyæum: it is otherwise called Cosaïum. The town is known as the birth-place of Alexander the Grammarian.

Repented on the passover,
Nicæa, A. D. 325, this, 17, 189.

CHAP. XXV.—CONCERNING APOLLINARIUS: FATHER AND SON OF THAT NAME. VITALIUS, THE PRESBYTER. RELAPSE INTO HERESY.

ABOUT this period, Apollinarius openly^odevised a heresy, to which his name has since been given.¹ He induced many persons to secede from the church, and formed separate assemblies. Vitalius, a presbyter of Antioch, and one of the clergy of Meletius, concurred with him in the promulgation of his peculiar opinions. In other respects, Vitalius was blameless in life and conduct, and was zealous in watching over those committed to his pastoral superintendence; hence he was greatly revered by the people. He seceded from communion with Meletius and joined Apollinarius, and presided over those at Antioch who had embraced the same opinions; by the sanctity of his life he attracted a great number of followers, who are still called Vitalians by the citizens of Antioch. It is said he was led to secede from the church from resentment at the contempt that was manifested towards him by Flavian, then one of his fellow presbyters, but who was afterwards raised to the bishopric of Antioch. Flavian having prevented him from holding his customary interview with the bishop, he fancied himself despised, and entered into communion with Apollinarius, with whom he contracted a strict friendship. From that period, the members of this sect have held separate assemblies in various cities, under the guidance of their own bishops, and have established laws and regulations contrary to those of the Catholic church. They sang the psalms composed by Apollinarius; for, besides his great attainments in other branches of literature, he was a poet, and by the beauty of his verses he induced many to adopt his sentiments. He composed verses to be sung by men at convivial meetings and at their daily labour, and by women while engaged at the loom. But, whether his songs were adapted for holidays, festivals, or other occasions, they were all alike to the praise and glory of God. Damasus, bishop of Rome, and Peter, bishop of Alexandria, were the first to receive information of the rise and progress of this heresy, and they condemned it at a council held at Rome,² as contrary to the doctrines of the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 46.

² In the year 373, according to Baronius. Valesius, however, considers that it must have been held one year later.

Catholic church. It is said that it was as much from weakness of mind as from any other cause that Apollinarius deviated from the authorized form of doctrine. For it appears that when Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, was on his road back to Egypt from the place whither he had been banished by Constantine, he had to pass through Laodicea, and that while in that city he formed an intimacy with Apollinarius, which terminated in the strictest friendship. As, however, the heretodox considered it disgraceful to hold communion with Athanasius, George, the bishop of the Arians in that city, ejected Apollinarius in a very insulting manner from the church, under the plea that he had received Athanasius contrary to the canons and holy laws. The bishop did not rest here, but reproached him with crimes which he had committed and repented of at a remote period. For when Theodotus, the predecessor of George, governed the church of Laodicea, Epiphanius, the sophist, recited a hymn which he had composed in honour of Bacchus. Apollinarius, who was then a youth, and the pupil of Epiphanius, went to hear the recitation, accompanied by his father, whose name also was Apollinarius, and who was a noted grammarian. After the exordium, Epiphanius, according to the custom always observed at the public recitation of hymns, directed the uninitiated and the profane to quit the assembly. But neither Apollinarius the younger nor the elder, nor, indeed, any of the Christians who were present, left the spot. When Theodotus heard that they had been present during the recitation, he was exceedingly displeased; he, however, pardoned the laymen who had committed this error, after they had received a moderate reproof. With respect to Apollinarius, father and son, he convicted them both publicly of their crime, and ejected them from the church; for they had belonged to the order of clergy, the father being a presbyter, and the son a reader of the Holy Scriptures. After some time had elapsed, and when the father and son had evinced by tears and fasting a degree of repentance adequate to their transgression, Theodotus restored them to their offices in the church. When George succeeded to the bishopric, he excommunicated Apollinarius on account of his having, as before stated, received Athanasius into communion. It is said that Apollinarius besought him repeatedly to restore him to communion, but that as he was inexorable, Apollinarius de-

terminated from resentment to introduce trouble and dissension in the church by broaching the aforesaid heresy; and that he thought by means of his eloquence to revenge himself on his enemy, by proving that George had deposed one who was more deeply acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures than himself. Thus do the private animosities of the clergy tend to the injury of the church, and the introduction of many heresies in religion! Had George, like Theodotus, received Apollinarius on his repentance into communion, I believe that we should never have heard of the heresy that bears his name. Men are prone, when loaded with opprobrium and contempt, to resort to extreme and contentious measures; whereas, when treated with justice, they moderate their natural impetuosity, and remain within bounds.

CHAP. XXVI.—EUNOMIUS AND AETIUS, THEIR LIFE AND DOCTRINES. OPINIONS FIRST BROACHED BY THEM CONCERNING THE RITE OF BAPTISM.

ABOUT this time, Eunomius, who had succeeded Eleusius in the bishopric of Cyzicus, and who presided over the Arians,¹ devised another heresy, which some have called by his name, but which is sometimes denominated the Anomian heresy. Some assert that Eunomius was the first who ventured to maintain that baptism ought to be performed by immersion, and to corrupt, in this manner, the apostolical tradition which has been carefully handed down to the present day. He introduced, it is said, a mode of discipline contrary to that of the church, and endeavoured to disguise the innovation under the cloak of a grave and severe deportment. He was very eloquent, and delighted in disputations and conferences. The generality of those who entertain his sentiments have the same predilections. They do not applaud a virtuous course of life and conduct, or charity towards the needy, unless exhibited by persons of their own sect, so much as skill in disputation, and the power of triumphing in debates over the arguments of an opponent. Persons possessed of these accomplishments are accounted religious and virtuous. Others assert, I believe, with greater appearance of probability, that Theo-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 7, and v. 24.

phranes, a native of Cappadocia, and Eutychus, both zealous propagators of this heresy, seceded from communion with Eunomius during the succeeding reign, and introduced heretical doctrines concerning the rite of baptism: they taught that baptism ought not to be administered in the name of the Trinity, but in the name of the death of Christ. It appears that Eunomius broached no new opinion on the subject, but remained from the beginning firmly attached to the sentiments of Arius. After his elevation to the bishopric of Cyzicus, he was accused by his own clergy of introducing innovations upon the established forms of doctrine. Eudoxius, bishop of the Arians at Constantinople, obliged him to undergo a public trial, and give an account of his doctrines to the people: finding, however, no fault in him, Eudoxius exhorted him to return to Cyzicus. Eunomius, however, replied, that he could not remain with people who regarded him with suspicion: and, it is said, seized this opportunity¹ to secede from communion; although it seems that in taking this step he was really actuated by the resentment he felt at the refusal which Aetius, his teacher, had met with, of being received into communion. Eunomius, it is added, dwelt with Aetius, and never deviated from his original sentiments. Such are the conflicting accounts of various individuals: some narrate the circumstances in one way, and some in another. But whether it was Eunomius, or any other person, who first introduced heretical opinions concerning baptism, it seems to me that such innovators, whoever they may have been, were alone in danger, according to their own representation, of quitting this life without having received the rite of holy baptism: for if, after having received baptism according to the ancient mode of the church, they found it impossible to re-confer it on themselves, it must be admitted that they introduced a practice to which they had not themselves submitted, and thus undertook to administer to others what had never been administered to themselves. Thus, after having laid down certain principles, according to their own fancy, without any data, they proceeded to bestow upon others what they had not themselves received. The absurdity of this assumption is manifest from their own confession; for they admit that those who have not received the rite of baptism have not the power of administering it. Now, according to

¹ Or, rather, "pretext." Compare the parallel account given by Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 12.

their opinion, those who have not received the rite of baptism in conformity with their mode of administration, are unbaptized; and they confirm this opinion by their practice, inasmuch as they re-baptize¹ all those who join their sect, although previously baptized by the Catholic church. These varying dogmas are the sources of innumerable troubles; and many are deterred from embracing Christianity by the diversity of opinion which prevails in matters of doctrine.

The dispute daily became stronger, and the heresy reached a greater height; for its advocates were not deficient in zeal or eloquence; indeed, it appears that the greater part of the Catholic church would have been subverted by this heresy, had not Basil and Gregory of Cappadocia strenuously opposed its further progress. With the view of repressing the heresies that had arisen, the emperor Theodosius, not long after, banished the founders of heretical sects from the populous parts of the empire, to the most desert and thinly-populated regions. But, lest those who read my history should be ignorant of the precise nature of the two heresies to which I have more especially alluded, I think it necessary to state that Aetius, the Syrian, was the originator of the heresy usually attributed to Eunomius; and that, like Arius, he maintained that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, that he is a created Being, and was created out of what had no previous existence. Those who first adopted these erroneous views were called Aetians; but afterwards, during the reign of Constantius, when, as we have stated, some parties maintained that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, and others, that he is like in substance to the Father, and when the council of Ariminum had decreed that the Son is only to be considered like unto the Father, Aetius was condemned to banishment, as guilty of impiety and blasphemy against God. For some time subsequently, his heresy seemed to have been suppressed; for neither he nor Eunomius ventured on undertaking its defence: but when Eunomius was raised to the bishopric of Cyzicus, he found it

¹ Valesius observes, that the Eunomians had learnt this practice from the Arians, as their forefathers in heresy; for the Arians, too, were accustomed to re-baptize the Catholics who came over to their party; and even re-ordained the Clerics who joined them. In proof of his assertion, Valesius quotes the author of the Life of St. Fulgentius, Marcellinus, Hieronymus, and other ancient authorities.

impossible to disguise his sentiments, and openly preached the doctrine of Aetius. Hence, as it often happens that the names of the original founders of heretical sects pass into oblivion, the followers of Eunomius were designated by his own name, although he merely renewed the heresy of Aetius, and promulgated it with greater boldness than Aetius himself.

CHAP. XXVII.—ACCOUNT GIVEN, BY GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, OF APOLLINARIUS AND EUNOMIUS, IN A LETTER TO NECTARIUS. THE HERESY OF EUNOMIUS IS OPPOSED BY THE MONKS OF THAT PERIOD.

It is obvious that Eunomius and Aetius held the same opinions. In several passages of his writings, Eunomius boasts that Aetius was his instructor. Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, speaks in the following terms of Apollinarius, in a letter addressed to Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople:—“Eunomius, who is a constant source of trouble among us, is not content with being a burden to us himself, but would consider himself to blame if he did not strive to drag every one with him to the destruction whither he is hastening. Such conduct, however, may be tolerated in some degree. The most grievous calamity against which the church has now to struggle arises from the audacity of the Apollinarians. I know not how your Holiness could have agreed that they should be as free to hold meetings as we are ourselves. You have been fully instructed, by the grace of God, in the mysteries of our religion, and you are well able to undertake the defence of orthodox doctrine against the attacks of heretics; yet it may not be amiss to inform your Excellency that a book, written by Apollinarius, has fallen into my hands, replete with more evil assertions than were ever advanced by any other heretic. He declares that the body which the Son of God assumed, when he came among us for our redemption, was not one which was prepared for Him; but that this carnal nature existed in the Son from the beginning. He substantiates this evil hypothesis by a misapplication of the following words of Scripture:—‘No one hath ascended up into heaven except the Son of man, who came down from heaven.’ He alleges, from this text, that Christ was the Son of man before He

descended from heaven; and that when He did descend, He brought with Him His own body, which was eternal. This heretic also refers to the following passage:—‘The second man is from heaven.’ He, moreover, maintains that this man who came down from heaven was destitute of mind (*νοῦς*), but that the Divinity of the only-begotten Son supplied the want of intellect, and constituted the third part of the human compound. The body and soul (*ψυχή*) formed two parts, as in other men; and the Word of God held the place of the third part that was wanting: but this is not the most dangerous of his errors. The most grievous point of the heresy is, that he asserts that the only-begotten Son of God, the Judge of all men, the giver of life, and the destroyer of death, is Himself subject to death; that He suffered in His Divine nature, which died with the body; and that it was, by the Father, raised again from the dead.” It would take too long to recount all the other extravagant doctrines propounded by these heretics. What I have said may, I think, suffice to show the nature of the sentiments maintained by Apollinarius and Eunomius. If any one desire more detailed information, I can only refer him to the works on the subject written by these heretics and by their opponents. I do not profess to understand or to expound these matters. That these heretical doctrines did not finally become predominant is mainly to be attributed to the zeal of the monks of this period; for all the monks of Syria, Cappadocia, and the neighbouring provinces, were sincerely attached to the Nicene faith. The eastern regions, however, from Cilicia to Phœnicia, were nearly subverted by the heresy of Apollinarius. The heresy of Eunomius was spread from Cilicia and the mountains of Taurus as far as the Hellespont and Constantinople. These two heretics found it easy to attract to their respective parties the persons among whom they dwelt, and those of the neighbourhood: but the same fate awaited them that had been experienced by the Arians; for they incurred the full weight of the popular odium and aversion, when it was observed that their sentiments were regarded with suspicion by the monks, whose doctrines were invariably received and followed by the people, on account of the virtue exhibited in their actions. In the same way the Egyptians were led by the monks to oppose the Arians.

Refer to the text on N. 286, A.D. 192
 Apollinarius
 323-341
 192

CHAP. XXVIII.—OF THE HOLY MEN WHO FLOURISHED AT THIS PERIOD IN EGYPT.

As this period was distinguished by many holy men, who devoted themselves to a life of philosophy, it seems requisite to give some account of them. There was not, it appears, a more celebrated man in Egypt than John; he had received from God the power of discerning the future and the most hidden things as clearly as the ancient prophets; and he had, moreover, the gift of curing the most desperate and inveterate diseases. Or was another eminent man of this period; he had lived in solitude from his earliest youth, occupying himself continually in singing the praises of God. He subsisted on herbs and roots; and his drink was water, when he could find it. In his old age he went, by the command of God, to Thebais, where he presided over several monasteries, and performed many wonderful works. By means of prayer alone, he expelled devils and healed divers diseases. He knew nothing of letters; but whatever might once engage his attention was never afterwards forgotten.

Ammon, the leader of the monks called Tabennesiotians, dwelt in the same regions, and was followed by about three thousand disciples. Benus and Theonas likewise presided over monasteries, and possessed the gift of foreseeing and of foretelling the future. It is said that, though Theonas was versed in all the learning of the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans, he preserved a profound silence for the space of thirty years. Benus was never seen to manifest any signs of anger, and never heard to swear, or to utter a false, a vain, a rash, or a useless word.

Coprus, Helles, and Elias also flourished at this period. It is said that Coprus had received from God the power of healing sickness and divers diseases, and of expelling demons. Helles had, from his youth upwards, pursued a life of monastic asceticism, and he wrought many wonderful works. He could carry fire in his bosom without burning his clothes. He excited the other monks to the practice of virtue, by representing that purity of life leads to the acquisition of the power of working miracles. Elias, who dwelt near the city of Antinös, was at this period about a hundred and ten

years of age, of which, he said, he had passed seventy years alone in the desert. Notwithstanding his advanced age, he was unremitting in the practice of fasting and asceticism.

Apelles flourished at the same period, and performed numerous miracles in the Egyptian monasteries, near the city of Acoris. He worked as a smith at the forge; and one night, when he was engaged at this employment, the devil undertook to tempt him to incontinence, by appearing before him in the form of a woman; Apelles, however, seized the iron which was heating in the furnace, and burnt the face of the devil, who screamed wildly, and ran away.

Isidore, Serapion, and Dioscorus, who presided over monasteries at this period, were among the most celebrated men of the æra. Isidore caused his monastery to be closed, so that no one could obtain egress or ingress, and supplied the wants of those within the walls. Serapion lived in the neighbourhood of Arsinoë,¹ and had about a thousand monks under his guidance. They lived on the produce of their labour, and provided for the poor. During harvest-time, they busied themselves in reaping; they set aside sufficient corn for their own use, and furnished grain gratuitously for the other monks. Dioscorus had not more than a hundred disciples; he was a presbyter, and applied himself with great diligence to the duties of his ministry; he scrupulously examined those who presented themselves as candidates for participation in the holy mysteries, and excluded those who had not a conscience void of offence. The presbyter Eulogius was still more scrupulous in the dispensation of the mysteries. It is said that, when he was officiating in the priestly office,² he could discern what was in the minds of those around him; so that he could clearly detect sin, and the secret thoughts of each one of his audience. He excluded from the altar all who had perpetrated crime, or formed evil resolutions, and publicly convicted them of sin; but, on their purifying themselves by repentance, he again received them into communion.

¹ Otherwise called Arsenoë.

² *ιερώμενον*. The present participle, as denoting a person in the act of officiating as a priest: the perfect participle, *ιερωμένον*, would denote merely one who had been ordained.

CHAP. XXIX.—CONCERNING THE MONKS OF THEBAIS.

APOLLOS flourished about the same period in Thebais. He early devoted himself to a life of philosophy; and, after having passed forty years in the desert, he shut himself up, by the command of God, in a cave formed at the foot of a mountain, near a very populous district. By his extraordinary miracles, he soon acquired so wide a reputation, that many monks placed themselves under his guidance and submitted to his instructions. Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, who has written an account of his conduct, and of that of the other monks whom I have mentioned, gives a long description of his mode of life and of his miracles.

About two thousand monks dwelt in the neighbourhood of Alexandria; some in a district called the Hermitage, and others more towards Mareota and Libya. Dorotheus, a native of Thebes, was among the most celebrated of these monks. He spent the day in collecting stones upon the sea-shore, which he used in erecting cells for those who were unable to build them. During the night, he employed himself in weaving baskets of palm leaves; and these he sold, to obtain the means of subsistence. He ate six ounces of bread with a few vegetables daily, and drank nothing but water. Having accustomed himself to this extreme abstinence from his youth, he continued to observe it in old age. He was never seen to recline on a mat or a bed, nor even to place his limbs in an easy attitude for sleep. Sometimes, from natural lassitude, his eyes would involuntarily close when he was at his daily labour or his meals; and the food would, on those occasions, drop from his mouth. One day, being utterly overcome by lassitude, he fell down on the mat: he was displeased at finding himself in this position, and said, in an under-tone of voice, "When angels are persuaded to sleep, then will men of real vigilance and zeal be induced to do likewise." Perhaps he might have said this to himself, or perhaps to the demon who disturbed him in his exercises of devotion. He was once asked why he destroyed his body? "Because it destroys me," was his reply.¹

¹ Valesius thinks that there is good reason for believing that Sozomen got this story at second-hand, not from Palladius, (who relates it differently,) but from an inferior annalist of his own time.

[SOZOMEN.]

Piammon and John presided over two celebrated Egyptian monasteries near Diolchis. They were presbyters, and eminent for the zeal wherewith they discharged the functions of their office. It is said that one day, when Piammon was officiating, he beheld an angel standing near the altar and writing down the names of the monks who were present, while he erased the names of those who were absent. John had received from God such power over disease, that he healed the sick and restored the paralytic.

An old man, named Benjamin, lived about this period in the desert near Scetis. God had bestowed upon him the power of removing diseases by the touch of his hand, or by means of a little oil consecrated by prayer. He was attacked by a dropsy, and his body was swollen to such a size that it became necessary, in order to carry him from his cell, to enlarge the door. As his malady would not admit of his lying in a recumbent posture, he remained, during eight months, seated on some large skins, and continued to heal the sick, without regretting that his own recovery was not effected. He comforted those who came to visit him, and requested them to pray for his soul; adding, that he cared little for his body, for it had been of no service to him when in health, and could not, now that it was diseased, be of any injury to him.

About the same time, the celebrated Mark, Macarius the younger, Apollonius, and Moses, an Egyptian, dwelt at Scetis. It is said that Mark was, from his youth upwards, distinguished by extreme mildness of disposition and prudence; he committed the Sacred Scriptures to memory, and manifested such eminent piety that Macarius, the priest of the Cells,¹ declared that he had never given to him what priests present to the initiated at the holy altar, but that he had beheld the hand of an angel administering it to him.

Macarius had received from God the power of dispelling demons. A murder, which he had unintentionally committed, was the original cause of his embracing a life of philosophy. He was a shepherd, and one day led his flock to graze on the banks of Lake Mareotis, when, in sport, he slew one of his companions. Fearful of being delivered up to justice, he fled

¹ κελλιών. Valesius, however, is inclined to regard the word as a proper name, and he identifies it with a place called Cellia, mentioned by Sozomen below, chap. 31.

to the desert. Here he concealed himself during three years, and afterwards erected a small dwelling on the spot, in which he dwelt twenty-five years. He was accustomed to say, that he owed much to the calamity that had befallen him in early life, and even called the unintentional murder he had committed a salutary deed, inasmuch as it had been the cause of his embracing an ascetic and blessed mode of life.

Apollonius, after passing his life in the pursuits of commerce, retired in his old age to Scetis. On reflecting that he was too old to learn a trade, or to acquire the art of writing, he purchased, with his own money, a supply of medical drugs, and of food suited for the sick, some of which he carried at stated hours to the door of every monastery, for the relief of those who were suffering from disease. Such was the mode of life in which he exercised himself; and, when he felt death approaching, he delivered his drugs to one whom he exhorted to go and do as he had done.

Moses was originally a slave, but was driven from his master's house on account of his perversity. He joined some robbers, and became leader of the band. After having perpetrated several murders and other crimes, he embraced a life of asceticism, and attained the highest point of philosophical perfection. As the healthful and vigorous habit of body which had been induced by his former avocations acted as a stimulus to his imagination, and excited a desire for pleasure, he resorted to every possible means of macerating his body; thus, he subsisted wholly upon bread, subjected himself to severe labour, and prayed fifty times daily. During six years, he spent all his nights in prayer; he prayed standing, without bending his knees or closing his eyes in sleep. He sometimes went, during the night, to the cells of the monks, and secretly filled their pitchers with water, although he had sometimes to go ten, sometimes twenty, and sometimes thirty, stadia in quest of the water. Notwithstanding all his efforts to macerate his body, it was long before he could subdue his natural vigour of constitution. Four robbers once broke into the dwelling where he lived alone; he bound them, threw them across his shoulders, and bore them to the church, that the monks who were then assembled might deal with them as they thought fit; for he did not consider himself authorized to punish any one. So sudden a conversion from vice to virtue

was never before witnessed, nor such rapid attainments in monastical philosophy. Hence God rendered him an object of dread to the demons, and he was ordained presbyter over the monks at Scetis. After a life spent in this manner, he died at the age of seventy-five, leaving behind him numerous eminent disciples.

Paul, Pachomius, Stephen, and Moses, of whom the two latter were Libyans, and Pior, who was an Egyptian, flourished during this reign. Paul dwelt at Ferma, a mountain of Scetis, and presided over five hundred disciples. He did not labour with his hands, neither did he receive alms of any one, except such food as was necessary for his subsistence. He did nothing but pray, and daily offered up to God three hundred prayers. He placed three hundred pebbles in his bosom, for fear of omitting any of these prayers; and, at the conclusion of each, he took away one of the pebbles. When there were no pebbles remaining, he knew that he had gone through the whole course of his prescribed prayers.

Pachomius also flourished during this period at Scetis. He dwelt in the desert, from youth to extreme old age, without ever being seduced by the appetites of the body, the passions of the soul, or the wiles of the devil, to desire any of those things from which the philosopher ought to abstain.

Stephen dwelt at Mareota, near Marmarica. During sixty years, he rigorously practised all the virtues of asceticism, became noted as a monk, and was admitted into the intimacy of Antony the Great. He was very mild and prudent, and his usual style of conversation was edifying and agreeable, and well calculated to comfort the afflicted, to assuage their sorrows, and to fill them with joy. The same principles supported him under affliction; he was troubled with an incurable ulcer, and surgeons were employed to operate upon the diseased limb: during the operation, Stephen employed himself in weaving palm leaves, and exhorted those who were around him not to concern themselves about his sufferings: he told them that God does nothing but for our good, and that his affliction would tend to his real welfare, inasmuch as it would atone for his sins, it being better to be judged in this life than in the life to come.

Moses was celebrated for his meekness, his goodness, and his power of healing diseases and infirmities by prayer. Pior determined, from his youth, to devote himself to a life of holy

asceticism; and, with this view, quitted his father's house, after having made a vow that he would never again look upon any one of his relations. After fifty years had expired, one of his sisters heard that he was still alive, and she was so transported with joy at this unexpected intelligence, that she could not rest till she had seen him. The bishop of the place where she resided was so affected by her groans and tears, that he wrote to the leaders of the monks of Scetis, desiring them to send Pior to him. The superiors accordingly directed him to repair to the city of his birth, and he could not but obey them, for disobedience was regarded as criminal by the monks of Egypt, as well as by other Christians. He went with another monk to the door of his father's house, and caused himself to be announced. When he heard the door being opened, he closed his eyes, and calling his sister by name, he said to her, "I am Pior, your brother: look at me as much as you please." His sister was delighted beyond measure at again beholding him, and returned thanks to God. He prayed at the door where he stood, and then returned to the place whence he came; he dug a well, and found that the water was bitter, but persevered in the use of it till his death. The height to which he had carried his self-denial was not known till after his death; for several attempted to establish themselves in the place where he had dwelt, but found it impossible to remain there, or to endure the inconveniences to which he had been exposed. I am convinced that, had it not been for the principles of asceticism which he had espoused, he could easily have rectified the bitterness of the water; for he caused water to flow in a spot where none had existed previously. It is said that some monks, under the guidance of Moses, undertook to dig a well, but failing in their expectation of finding water, they were about to abandon the task, when, about mid-day, Pior joined them; he first embraced them, and then rebuked their want of faith; he then descended into the pit they had excavated; and, after engaging in prayer, struck the ground thrice with a rod. A spring of water soon after rose to the surface, and filled the whole excavation. After prayer, Pior departed, and though the monks urged him to break his fast with them, he refused, alleging that he had not been sent to them for that purpose, but merely in order to perform the act he had effected.

CHAP. XXX.—MONKS OF SCETIS.

At this period, many of the disciples of Antony the Great still flourished in the solitude of Scetis. Origen, who was then far advanced in life, Didymus, Cronius, who was about one hundred and ten years of age, Arsius the Great, Putubastes, Arsio, and Serapion, had all been contemporary with Antony the Great. They had grown old in the exercises of asceticism, and were at this period presiding over the monasteries. There were some holy men among them who were not so far advanced in age, but who were celebrated for their great and excellent qualities; among these were Ammon, Eusebius, and Dioscorus: they were brothers; but, on account of their height of stature, were called the "Great Brothers." It is said that Ammon attained the height of philosophy, and overcame the love of ease and pleasure; he was very studious, and had read the works of Origen, of Didymus, and of other ecclesiastical writers.¹ From his youth to the day of his death he never tasted anything, with the exception of bread, that had been prepared by means of fire. He was once chosen to be ordained bishop, and after urging every argument that could be devised in rejection of the honour, but in vain, he cut off one of his ears, and said to those who were besieging him with their importunities, "Henceforward I am excluded from ordination; for the ecclesiastical canons require that the person of a priest should be perfect." Those who had been sent for him accordingly departed; but, on ascertaining that the church does not observe the Jewish law, in requiring a priest to be perfect in all his members, but merely requires him to be irreprehensible in point of morals, they returned to Ammon, and endeavoured to take him by force. He protested to them that, if they attempted any violence against him, he would cut out his tongue; and, terrified at this menace, they immediately took their departure. Ammon was ever after surnamed Parstides. Some time afterwards, during the ensuing reign, the wise Evagrius formed an intimacy with him. Evagrius was a very learned man, powerful in thought and in word, and skilful in discerning the first appearances of virtue and of vice, and in urging

¹ Nicephorus understands Sozomen here to refer to Evagrius. But Valesius shows the absurdity of this supposition by a comparison of dates.

others to imitate the one, and to eschew the other. His eloquence is fully attested by the works he has left behind him. With respect to his moral character, it appears that he was totally free from all pride or superciliousness, so that he was not elated when just commendations were awarded him, nor displeased when unjust reproaches were brought against him. He was a native of Iberia,¹ near the Euxine; he had studied philosophy and the Sacred Scriptures under Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, and had filled the office of archdeacon in the church of Gregory at Constantinople. He was handsome in person, and careful in his mode of attire; and hence, an acquaintance-ship he had formed with a certain lady excited the jealousy of her husband, who determined upon slaying him. While the assassins were waiting for an opportunity to take his life, God vouchsafed to show him a vision, which was the means of saving him. It appeared to him that he had been arrested in the act of committing some crime, and that he was chained hand and foot: as he was being led before the magistrates, to receive the sentence of condemnation, a man who held in his hand the book of the Holy Gospels, addressed him, and swore to rescue him, provided he would promise to quit the city. Evagrius touched the book,² and gave the required promise: immediately his chains appeared to fall off, and he awoke. Having received this timely intimation of danger, he was enabled to evade it. He resolved upon devoting himself to a life of asceticism, and proceeded from Constantinople to Jerusalem. Some time after, he went to visit the ascetics of Scetis, with whom he eventually fixed his abode.³

¹ This place is also called Ibora by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Uranius, bishop of Ibora, was among the bishops who subscribed to the council of Chalcedon; and another bishop of the same see was present at the council of Constantinople.

² The custom of swearing upon the Holy Scriptures is very ancient. Allusion is made to it by Gregory Nazianzen, Ep. 219, and in his Iambic verses, entitled "Contra sæpè jurantes;" as also by Tertullian, de Idol. ch. 23.

³ Sozomen is probably mistaken as to his chronology here, as it is certain that Evagrius adopted the monastic life in the reign of Theodosius.

CHAP. XXXI.—CONCERNING THE MONASTERIES OF NITRIA.
MONASTERIES CALLED CELLS.

NITRIA,¹ inhabited by a great number of persons devoted to a life of philosophy, derives its name from its vicinity to a village in which nitre is found. It contains about fifty monasteries, built tolerably near to each other, some of which are inhabited by monks who live together in society, and others by monks who have adopted a solitary mode of existence. More in the interior of the desert, about seventy stadia from this locality, is a region called the cells,² throughout which numerous little dwellings are dispersed hither and thither, but at such a distance that those who dwell in them can neither see nor hear each other. They assemble together on the first and last days of each week; and if any monk happen to be absent, it is immediately concluded that he is ill, or has been attacked by some disease, and all the other monks visit him alternately, and carry to him such remedies as are suited to his case. Except on these occasions, they seldom converse together, unless, indeed, there be one among them capable of communicating further knowledge concerning God and the salvation of the soul. Those who dwell in the cells are those who have attained the summit of philosophy, and who are therefore able to regulate their own conduct, to live alone, and to seek nothing but quietude. This is what I had briefly to state concerning Scetis and its ascetic inhabitants. I should be justly reproached with prolixity, were I to enter into further details concerning their mode of life, their labours, their customs, their exercises, their abstinence, and other regulations which they adapted to their respective circumstances and ages.

Rinocorurus was also celebrated at this period, on account of the holy men who were born, and who flourished there. I have heard that the most eminent among them were Melas, the bishop of the country; Denis, who presided over a monastery situated to the north of the city; and Solon, the brother and successor of Melas. When the decree for the ejection of all bishops opposed to Arianism was issued, the officers appointed to execute the mandate found Melas en-

¹ A town of Egypt, in the Mareotic nome.

² See above, note on chap. 29.

gaged in trimming the lights of the church, and clad in an old cloak soiled with oil, fastened by a girdle. When they asked him for the bishop, he replied that he was within, and that he would conduct them to him. As they were fatigued with their journey, he led them to the episcopal dwelling, made them sit down to table, and placed before them such things as he had. After the repast, he supplied them with water to wash their hands, and then told them who he was. Amazed at his conduct, they confessed the mission on which they had arrived; but, from respect to him, gave him full liberty to go wherever he would. He, however, replied that he would not shrink from the sufferings to which the other bishops who maintained the same sentiments as himself were exposed, and that he was ready to go into exile. He had been accustomed, from his youth upwards, to the practice of all the virtues of asceticism.

Solon quitted the pursuits of commerce to embrace a monastic life, a measure which tended greatly to his welfare; for, under the instruction of his brother and other ascetics, he progressed rapidly in piety towards God, and in charity towards his neighbour. The church of Rinocorus having been thus, from the beginning, under the guidance of such exemplary bishops, never afterwards swerved from their precepts, and can still boast of many eminent men. The clergy of this church dwell in one house, sit at the same table, and have everything in common.

CHAP. XXXII.—MONKS OF PALESTINE.

MANY monastical institutions flourished in Palestine. In narrating the events of the reign of Constantius, I had occasion to mention several of the illustrious individuals who dwelt in these monasteries. Many of their associates attained the summit of philosophical perfection, and added lustre to the reputation of the monasteries to which they belonged, and among them Hesycas, a companion of Hilarion, and Epiphanius, afterwards bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, deserve to be particularly noticed. Hesycas devoted himself to a life of philosophy in the same locality where his master had for-

merly resided; and Epiphanius fixed his abode near the village of Besauduc, which was his birth-place, in the government of Eleutheropolis. Having been instructed from his youth by the most celebrated ascetics of Egypt, with whom he resided many years, Epiphanius became celebrated both in Egypt and Palestine by his attainments in monastic philosophy, and was chosen by the inhabitants of Cyprus to fill the metropolitan see of their island. This important office tended to increase the reputation which his virtues had acquired; and the admiration of strangers and of the inhabitants of the country was soon attracted by the exemplary manner in which he discharged the episcopal duties. Before he went to Cyprus, he resided for some time, during the reign of Valens, in Palestine.¹

At the same period, Salamanes, Phuscon, Malchius, and Crispus, four brethren who were distinguished by their high attainments in ascetic philosophy, dwelt in seclusion, near Bethlehem, a town of Gaza; they were of noble origin, and had been instructed in philosophy by Hilarion. It is related that the brothers were once journeying homewards, when Malchius was suddenly snatched away and became invisible; soon afterwards, however, he re-appeared and continued the journey with his brothers. He did not long survive this occurrence, but died in the flower of his youth. In point of philosophy, virtue, and piety, he was equal to men of the most advanced age.

Ammonius lived at a distance of ten stadia from those last mentioned; he dwelt near Capharcobra, the place of his birth, a town of Gaza. He was very exact in the discharge of duty, and sincerely devoted to the practice of asceticism. I think that Silvanus, a native of Palestine, to whom, on account of his virtue, an angel was once seen to minister, dwelt about the same time in Egypt. At one period, he fixed his residence on Mount Sinai, and afterwards founded at Geraris, near the great torrent, a very extensive establishment for holy men, over which the excellent Zachariah subsequently presided.

¹ Or Malachias, otherwise Malachion. He is mentioned by Theodoret in his Philotheus.

CHAP. XXXIII.—MONKS OF SYRIA.

PASSING thence to Syria and Persia, we shall find that the monks of these countries emulated those of Egypt in zeal and austerity. Battheus, Eusebius, Barges, Halas, Abbo, Lazarus, who attained the episcopal dignity, Abdaleus, Zeno, and Heliodorus flourished in Nisibis, near the mountain called Sigoro. When they first entered upon the ascetic mode of life, they were denominated shepherds, because they had no houses, ate neither bread nor meat, and drank no wine, but dwelt constantly on the mountains, and passed their time in praising God by prayers, and hymns, according to the canons of the church. At the usual hours of meals, they each took a sickle, and cut some grass on the mountains; and this served for their repast. Such was their course of life. Eusebius voluntarily shut himself up in a cell, near Carræ. Protogenes dwelt in the same locality, and subsequently succeeded to the bishopric of the celebrated Vitus,¹ whom God caused repeatedly to appear in a vision before Constantine, after charging the emperor to follow faithfully the injunctions of the man who should be shown him. Aones dwelt at Phadana, near the spot where Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, on his journey from Palestine, met the damsel whom he afterwards married, and where he rolled away the stone, that her flock might drink of the water of the well. It is said that Aones was the first who introduced the ascetic mode of life in Syria, just as ascetic philosophy was first introduced by Antony in Egypt.

CHAP. XXXIV.—MONKS OF EDESSA, MONKS OF GALATIA AND CAPPADOCIA.

GADDANAS and Azizius dwelt with Aones and emulated his virtues. Ephraim the Syrian, who was an historian, and has been noticed² in our recital of events under the reign of Constantius, acquired great renown by his devotion to ascetic philosophy in the neighbourhood of Edessa; and the same may be said of Julian. Barses and Eulogius were both, at a later period than that to which we are referring, ordained bishops,

¹ He was bishop of Carræ under Valens.

² See above, b. iii. ch. 14, 16.

but not over any particular church; for the title was merely an honorary one, conferred on them on account of their purity of life; and they were ordained in their own monasteries. Lazarus, to whom we have already alluded, was ordained bishop in the same manner. Such were the most celebrated philosophers of asceticism who flourished in Syria, Persia, and the neighbouring countries, so far, at least, as I have been able to ascertain. Their invariable course of life, so to speak, consisted in diligent attention to the state of the soul, which by means of fasting, prayer, and offering up praise to God, they kept in constant preparation to quit the things of this world. They devoted the greater part of their time to these holy exercises, and they despised worldly possessions, temporal affairs, and the ease and adornment of the body. Some of the monks carried their self-denial to an extraordinary height; Battheus, for instance, by long abstinence from food, had worms generated between his teeth. Halas, again, did not taste bread till he was seventy years of age, and Heliodorus passed many nights without yielding to sleep, and only partook of food one day in seven.

Although Coele-syria and Upper Syria, with the exception of the city of Antioch, did not receive the Christian religion till a comparatively later period, they produced several individuals who devoted themselves to ecclesiastical philosophy, and whose conduct appeared the more heroic from their having to encounter the enmity and malice of their fellow-countrymen. For they did not repel the injuries with which they were assailed, by having recourse to violence or to the law, the only opposition which they tendered was the patience with which they submitted to these sufferings. Such was the course pursued by Valentian, who, according to some accounts, was born at Edessa, but, according to others, at Arethusa. Another individual of the same name, distinguished himself by similar conduct, as likewise Theodore of Tittis in Apamea, Marosas, a native of Nechilis, Bassus, Bassones, and Paul. This latter was a native of the village of Telmison. He founded several monastic institutions; the most extensive and most celebrated was at a place called Jugates. Here, after a long and honourable life, he died and was interred. Some of the ascetic philosophers have survived to our own days; indeed, most of those to whom allusion has been made, enjoyed a very long

term of existence, and I am convinced that God added to the length of their days, for the express purpose of furthering the interests of religion. They were instrumental in converting nearly the whole Syrian nation, and many of the Persians and Saracens from Paganism. They also induced many individuals to follow their example, and embrace the monastic mode of life.

It appears reasonable to suppose that there were many monks in Galatia, Cappadocia, and the neighbouring provinces, for Christianity was embraced at an early period by the inhabitants of these regions. The monks of these countries, however, dwelt together in cities and villages, for they did not habituate themselves, like other monks, to live in deserts: the severity of the winters would probably render such a course almost impracticable in these regions. Leontius and Prassides were, I understand, the most celebrated of these monks; the former was bishop of Ancyra, and the latter, a man of very advanced age, performed the episcopal functions in several villages. Prassides also presided over a hospital of great celebrity, founded by Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, whose name it still retains.

CHAP. XXXV.—THE WOODEN TRIPOD ON WHICH WERE INDICATED THE FIRST LETTERS COMPOSING THE NAME OF HIM WHO WAS TO SUCCEED TO THE THRONE. DESTRUCTION OF THE PAGAN PHILOSOPHERS.

SUCH is the information which I have been enabled to collect concerning the ecclesiastical philosophers.¹ As to the Pagan philosophers, they were nearly all exterminated about the period to which we have been referring. Some among them who were reputed to excel in philosophy, and who viewed with extreme displeasure the progress of the Christian religion, were desirous of ascertaining who would be the successor of Valens on the throne of the Roman empire, and resorted to magical arts for the purpose of attaining this insight into futurity. After various incantations, they constructed a tripod of laurel wood, and uttered certain magical words over it, so that the letters of the alphabet might appear upon the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 19.

tripod, and indicate the name of the future emperor. Theodore, who held a distinguished appointment at court, and who was a Pagan, was the individual whom they most desired to see on the imperial throne; and the first letters of his name, so far as the letter *d*, appeared on the tripod, and deceived the philosophers. They hence expected that Theodore would be the future emperor; but their hopes were utterly frustrated, for their proceedings were detected by Valens, and he was as deeply incensed as if a conspiracy had been formed against himself. He ordered all the parties concerned in the construction of the tripod to be arrested; commanded them to be burned alive, and caused Theodore himself to be beheaded. The indignation of the emperor was, in fact, so unbounded, that the most famous philosophers of the time were slain in consequence of what had occurred; and even those who were not philosophers, but who wore garments similar to those of the philosophers,¹ were sacrificed to his resentment; hence, these garments were disused, lest they should lead to the imputation of magic and sorcery. I believe that all sensible persons will not blame the cruelty and impetuosity of the emperor more than the rashness of the philosophers in entering upon so unphilosophical an undertaking. The emperor, absurdly supposing that he could put his successor to death,² spared neither those who had performed the incantations, nor those who bore the name that had been indicated, for he sacrificed even those whose names commenced with nearly the same letters as those that had appeared on the tripod. The philosophers, on the other hand, acted as if the deposition and restoration of emperors had depended solely on them; for if the imperial succession was to be considered dependent on the arrangement of the stars, what was requisite but to await the accession of the future emperor, whoever he might be? or if the succession was regarded as dependent on the will of God, what right had man to interfere with His decrees? Can man penetrate the secret counsels of God? or can man, whatever may be his wisdom, make a better choice than God? If it

¹ These were called *κροκωρά*, or *κροσσωρά*. See Hesych. sub voce. The flowing robe of the philosophers is frequently alluded to in the Greek and Latin classical writers as approximating to the long dress of women.

² Sozomen probably alludes here to the celebrated saying of Diocletian, "Successorem suum nullus occidit."

were merely from rash curiosity to discern the things of futurity, that these philosophers were induced to violate the laws of the Roman empire, that had subsisted ever since the legislation of the Pagan sacrifices, their motives and conduct differed widely from those of Socrates; for, when unjustly condemned to drink poison, he refused to save himself by violating the laws of his country, nor would he escape from prison, although it was in his power to do so.

CHAP. XXXVI.—EXPEDITION AGAINST THE SARMATIANS; DEATH OF THE EMPEROR VALENTINIAN IN GAUL; VALENTINIAN THE YOUNGER; PERSECUTION OF THE PRIESTS; ORATION OF THE PHILOSOPHER THEMISTIUS.

SUCH subjects as the above, however, are best left to the examination and decision of individual judgment.

The Sarmatians,¹ having invaded the Western provinces of the empire, Valentinian levied an army to oppose them. As soon, however, as they heard of the number and strength of the troops raised against them, they sent an embassy to solicit peace. When the ambassadors were ushered into the presence of Valentinian, he asked them whether all the Sarmatians were similar to them. On their replying that the principal men of the nation had been selected to form the embassy, the emperor exclaimed, in great fury, that he regarded it as an especial misfortune that the territories under his sway should be exposed to the incursions of a barbarous nation like the Sarmatians, who had even presumed to take up arms against the Romans! He spoke in this strain for some time in a very high pitch of voice; and his rage was so violent, and so unbounded, that at length he burst simultaneously a blood-vessel and an artery. He lost, in consequence, a great quantity of blood, and expired soon after in a fortress of Gaul.² He was about fifty-four years of age, and had during thirteen years guided the reins of government with great wisdom and skill. Six days after his death, his youngest son, who bore the same name as himself, was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers; and soon afterwards Valens and Gratian formally assented to this election, although

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 31.

² It was in Pannonia, as is clear from the narrative of Ammian. Marcellinus.

they were at first irritated at the soldiers having adopted such a measure without their sanction.

During this period, Valens had fixed his residence at Antioch in Syria, and carried on a most cruel and unmerciful persecution against all who differed from him in opinion concerning the Divine nature.¹ The philosopher Themistius pronounced an oration in his presence, in which he took occasion to show that the diversity of opinion existing concerning ecclesiastical doctrines ought not to be regarded with surprise, inasmuch as still greater diversity of opinion, leading to perpetual disputes and contentions, was prevalent among the Pagans; and he further insisted, that God might be well pleased to permit this diversity of opinion concerning his own nature, because the inscrutability of this subject, and the deficiency of all accurate knowledge concerning it, tend to afford exalted ideas of the Divine nature.

CHAP. XXXVII.—CONCERNING THE BARBARIANS BEYOND THE DANUBE, AND THEIR CONVERSION TO CHRISTIANITY; ULPILAS AND ATHANARICUS; CAUSE OF ARIANISM BEING EMBRACED BY THE GOTHs.

THE oration of Themistius had some effect in mitigating the resentment of the emperor, and the persecution became in consequence less cruel and violent than before. The priests, however, were not restored to favour, and they would have felt the full weight of the emperor's indignation, had not the state of public affairs diverted his attention from the concerns of the church. For the Goths who inhabited the regions beyond the Danube, and held several barbarian nations under their sway, having been vanquished and driven from their country by the Huns, marched towards the Roman territories. The Huns, it is said, were unknown to the Thracians of the Danube, and the Goths before this period; for though they dwelt in a neighbouring region, a lake of vast extent formed a boundary between them, and the inhabitants on each side of the lake respectively imagined that their own country was situated at the extremity of the earth, and that there was nothing beyond them but the sea and water. It so happened, however, that an ox, tormented by insects, plunged into the

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. iv. 32.

lake and was pursued by the herdsman, who perceiving for the first time that the opposite bank was inhabited, made known the circumstance to his countrymen. Some, however, relate that a stag pursued by hunters, showed them the way to cross the lake by fording it at a place where the water was not deep. On arriving at the opposite bank, the hunters were struck with the beauty of the country, the abundance of its produce, and the serenity of the air, and they reported what they had seen to their king. The Huns then made an attempt to attack the Goths with a few soldiers, but they afterwards raised a powerful army, conquered the Goths, and took possession of their whole country. The vanquished nation, being pursued by their enemies, fled towards the Roman territories; they crossed the river, and despatched an embassy to the emperor, assuring him of their co-operation in any warfare in which he might engage, provided that he would assign a portion of land for them to inhabit. Ulphilas, the bishop of the nation, was the chief of the embassy. The object of his embassy was fully accomplished, and the Goths were permitted to take up their abode in Thrace. Soon after, contentions broke out among them, which led to their division into two parties, one of which was headed by Athanaric, and the other by Phritigernes. They took up arms against each other, and Phritigernes was vanquished, and implored assistance of the Romans. The emperor having commanded the troops in Thrace to assist him, a second battle was fought, and Athanaric and his party were put to flight. In acknowledgment of the timely succour afforded by Valens, and in proof of his fidelity to the Romans, Phritigernes embraced the religion of the emperor, and persuaded the barbarians over whom he ruled to follow his example. It does not, however, appear to me that this is the only reason that can be advanced to account for the Goths having retained, even to the present day, the tenets of Arianism. Ulphilas, their bishop, originally held no opinions at variance with those of the Catholic church; for though he took part, as I am convinced from thoughtlessness, at the council of Constantinople, in conjunction with Eudoxius and Acacius, yet he did not swerve from the doctrines of the Nicene council.¹ He afterwards, it appears, returned to Con-

¹ Christopherson wrongly understood Sozomen to mean here that Eudoxius and Acacius were among the bishops present at the council of [SOZOMEN.]

stantinople, and entered into disputations on doctrinal topics with the chiefs of the Arian faction; and they promised to lay his requests before the emperor, and forward the object of his embassy, if he would conform to their opinions. Compelled by the urgency of the occasion, or, possibly, induced by a conviction of the truth of their sentiments concerning the Divine nature, Ulphilas entered into communion with the Arians, and separated himself and his whole nation from all connexion with the Catholic church. For as he had instructed the Goths in the elements of religion, and the practice of morality and gentleness, they placed the most implicit confidence in his directions, and were firmly convinced that he could neither do nor say anything that was evil. He had, in fact, given many signal proofs of the greatness of his virtue. He had exposed himself to innumerable perils in defence of the faith, during the period that the aforesaid barbarians were abandoned to Paganism. He taught them the use of letters, and translated the Sacred Scriptures into their own language. It was on this account that the nations on the banks of the Danube followed the tenets of Arius. At the same period, there were many of the subjects of Phritigernes who testified to Christ, and were martyred. Athanaric also resented the change in religion that had been effected by Ulphilas; and irritated because his subjects had abandoned the superstition of their fathers, he imposed cruel punishments on many individuals; some he put to death after they had been dragged before tribunals and had nobly confessed the faith, and others were slain without being permitted to utter a single word in their own defence. It is said that the officers appointed by Athanaric to execute his cruel mandates, caused a statue to be constructed, which they placed on a chariot, and had it conveyed to the tents of those who were suspected of having embraced Christianity, and who were therefore commanded to worship the statue and offer sacrifice:

Nicæa. But Acacius was not made bishop till many years later. Sozomen here says that Ulphilas at first strictly adhered to the Nicene faith, but that during the reign of Constantius he was imprudently led to join in the synod at Constantinople with Eudoxius and Acacius, (A. D. 359,) but that he still kept up outward communion with the orthodox bishops; and at length, on the accession of Valens, upon coming to Constantinople as representative of the Goths, he went openly over to the side of the Arians.

if they refused to do so, they were burnt alive in their tents. But I have heard that an outrage of still greater atrocity was perpetrated at this period. Men, women, and children, who were compelled to offer sacrifice, fled from their tents and sought refuge in a church, whither also they carried the infants at the breast; the Pagans set fire to the church and consumed it, with all who were therein.

The Goths were not long in making peace among themselves; and they then began to ravage Thrace and to pillage the cities and villages. Valens was soon convinced of the utter failure of his experiment; for he had calculated that the Goths would always be useful to the empire and formidable to its enemies, and had therefore neglected the reinforcement of the Roman legions. He had taken gold from the cities and villages under his dominion, instead of the usual complement of men for the military service. On his expectation being thus frustrated, he quitted Antioch and hastened to Constantinople. Hence the persecution which he had been carrying on against Christians differing in opinion from himself, was arrested. Euzoius, bishop of the Arians, died, and was succeeded by Theodore.

CHAP. XXXVIII.—CONCERNING MAVIA, QUEEN OF THE SARACENS. WAR AND SUBSEQUENT PEACE BETWEEN THE SARACENS AND ROME.—DETAILS CONCERNING THE ISHMAELITES AND THE SARACENS, AND THEIR CONVERSION TO CHRISTIANITY.

ABOUT this period the king of the Saracens died,¹ and the peace which had previously existed between that nation and the Romans was dissolved. Mavia,² the widow of the late monarch, finding herself at the head of the government, led her troops into Phœnicia and Palestine, as far as the regions of Egypt lying to the left of those who sail towards the source of the Nile, and which are generally denominated Arabia. This war was by no means a contemptible one, al-

¹ Compare Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 36.

² Otherwise called Mania; though she is termed Mavia by Socrates, Nicephorus, Epiphanius, and all writers before Rufinus, from whom, in the opinion of Valesius, Sozomen borrowed this account. See Theodoret, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 23, and Rufinus, ii. 6.

though conducted by a woman. The Romans, it is said, considered it so arduous and so perilous, that the general of the Phœnician troops applied for assistance to the general of the cavalry and infantry of the East. This latter ridiculed the summons, and undertook to give battle alone. He accordingly attacked Mavia, who commanded her own troops in person; and he met with so signal a defeat, that it was with difficulty he saved his life. This rescue was solely effected by the intervention of the general of the troops of Palestine and Phœnicia. Perceiving the extremity of the danger, this general deemed it unnecessary to obey the orders he had received to keep aloof from the combat; he therefore rushed upon the barbarians, and then, while retreating, discharged volleys of arrows upon them, in order to enable the Romans to make good their escape. This occurrence is still held in remembrance among the people of the country, and is celebrated in songs by the Saracens.

As the war was still pursued with vigour, the Romans found it necessary to send an embassy to Mavia to solicit peace. It is said that she refused to comply with the request of the embassy, unless consent were given for the ordination of a certain man named Moses, who dwelt in solitude in a neighbouring desert, as bishop over her subjects. This Moses was a man of virtuous life, and capable of performing the most wonderful miracles. On these conditions being announced to the emperor, the chiefs of the army were commanded to seize Moses, and conduct him to Lucius. The monk exclaimed, in the presence of the rulers and the assembled people, "I am not worthy of the honour of bearing the name of bishop; but if, notwithstanding my unworthiness, God destines me to this office, I take him to witness who created the heavens and the earth, that I will not be ordained by the imposition of the hands of Lucius, which are defiled with the blood of the saints." Lucius immediately rejoined, "If you are unacquainted with the nature of my creed, you do wrong in judging me before you are in possession of all the circumstances of the case. If you have been prejudiced by the calumnies that have been circulated against me, at least allow me to declare to you what are my sentiments; and do you be the judge of them." "Your creed is already well known to me," replied Moses; "and its nature is testified by

bishops, priests, and deacons, of whom some have been sent into exile, and others condemned to the mines. It is clear that your sentiments are opposed to the faith of Christ, and to all orthodox doctrines concerning the Godhead.”¹ Having again protested, upon oath, that he would not receive ordination at the hands of Lucius, the Roman rulers conducted him to the bishops who were then in exile. After receiving ordination from them, he went to exercise the functions of his office among the Saracens. He concluded a peace with the Romans, and converted many of the Saracens to the faith.

It appears that the Saracens were descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham, and were, in consequence, originally denominated Ishmaelites. As their mother Hagar was a slave, they afterwards, to conceal the opprobrium of their origin, assumed the name of Saracens, as if they were descended from Sara, the wife of Abraham. Such being their origin, they practise circumcision like the Jews, refrain from the use of pork, and observe many other Jewish rites and customs. If, indeed, they deviate in any respect from the observances of that nation, it must be ascribed to the lapse of time, and to their intercourse with neighbouring nations. Moses, who lived many centuries after Abraham, only legislated for those whom he led out of Egypt. The inhabitants of the neighbouring countries, being strongly addicted to superstition,² probably soon corrupted the laws imposed upon them by their forefather Ishmael. These laws, though not set down in writing, were the only ones known to the ancient Hebrews before the promulgation of the written laws of Moses. These people certainly served the same gods as the neighbouring nations, recognised them by the same appellations, and rendered them the same species of homage; and this clearly evidences their departure from the laws of their forefathers. It appears probable that, in the lapse of time, their ancient customs fell into oblivion, and that they gradually learnt to follow the practices of other nations. Some of their tribe afterwards happening to come in contact with the Jews, gathered from them the facts of their true origin, and returned to the observance of the Hebrew customs and laws. Indeed, there are

¹ See above, book ii. 46.

² ὡς ἄγαν δεισιδαίμονες ὄντες. Compare Acts xvii. 22, and Xenophon Cyr. iii. 3, 58.

some among them, even at the present day, who regulate their lives according to the Jewish precepts. Some of the Saracens were converted to Christianity not long before the accession of Valens. Their conversion appears to have been the result of their intercourse with the priests who dwelt among them, and with the monks who dwelt in the neighbouring deserts, and who were distinguished by their purity of life, and by their miraculous gifts. It is said that a whole tribe, and Zocomus, their chief, were converted to Christianity and baptized about this period, under the following circumstances:—Zocomus was childless, and went to a certain monk of great celebrity to complain to him of this calamity; for among the Saracens, and I believe other barbarian nations, it was accounted of great importance to have children. The monk desired Zocomus to be of good cheer, engaged in prayer on his behalf, and sent him away with the promise that if he would believe in Christ, he would have a son. When this promise was accomplished by God, and when a son was born to him, Zocomus was baptized, and all his subjects with him. From that period this tribe was peculiarly fortunate, and became strong in point of number, and formidable to the Persians as well as to the other Saracens. Such are the details that I have been enabled to collect concerning the conversion of the Saracens and their first bishops.

CHAP. XXXIX.—PETER, HAVING RETURNED FROM ROME, SUPERSEDES LUCIUS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCHES OF EGYPT. EXPEDITION OF VALENS AGAINST THE SCYTHIANS.

THOSE in every city who maintained the Nicene doctrine, now began to take courage, and more particularly the inhabitants of Alexandria. Peter had returned thither with a letter from Damascus, confirmatory of the tenets of Nicæa, and of his own ordination, and he was installed in the government of the churches in the place of Lucius, who retired to Constantinople. The emperor Valens was so distracted by other affairs, that he had no leisure to attend to these transactions. He had no sooner arrived at Constantinople than he incurred the suspicion and hatred of the people. The barbarians were pillaging Thrace, and were even advancing to the very gates

of Constantinople, and yet the emperor made no effort to repress their incursions. Hence he became an object of popular indignation, and was even regarded as the cause of the inroads of the enemy. At length, when he was present at the sports of the Hippodrome, the people openly and loudly accused him of neglecting the affairs of the state, and demanded arms that they might fight in their own defence. Valens, offended at these reproaches, immediately undertook an expedition against the barbarians; but he threatened to punish the insolence of the people on his return, and also to take vengeance on them for having formerly supported the tyrant Procopius.

CHAP. XL.—SAINT ISAAC, THE MONK, PREDICTS THE DEATH OF VALENS. VALENS IS DEFEATED. HIS DEATH.

WHEN Valens was on the point of departing from Constantinople, Isaac, a monk of great virtue, who feared no danger in the cause of God, presented himself before him, and addressed him in the following words:—"Give back, O emperor, to the orthodox, and to those who maintain the Nicene doctrines, the churches of which you have deprived them, and the victory will be yours." The emperor was offended at this act of boldness, and commanded that Isaac should be arrested and kept in chains until his return, when he meant to bring him to justice for his temerity. Isaac, however, replied, "You will not return unless you restore the churches." And so, in fact, it came to pass. Valens marched at the head of his troops in pursuit of the Goths, through Thrace, as far as Adrianople; here he found the barbarians encamped in a very advantageous position, and yet he had the rashness to attack them before he had ranged his own legions in proper order. His cavalry was dispersed, his infantry compelled to retreat, and he himself escaped with difficulty with a few of his attendants, and sought refuge and concealment in a small house or tower. The barbarians were in full pursuit, and went beyond the tower, not suspecting that he had selected it for his place of concealment. As the last detachment of the barbarians was passing by the tower, the attendants of the emperor let fly a volley of arrows, which immediately led to the conjecture that Valens was concealed within the building:

the barbarians loudly shouted this intelligence to their companions who were in advance of them, and thus the news was conveyed till it reached the detachments which were foremost in the pursuit. They returned, and encompassed the tower. They collected vast quantities of wood from the country around, which they piled up against the tower, and finally set fire to the mass. A wind which then happened to arise, favoured the progress of the conflagration; and in a short period, the tower, with all that it contained, including the emperor and his attendants, was utterly destroyed. Valens was fifty years of age; he had reigned thirteen years conjointly with his brother, and three by himself.

BOOK VII.

CHAP. I.—MAVIA ASSISTS THE ROMANS AGAINST THE BARBARIANS. GRATIAN LEAVES TO EVERY ONE FULL LIBERTY OF OPINION.

SUCH was the fate of Valens. The barbarians,¹ flushed with victory, overran Thrace, and advanced to the gates of Constantinople. In this emergency, a few Saracens, sent by Mavia, were of great service. Dominica, the widow of Valens, furnished money out of the public treasury, and some of the people, after hastily arming themselves, attacked the barbarians and drove them from the city.

Gratian, who at this period reigned conjointly with his brother over the whole Roman empire, disapproved of the late persecution that had been carried on to check the diversity in religious creeds, and recalled all those who had been banished on account of their religion. He also enacted a law by which it was decreed that every individual should be freely permitted the exercise of his own religion, and should be allowed to hold assemblies, with the exception of the Manichæans and the followers of Photinus and Eunomius.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 1, 2.

CHAP. II.—THEODOSIUS IS ASSOCIATED WITH GRATIAN IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE EMPIRE. ARIANISM PREVAILS THROUGHOUT THE EASTERN CHURCHES EXCEPT THAT OF JERUSALEM. COUNCIL OF ANTIOCH.¹

ON reflecting that, while it was indispensably requisite to check the incursions of the barbarians of the Danube in Thrace and Illyria, his presence was equally necessary in Gaul to repel the inroads of the Alemanni,² Gratian associated Theodosius with himself at Sirmich, in the government of the empire. Theodosius belonged to an illustrious family of the Pyrnees in Spain, and had acquired so much renown in war, that before he was raised to the imperial power, he was universally considered capable of guiding the reins of the empire.

At this period all the churches of the East, with the exception of that of Jerusalem, were in the hands of the Arians. The Macedonians differed but little in opinion from those who maintained the doctrines of Nicæa, and held intercourse and communion with them in all the cities; and this had been more especially the case with the Macedonians of Constantinople, ever since their reconciliation with Liberius. But after the enactment of Gratian's law, by which every sect was permitted the full exercise of its own form of religion, the Macedonians re-took possession of the churches from which they had been ejected by Valens. They assembled together at Antioch in Caria,³ and protested that the Son is not to be declared "consubstantial" with the Father, but only like unto him in substance. From that period, many of the Macedonians seceded from the others, and held separate assemblies, while others, condemning this schismatic spirit, united themselves still more closely with the followers of the Nicene doctrines.

Many of the bishops who had been banished by Valens, and who were recalled about this period in consequence of the law of Gratian, manifested no ambition to be restored to the highest offices in the church: on the contrary, they urged the Arian

¹ With this chapter compare the parallel account given in Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 3.

² This people dwelt near Belgæ and on the east of the river Rhine; their name has remained as an appellation of Germany itself.

³ See above, vi. 12, and note.

bishops to retain the posts they occupied, and not to rend the church by their love of contention and of personal promotion, or disturb the unity which had been established by God and the apostles. Eulalius, bishop of Amasia in Pontus, was one of those who pursued this course of conduct. It is said that when he returned from exile, he found that his church had passed into the hands of an Arian bishop, and that scarcely fifty inhabitants of the city had submitted to the control of this new bishop. Eulalius, desiring the restoration of concord above all other considerations, offered to take part with the Arian bishop in the government of the church, and expressly agreed to allow him the precedence. But as the Arian would not comply with this proposition, it was not long before he found himself deserted by the few who had followed him, and who went over to the other party.

CHAP. III.—CONCERNING ST. MELETIUS AND PAULINUS, BISHOPS OF ANTIOCH. THEIR OATH RESPECTING THE BISHOPRIC.

In consequence of this law, Meletius returned about this period to Antioch in Syria; and his presence gave rise to great contentions.¹ Paulinus, whom Valens from veneration for his piety had not ventured to banish, was still alive. The partisans of Meletius, therefore, proposed his association with Paulinus in the government of the church. This was opposed by the followers of Paulinus, who condemned the ordination of Meletius, because it had been conferred by Arian bishops. The other party, however, possessing the advantage in point of strength, placed Meletius over a church in the suburbs of the city. The mutual animosity of the two parties increased, and sedition would doubtless have been the consequence, had not means been devised for the restoration of concord. Flavian and five of the clergy, who were in expectation of eventually being elected to the episcopal dignity, promised that they would not accept this office during the life of Paulinus and Meletius, and that in the event of the decease of either of these great men, the other should succeed to the bishopric. On their ratifying this promise with oaths, unanimity was restored among the people, and no further dissension remained except among a

¹ Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 5.

small party of Luciferians, who contended that Meletius had been ordained by heretics. On the termination of this contest, Meletius proceeded to Constantinople, where some bishops had assembled together to deliberate on the necessity of translating Gregory from the bishopric of Nazianzen to that of this city.

CHAP. IV.—REIGN OF THEODOSIUS THE GREAT; HE IS BAPTIZED BY ASCHOLIUS, BISHOP OF THESSALONICA.

As Gaul was about this period infested by the incursions of the Alemanni,¹ Gratian returned to his Western dominions, which he had reserved for himself² and his brother, when he bestowed the government of Illyria and of the Eastern provinces upon Theodosius. He succeeded in repelling these barbarians; and Theodosius was equally successful against the tribes from the banks of the Danube; he defeated them, compelled them to sue for peace, and, after accepting hostages from them, proceeded to Thessalonica. He fell ill while in this city, and after receiving instructions in the rudiments of religion from Ascholius the bishop, he was baptized, and was soon after restored to health. The parents of Theodosius were Christians, and were attached to the Nicene doctrines; hence he took pleasure in the ministrations of Ascholius, who maintained the same doctrines, and was endowed with every priestly virtue and qualification.³ He also rejoiced at finding that the Arian heresy had not been received in Illyria.⁴ He inquired concerning the religious sentiments which were prevalent in the other provinces, and ascertained that, as far as Macedonia,⁵ one form of belief was universally predominant, which was, that the same homage ought to be rendered to God the Word, and to the Holy Ghost, as to God the Father; but that to-

¹ Comp. Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 6.

² The ancient annotators remark that Gaul, Britain, and Spain fell to the lot of Gratian; while his brother Valentinian took Italy, Illyricum, and Africa. See Zosimus, iv. p. 746. Sozomen is therefore mistaken in connecting Illyria with the name of Gratian.

³ The original Greek is here hopelessly corrupt: we have followed the opinion of Valesius in our text.

⁴ The same testimony is given by Basil, *Ep.* 324, ad Valerianum.

⁵ This is also asserted in the synodical epistle put forth by the council of Aquileia.

Referred to in our Essay
on the Relation of Bishops to clergy

and people thus
Oct-13, '96-

wards the East, and particularly at Constantinople, the people were divided into many different sects. Reflecting that it would be better to propound his own religious views to his subjects, than to enforce the reception of any creed by mere compulsion, Theodosius enacted a law at Thessalonica, which he caused to be published at Constantinople, that it might be thence transmitted to the remotest cities of his dominions. He made known by this law his intention of leading all his subjects to the reception of that faith which Peter, the chief of the apostles, had from the beginning preached to the Romans, and which was professed by Damasus, bishop of Rome, and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria. He enacted¹ that the title of "Catholic Church" should be exclusively confined to those who rendered equal homage to the Three Persons of the Trinity, and that those individuals who entertained opposite opinions should be treated as heretics, regarded with contempt, and delivered over to punishment.

CHAP. V.—GREGORY, THE THEOLOGIAN, RECEIVES FROM THEODOSIUS THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCHES. EXPULSION OF DEMOPHILUS, AND OF ALL WHO DENY THAT THE SON IS "CONSUBSTANTIAL" WITH THE FATHER.

SOON after the enactment of this law, Theodosius went to Constantinople. The Arians, under the guidance of Theophilus, still retained possession of the churches. Gregory of Nazianzen presided over those who maintain the "consubstantiality" of the Holy Trinity, and assembled them together in a dwelling which had been altered into the form of a house of prayer, and which subsequently became one of the most remarkable in the city by the magnificence of its decorations, and the special revelations which were there vouchsafed of the grace of God. For the power of God was there manifested by dreams, by visions, and by miraculous cures of divers diseases; these miracles were usually attributed to the instrumentality of Mary the Holy Virgin, the Mother of God. The name of Anastasia was given to this church, because, as I believe, the Nicene doctrines which were, so to speak, buried

¹ This edict is extant in the Theodosian Code, under the title "de Fide Catholica."

beneath the errors of heterodoxy at Constantinople, were here brought to light and maintained by Gregory. Others ascribe the origin of this appellation to the miracle, and relate that one day, when the people were met together for worship in this edifice, a pregnant woman fell from the highest gallery, and was found dead on the spot, but that, at the prayer of the whole congregation, she was restored to life, and she and the infant were saved. On account of this wonderful occurrence, the place, as some assert, obtained its name.

The emperor sent to command Demophilus¹ to conform to the doctrines of Nicæa, and to lead the people to embrace the same sentiments, or else to deliver up the government of the churches. Demophilus assembled the people, acquainted them with the imperial edict, and informed them that it was his intention to hold an assembly the next day without the walls of the city, in accordance, he said, with the Divine law, which commands us when we are persecuted in one city to "flee unto another."² From that day he always assembled without the city with Lucius, who was formerly the bishop of the Arians at Alexandria, and who, after having been expelled, as above related, from that city, had fixed his residence at Constantinople. When Demophilus and his followers had quitted the church, the emperor entered therein, and engaged in prayer; and from that period those who maintained the consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity, held possession of the houses of prayer. These events occurred in the fifth year of the consulate of Gratian, and in the first of that of Theodosius, and after the churches had been during forty years³ in the hands of the Arians.

CHAP. VI.—INTRIGUES OF THE ARIANS. ELOQUENCE OF EUNOMIUS. BOLDNESS OF ST. AMPHILOCHIUS.

THE Arians, who were still very strong in point of numbers, and who, through the protection formerly granted by Constantius and Valens, were still permitted to hold their assemblies, and discourse publicly concerning God and the Divine nature, now determined upon making an attempt to gain over

¹ See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 7.

² *Matt.* x. 23.

³ *Viz.* from A. D. 339.

the emperor to their party, through the intervention of individuals of their sect who held appointments at court; and they entertained hopes of succeeding in this project as well as they had succeeded in the case of Constantius. These machinations excited great terror among the members of the Catholic church, but the chief cause of their apprehension was the eloquence of Eunomius. It appears that, during the reign of Valens, Eunomius had some dispute with the clergy of Cyzicus, and had in consequence seceded from the Arians, and retired to Bithynia, near Constantinople; here multitudes resorted to him, some with the design of testing his principles, and others merely from the desire of listening to his discourses. His reputation reached the ears of the emperor, who would gladly have held a conference with him;¹ but the empress Flacilla² studiously prevented any interview from taking place between them, for she was strenuously attached to the Nicene doctrines, and feared lest Eunomius might, by his powers of disputation, induce a change in the sentiments of the emperor.

In the mean time, while these intrigues were being carried on by each party, it is said that the bishops then residing in Constantinople went to the emperor to render him the customary salutations. An old bishop who presided over a city of little note,³ and who was simple and unworldly, yet well instructed in Divine subjects, formed one of this party. He went through precisely the same forms as the others in reverentially saluting the emperor. But, instead of rendering equal honour to the prince who was seated beside his father, the old priest approached him, patted him familiarly, and called him his dear child. The emperor was deeply incensed at this indignity being offered to his son, and commanded that the old man should be thrust from his presence. While being led away, however, the old bishop turned round, and exclaimed, "Reflect, O emperor, on the wrath of the Heavenly Father against those who do not honour his Son as himself, and who

¹ Valesius sees good reason for doubting the truth of this assertion; he thinks that the credulity of Sozomen led to his being imposed upon by one of the partisans of Eunomius.

² She was the first, and not the second, wife of Theodosius, and the mother of Arcadius and Honorius. Her funeral panegyric was delivered by Gregory of Nyssa, among whose works it is still extant.

³ Nicephorus says that the old man was Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium; but this city can hardly be said to be one "of little note."

have the audacity to assert that the Son is inferior to the Father." The emperor felt the force of this observation, recalled the priest, apologized to him for what had occurred, and confessed that he had spoken the truth. The emperor was henceforward less disposed to hold intercourse with heretics; and he enacted a law by which he prohibited, under the severest penalties, all public disputes, assemblies, or disputations concerning the Divine substance and nature.

CHAP. VII.—CONCERNING THE SECOND HOLY GENERAL COUNCIL, AND THE PLACE AND THE CAUSE OF ITS CONVENTION. ABDICATION OF GREGORY, THE THEOLOGIAN.

A. D. 381.—THE emperor soon after convened a council of orthodox bishops, for the purpose of confirming the decrees of Nicæa, and of electing a bishop to the vacant see of Constantinople.¹ He likewise summoned the Macedonians to this assembly; for as their doctrines differed but little from those of the Catholic church, he judged that it would be easy to effect a re-union with them. About a hundred and fifty bishops who maintained the consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity were present at this council,² as likewise thirty-six of the Macedonian bishops, chiefly from the cities of the Hellespont, of whom the principal were Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, and Marcian, bishop of Lampsacus. The other party was under the guidance of Timothy, who had succeeded his brother Peter as bishop of Alexandria; of Meletius, bishop of Antioch, who had repaired to Constantinople a short time previously, on account of the election of Gregory, and of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, who had, at this period, renounced the tenets of the Macedonians. Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, and Acacius, bishop of Berea, were also present at the council. These latter unanimously maintained the decrees of Nicæa, and urged Eleusius and his partisans to conform to these sentiments; reminding them, at the same time, of the embassy they had formerly deputed to Liberius, and of the confession they had conveyed to him through the me-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 8.

² For a parallel account of this council, see Socrates, v. 8.

dium of Eustathius, Silvanus, and Theophilus. The Macedonians, however, declared openly that they would never admit the Son to be of the same substance as the Father, whatever confession they might formerly have made to Liberius, and immediately withdrew. They then wrote to those of their own sect in every city, exhorting them not to conform to the doctrines of Nicæa.

The bishops who remained at Constantinople now turned their attention to the election of a prelate to the see of that city. It is said that the emperor, from profound admiration of the sanctity and eloquence of Gregory, judged that he was worthy of this high dignity, and that, from reverence of his virtue, the greater number of the bishops were of the same opinion. Gregory at first consented to accept the bishopric of the city; but afterwards, on ascertaining that some of the bishops,¹ particularly those of Egypt, objected to the election, he withdrew his consent. For my own part, I confess that in reviewing these circumstances, I know not how to express adequate admiration of this great man. His eloquence did not inspire him with pride, nor did vain-glory lead him to desire to retain an office upon which he had entered at a very perilous juncture. He surrendered his appointment to the bishops when it was required of him, as readily as if it had been merely a deposit committed to his charge, and never complained of the labours to which he had been exposed, or of the dangers he had incurred in the suppression of heresies. Had he retained possession of the bishopric of Constantinople, it would have been no detriment to the interests of any individual, as another bishop had been appointed in his stead at Nazianzen. But the council, in strict obedience to the laws of the fathers and the canons of the church, withdrew from him, with his own acquiescence, the deposit which had been confided to him, without making an exception in favour of so eminent a man. The emperor and the priests therefore proceeded to the election of another bishop, which they regarded as the most important affair then requiring attention, and the emperor was urgent that diligent investigations might be instituted, so that the most able and exemplary individual might be intrusted with

¹ Namely, Maximus and his party, who had irregularly elected the latter into the see of Constantinople.

the archbishopric of the great and royal city. The council, however, was divided in sentiment; for each of the members desired to see one of his own friends ordained over the church.

CHAP. VIII.—ELECTION OF NECTARIUS TO THE BISHOPRIC OF CONSTANTINOPLE; HIS BIRTH-PLACE AND EDUCATION.

A CERTAIN man of Tarsus in Cilicia, of the order of senator, was at this period residing at Constantinople.¹ Being about to return to his own country, he called upon Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, to inquire whether he had any letters to send by him. Diodorus was fully intent upon the election of a bishop, which was the subject then engrossing universal attention. He had no sooner seen Nectarius, than, struck by the dignity of his appearance and the suavity of his manners, he judged him to be worthy of the bishopric, and secretly desired that he might be elected to it. He conducted him, as if upon some other business, to the bishop of Antioch, and requested him to use his influence to procure his election. The bishop of Antioch derided this request, for the names of the most eminent men had already been proposed for consideration. He, however, called Nectarius to him, and desired him to remain for a short time with him. Some time after, the emperor commanded the bishops to draw up a list of the names of those whom they desired to ordain to the bishopric, reserving to himself the right of nominating any one of those whose names were thus submitted to him. All the bishops complied with this mandate; and, among the others, the bishop of Antioch wrote down the names of those whom he proposed as candidates for the bishopric, and, at the end of his list, from consideration for Diodorus, he inserted the name of Nectarius. The emperor read the list, stopped at the name of Nectarius, on which he placed his finger, and seemed for some time lost in reflection; then he again read the list, and finally nominated Nectarius. This nomination excited great astonishment, and all the people were anxious to ascertain whence Nectarius came, and who and what he was. When they heard that he had not been baptized, their amazement was increased at the decision of the emperor. I believe that

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 8.

I have seen this in the original

 Diodorus himself was not aware that Nectarius had not been baptized; for, had he been acquainted with this fact, it is probable that he would not have ventured to seek his election to the bishopric. It appears reasonable to suppose, that on perceiving that Nectarius was of advanced age, he took it for granted that he had been baptized long previously. But these events did not take place without the interposition of God.¹ For when the emperor was informed that Nectarius had not been baptized, he did not alter his decision, although strongly opposed by the bishops. When at last consent had been given to the imperial mandate, Nectarius was baptized, and while yet clad in his white robes was proclaimed bishop of Constantinople by the unanimous voice of the synod. Many have conjectured that the emperor was led to make this election by a Divine revelation. I shall not pause to inquire whether this conjecture be true or false; but I feel convinced when I reflect on the extraordinary circumstances attending this ordination, that all the events were brought about by the interposition of Divine Providence, and that it was by the will of God that so mild and virtuous and exemplary a man was elevated to the priesthood. Such are the details which I have been able to ascertain concerning the ordination of Nectarius.

CHAP. IX.—DECREES OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL.
 MAXIMUS, THE CYNICAL PHILOSOPHER.

AFTER these transactions, Nectarius and the other priests assembled together, and decreed that the faith established by the council of Nicæa should remain inviolate, and that all heresies should be condemned; that the churches should be governed according to the ancient canons; that each bishop should remain in his own church, and not go elsewhere under any light pretext, or perform ordinations in which he had no right to interfere, as had frequently been the case in the Catholic church during the times of persecution. They like-

¹ Sozomen has already mentioned (vi. 24) that Ambrose, while yet a catechumen, was elected by the suffrages of the people to the archbishopric of Milan, contrary to the 80th of the Apostolical Canons, and in defiance of the 2nd Canon of Nicæa. This happened, however, doubtless by the special intervention of God, as also in the case of Nectarius.

wise decreed that the affairs of each church should be subjected to the investigation and control of a council of the province, and that the bishop of Constantinople should rank next in point of precedence to the bishop of Rome, as occupying the bishopric of New Rome ;¹ for Constantinople was not only favoured with this appellation, but was also in the enjoyment of many privileges—such as a senate of its own, and the division of the citizens into ranks and orders ; it was also governed by its own magistrates, and possessed contracts,² laws, and immunities, similar to those of Rome in Italy.

The council also decreed that Maximus was not a bishop, and that those individuals whom he had ordained were not of the order of the clergy ; and that all that had been done by him, or in his name, was null and void. Maximus was a native of Alexandria, and by profession, a cynical philosopher ; he was zealously attached to the Nicene doctrines, and had been secretly ordained bishop of Constantinople by bishops from Egypt.³

Such were the decrees of the council. They were confirmed by the emperor, who enacted that the faith established at Nicæa should be preserved inviolate, and that the churches should be placed in the hands of those who acknowledged one God in three Persons of equal honour, and of equal power, namely—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.⁴ To designate them still more precisely, the emperor declared that he referred to those who held communion with Nectarius, at Constantinople, with Timothy, bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, with Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, with Pelagius, bishop of Laodicea in the East, and with Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium in Asia : to those in Pontus and Bithynia who held communion with Helladius, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, with Gregory, bishop of Nyssa ; and with Otreius, bishop of

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 8, with Valesius' note in loco. The canon, which was the 28th of Chalcedon, ran as follows : " We following in all things the decision of the holy Fathers, . . . do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the Most Holy City Constantinople, new Rome. For the Fathers properly gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Romê. Baronius, it should be added, considered this canon spurious.

² *συμβολαῖα*. This is the emendation of Valesius for the received *σύμβολα*, the sense of which is very obscure.

³ On this uncanonical ordination of Maximus, see Baronius Annal. A. D. 379.

⁴ See above, note on chap. 4.

Melitine; and to the inhabitants of Thrace and Scythia, who held communion with Terence, bishop of Tomis, and with Martyrius, bishop of Marcianopolis. The emperor was personally acquainted with all these bishops, and had ascertained, that they governed their respective churches wisely and piously. After these transactions, the council was dissolved, and each of the bishops returned homewards.

CHAP. X.—CONCERNING MARTYRIUS OF CILICIA. TRANSLATION OF THE REMAINS OF ST. PAUL, THE CONFESSOR, AND OF MELETIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH.

NECTARIUS made himself acquainted with the routine of sacerdotal ceremonies under the instruction of Cyriacus, bishop of Adana, whom he had requested Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, to leave with him for a short period. Nectarius also retained several other Cilicians with him, amongst whom was Martyrius his physician, who had been a witness of the regularities of his youth. Nectarius was desirous of ordaining him deacon, but Martyrius refused the honour, under the plea of his own unworthiness, and called upon Nectarius himself to witness as to the course of his past life. To this Nectarius replied as follows:—"Although I am now a priest, do you not know that my past career was a more guilty one than yours, inasmuch as you were but an instrument in my numerous transgressions?" "But you, O blessed one," replied Martyrius, "were cleansed by baptism, and were then accounted worthy of the priesthood. Both these ordinances are appointed by the Divine law for purification from sin;¹ and it seems to me that you now differ in no respect from a new-born infant: but I received long ago the holy rite of baptism, and lived subse-

¹ ἀμφότερα δὲ καθάρσια. Valesius remarks as follows on this passage. "The sacrament of Orders has not the same power to wash away sins as belongs to that of Baptism; to receive the grace of the latter sacrament, faith only is necessary, as Christ says, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' (Mark xvi. 16.) But holy orders do not confer remission of sins. So, if any one is ordained in a state of sin, he receives the indelible character of the priesthood, but not the grace, because his sins are a barrier. But if, after ordination, his sins are remitted in the sacrament of Penance, the character impressed upon him works grace, as the *obex* is removed. In this sense holy Orders may be called καθάρσια τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων."

quently as if I had not received it." It was under this plea, that he excused himself from receiving ordination; and it appeared to me to be so valid and commendable, that I have given the whole transaction a place in my history.

The emperor Theodosius, on being informed of various events connected with Paul, formerly bishop of Constantinople, caused his remains to be removed to the church erected by Macedonius his enemy. This church is a spacious and magnificent edifice, and is still distinguished by the name of Paul. Hence, many persons who are ignorant of the facts of the case, particularly women and the mass of the people, imagine that Paul the apostle is interred therein. The remains of Meletius were at the same time conveyed to Antioch; and deposited near the tomb of Babylas the martyr. It is said that, by the command of the emperor, the relics were received with honour in every city through which they had to be conveyed during the journey to Antioch, and that psalms were sung on the occasion, a practice which was quite contrary to the usual Roman customs.

CHAR. XI.—ORDINATION OF FLAVIAN AS BISHOP OF ANTIOCH,
AND SUBSEQUENT OCCURRENCES.

AFTER the pompous interment of the remains of Meletius, Flavian was ordained in his stead, and that too in direct violation of the oath he had taken; for Paulinus was still alive.¹ This gave rise to fresh troubles in the church of Antioch. Many persons refused to hold communion with Flavian, and assembled together apart with Paulinus. Even priests differed among themselves on this subject. The bishops of Egypt, of Arabia, and of Cyprus, were indignant at the injustice that had been manifested towards Paulinus. On the other hand, the bishops of Syria, of Palestine, of Phœnicia, and of the greater part of Armenia, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Pontus, sided with Flavian. The bishop of Rome, and all the Western priests, regarded the conduct of Flavian with the utmost displeasure. They addressed the customary epistles, called synodical, to Paulinus as bishop of Antioch, and took no notice of Flavian. They also withdrew from communion with Dio-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 9, and 17.

dorus, bishop of Tarsus, and Acacius, bishop of Berea, because they had ordained Flavian.¹ To take further cognizance of the affair, the Western bishops and the emperor Gratian wrote to the bishops of the East, and summoned them to attend a council in the West.

CHAP. XII.—PROJECT OF THEODOSIUS TO UNITE ALL THE DIFFERENT FORMS OF RELIGION INTO ONE. AGELIUS AND SISINIUS. THE NOVATIANS. THOSE WHO REJECT THE TERM “CONSUBSTANTIAL” ARE EJECTED FROM THE CHURCHES.

ALTHOUGH all the houses of prayer were at this period in the possession of the Catholic church, yet the Arians continued to be a constant source of trouble and contention.² The emperor Theodosius, therefore, soon after the council above mentioned, again summoned together the leaders of the different sects, in order that they might either bring others to their own state of conviction on disputed topics, or be convinced themselves: for he imagined that all would be brought to oneness of opinion, if a free discussion were entered upon concerning ambiguous points of doctrine. The council, therefore, was convened. This occurred in the year of the second consulate of Merobandes, and the first of Saturninus, and at the same period that Arcadius was associated with his father in the government of the empire. Theodosius sent for Nectarius, consulted with him concerning the synod, and commanded him to introduce the discussion of all questions which had given rise to heresies, so that one faith might be established throughout the church of Christ. When Nectarius returned home, feeling anxious about the affair confided to him, he made known the mandate of the emperor to Agelius, the bishop of the Novatians, who held the same religious sentiments as himself. Agelius was a man of virtuous and exemplary life, but was unaccustomed to discussions and disputations; he therefore recommended the services of one of his readers, by name Sisinius, who afterwards succeeded him as bishop. Sisinius

¹ The Western bishops condemned not only Diodorus and Flavian, because they had ordained Flavian while Paulinus was still surviving, but also Nectarius, because he had been privy to the proceeding.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 10.

possessed great powers of intellect and of eloquence ; he was deeply versed in the knowledge of Scripture, and was well acquainted with profane and with ecclesiastical literature. He proposed that all disputation with the heterodox, as being a fruitful source of contention and animosity, should be avoided, but recommended that inquiries should rather be instituted as to whether the heretics admitted the testimony of the teachers and expositors of Scripture who lived before the church was rent by division. "If they reject the testimony of these great men," said he, "they will be condemned by their own followers ; but, if they admit their authority as being adequate to resolve ambiguous points of doctrine, we will produce their works." For Sisinius was well aware that, as the ancients recognised the Son to be eternal like the Father, they had never presumed to assert that he had had a beginning. This suggestion received the approbation of Nectarius, and afterwards of the emperor ; and investigations were set on foot as to the opinions entertained by heretics concerning the ancient interpreters of Scripture. As it was found that the heretics professed to hold these early writers in great admiration, the emperor asked them whether they would defer to their authority on controverted topics, and test their own doctrines by the sentiments propounded in their works. This proposition excited great contention among the leaders of the various heretical sects ; but it was withdrawn by the emperor, when he perceived that the heretics were divided in opinion concerning the doctrines and books of the ancients, and that each sect was mainly intent on the defence of its own peculiar dogmas. He blamed their proceedings, and commanded each party to draw up a written exposition of its own creed. On the day appointed for the presentation of these documents, Nectarius and Agelius appeared at the palace, as representatives of those who maintain the consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity ; Demophilus, the Arian bishop, came forward as the deputy of the Arians ; Eunomius represented the Eunomians ; and Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, appeared for the sectarians denominated Macedonians. The emperor, after receiving their formularies, expressed himself in favour of that one alone in which the consubstantiality of the Trinity was recognised, and destroyed the others. The interests of the Novatians were not affected by this transaction ; for they held the same doctrines as the Catholic church

concerning the Divine nature. The members of the other sects were indignant with the bishops for having entered into unwise disputations in the presence of the emperor. Many renounced their former opinions, and embraced the authorized form of religion. The emperor enacted a law, prohibiting heretics from holding assemblies, from giving public instructions in religion, and from conferring ordination.¹ Some of the heterodox were expelled from the cities and villages, while others were disgraced,² and deprived of the privileges enjoyed by other subjects of the empire. Great as were the punishments adjudged by the laws against heretics, they were not always carried into execution; for the emperor had no desire to persecute his subjects; he only desired to enforce uniformity of religion through the medium of intimidation. Those who voluntarily renounced heretical opinions received great commendation from him.

CHAP. XIII.—TYRANNY OF MAXIMUS. CONCERNING THE EMPRESS JUSTINA AND ST. AMBROSIUS. DEATH OF THE EMPEROR GRATIAN.

As the emperor Gratian was at this period occupied with a war against the Germans,³ Maximus quitted Britain with the design of usurping the imperial power. Valentinian was then residing in Italy, but, as he was a minor, the affairs of state were transacted by Probus, a prætorian prefect, who had formerly been consul.

Justina, the mother of the emperor, having espoused the Arian heresy, persecuted Ambrose, bishop of Milan, and disquieted the churches by her efforts to introduce alterations in the Nicene doctrines, and to obtain the predominance of the form of belief set forth at Ariminum.⁴ She was incensed against Ambrose because he strenuously opposed her attempts

¹ Sozomen alludes to the 6th, 7th, and following edicts of the Theodosian code.

² ἀρίμων. He alludes to the Manichæans, who were made incapable of even executing a will.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 11.

⁴ See Socrates, ubi supr. Valesius remarks that Valentinian allowed the Arian party to assemble in the churches: he quotes the Codex Theodos. under the title de Fide Catholicâ.

at innovation ; and she represented to her son that he had insulted her. Valentinian believed this calumny, and determining to avenge the supposed wrongs of his mother, he sent a party of soldiers against the church. On their reaching the edifice, they forced their way into the interior, arrested Ambrose, and were about to lead him into exile, when the people assembled in crowds, and evinced a resolution to die rather than submit to the banishment of their bishop. Justina was still further incensed at this occurrence ; and with a view of enforcing her project by law, she sent for Benevolus, one of the legal secretaries, and commanded him to draw up, as quickly as possible, an edict confirmatory of the decrees of Ariminum. Benevolus,¹ being firmly attached to the Catholic church, refused to write the document, and the empress tried to bribe him by promises of honours and promotion. He still, however, refused compliance, and, tearing off his belt, he threw it at the feet of Justina, and declared that he would neither retain his present office, nor accept of promotion, as the reward of impiety. As he remained firm in his refusal, others were intrusted with the compilation of the document. By this law, all were prohibited from holding assemblies except those who conformed to the doctrines set forth at Ariminum, and ratified at Constantinople ; and it was enacted, that death should be the punishment of those who should violate this decree.

While Justina was planning the means of carrying this cruel law into execution, intelligence was brought of the murder of Gratian, through the treachery of Andragathos, the general of Maximus. Andragathos obtained possession of the chariot of the empress, and sent word to the emperor, that his consort was travelling towards his camp. Gratian, who was but recently married, and was exceedingly attached to the empress, hastened across the river, and, in his anxiety to meet her, fell into the hands of Andragathos, and was put to death. He was in the twenty-fourth year of his age, and had reigned fifteen years. This calamity diverted the thoughts of Justina from her angry altercation with Ambrose.

Maximus in the mean time raised a large army of Britons,

¹ Socrates, as Valesius remarks, has borrowed much of what follows from the 11th Book of Rufinus' Ecclesiastical History. Sozomen is, however, mistaken here in his chronology, the events which he mentions as happening before the death of Gratian, not having occurred till A. D. 386

Gauls, Celts, and other nations, and marched into Italy. The pretext which he advanced for this measure was, that he desired to prevent the introduction of innovations in the ancient form of religion and of ecclesiastical discipline; but he was, in reality, actuated by the desire of dispelling any suspicion that might have been excited as to his aspiring to tyranny; he wished it to appear that it was not by force, but by the sanction of the laws and the consent of the people, that he had been invested with the imperial power. Valentinian, who was compelled by the exigencies of the times to recognise him as emperor, soon after fled with his mother Justina and Probus, the prætorian prefect, to Thessalonica.

CHAP. XIV.—BIRTH OF HONORIUS. THEODOSIUS LEAVES ARCADIOUS AT CONSTANTINOPLE, AND PROCEEDS TO ITALY. SUCCESSION OF THE NOVATIAN AND OTHER PATRIARCHS. AUDACITY OF THE ARIANS. TRIUMPH OF THEODOSIUS.

WHILE Theodosius was making preparations for a war against Maximus, his son Honorius was born.¹ On the completion of these warlike preparations, he left his son Arcadius to govern at Constantinople, and proceeded to Thessalonica, where he saw Valentinian. He refused either to dismiss or to give audience to the embassy sent by Maximus, but continued his journey at the head of his troops towards Italy.

About this period, Agelius, bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, feeling his end approaching, nominated Sisinius, one of the presbyters of his church, as his successor. The people, however, murmured that the preference had not rather been given to Marcian, who was noted on account of his piety, and Agelius therefore ordained him, and addressed the people who were assembled in the church in the following words: "After me you shall have Marcian for your bishop, and after him, Sisinius." Agelius died soon after he had uttered these words: he had governed his church forty years with the greatest approbation of his own party; and some assert that, during the times of Pagan persecution, he had openly confessed the name of Christ.

Not long after, Timothy and Cyril died; Theophilus suc-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 12—14.

ceeded to the bishopric of Alexandria, and John to that of Jerusalem. Demophilus, bishop of the Arians at Constantinople, likewise died, and was succeeded by Marinus; but he was superseded by Dorotheus, who soon after arrived from Antioch in Syria, and who was considered by his sect to be better qualified for the office than Marinus.

Theodosius having in the mean time entered Italy, various conflicting reports were spread as to the success of his arms. It was rumoured among the Arians that the greater part of his army had been cut to pieces in battle, and that he himself had been captured by the tyrant; and assuming this report to be true, these sectarians ran to the house of Nectarius and set it on fire, from indignation at the power which the bishop had obtained over the churches. The emperor, however, was completely successful in this war, for the soldiers of Maximus, impelled by fear or treachery, slew the tyrant. Andragathos, the murderer of Gratian, no sooner heard of the death of Maximus, than he leaped into the river with his armour, and perished. The war having been thus terminated, and the death of Gratian avenged,¹ Theodosius, accompanied by Valentinian, entered Rome in triumph, and restored order in the churches in Italy, for the empress Justina was dead.

CHAP. XV.—FLAVIAN AND EVAGRIUS, BISHOPS OF ANTIOCH.
DEMOLITION OF IDOLATROUS TEMPLES.

PAULINUS,² bishop of Antioch, died about this period, and those who had assembled with him, persisted in their aversion to Flavian, although his religious sentiments were precisely the same as their own, because he had violated the oath he had formerly made to Meletius. They, therefore, elected Evagrius as their bishop. Evagrius did not long survive this appointment, and although Flavian prevented the election of another bishop, those who had seceded from communion with him, still continued to hold their assemblies apart.

About this period, the bishop of Alexandria, to whom the

¹ Namely, in the war itself. "Neque enim bello jam finito, Theodosius Gratianum ultus est; sed in ipso bello cædem Gratiani vindicavit, sumpto de Maximo Gratiani interfectore supplicio." *Vales.*

² Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 15, 16.

temple of Bacchus had, at his own request, been granted by the emperor, converted the edifice into a Christian church. The statues were removed, the most secret recesses of the temple explored, and in order to cast contumely on the Pagan mysteries, the most absurd and indecorous objects appertaining thereto, that had been concealed within the temple, were exposed to the public gaze. The Pagans, amazed at so unexpected an exhibition, could not suffer it in silence, but conspired together to attack the Christians. They slew many of the Christians, wounded others, and seized the temple of Serapis, a large and beautiful structure seated on an eminence. This they converted into a temporary citadel, and here they conveyed their prisoners, put them to the torture, and compelled them to offer sacrifice. Those who refused compliance were crucified, had their legs broken, or were put to death in some cruel manner. When the sedition had lasted some time, and had attained a fearful height, the rulers, with Romanus, the general of the Egyptian troops, and Evagrius, the Alexandrian prefect,¹ hastened to the spot, and urged the people to obey the laws, to lay down their arms, and to give up the temple of Serapis. As their efforts, however, to reduce the people to submission were utterly in vain, they made known what had transpired to the emperor. Those who had shut themselves up in the temple of Serapis were averse to yield, from fear of the punishment that they knew would await their audacious proceedings, and they were further instigated to revolt by the inflammatory discourses of a man named Olympius, attired in the garments of a philosopher, who told them that they ought to die rather than neglect the gods of their fathers. Perceiving that they were greatly intimidated by the destruction of the idolatrous statues, he assured them that such a circumstance did not warrant their renouncing their religion; for that the statues were composed of corruptible materials, subject to decay; whereas, the powers which had dwelt within them, had flown to heaven. By such representations as these, he retained the multitude with him in the temple of Serapis.

When the emperor was informed of these occurrences, he

¹ ὕπαρχος. He held the office of Præfectus Augustalis, A. D. 391, and also that of Romanus Comes rei familiaris in the same year, as we learn from the Codex Theodosianus, Lex xi. de Paganis, &c.

declared that the Christians who had been slain were blessed, inasmuch as they had been admitted to the honour of martyrdom, and had suffered in defence of the faith. He offered free pardon¹ to those who had slain them, hoping that by this act of clemency they would be the more readily induced to embrace Christianity; and he commanded the demolition of the temples which had been the cause of the sedition. It is said that, when this edict was read in public, the Christians uttered loud shouts of joy, because the emperor laid the odium of what had occurred upon the Pagans. The people who were guarding the temple of Serapis were so terrified at hearing these shouts, that they took to flight, and the Christians immediately obtained possession of the spot, which they have retained ever since. I have been informed that, on the night preceding this occurrence, Olympius heard the voice of one singing hallelujah in the temple of Serapis.² The doors were shut, and as he could see no one, but could only hear the voice of the singer, he at once understood what the sign signified; and unknown to any one he quitted the temple and embarked for Italy. It is said that when the temple was being demolished, some stones were found, on which were hieroglyphic characters in the form of a cross, which, on being submitted to the inspection of the learned, were interpreted as signifying the life to come.³ These characters led to the conversion of several of the Pagans, as did likewise other inscriptions found in the same place, and which contained predictions of the destruction of the temple. It was thus that the temple of Serapis was converted into a church; it received the name of the emperor Arcadius.

There were still Pagans in many cities, who contended zealously in behalf of their temples; as, for instance, the inhabitants of Petræa and of Areopolis,⁴ in Arabia; of Raphi and Gaza, in Palestine; of Hieropolis, in Phœnicia; and of Apamea, on the river Axius, in Syria. I have been informed that the inhabitants of the last-named city often armed the men of

¹ The opinion of St. Augustine (Ep. 158, ad Marcellin.) is here quoted by Valesius; "lest the sufferings of the servants of God, which ought to be held in esteem in the church, be defiled by the blood of their enemies." See also below, the death of Marcellus of Apamea.

² It is to be observed that Sozomen reports this story only on hearsay.

³ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 17, and Rufinus, xi. 29.

⁴ Or, in the opinion of Valesius, Aëropolis, which place is mentioned by Eusebius as a town of Arabia.

noted on the "Martyr" Church at Eph. on Act. 1 of the
 this even. Synod, this sup. 'ff.

Galilee, and the peasants of Lebanon, in defence of their temples; and that they even carried their audacity to such a height, as to slay a bishop named Marcellus. This bishop had commanded the demolition of all the temples in the city and neighbouring villages, under the supposition that more efficient means of deterring the people from the observance of their ancient superstitions could not be devised. Having heard that there was a very spacious temple at Aulone, a district of Apamea, he repaired thither with a body of soldiers and gladiators. He stationed himself at a distance from the scene of conflict, beyond the reach of the arrows; for he was afflicted with the gout, and was unable either to fight, or to effect an escape in case of defeat. Whilst the soldiers and gladiators were engaged in the assault against the temple, some Pagans, discovering that he was alone, hastened to the place where he was awaiting the issue of the combat, seized him, and burnt him alive. The perpetrators of this deed were not then known, but, in course of time, they were detected, and the sons of Marcellus determined upon avenging his death. The council of the province, however, prohibited them from executing this design, and declared that it was not just that the relatives or friends of Marcellus should seek to avenge his death; when they should rather return thanks to God, for having accounted him worthy to die in such a cause.

CHAP. XVI.—IN WHAT MANNER, AND FROM WHAT CAUSE, THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESBYTER, APPOINTED TO PRESIDE OVER THE IMPOSITION OF PENANCE, WERE ABOLISHED. DISSERTATION ON THE MODE OF IMPOSING PENANCE.

NECTARIUS, about this period, abolished the office of the presbyter whose duty it was to preside over the imposition of penance; and this is the first instance of the suppression of this office in the church.¹ This example was followed by the bishops of every region. Various accounts have been given of the nature, the origin, and the cause of the abolition of this office. I shall state my own views on the subject. Impeccability is a Divine attribute, and belongs not to human nature;

¹ Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 19.

therefore God has decreed that pardon should be extended to the patient, even after many transgressions. As in supplicating for pardon,¹ it is requisite to confess the sin, it seems probable that the priests, from the beginning, considered it irksome to make this confession in public, before the whole assembly of the people. They therefore appointed a presbyter, of the utmost sanctity, and the most undoubted prudence, to act on these occasions; the penitents went to him, and confessed their transgressions; and it was his office to indicate the kind of penance adapted to each sin, and then, when satisfaction had been made, to pronounce absolution. As the custom of doing penance never gained ground among the Novatians, regulations of this nature were, of course, unnecessary among them; but the custom prevailed among all other religious sects, and exists even to the present day. It is observed with great rigour by the Western churches,² particularly at Rome, where there is a place appropriated to the reception of penitents, where they stand and mourn until the completion of the solemn services, from which they are excluded; then they cast themselves, with groans and lamentations, prostrate on the ground. The bishop conducts the ceremony, sheds tears, and prostrates himself in like manner;³ and all the people burst into tears, and groan aloud. Afterwards, the bishop rises from the ground, and raises up the others; he offers up prayer on behalf of the penitents, and then dismisses them. Each of the penitents subjects himself in private to voluntary suffering, either by fastings, by abstaining from the bath or from divers kinds of meats, or by other prescribed means, until a certain period appointed by

See!

¹ ἐν τῷ παραίτησθαι. Christopherson renders these words, "in order to obtain pardon," but, as Valesius observes, this must be incorrect. The passage is doubtless corrupt: we have endeavoured to give the simplest meaning.

² Hence it is inferred that it was Sozomen's opinion that it was customary in the West to have a presbyter appointed by the bishop as Pœnitentiarius: but it is remarkable that no mention is made of such an ecclesiastical officer in the early councils of the church, or in the canons which they promulgated.

³ This (observes Valesius) was the ancient custom of the Roman church, that the bishop, in conducting the ceremony of absolution, should prostrate himself upon the ground in the presence of the penitents; and a second time when he reconciled them. This is supported by the ancient "Ordo Romanus," which, though of more recent date than the days of Sozomen, preserves many vestiges of an earlier antiquity.

the bishop. When this time arrives, he is made free from the consequences of his sin, and is permitted to resume his place in the assemblies of the church. The Roman priests have carefully observed this custom from the beginning to the present time. At Constantinople, a presbyter was always appointed to preside over the penitents, until a lady of illustrious birth made a deposition to the effect, that when she resorted as a penitent to the presbyter, to fast and offer supplications to God, and tarried, for that purpose, in the church, a rape had been committed on her person by the deacon. Great displeasure was manifested by the people when this occurrence was made known to them, on account of the discredit that would result to the church; and the priests, in particular, were thereby greatly scandalized. Nectarius, after much hesitation as to what means ought to be adopted, deposed the deacon; and, at the advice of certain persons, who urged the necessity of leaving each individual to examine himself before participating in the sacred mysteries, he abolished the office of the presbyter presiding over penance. From that period, therefore, the performance of penance fell into disuse; and it seems to me, that extreme laxity of principle was thus substituted for the severity and rigour of antiquity. Under the ancient system, I think, offences were of rarer occurrence; for people were deterred from their commission, by the dread of confessing them, and of exposing them to the scrutiny of a severe judge. I believe it was from similar considerations, that the emperor Theodosius, who was always zealous in promoting the glory of the church, issued a law,¹ enacting that women should not be admitted into the ministry, unless they had had children, and were upwards of sixty years of age, according to the precept of the apostle Paul.² By this law it was also decreed, that women who had shaved their heads should be ejected from the churches; and that the bishop by whom such women were admitted, should be deposed.

see that hits
Lex 27, Codicis Theodos. de Episcopis et Clericis.

Lex 27, Codicis Theodos. de Episcopis et Clericis.
² 1 Tim. v. 9. Compare Justinian Novell. 123, ch. 13.

CHAP. XVII.—BANISHMENT OF EUNOMIUS BY THEODOSIUS THE GREAT. HERESIES OF HIS SUCCESSOR THEOPHRONIUS, OF EUTYCHUS, AND OF DOROTHEUS. DIVISIONS AMONG THE ARIANS.

SUCH subjects as the above, however, are best left to the decision of individual judgment.

The emperor, about this period, condemned Eunomius to banishment.¹ This heretic had fixed his residence in the suburbs of Constantinople,² and held frequent assemblies in private houses, where he read his own writings. He induced many to embrace his sentiments, so that the sectarians who were named after him, became very numerous. He died not long after his banishment, and was interred at Dacora, his birth-place, a village of Cappadocia, situated near Mount Argeus, in the territory of Cæsarea. Theophronius, who was also a native of Cappadocia, and who had been his disciple, continued to promulgate his doctrines. Having given some attention to the writings of Aristotle, he composed an appendix to them, which he entitled "Exercises for the Mind." But he afterwards engaged, I have understood, in many unprofitable disputations, and soon ceased to confine himself to the doctrines of his master. Under the assumption of being deeply versed in the terms of Scripture, he attempted to prove that though God is acquainted with the present, the past, and the future, his knowledge on these subjects is not the same in degree, and is subject to some kind of mutation. As this hypothesis appeared positively absurd to the Eunomians, they excommunicated him from their church; and he constituted himself the leader of a new sect, called, after his own name, Theophronians. Not long after, Eutychus, one of the Eunomians, originated another sect at Constantinople, to which his own name was given. For the question having been proposed, as to whether the Son of God is or is not acquainted with the day and hour of the last judgment, the words of the evangelist were quoted, in which it is stated, that the day and hour are known only to the Father. Eutychus, however, contended that this knowledge belongs also to the Son, inasmuch as he has received all things from the Father. The Eunomian bishops, having condemned this opinion, he seceded from com-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 10, 20, 23, 24.

² Or, rather, at Chalcedon.

munions with them, and went to join Eunomius, in his place of banishment. A deacon, and some other individuals who had been despatched from Constantinople to accuse Eutychus, and, if necessary, to oppose him, arrived first at the place of destination. When Eunomius was made acquainted with the object of their journey, he expressed himself in favour of the sentiments propounded by Eutychus; and on his arrival, prayed with him, although it was not customary to pray with any one who travels unprovided with letters written in secret characters, attesting his being in communion. Eunomius died soon after this contention; and the Eunomian bishop, at Constantinople, refused to receive Eutychus into communion, from envy and jealousy at the part he had enacted in the late controversy; more especially as he held no rank among the clergy. Eutychus, therefore, formed those who had espoused his sentiments into a separate sect. Many assert that he and Theophrastus were the first who propounded the peculiar views entertained by the Eunomians concerning the rite of baptism. The above is a brief account of such details, as I have been able to ascertain, concerning the disputes of the Eunomians. I should be prolix were I to enter into further particulars; and, indeed, the subject would be by no means an easy one to me.

The following question was, in the mean time, agitated among the Arians of Constantinople:—Prior to the existence of the Son (whom they regard as having proceeded out of nothing) is God to be termed the Father? Dorotheus, who had been summoned from Antioch to rule over them in the place of Marinus, was of opinion that God could not have been called the Father prior to the existence of the Son, because the name of Father has a necessary connexion with that of Son. Marinus, on the other hand, maintained that the Father was the Father even when the Son existed not; and he advanced this opinion either from conviction, or else from the desire of contention, and from jealousy at the preference that had been shown to Dorotheus. The Arians were thus divided into two parties; Dorotheus and his followers retained possession of the houses of prayer, while Marinus and those who seceded with him erected new edifices in which to hold their assemblies. The names of Psathyrians and of Goths were given to the partisans of Marinus; Psathyrians, because

what is margined in this chapter on this page had on page 339 referred to on the next page. on "God was not always a Father, this

179.
179.

Theoctistes, a certain vendor of cakes (*ψαθροπώλης*) was a zealous advocate of their opinions; and Goths, because their sentiments were approved by Selinus, bishop of that nation. All these barbarians followed the instructions of Selinus, who had formerly been the secretary of Ulphilas, and had succeeded him as bishop. He was capable of preaching, not only in the vernacular, but also in the Greek language.

Soon after, a contest for precedency arose between Marinus and Agasius, whom Marinus himself had ordained over the Arians at Ephesus; and, in the quarrel which ensued, the Goths took the part of Agasius. It is said, that many of the Arian clergy of that city were so much irritated at the ambition displayed by these two bishops, that they seceded from them, and joined the Catholic church. Such was the origin of the division of the Arians into two factions—a division which still subsists; so that, in every city, they have separate places of meeting. The Arians of Constantinople, however, after a separation of thirty-five years, were reconciled to each other by Plinthus, formerly a consul,¹ general of the cavalry and infantry; a man possessed of great influence at court. To prevent the revival of the former dissension among them, the question which had been the cause of the division was forbidden to be mooted.

CHAP. XVIII.—ANOTHER HERESY ORIGINATED BY THE NOVA-TIANS. DIGRESSION CONCERNING THE FESTIVAL OF EASTER.

A DIVISION arose during the same reign among the Novatians,² concerning the celebration of the festival of Easter; and from this dispute originated another, called the Sabbatian. Sabbatius, who, with Theoctistes and Macarius, had been ordained presbyter by Marcian, adopted the opinion of the priests, who had been converted at Pazacoma during the reign of Valens, and maintained that the feast of the Passover (Easter) ought to be celebrated by Christians in the same manner, and on the same day, as by the Jews. He seceded from communion for the purpose of exercising greater austerity, for he professed to adopt a very austere mode of life. He also declared, that one motive of his secession was, that many persons who par-

¹ He held the consulate A. D. 418, or 419.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 21, 22.

See margin of p. 339.

Chief of the collection of Socrates and Sozomenus

participated in the mysteries appeared to him to be unworthy of the honour. When, however, his design of introducing innovations was detected, Marcian expressed his regret at having ordained him; and, it is said, was often heard to exclaim, that he would rather have laid his hands upon thorns than upon the head of Sabbatius. Perceiving that the people of his diocese were being rent into two factions, Marcian summoned all the bishops of his own persuasion to Sangara, a town of Bithynia, near the sea-shore, not far from the city of Helenopolis. When Sabbatius appeared before them they inquired into the grievances which had been the cause of his secession; and as he merely complained of the diversity of customs prevailing in regard to the observance of the Paschal feast, they inferred that he advanced this complaint as a pretext to disguise his real motives, and, suspecting that he was mainly actuated by the ambition of obtaining a bishopric, they made him declare upon oath that he would never accept the episcopal office. When he had taken the required oath, all the members of the assembly declared themselves of opinion that the difference prevailing in the mode of celebrating the Paschal feast, ought by no means to be made an occasion of schism, or cessation from communion; and they decided that each individual should be at liberty to observe the feast according to his own judgment. They enacted a decree on the subject, which they styled the "Indifferent (*ἀδιάφορος*) Decree." Such were the transactions of the assembly at Sangara. From that period, Sabbatius adhered to the usages of the Jews; and as the Christians did not observe the paschal feast on the same day as the Jews, he was a day in advance of them. He fasted according to custom, and celebrated the feast with the usual ceremonies by himself. He passed the Saturday from the evening to the appointed time, in watching and in offering up the prescribed prayers, and on the following day he assembled with the multitude, and partook of the mysteries. This mode of observing the feast was at first unnoticed by the people, but as, in process of time, it began to attract observation, and to become more generally known, he found a great many imitators, particularly in Phrygia and Galatia. Eventually, he openly seceded from communion, and became the bishop of those who had espoused his sentiments, as we shall have occasion to show in the proper place.

25. 225, on the paschal festival, this 17. 89.

I am, for my own part, astonished that Sabbatius and his followers attempted to introduce this innovation; the ancient Hebrews, as is related by Eusebius,¹ on the testimony of Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus, and several others, celebrated the Passover after the vernal equinox, when the sun is in the first sign of the Zodiac, called by the Greeks, the Ram; and when the moon is in the opposite quarter of the heavens, and in the fourteenth day of her age. Even the Novatians themselves, who have studied the subject with some accuracy, declare that the founder of their sect and his first disciples did not follow this custom, which was introduced, for the first time, by those who assembled at Pazacoma; and that at Rome, the members of this sect still observe the same practice as the Romans, who have never deviated from their original usage in this particular; the custom having been handed down to them by the holy apostles Peter and Paul. Further, the Samaritans, who are scrupulous observers of the laws of Moses, never celebrate this festival till the first-fruits have reached maturity; it is hence called the Feast of First-Fruits, and cannot, therefore, necessarily have been observed till after the vernal equinox. Hence arises my astonishment, that those who profess to adopt the Jewish custom in the celebration of this feast, do not conform to the ancient practice of the Jews. With the exception of the people above mentioned, and the Quartodecimani of Asia, all other sects, I believe, celebrate the Passover in the same manner as the Romans and the Egyptians. The Quartodecimani are so called, because they observe this festival, like the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon. The Novatians observe the day of the resurrection. They follow the custom of the Jews and the Quartodecimani, except when the fourteenth day of the moon falls upon the first day of the ~~Sabbath~~ ^{week}; in which case, they celebrate the feast so many days after the Jews as there are intervening days between the fourteenth day of the moon and the following Lord's day. The Montanists, who are called Pepuzites and Phrygians, celebrate the Passover according to a mode of their own devising. They blame those who regulate the time of observing the feast according to the course of the moon, and affirm that it is right to attend exclusively to the revolutions of the sun. They

¹ See Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. vii. 32.

reckon each month to consist of thirty days,¹ and account the day after the vernal equinox as the first day of the year; which, according to the Roman method of computation, would be called the ninth day before the calends of April. It was on this day, they say, that the two great luminaries appointed for the indication of times and of years were created. This they prove by the fact, that every eight years the sun and the moon meet together in the same point of the heavens. The moon's cycle of eight years is accomplished in ninety-nine months, and in two thousand nine hundred and twenty-two days; and during that time there are eight revolutions made by the sun, each comprising three hundred and sixty-five days, and the fourth part of a day. For they compute the day of the creation of the sun, mentioned in Sacred Writ, to have been the fourteenth day of the moon, occurring after the ninth day before the calends of the month of April, and answering to the eighth day prior to the ides of the same month. They always celebrate the Passover on this day,² when it falls on the day of the resurrection; otherwise, they celebrate it on the following Lord's day; for it is written, according to their assertion, that the feast may be held on any day between the fourteenth and the twenty-first.

CHAP. XIX.—DISSERTATION ON THE VARIOUS CUSTOMS, PREVALENT AMONG DIFFERENT CHURCHES AND NATIONS.

WE have now described the various usages that prevailed in the celebration of the Passover.³ It appears to me that Victor, bishop of Rome, and Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, came to a very wise decision on the controversy that had arisen among them.⁴ For as the bishops of the West considered it right to adhere to the tradition handed down to them by Peter and by Paul; and as, on the other hand, the Asiatic bishops

¹ Usher, in his learned treatise "de anno solari Macedonum et Asianorum," chap. 2, asserts that Sozomen is mistaken here.

² Valesius points out that Usher has good reason for doubting the assertion of Sozomen in this point also: and in his own support he quotes Tertullian de Jejun. ch. 14, to which we must refer the reader.

³ With this chapter the reader will do well to compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 22.

⁴ See Pearson de Success. Rom. Pontif. ii. 19.

persisted in following the rules laid down by John the evangelist, they unanimously agreed to continue in the observance of the festival according to their respective customs, without abstaining from communion with each other. They very justly reflected, that it would be absurd to render a mere point of discipline a ground of schism between those who were bound to each other by the profession of the same faith. Different customs prevail in many churches, where the same doctrines are received. There are, for instance, many cities in Syria, which possess but one bishop between them; whereas, in other nations, a bishop is appointed even over a village, as I have myself observed in Arabia, and in Cyprus; and among the Novatians and Montanists, of Phrygia. Again, there are but seven deacons at Rome, answering precisely to the number ordained by the apostles, of whom Stephen was the first martyr; whereas, in other churches, the number of deacons is unlimited. At Rome, hallelujah¹ is sung once annually,² namely, on the first day of the festival of the Passover; so that it is a common thing among the Romans to swear by the fact of hearing or singing this hymn. In this city, the people are not taught by the bishop, nor by any one in the church.³ At Alexandria, the bishop alone teaches the people; and it is said that this custom has prevailed there ever since the days of Arius, who, though but a presbyter, broached a new doctrine. Another custom also prevails at Alexandria, which I have never witnessed nor heard of elsewhere; and this is, that when the Gospel is read, the bishop does not rise from his seat. The archdeacon alone reads the Gospel in this city, whereas in some places it is read by the deacons, and in others only by the presbyters; while in many churches, it is read on stated days by the bishops; as, for instance, at Constantinople, on the first day of the festival of the resurrection.⁴ In some churches, the

¹ See Augustine on Ps. cvi. and cxlviii.

² Baronius, Annal. A. D. 384, condemns this assertion as untrue; but Valesius considers his arguments insufficient.

³ It is probable that sermons, homilies, or discourses were not delivered at this early date. Those of Popes Leo and Gregory were more recent; and Valesius considers that they were the earliest that were ever preached in Rome. He remarks that the verb *διδάσκειν* is used technically concerning this kind of teaching.

⁴ Nicephorus (xii. 34) declares that this custom lasted down to his own day; and that it was practised also on the 1st of January, as well as at Easter.

interval, called Quadragesima, which occurs before this festival, and is devoted by the people to fasting, is made to consist of six weeks; and this is the case in Illyria, and the Western regions, in Libya, throughout Egypt, and in Palestine: whereas it is made to comprise seven weeks at Constantinople, and in the neighbouring provinces, as far as Phœnicia. In some churches, the people fast three alternate weeks, during the space of six or seven weeks; whereas in others, they fast continuously, during the three weeks immediately preceding the festival. Some people, as the Montanists, only fast two weeks. Assemblies are not held in all churches on the same day, or upon the same occasions. The people of Constantinople, and of several other cities, assemble together on the sabbath, as well as on the next day; which custom is never observed at Rome, or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usages established elsewhere, the people meet together on sabbath evenings; and although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited, nor the same passages read on the same occasions, in all churches. Thus the book entitled "The Apocalypse of Peter," which was considered spurious by the ancients, is still read in some of the churches of Palestine, on the day of preparation, when the people observe a fast in memory of the passion of the Saviour. So the work entitled "The Apocalypse of the Apostle Paul," though rejected by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. Some persons affirm that the book was found during this reign, by Divine revelation, in a marble box, buried beneath the soil, in the house of Paul, at Tarsus, in Cilicia. I have been informed that this report is false by a presbyter of Tarsus, a man of very advanced age, as is indicated by his grey hairs. He says that the rumour was probably devised by heretics. What I have said upon this subject must now suffice. Many other customs are still to be observed in cities and villages: and those who have been brought up in their observance would, from respect to the great men who instituted and perpetuated these customs, consider it wrong to abolish them. Similar motives must be attributed to those who observe different practices in the celebration of the feast, which has led us into this long digression.

Referred to on the same
 time 20, 3, 8 & 9.

CHAP. XX.—EXTENSION OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. DEMOLITION OF TEMPLES. INUNDATION OF THE NILE.

THE dissensions among heretics contributed greatly to the extension of the church ; which was daily increased by the accession of malcontents from the heretics, and of converts from the Pagan multitudes. The emperor having observed that the practice of idolatry had been greatly promoted by the facility of constant ingress and egress to and from the temple, directed the entrances of all temples to be closed ; and eventually he commanded the total demolition of these edifices. When the Pagans found themselves deprived of their own houses of prayer, they began to frequent our churches ; for they did not dare to offer sacrifices in secret, there being a law prohibiting the practice, under the penalty of death and of confiscation of property.

It is said that the river of Egypt did not overflow its banks this year at the proper season, and that the Egyptians angrily ascribed this circumstance to the laws that had been enacted, prohibiting sacrifices from being offered to it. The governor of the province, apprehensive lest the general discontent should terminate in sedition, sent a message to the emperor on the subject. But the emperor, far from attaching more importance to the temporary fertility produced by the Nile, than to the fidelity he owed to God and the interests of religion, replied as follows : “ Let the river cease to flow, if enchantments are requisite to insure the regularity of its course ; or if it delights in sacrifices, or if blood must be mingled with the waters that derive their source from the paradise of God.” Soon afterwards, the Nile overflowed its banks with such violence, that the highest eminences were submerged. The fears of drought and scarcity that had prevailed throughout Egypt, were now converted into dread lest the city of Alexandria and part of Libya should be destroyed by the inundation. The Pagans of Alexandria, irritated at this unexpected occurrence, exclaimed in derision at the public theatres, that the river, like an old man or fool, could not moderate its proceedings. Many of the Egyptians were hence induced to abandon the superstitions of their forefathers, and embrace Christianity.

CHAP. XXI.—DISCOVERY OF THE HEAD OF THE PRECURSOR OF OUR LORD.

ABOUT this period, the head of John the Baptist, which Herodias had asked of Herod the tetrarch, was removed to Constantinople.¹ It is said that it was discovered by some monks of the Macedonian persuasion, who originally dwelt at Constantinople, and afterwards fixed their abode in Cilicia. Mardonius, the first eunuch of the palace, made known this discovery at court, during the preceding reign; and Valens commanded that the relic should be removed to Constantinople. The officers appointed to convey it thither, placed it in a public chariot, and proceeded with it as far as Pantichium, a district in the territory of Chalcedonia. Here the mules of the chariot suddenly stopped; and neither the application of the lash, nor any of the other means that were devised, could induce them to advance further. So extraordinary an event was considered by all, and even by the emperor himself, to be of God; and the holy head was therefore deposited at Cosila, a village in the neighbourhood, which belonged to Mardonius. Soon after, the emperor Theodosius, impelled by an impulse from God, or from the prophet, repaired to the village. He determined upon removing the remains of the Baptist, and it is said met with no opposition, except from a holy virgin, who had been intrusted with the care of the relic. He laid aside all authority and force, and after many entreaties, extorted a reluctant consent from her to remove the head; for she bore in mind what had occurred at the period when Valens commanded its removal. The emperor placed it, with the box in which it was encased, in his purple robe, and conveyed it to a place called Hebdoma, in the suburbs of Constantinople, where he erected a spacious and magnificent church. The woman who had been appointed to the charge of the relic, could not be persuaded by the emperor to renounce her religious sentiments, although he had recourse to entreaty and promises; for she was, it appears, a Macedonian. A presbyter of the same sect, named Vincent, who also took charge of the remains of the prophet, and performed the sacerdotal functions

¹ Valesius is far from satisfied as to the truth of this story. It rests, as he observes, on the statement of a certain Archimandite, named Marcellus, and there is a discrepancy as to the time at which it occurred.

over it,¹ followed the religious opinions of the emperor, and entered into communion with the Catholic church. He had taken an oath, as the Macedonians affirm, never to swerve from the doctrines of his religion; but he afterwards openly declared, that if the Baptist would follow the emperor, he also would enter into communion with him. He was a Persian, and had left his country in company with a relative named Abdus, during the reign of Constantius, in order to avoid the persecution which the Christians were then suffering in Persia. On his arrival in the Roman territories he was placed in the ranks of the clergy, and appointed a presbyter. Abdus married, and rendered great services to the church. He left a son, named Auxentius, who was noted for his piety, his benevolence, the sanctity of his life, and the greatness of his attainments in Grecian and ecclesiastical literature. He was modest and retiring in deportment, although admitted to familiarity with the emperor and the courtiers, and possessed of a very illustrious appointment. His memory is still revered by the monks and ascetics, who were well acquainted with him. The woman who had been intrusted with the relic, remained during the rest of her life at Cosila. She was greatly distinguished by her piety and wisdom, and instructed many holy virgins, and I have been assured that, even at the present day, their virtue reflects honour on their instructress.

CHAP. XXII.—DEATH OF VALENTINIAN. TYRANNY OF EUGENIUS. PROPHECY OF JOHN, A MONK OF THEBAIS.

WHILE Theodosius was thus occupied in the wise and peaceful government of his subjects, and in the service of God, intelligence was brought that Valentinian had been strangled.² Some say that he was put to death by the eunuchs at the solicitation of Arbogastes, a military chief, and of certain courtiers, who were displeased because the young prince had begun to walk in the footsteps of his father, and had adopted a system of government of which they disapproved.

¹ Valesius here observes on the antiquity of the custom of placing the relics of saints and martyrs beneath the altars of churches.

² Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 25.

Others assert, however, that Valentinian committed the fatal deed with his own hands, because he found himself impeded from the gratification of the impetuous passions of his age by the authority of those around him, who did not permit him to act according to the dictates of his own will. It is said that he was handsome in person, and of a good disposition, and that, had he lived to the age of manhood, he would have shown himself worthy of holding the reins of empire, and would have surpassed his father in magnanimity and justice. But though endowed with these promising qualities, he died in the manner above related.

A certain man, named Eugenius, who was by no means sincere in his profession of Christianity, aspired to sovereignty, and seized the symbols of imperial power. It is thought that his ambition was excited by the predictions of individuals who professed to foresee the future by the examination of the entrails of animals and the course of the stars. Men of the highest rank among the Romans were addicted to these superstitions. Flavian, then a prætorian prefect, a learned and an able man, was noted for being conversant with every means of foretelling the future.¹ He persuaded Eugenius to take up arms by assuring him that he was destined to the throne, that his warlike undertakings would be crowned with victory, and that the Christian religion would be abolished. Deceived by these flattering representations, Eugenius raised an army and took possession of the Julian Alps, an elevated and precipitous range of mountains, among which was a very narrow passage leading into Italy. Theodosius was perplexed as to whether he ought to wait the issue of the war, or whether it would be better in the first place to attack Eugenius; and in this dilemma he determined to consult John, a monk of Thebais, who, as I have before stated, was celebrated for his knowledge of the future. He, therefore, sent Eutropius, a eunuch of tried fidelity, to Egypt, with orders to bring John, if possible, to court; but, in case of his refusal, to question him on the results of the war. The monk could not be persuaded to go to the emperor, but he sent word by Eutropius that the war would terminate in favour of Theodosius, and that the tyrant would

¹ Valesius observes that Sozomen has borrowed this story from Rufinus, Eccl. Hist. xi. 33.

be slain ; but that, after the victory, Theodosius himself would die in Italy. The truth of both these predictions was confirmed by events.

CHAP. XXIII.—EXACTION OF TRIBUTE IN ANTIOCH. DEMOLITION OF THE STATUES OF THE EMPEROR. EMBASSY HEADED BY FLAVIAN THE ARCHBISHOP.

THE continuance of the war having compelled the rulers to impose fresh taxes on the people, a sedition was excited at Antioch in Syria ;¹ the statues of the emperor and of the empress were thrown down and dragged through the city, and, as is usual on such occasions, the enraged multitude uttered every insulting epithet that passion could suggest. The emperor, determining to avenge this insult by the death of the principal conspirators, the whole city was filled with terror at the announcement of his intended vengeance. The rage of the citizens had subsided, and had given place to repentance ; and, as if already subjected to the threatened punishment, they abandoned themselves to grief and lamentation, and sang psalms of supplication to God to turn away the anger of the emperor. They deputed Flavian their bishop on an embassy to Theodosius, but on his arrival, finding that the resentment of the emperor at what had occurred was unabated, he had recourse to the following artifice. He caused some young men to sing the psalms of supplication and contrition at the table of the emperor, which the inhabitants of Antioch had composed in reference to their condition. It is said that the compassion of the emperor was excited ; his wrath was subdued, and as his heart yearned over the city, he shed tears on the cup which he held in his hand. It is reported, that on the night before the sedition occurred, a spectre was seen in the form of a woman of prodigious height and terrible aspect, pacing through the city with a whip in her hand, similar to that which is used in goading on the beasts brought forward at the public theatres. It might have been inferred that the sedition was excited by the agency of some evil and malicious demon. There is no doubt but that much bloodshed would have ensued, had not

¹ Sozomen, as Valesius observes, is wrong in the date which he assigns to this sedition. Theodoret, however, (Eccl. Hist. v. 20,) agrees with him. Baronius shows that it occurred A. D. 388.

the wrath of the emperor been stayed by his respect for the entreaties of a bishop.

CHAP. XXIV.—VICTORY OF THEODOSIUS OVER EUGENIUS.

WHEN he had completed his preparations for war, Theodosius declared his younger son Honorius emperor, and leaving him to reign at Constantinople conjointly with Arcadius, who had previously been appointed emperor, he departed from the West at the head of his troops. His army consisted not only of Roman soldiers, but of bands of barbarians from the banks of the Danube. It is said that on his arrival at Constantinople, he went to the church which he had erected at Hebdoma in honour of John the Baptist, and in his name prayed that success might attend the Roman arms, and besought the Baptist himself to aid him. After offering up these prayers he proceeded towards Italy, and crossed the Alps. On descending from the heights of these mountains, he perceived a plain before him, covered with infantry and cavalry, and became at the same time aware that some of the enemy's troops were lying in ambush behind him, among the recesses of the mountains. The advance guard of his army attacked the infantry stationed in the plain, and a desperate and very doubtful conflict ensued. At this juncture, the troops in ambuscade appeared on the point of attacking the army behind, and seeing that all chances of escape would thus be cut off, and that his position was one of imminent peril, and beyond the intervention of human aid, the emperor prostrated himself on the ground, and besought with tears the assistance of God. His request was instantly granted, for the officers of the troops stationed in ambush sent to offer him their services as his allies, provided that he would assign them honourable posts in his army. As he had neither paper nor ink within reach, he took up some tablets, and wrote on them the high appointments he would confer upon them, provided that they would fulfil their promise to him. Under these conditions, they ranged themselves under the imperial standard. Even after this reinforcement, the issue of the combat still remained uncertain, when a wind of unheard-of violence suddenly arose, and blew right in the face of the enemy. Their darts were

blown back upon themselves, and their bucklers were wrenched from them and rolled in the dust. Standing thus exposed in a defenceless condition to the weapons of the Romans, many of them perished, while the few who attempted to effect an escape were soon captured. Eugenius threw himself at the feet of the emperor, and implored him to spare his life; but, while in the act of offering up these entreaties, a soldier struck off his head. Arbogastes fled after the battle, and fell by his own hands. It is said that while the battle was being fought, a demoniac presented himself in the temple of Hebdoma where the emperor had engaged in prayer, and insulted John the Baptist, taunting him with having had his head cut off, and shouted the following words: "You conquer me, and lay snares for my army." The persons who happened to be on the spot, and who were waiting impatiently to learn the issue of the war, wrote an account of this extraordinary circumstance on the day that it occurred, and afterwards ascertained that it was the same day as that on which the battle had been fought. Such is the history of these transactions.

CHAP. XXV.—INTREPID BEARING OF ST. AMBROSE IN THE PRESENCE OF THE EMPEROR. MASSACRE AT THESSALONICA.

AFTER the death of Eugenius, the emperor went to Milan, and repaired towards the church to pray within its walls. When he drew near the gates of the edifice, he was met by Ambrose, the bishop of the city, who took hold of him by his purple robe, and said to him, in the presence of the multitude, "Stand back! a man defiled by sin, and with hands imbrued in blood unjustly shed, is not worthy, without repentance, to enter within these sacred precincts, or partake of the holy mysteries." The emperor, struck with admiration at the boldness of the bishop, began to reflect on his own conduct, and, with much contrition, retraced his steps. The crime alluded to had been committed under the following circumstances. A charioteer had made a declaration of obscene passion to Buthericus,¹ a military chief of Illyria, and had in consequence been committed to prison. Some time after, some magnificent races were to be held at the hippodrome, and

¹ Sozomen is mistaken here. See Baronius, Annal. A. D. 390.

the populace of Thessalonica demanded the release of the prisoner, considering him necessary to the celebration of the games. As their request was not attended to, they rose up in sedition and slew Buthericus. On hearing of this deed, the wrath of the emperor was excited to a fearful height, and he commanded that a certain number of the citizens should be put to death. The whole city was deluged with blood unjustly shed, for strangers, who had but just arrived there on their journey to other lands, were sacrificed with the others. There were many cases of suffering well worthy of commiseration, of which the following is an instance. A merchant offered himself to be slain as a substitute for his two sons who had both been selected as victims, and promised the soldiers to give them all the gold he possessed, on condition of their effecting the exchange. They could not but compassionate his misfortune, and consented to take him as a substitute for one of his sons, but declared that they did not dare to let off both the young men, as that would render the appointed number of the slain incomplete. The father gazed on his sons and wept bitterly, and loving them both equally, he could not make choice between them; he was still standing irresolute, and utterly unable to decide, when they were both slain before his eyes. I have also been informed, that a faithful slave voluntarily offered to die instead of his master, who was being led to the place of execution. It appears that it was for these and other acts of cruelty that Ambrose rebuked the emperor, forbade him to enter the church, and excommunicated him. Theodosius publicly confessed his sin in the church, and during the time set apart for penance, refrained from wearing his imperial ornaments, as being inconsistent with a season of mourning. He also enacted a law¹ prohibiting the officers intrusted with the execution of the imperial mandates, from inflicting the punishment of death till thirty days after the mandate had been issued, in order that the wrath of the emperor might have time to be appeased, and that room might be made for the exercise of mercy and repentance.

Ambrose, no doubt, performed many other actions worthy of his priestly office, which are known only to the inhabitants of the country. Among the illustrious deeds that are attributed to him, I have been made acquainted with the following.

¹ See Baronius, Annal. A. D. 390.

It was the custom for the emperor to take a seat in assemblies of the church within the palisades of the altar, so that he sat apart from the rest of the people. Ambrose, considering that this custom had originated either from subserviency or from want of discipline, caused the emperor to be seated without the trellis work of the altar, so that he sat in front of the people, and behind the priests.¹ The emperor Theodosius approved of this wise alteration, as did likewise his successors; and we are told that it has been ever since scrupulously observed.

I think it necessary to mention another magnanimous action performed by this bishop. A Pagan of distinction insulted Gratian, affirming that he was unworthy of his father; and he was in consequence condemned to death. As he was being led out to execution, Ambrose went to the palace to implore a pardon. Gratian was then engaged in witnessing a private exhibition of horse-racing, for it was frequently the practice of the emperors to engage in these diversions at times that the public were excluded: the officers at the gates of the palace would not therefore interrupt him by informing him that Ambrose solicited an interview. On finding this to be the case, the bishop went to the circus, and entering with the persons who took charge of the animals, he made his way up to the emperor, and would not leave him till he had obtained a pardon for the man who had been condemned to death. Ambrose was very diligent in the observance of the canons of the church, and in maintaining discipline among his clergy. I have selected the above two incidents from among the records of his numerous magnanimous deeds, in order to show with what intrepidity he addressed those in power when the service of God was in question.

CHAP. XXVI.—ST. DONATUS, BISHOP OF EURŒA, AND THEOTIMUS, ARCHBISHOP OF SCYTHIA.

THERE were at this period many other bishops in various parts of the empire highly celebrated for their sanctity and high qualifications, of whom Donatus, bishop of Eurœa² in Epirus,

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. v. 18.

² We have emended the proper name according to the suggestion of Valesius.

[SOZOMEN.]

deserves to be particularly instanced. The inhabitants of the country relate many extraordinary miracles which he performed, of which the most remarkable seems to have been the destruction of a dragon of enormous size. It had stationed itself on the high road, at a place called Chamaigephyra, and devoured sheep, goats, oxen, horses, and men. Donatus attacked it unarmed, without sword, lance, or javelin; it raised its head, and was about to dart upon him, when Donatus made the sign of the cross with his finger in the air, and spat upon the dragon. The saliva entered its mouth, and it immediately expired. As it lay extended on the earth, it did not appear inferior in size to the noted serpent of India. I have been informed, that the people of the country yoked eight pair of oxen to transport the body to a neighbouring field, where they burnt it, that it might not during the process of decomposition corrupt the air, and generate disease. The tomb of this bishop is deposited in a magnificent house of prayer which bears his name. It is situated near a stream of water which God caused to rise from the ground, in answer to his prayer, in an arid spot where no water had previously existed. For it is said that one day, when on a journey, he had to pass through this locality, and, perceiving that his companions were suffering from thirst, he moved the soil with his hand and engaged in prayer; before his prayer was concluded, a spring of water arose from the ground which has never since been dried up. The inhabitants of Isoria, a village in the territory of Eurœa, bear testimony to the truth of this narration.

The church of Tomis, and indeed all the churches of Scythia, were at this period under the government of Theotimus. He had been brought up in the practice of philosophical asceticism, and his virtues had so won the admiration of the Huns, who dwelt on the banks of the Danube, that they called him the god of the Romans. It is said that one day, when travelling towards their country, he perceived at a distance some of these barbarous tribes advancing towards Tomis: his attendants burst forth into lamentations, and gave themselves up for lost; but he merely descended from horseback and prayed. The consequence was that the barbarians passed by without seeing him, his attendants, or the horses. As these tribes frequently devastated Scythia by their predatory incursions, he tried to subdue the ferocity of their disposition by presenting them

with food and gifts. One of the barbarians hence concluded that he was a man of wealth, and, determining to take him prisoner, leaned upon his shield, as was his custom when parleying with his enemies, and raised up his right hand in order to throw a rope which he firmly grasped over the bishop, for he intended to drag him away to his own country; but his arm, while extended in this position, became fixed and perfectly immoveable, until his companions had implored Theotimus to intercede with God for the removal of the invisible bonds.

It is said that Theotimus always retained the long hair which he wore when he first devoted himself to the practice of philosophy. He was very temperate, had no stated hours for his repasts, but ate and drank when compelled to do so by the calls of hunger and of thirst. I consider it to be the part of a philosopher to yield to the demands of these appetites from necessity, and not from the love of sensual gratification.

CHAP. XXVII.—PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF ST. EPIPHANIUS,
BISHOP OF CYPRUS.

EPIPHANIUS was at this period at the head of the metropolitan church of Cyprus.¹ He was celebrated, not only for his virtues and miraculous deeds during life, but also for the honour that was rendered to him by God after his death; for it is said that demons were expelled and diseases healed at his tomb. Many wonderful actions are attributed to him, of which the following is one of the most remarkable that has come to our knowledge. He was extremely liberal towards those who had suffered from shipwreck or any other calamity; and, after expending the whole of his own patrimony in the relief of such cases, he applied the treasures of the church to the same purpose. These treasures had been greatly increased by the donations of pious men of various provinces, who had been induced by their admiration of Eusebius to intrust him with the distribution of their alms during their lives, or to bequeath their property to him for this purpose at their death. It is said that on one occasion the treasurer, who was a godly man, discovered that the revenues of the church had been nearly drained; and so little remained in the treasury, that he con-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 14.

sidered it his duty to rebuke the bishop for his extensive liberality. Epiphanius, however, having, notwithstanding these remonstrances, given away the small sum that had remained, a stranger went to the treasurer and placed in his hands a bag filled with gold. As it is very seldom that such liberality is practised in secret, the whole transaction was regarded as the work of God.

I shall now relate another miracle that is attributed to Epiphanius. I have heard that a similar action has been related of Gregory, formerly bishop of Neocæsarea; and I see no reason to doubt the veracity of the account: but it does not disprove the authenticity of the miracle attributed to Epiphanius. Peter, the apostle, was not the only man who raised another from the dead; John, the evangelist, wrought a similar miracle at Ephesus, as did likewise the daughters of Philip at Hierapolis. Similar actions have been performed in different ages by the men of God. The miracle which I wish to instance is the following. Two beggars, having ascertained when Epiphanius would pass that way, agreed to extract a larger donation than usual from him by having recourse to stratagem; as soon as the bishop was seen approaching, one of the beggars flung himself on the ground and simulated death; the other uttered loud lamentations, deploring the loss of his companion, and his own inability to procure him the rite of sepulture. Epiphanius prayed to God that the deceased might rest in peace: he gave the survivor sufficient money for the interment, and said to him, "Take measures, my son, for the burial of your companion, and weep no more; he cannot now arise from the dead; the calamity was inevitable, therefore you ought to bear it with resignation." Saying these words, the bishop departed from the spot. As soon as there was no one in sight, the beggar, who had addressed Epiphanius, touched the other with his foot, as he lay extended on the ground, and said to him, "You have well performed your part; arise now, for through your labour we have a good provision for to-day." He, however, returned no answer to this address, and as he appeared incapable of speech or motion, the other beggar ran after Epiphanius, wept, and tore his hair, confessed the deception that had been practised, and besought him to restore the dead man to life. Epiphanius merely exhorted him to submit with patience to the catastrophe, and sent him away.

God did not raise the dead beggar to life, because, I feel persuaded, it was his design to show that those who practise deception on his servants, are accounted as guilty of the fraud as if it had been perpetrated against him who sees all, and who hears all.

CHAP. XXVIII.—VIRTUES OF ACACIUS, BISHOP OF BERCEA, OF ZENO, AND OF AJAX.

ACACIUS, who was at this period bishop of Bercea in Syria, rendered himself very conspicuous by his virtues. Many wonderful actions are ascribed to him. He was from his youth brought up to the profession of ascetic monasticism, and was rigid in observing all the regulations of this mode of life. When he was raised to the bishopric, he kept his house open at all hours of the day, so that the citizens and strangers were always free to enter, even when he was at meals or at repose. This course of conduct is, in my opinion, very admirable; it might have emanated from his perfect confidence in his own rectitude; or possibly he might have been led to seek the presence of others, in order to be always on his guard against those infirmities to which all men are liable, and perhaps from fear lest he should be unawares tempted to any action inconsistent with his profession.

Zeno and Ajax, two celebrated brothers, flourished about the same period. They devoted themselves to a life of monasticism, but did not fix their abode in the desert, but at Gaza, a maritime city in the territory of Majuma. They both defended the truth of their religion with invincible intrepidity, and confessed themselves to be Christians so repeatedly in the presence of the Pagans, that they were subjected to the most cruel treatment. It is said that Ajax married a very lovely woman, and after he had known her thrice, had three sons; and that subsequently he held no further intercourse with her, but persevered in the exercises of asceticism. He brought up two of his sons to the monastic profession, and the third he permitted to marry. He governed the church of Botelion with great wisdom and piety.

Zeno, who had from his youth renounced the world and marriage, persevered in steadfast adherence to the service of God. It is said, and I myself am witness of the truth of the

assertion, that when he was bishop of Majuma, he was never absent, morning or evening, or any other period, from the public worship of God, unless attacked by some malady, and yet he was at this period nearly a hundred years of age. After his elevation to the episcopal dignity, he did not relax in any of the exercises of monasticism, but, by pursuing his trade of weaving linen, continued to earn the means of supplying his own wants and of providing for the poor. He never deviated from this course of conduct till the close of his life, although he attained, as I before said, a very advanced age, and although he presided over the richest and greatest church of the province.

I have advanced the examples of these bishops to show the high attainments possessed by those who ruled over the church at this period. It would be difficult to enumerat  all the bishops who were distinguished in this manner; the majority of them were endowed with extraordinary virtues, and God bore testimony to this fact by granting their prayers and by working miracles on their behalf.

CHAP. XXIX.—DISCOVERY OF THE REMAINS OF THE PROPHETS HABAKKUK AND MICAH. DEATH OF THE EMPEROR THEODOSIUS THE GREAT.

WHILE the church was under the sway of these eminent men, the clergy and people were excited to the imitation of their virtues. Nor was the church of this era distinguished only by these illustrious examples of piety, for the relics of the proto-prophets¹ Habakkuk and Micah were brought to light about the same period. God made known the place where these relics were deposited in a dream to Zebennus, bishop of Eleutheropolis. The relics of Habakkuk were found at Cela, a city formerly called Ceila. The tomb of Micah was discovered at a distance of ten stadia from Cela, at a place called Beratsatia;² this tomb was ignorantly styled by the people of the country, "the tomb of the faithful," or, in their language, Nephsameemana. Such were the events which

¹ They were not actually the earliest, though among the earliest, of the prophets. Jonah and Joel were the two *πρωτοπροφήται*.

² Or, simply, Bera.

occurred during the reign of Theodosius to the honour and glory of the Christian religion.

After conquering Eugenius,¹ Theodosius remained for some time at Milan, and here he was attacked with a serious malady. He recalled to mind the prediction of the monk John, and conjectured that his sickness was unto death. He sent in haste for his son Honorius from Constantinople, and after his arrival found himself a little better, so that he was able to be present at the sports of the Hippodrome. After dinner, however, he grew worse, and sent to desire his son to preside at the games. He died on the following night; this event happened during the consulate of the brothers Olubrius and Probinus.

BOOK VIII.

CHAP. I.—SUCCESSORS OF THEODOSIUS THE GREAT. RUFINUS, THE PRÆTORIAN PREFECT, IS SLAIN. PRIMATES OF THE PRINCIPAL CITIES. DISPUTES AMONG THE HERETICS. ACCOUNT OF SISINIUS, BISHOP OF THE NOVATIANS.

SUCH was the death of Theodosius, who had contributed so efficiently to the aggrandizement of the church. He expired in the sixtieth year of his age, and the sixteenth of his reign. He left his two sons as his successors; Arcadius the elder reigned in the East, and Honorius in the West: they both held the same religious sentiments as their father.

Damasus was dead; and at this period, Siricius had succeeded him as bishop of Rome: Nectarius presided over the church of Constantinople, Theophilus over the church of Alexandria, Flavian over the church of Antioch, and John over that of Jerusalem. Armenia and the Eastern provinces were at this time overrun by the Huns. Rufinus,² prefect of the East, was suspected of having clandestinely invited them to devastate the Roman territories,³ in furtherance of his own ambitious designs; for he was said to aspire to tyranny. This

¹ Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 26.

² Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 1.

³ Valesius observes that Claudianus, in his 2nd book against Rufinus, has mentioned that the Huns were called in by the latter for the purpose of lay-

suspicion led to his being soon after slain; for on the return of the troops from the conquest of Eugenius, the emperor Arcadius, according to custom, went forth from Constantinople to meet them; and the soldiers took this opportunity to massacre Rufinus. These circumstances tended greatly to the extension of religion. The emperors attributed to the piety of their father the ease with which the tyrant had been vanquished, and the insidious and ambitious schemes of Rufinus arrested; and they confirmed all the laws which had been enacted by their predecessors in favour of religion, and bestowed upon the church fresh tokens of their own zeal and devotion.¹ Their subjects profited by their example; so that even the Pagans were converted without difficulty to Christianity, and the heretics united themselves to the Catholic church.

Owing to the disputes which had arisen among the Arians and Eunomians, and to which I have already alluded, these sectarians daily diminished in number. Many of them, on reflecting on the diversity of sentiments which prevailed among those of their own persuasion, judged that the truth of God could not be present with them, and went over to those who held the same faith as the emperors.

The interests of the Macedonians of Constantinople were materially affected by their possessing no bishop; for ever since they had been deprived of their churches by Eudoxius, under the reign of Constantius, they had been governed only by presbyters. The Novatians, on the other hand, although they had been agitated by the controversy concerning the Passover, which had been renewed by Sabbatius, had been allowed to remain in quiet possession of most of their churches, and had not been molested by any of the laws enacted against other heretics, because they maintained that the Three Persons of the Trinity are of the same substance. The virtue of their bishops also tended greatly to the maintenance of union and concord among them. After the death of Agelius, they were governed by Marcian, a bishop of eminent piety; and on his decease² the

ing waste the Eastern provinces. Hieronymus also mentions the same invasion of the Huns, and says that it took place in the consulship of Arcadius III. and Honorius II. (A. D. 394).

¹ Concerning the laws passed by Arcadius, in support of the Catholic faith, at the beginning of his reign, see Baronius, Annals, vol. v.

² Marcian is said to have died the 5th day of the Calends of December A. D. 395.

bishopric devolved upon Sisinius,¹ a very eloquent man, well versed in the doctrines of philosophy and of Scripture ; and so expert in disputation, that even Eunomius, who made a practice of discussing controverted topics, often refused to hold disputes with him. His course of life was exemplary, and above the reach of calumny, yet he indulged in luxury, and even in superfluities ; so that those who knew him not, were incredulous as to whether he could remain temperate in the midst of so much abundance. He possessed so much kindness of disposition and suavity of manner, that he was highly esteemed by the bishops of the Catholic church, by the rulers, and by the learned. His jests were replete with good nature, and he could bear ridicule without manifesting the least resentment ; he was very prompt and witty in his rejoinders. Being once asked wherefore, as he was a bishop, he bathed twice daily, he replied, "Because I do not bathe thrice." On another occasion, being ridiculed by a member of the Catholic church because he dressed in white, he asked where it was commanded that he should dress in black ; and as the other hesitated for a reply, he continued, "you can give no argument in support of your position ; but I refer you to Solomon, the wisest of men, who says, 'Let your garments be always white :' moreover Christ is described in the Gospel as having appeared in white ; and Moses and Elias manifested themselves to the apostles in robes of white." It appears to me that the following reply was also very ingenious. Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, repaired to Constantinople, after he had deprived the Novatians in his province of their churches. Sisinius went to him to request that the churches might be restored ; but far from yielding compliance, he reviled the Novatians, and said that they were not worthy of holding assemblies, because, by abolishing the observance of penance, they intercepted the mercy of God. To this Sisinius replied : "No one does penance as I do." Leontius asked him in what way he did penance. "In coming to see you," retorted Sisinius. Many other witty speeches are attributed to him, and he is even said to have written several works with some elegance. But his discourses obtained greater applause than his writings, for the intonation of his voice, the expression of his countenance, and all his attitudes, produced extraordinary effects upon his audience.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 22.

This brief description may serve to convey some idea of the disposition and mode of life of this great man.

CHAP. II.—CONDUCT AND WISDOM OF THE GREAT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM; HIS PROMOTION TO THE BISHOPRIC OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

NECTARIUS died about this period,¹ and lengthened debates were held on the ordination of a successor. Great division of opinion prevailed on this subject. There was, however, at Antioch on the Orontes, a certain presbyter, named John; a man of noble birth, and of exemplary life, and possessed of such wonderful powers of eloquence and persuasion, that he was declared, by Libanius the Syrian, to surpass all the orators of the age. When this sophist was on his death-bed, he was asked by his friends, who should take his place. "It would have been John," replied he, "had not the Christians taken him from us." Many of those who heard the discourses of John in the church, were thereby excited to the love of virtue, and to the reception of his own religious sentiments.² But it was chiefly by the bright example of his private virtues, that John inspired his auditors with emulation. He produced conviction the more readily,³ because he did not resort to rhetorical artifices, but expounded the Sacred Scriptures with truth and sincerity. Arguments which are corroborated by actions always commend themselves as worthy of belief; but when a preacher's deeds will not bear investigation, his words, even when he is anxious to declare the truth, are regarded as contradictory. John taught both by precept and example; for while, on the one hand, his course of life was virtuous and austere, on the other hand, he possessed considerable eloquence

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 2, 3.

² Some of the disciples of Libanius, who had the habit of attending to the public instructions of John in the church, were converted by him to the faith of Christ.

³ Valesius here remarks, that Sozomen says that John by his teaching in the church restored his listeners to virtue, and the right and orthodox faith. He inspired them with a love of virtue by the example of his own life and conversation: he persuaded them to come back to the true faith, not by his eloquence, but by his pure and faithful interpretation of the Holy Books. Such is the sense of the passage; though perhaps the words have been altered.

and persuasiveness of diction. His natural abilities were excellent, and he improved them by studying under the best masters. He learnt rhetoric from Libanius, and philosophy from Andragathius. It was expected that he would have embraced the legal profession, but he devoted himself to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and to a life of ecclesiastical philosophy, under the guidance of Carterius and Diodorus, two celebrated presidents of monastic assemblies. Diodorus was afterwards bishop of Tarsus, and I have been informed, wrote several works in which he explained the words of Scripture according to their literal meaning, without having recourse to allegory. John did not receive the instructions of these men by himself, but persuaded Theodore and Maximus, who had studied with him under Libanius, to accompany him. Maximus afterwards became bishop of Seleucia, in Isauria; and Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia. Theodore was a learned man, well conversant with sacred and profane literature. After studying the ecclesiastical laws, and frequenting the society of holy men, he was filled with admiration of the ascetic mode of life, and devoted himself to it. Afterwards, however, he changed his purpose, and resumed his former course of life, and, to justify his conduct, cited many examples from ancient history, with which he was well acquainted. On hearing of the steps he had taken, John addressed a most divine epistle¹ to him, which contained thoughts and expressions apparently transcending all productions of the human mind. Upon receiving this letter, Theodore gave up his possessions, renounced his intention of marrying, and, in accordance with the remonstrances of John, returned to the profession of monasticism. This seems to me a remarkable instance of the power of John's eloquence; for he readily forced conviction on the mind of one who was himself habituated to persuade and convince others. By the same eloquence, John attracted the admiration of the people, while he strenuously expatiated against sin, and testified the same indignation against all acts of injustice as if they had been perpetrated against himself. This boldness pleased the people, but grieved the wealthy and the powerful, who were guilty of most of the vices which he denounced.

Being, then, held in such high estimation by those who

¹ This letter of Chrysostom still exists in vol. iv. of the works of that father.

knew him personally, and by those who were acquainted with him through the reports of others, John was adjudged worthy, in word and in deed, by all the subjects of the Roman empire, to preside over the church of Constantinople. The clergy and people were unanimous in electing him; their choice was approved by the emperor; messengers were despatched for John; and, to confer greater solemnity on his ordination, a council was convened. When the edict of the emperor reached Asterius, the general of the East, he sent to desire John to repair to him, as if he had need of him. On his arrival, he made him get into his chariot, and conveyed him to Pagras, where he delivered him to the officers whom the emperor had sent in quest of him. Asterius acted very prudently in sending for John before the citizens of Antioch knew what was about to transpire; for they would probably have excited a sedition, and have inflicted injury on others, or subjected themselves to acts of violence, rather than have suffered John to be taken from them.

When John had arrived at Constantinople, and when the priests were assembled together, Theophilus¹ opposed his ordination, and proposed as a candidate, in his stead, a presbyter of his church, named Isidore, who took charge of strangers and of the poor at Alexandria. I have been informed by persons who were acquainted with Isidore, that from his youth upwards he led a life of virtue and asceticism, near Scetis. Others say, that he had gained the friendship of Theophilus by assisting him in a very perilous undertaking. For it is reported that during the war against Maximus, Theophilus intrusted Isidore with gifts and letters respectfully addressed to the emperor and to Maximus, and sent him to Rome,² desiring him to remain there until the termination of the war, when he was to deliver the gifts, with the letters, to whoever might prove the victor. Isidore acted according to his instructions, but the artifice was detected; and, fearful of being arrested, he fled to Alexandria. Theophilus from that period evinced much attachment towards him, and with a view of recompens-

¹ Socrates also, in the 6th book of his Ecclesiastical History, attests that Theophilus was present at the ordination of John Chrysostom.

² Valesius says that Isidore had been sent to Theophilus of Alexandria, for the purpose of delivering a pacific or communicatory letter, written to Theophilus by Flavian, to Anastasius, bishop of Rome (A. D. 398).

ing his services, strove to raise him to the bishopric of Constantinople. But whether there was really any truth in this report, or whether Theophilus was solely influenced by a sense of the merit of Isidore, in proposing him for election, it is certain that he eventually yielded to the wishes of the other bishops, and nominated John. He was induced to accede to the ordination of John from fear of the menaces of Eutropius, who held a situation in the palace, and who threatened, unless he would vote with the other bishops, to call him to account at the synod for his conduct; for many accusations had been preferred against him.

CHAP. III.—PROMOTION OF JOHN TO THE BISHOPRIC. HE RE-ESTABLISHES DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCHES. DEPUTATION TO ROME.

As soon as John was raised to the episcopal dignity, he devoted his attention to the reformation of the lives of his clergy, and to the regulation of their pursuits and conduct. He even ejected some of the clergy from the church. He was naturally disposed to reprehend the misconduct of others, and to feel excessive indignation against those who acted unjustly; and these characteristics gained strength after his elevation to the bishopric; for when power was placed in his hands, he became more zealous than ever in testifying his anger and resentment against sin. He did not confine his efforts to the reformation of his own church, but sought to rectify abuses throughout the world. He strove to put an end to the dissension which had arisen concerning Paulinus, between the Western and Egyptian bishops, and the bishops of the East; and requested the assistance of Theophilus in effecting the reconciliation of Flavian with the bishop of Rome. Theophilus agreed to co-operate with him in the restoration of concord; and Acacius, bishop of Beroëa, and Isidore, whom Theophilus had proposed as a candidate for ordination instead of John, were sent on an embassy to Rome. They soon effected the object of their journey, and returned to Egypt. Acacius repaired to Syria, bearing conciliatory letters concerning Flavian, from the bishops of Egypt and of the West. By these means, unity was restored among the churches after a long period of mutual animosity and division. The people at Antioch, who were called Eusta-

thians, continued, indeed, for some time to hold separate assemblies, although they possessed no bishop. Evagrius, the successor of Paulinus, did not, as we have stated, long survive him, and unanimity was the more easily re-established from there being no one to keep up the division. The laity, as is customary with the populace, gradually went over to those who assembled together under the guidance of Flavian: and thus, in course of time, unity was restored among them.

CHAP. IV.—ENTERPRISE OF GAÏNAS, THE GOTH. EVILS WHICH HE PERPETRATED.

A BARBARIAN, named Gaïnas,¹ who had taken refuge among the Romans, and who had risen from the lowest ranks of the army to military command, formed a design to usurp the throne of the Roman empire. With this view, he invited his countrymen, the Goths, to invade the Roman territories; and promoted several of them, who were his particular friends, to the highest posts of the army.² Tribigildes, a relative of his, who commanded a large body of troops in Phrygia, commenced an insurrection; and all persons of judgment rightly inferred, that he was acting in concert with Gaïnas. Under the pretext of resenting the devastation of many of the Phrygian cities, which had been committed to his superintendence, Gaïnas hastened into that province; but on his arrival, he threw aside the mask he had assumed, and openly pillaged some cities, and prepared to take possession of others. He then proceeded to Bithynia, and threatened to attack Chalcedonia. The cities of the East, of Asia, and of the countries bordering on the Euxine, being thus menaced with imminent danger, the emperor and his counsellors judged that it would not be safe at so critical a juncture to give battle to the insurgents without having previously made due preparations, and sent to Gaïnas to offer him whatever he might demand. He requested that two consuls, named Saturninus and Aurelian, whom he suspected of being inimical to him, should be de-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 6.

² Christopherson explains "*συνταγματάρχας*" by "officers of the armies:" but Valesius thinks better to translate it by "chiefs." Sozomen uses the same word in the sense of "tribune," above, b. vi. ch. 6.

livered up to him ; and when they were in his power, he pardoned them. He afterwards held a conference with the emperor near Chalcedonia, in the house of prayer in which the tomb of St. Euphemius the martyr is deposited ; and after he and the emperor had mutually bound themselves by vows of friendship to each other, he threw down his arms, and repaired to Constantinople, where, by an imperial edict, he was appointed general of the infantry and cavalry. Prosperity so far beyond his deserts was more than he could bear with moderation ; and as, contrary to all expectation, he had succeeded so wonderfully in his former enterprise, he determined to undermine the peace of the Catholic church. He was a Christian, and, like the rest of the Goths, had espoused the Arian heresy.¹ Urged either by the solicitations of his party, or by the suggestions of his own ambition, he applied to the emperor to place one of the churches of the city in the hands of the Arians. He represented that it was neither just nor proper that, while he was at the head of the Roman troops, he should be compelled to retire without the walls of the city when he wished to engage in prayer. John did not remain inactive when made acquainted with these proceedings. He assembled all the bishops who were then residing in the city, and went with them to the palace. He spoke at great length in the presence of the emperor and of Gainas, reproached the latter with being a stranger and a fugitive, and reminded him that his life had been saved by the father of the emperor, to whom he had sworn fidelity, as likewise to his children, to the Romans, and to the laws which he was striving to violate. Then, addressing himself to the emperor, John exhorted him to maintain the laws which had been established against heretics, and told him that it would be better to be deprived of the empire, than to betray the house of God into the hands of the impious. Thus did John boldly contend in defence of the church that was under his care. Gainas, however, regardless of his oaths, attacked the city. His enterprise was pre-announced by the appearance of a comet directly over the city : this comet was of extraordinary magnitude, larger, indeed, than any that had previously been

¹ According to Valesius, the words "Οὐ τὰ Ἀρείου προνοῦσι" seem not to be the words of Sozomenus, but to have been added by somebody as an interpretation, and ought therefore to be thrown back to the margin.

seen. Gaïnas intended to seize first upon the stores of the silversmiths, and to appropriate their enormous wealth. The silversmiths, however, received timely notice of his designs, and concealed the precious commodities,¹ which were usually kept exposed to the view of the public. Gaïnas then sent some of the barbarians by night to set fire to the palace; but fear fell upon them, and they returned without executing the mandate. For when they drew near the edifice, they fancied that they saw before them a multitude of armed men of immense stature, and they returned to inform Gaïnas that fresh troops had just arrived. Gaïnas disbelieved their report, for he was confident that no troops had entered the city. As, however, other individuals whom he despatched to the palace for the same purpose, on the following night, returned with the same report, he went out himself to be an eye-witness of the extraordinary spectacle. Imagining that the army before him consisted of soldiers who had been withdrawn from other cities, and that these troops protected the city and palace by day, and concealed themselves by night, Gaïnas feigned to be possessed of a demon; and under the pretext of offering up prayer, went to the church which the father of the emperor had erected in honour of John the Baptist, at Hebdoma. Some of the Goths remained in Constantinople, and others accompanied Gaïnas, having first clandestinely provided themselves with weapons of war, which they placed in their chariots. The soldiers who guarded the gates of the city, stopped the chariots, and forbade them to carry away arms. The Goths, thereupon, slew the guards, and the city was immediately filled with as much confusion and uproar, as if it had suddenly fallen under the power of an enemy. A timely thought, however, occurred to the emperor at this perilous juncture, which was, to declare Gaïnas a public enemy, and to command that all the Goths within the city should be slain. No sooner was this mandate issued, than the soldiers rushed upon the Goths, and slew the greater number of them; they then set fire to the church which belonged to that people, and in which those who had escaped the sword had taken refuge; as the doors were closed, the barbarians could not effect an exit,² and they all perished. On hearing

¹ "Τὸν πρόχειρον πλοῦτον" mean "gems, gold and silver vases, and all precious household goods," according to the interpretation of Valesius.

² By the words "Οἷς οὐκετι φυγεῖν ἐξεγενετο" is meant either that those

of this calamity, Gaiñas passed through Thrace, and proceeded towards the Chersonesus, intending to cross the Hellespont, and to subdue some of the Eastern provinces. His expectations proved as futile, however, on this occasion as before; and the Romans were again aided by the intervention of Divine power on their behalf. The emperor sent naval and military forces against the insurgents, under the command of Fravitas, who, although a barbarian by birth, was a good man, and an able general. The Goths, having no ships, imprudently attempted to cross the Hellespont on rafts, which, when the wind arose, were dashed to pieces against the Roman vessels. The greater part of the barbarians and their horses were drowned; but many were slain by the military. Gaiñas, however, with a few of his followers, escaped; but not long after, when making their way through Thrace, they fell in with another detachment of the Roman army, and Gaiñas, with all his barbarians, perished. Such was the termination of the life and daring schemes of Gaiñas.

Fravitas had rendered himself very conspicuous in this war, and was therefore appointed consul.¹ During his consulate, and that of Vincent, a son was born to the emperor. The young prince was named after his grandfather, and, at the commencement of the next consulate, was proclaimed Augustus.

CHAP. V.—PUBLIC DISCOURSES OF JOHN. CONCERNING THE MACEDONIAN WOMAN, AND THE CONVERSION OF BREAD INTO STONE.

JOHN governed the church of Constantinople with exemplary prudence, and induced many of the Pagans and of the heretics to unite themselves with him. Crowds of people daily resorted to him; some for the purpose of being edified by listening to his discourses, and others with the intention of tempting him. He, however, pleased and attracted all classes, and led them to embrace the same religious sentiments as himself. As

who were in that church could not go out because the doors were shut, or that, not being able to escape with Gaiñas because the gates of the town were closed, they had taken refuge in that church. This last interpretation Valesius thinks the right one.

¹ Fravitas was consul (A. D. 401) with Vincentius.

[SOZOMEN.]

the people pressed around him, and, so far from feeling any weariness, crowded to hear him in such numbers as even to molest each other, he placed himself in the midst of them at the desk (*βήμα*) of the readers, and having taken a seat, taught the multitude. It seems to me, that this is a suitable place in my history for the insertion of the account of a miracle which was performed during the life of John. A certain man, of the sect of the Macedonians, who was married and lived with his wife, chanced to hear John discoursing concerning the Divine nature; he was convinced by the argument he heard advanced, and strove to persuade his wife to embrace the same sentiments. Her previous habits of mind, and the conversation of other women, deterred her from complying with his wishes; and, when he found that all his efforts to convince her were futile, he told her that, unless she would be of one mind with him on Divine subjects, she should not continue to live with him. The woman, therefore, promised to do as she was required; but, at the same time, she made known the matter to one of her servant maids, in whose fidelity she confided, and used her as an instrument in deceiving her husband. At the time of the celebration of the mysteries (the initiated will understand what I mean) this woman kept what was given to her, and held down her head as if engaged in prayer. Her servant, who was standing behind her, placed in her hand a bit of bread which she had brought with her; but, as soon as she had placed it between her teeth, it was converted into stone. Astonished at what had occurred, and fearful lest any further calamity should befall her, she ran to the bishop, and informed him of what had happened. She showed him the stone, which bore the marks of her teeth; it was composed of some unknown substance, and was of a very strange and peculiar colour. She implored forgiveness with tears, and continued ever after to hold the same religious tenets as her husband. If any person should consider this narrative incredible, he can inspect the stone in question; for it is still preserved in the treasury of the church of Constantinople.

Refer to in the Arch. on 2/10.
This ins. 7, 92.

CHAP. VI.—PROCEEDINGS OF JOHN IN ASIA AND PHRYGIA.
HERACLIDES, BISHOP OF EPHESUS, AND GERONTIUS, BISHOP OF
NICOMEDIA.

JOHN, having been informed that many of the bishops of Asia and of the neighbouring churches were unworthy of their office, and that they sold the priesthood for money, or bestowed that dignity as a matter of private favour, repaired to Ephesus, and deposed thirteen bishops of Lycia, Phrygia, and Asia, and elected others in their stead. The bishop of Ephesus was dead,¹ and he therefore ordained Heraclides² over that church. Heraclides was a native of Cyprus, and was one of the deacons under John: he had formerly joined the monks at Scetis, and had been the disciple of Evagrius. John also deposed Gerontius, bishop of Nicomedia. This latter was a deacon under Ambrosius, of the church of Milan: he declared, either with an intention to deceive others, or because he had been himself deceived by some illusion of the devil, that he had seized a quadruped resembling an ass (*ὄνοσκελῖς*)³ by night, had cut off its head, and flung it into a grinding-house. Ambrose regarded this mode of discourse as utterly unworthy of a servant of God, and commanded Gerontius to remain in seclusion until he had expiated his fault by repentance. Gerontius, however, was a very skilful physician; he was eloquent and persuasive, and knew well how to gain friends; he therefore ridiculed the command of Ambrose, and repaired to Constantinople. In a short time, he obtained the friendship of the most powerful men at court; and, not long after, was elevated to the bishopric of Nicomedia. He was ordained by Helladius,⁴ bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who performed this office the more readily for him because he had been instrumental,

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 11.

² Socrates, in b. vi, ch. 10, says that this Heraclides was the deacon of Chrysostom.

³ The Gentiles gave this name to a certain spectre, because it had the legs and feet of a young ass. By the ancient Greeks it was called *ἔμπουσα* (see Aristoph. Ranæ, l. 293). This spectre usually presented itself to travellers, as we learn from Harpocrates.

⁴ Valesius says that he does not see why it is that Helladius, bishop of Cæsarea, ordained Gerontius bishop of Nicomedia. It can be alleged that the bishop of Cæsarea claimed the ordination of the bishop of Nicomedia, as being primate of the diocese of Pontus.

Repaired to Ephesus
 of John in the diocese of Asia
 with 3, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

through his interest at court, in obtaining a high appointment in the army for his son. When Ambrose heard of this ordination, he wrote to Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, desiring him to eject Gerontius from the priesthood, and not to permit the discipline of the church to be violated by such gross abuses. However desirous Nectarius might have been to obey this injunction, he could never succeed in carrying it into effect, owing to the determined resistance of the people of Nicomedia. John deposed Gerontius, and ordained Pansophius, who had formerly been preceptor to the wife of the emperor, and who, though a man of decided piety and of a mild and gentle disposition, was not liked by the Nicomedians. They arose in sedition, and declaimed publicly and privately on the charity and beneficence of Gerontius, and on the benefits which all classes, rich and poor, had enjoyed from his skill in medicine; and, as is usual when we applaud those we love, they ascribed many other virtues to him. They went about the streets of Nicomedia and Constantinople as if some earthquake, or pestilence, or other visitation of Divine wrath had occurred, and sang psalms, and offered supplications that they might have Gerontius for their bishop. They were at length compelled to yield to necessity, and parted most reluctantly with Gerontius, receiving in his stead a bishop whom they regarded with fear and aversion. The bishops who had been deposed and all their followers declaimed against John, and alleged that he had violated the laws of the church, and set aside ordinations which had been legally conferred; and, in the excess of their resentment, they condemned deeds which were worthy of commendation. Among other matters, they reproached him with the proceedings that had been taken against Eutropius.

CHAP. VII.—CONCERNING EUTROPIUS, CHIEF OF THE EUNUCHS, AND THE LAW ENACTED BY HIM. MURMURS AGAINST JOHN.

EUTROPIUS was originally the chief of the eunuchs, and was the first and only person of that rank who attained the consular and patrician dignity.¹ When he was raised to power, he thought not of the future, nor of the instability of human af-

¹ Πατρός βασιλεύς. The Patricians were called the Fathers of the Emperor—a title first given to them by Constantine.

fairs, but caused those who sought an asylum in churches to be thrust out. He treated Pentadia, the wife of Timasius, in this manner. Timasius was a general in the army, possessed of considerable influence; but Eutropius procured an edict for his banishment¹ to Pasis in Egypt, under the pretext that he aspired to tyranny. I have been informed that Timasius fell a victim to thirst or the cruelty of his enemies, and was found dead among the sands of the desert. Eutropius issued a law enacting that no one should seek refuge in churches, and that the asylums should be violated if any one should attempt to avail himself of them. He was, however, the first to transgress this law; for not long after its enactment, he offended the empress, and immediately left the palace and fled to the church. While he was lying beneath² the altar, John pronounced a discourse in which he reprehended the pride of power, and directed the attention of the people to the instability of human greatness. The enemies of John hence took occasion to cast reproach on him, because he had rebuked instead of compassionating one who was suffering under the calamities of adverse fortune. Eutropius soon after paid the penalty of his impiety, and was beheaded; and the law which he had enacted was effaced from the public inscriptions. The wrath of God having been thus promptly visited on the injustice that had been perpetrated, prosperity was restored to the church, and the people of Constantinople were hence more sedulous than before in attendance at the singing of the morning and the evening hymns.

CHAP. VIII.—HYMNS AGAINST ARIANISM INTRODUCED BY JOHN. EFFECTS OF HIS PUBLIC MINISTRATIONS.

THE Arians, having been deprived of their churches in Constantinople during the reign of Theodosius, held their assemblies without the walls of the city.³ They assembled by night in the public porticoes, and sung in parts certain hymns⁴

¹ This happened A. D. 395, or, according to Valesius, 396.

² ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν γράπεζαν. Compare the passage relating to Alexander in Socrates, Eccl. Hist. i. 36, where the same phrase is used.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 8.

⁴ ἀκροτελεύτια. Literally, "endings of verses." Sozomen understands the Arian doxologies mentioned by Socrates (see Valesius' notes on his

which they had composed in vindication of their own tenets ; and, at the break of day, marched in procession, singing these hymns, to the places in which they held their assemblies. They proceeded in this manner on all solemn festivals, and on the first and last¹ days of the week. The sentiments propounded in these hymns were such as were likely to engender disputes ; as, for instance, the following :—“ Where are those who say that the Three Persons constitute one Power ? ” Other similar acrimonious observations were interspersed throughout their compositions. John was fearful lest any of his own people should be led astray by witnessing these exhibitions, and therefore commanded them to sing hymns in the same manner. The orthodox, being more numerous and more wealthy than the Arians, soon surpassed them in the pomp and splendour of their processions ; for they had silver crosses and lighted torches borne before them. The eunuch of the empress was appointed to regulate these processions, to pay the cost of whatever might be required, and to prepare hymns adapted to be sung on these occasions. Hence the Arians, impelled either by jealousy or revenge, attacked the members of the Catholic church. Much bloodshed ensued on both sides. Briso (for this was the name of the eunuch) was wounded on the forehead by a stone that was cast at him. The resentment of the emperor was kindled, and he put a stop to the Arian assemblies. Having commenced the custom of singing hymns, in the manner and from the cause above stated, the members of the Catholic church did not discontinue the practice, but have retained it to the present day. The institution of these processions, and the faithfulness of his ministrations in the church, endeared John to the people ; but he was hated by the clergy and the powerful on account of his boldness and candour ; for he never failed to rebuke the clergy, when he detected them in acts of injustice, nor to exhort the powerful to return to the practice of virtue, when they abused their wealth, committed impiety, or yielded to voluptuousness.²

Eccl. Hist. ii. 21) subjoined to Arian hymns. Valesius thinks it more probable that they were added at the end of the Psalms of David.

¹ That is, on the Sunday, or Lord's day, and on the Saturday, or Jewish sabbath. The Sunday is always called the first day of the week by Christian writers. See note on Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 38.

² For an account of the birth and early education of St. John Chrysostom, see Socrates, b. vi. ch. 3.

CHAP. IX.—SERAPION THE ARCHDEACON, AND ST. OLYMPIA.
COMPLAINTS OF THE CLERGY AGAINST JOHN.

THE enmity of the clergy against John was greatly increased by Serapion, his archdeacon, a man naturally prone to anger, and always ready to insult his opponents.¹ The feelings of hostility were further fostered by the counsel which Olympia received from John. Olympia was a widow of illustrious birth, zealously attached to the exercises of monastic philosophy; and, notwithstanding her youth, Nectarius had ordained her deaconess.² John, perceiving that she bestowed her goods liberally on whoever asked her for them, and that she despised everything but the service of God, said to her: "I applaud your intentions; but would have you know that those who aspire to the perfection of virtue ought to distribute their wealth with prudence. You, however, have been bestowing wealth on the wealthy, which is as useless as if you had cast it in the sea. Know you not that you have, for the sake of God, devoted all your possessions to the relief of the poor. You ought, therefore, to regard your wealth as belonging to your Master, and to remember that you will have to account for its distribution. If you will be persuaded by me, you will in future regulate your donations according to the wants of those who solicit relief. You will thus be enabled to extend the sphere of your benevolence, and your zeal and charity will be accepted by God."

John had several disputes with many of the monks, particularly with Isaac. He commended those who, in conformity with the rules of their profession, remained in quietude in their monasteries; he protected them from all injustice, and supplied all their wants.³ But the monks who made their appearance in cities were severely censured by him, and declared to be the disgrace of monasticism. He hence incurred the hatred of the clergy, and of many of the monks, who represented him as a hard, passionate, morose, and arrogant man. They therefore

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 4.

² It is to be observed, remarks Valesius, that she was ordained at an age earlier than was generally allowed, and also that she was ordained by Nectarius: and that each of these points were contrary to the canons of the church. See Council Chalcedon, can. 15; and Nicene, can. 19; and compare Rufinus, Eccl. Hist. x. 6; St. Clemens. Constitut. iii. 15.

³ Sozomen here speaks of the monks of Constantinople and its neighbourhood, where monasteries abounded. See above, b. iv. 2.

Another on the
 Marcianians, this 3, 17, & 1

attempted to bring his life into public disrepute, by stating confidently, as if it were the truth, that he would eat with no one, and that he refused every invitation that was offered him. I know of no pretext that could have given rise to this assertion, except that, as I have been assured by a man of undoubted veracity, John had, by rigorous asceticism, rendered himself liable to pain in the head and stomach, and was thus prevented from being present at some of the most solemn festivals. Hence, however, originated the greatest accusation that was ever devised against him.

CHAP. X.—SEVERIAN, BISHOP OF GABALES, AND ANTIOCHUS, BISHOP OF PTOLEMAIS. DISPUTE BETWEEN SERAPION AND SEVERIAN. RECONCILIATION EFFECTED BY THE EMPRESS.

JOHN likewise incurred the enmity of the empress, through the machinations of Severian, bishop of Gabales in Syria. Severian and Antiochus bishop of Ptolemais in Syria, were both learned men, and well qualified to teach the people. Antiochus had so fine a voice and delivery that, by some persons, he was surnamed Chrysostom: Severian, on the other hand, had a harsh and provincial accent; but, in point of general knowledge and acquaintance with Scripture, he was considered superior to Antiochus. It appears that Antiochus was the first to visit Constantinople; he gained great applause by his eloquence, amassed some property, and then returned to his own city. Severian followed his example, and went to Constantinople: he formed an intimacy with John, secured the admiration of the public by his ministrations in the church, and even attracted the notice of the emperor and empress. When John went to Asia, he commended the church to his care; for he was so far deceived by the adulation of Severian, as to imagine him his friend. Severian, however, thought only of gratifying his auditors, and of pleasing the people by his eloquence. When John was apprized that this was the course he was pursuing, he was highly incensed against him; and his resentment was further kindled, it is said, by the representations of Serapion. After the return of John from Asia, Serapion happened to see Severian passing; but, instead of rising to salute him, he kept his seat, in order to show his utter contempt

for the man. Severian was offended by this manifestation of disrespect, and exclaimed, "If Serapion die a Christian, then Christ was not incarnate." Serapion reported these words; and John, in consequence, expelled Severian from the city as a blasphemer; for witnesses were brought forward to attest that the above words had been really uttered by him. Some of the friends of Serapion even went so far as to suppress part of the speech of Severian, and to affirm that he had declared that Christ was not incarnate. John also rebuked Severian, by asking whether, if Serapion should not die among the clergy, it would follow that Christ had not been incarnate. As soon as the wife of the emperor was informed of what had occurred by the friends of Severian, she immediately sent for him from Chalcedonia. John, notwithstanding all her remonstrances, positively refused to hold any intercourse with him until the empress placed her son Theodosius on his knees¹ in the church of the Apostles; and then John yielded a reluctant consent to receive Severian into favour. Such are the accounts which I have received of these transactions.

CHAP. XI.—QUESTION AGITATED IN EGYPT, AS TO WHETHER GOD HAS A CORPOREAL FORM. THEOPHILUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA. BOOKS OF ORIGEN.

A QUESTION was at this period agitated in Egypt, which had been propounded a short time previously, namely, whether it is right to believe that God possesses a corporeal nature.² Owing to a too liberal and simple mode of interpreting Scripture, most of the monks of that part of the world supposed that God possesses eyes, a face and hands, and other members of the bodily organization. This position, however, was denied by those who searched into the hidden meaning of the words of Scripture; and they maintained that those who denied the incorporeality of God were guilty of blasphemy. This latter opinion was espoused by Theophilus, and preached by him in the church; and in the epistle³ which, according to custom, he wrote respecting the celebration of the passover, he took occasion to state, that God is to be regarded as incorporeal,

¹ Adjuring him by her son.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 7.

³ This epistle is no longer extant.

Chapters XI to XIX included referred to. A part of them quoted on the corporeity of God, viz. 14, 17, 18.

and as bearing no resemblance to the human form. When it was signified to the Egyptian monks that Theophilus had broached these sentiments, they went to Alexandria, assembled the people together, excited a tumult, and determined upon slaying the bishop as an impious man. Theophilus, however, presented himself to the insurgents, and said to them, "When I look upon you, it is as if I beheld the face of God." This address mollified their resentment, and they replied: "Wherefore, then, if you really hold orthodox doctrines, do you not denounce the books of Origen, which set forth doctrine of an opposite tendency?" "Such has long been my intention," replied he, "and I shall do as you advise; for I blame as much as you do all those who follow the doctrines of Origen." By these means he deluded the monks, and quelled the sedition.

CHAP. XII.—ENMITY OF THEOPHILUS AGAINST FOUR BROTHERS, CALLED "THE GREAT."

THE controversy would most likely have been terminated, had it not been renewed by Theophilus himself, from inimical feelings against Ammon, Dioscorus, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who were called "the great."¹ They were brothers, and, as we have before stated, rendered themselves very conspicuous among the ascetics at Scetis. They were at one period beloved by Theophilus above all the other monks of Egypt; he sought their society, and frequently dwelt with them. He even conferred on Dioscorus the bishopric of Hermopolis. But from the time of his attempt to ordain Isidore as successor to Nectarius, in the bishopric of Constantinople, he had regarded them with hatred. Some² say, that a woman, belonging to the Manichean sect, having been converted to the faith of the Catholic church, Theophilus rebuked the arch-presbyter, (towards whom he had other reasons for entertaining resentful feelings,) because, he had admitted her to participate in the sacred mysteries before she had abjured her former heresy. Peter, for this was the name of the arch-presbyter, maintained that he had received the woman into communion according to

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 7, 9.

² He probably alludes to Socrates, (ubi supr.,) or to those authors whence Socrates borrowed his information.

see p. 377, margin.

the laws of the church, and at the consent of Theophilus; and referred to Isidore, as a witness to the truth of what he deposed. Isidore happened to be then at Rome; but, on his return, he testified that the assertions of Peter were true. Theophilus resented this avowal, and ejected both him and Peter from the church. Such is the account given by some persons of the transaction. I have, however, heard it alleged, by a man of undoubted veracity, who was very intimate with the monks above-mentioned, that the enmity of Theophilus towards Isidore originated from two causes. One of these causes was identical with that specified by Peter the presbyter, namely, that he had refused to attest the existence of a testament in which the inheritance was entailed on the sister of Theophilus: the other cause alleged by this individual was, that Isidore refused to give up certain monies that had been confided to him for the relief of the poor, and which Theophilus wished to appropriate to the erection of churches; and told his bishop, that it would be far better to apply the money to the relief of the bodies of the sick, which are the temples of God, than to the building of edifices. But from whatever cause the enmity of Theophilus might have originated, Isidore, immediately after his excommunication, joined his former companions, the monks at Scetis. Ammon, with a few others, then repaired to Theophilus, and entreated him to restore Isidore to communion. Theophilus readily promised to do as they requested; but as time passed away, and his promise still remained unfulfilled, they again repaired to him, renewed their entreaties, and pressed him to be faithful to his engagement. Instead of complying, Theophilus thrust one of the monks into prison, for the purpose of intimidating the others. Ammon and all the monks then went to the prison, into which they were readily admitted by the gaoler, who imagined that they had come to bring provisions to the prisoner; but having once obtained admission, they refused to leave the prison. When Theophilus heard of their voluntary confinement, he sent to desire them to come to him. They replied, that he ought to take them out of prison himself, for it was not just, after having been subjected to public indignity, that they should be privately released from confinement. At length, however, they yielded and went to him. Theophilus apologized for what had occurred, and dismissed them as if he had no further intention of

see p. 377, margin

molesting them; but he retained in secret the utmost resentment against them, and studied the most efficient means of injuring them. He was in doubt, however, as to how he could ill-treat them, as they had no possessions, and despised everything but wisdom, until it occurred to him, to disturb the peace of their retirement. From his former intercourse with them he had gathered that they blamed those who believe that God has a human form, and that they adhered to the opinions of Origen; he therefore seized this pretext to set all the other monks, who maintained contrary doctrines, at variance with them.¹ A furious dispute ensued among the monks; for instead of resorting to argument, and striving to convince each other of the truth, they mutually insulted each other, and gave the name of Origenists to those who maintained the incorporeality of the Deity, while those who held the opposite opinion were called Anthropomorphists.

CHAP. XIII.—THE MONKS REPAIR TO JOHN. HOSTILITY OF THEOPHILUS AGAINST JOHN.

DIOSCORUS, Ammon, and the other monks, having discovered the machinations of Theophilus, retired to Jerusalem, and thence proceeded to Scythopolis, because this latter region abounded in palm trees, and the wood of these trees was wrought into various articles by the monks. Dioscorus and Ammon were accompanied hither by about eighty other monks. In the mean time, Theophilus sent messengers to Constantinople, to prefer complaints against them, and to oppose any petitions that they might lay before the emperor. On being informed of this fact, Ammon and the monks embarked for Constantinople, and took Isidore with them; and they requested that their cause might be tried in the presence of the emperor and of the bishop, for they imagined that the well-known boldness of John would be of assistance to them at this juncture. John, although he received them with kindness, and treated them with honour, and did not forbid them to pray in the church,

¹ Socrates gives the same account; but, like Sozomen, he suppresses the reason: viz. that Theophilus had convened an episcopal synod at Alexandria, and had condemned Ammonius and his brethren as followers of Origen.

notes on See p. 377, margin.
 Nicen. A. D. 325
 his day
 90.

refused to admit them to participation in the mysteries until their cause had been decided. He wrote to Theophilus, desiring him to receive them back into communion, as their sentiments concerning the Divine nature were orthodox: requesting him, if he regarded their orthodoxy as doubtful, to send some one to act as their accuser. Theophilus returned no reply to this epistle. Some time subsequently, Ammon and his companions presented themselves before the wife of the emperor, and complained of the machinations of Theophilus against them. As she was well acquainted with the facts of the case, she stopped her chariot, inclined her head forwards, and said to them, "Pray for the emperor, for me, for our children, and for the empire. For my part, I shall shortly cause a council to be convened, to which Theophilus shall be summoned." A false report having been spread abroad in Alexandria, that John had received Dioscorus and his companions into communion, and had afforded them every aid and encouragement in his power, Theophilus began to reflect upon what measures it would be possible to adopt in order to eject John from the church.

Noticed this here in original in 4
 3, 16, ff in original
 See p. 377, in original

CHAP. XIV.—PERVERSITY OF THEOPHILUS. ARRIVAL OF ST. EPIPHANIUS AT CONSTANTINOPLE; HE EXCITES THE PEOPLE OF THAT CITY AGAINST JOHN.

THEOPHILUS kept his designs against John as secret as possible; and wrote to the bishops of every city, condemning the books of Origen.¹ It also occurred to him that it would be advantageous to enlist Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus, on his side, because the eminent virtues of this prelate had secured him universal admiration; and he therefore formed a friendship with him, although he had formerly blamed² him for asserting that God possessed a human form. As if repentant of having ever entertained any other sentiment, Theophilus wrote to Epiphanius to acquaint him, that he now held the same opinions as himself, and to condemn the works of Origen, whence he had drawn his former hypothesis. Epiphanius had long regarded the writings of Origen with pecu-

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 10.

² See Valesius' notes on Socrates (ubi supr.).

liar aversion, and was therefore easily led to attach credit to the epistle of Theophilus. He soon after assembled the bishops of Cyprus together, and prohibited the perusal of the books of Origen. He also wrote to the other bishops, and, among others, to the bishop of Constantinople, exhorting them to issue similar prohibitions. Theophilus, perceiving that there could be no danger in following the example of Epiphanius, whose exalted virtues were universally appreciated and revered, assembled the bishops of his province, and enacted a similar decree. John, on the other hand, paid little attention to the letters of Epiphanius and Theophilus. Those among the powerful and the clergy who were opposed to him, perceived that the designs of Theophilus tended to his ejection from the bishopric, and therefore endeavoured to procure the convention of a council in Constantinople, in order to carry this measure into execution. Theophilus exerted himself to the utmost in convening this council; he commanded the bishops of Egypt to repair by sea to Constantinople; he wrote to request Epiphanius and the other Eastern bishops to proceed to that city with as little delay as possible, and he himself set off on the journey thither by land. Epiphanius was the first to sail from Cyprus; he landed at Hebdoma, a suburb of Constantinople, and, after having prayed in the church erected at that place, he proceeded to enter the city. In order to do him honour, John went out with all his clergy to meet him. Epiphanius, however, evinced clearly by his conduct that he believed the disadvantageous report that had been spread against John, for he would not remain in his house, and avoided all intercourse with him. He also privately assembled all the bishops who were in Constantinople, and showed them the decrees that he had issued against the works of Origen. Some of the bishops approved of these decrees, while others objected to them. Theotimus, bishop of Scythia, strongly opposed the proceedings of Epiphanius, and told him that it was not right to cast insult on the memory of one who had long been numbered with the dead, nor to call into question the conclusion to which the ancients had arrived on the subject. While discoursing in this strain, he drew forth a work of Origen's which he had brought with him; and after reading aloud a passage conducive to the edification of the church, he remarked that those who condemned such

See p. 377, margin.

sentiments were guilty of manifest absurdity, and that while they were ridiculing the words of the author, they were evidently in danger of being tempted to ridicule the subjects themselves upon which he wrote. John manifested great respect towards Epiphanius, and invited him to join in the meetings of his church, and to dwell with him. But Epiphanius declared that he would neither reside with John, nor pray with him, unless he would denounce the works of Origen and expel Dioscorus and his companions from the city. Not considering it just to act in the manner proposed until judgment had been passed on the case, John tried to postpone the adoption of further measures to some future time. In the mean time his enemies met together, and arranged that on the day when the people would be assembled in the church of the apostles, Epiphanius should publicly pronounce condemnation on the works of Origen, and on Dioscorus and his companions as the partisans of this writer; and also denounce the bishop of the city as the abettor of Dioscorus. By this means, it was hoped, that the affections of the people would be alienated from their bishop. The following day, when Epiphanius was about entering the church, in order to carry his design into execution, he was stopped by Serapion, at the command of John, who had received intimation of the plot. Serapion proved to Epiphanius that while the project he had devised was unjust in itself, it could be of no personal advantage to him, for that, if it should excite a popular insurrection, he would be regarded as responsible for the outrages that might follow. By these arguments Epiphanius was induced to relinquish his designs.

See
 See
 See p. 377.
 See

CHAP. XV.—THE SON OF THE EMPRESS AND THE HOLY EPIPHANIUS. CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE "GREAT BROTHERS" AND EPIPHANIUS, AND THE RETURN OF THIS LATTER TO CYPRUS. EPIPHANIUS AND JOHN.

ABOUT this time, the son of the empress was attacked by a dangerous illness, and the mother, apprehensive of consequences, sent to implore Epiphanius to pray for him. Epiphanius returned for answer, that her son would recover provided that

she would avoid all intercourse with the heretic Dioscorus and his companions. To this message the empress replied as follows: "If it be the will of God to take my son, his will be done. The Lord who gave me my child, can take him back again. You have not power to raise the dead, otherwise your archdeacon would not have died." She alluded to Chrispio, the archdeacon, who had died a short time previously; he was brother to Fusconius and Salaman, monks whom I had occasion to mention¹ when detailing the history of events under the reign of Valens.

Ammon and his companions went to Epiphanius, at the permission of the empress. Epiphanius inquired who they were, and Ammon replied, "We are, O father, the Great Brothers: allow us to ask whether you have read any of our works or those of our disciples." On Epiphanius replying that he had not seen them, he continued, "How is it then that you condemn us as heretics, when you have no proof as to what sentiments we may hold." Epiphanius said that he had formed his judgment by the reports he had heard on the subject; and Ammon replied, "We have pursued a very different line of conduct from yours. We have conversed with your disciples, and read your works, and among others, that entitled 'The Anchor.' When we have met with persons who have ridiculed your opinions, and asserted that your writings are replete with heresy, we have defended you as our father. Ought you then to condemn upon mere report, and without any substantial proofs, those who have so zealously defended your sentiments, and spoken well of you?" Epiphanius was affected by this discourse, and dismissed them. Soon after, he embarked for Cyprus,² either because he recognised the futility of his journey to Constantinople, or because, as there is reason to believe, God had revealed to him his approaching death; for he died while on his voyage back to Cyprus. It is reported that he said to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." I have been informed by several persons that John predicted that Epiphanius would die at sea, and that this latter predicted the deposition of John. For it appears

¹ See above, b. vi. 32.

² Comp. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 14.

that when the dispute between them was at its height, Epiphanius said to John, "I hope you will not die a bishop," and that John replied, "I hope you will never return to your bishopric."

CHAP. XVI.—DISPUTE BETWEEN THE EMPRESS AND JOHN.
ARRIVAL OF THEOPHILUS FROM EGYPT. CYRINUS, BISHOP OF
CHALCEDONIA.

AFTER the departure of Epiphanius, John, when preaching in the church as usual, chanced to inveigh against the vices to which females are more peculiarly prone.¹ The people imagined that his strictures were expressly directed against the wife of the emperor. The enemies of the bishop did not fail to report his discourse in this sense to the empress; and she, conceiving herself to have been insulted, complained to the emperor, and urged the necessity for the presence of Theophilus, and the immediate convocation of a council. Severian, bishop of Gabales, who still entertained great resentment against John, strenuously supported these measures. I am not in possession of sufficient data to determine whether there was any truth in the current report that John delivered the discourse above mentioned with express allusion to the empress, because he suspected her of having excited Epiphanius against him. Theophilus arrived soon after at Chalcedonia in Bithynia, and was followed thither by many bishops. Some of the bishops joined him in compliance with his own invitation, and others, in obedience to the commands of the emperor. The bishops whom John had deposed in Asia, repaired to Chalcedonia with the utmost alacrity, as likewise all those who cherished any feeling of hostility against him. On the arrival of the ships which Theophilus expected from Egypt, the enemies of John met to deliberate on the means of carrying on their designs against him; and at this assembly Cyrinus, bishop of Chalcedonia, who was an Egyptian and a relative of Theophilus, and who had besides some private motives of resentment against John, burst forth into bitter invectives against him. His injustice, however, was speedily followed by judgment, for Maruthas, a native of Mesopotamia who had accompanied the bishops, happened to tread on his foot, and Cyrinus suffered so severely from this accident, that he was unable to repair with the other

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 15.

see p. 377, margin.

bishops to Constantinople, although his aid was necessary to the execution of the designs that had been formed against John. The wound assumed so alarming an appearance, that the surgeons were obliged to perform several operations on the leg; and at length mortification took place, and spread over the whole body, and even extended to the other foot. He expired soon afterwards in great agony.

CHAP. XVII.—COUNCIL HELD BY THEOPHILUS AND THE ENEMIES OF JOHN. JOHN IS SUMMONED TO ATTEND, BUT ON HIS REFUSAL IS DEPOSED BY THEOPHILUS.

WHEN Theophilus entered Constantinople, none of the clergy went out to meet him; for his enmity against John had become publicly known.¹ Some sailors from Alexandria, however, who chanced to be on shore, received him with great acclamations of joy. Passing by the church he proceeded direct to the palace, where a lodging had been prepared for his accommodation. He soon perceived that many people of the city were strongly prejudiced against John, and ready to bring accusations against him; and taking his measures accordingly, he repaired to a place called "The Oak," in the suburbs of Chalcedonia. This place now bears the name of Rufinus, for he was a consul, and erected here a magnificent palace, and a church in honour of the apostles, Peter and Paul, and appointed a congregation of monks to perform the clerical duties in the church.² When Theophilus and the other bishops met for deliberation in this place, he judged it expedient to make no further allusion to the works of Origen, and tried to extort some expression of contrition from the monks of Scetis, by assuring them that the past should be buried in oblivion. His partisans zealously seconded his efforts, and told them that they must ask Theophilus to pardon their conduct; and as all the members of the assembly concurred in this request, the monks were troubled, and believing that it was necessary to do what they were desired by so many bishops, they used the words which it was their custom to use even when injured, and declared

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 15.

² This practice, in course of time, became very general. See Possidius, Life of St. Augustine.

see p. 377 margin

that they asked forgiveness. Theophilus willingly received them into favour, and restored them to communion; and all further investigation of their conduct was abandoned. I feel convinced that this matter would not have been so quickly settled, had Dioscorus, Ammon, and the other monks, been present. But Dioscorus had died some time previously, and had been interred in the church dedicated to St. Mocius the martyr. Ammon, also, had been taken ill at the very time that preparations were being made for the convocation of the council; and although he insisted upon repairing to "The Oak," yet his malady was thereby greatly increased: he died soon after his journey, and was buried with great pomp. Theophilus, it is said, shed tears on hearing of his death, and declared that, although he had been the cause of much perplexity, there was not a monk to be found of more exalted character than Ammon. It must, however, be admitted, that the death of this monk tended much to promote the success of the designs of Theophilus.

The members of the council summoned all the clergy of Constantinople to appear before them, and threatened to depose those who did not obey the summons. They cited John to appear, and answer to the accusations laid to his charge; as likewise Serapion, Tigris a presbyter, and Paul a reader. John acquainted them, through the medium of Demetrius, bishop of Pessena, and of some of the other clergy, who were his friends, that he did not desire to screen his conduct from investigation, and that he was ready, if the names of his accusers and the subject of his accusations were made known to him, to justify his proceedings before a larger council than that which was then assembled; but he added, that he was not so imprudent as to subject himself to the judgment of his enemies. The bishops testified so much indignation at the non-compliance of John, that some of the clergy whom he had sent to the council were intimidated and did not return to him. Demetrius, and those who preferred his interests to all other considerations, quitted the council, and returned to him. The same day, a courier and a secretary were despatched by the emperor to command John to repair to the bishops, and to urge the bishops to decide his cause without further delay. After John had been cited four times, and had appealed to a general council, no other accusation could be substantiated

see p. 377, margin

against him, except his refusal to obey the summons of the council; and, upon this ground, he was deposed.

CHAP. XVIII.—SEDITION OF THE PEOPLE AGAINST THEOPHILUS AND THE MEMBERS OF HIS COUNCIL. RE-INSTALLATION OF JOHN IN THE BISHOPRIC.

THE people of Constantinople were made acquainted with the decree of the council towards the evening, and they immediately rose up in sedition.¹ At the break of day they ran to the church, and shouted that a large council ought to be convened to take cognizance of the matter; and they prevented the officers, who had been sent by the emperor to convey John into banishment, from carrying the edict into execution. John, apprehensive lest another accusation should be preferred against him, under the pretext that he had disobeyed the mandate of the emperor, or excited an insurrection among the people, secretly made his escape from the church at noon, three days after his deposition. When the people became aware that he had gone into exile, the sedition assumed a more formidable aspect than before, and many insulting speeches were uttered against the emperor and the council, and particularly against Theophilus and Severian, who were regarded as the originators of the plot. Severian happened to be teaching in the church at the very time that these occurrences were taking place; and he took occasion to commend the sentence that had been enacted against John, and stated that, even supposing him guiltless of other crimes, John deserved to be deposed on account of his pride; because, while God willingly forgives all other sins, he resists the proud. This discourse excited the anger of the people to such a pitch, that their impetuosity could no longer be repressed. They ran to the churches, to the market-places, and even to the palace of the emperor, and with loud vociferations demanded the restoration of their bishop. The empress was, at length, overcome by their vehemence and importunity; and she persuaded the emperor to yield to the wishes of the people. She sent a eunuch, named Brison, in whom she placed the utmost confidence, to bring back John without delay from Prenetes, a

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 16.

See p. 377 margin.

small city of Bithynia, whither he had been banished; and protested that she had taken no part in the machinations that had been carried on against him, but had, on the contrary, always respected him as a priest, and as the administrator of baptism¹ to her children.

When John, on his journey homeward, reached the suburbs belonging to the empress, he stopped near Anaples, and refused to re-enter the city until the injustice of his deposition had been recognised by a larger synod of bishops: but as this refusal tended to augment the popular excitement, and led to many public declamations against the emperor and the empress, he allowed himself to be persuaded to enter the city. The people went forth to meet him, bearing lighted torches, and singing psalms in honour of his return. They conducted him to the church, and although he at first objected to enter the edifice until the sentence enacted against him had been revoked, yet they compelled him to take the episcopal seat, and to bestow the benediction of peace, as usual, upon the people. He then delivered an extemporaneous discourse, in which, by a pleasing figure of speech, he declared that Theophilus had meditated an injury against his church, even as the king of Egypt had contemplated the violation of Sarah, the wife of the patriarch Abraham, which is recorded in the books of the Hebrews: he then proceeded to commend the zeal of the people, and to extol the emperor and the empress; and his praises of these august personages so excited the admiration of his auditors, that the discourse was interrupted by their acclamations.

CHAP. XIX.—PERVERSITY OF THEOPHILUS. ENMITY BETWEEN THE EGYPTIANS AND THE CITIZENS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. DEPARTURE OF THEOPHILUS. NILAMMON THE ASCETIC.

ALTHOUGH Theophilus would fain have brought an accusation against John,² under the plea that he had unlawfully reinstated himself in his bishopric, yet he was deterred from doing so by the fear of offending the emperor, who had been compelled to

¹ *μυσταγωγός*. Others regard the word as equivalent to tutor; others, to catechist. But, as Valesius remarks, the meaning of the term is settled by the use of *μυσταγωγείν*, in ch. 21, below, in the sense of "baptize."

² Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 17.

see p. 377, margin.

recall John, as the means of suppressing the popular insurrection. Theophilus, however, received an accusation against Heraclides during the absence of the accused, in the hope of thereby authorizing the sentence of condemnation which had been issued against John. But the friends of Heraclides interposed, and declared that it was unjust, and contrary to ecclesiastical law, to condemn one who was absent. Theophilus and his partisans maintained the opposite side of the question: the people of Alexandria and of Egypt sided with them, and were opposed by the citizens of Constantinople. The strife between the two parties became so vehement that bloodshed ensued; many were wounded, and others slain in the contest. Severian, and all the bishops at Constantinople who did not support the cause of John, became apprehensive for their personal safety, and quitted the city in haste. Theophilus, also, fled the city at the commencement of the winter; and, in company with Isaac the monk, sailed for Alexandria. A wind arose which drove the vessel to Gera,¹ a small city about fifty stadia from Pelusium. The bishop of this city died, and the inhabitants, I have been informed, elected Nilammon to preside over their church; he was a good man, and had attained the summit of monastic philosophy. He dwelt without the city, in a cell, of which the door was built up with stones. He refused to accept the dignity of the priesthood; and Theophilus, therefore, visited him in person, to exhort him to receive ordination at his hands. Nilammon repeatedly refused the honour; but, as Theophilus would take no refusal, he said to him, "To-morrow, my father, you shall act as you please; to-day it is requisite that I should arrange my affairs." Theophilus repaired, on the following day, to the cell of the monk, and commanded the door to be opened; but Nilammon exclaimed, "Let us first engage in prayer." Theophilus complied, and began to pray. Nilammon likewise prayed within his cell, and in the act of prayer he expired. Theophilus, and those who were with him without the cell, knew nothing at the time of what had occurred; but, when the greater part of the day had passed away, and the name of Nilammon had been loudly reiterated without his returning any answer, the stones were removed from the door, and the monk was found dead. He was interred with great solemnity, a tomb was erected to his honour, and a house of

¹ This city is mentioned in the 4th Act of the council of Chalcedon.

See p. 377, margin.

prayer built on the spot ; and the day of his death is still commemorated. Thus died Nilammon, if it can be called death to quit this life for another, rather than accept a bishopric of which, with extraordinary modesty, he considered himself unworthy.

After his return to Constantinople, John appeared to be more than ever beloved by the people. Sixty bishops assembled together in that city, and annulled all the decrees of the council of the Oak. They confirmed John in the possession of the bishopric, and enacted that he should officiate as a priest, confer ordination, and perform all the duties of the church usually devolving on the bishop. At this time, Serapion was appointed bishop of Heraclea in Thrace.

See margin of p. 379.

CHAP. XX.—THE STATUE OF THE EMPRESS. PUBLIC TEACHING OF JOHN. CONVOCATION OF ANOTHER SYNOD AGAINST JOHN. HIS DEPOSITION.

NOT long after these occurrences, the silver statue of the empress, which is still to be seen to the south of the church opposite the grand council-chamber, was placed upon a column of porphyry ;¹ and the event was celebrated by loud acclamations, dancing, games, and other manifestations of public rejoicing, usually observed on the erection of the statues of the emperors. In a public discourse to the people, John declared that these proceedings reflected dishonour on the church. This remark recalled former grievances to the recollection of the empress, and irritated her so exceedingly, that she determined to procure the convocation of another council. Instead of striving to conciliate her, John added fuel to her indignation, by openly declaiming against her in the church ; and it was at this period that he pronounced the memorable discourse commencing with the words, " Herodias is again enraged ; again she dances ; again she demands the head of John in a basin."

Several bishops arrived soon after at Constantinople ; and amongst them were Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, and Acacius, bishop of Berea. The festival of our Lord's Nativity was then at hand ; and the emperor, instead of repairing to the church as usual, sent to acquaint John that he could not hold communion with him until he had cleared himself of the crimes

Revised notes on imperor's statutes this 17/5/88.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 10.

whereof he was accused. John replied that he was ready to prove his innocence; and this so intimidated his accusers, that they did not dare to appear against him, or proffer the accusations. The judges decided that, having been once deposed, he ought not to be admitted to a second trial. Without taking cognizance of any other ground of accusation, they therefore called him to account for having taken possession of the bishopric of Constantinople after having been deposed by one council, and before he had been reinstated by another. In his defence, he appealed to the decision of the bishops who had, subsequently to the council of the Oak, held communion with him. The judges waved this argument, under the plea that those who had held communion with John were inferior, in point of number, to those who had deposed him,¹ and that a canon was in force by which he stood condemned. Under this pretext, they therefore deposed him, although the law in question had been enacted by heretics: for the Arians, after having taken advantage of various calumnies to expel Athanasius from the church of Alexandria, enacted this law from the apprehension that their machinations against him, and the cause and manner of his deposition, might at some future time be subjected to investigation.

CHAP. XXI.—CALAMITIES SUFFERED BY THE PEOPLE AFTER THE
EXPULSION OF JOHN. MACHINATIONS AGAINST HIS LIFE.

AFTER his deposition, John held no more assemblies in the church, but quietly remained in the episcopal dwelling-house. At the termination of the season of Quadregesima, on the holy night on which the people were gathered together to commemorate the resurrection of Christ, the celebration of the baptismal mysteries² was suddenly interrupted by the unexpected entrance of some soldiers, and the enemies of John. The baptistry was filled with tumult and disorder; the women wept and lamented, and the children screamed; the priests and the deacons were beaten, and were forcibly ejected from the church, in the priestly garments in which they had been officiating. They

¹ The exact number is debated; according to one account they were 36, according to another, 45.

² *μυσταγωγούντες*. See above, note on chap. 18. Some commentators have wrongly interpreted the term as referring to the holy eucharist.

were charged with the commission of such disorderly acts as can be readily conceived by those who have been admitted to the mysteries, but which I consider it requisite to pass over in silence, lest my work should fall into the hands of the uninitiated.

The next day the church was, in consequence of this outrage, abandoned; and the people assembled at some public baths of vast extent, called the baths of Constantius,¹ to celebrate the Passover, under the guidance of bishops and presbyters who espoused the cause of John. They were, however, driven hence, and then assembled on a spot without the walls of the city, which the emperor Constantine had caused to be cleared and enclosed with woods, for the purpose of celebrating there the games of the hippodrome. From that period, the people held separate assemblies, sometimes in that locality, and sometimes in another; and they hence obtained the name of Johnites. About this time, a man who was either possessed of a devil, or who feigned to have one, was seized with a poignard on his person, which he had concealed, with the intention of assassinating John; he was dragged by the people before the magistrate, but John sent some bishops to free him from custody before he had been questioned by torture. Some time afterwards, a slave of Elpidus the presbyter, who was an avowed enemy of the deacon,² was seen running as swiftly as possible towards the episcopal residence. A passer-by endeavoured to stop him, in order to ascertain the cause of so much haste; but, instead of answering him, the slave plunged his poignard into him. Another person, who happened to be standing by, and who cried out at seeing the other wounded, was also wounded in a similar way by the slave, as was likewise a third by-stander. All the people in the neighbourhood, on seeing what had occurred, shouted that the slave ought to be arrested; and as he tried to escape, they pursued him. A man, who just then came out from the baths, strove to stop him, and was so grievously wounded that he fell down dead on the spot. At length, the people contrived to encircle the slave; they seized him, and conveyed him to the palace of the emperor, declaring that he had intended to

¹ See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 8. And Palladius, *Life of Constantine*, p. 83.

² Namely, the deacon of John Chrysostom.

have assassinated John, and that the crime ought to be visited with punishment. The magistrate allayed the fury of the people by putting the delinquent into custody, and by assuring them that justice should have its course against him.

CHAP. XXII.—UNLAWFUL EXPULSION OF JOHN FROM HIS BISHOPRIC. CONFLAGRATION OF THE CHURCH BY FIRE FROM HEAVEN. EXILE OF JOHN TO CUCUSUM.

FROM this period the most zealous of the people alternately guarded the house of John by night and by day.¹ The bishops who had condemned him complained of this conduct as a manifest violation of the laws of the church, declared that they could answer for the justice of the sentence that had been enacted against him, and asserted that tranquillity would never be restored among the people until he had been expelled the city. A messenger having conveyed to him a mandate from the emperor enjoining his immediate departure, John obeyed, and escaped from the city, unnoticed by those who had been appointed to guard him. He made no other remark than that, in being sent into banishment without a legal trial, or any of the forms of the law, he was treated more severely than murderers, sorcerers, and adulterers. He was conveyed in a bark to Bithynia, and thence continued his journey. Some of his enemies were apprehensive lest the people, on hearing of his departure, should pursue him, and bring him back by force; and therefore commanded the gates of the church to be closed. When the people who were in the public places of the city heard of what had occurred, great confusion ensued; for some ran to the sea-shore, and others fled hither and thither, and awaited in great terror the calamities consequent on sedition, and the vengeance of the emperor. Those who were within the city pressed towards the doors, and by thus obstructing the entrance, rendered it impossible to force open the doors. While they were endeavouring to effect an exit, and while efforts were being made by another party without the edifice to break open the doors by means of stones, the church was suddenly discovered to be on fire; the flames extended to the grand council-chamber, which

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 18.

is situated towards the south. The two parties mutually accused each other of incendiarism; the enemies of John asserted that his partisans had been guilty of the deed from revenge, on account of the sentence that had been passed against him by the council: these latter, on the other hand, maintained that they had been calumniated, and that the crime was perpetrated by their enemies, with the intention of burning them in the church. In the mean time, while the conflagration was spreading on all sides, the officers who held John in custody conveyed him to Cucusum, a city of Armenia, which the emperor had appointed as the place of his detention. Other officers were commissioned to arrest all bishops and priests who had favoured the cause of John, and to imprison them in Chalcedonia. Those citizens who were suspected of attachment to John were sought out and cast into prison, and compelled to pronounce anathema against him.

CHAP. XXIII.—ARSACIUS APPOINTED TO SUPPLANT JOHN IN THE BISHOPRIC. PERSECUTION OF THE FOLLOWERS OF JOHN.

ARSACIUS, brother of Nectarius the predecessor of John, was, not long afterwards, ordained over the church of Constantinople.¹ He was of a very mild disposition, and possessed of great piety; but the reputation he had acquired as a presbyter was diminished by the conduct of some of the clergy to whom he delegated his power, and who did what they pleased in his name, for their evil deeds were imputed to him. Nothing, however, operated so much to his disadvantage as the persecution that was carried on against the followers of John. They refused to hold communion, or even to join in prayer with him, because the enemies of John were associated with him; and as they persisted, as we have before stated, in meeting together in the further parts of the city, he complained to the emperor of their conduct. The tribune was commanded to attack them with a body of soldiers, and by means of clubs and stones he soon dispersed them. The most distinguished among them in point of rank, and those who were most zealous in their adherence to John, were cast into prison. The soldiers, as is usual on such occasions, went beyond their orders, and

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 19.

stripped the women of their ornaments, their golden girdles, their earrings, and their jewels. Although the whole city was thus filled with trouble and lamentation, the affection of the people for John still remained the same, and they refrained from appearing in public. Many of them absented themselves from the market-place and public baths, while others, not considering themselves safe in their own houses, fled the city.

Among the zealous men and excellent women who adopted this latter measure was Nicarete, a lady of Bithynia. She belonged to a very illustrious family, and was celebrated on account of her perpetual virginity, and her virtuous life. She excelled all women that we have ever seen in modesty and circumspection, and throughout her life she invariably preferred the service of God to all earthly considerations. She bore with invincible fortitude the calamities which befell her; she saw herself unjustly despoiled of the greater part of her ample patrimony without manifesting any indignation, and managed the little that remained to her with so much economy, that although she was advanced in age, she contrived to supply all the wants of her household, and to contribute largely to the relief of the poor. To great charity she added so much ingenuity, that she was able to compound medicines for the poor who were suffering from sickness, and she frequently succeeded in curing patients who had derived no benefit from the skill of the physicians. To sum all in a few words, we have never known a religious woman endowed with so much modesty, gravity, and virtue; but her great qualifications were concealed by her humility. She would not accept of the office of deaconess, nor of instructress of the virgins consecrated to the service of the church,¹ because she accounted herself unworthy, although the honour was pressed upon her by John.

After the popular insurrection had been quelled, the prefect of the city appeared in public, as if to inquire into the cause of the conflagration, and to bring the perpetrators of the deed to punishment; but being a Pagan, he exulted in the destruction of the church, and ridiculed the calamity.

¹ These differed from the regular "monachæ," or nuns; they had a separate place in the churches, and communicated apart from the others. They were called "ecclesiasticæ," says Valesius, "quod ascriptæ essent albo seu matriculo ecclesiæ."

CHAP. XXIV.—EUTROPIUS THE READER, AND THE BLESSED OLYMPIADE, AND THE PRESBYTER TIGRIS, ARE PERSECUTED ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR ATTACHMENT TO JOHN.

EUTROPIUS, a reader,¹ was required to name the persons who had set fire to the church; but although he was scourged severely, although his sides and cheeks were torn with iron nails, and although lighted torches were applied to the most sensitive parts of his body, no confession could be extorted from him, notwithstanding his youth and delicacy of constitution. After having been subjected to these tortures, he was cast into a dungeon, where he soon afterwards expired.

A dream of Sisinius concerning Eutropius seems worthy of insertion in this history. Sisinius, the bishop of the Novatians, saw in his sleep a man, tall of stature and handsome in person, standing near the altar of the church which the Novatians erected to the honour of Stephen, the proto-martyr; the man complained of the rarity of goodness among men, and said that he had been searching throughout the city, and had found but one who was good, and that one was Eutropius. Astonished at what he had seen, Sisinius made known the dream to the most faithful of the presbyters of his church, and commanded him to seek Eutropius, wherever he might be. The presbyter rightly conjectured that this Eutropius could be no other than he who had been so barbarously tortured by the prefect, and went from prison to prison in quest of him. At length he found him, and made known to him the dream of the bishop, and besought him with tears to pray for him. Such are the details we possess concerning Eutropius.

Great fortitude was evinced in the midst of these calamities by Olympiade, the deaconess. Being dragged before the tribunal, and interrogated by the prefect as to her motives in setting fire to the church, she replied, "My past life ought to avert all suspicion from me, for I have devoted my large property to the reconstruction and embellishment of the temples of God." The prefect alleged that he was well acquainted with her past course of life. "Then," continued she, "you ought to appear as our accuser instead of sitting as our judge." As the accusation against her was wholly unsubstantiated by proofs, and as the prefect found that he had no ground on which he could justly blame her, he adopted another tone, and

¹ The ἀναγνώστῃς were sometimes called "Psaltæ" and "Lectores."

as if desirous of advising her, represented to her and the other ladies, that it was absurd in them to secede from communion with their bishop, and thereby to entail trouble upon themselves. They all deferred to the advice of the prefect with the exception of Olympiade, who said to him, "It is not just that, after having been publicly calumniated, without having had anything proved against me, I should be obliged to clear myself of charges totally unconnected with the accusation in question. Let me rather take counsel concerning the original accusation that has been preferred against me. For even if you resort to unlawful compulsion, I will not hold communion with those from whom I ought to secede, nor consent to anything that is contrary to the principles of piety." The prefect, finding that he could not prevail upon her to hold communion with Arsacius, dismissed her that she might consult the advocates. On another occasion, however, he again sent for her and condemned her to pay a heavy fine, for he imagined that by this means she would be compelled to change her mind. But she totally disregarded the loss of her property, and quitted Constantinople for Cyzicus. Tigris, a presbyter, was about the same period stripped of his clothes, scourged on the back, bound hand and foot, and stretched on the rack. He was a foreigner, and a eunuch, but not by birth. He was originally a slave in the house of a man of rank, and on account of his faithful services had obtained his freedom. He was afterwards ordained as presbyter, and was distinguished by his moderation and meekness of disposition, and by his charity towards strangers and the poor. Such were the events which took place in Constantinople.

Siricius died, after having governed the church of Rome fifteen years. Anastasius held the same bishopric three years, and then died, and was succeeded by Innocent. Flavian, who refused to consent to the deposition of John, was also dead, and Porphyry, being appointed to succeed him in the bishopric of Antioch, signed the condemnation of John. Many seceded on this account from communion with him, and hence a cruel persecution was commenced against them in Syria. Those who were in power at court procured a law in favour of Arsacius, Porphyry, and Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, by which it was enacted¹ that the orthodox were to assemble together in

¹ This law is extant in the Codex Theodos. b. 16, tit. "de his qui de religione contendunt." See Baronius, Annal. A. D. 404, ch. 54, &c.

churches only, and that if they seceded from communion with the above-mentioned bishops, they were to be exiled.

CHAP. XXV.—TROUBLES IN THE CHURCH FOLLOWED BY DISTURBANCES IN THE STATE. STILICHO, THE GENERAL OF HONORIUS.

ABOUT this period¹ the dissensions by which the church was agitated were followed, as is frequently the case, by commotions in the state. The Huns crossed the Danube and devastated Thrace. A band of robbers from Isauria ravaged cities and villages as far as Caria and Phœnicia. Stilicho, the most powerful general of his time, commanded the troops of Honorius, and had under his sway the flower of the Roman and of the barbarian soldiery; conceiving feelings of enmity against the rulers who held office under Arcadius, he determined to sow the seeds of dissension between the two empires. He caused Alaric, the leader of the Goths, to be appointed by Honorius to the command of the Roman troops, and sent him into² Illyria, whither also he despatched Jovian, the prætorian prefect, and promised to join them there with military forces, in order to add that province to the dominions of Honorius. Alaric marched at the head of his troops from the barbarous regions bordering on Dalmatia and Pannonia to Epirus; and after passing some time in waiting the arrival of Stilicho, returned to Italy. Stilicho was prevented from fulfilling his agreement of joining Alaric, by some letters which were transmitted to him from Honorius.

CHAP. XXVI.—TWO EPISTLES FROM INNOCENT, THE POPE OF ROME, OF WHICH ONE WAS ADDRESSED TO JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, AND THE OTHER TO THE CLERGY OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

INNOCENT, bishop of Rome,³ was extremely indignant when apprized of the measures that had been adopted against John,

¹ With this chapter compare the parallel account given by Zosimus, *Hist. b. v. p. 802, &c.*

² This passage has been wrongly rendered by commentators. We have followed the emendation of Valesius, who quotes in his support the passage of Sozomen above, *b. iv. 9.*

³ He succeeded to the papal chair A. D. 402. Chrysostom appealed to him on being ejected from his see, and was restored by him.

and condemned the whole proceedings. He then turned his attention to the convocation of an œcumenical council, and wrote to John and to the clergy of Constantinople. Subjoined are the two letters, precisely as I found them, translated from the Latin into Greek.

“Innocent, to the beloved brother John.

“Although one conscious of his own innocence ought to expect every blessing and to look for the mercy of God, yet it seems well to us to write to you by Cyriacus, the deacon, and to exhort you to patience, lest the contumely cast upon you should have more power in subduing your courage than the testimony of a good conscience in encouraging you to hope. It is not requisite to remind you, who are the teacher and pastor of so great a people, that God often tries the best of men and puts their patience to the severest tests; and that they are firmly supported under the most adverse occurrences that can befall them, by the approving voice of conscience. He who does not triumph over calamity by patience, is necessarily regarded with suspicion, for either his trust is not firm in God, or his own conscience condemns him. A good man may be sorely tried, but he cannot be overcome, for he is preserved and guarded by the truths of Holy Scripture. The Holy Bible, which we expound to the people, affords abundant examples of the afflictions to which the saints have been invariably subjected, and shows that they did not receive their crowns till they had passed with patience through the severest trials. Take courage, then, O honoured brother, from the testimony of your conscience, for virtue affords support in calamity. When you have been purified by affliction you will enter into the haven of peace, in the presence of Christ our Lord.”

“Innocent, the bishop, to the Presbyters, Deacons, and all the Clergy, and to the people of Constantinople under the episcopal guidance of John; peace be unto you, beloved brethren.

“From the letters that you forwarded to me through Germanus the presbyter, and Cassius the deacon, I have been made acquainted with the scenes of evil that have been enacted be-

fore your eyes, and have learnt how great has been the trial of faith among you. In such circumstances there is no remedy but patience. Our God will shortly put an end to such sufferings, and they will eventually tend to your profit. But I read with much pleasure several remarks at the commencement of your letter on the necessity of patience in affliction, and find that you have there anticipated the consolation which we ought to have conveyed to you in our letter. Our Lord gives to his servants the power of procuring consolation for themselves in tribulation, by the reflection that like afflictions were endured by the saints. And even we ourselves derive comfort from your letters, for we are not insensible to your sufferings, but suffer with you. Who, indeed, can endure to witness the disorders introduced by those who were bound to preserve peace and concord? But far from maintaining peace, they expel guiltless bishops from their own churches. John, our brother and fellow-minister and your bishop, has been the first to suffer this unjust treatment, without being allowed to speak in his own defence; no accusation was brought against him, nor was anything permitted to be advanced in his justification. What proceedings could be more contrary to reason than to give, without the formality of investigation or the shadow of justice, successors to living priests? Those who by such iniquitous measures have been appointed to their bishoprics, cannot surely be held in estimation in the church. Our fathers never acted in any way that could authorize so audacious a step, but, on the contrary, prohibited it by enacting that no one should ever be ordained during the lifetime of a bishop as his successor.¹ It is not possible that by so illegal an ordination a bishop can be excluded from his office, or that the dignity can be transferred to the person unjustly appointed to supplant him.

“ With respect to the observance of canons, we declare that those established at Nicæa are alone² entitled to the obedience of the Catholic church. If any individuals should attempt to introduce other canons, at variance with those of Nicæa, and the compilation of heretics, such canons ought to be rejected

¹ Innocent probably here alludes to the 8th canon of the council of Nicæa.

² Hence it is clear that the Roman church, at the commencement of the fifth century, had received only the Nicene canons, of course with those of Sardica added by way of appendix. The same church also at this time held only to the Nicene creed as sufficient.

*Proton
Nicene
in the
Roman
Synod
of
405*

by the Catholic church : for it is not lawful to add the inventions of heretics¹ to the catholic canons. Attempts are always being made by adversaries to subvert the objects aimed at by the fathers of Nicæa. We say, then, that the canons we have censured are not only to be disregarded, but to be condemned with the dogmas of heretics and schismatics, even as they have been already condemned at the council of Sardica by the bishops who were our predecessors. For it would be better, O honoured brethren, to condemn laudable enactments, than to establish any decrees that are contrary to the canons.

“What measures ought we to adopt under these adverse circumstances? It is necessary, as we have before said, to convene a council. There are no other means of arresting the fury of the tempest. Until a council can be assembled, it will be well to await the manifestation of the will of the Great God and of our Lord Christ. We shall thus behold the cessation of all the woes which have been excited by the malice of the devil, and which have served as trials for our faith. If we remain firm in the faith, there is nothing that we ought not to expect from our Lord. We are constantly watching for the opportunity of convening an Œcumenical Council, whereby, in accordance with the will of God, an end may be put to trouble and dissension. Let us, then, wait till this can be accomplished; and, being supported by patience, let us trust in the goodness of God for the restoration of order.

“We had previously been made acquainted with all that you have related concerning your trials, by our fellow-bishops, Demetrius, Cyriacus, Eleusius, and Paladius,² who visited Rome at different periods; and while they were with us, we carefully inquired into all the details of the case.”

CHAP. XXVII.—DEATH OF THE EMPRESS EUDOXIA. DEATH OF ARSACIUS. HISTORY OF ATTICUS, THE PATRIARCH.

FROM these two letters of Innocent, the opinion which he entertained of John may readily be inferred.

¹ This is not to be understood as if all of those who put together the Antiochian canons were heretics, but only that some of them were such. Pope Julius bears witness to this effect in his epistle to the oriental bishops, quoted by Athanasius in his Second Apology against the Arians.

² These four bishops were among those afterwards sent on an embassy to the emperor Arcadius by Pope Innocent. See below, chap. 28.

About the same period some hailstones of extraordinary magnitude fell at Constantinople and in the suburbs of the city.¹ Four days afterwards, the wife of the emperor died. These occurrences were by many regarded as indications of Divine wrath on account of the persecution that had been carried on against John. For Cyrinus, bishop of Chalcedonia, one of his principal calumniators, had not long previously terminated his life in the midst of great bodily agony arising from the accident that had occurred to his foot, and the consequent necessary amputation of the leg. Arsacius, too, died after he had presided but a very short period over the church of Constantinople. Many candidates were proposed as successors to his bishopric; and four months after his decease, Atticus, a presbyter of the clergy of Constantinople, and one of the enemies of John, was ordained over the church. He was a native of Sebaste in Armenia. He had been instructed from his youth in the principle of monastic philosophy by some monks of the Macedonian sect. These monks, who then enjoyed a very high reputation at Sebaste, had been the disciples of Eustathius, to whom allusion has been already made as an exemplary bishop and a president of monastic establishments. When Atticus attained the age of manhood, he embraced the tenets of the Catholic church. He possessed more natural gifts than literary attainments, evinced considerable aptitude for the management of affairs, and was as skilful in carrying on intrigues as in evading the machinations of others. He was of a very engaging disposition, and was generally beloved. The discourses which he delivered in the church did not rise above mediocrity, and although not totally devoid of erudition, were not accounted by his auditors of sufficient value to be preserved in writing. When he had leisure and opportunity, he studied the writings of ancient authors; but he made little display of acquaintance with their works in conversation or disputation, and was not, therefore, considered a learned man. It is said that he manifested much zeal in behalf of those who entertained the same sentiments as himself, and that he rendered himself formidable to his opponents. But while he inspired them with dread, he never failed to treat them with lenity. Such is the information which we have gathered concerning this bishop.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 19, 20.

John acquired great celebrity even in the place of his exile. He possessed ample pecuniary resources, and being besides liberally supplied with money by Olympiade, the deaconess, and others, he purchased the liberty of many captives in Isauria, and restored them to their families. He also administered to the necessities of many who were in want; and by his kind words comforted those who did not stand in need of money. He was hence exceedingly beloved, not only in Armenia where he dwelt, but by all the people of the neighbouring countries, and the inhabitants of Antioch and of the other parts of Syria, and of Cilicia, frequently sought his society.

CHAP. XXVIII.—EFFORTS OF INNOCENT, BISHOP OF ROME, TO CONVENE A COUNCIL AND PROCURE THE RECALL OF JOHN. DEATH OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

INNOCENT, bishop of Rome, was very anxious, as appears by his letters, to procure the recall of John.¹ He sent five bishops and two presbyters with the bishops² who had not returned from the East, to the emperors Honorius and Arcadius, to request the convocation of a council, and solicit them to name the time and place. The enemies of John at Constantinople brought the embassy into disrepute by their calumnies, and caused the ambassadors to be ignominiously dismissed under the pretext that indignity had been offered to the emperor of the East. John was at the same time condemned by an imperial edict to a remoter place of banishment, and soldiers were sent to conduct him to Pityuntum, the spot appointed by the emperor. It is said that during this journey, Basilicus, the martyr, appeared to him at Comana in Armenia, and apprized him of the time of his death. Being attacked with pain in the head, and being unable to bear the heat of the sun, he could not prosecute his journey, but closed his life in this town.

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 21.

² See above, note on chap. 26.

BOOK IX.

CHAP. I.—DEATH OF ARCADIUS. ACCESSION OF THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER. PIETY, VIRTUE, VIRGINITY, AND GOOD WORKS OF THE PRINCESS PULCHERIA.

SUCH are the details that have been transmitted concerning John. Not long after his death, and three years after the elevation of Atticus to the bishopric of Constantinople, and during the consulate of Bassus and Philip, Arcadius died. He left Theodosius his son,¹ who was still an infant, as his successor to the empire. He also left three daughters of tender age, named Pulcheria, Arcadia, and Marina.

It appears to me that it was the design of God to show by the events of this period, that piety alone suffices for the safety and prosperity of princes; and that without piety, armies, a powerful empire, and political resources, are of no avail. He who alone regulates the affairs of the universe, foresaw that the young emperor would be distinguished by his piety, and therefore caused his education to be conducted by his sister Pulcheria. This princess was but fifteen years of age, but was endowed with astonishing wisdom and prudence. She devoted her virginity to God, and instructed her sisters to do likewise. To avoid all cause of scandal and opportunity for intrigue, she permitted no man to enter her palace. In confirmation of her resolution, she took God, the priests, and all the subjects of the Roman empire as witnesses of her self-dedication, and presented a table, elaborately adorned with gold and precious stones, to the church of Constantinople, in token of the life of virginity to which she and her sisters had devoted themselves; and a suitable inscription was carved on the table. She superintended with extraordinary wisdom the transactions of the Roman government; concerted her measures well, and allowed no delay to take place in their execution. She was able to write and to converse with perfect accuracy in the Greek and Latin languages. She caused all affairs to be transacted in the name of her brother, and devoted great attention to furnishing him with such information as was suitable to his years. She employed masters to instruct him in

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vi. 23.

horsemanship and the use of arms, and in literature and science. But he was taught how to maintain a deportment befitting an emperor by his sister; she showed him how to gather up his robes, and how to take a seat; and taught him to refrain from ill-timed laughter, to assume a mild or a formidable aspect as the occasion might require, and to inquire with urbanity into the cases of those who came before him with petitions. But she chiefly strove to imbue his mind with piety and with the love of prayer; she taught him to frequent the church regularly, and to be zealous in contributing to the embellishment of houses of prayer; and she inspired him with reverence for priests and other good men, and for those who, in accordance with the law of Christianity, had devoted themselves to philosophical asceticism. Many troubles which would have been excited in the church at this period by the influence of erroneous opinions, were averted by her zeal and vigilance. It is mainly owing to her prudence, as we shall have occasion to show in the after-part of this history, that we are at the present time preserved from new heresies. It would take a long time to describe the magnificent houses of prayer which she erected, the hospitals for the relief of the poor and of strangers which she founded, and the monastical establishments which she endowed. If any one should doubt my statements, and desire to inquire into their truth, he will discover that I have been guilty neither of falsehood nor of partiality, if he will examine the registers kept by the treasurers of the princess. If these proofs suffice not to convince him of the truth, let him believe the testimony vouchsafed by God himself; for he heard and answered her prayers, and on many occasions bestowed on her the knowledge of future events. Such indications of Divine love are not conferred upon men unless they have merited them by their good works. But I must pass over in silence the manifestations of Divine favour that were granted to the sister of the emperor, lest I should be condemned as a mere panegyrist. One incident relating to her is, however, so connected with my history, that I shall now proceed to detail it, although it did not occur till a period subsequent to that which we are now reviewing.

CHAP. II.—DISCOVERY OF THE REMAINS OF FORTY HOLY MARTYRS.

A WOMAN, by name Eusebia, who was a deaconess of the Macedonian sect, had a house and garden without the walls of Constantinople, in which she kept the holy remains of forty soldiers,¹ who had suffered martyrdom under Licinius, at Sebaste in Armenia. When she felt death approaching, she bequeathed the aforesaid property to some orthodox monks, and bound them by oath to place the relics of the martyrs in her coffin, above her head, without apprizing any one of the circumstance. The monks fulfilled their promise: but in order to render due honour to the martyrs, and at the same time to keep the affair a secret, they formed a subterranean house of prayer beneath the spot where they had interred Eusebia; above this chapel they erected a small edifice, with the flooring so contrived as to furnish a secret means of access to the relics of the martyrs, which were preserved beneath. Soon after, Cæsar, a man of high rank, who had formerly been consul and prefect, lost his wife, and caused her to be interred near the tomb of Eusebia; for the two ladies had been knit together by the most tender friendship, and had been of one mind on all doctrinal and religious subjects. Cæsar was hence induced to purchase the whole of the adjacent spot of ground; for he desired to erect a sepulchre for himself close to that of his wife. After having disposed of the property, the monks went elsewhere, without divulging the concealment of the holy relics. Cæsar ordered the building to be demolished, and the ground to be cleared, in order to erect a magnificent temple in honour of Thrysus, the martyr, on the spot. It appears probable that God permitted the demolition of this building, in order that the discovery of the relics of the martyrs, after so long a period of concealment, might be regarded as a marvellous and auspicious event, and as a proof of the Divine favour towards the discoverer. The discoverer was, in fact, no other than Pulcheria, the sister of the emperor. Thry-

¹ The names of the Forty Martyrs (for such is the name under which they are commemorated) may be seen in Theod. Ruinart. Act. Mart. p. 581, and in the Lives of the Bollandists. They suffered martyrdom under Licinius at Sebaste in Armenia, about A. D. 320. The finest Homily on the Forty Martyrs extant is that by St. Basil.

sus, the martyr, appeared to her three times, and revealed to her that the relics of the martyrs were concealed beneath the earth, and commanded that they should be deposited near his tomb, in order that the same honour might be rendered to them that was rendered to him. The forty martyrs themselves also appeared to her, arrayed in shining robes, and made the same communication to her. But the occurrence seemed too marvellous to be credible; for the aged of the clergy of that region, after having prosecuted numerous inquiries, had always failed in gathering any information concerning the relics of the martyrs. At length, when all further researches had been abandoned as futile, a certain presbyter, who had formerly been a servant in the household of Cæsar, was reminded by God that the locality in question had once been inhabited by monks: he therefore went to the clergy of the Macedonian sect to inquire concerning them. All the monks were dead with the exception of one, who seemed to have been preserved in life for the express purpose of pointing out the spot where the relics of the holy martyrs were concealed. Polychronius questioned him closely on the subject, and finding that, on account of the promise made to Eusebia, his answers were reserved and unintelligible, he made known to him the revelation that had been vouchsafed to Pulcheria, and her consequent anxiety for further information. The monk then confessed that he remembered that in his youth, when he was first entering on the course of monastic discipline under the instructions of the superiors of the monastery, the relics of the martyrs had been deposited near the tomb of Eusebia; but that the subsequent lapse of time, and the changes which had been carried on in that locality, deprived him of the power of recalling to his recollection whether the relics had been deposited beneath the church, or in any other spot. "I remember," replied Polychronius, "that I was present at the interment of the wife of Cæsar, and, as well as I can judge from the relative situation of the high road, I infer that she must have been buried beneath the pulpit,¹ where the desk of the readers now stands."

¹ ἀμβών. "Latini pulpitum vocant, quod medium est inter altare et capsum ecclesiæ." The term is derived from the Greek word ἀναβαίνειν, ascendere. Valesius remarks that only priests, and martyrs, and founders of churches, were usually buried within the choir near the altar, the laity being buried outside the city in cemeteries.

“Then,” exclaimed the monk, “it must be near the remains of Cæsar’s wife that the tomb of Eusebia must be sought; for the two ladies lived on terms of the closest friendship and intimacy, and mutually agreed to be interred beside each other.” When it was intimated to the princess that the holy relics were deposited under-ground, she¹ commanded the work of disinterment to be forthwith commenced. On removing the earth near the pulpit of the church, the coffin of Cæsar’s wife was discovered according to the conjecture of Polychronius. At a short distance they found a pavement of bricks placed transversely, and a marble tomb of equal dimensions, in which was the coffin of Eusebia; and close by was an elegant oratory, constructed of white and purple marble. The upper part of the tomb was in the form of an altar, and at the summit, where the relics were deposited, a small orifice² was visible. A man attached to the palace, who happened to be standing by, thrust a cane which he held in his hand into the orifice, and on withdrawing the cane the most delightful fragrance was diffused around, which inspired the workmen and by-standers with fresh confidence. When the coffin was opened, the remains of Eusebia were found, and near her head was discovered the coffer, firmly bound on each side with bars of iron and lead. A small aperture at the top of the coffer clearly revealed the fact of the relics being concealed within. As soon as the discovery was announced, the princess and the bishop ran to the church of the martyr,³ and sent for smiths to unfasten the iron bars and open the coffer. A great many perfumes were found within, and among the perfumes were two silver caskets, containing the holy relics. The princess returned thanks to God for the discovery of the relics, and for having accounted her worthy of being the discoverer. She then caused the relics to be deposited in a most splendid vase, and placed with the utmost pomp and ceremony beside the remains of St. Thrysus. I myself was present at this gorgeous spectacle; and others who were present can also bear testimony to the grandeur of the festival, for it occurred at no great dis-

¹ It would have been sacrilege, as Valesius remarks, to have attempted to do this without her command.

² *τρύπημα μικρόν*. Probably for the purpose of letting down handkerchiefs, &c., to touch the remains of the deceased.

³ Called in Greek *μαρτύριον*, and in Latin *confessio*.

tance of time, but during the period that Proculus governed the church of Constantinople.

CHAP. III.—THE VIRTUES AND PIETY OF PULCHERIA, AND OF HER SISTERS.

It is said that God, on many occasions, revealed future events to Pulcheria, and conferred on her, and on her sisters, many special indications of favour. They all pursue the same mode of life; they are sedulous in their attendance in the house of prayer, and evince great charity towards strangers and the poor. These sisters generally take their meals and walks together, and pass their days and their nights together in singing the praises of God. Like other exemplary women, they employ themselves in weaving, and in similar occupations. Although of royal birth, and educated in palaces, they avoid idleness, as unworthy of the life of virginity to which they have devoted themselves. The favour of God has been, for their sakes, manifested towards their family, and the state; and the emperor, in proportion as he has grown in years, has increased in power, while all seditions and wars undertaking against him have spontaneously come to nought.

CHAP. IV.—TRUCE WITH PERSIA. HONORIUS AND STILICHO. TRANSACTIONS IN ROME AND DALMATIA.

ALTHOUGH the Persians had prepared to take up arms, they were induced to conclude a truce with the Romans for a hundred years.

Stilicho, the general of the troops of Honorius, was suspected of having conspired to raise his son Eucherius to the throne of the Eastern empire, and was, in consequence, slain by the army at Ravenna. He had, at a former period, conceived bitter feelings of enmity against the chiefs of the troops of Arcadius, and was hence impelled to sow the seeds of division between the two empires. He caused Alaric, the leader of the Goths, to be invested with the command of the troops of Honorius, and advised him to seize Illyria: and, at the same time, he appointed Jovian prefect¹ of that province, and sent him

¹ See Cassiodorus, *Histor. Tripart.* x. 24.

thither; promising to join him shortly with some Roman legions, and to take possession of Illyria in the name of Honorius. Alaric quitted the barbarous region bordering on Dalmatia and Pannonia, where he had been dwelling, and marched at the head of his soldiery to Epirus: after remaining for some time in that country, he retreated to Italy, without having accomplished anything. After the death of Arcadius, Honorius projected a journey to Constantinople, for the purpose of appointing ministers in whose fidelity confidence might be placed, and who might be trusted to watch over the security, and maintain the power, of his nephew: but, when Honorius was on the very point of setting out on this journey, Stilicho dissuaded him from his design, by proving to him that his presence was requisite in Italy, to repress the schemes of Constantine, who sought to possess himself of the sovereign power at Arles. Stilicho then took one of the Roman standards, obtained some letters from the emperor, with which he set out, at the head of four legions, to carry on war in the East: but, a report having been spread that he had conspired against the emperor, and had formed a scheme, in conjunction with those in power, to raise his son¹ to the throne, the troops rose up in sedition, and slew the prætorian prefect² of Italy and of Gaul, the military commanders, and the chief officers of the court. Stilicho himself was slain by the soldiers at Ravenna. He had attained almost absolute power; and all men, so to speak, whether Romans or barbarians, were under his control. Thus perished Stilicho, on a suspicion of having conspired against the emperors. Eucherius, his son, was slain with him.

CHAP. V.—NUMEROUS NATIONS TAKE UP ARMS AGAINST THE ROMANS; OF WHOM SOME ARE, THROUGH THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD, DISPERSED; AND OTHERS BROUGHT TO TERMS OF AMITY.

It happened about the same time that the Huns, who were encamped in Thrace, suddenly took to flight, although they had neither been attacked nor pursued. Uldis, the leader of some barbarous tribes who dwell near the Danube, crossed that river at the head of a large army, and encamped on the

¹ Zosimus says the same, b. v. p. 808.

² His name was Longianus.

frontiers of Thrace. He took possession of a city of *Moesia*, called the Camp of Mars, and thence made incursions in Thrace, and insolently refused to enter into terms of alliance with the Romans. The prefect of the Thracian cohorts made propositions of peace to him: but he replied by pointing to the sun, and declaring that it would be easy to him, if he desired to do so, to subjugate every region of the earth that is enlightened by that luminary. But, while Uldis was uttering menaces of this description, and even threatening to impose a tribute on the Romans, God gave manifest proofs of special favour towards the emperor; for shortly afterwards, the immediate attendants and chief officers of Uldis were discussing the Roman form of government, the philanthropy of the emperor, and his promptitude in rewarding merit, when they suddenly formed the resolution of ranging themselves under the Roman banners. Finding himself thus abandoned, Uldis escaped with difficulty to the opposite bank of the river. Many of his troops were slain; and among others, a barbarous tribe called the *Sciri*: this tribe had previously been very strong in point of numbers; but, being pursued and overtaken when vainly endeavouring to effect an escape, many of its members were cut to pieces, and others were taken prisoners, and conveyed in chains to Constantinople. The governors were of opinion that, if allowed to remain together, they would probably combine and create a sedition: some of them were, therefore, sold at a low price, while others were given away as slaves, upon condition that they should never be permitted to return to Constantinople, or to Europe, but be conveyed across the sea. I have seen several of these slaves employed in cultivating the earth in Bithynia, near Mount Olympus.

CHAP. VI.—ALARIC, KING OF THE GOTHs. SIEGE OF ROME.

THUS was the Eastern empire preserved from the evils of war,¹ and governed with consummate prudence, contrary to all expectations, for the emperor was still in extreme youth. In the mean time, the Western empire fell a prey to disorders and to the domination of tyrants. After the death of Stilicho, Alaric, king of the Goths, sent an embassy to Honorius to

¹ Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vii. 10.

treat of peace ; but as his terms were rejected, he laid siege to Rome ; and by posting a large army of barbarians on the banks of the Tiber, he effectually prevented the transmission of all provisions from the port to the city. After the siege had lasted some time, and fearful ravages had been made in the city by famine and pestilence, many of the slaves, and most of the foreigners within the walls, went forth to Alaric. Those among the senators who still adhered to Pagan superstition, proposed to offer sacrifice in the Capitol and the other temples ; and certain Etrurians, who were summoned by the prefect of the city, promised to launch thunder and lightning, and disperse the barbarians : they boasted of having performed a similar exploit at Narni,¹ a city of Tuscany. Events, however, proved the futility of these propositions. All persons of sense were aware that the calamities which this siege entailed upon the Romans were indications of Divine wrath sent to chastise them for their luxury, their debauchery, and their manifold acts of injustice towards each other, as well as towards strangers. It is said that, when Alaric was marching against Rome, a monk of Italy besought him to spare the city, and not to become the author of so many calamities. Alaric, in reply, assured him that he did not feel disposed to commence the siege, but found himself compelled by some hidden and irresistible impulse to accomplish the enterprise. While he was besieging the city, the inhabitants presented many gifts to him, as inducements to abandon the undertaking, and promised to persuade the emperor to enter into a treaty of peace with him.

CHAP. VII.—DEPUTATION SENT TO ALARIC BY INNOCENT, BISHOP OF ROME. JOVIUS, PREFECT OF ITALY. EMBASSY DESPATCHED TO THE EMPEROR.

ALTHOUGH ambassadors were despatched to treat of peace, the enemies of Alaric at the court of the emperor sedulously guarded against the conclusion of any treaty with him. But as an embassy was sent to him by Innocent, bishop of Rome, and as an imperial edict reached him about the same time, summoning him to appear before the emperor, Alaric repaired

¹ Otherwise called Nevia and Larnia.

to the city of Ariminum, which is two hundred and ten stadia distant from Ravenna. He encamped beyond the walls of the city, and Jovius, the prætorian prefect of Italy, held a conference with him and conveyed his demands to the emperor, one of which was, that he might be appointed to the generalship of the cavalry and infantry. The emperor gave full power to Jovius to grant Alaric as much money and corn as he might desire, but firmly refused to confer the military dignity to which he aspired. Jovius waited in the camp of Alaric the return of the messenger who had been despatched to the emperor, and had the imprudence to cause the imperial reply to be read aloud in the presence of all the barbarians. On finding that the appointment he had demanded was denied him, Alaric ordered the trumpets to be sounded, and marched towards Rome. Jovius, apprehensive of being suspected of siding with Alaric, committed a still greater act of imprudence by taken an oath on the safety of the emperor, and compelling the principal officers to swear that they would never consent to any terms of peace with Alaric. The barbarian chief, however, soon after changed his mind, and sent word he did not desire any post of rank or dignity, but was willing to act as an ally of the Romans, provided that they would grant him a certain quantity of corn, and some territory of secondary importance to them, in which he might establish himself.

CHAP. VIII.—REBELLION OF ATTALUS; AND HOW HE EVENTUALLY CRAVES FORGIVENESS AT THE FEET OF HONORIUS.

AFTER having sent some bishops as ambassadors on two different occasions to treat on this subject, but without effect, Alaric returned to Rome, raised the siege, took possession of the port, and compelled the inhabitants of Rome to recognise Attalus, then prefect of the city, as their sovereign.¹ The other officers of rank were then distributed; Alaric was appointed general of the cavalry and infantry, and Ataulphus, his brother-in-law, was raised to the command of the force called the domestic cavalry. Attalus assembled the senators, and addressed them in a long and elaborate discourse, in which he promised to restore the ancient honours of the senate, and

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vii. 10.

also to bring Egypt and the other Eastern provinces under the sway of Italy. Such was the vanity of a man who was not destined to bear the name of sovereign during the space of a single year. He was deceived by the representations of some diviners, who assured him that he would be able to conquer Africa without striking a single blow: under the influence of this false impression, he neglected the advice of Alaric, who urged him to send a moderate supply of troops to Carthage to slay the officers of Honorius, in case of their attempting any resistance. He also refused to follow the counsels of John, whom he had raised to military command, and who advised him to intrust Constans, on his proposed departure for Africa, with an edict¹ drawn up in the name of Honorius, by which Heracleian might be dispossessed of the command of the troops in Africa. Had this artifice been adopted, it would probably have proved successful; for the designs of Attalus were unknown in Africa. But as soon as Constans had set sail for Carthage, Attalus, who laboured under the delusive idea that Africa would, according to the assurances of the diviners, soon acknowledge his authority, marched at the head of his army towards Ravenna. When it was announced that Attalus had reached Ariminum with an army, composed partly of Roman and partly of barbarian troops, Honorius wrote to him to acknowledge him as emperor, and deputed the highest officers of his court to wait upon him, and offer him a share in the government. Attalus, however, refused to share the imperial power with another, and sent word that Honorius might choose an island or spot of ground in any region for his residence, and that he might retain in this retirement the outward honours of sovereignty. The affairs of Honorius were reduced to so critical a condition, that ships were kept in readiness to convey him to the Eastern court that he might implore aid of his nephew, when an army of four thousand men arrived unexpectedly during the night at Ravenna from the East. Honorius caused the walls of the city to be guarded by this reinforcement, for he distrusted the troops of Italy, and believed them to be inclined to treachery.

In the mean time, Heracleian had put Constans to death, and had ranged troops along the shores and ports of Africa to put a stop to all traffic with Rome. The Romans were in conse-

¹ γράμμα. Valesius would render it by "preceptum."

quence exposed to the horrors of famine, and in this extremity they sent to request assistance of Attalus. Being at a loss what measures to adopt, he returned to Rome to consult the senate. The famine was so grievous that chesnuts were used to supply the place of corn, and many persons were suspected of having partaken of human flesh. Alaric advised that five hundred barbarians should be sent into Africa against Heraclean; but the senators and Attalus objected to intrust an expedition of this nature to them. It then became evident to Alaric that God disapproved of Attalus; and finding that it would be futile to make any further attempts to maintain his power, he entered into negotiations with Honorius to deprive him of his sovereignty. All the parties concerned assembled together without the walls of the city, and Attalus threw aside the symbols of imperial power. His officers stripped themselves of their girdles, and they all joined together in imploring forgiveness of Honorius for the past. He granted them permission to retain their rank and honours. Attalus retired with his son to Alaric, for he thought his life would not be in safety if he continued to dwell among the Romans.

CHAP. IX.—PRESUMPTUOUS EXPECTATIONS ENTERTAINED BY THE PAGANS AND ARIANS CONCERNING ATTALUS. ALARIC, BY A STRATAGEM, OBTAINS POSSESSION OF ROME.

THE failure which had attended the designs of Attalus was a source of deep displeasure to the Pagans and the Christians of the Arian denomination. The Pagans had inferred from the known predilections and early education of Attalus, that he would openly maintain their superstitions, and restore their ancient temples, their festivals, and their altars. The Arians imagined that as soon as he found himself firmly established in the possession of power, Attalus would reinstate them in the supremacy over the churches which they had enjoyed during the reigns of Constantius and of Valens; for he had been baptized by Sigisarius,¹ bishop of the Goths, to the great satisfaction of Alaric and the Arian party.

¹ He is mentioned by Olympiodorus as having endeavoured in vain to rescue the sons of the king of the Goths from death.

Soon after, Alaric stationed himself among the Alps,¹ at a distance of about sixty stadia from Ravenna, and held a conference with the emperor concerning the conclusion of a peace. Saros, a barbarian by birth, imagining that any treaty formed between the Romans and the Goths would militate against his own private interests, rushed upon Alaric with an army only three hundred strong, but composed of chosen and valiant men. Many of the Goths fell in this encounter, and, impelled by rage and terror, Alaric retraced his steps, and returned to Rome, and the city was betrayed into his hands. He permitted his followers to seize the wealth of the citizens, and to plunder the houses; but from respect towards the apostle Peter, he prohibited the desecration of the large and beautiful church erected around his tomb. This prohibition was the only cause which prevented the entire demolition of Rome; for many had taken refuge within the church, and being permitted to escape with their lives, they undertook to rebuild their city.

CHAP. X.—VIRTUE OF A ROMAN LADY.

It is obvious that the capture of so great a city as Rome must have been attended with many remarkable circumstances; I shall therefore now proceed to the narration of such events as seem worthy of a place in ecclesiastical history. I shall recount a pious action performed by a barbarian, and record the fortitude and chastity of a Roman lady. The barbarian and the lady were both Christians, but belonged to different sects, the former being an Arian, and the latter a zealous follower of the Nicene doctrines. The lady was very beautiful, and the barbarian above-mentioned, who was a young man and a soldier in the army of Alaric, was dazzled by her extreme loveliness, and attempted to offer her violence. As she, however, exerted all her strength, and resisted his designs, he drew his sword and threatened to slay her: but he was restrained by the passion which he entertained towards her, and merely inflicted a slight wound on her neck. The blood flowed in abundance, and the lady meekly waited to receive her death-blow, for she preferred death to the violation of her chastity

¹ Another reading is "Classen," meaning the port of Ravenna, which was called Classis; but the distance does not agree.

[SOZOMEN.]

and duty towards her husband. The barbarian redoubled his efforts, but finding that they availed nothing, he was at length struck with wonder and admiration at her chastity; he conducted her to the church of Peter the Apostle, and gave six pieces of gold to the officers who were guarding the church, commanding them to take care of her, and to restore her in safety to her husband.

CHAP. XI.—MANY INSTANCES OF REBELLION AND USURPATION OCCUR IN THE WEST. THE FAVOUR OF GOD MANIFESTED TOWARDS HONORIUS BY THE DEFEAT AND DEATH OF THE TYRANTS.

DURING this period, many persons rebelled against Honorius, and seized the imperial authority in the West; but some of these tyrants were permitted to destroy each other, while others most unexpectedly fell under the power of the Roman arms, and in every case it was evidenced that the Divine favour rested in an especial manner upon Honorius. The soldiers in Britain¹ were the first to rise up in sedition, and they proclaimed Mark as tyrant; afterwards, however, they slew Mark, and proclaimed Gratian. Within four months subsequently they killed Gratian and elected Constantine in his place, imagining that, on account of his name, he would be able to reduce the empire under his authority; and for no other reason than this, several other persons of the same name were advanced to power. Constantine passed over from Britain to Boulogne,² a maritime city of Gaul, and after inducing all the troops in Gaul and Aquitaine to espouse his cause, he reduced to obedience the inhabitants of the regions extending to the mountains which divide Italy from Gaul, and which the Romans have named the Cot-

¹ Zosimus, b. vi. p. 824, relates the story in the same way. He is confirmed by the Venerable Bede, Eccl. Hist. b. i., who says, "In the year of our Lord's Incarnation 407, Honorius, the younger son of Theodosius, and the 44th from Augustus, being emperor two years before the invasion of Rome by Alaric, king of the Goths, when the nations of the Alani, Suevi, Vandals, and many others with them, having defeated the Franks, and crossed the Rhine, ravaged all Gaul, Gratianus Municeps was set up as tyrant, and killed. In his place, Constantine, one of the meanest soldiers, only for his name's sake, and without any worth to recommend him, was chosen emperor. As soon as he had taken upon him the command, he passed over into France."

² *Βουβονία*, though others read *Βονωνία*, Bononia.

tian Alps. He then sent his eldest son, Constans, whom he had already nominated Cæsar, and whom he afterwards proclaimed emperor, into Spain. Constans, after making himself master of this province, and appointing governors over it, commanded that Didymus and Verinian, relatives of Honorius, should be loaded with chains and brought before him. Didymus and Verinian had long been on unfriendly terms, but a reconciliation was effected between them, when they found themselves menaced by the same danger. They combined their forces, which consisted chiefly of armed peasants and slaves, committed some acts of hostility in Lusitania, attacked the troops that had been sent against them by the tyrant, and slew a great number of them.

CHAP. XII.—THEODOSIOLUS AND LAGODIUS. THE VANDALS AND SUEVI. DEATH OF ALANICUS. RETREAT OF THE TYRANTS CONSTANTINE AND CONSTANS.

THE troops of Constans were shortly afterwards strengthened by reinforcements, and Didymus and Verinian, with their wives, were taken prisoners, and were eventually put to death. Their brothers Theodosiolus and Lagodius fled the country, and sought refuge elsewhere: the former escaped to Italy, and put himself under the protection of the emperor Honorius; the latter fled to the East, and sought safety at the court of Theodosius. After these transactions, Constans returned to his father; but, on leaving the country, he established forts along the frontiers, which he garrisoned with his own soldiers; for he feared to adopt the ancient custom of intrusting the Spaniards with the defence of their native land. This precaution was probably the cause of the ruin of the country; for, when Constantine was deprived of his power, the Vandals, Suevi, and Alans seized the mountain passes, took possession of many forts and cities in Spain and Gaul, and arrested the chief officers of the tyrant.

In the mean time Constantine, who was still confident of ultimate success, caused his son Constans to be proclaimed emperor, and determined to possess himself of Italy. With this view, he crossed the Cottian Alps, and entered Verona,¹ a city of Liguria. He was on the point of crossing the Po, when

¹ Διβίρωνα. We have followed here the opinion of Valesius.

he was compelled to retrace his steps, by the intelligence which was then conveyed to him of the death of Alanicus. This Alanicus was the commander of the troops of Honorius, and being suspected of conspiring to place the Western empire under the domination of Constantine, he was slain when returning from a procession, in which, according to custom, it was his office to march in advance of the emperor. Immediately after this occurrence, the emperor descended from horseback, and publicly returned thanks to God for having delivered him from one who had openly conspired against him. Constantine fled to Arles, and Constans his son hastened from Spain, and sought refuge in the same city.

On the decline of the power of Constantine, the Vandals, Suevi, and Alans took forcible possession of the rich and fertile region of the Pyrenees. They easily dispossessed the soldiers whom Constans had left to guard the frontier, and effected an entrance into Spain.

CHAP. XIII.—CONCERNING GERONTIUS, MAXIMUS, AND THE TROOPS OF HONORIUS. DEFEAT OF GERONTIUS; HE AND HIS WIFE PERISH TOGETHER.

GERONTIUS, from being the most efficient of the generals of Constantine, became his enemy; and believing that Maximus, his intimate friend, was well qualified to hold the reins of power, he invested him with the imperial purple, and conveyed him to Tarracon. Gerontius then marched against Constantine, and put Constans to death at Vienna.

As soon as Constantine heard of the usurpation of Maximus he sent one of his generals, named Edovicus, beyond the Rhine, to levy an army of Franks and Alemanni; and he sent his son Constans to guard Vienna and the neighbouring towns. Gerontius then laid siege to Arles; but some troops of Honorius marched to its relief, under the command of Constantius, the father of that Valentinian who subsequently became emperor of Rome. Gerontius retreated precipitately with a few soldiers; for the greater number of his troops deserted to the army of Constantius. The Spanish soldiery conceived an utter contempt against Gerontius, on account of his cowardly retreat, and took counsel how to slay him. They attacked his

house during the night, but he, with one Alanus his friend, and a few slaves, ascended to the top of the house, and did such execution with their arrows, that no less than three hundred of the soldiers fell. When the stock of arrows was exhausted, the slaves made their escape from the house; and Gerontius might easily have followed their example, had not his affection for Nunchia, his wife, detained him by her side. At day-break the next day, the soldiers deprived him of all hope of saving his life, by setting fire to the house; and he cut off the head of Alanus, in compliance with his entreaties. His wife then besought him, with groans and tears, to perform the same office for her rather than permit her to fall into the hands of another; and he complied with her last request. Thus died one who manifested a degree of courage worthy of her religion; for she was a Christian: and her death deserves to be held in remembrance. Gerontius then struck himself thrice with his sword; but, not succeeding in wounding himself mortally, he drew forth his poignard, which he wore at his side, and plunged it into his heart.

CHAP. XIV.—DEFEAT AND DEATH OF EDOVICUS.

ALTHOUGH the city of Arles was closely besieged, Constantine refused to surrender, because he was in expectation of the arrival of the reinforcements for which he had despatched Edovicus. The besiegers were seized with terror when they heard of his return; and, after some deliberation, they hastened to cross the river Rhone. Constantius, who commanded the infantry, quietly awaited the approach of the enemy, while Ulphilas, his general, remained in ambush with his cavalry. When the troops of the enemy attacked Constantius, and commenced the conflict, Ulphilas, at a given signal, rushed upon them from behind, and soon threw them in disorder. Some tried to escape, some were slain, while others threw down their arms, and entreated for life and pardon. Edovicus mounted his horse, and fled to the lands of one Ecdicius, to whom he had formerly rendered some important service, and whom he therefore imagined to be his friend. Ecdicius, however, struck off his head, and presented it to the generals of Honorius, in hope of receiving some great reward. Constantius exclaimed, as he

received the head, that the public were obliged to Ecdicius for the victory of Ulphilas.¹ He commanded, however, that Ecdicius should be dismissed from the army; for he disdained to retain in his service a man capable of enacting so dishonourable a part against his guest and his former friend. Thus Ecdicius reaped no advantage from the murderous deed which he had perpetrated.

CHAP. XV.—CONSTANTINE THROWS ASIDE THE EMBLEMS OF IMPERIAL POWER, AND IS ORDAINED AS PRESBYTER. HIS DEATH. DEATH OF THE OTHER TYRANTS WHO HAD CONSPIRED AGAINST HONORIUS.

AFTER this victory the troops of Honorius again laid siege to Arles. When Constantine heard of the death of Edovicus, he cast aside his purple robe and imperial ornaments, and repaired to the church, where he caused himself to be ordained as presbyter. The besieged surrendered and opened the gates of their city, and their lives were spared. From that period the whole province returned to its allegiance to Honorius, and has since been governed by the rulers of his appointment. Constantine with his son Julian was sent into Italy, but he was waylaid and killed. Not long afterwards, Jovius and Maximus, the tyrants above-mentioned, Saros,² and many others who had conspired against Honorius, were slain.

CHAP. XVI.—FAVOUR OF GOD MANIFESTED TOWARDS THE EMPEROR HONORIUS. DEATH OF HONORIUS. HIS SUCCESSORS. PEACE ESTABLISHED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

THIS is not the proper place to enter into details concerning the deaths of the tyrants; but I considered it necessary to allude to the circumstance in order to show that to insure the stability of imperial power, it is sufficient for an emperor to serve God with reverence, which was the course pursued

¹ For, as Valesius remarks, if Ulphilas had not routed the forces of Edovicus, Ecdicius would never have been able to cut off his head.

² He was a Goth, and had been on the side of Honorius against Alaric: but afterwards in anger he abandoned the cause of Honorius, and espoused the cause of Jovius.

by Honorius. Galla Placida, who was born of the same father as himself, dwelt with him, and likewise distinguished herself by real zeal in the maintenance of religion and of the churches. After Constantius, who was a brave and able general, had conquered the tyrant Constantine, the emperor rewarded him by giving him his sister in marriage, and admitting him to a share in the government. Constantius did not long survive the promotion: ¹ he died soon after, and left two children, Valentinian, who succeeded Honorius, and Honoria. A profound peace reigned at this period throughout the Eastern empire, and notwithstanding the extreme youth of the emperor, the affairs of government were, contrary to all expectation, conducted with great wisdom. It seems as if God openly manifested his favour towards the emperor, not only by causing all wars and seditions to cease, but also by permitting the discovery of the remains of many persons who had rendered themselves celebrated by their piety. Among other relics, those of Zechariah, the ancient prophet, and of Stephen, who was ordained deacon by the apostles, were discovered; and it seems incumbent upon me to describe the mode in which these holy remains were unexpectedly brought to light.

CHAP. XVII.—DISCOVERY OF THE REMAINS OF ZECHARIAH
THE PROPHET, AND OF STEPHEN THE PROTO-MARTYR.

I SHALL first speak of the relics of the prophet. Caphar-Zechariah is a village of the territory of Eleutheropolis, a city of Palestine. The land of this district was cultivated by Calemerus, a man who was faithful to the proprietor of the soil, but morose, and even unjust towards his neighbours. Although he possessed these defects of character, the prophet appeared to him in a dream, pointed out to him a particular garden, and said to him, "Go, dig in that garden at the distance of two cubits from the hedge which divides it from the road leading to the city of Bithere-man. You will there find two coffins, a wooden one enclosed in one of lead. Beside the coffins you will see a crystal vase full of water, and two serpents of moderate size, but tame, and perfectly innoxious." Calemerus

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vii. 22.

followed the directions of the prophet, and zealously applied to the task. When he found the holy coffins, the one enclosed within the other, as had been described to him, the prophet appeared to him, clad in a white robe, which makes me think that he was a priest. At the foot of the coffin was the body of a child, apparently of royal birth, for on its head was a golden crown, its feet were encased in golden sandals, and it was arrayed in a costly robe. The wise men and priests of the time were greatly perplexed about this child; for they could ascertain no particulars concerning its birth or parentage, or the reason of its having been interred in this place. It is said that Zechariah, the superior of a monastery at Gerasis, found an ancient document written in Hebrew, which had not been received among the canonical books. In this document it was stated, that when Zechariah the prophet had been put to death by Joash, king of Judah, the family of the monarch was visited by a dire calamity; for, on the seventh day after the death of the prophet, one of the sons of Joash, whom he tenderly loved, suddenly and unexpectedly expired. Judging that this affliction was a special manifestation of Divine wrath, the king ordered his son to be interred at the feet of the prophet, as a kind of atonement for the crime. Such are the particulars which I have ascertained on the subject.

Although so long a space of time had elapsed since the interment of the prophet, his body was found in a state of perfect preservation; his hair was closely shorn, his nose was straight, his beard of a moderate length, his head short, his eyes rather sunken, and overshadowed by thick eye-brows.

EPITOME
OF THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF
PHILOSTORGIUS,
COMPILED BY
PHOTIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

TRANSLATED
BY EDWARD WALFORD, M. A.
LATE SCHOLAR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF PHILOSTORGIUS,

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

ALL that is known with certainty of Philostorgius, is that he was a native of Cappadocia, and was born of humble parentage about the year A. D. 364. It would seem that he came to Constantinople in his youth to complete his studies; but it is uncertain whether he was educated for the legal or for the ecclesiastical profession. In later life he composed a History of the Church, comprised in twelve books, from the beginning of the Arian schism down to the year A. D. 425.

The work itself is no longer extant; but we have an Epitome of it compiled by Photius, who was appointed to the Patriarchal see of Constantinople, A. D. 853, and under whom the schism between the Eastern and Western churches was formally consummated. We have also a short notice of this work in the Bibliotheca of the same learned writer (*Myriobiblion*, Cod. 40). It is to be observed that Photius, although he was the author of the expulsion of the term "*Filioque*" from the Nicene Creed, inveighs throughout his Epitome against Philostorgius as a heretic and impious person, and as a friend and apologist of Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Apollinaris, and other heretics of the fourth and fifth centuries.

Philostorgius would seem to have been a person possessed

of a considerable amount of general information, and he has inserted in his narrative many curious geographical and other details about remote and unknown countries, and more especially about the interior of Asia and Africa. He was rather inclined to credulity, in regard to portents, monsters, prodigies, and other wonderful things, of which he gives accounts at considerable length; and Photius himself vehemently censures him for his absurdity in attributing miracles to those whom the patriarch himself regarded as heretics. He is quoted by Gibbon in the 18th, 19th, and 20th chapters of his "Decline and Fall," not however without a caution against his Arian predilections and his partiality to the cause of Gallus.

The Epitome was translated into Latin, with comments by J. Gothofredus, and published in 4to at Geneva in 1642; as also by H. de Valois, under the title of "Compendium Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Philostorgii, quod dictavit Photius Patriarcha," Paris, 1673, with notes. It has also been translated into French, and published at Paris in 1676, under the title *Abregé de l' Histoire de l' Eglise de Philostorge*. It appears now for the first time in an English translation.

E. W.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF
PHILOSTORGIUS.

THE History composed by this author was comprised in twelve books, and the initial letters of each book being put together composed the author's name. Philostorgius commenced his History from the outbreak of the contest between Arius and Alexander, which he regarded as the first cause of the outbreak of the Arian heresy : and he continued it down to the date of the proclamation as emperor of Valentinian the younger, the son of Constantius and Placidia, and the violent death of John the Tyrant. The History itself was written as an encomium on the heretical party, and an attack and assault upon the orthodox, rather than a history.

EPITOME OF BOOK I.

CHAP. 1.—PHILOSTORGIUS says that he cannot tell who was the author of the two books which are commonly called those of the Maccabees. But he is especially loud in the praise of their unknown author, inasmuch as the events which he narrates in them are found to correspond exactly with the prophecies of Daniel:¹ and also because of the skill which he

¹ The Books of the Maccabees are most useful in explaining the difficulties which arise in the interpretation of chapters 7th, 8th, and 11th of Daniel, and especially that part which refers to the "little horn," (Dan. vii. 8,) by which the sanctuary was profaned. This "horn" was Antiochus, whose evil deeds, alluded to by Daniel, are so clearly described in the 1st and 2nd Books of the Maccabees, that the very time and the number of the days mentioned by Daniel are found to coincide with the facts of history. *Vales.*

shows in explaining how the evil deeds of men reduced the condition of the Jewish people to the lowest depths, just as afterwards it was the valour of other men that retrieved it again; when the Jews resuscitated the spirit in which they had met their enemies of old, and had seen their temple purged of foreign superstitions. The Second Book of Maccabees, however, according to Philostorgius, would seem to be the work of a different writer from the First; and is a mere compendium of what Jason of Cyrene related at length in five books. It gives an account of the war carried on by Judas Maccabeus against Antiochus Epiphanes, and his son named Eupator. But as to the Third Book of the Maccabees, Philostorgius utterly rejects it as monstrous, and as bearing no resemblance to the two former ones. The Fourth Book he asserts to have been the work of Joseph, and to be regarded rather as an encomium upon Eleazar and his seven sons, the Maccabeans, than as a regular history of events.

CHAP. 2.—Though Philostorgius praises Eusebius Pamphilus as well on other grounds as on account of his Ecclesiastical History, yet he accuses him of erroneous opinions in matters relating to religion.¹ The accusation which he brings against him is to the effect that Eusebius considered the Deity as unintelligible and incomprehensible, and that he was implicated in a variety of other strange opinions. He also bears

¹ See the Life of Eusebius prefixed to Bohn's edition of his Ecclesiastical History, pp. xxv. and xxvi. The following is the estimate of his character as given by Fleury. "Though the doctrine of Eusebius of Cæsarea might be excused, it is hard to justify his conduct. He is marked from the beginning among the bishops who took Arius under their protection against Alexander of Alexandria. In his Ecclesiastical History he does not say a word of this famous dispute (the Arian controversy); and that it may not be said that he ended his History where it began, he speaks nothing plainly of it in his Life of Constantine, saying only in general terms, that there was a division in the church, principally in Egypt, without ever explaining the cause of it; and it might seem, according to him, that in the council of Nicæa no other important question was treated of than that of Easter. In relating the laws of Constantine against heretics, he makes no mention of that which condemned the writings of Arius to be burnt. Speaking of the council of Tyre, he says not a word of the process of St. Athanasius, who was the subject of it. This affected silence gives better authority to those among the ancients who have accused him of Arianism, than to those who would justify him from it. Acacius also, his disciple and successor in the see of Cæsarea, became afterwards one of the chiefs of the Arians." Fleury, Eccl. Hist. b. xii. ch. 6.

witness that Eusebius brought down his history to the period when Constantine the Great was succeeded in the empire by his sons.¹

CHAP. 3.—The impious Philostorgius says that when the votes of the people were inclining to his own side in the election of an archbishop of Alexandria, Arius preferred Alexander to himself, and so contrived to give him a majority.

CHAP. 4.—He also says that a certain presbyter of Alexandria, who was called Baucalis,² on account of a lump of superfluous flesh which had grown upon his back to the size of an earthen vessel, such as the Alexandrians call "Baucala" in their provincial dialect, having obtained the post of honour among the presbyters next to Arius himself, brought about the beginning of contention between Alexander and Arius, and that it was from this circumstance that the preaching of the Homoöusian³ doctrine was devised.⁴

CHAP. 5.—Constantius, the father of Constantine the Great, according to Philostorgius, was proclaimed emperor⁵ of Upper Galatia and the district lying around the Alps; regions which were very remote and difficult of access. This Upper Galatia

¹ A. D. 336.

² The learned Gothofred is of opinion that "Baucalis" was not the name of the presbyter, but that he was named Arius, and attached to a church in Alexandria called Baucalis. He is not mentioned by any other writer.

³ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. book i. chap. 8, and note in loco.

⁴ Fleury states that Arius was not only a priest, but had also charge of the church called Baucalis at Alexandria. He had aimed at the episcopal dignity, and could not bear that Alexander should be preferred before him. Finding nothing that he could blame in Alexander's conduct, Arius sought to cavil at his doctrine, and the following opportunity occurred. Alexander, speaking of the Holy Trinity in the presence of the priests and others of the clergy, maintained that there was a Unity in the Trinity. Arius pretended that this assertion was an introduction of the heresy of Sabellius, and ran into the contrary extreme; for disputing with too much wrath, he said that if the Father begot the Son, he who was begotten must have had a beginning of his being; from which it follows that there was a time when the Son was not, and consequently that he is derived from nothing. He added that the Son of God is God's creature and work, capable of virtue and vice by his own free will, with some other consequences of the erroneous principles which he laid down. This doctrine was new and unheard of till then. On the other side, Alexander taught with the whole church that the Son of God is the same in dignity and substance with the Father. (Book x. chap. 28.)

⁵ A. D. 305.

is now called Gallia or Gaul by the Romans. The death of Constantius occurred in Britain,¹ which is also called the island of Albion. Constantine succeeded in avoiding the treachery of Diocletian, and finding his father on his death-bed upon his arrival in Britain, he soon after committed his body to the tomb, and was shortly proclaimed his successor in the empire.

CHAP. 6.—As to the cause of the conversion² of Constantine from heathen superstitions to the Christian faith, Philostorgius, in conformity with all other writers, ascribes it to his victory over Maxentius, in a battle in which the sign of the cross was seen in the East, vast in extent and lit up with glorious light, and surrounded on each side by stars like a rainbow, symbolizing the form of letters. The letters too were in the Latin tongue and formed these words, “In hoc signo vinces.”³

¹ A. D. 306.

² Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* book i. chap. 2, and Euseb. *Life of Constantine*, book i. chapters 2 and 28.

³ As his force was smaller than that of Maxentius, he thought that he required some superior assistance, and considered to what deity he should address himself. He reflected that the emperors who in his time were zealous for idolatry had perished miserably, and that his father Constantius, who during his life had revered the only Supreme God, had received visible tokens of his protection. He therefore determined to adhere to this great God, and instantly began to beseech him to stretch his favourable hand over him. The emperor Constantine prayed thus with the greatest earnestness, when about noon, the sun beginning to decline, as he traversed the country with some of his forces, he saw in the sky above the sun a cross of light, with an inscription to this effect, “By this thou shalt conquer.” . . . Constantine’s thoughts were employed the rest of the day on this miracle, considering what could be the meaning of it. At night, while he was asleep, Jesus Christ appeared to him with the same sign that he had seen in the sky, and ordered him to make a representation of it, and to make use of it in battle against his enemies. . . . This was the fashion of it, a long pole like a pike, covered with gold, traversed by another in the form of a cross: at the upper end there was fastened a garland of gold and precious stones, enclosing the symbol of the name of Christ, namely the two first letters of the word in Greek, viz. X and P. On the cross stick hung a small square standard of very rich stuff, being purple and gold tissue set with jewels. On the top of these colours and below the sacred monogram were the images of the emperor and his two sons wrought in gold. The form of the standard was not new, but it was called by the new name of Labarum. The emperor caused banners of the same fashion to be made for all his troops, and he himself wore upon his helmet the cross, or rather the monogram of the word Christ: his soldiers wore it on their shields, and the coins and medals of Christian emperors are full of it. Fleury’s *Eccl. Hist.* book ix. chap. 43.

CHAP. 7.—Philostorgius says that before the synod at Nicæa, Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, came to Nicomedia, and after a convention with Hosius¹ of Cordova and the other bishops who were with him, prevailed upon the synod to declare the Son consubstantial with the Father, and to expel Arius from the communion of the church.

2nd ed.
on Nicæa
A. D. 325
the council
this 25
7, 88-

CHAP. 8.—Not long after this, the synod of Nicæa was held; at this synod, over and above the other high priests of God, Basileus,² bishop of Amasea, and Meletius,³ bishop of Sebastopolis, were present.

CHAP. 9.—Philostorgius also confesses that all the bishops consented to the exposition of the faith made at Nicæa, with the exception of Secundus,⁴ bishop of Ptolemais, and Theon, bishop of Marmarica. But the rest of the band of Arian bishops, such as Eusebius of Nicomedia, (whom Philostorgius calls the Great,) Theognis of Nicæa, and Tharis of Chalcedon, and all the others, embraced the sentence of the council, though with a fraudulent and treacherous purpose, (as Philostorgius admits,) for under the term *ὁμοούσιος* they secretly introduced that of *ὁμοιούσιος*.⁵ But still they did not refuse submission to the decrees of the synod, though Constantina, the emperor's sister, suggested this counsel to them.

CHAP. 10.—Philostorgius adds that Secundus, on going into exile, said to Eusebius, "You subscribed, Eusebius, in order to escape being sent into banishment: but I place my confidence in a revelation made to me by God, that within a year you will be sent into exile too." In point of fact, within three months after the conclusion of the synod, Eusebius was

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 8.

² Or Basil (*Βασίλειος*) according to other writers. It is to be observed that all other writers agree in considering that he was killed in the persecution under Licinius, and was not therefore present at Nicæa. Valesius is of this latter opinion.

³ Concerning this Meletius, see the note of Valesius on Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 32. The interpreters of Philostorgius confound him with Meletius of Sebaste, who was afterwards bishop of Antioch.

⁴ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 8, and note in loco. Socrates states that *five* bishops declined to subscribe to the exposition of faith at Nicæa. It is clear, however, that he is mistaken, not only from this passage of Philostorgius, but also from the letter of the council given by himself subsequently in chap. 9, where, it may be observed, Theon is called Theonas.

⁵ Compare note on Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 8.

[PHILOSTORGIUS.]

sent into exile according to the prediction of Secundus, upon returning to his own original and manifest impiety.

EPITOME OF BOOK II.

CHAP. 1.—PHILOSTORGIUS falsely relates, that after the general council and the recantation of the Eusebians, and their open return to the orthodox faith, the emperor Constantine punished them, because, while they subscribed to the Homoöusian faith, they entertained sentiments at variance with it,¹ and on the other hand, that he recalled Secundus and his associates from banishment, and sent letters in every direction, exploding the term “Homoöusios,” and confirming the doctrine of a diversity of substance. He adds that Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, subscribed these letters, and that on this account Arius communicated with him. But when all fear on account of the emperor was at an end, Alexander returned to his original sentiments, while Arius and those who joined with him in his opinions seceded from communion with Alexander and the church.

CHAP. 2.—He says that Arius, after his secession from the church, composed several songs to be sung by sailors, and by millers,² and by travellers along the high road, and others of the same kind, which he adapted to certain tunes, as he thought suitable in each separate case, and thus by degrees seduced the minds of the unlearned by the attractiveness of his songs to the adoption of his own impiety.

CHAP. 3.—Though Philostorgius extols Arius to the skies for impugning the Divinity of the Son, yet he asserts that the latter is involved in the most absurd errors, because he everywhere affirms that God cannot be known, or comprehended, or conceived by the human mind; and not only by men, (which perhaps were an evil more easy to endure,) but also not even by His own only-begotten Son. And he asserts that not only Arius, but also a large body of his followers, were carried

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 16, 20.

² ᾠσματα ἐπιμύλια. Philostorgius here makes no mention of the song known in the “Thalia,” from which Athanasius distinguishes these popular songs in his book concerning the Decrees of the Council of Nicæa. *Vales.*

away into this absurd error at the same time. For with the exception of Secundus and Theonas, and the disciples of the martyr Lucian, namely Leontius, Antonius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, the rest of the impious band of heretics adopted this opinion.

CHAP. 4.—Philostorgius asserts that Constantine was induced by the fraudulent artifices of his step-mother to put his son Crispus to death ;¹ and afterwards, upon detecting her in the act of adultery with one of his *Cursores*, ordered the former to be suffocated in a hot bath. He adds, that long afterwards Constantine was poisoned by his brothers during his stay at Nicomedia, by way of atonement for the violent death of Crispus.

CHAP. 5.—He also says that Urphilas² brought over as settlers to the Roman territory a large body of persons who had been driven out of their ancient abodes for the sake of their religion. These came from among the Scythians, north of the Ister, and were formerly called *Getæ*, though now they are better known as Goths. And he asserts that this race of men were brought over to the faith of Christ in the following manner. While Valerian and Gallienus were administering the empire, a large multitude of Scythians, who lived north of the Ister, made an incursion into the Roman territory, and laid waste a great part of Europe by their predatory excursions : and afterwards having crossed over into Asia, invaded Cappadocia and Galatia. Here they took a large quantity of prisoners, among whom were not a few ecclesiastics ; and they returned to their own country laden with spoils and booty. These pious captives, by their intercourse with the barbarians, brought over a great number of the latter to the true faith, and persuaded them to embrace the Christian religion in the place of heathen superstitions. Of the number of these

¹ Compare the account given in Aurelius Victor, chap. 41, Ammianus Marcellinus, book xiv. 6, and others, who state that Crispus and Fausta were put to death by Constantine. It is to be observed, however, that Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, and Socrates, in his *History*, make no mention of the fact, which is entirely discredited by Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 5*) and Evagrius (*Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 40, 41*). *Vales*.

² Concerning Urphilas, or Ulphilas, as others call this bishop of the Goths, and the conversion of the Goths to the Christian faith, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 34* ; Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 37* ; Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 37*.

scriptives were the ancestors of Urphilas himself, who were of Cappadocian descent, deriving their origin from a village called Sadagolthina, near the city of Parnassus. This Urphilas, then, was the leader of this pious band which came out from among the Goths, and became eventually their first bishop. The following was the method of his appointment. Being sent by the then king of the Goths on an embassy to the court of the emperor Constantine, (for the barbarous tribes in those parts were subject to the emperor,) he was ordained bishop of the Christians among the Goths, by Eusebius and the other prelates that were with him. Accordingly he took the greatest care of them in many ways, and amongst others, he reduced their language to a written form, and translated into their vulgar tongue all the books of Holy Scripture, with the exception of the Books of Kings, which he omitted, because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war. But those books have the greatest influence in exciting the minds of readers, inasmuch as they are regarded with great veneration, and are adapted to lead the hearts of believers to the worship of God. This multitude of converts were located by the emperor in the different parts of Mœsia, as he thought best, and he held Urphilas himself in such high honour, that he would often speak of him in conversation as the Moses of his day. Philostorgius is loud in his praises of this Urphilas;¹ and asserts that both he

¹ This is not to be wondered at, considering that Urphilas adopted the Arian heresy. "Being arrived at Constantinople on this embassy," (says Fleury,) "he conferred with the chiefs of the Arians; and whether he hoped to succeed in his negotiation by their credit, or whether he was really convinced by their persuasions, he came over to them; and this was the reason why the Goths likewise fell into Arianism, and afterwards spread it all over the East. Till this time they had followed the apostolical doctrine which they had at first received, and even at that time they did not wholly forsake it. For they by whom they were seduced persuaded them that the dispute between the Catholics and the Arians was only about words which did not alter the fundamental points of doctrine. Thus, in the time of Theodoret, (Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 37,) the Goths did indeed confess that the Father was greater than the Son; still, however, they did not say that the Son was a creature, although they communicated with those that said so. . . . The Gospel is still extant, as translated into their language by Urphilas." Fleury, Eccl. Hist. b. xvii. ch. 36.

and the Goths who were under his spiritual rule, were followers of his own heretical opinions.

CHAP. 6.—The impious Philostorgius relates that the Christians in Central India,¹ who were converted to the faith of Christ by the preaching of St. Bartholomew, believe that the Son is not of the same substance with the Father. He adds that Theophilus the Indian,² who had embraced this opinion,³ came to them, and delivered it to them as a doctrine; and also that these Indians are now called Homeritæ,⁴ instead of their old name of Sabæans, which they received from the city of Saba, the chief city of the whole nation.

CHAP. 7.—Philostorgius says, that Eusebius,⁵ Maris, and Theognis, after a period of three years spent in banishment, were recalled by command of the emperor, and immediately put forth an heretical form of faith, and sent it in every direction, in order to counteract the Nicene Creed. He adds, that Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, was deposed⁶ and excommunicated by the same parties, because he afterwards returned to the Homoousian faith; but that Eustathius,⁷ bishop of Antioch, was deposed by them on different grounds, namely, on a charge of having attempted the chastity of a certain woman, and seduced her; upon this the emperor condemned him to banishment, and sent him into the western parts of the empire. As to the rest, he writes, that in this illegitimate council there were no less than two hundred and fifty bishops, and that Nicomedia was the workshop where they contrived all their evil deeds.

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 23.

² Philostorgius always calls him by this name. St. Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, calls him a Blemmyan. It is suggested, however, by Valesius, that this name may be but another name for the Moors or Æthiopians. Some think that he was called the "Indian," not because he was born there, or even of Indian extraction, but because he was sent by Constantius as ambassador to the Indians or Æthiopians.

³ This is certainly true of Theophilus; he was consecrated a bishop by the Arian party, who ascribed to him the gift of miracles. See below, b. iii. ch. 4.

⁴ See below, b. iii. ch. 4.

⁵ They had been banished three years before, viz. A. D. 325. Some time after this period, he was transferred from his see of Nicomedia to Constantinople.

⁶ Valesius observes that the falsehood of this statement is clear from the agreement of all other historians of the same period.

⁷ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 21.

CHAP. 8.—Concerning Agapetus,¹ a follower of his own peculiar heretical sect, who was originally a soldier, then a priest of his sect, and eventually became bishop of Synada, he tells many wonderful stories ; he says, for example, that many dead men were raised by him to life again, and that he expelled and healed many maladies of various kinds. He adds that many other wonderful things were done by him, and that by his exertions many of the Gentiles were converted to the Christian religion.

CHAP. 9.—He says that, in the twenty-eighth year² of his reign, Constantine turned Byzantium into the city of Constantinople ; and that, when he went to mark out the circuit of the city,³ he walked round it with a spear in his hand ; and that when his attendants thought that he was measuring out too large a space, one of them came up to him and asked him, “ How far, O prince ? ” and that the emperor answered, “ Until he who goes before me comes to a stop ; ” by this answer clearly manifesting that some heavenly power was leading him on, and teaching him what he ought to do. Philostorgius adds, that Constantine, after building the city, called it “ Alma Roma,” which means in the Latin tongue, “ Glorious.” He also states, that the emperor established there a senate, and distributed among the citizens a copious allowance of corn, and adorned the city in other particulars with such sumptuous magnificence, that it became a rival to ancient Rome in splendour.

CHAP. 10.—He states, that on the decease of Alexander, the bishop of this city, Eusebius,⁴ bishop of Nicomedia, was translated to the episcopal chair of the newly erected metropolis.

CHAP. 11.—The impious contriver of lies asserts, that after the death of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, the votes of the prelates were not unanimous, and that when there was a di-

¹ Compare the extract of Philostorgius from Suidas, given at the end of this volume. Eusebius, it is to be observed, makes no mention of this Agapetus, though Suidas ascribes it erroneously to him.

² A. D. 334.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 16.

⁴ This would seem to be a mistake, as Valesius shows in the first chapter of his Ecclesiastical Observations on Socrates and Sozomen. Theodoret (Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 19) falls into the same error with respect to Eusebius.

versity of sentiment, and a considerable amount of time had been spent in altercation, the divine Athanasius suddenly appeared one evening in the church called after Dionysius, and finding there two Egyptian bishops, firmly closed the doors with the assistance of some of his followers, and so was ordained by them,¹ though strongly against the will of the ordainers. For a power from above fell upon them, and so constrained their will and powers that what Athanasius wished was at once done. Philostorgius adds, that the remainder of the bishops then present anathematized Athanasius on account of this transaction; and that the latter, having first thoroughly strengthened his cause, addressed to the emperor certain letters relating to his ordination, in the name of the entire state; and that the emperor, thinking that the letters in question were written by the assembly of the Alexandrians, ratified the election with his own approval. Afterwards, however, upon being informed of the details of the transaction, he sent Athanasius to Tyre, a city of Phœnicia, to give account of the matter before a synod which was assembled there. And Philostorgius writes, that Athanasius gave way before the threats of the emperor. At length, however, upon arriving at Tyre, he was unwilling to submit to a legal inquiry, but fraudulently suborned a certain harlot, whose belly proclaimed her shame, and laid his plots against Eusebius, who was regarded as the head and chief of the assembly,²—thinking doubtless that he would escape from trial, and avoid the sentence of the synod, in the midst of the tumult and commotion which he thought in all probability would be raised. But our author, so partial to liars, writes that the fraud was openly detected in the very same manner, as the orthodox party say the harlot was detected who had been suborned by the heretics to give evidence against the great Athanasius. For he says that Eusebius asked the harlot if she knew the person who had defiled her; and that upon her answering that she knew him well, Eusebius again asked her whether the party in question was present

¹ This is a calumny commonly uttered against Athanasius by the Arian party. Its falsehood is clearly proved by the Epistle of the synod of Alexandria, as given by him in his Second Apology. *Lowth.*

² It is almost needless to add that this story against Athanasius rests solely on the statement of Philostorgius, and is unsupported by facts or probabilities.

among the episcopal assembly. She answered, "Spare evil words, my lord; I should be mad, if I were to accuse such holy men of such foul lust." From this the truth was elucidated, and so the whole of the fraudulent conspiracy was brought to light. Thus, says Philostorgius, Eusebius showed himself superior to every calumny that was brought forward, but Athanasius, who had hoped to escape trial altogether, went away after having been convicted of a double crime, not merely an illegal ordination, but also a foul calumny; and so, by the common consent of all, a sentence of deposition was passed against him. Athanasius, however, went on unblushingly, and ventured to assert that the sentence of deposition and the calumnious stories thrown in his teeth were equally untrue, being mere fabrications of the hatred and ill-will of the bishops assembled in the synod, because he refused to receive ordination at their hands. On this account the emperor, he adds, charged a second synod of bishops to examine into the cause of Athanasius; and the latter added some fresh charges to the original calumnies. For they said that Callinicus the confessor, and bishop of Pelusium, had been loaded by him with iron chains and sent into confinement, and that Athanasius did not cease to treat him with contumely, until he had fairly removed him out of his way. Then also the hand of Armenius was brought into court, and Mareotes and Ischyras came forward, and the sacred cup and other stories of a like kind were devised. For these reasons, he says, Athanasius was excommunicated by the synod, and Gregory the Cappadocian substituted in his place.¹ Such are the stories of this lover of untruth against the holy Athanasius.

CHAP. 12.—He says that Helen, the mother of the emperor, built the city which was called Helenopolis,² at the entrance of the Gulf of Nicomedia: and that the reason of her great predilection for the spot, was because the body of the martyr Lucian was carried thither by a dolphin after his death by martyrdom.

¹ In chap. 18 below, he says that Gregory died before the return of Athanasius from exile, immediately upon the death of Constantine. But on the contrary it is clear that Gregory was ordained by the synod held at Antioch, A. D. 341.

² The city was built on the site of an ancient place called Drepanum, A. D. 327. The new city was named in honour of the empress Helen, wife of Constantine. Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 2.

CHAP. 13.—He says that when this martyr Lucian was about to die, and was debarred from the church and the altar by the hand of tyranny, and when chains and stripes forbade him even to move, he lay upon his back and offered the venerable sacrifice upon his own breast, and so partook himself, and gave his companions the opportunity of receiving likewise of the unspotted sacrifice. This act of sacrifice was performed in the prison, and the holy band of Christians who stood as it were around his dying bed, at the same time represented the church, and afforded a screen to prevent the heathen from seeing what was being done.

CHAP. 14.—Philostorgius recounts many other disciples of this martyr Lucian, and especially Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, and Theognis, bishop of Nicæa; and also Leontius, who afterwards became bishop of Antioch, and Antonius of Tarsus in Cilicia; likewise Menophantus, Numenius, and Eudoxius, together with Alexander and Asterius the Cappadocian; of whom he says that they yielded to the violence of tyrants so far as to offer sacrifice to the gods of the heathen; but afterwards made amends for their lapse, their master himself assisting to bring them to repentance.

CHAP. 15.—Out of the above-mentioned individuals he specifies Antonius and Leontius as having preserved their piety pure and unsullied; but as for Eusebius, Maris, and Theognis, they were brought into collision with the Nicene symbol, but afterwards returned to their original opinions. But Maris, after returning to the orthodox belief, fell afterwards into another grievous error. In like manner, too, Theognis, who held that God was the Father even before he had begotten the Son, inasmuch as he had the power of begetting him. Of Asterius he says that he interpolated the doctrine of Lucian, affirming in his writings and orations that the Son is the image of the Father's substance, and in no way differing from him.¹

CHAP. 16.—He says that Constantine, having entered

¹ ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα. Bull, in his Defence of the Nicene Faith, Part II. ch. 13, note 6, asserts that these words are quoted directly from the creed of Lucian. See Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 5, note; and compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. ii. 10. Baronius in his Annals, a. d. 311 and 318, endeavours to rescue Lucian from the imputation of heresy.

upon the thirty-second year of his reign, was poisoned by his brothers at Nicomedia. And that when his end drew near, and the plot was discovered, he drew up a testament enjoining that the authors of his death should be punished, and ordering that whichever of his sons should first arrive, should proceed to take measures against them, lest his children too should be destroyed by a like conspiracy. He further adds, that the document itself which contained these instructions, was intrusted to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; but that the latter, being alarmed lest the emperor's brothers should make search for it, and wish to know what was written in it, placed the tablet in the hands of the deceased emperor, and concealed it beneath his clothes. Accordingly when they had come, as Eusebius expected they would, to search for the tablet which contained the will, Eusebius answered that he had indeed received it, but that he had immediately returned it into the hands of the emperor. Afterwards, however, this same Eusebius, having again taken away the tablet, deposited it in the hands of Constantius the son of Constantine, who was the first of the brothers to arrive; and who not long afterwards put into execution the instructions contained in his father's will.

CHAP. 17.—This impious enemy of God also accuses the Christians of offering sacrifices¹ to an image of Constantine placed upon a column of porphyry, and of honouring it with lighted lamps and incense, and of offering vows to it as to God, and making supplications to it to ward off calamities.

CHAP. 18.—He writes also, that after the death of Constantine the Great, when all who were in exile in various parts had obtained permission to return, Athanasius, too, returned² from Gaul to Alexandria, and hearing of the death of Gregory, landed and went straight from the ship, just as he was, to the church, and took his episcopal seat, without showing any regard to those who had deposed him.

¹ Photius does well in censuring Philostorgius for this assertion, which, it need hardly be added, is a gross falsehood; for it is forbidden by the Christian religion to offer sacrifice to any created being, and much more to the statue of one. It is probable however, as Valesius observes, and as asserted by Theodoret, (Eccl. Hist. b. i. ch. 34,) that lamps and wax candles were lit before the statue, and that prayers were offered there for the healing of diseases.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 3.

EPITOME OF BOOK III.

CHAP. 1.—PHILOSTORGIUS says that Constans,¹ the eldest of the sons of Constantine, plotted against the life of his brother Constantine the younger, and that the latter, together with his generals, was defeated and put to death, and his portion of the empire added to that of Constans.

CHAP. 2.—Philostorgius is loud in his praise of Constantius, and says that he built at Constantinople the church which is deservedly called “the Great.” He also writes that he translated the remains of St. Andrew the apostle from Achaia to the church which he had erected, and which was called that of “the Holy Apostles;”² as also that he erected near it a tomb in honour of his father. And lastly, he adds, that the body of the apostle Timothy was translated from Ephesus in Ionia to the same renowned and venerable church by the command of the same Constantius.

CHAP. 3.—Philostorgius says that Constantius, having learned that Athanasius had again taken possession of the see of Alexandria, expelled him from that city, and issued a mandate ordering that George the Cappadocian should be elected in his room. Accordingly, he adds that Athanasius, in fear of the emperor’s threats and the snares of his enemies, betook himself again to the emperor of the West.

CHAP. 4.—He says that Constantius sent ambassadors³ to those who were formerly called Sabæans, but are now known as Homeritæ,⁴ a tribe which is descended from Abraham by Keturah. As to the territory which they inhabit, he says that it is called by the Greeks “Arabia Magna” and “Arabia Felix,” and that it extends into the most distant part of the ocean. Its metropolis, he says, is Saba, the city from which

¹ On the contrary, other historians are agreed in asserting that it was Constantine who, while he was in Africa, raised a quarrel with his brother Constans, and afterwards went to war against him. Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 5; Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iii. ch. 2.

² This Church of the Apostles was inferior in beauty to that of St. Sophia only in Constantinople. It was erected by Constantine the Great as a burial-place for himself and future emperors. See Du Cange, *Constantinopolis Christiana*, lib. iv. cap. 5, and compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. i. ch. 16, and Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, b. iv. ch. 58.

³ This embassy took place A. D. 356.

⁴ See above, b. i. ch. 6.

the queen of Sheba went forth to see Solomon. This tribe is part of the Israelitish family, and practises circumcision on the eighth day; but they also offer sacrifices to the sun and moon, and to the native gods of the country. Constantius accordingly sent an embassy to them, in order to induce them to come over to the true religion. The king determined, in pursuance of his plan, to conciliate the king of that people by magnificent presents and words of gentle persuasion, and thence to take an opportunity forthwith of sowing the seeds of religion. He also asked for licence to build churches on behalf of the Romans who came thither by sea, and the inhabitants of the country who wished to embrace the Christian faith. At the head of this embassy was placed Theophilus the Indian, who had been sent when very young as a hostage from the Divæans to the Romans when Constantine was at the head of the empire. The island called Divus,¹ is a portion of their territory, and the inhabitants of it are called Indians. Further, he relates that this Theophilus, having passed a long life among the Romans, formed his character upon a pattern of the most strict and perfect virtue, and embraced the true faith concerning God; but, he adds, that he chose the monastic life, and was promoted to the diaconate at the hands of Eusebius. Thus much as to his early life. But afterwards, having undertaken this embassy, he was invested, by the men of his own party, with the episcopal² dignity. But Constantius, wishing to array the embassy with peculiar splendour, put on board of their ships two hundred well-bred horses from Cappadocia, and sent with them many other gifts, with the double view of making an imposing show and of conciliating the feelings of the people. Accordingly, Theophilus, on his arrival among the Sabæans, endeavoured to persuade the ruler of the tribe

¹ This island is said to lie in the Indian Ocean, near the mouth of the Indus, and to have been known also under the name of Diva, Divu, and Devu.

² ἐφόρον ἀξίωμα. See below, note on the extract from Suidas concerning Auxentius, at the end of this volume. We may observe that this step of the Arian party was taken out of opposition to Athanasius and his friends, for the latter had recently sent Frumentius as bishop to the Auxumitæ, as Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufinus testify. The Arians took care also to engage the secular power on their own side, by obtaining from the emperor letters to the chiefs of the Auxumitæ, urging the expulsion of Frumentius from their country, as we learn from Athanasius in his *Apologetica*. *Vales*.

to become a Christian, and to give over the deceits of heathenism. Hereupon, the customary fraud and malice of the Jews was compelled to shrink into deep silence, as soon as ever Theophilus had once or twice proved by his wonderful miracles the truth of the Christian faith. The embassy turned out successfully; for the prince of the nation, by sincere conviction, came over to the true religion, and built three churches in the district, not, however, with the money which the emperor's ambassadors had brought with them, but out of sums which he voluntarily supplied out of his private resources, with a laudable strife to show that his own zeal was a match for the wonders performed by Theophilus. One of these churches he erected in a place called Tapharum, the metropolis of the nation: another in the place where the mart of Roman commerce stood, lying towards the outer sea. This place is called Adane; and it is the spot where everybody is in the habit of landing on coming out of the Roman territories. The third church he built in another part of the district, where the mart of Persian commerce stands, hard by the mouth of the Persian Sea, which lies along those parts.

CHAP. 5.—Theophilus, having arranged everything among the Homeritæ according to his ability and circumstances, and having dedicated the churches, and adorned them with such decorations as he could, crossed over to the island of Divus, which, as we above showed, was his native country. Thence he made his way to the other districts of India, and corrected many disorders among their inhabitants. For they listened to the reading of the Gospel in a sitting posture,¹ and used other customs repugnant to the Divine law. But Theophilus, having corrected everything among them according to a religious rule, confirmed the doctrine of the church. For, with regard to the worship of the Divine Being, as that impious writer asserts, they needed no correction, inasmuch as from the earliest antiquity they constantly professed to believe the Son to be of a different substance from the Father.

¹ It was the custom for all Christians who were present at the solemn mysteries of the church, to stand with their heads bare, and their staves on the ground, while the Gospel was read aloud. We learn from Augustine, (Hom. b. v. serm. 26,) that the same custom prevailed in Africa. Compare Eusebius, Life of Constantine, chap. 33; Augustine, serm. 2, "de SS. Martyribus," Tract. 112, on the Gospel of St. John, and serm. 112, delivered in the Basilica of Faustus.

CHAP. 6.—From this Arabia Magna Theophilus proceeded to the Æthiopians who are called Auxumitæ,¹ who dwell along the coast near the entrance of the Red Sea, which is formed there by the ocean deeply indenting the continent. The Red Sea, in its turn, after extending to a very great length, terminates in two distinct gulfs, the one of which bends in the direction of Egypt, and is called Clysma,² after the name of a place situated at the head of it. This was the sea across which the Israelites passed on dry ground, when they fled away from the Egyptians. The other gulf goes off in the direction of Palestine, near a city which, from the earliest times, has borne the name of Aila. On the further coast of this gulf of the Red Sea, and on its left side, dwell the Auxumitæ, so called from their metropolis, which bears the name of Auxumis. Next to these Auxumitæ, but to the east, dwell the Syrians, who stretch to the other ocean, and who are so called even by the men of those parts. For Alexander the Great of Macedon placed them there after he had removed them from Syria; and they still use their hereditary Syrian tongue. Further, these are all of a very dark colour, from the effects of the vertical rays of the sun. Among these, the wood-casia, and the common casia, grow in the greatest abundance, as likewise the cassamum and cinnamon. In this same region, also, there is an abundance of elephants. Theophilus did not penetrate as far as these people, but he came to the Auxumitæ, and, having ordered all things there correctly, he thence began to return into the territory of the Romans: and after his return he was loaded with honours by the emperor; he received the charge of no episcopal see; but was looked up to by the followers of his own sect, as a public example of excellence.

CHAP. 7.—Philostorgius says, that among other large rivers, the Tigris falls into the inner part of the Persian Sea,

¹ Philostorgius states that these Auxumitæ were converted to Christianity by Theophilus the Arian, in the time of Constantine: but it is quite clear that their conversion is in reality to be ascribed to Frumentius, who was ordained by Athanasius in the commencement of his episcopate, about A. D. 337, and soon after sent among them. See above, note on chap. 4, and compare the epistle addressed by Constantine to the chiefs of the Auxumitæ, as given by Baronius (Annals, A. D. 356). *Lowth.*

² Just as the other gulf is termed the Elanitic gulf, from the town of Elana (or Aila) which is situated at its head.

which is here connected with the ocean. The shores of this sea are surrounded by many nations; and the river itself runs in a south-easterly direction, below the Hyrcanian Sea, and appears to take its rise among the Cordiæans. Thence it flows along the side of Syria,¹ and upon reaching the district of Susis, it joins the waters of the Euphrates with its own, and thence flowing on with a deep and rapid stream, it rushes on with a violent roar of its eddies, from which circumstance they say it derives its name of Tigris.² Before, however, it reaches the sea, it divides its waters into two large channels; and thence it flows into the Persian Sea, the extreme points of its mouths being so far distant from each other, that the two mouths embrace between them a large extent of country. This is an island; it is washed both by the rivers and the sea, and it is inhabited by a tribe called Messenians.

CHAP. 8.—The Euphrates, however, to all appearance, takes its rise among the Armenians; in this region stands the Mount of Ararat, so called even to the present day by the Armenians,—the same mount on which the Holy Scripture says that the ark rested. Many fragments of the wood and nails of which the ark was composed are said to be still preserved in those localities. This is the place where the Euphrates takes its rise. At first it is but a small stream, but gradually increases in size, and absorbing into itself many other tributary rivers which flow into it, it passes through Upper and Lower Armenia in its onward course. First of all it cuts Syria Euphratensis, so called after the river. Afterwards, however, it cuts its way through the rest of Syria, winding along with many varied folds in every region which it passes through, until it reaches Arabia, where it takes a circular course, when nearly opposite to the Red Sea; and embracing in its windings a large tract of country, finally turns its course towards the wind called Cæcias, or North-east, and falls into the Tigris. Here its waters do not entirely mingle with those of the Tigris; but though partly absorbed in it, it flows parallel to the Tigris with the largest

¹ That is, Assyria. The two names are frequently interchanged in classical writers. See Herodotus, b. vii. ch. 63, and the notes of Baehr in loco.

² Curtius, however, (b. vi.) Strabo, (b. viii.) and Pliny, (b. vi. ch. 27,) state that the river Tigris is so called from the arrow-like rapidity of its course, Tigris being the Median word for a "dart."

portion of its waters, and finally mixes with the Tigris near about Susa; and thenceforward, the Euphrates having lost its independent name, the two rivers flow conjointly into the Persian Gulf. The district which lies between these two rivers, the Euphrates, namely, and the Tigris, is called Mesopotamia.

CHAP. 9.—The sources of the Euphrates and the Tigris, so far as we have been able to ascertain, are such as we have related. But our sacred books, when they say that these rivers flow out of Paradise, speak most truly. For it is from this place that they derive their first supplies of water; inasmuch as after having traversed some distance in all probability above-ground, they afterwards pass into a large sandy desert, where they sink deep into the sand, and do not cease from this downward course, until they reach the firm rocky soil, of which that region consists: the base of this region affords a check on their downward course, and so they each gather their waters together and rush onwards, making their course all the more straight on account of the force and magnitude of their accumulating waters. But these rivers flowing beneath the ground, being partially absorbed by the sand of the intermediate district, burst forth again with a considerably diminished supply of water. It is not, however, after all so incredible a thing, that these rivers should flow so long a distance underground. For there are found everywhere the largest and most rapid streams and rivers whose course is underground, as is clear from the fact that their sound is heard as they rush on with loud murmurs and roarings. Moreover, some persons in their attempts to sink wells in the ground above these rivers, when they had gradually dug down to the rocky soil which resisted their efforts, beneath which the roaring waves endeavoured to force an egress upwards, were with difficulty rescued by those who stood above at the brink of the well, for the water burst forth in a torrent, which was intercepted by no subsequent drought, on account of the perpetual supply of water. For the secret wisdom of God has rendered the very courses of rivers, some occult and others open to the view, like veins supplying the necessary blood in the body. Whence also the prophet David sings, "He hath founded it upon the seas, and hath prepared it upon the floods,"¹ enclosing the seas

¹ Ps. xxiv. 2. Comp. Ps. cxxxvi. 6.

like treasures in the embraces of the largest tracts of land, and supplying them with a firm bottom for supporting the vast mass and multitude of waters which are collected in them. But to rivers, by a wise arrangement, he has ever given a free course: affording a passage to the onward current of their waters by the depression of certain localities, and by declivities from the higher to the lower parts.

CHAP. 10.—Philostorgius, going entirely upon conjecture, writes, that the situation of Paradise was towards the east;¹ and he so conjectures, firstly, because in the first place the parts to the south of it are all inhabited as far as the outer sea, which the sun scorches with his perpendicular rays; (this is what is called the Middle, or Torrid, Zone;) and, secondly, because the river now called the Hyphasis, and which is called Pison in the Holy Scriptures, itself taking its rise out of Paradise, seems to flow from the northern parts of the east down towards the south, and to pour its waters into the ocean there, opposite to the island of Taprobana. On the banks of this river is found the fruit, or flower, which is known under the name of Karyophyllum. The inhabitants of those parts believe that it formerly grew in Paradise; and, moreover, all the district above them is especially desert and barren. But as the river produces that fruit, it would seem clear that the river runs entirely above-ground, and that it nowhere has a subterranean channel, for else it could not produce the plant which grows there. And further still, this river shows another sign of its connexion above-ground with Paradise; for they say, that if a man bathe in its waters when he is suffering under the most burning fever, he immediately recovers. On the other hand, the Tigris and Euphrates, as flowing under-ground and then emerging again, can bring down their streams no production of those parts, as the Hyphasis does: No, nor even the Nile; and yet the Nile also flows out of Paradise, according to the oracles of Moses, in which it is called Ghion, though the Greeks named it Ægyptus. This river then, if one may conjecture, takes its rise in Paradise, and before reaching any inhabited region, its waters are absorbed by the sand, whence it makes its way secretly into the Indian Sea, and there takes a sort of circular course,—for what man knows anything accurately concerning this matter,

¹ "Ad æquinocetium Orientis." *κατὰ τὰς ἰσημερινὰς τῆς ἡοῦς.*
[PHILOSTORGIUS.] 2 G

—and then passing under all the intervening continent, makes its hidden passage into the Red Sea, on the other side of which it eventually appears again beneath the mountain which is called after the Moon. There it is said to form two great fountains, situated at no great distance from each other, and throwing their waters up to a great height from below. The river then falls down a steep ridge of cliffs and passes through Æthiopia into Egypt.

CHAP. 11.—He says that the whole district which lies to the east and the south, though parched up with the excessive heat, brings forth by far the finest and best productions, both by land and sea. For the sea teems with whales of incredible size, which are often seen as they rise out of the sea by those who sail around the coasts. The land also produces elephants of prodigious and gigantic size, and those which are called bull-elephants. As to this kind of beast, it is an ox of huge magnitude, and has a hide in colour and thickness closely resembling that of the elephant. This animal I saw with my own eyes, when it was brought to Rome; and I simply describe what I beheld. There are also among them serpents whose bodies are as thick as beams, and extending in length as much as fifteen fathoms;¹ for I have seen their skins brought to Rome. There is also an animal called a unicorn which is found in these parts. It has a head like a serpent, with the exception of a single crooked horn of no great size which grows upon it; and its whole chin is covered with a beard. Its neck is lengthy and reaches high aloft, and especially resembles the folds of a serpent: but the rest of its body more nearly approaches that of a stag, with the exception of its feet, which are those of a lion. A picture of this animal is to be seen at Constantinople. Moreover, the cameleopard is a production of this region: this beast is in most respects like a very large stag, but in its height it approximates the form of the camel. Its neck, which it carries high aloft, is long beyond proportion to the rest of its body; and the whole of its skin from head to foot is dappled with spots like a leopard. Its fore legs are much taller than its hind ones. In these parts too there is a kind of ape, called the *æsopthecus*; for the ape tribe comprises a variety of kinds. There is, for in-

¹ ὄρυια, an Eastern measure, containing about six feet; it is said to have been nearly equal to the Latin "*ulna*."

stance, the arctopithecus and the leontopithecus, and the dog-headed ape ; for the ape form is found conjoined with a variety of other animals, as is evident from the various specimens of the ape tribe which are brought to us. Of this kind is the deity called Pan, who resembles a goat in his head, face, and horns, and from his middle downwards ; while in his breast, his belly, and his hands he is almost a perfect ape. One of these animals was sent by the king of the Indians as a present to the emperor Constantine ; it lived a little while and was carried about as a sight, enclosed in a cage on account of its ferocity. After its death, those who had the care of it embalmed its body in salt for the purpose of turning the strange sight to account, and they took it safe and entire to Constantinople. It seems to me that the Greeks must once upon a time have seen this monster, and, amazed at the strangeness of its appearance, adopted it as a god, in accordance with their ordinary practice of making a god out of everything strange and wonderful. This they clearly did in the case of the satyr, which is of the ape tribe, with a red face, and restless motion, and furnished with a tail. The sphinx, too, is a kind of ape, as I myself can testify from what I have seen. The rest of the body of the sphinx is covered with hair, just as all other apes, but from its head to its breast it is free from hair, and has the breasts of a woman. Where its body is bare, it has a raised portion of red, like millet, running round it, which elegantly harmonizes with the fleshy colour in the middle, and improves it. Its face is tolerably round, and inclining to the form of a woman. Its voice is very like the human voice, though not articulate ; it most nearly approximates that of a woman uttering her words in a hurried and indistinct manner under the influence of anger and grief, and it is rather flat than sharp ; the beast moreover is very savage and cunning, and cannot be tamed without difficulty. This beast, I imagine, was formerly carried to Thebes in Bœotia, and having flown at several of the spectators who came together to view it, and having torn their faces, Œdipus slew the monster, because he was indignant at seeing his fellow-citizens thus mangled ; and so, as it seems to me, he gained his high renown. But in order to exaggerate the praises of Œdipus, the story makes out that the animal was winged, because it flew violently at the spectators ; it adds the breast of a woman and the body

of a lion, because the former was bare and closely approximated to the female figure, and as to the latter, because it was fierce and generally went upon all four feet. The story also represented it as endued with reason, because its voice approached so nearly to that of man; and attributed to it enigmas, because it uttered indistinct sounds and inarticulate words. And the whole of this matter is not to be wondered at, considering that the Greeks are accustomed to distort many other stories also into a fabulous form.¹ This region produces also wild asses of lofty stature, and with skins wonderfully variegated with a mixture of black and white. For they have certain coloured streaks running down from their backs to their sides and belly, and then separating, which mutually connecting form a strange intermixture and variety. The phoenix too, a bird so celebrated in story, is found among them. I have also seen a parrot brought from those parts; this bird is the most loquacious of all, and its voice approaches very nearly to that of man. I have seen also some painted and spotted birds which are commonly called Garamantides, (by a name borrowed from the African tribe,) very many of which are brought over to us. Many other animals besides of a remarkable character come from the same districts, but I shrink from recounting them in my present narrative. Above all, the purest gold is obtained there, with golden fibres, as it were, springing out of the ground, layers of which are piled upon layers, and show the clearest proofs of the production of gold. Their fruits too are very large and fine; among these the most remarkable are the nuts. And in a word, the whole region of the Homeritæ, even to the Red Sea itself, brings forth its produce twice every year, from which circumstance it is called Arabia Felix. But speaking generally, all that district which lies toward the east is far superior to the remaining regions in every respect. But Paradise, as being the most pure and excellent spot of all the East, and endued with the brightest and fairest climate, and irrigated by the most limpid of streams, is beyond a doubt incomparably superior to all other portions of the habitable globe, lying

¹ The classical author will remember here, among a crowd of other passages, the "Quicquid Græcia mendax audet in historia" of Juvenal, and the character given by Thucydides of the early legends of Greece, *τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ μυθῶδες εἰς ἀπιστίαν ἐκνευικηκότα*, (b. i. ch. 21).

as it does towards the east, and washed by the waves of the sea.

CHAP. 12.—Philostorgius says that Athanasius reached the emperor of the West, and having used presents in order to propitiate the nobles of his palace, and especially Eustathius, chamberlain of his privy purse, who had very great weight with the emperor, produced letters from Constans to Constantius¹ to the following purport. “Athanasius comes to us and shows by manifest proofs that the bishopric of Alexandria belongs to him, wherefore allow him to obtain possession of it, or certainly he shall recover it by the assistance of my arms.” He adds that, on receipt of this letter, Constantius convened the bishops in order to deliberate with them as to what should be done; and that they advised Constantius that it was better to leave Alexandria smarting under the severe yoke of Athanasius, than to undertake a war against his brother. Constantius therefore, he adds, allowed Athanasius to recover his see, and sent a letter to George, summoning him to his presence. George returned into his native country, Cappadocia, and there busied himself with the administration of his own private affairs. But Athanasius henceforth passed through the cities with greater confidence, and by his discourse brought over all the separate bishops with whom he had any intercourse to the Homoöusian faith. He writes, however, that certain other bishops did not pay deference to the words of Athanasius,² and that Aetius,³ a bishop of Palestine, who had been accused of fornication, endeavoured to avoid the charge by coming over to the communion of Athanasius, and so ranged himself upon his side; but that he soon paid the penalty of his sin, for that a disease seized upon his genitals, and producing worms, in the end deprived him of

¹ Concerning the threatening letters of Constans to his brother Constantius, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 22, 23; and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iii. ch. 20.

² This is beyond a doubt the real meaning of the Greek text, though it has been misunderstood by several interpreters. The assertion, however, of Philostorgius, is proved to be false by the letter of the synod of bishops of Palestine held by the bishop of Jerusalem, of which an account is given by Athanasius in his *Apology*.

³ The learned Gothofred shows reasons for believing that this is a calumny of Philostorgius, and that Aetius, at all events at this period, was untainted with heresy.

life. He writes also that Maximus,¹ bishop of Jerusalem, inclined to the side of Athanasius, although in the persecution under Maximian he had become illustrious as a confessor, and had had one eye put out. He adds that Athanasius by degrees brought several others also over to his doctrine.

CHAP. 13.—He says that Flavian of Antioch was the first who collected together a large band of monks, and uttered aloud the doxology, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost."² For among those who had gone before him, some had been accustomed to say, "Glory be to the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Ghost," and that this latter form of doxology was the one more customarily received. He says that others again used a different form, saying, "Glory be to the Father, *in* the Son, and *in* the Holy Ghost."

CHAP. 14.—He says that the Arians, though they differed in their doctrinal statements from those who preached the Catholic faith, were nevertheless accustomed to communicate with them in prayers, hymns, and deliberations, and in everything except the mystic sacrifice. As soon, however, as Aetius came and began the contention on these points, he persuaded the multitude of his followers³ to break the bands of amity and friendship which had formerly bound them to the Homoöusians, and to range themselves as a faction in entire opposition to them.

CHAP. 15.—He says that Aetius⁴ came from Coele-Syria.

¹ Concerning the conduct of this Maximus towards Athanasius, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 24.

² Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 24.

³ ἡ ὁμόδοξος συναγωγή. These words cannot possibly refer, as Gothofred would have it, to the orthodox or consubstantial party.

⁴ The account of Aetius as given by Fleury, on the authority of Gregory Nyssenius, (lib. i. Conc.) is, that upon the death of his father in a state of insolvency, he became slave to a woman; and having recovered his liberty, by what means is not known, he applied himself to the trade of a common tinker, and gained his livelihood by mending brass vessels. He adds that on one occasion he was punished by the magistrates for giving back a bracelet or collar of brass gilded over to a lady who had intrusted to him a gold one to mend. Being obliged on oath to renounce his trade for this deceit, he put himself under an empiric named Sopolus, and having found an Armenian simple enough to believe him to be really skilful, he got from him abundance of money, with which he set up as a physician. He is said afterwards to have composed 300 Syllogisms against the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. See Fleury, Eccl. Hist. b. xii. ch. 47.

His father, who had held a post in the victualling department of the army, failed in his business; and upon his dying insolvent, the governor of the province to which he belonged paid the proceeds of his effects into the imperial treasury. Thus it happened that Aetius was left at a very early age, together with his mother, in a state of extreme destitution; on this account he was obliged to follow the trade of gilding to provide a maintenance for his mother and himself. He had followed this art for a considerable time, when, on account of his superior intelligence, he began to turn his attention to the study of philosophy. In the first instance he became the disciple of Paulinus,¹ who had been translated to the see of Antioch from that of Tyre. Afterwards, however, upon the death of his mother, on whose account more especially he followed his trade as a gilder, Aetius began to apply himself entirely to the study of logic; nor was it long before he began to show himself superior to his fellows in disputation, which was the cause of more than ordinary ill-will being roused against him. As long as Paulinus lived, this envious feeling was kept in check; but upon his death, after having held the bishopric for the short space of six months, Eulalius² was appointed to the see in his room, and the old grudge against Aetius broke out afresh with such violence that Eulalius was induced to banish him from Antioch. Accordingly Aetius went to Anagarbus, a city of Cilicia, and again resorted to the practice of his craft in order to maintain himself; at the same time, however, he did not wholly abstain from disputations with such as desired to enter upon them with him. At this conjuncture, a certain grammarian was so struck with admiration at his

¹ This Paulinus is mentioned by Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* b. x. ch. 1. The reader will do well to consult the valuable annotations of Valesius on the passage. This Paulinus, who was afterwards translated from Tyre to Antioch, is to be carefully distinguished from another Paulinus, bishop of the same see after the death of Philogonius, a little previous to the council of Nicæa, of whom Valesius gives a lengthened detail in his *Annotations to Sozomen*. The learned Cave, however, denies that the former Paulinus was ever bishop of Antioch, and asserts that the passage cited by Valesius from the tenth book of Eusebius, need be understood to imply that he was ever bishop of Antioch; and if so, the fact rests on the authority of Philostorgius alone.

² There is considerable doubt as to the succession of the bishops of Antioch, and especially as to the place held by Eulalius, as to whom it is uncertain whether he was twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth in the line.

ability that he offered to teach him the rudiments of his art, and Aetius became an inmate of his home, and performed for him the menial duties of the house. He willingly instructed Aetius in the first principles of grammar ; but when at length Aetius had publicly confuted his master, showing that he gave a wrong interpretation to the Divine oracles, and had covered him with shame on account of his want of skill in expounding, he was rewarded for his pains by being expelled from the house that owed him so much. After this expulsion, he lived for some time with Athanasius, a disciple of the martyr Lucian, who at that time was bishop of Anagarbus. Under him he read the writings of the evangelists, and made himself perfect master of their contents ; this done, he found his way to Tarsus, in order to see Anthony, who had himself been one of the disciples of Lucian. From him he learned the interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles, and lived with him for some space of time, while he as yet held the rank of a mere presbyter. But upon his elevation to the episcopate, Anthony found that he had no time to devote to the instruction of Aetius ; so the latter returned to Antioch, in order to become the disciple of Leontius, who was at that time a presbyter at Antioch, and had been one of the pupils of Lucian. He expounded to Aetius the books of "the Prophets," and especially Ezekiel. But again ill-will, as Philostorgius dreams, or rather, as one might say with greater truth, his own unbridled tongue, and the impious nature of his doctrines, drove him from the city. Thence accordingly Aetius took his departure into Cilicia, where one of the heretical sect of the Borboriani entirely overcame and confounded him in a disputation in defence of his doctrines. On this account he began to be cast down in spirit, and to feel that life was no longer worth living for, seeing that he found falsehood to be more powerful than truth. While Aetius was in this state of mind, as Philostorgius declares, a vision appeared to him, which raised him up again, and confirmed his mind ; for it showed him by certain external signs the indomitable strength of the wisdom which should hereafter be imparted to him. From that time forward Aetius had a special gift from God, which saved him from defeat in his disputations. Not long afterwards a certain man named Aphthonius, a leader of the mad heresy of the Manichæans, and who had gained great renown for his wisdom as well as

for his eloquence, met him in the city of Alexandria, for the curiosity of Aetius was so much excited by his fame that he had actually gone thither from Antioch to see him. But upon coming to a regular discussion, Aetius very shortly dumb-founded Aphthonius, and reduced him to deep shame from the pinnacle of glory. Aphthonius was so grievously afflicted by the suddenness of his defeat that he fell into a dangerous sickness, on which death shortly ensued, his bodily strength not being able to bear up against it for more than seven days. But Aetius went on everywhere overcoming his adversaries, and gaining the most illustrious victories. At the same time, he gave himself up to the study of medicine,¹ that he might be able to cure diseases not of the soul only, but also of the body. He had also, as a master in this line, Sopolis, a man inferior to none of his day in his art. But if at any time he chanced to be in want of necessaries, he would go by night to some artisan of his former trade, that he might not be hindered from attending to more important business during the day, and quickly finished anything of gold that needed a skilful hand, and so getting his pay from the goldsmith, he supported life. But this all happened in the reign of Constantius, at the same time when Theophilus was staying at Antioch, after his return from India.

CHAP. 16.—He says that Aetius, in a discussion upon substantiality, which he maintained against Basil, bishop of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Sebastia, proved them to be the most foolish of all men; and on this account, according to his fabulous narrative, he incurred their implacable hatred.

CHAP. 17.—He says that this Leontius, of whom we have already made mention as a presbyter, and as the instructor of Aetius, upon his promotion to the bishopric of Antioch, raised his former disciple to the diaconate, and gave him permission publicly to teach in the church the ecclesiastical doctrines. Aetius² shrunk from the humble function of a deacon, but willingly embraced the office of a teacher; and having remained as long as he judged sufficient in order to teach the sacred doctrines which were intrusted to him, he went again back to Alexandria, where Athanasius was already in high

¹ The same thing is asserted by Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*, b. i. p. 293.

² Compare, however, Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 24.

repute, and was so manfully defending the doctrine of consubstantiality, that it was necessary to find some one to oppose him.

CHAP. 18.—Philostorgius says that Flavian and Paulinus, who afterwards divided between them the diocese of Antioch, were deposed by the same Leontius, as holding opinions at variance with his own. These followed Eustathius when he was driven into banishment; and Leontius permitted none of his cares¹ at Antioch, or rather the interests of religion in general, to suffer by the many vicissitudes of the time.

CHAP. 19.—Philostorgius says that Aetius refused his consent to Secundus and Serras,² when they wished to put him forward as a candidate for the episcopal office; for he said that they did not celebrate the Divine mysteries purely or holily, seeing they were in communion³ with the professors of consubstantiality.

CHAP. 20.—Upon hearing the report of Aetius's wisdom, Eunomius came from Cappadocia to Antioch, and held a conference with Secundus. He recommended Eunomius to Aetius, who at this time was living at Alexandria. Accordingly they lived together; Aetius being engaged in teaching, and Eunomius in attending upon his course of sacred instruction.⁴

CHAP. 21.—The impious Philostorgius says that he wrote an encomium in praise of Eunomius, and he does not blush to avow the deed.

CHAP. 22.—He says that Constans was put to death by the tyrant Magnentius, on account of his zeal for Athanasius. After his death, Constantius stayed for some time at Edessa in Mesopotamia, his presence being required there on account of the Persian war. During this time their elder sister Constantia,⁵ the widow of Hanniballian, in fear lest the tyrant Magnentius should reduce the whole empire under his power, proclaimed as Cæsar Veteranis, one of the masters of the

¹ Valesius and Gothofredus understand this to refer to Leontius, not to Eustathius.

² These were two Arian bishops, Secundus of Ptolemais, Serras of Parætonius in Libya.

³ Socrates (Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 22) bears witness that at this time communion was not entirely broken off between the Arian and orthodox party.

⁴ Eunomius was not only the pupil, but also the amanuensis and secretary of Aetius. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 35.

⁵ Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 1.

cavalry. She seemed to do this in her own right, because their father, while alive, had placed the imperial crown upon her head, and had named her *Augusta*. As soon as he received intelligence of these matters, Constantius sent the crown forthwith to *Veteranis*, confirming to him by this act his title of king; afterwards, however, he set out with an army into the West against *Magnentius*, under the pretext of a desire to enter into a friendly conversation with *Veteranis*; and because the latter had afforded him some ground for suspecting a revolt, he apprehended him, and deprived him of his imperial robe. But he punished him with no other disability, and even admitted him to his table; and eventually he banished him to *Prusa* in *Bithynia*, and assigned him an ample and magnificent estate, thus securing him against all possibility of being in want of those comforts which constitute the happiness of private life.

CHAP. 23.—*Philostorgius* says that *Sapor*, king of *Persia*, waged war against the Romans, and laid siege to the city of *Nisibis*; but that, contrary to the general expectation, he was obliged to withdraw his forces and to return covered with shame, because *James*,¹ bishop of that city, had shown the citizens what to do on their own behalf, and had fought wonderfully with a firm hope and confidence in God on behalf of the safety of the city.

CHAP. 24.—The *Sucian Alps*, as *Philostorgius* says, as well as those which are called the *Julian Alps*, are a succession of narrow passes, with large mountains meeting closely together, so as to afford mutual strength to the position. These passes, he observes, by the way, are somewhat like the narrow pass of *Thermopylæ*. The *Julian Alps*² divide *Gaul* from *Italy*, but the *Sucian Alps* are the frontier between *Dacia* and *Thrace*. *Veteranius* seized upon these narrow passes, and so afforded to *Constantius* grounds for suspecting him of meditating a revolt.

CHAP. 25.—While *Constantius* was preparing his expedition against the tyrant *Magnentius*, intelligence was brought to him that the *Persians* had already set their forces in motion against the provinces of the East. On this account he deemed it necessary to nominate *Gallus* as *Cæsar*, and to send

¹ Compare *Theodoret*, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 30.

² Compare *Socrates*, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 108, note 1.

him into the East against the Persians. Now Gallus was his own cousin ; for Constantius, the father of Gallus, was brother to Constantine the Great, who was the father of Constantius and his brothers.

CHAP. 26.—Constantius gained a victory over the tyrant : upon this occasion also the sign of the cross appeared to him : its appearance was of immense size, and in the brightness of its rays it wonderfully surpassed even the brightness of day. It appeared at Jerusalem¹ about the third hour of the day which is called the day of Pentecost. This sign, which was portrayed by no human hand, was seen to stretch from the Mount of Calvary even to the Mount of Olives, and was accompanied by a large iris, like a crown, which surrounded it on all sides. The iris, indeed, signified the mercy of Jesus Christ crucified and taken up into heaven, and the crown denoted the victory of the emperor. Moreover, that splendid and venerable sign did not escape the notice even of the soldiers. But though it was clearly seen by both armies, it frightened above all measure Magnentius and his partisans, who were addicted to superstitious practices ; while, on the other hand, it inspired Constantius and his army with invincible bravery. Magnentius, however, having suffered this defeat from Constantius, afterwards recovered his strength by degrees, and, engaging with him in a second battle, was entirely defeated, and fled away to Lyons with the loss of nearly all his army. And first, indeed, under the assumed appearance of good-will he killed his brother in order to rescue him from injury at the hands of the enemy. Finally, he fell upon the sword which he had placed to his breast, and so died by his own hand, having exercised his usurped power for about four years.

CHAP. 27.—Philostorgius says, that Basil and Eustathius, having fallen into enmity with Aetius, devised some absurd calumnies, and incited Gallus against him, so that Gallus, in reliance upon his bishops and burning with rage, ordered Aetius to be sought out and to be put to death by having his legs broken. But when Leontius, bishop of Antioch, had given the Cæsar information which directly contradicted what had been alleged against Aetius, the sentence of condemnation was revoked, and Aetius soon afterwards went to the court of

¹ Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. pp. 134, 137.

Gallus and was reckoned among his friends. He was also repeatedly sent to Julian, especially at the time when Gallus had taught his brother to lean rather to the side of heathenism. He was sent, however, with the design of recalling Julian from his impiety. Gallus, moreover, appointed Aetius his superintendent of religious instruction.

CHAP. 28.—Gallus having shown considerable valour in the war against the Persians, certain calumniators endeavoured to stir up against him the hostility of Constantius. The latter, accordingly, as soon as the war was settled by the valour and bravery of Gallus, sent Domitian the prefect of the Prætorium with secret instructions to keep Gallus from quitting the city of Antioch. For by this means he thought to diminish the glory which Gallus was reaping from his bravery and care of the state. But Domitian, who was so far from acting within the tenor of instructions, that he even exceeded them by his boldness both of thought and of deed, as soon as he reached Antioch, where Gallus was staying, would not endure even to appear in his presence. On account of this insult, and other matters besides, Gallus determined to inflict capital punishment on the prefect for his haughtiness and contumacious conduct, and took Montius¹ as his assessor in this determination. The latter, using unbounded confidence, addressed Gallus in these terms: “You are not empowered to create even a curator² of the city; how then can you venture to kill the prefect of the Prætorium?” Constantia,³ the wife of Gallus, was so exasperated by these words, because Gallus was both Cæsar and the husband of Augusta—(for this latter dignity she had herself received from her father)—that she dragged down Montius from the judgment-seat with her own hands, and gave him over into the hands of the attendants, who immediately seized him and carried him to Domitian; they then seized him also, dragged him down from his throne, and tying ropes round the feet of both,

¹ This Montius was quæstor of the palace: he is mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, b. xiv. 6.

² Δογιστήν. The exact meaning of this term is explained by Valesius in his Annotations on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.

³ She is here called Augusta, as being the daughter of Constantine. She had been formerly married to Anniballianus. Her character may be gathered from Ammianus Marcellinus, (b. xiv. ch. 1,) who calls her “Altera Megæra.” *Louth.*

they put them to death with every mark of insult. This was done in great haste, and with the consent of Gallus.

EPITOME OF BOOK IV.

CHAP. I.—CONSTANTIUS was much enraged when he heard what had happened to Montius and Domitian, and summoned to his presence Gallus, who immediately obeyed the command, because, although he suspected no good from his sudden summons, yet he feared the chance of a civil war following in the event of his refusal. Constantia, however, went on before him, and endeavoured to obtain an interview with her brother before her husband, and to implore mercy on his behalf. But upon her arrival at Bithynia, her journey and her life were at once broken off by a sudden attack which ended fatally. By this mischance the fears of Gallus were considerably increased, but still he did not depart from his previous resolution, so he went on his way accompanied by Theophilus the Indian. Moreover, upon the arrival of Gallus in Noricum, Barbation is sent from Milan, where Constantius then happened to be, to strip him of his purple robes, and to banish him to an island¹ in Dalmatia. But Theophilus, who chanced to be at hand, would by no means allow the matter to be brought to so ready a decision: for at the time when Gallus was created Cæsar, he was himself the mediator of the treaty made between Gallus and Constantius, by which they mutually pledged themselves to friendship, and promised that they would not lay plots against each other; and it was he who all along had kept them at peace. Accordingly, on being informed of this middle position thus held by Theophilus, Constantius ordered him to be sent away into exile, and Gallus to be stripped of his purple and carried in the dress of a private citizen into a certain island, where a military guard was set over him. Moreover, the eunuch Eusebius, who had been elevated to the dig-

¹ This island is called Flano by Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 34, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 7. The emperor Julian asserts in his Letter to the Senate and People of Athens, that the eunuch Eusebius was the cause of Gallus being put to death.

nity of a Præpositus, was supported by a party in his attempts to excite the mind of Constantius more and more against Gallus; for they feared that Constantius, either in remembrance of his oath, or moved by the tie of consanguinity, would recall the Cæsar from banishment, and that Gallus, as soon as he had escaped that danger, would miserably destroy them all. Accordingly, they fraudulently and treacherously plotted together and sent persons to put Gallus to death. But, before the deed of blood was accomplished, Constantine relented, and sent another party to prevent the bloodshed. But Eusebius persuaded them not to approach the island, and not to show any one the rescript of the emperor forbidding the execution of Gallus before he was actually put to the sword. The matter was carried out in accordance with their designs: and hence it was that Julian, when he afterwards succeeded to the purple, put to death Eusebius and his comrades on account of the iniquitous execution of Gallus.

CHAP. 2.—Constantius, moreover, weighing well the weight of the imperial power, and his own inability to support it single-handed, summoned Julian, the brother of Gallus, out of Ionia, and appointed him Cæsar, at the same time giving him his sister Helen in marriage; and sent him forthwith into Gaul as governor; for matters were in a very troubled state in those parts.

CHAP. 3.—He went however himself to Sirmium, where he settled for some time. At this period he recalled from exile and restored to his citizens Liberius the bishop of Rome, for whose recall the Romans were very clamorous. Philostorgius then goes on to say that this same Liberius, and with him Hosius the bishop [of Cordova], wrote openly against the term “*consubstantial*,”¹ and against Athanasius himself, when a synod had been convened there, and had brought over the aforementioned prelates to its own opinion. But as soon as they had subscribed, adds Philostorgius, Hosius returned to his see of Cordova in Spain and governed the church in that place, while Liberius² administered the church of Rome. Felix, who had been consecrated as bishop during the absence of Liberius, voluntarily retired, retaining

¹ Compare Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 15.

² Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 17.

the dignity of a bishop, though he presided over no local church.

CHAP. 4.—Upon the death of Leontius, bishop of Antioch, the friends and partisans of Eudoxius,¹ as Philostorgius relates, translated him from his see of Germanicea, and placed him in the chair of Antioch.² This Eudoxius followed the opinions of the Arians, except only in as far as he was led by the writings of Asterius to profess the opinion of those who held that the Son was like in substance to the Father. But the Arians led him to abandon this opinion, and brought him over to believe the persons to be unlike in substance. But Philostorgius says that Eudoxius was gentle and modest in his character, and endued with no small degree of dexterity and cunning, but he vehemently censures him for want of courage. He says also that his father's name was Cæsarius, and that he derived his origin from Arabissus, a town of Armenia Minor; adding at the same time, that though he yielded to the blandishments of women, yet he ended his life by martyrdom, thus blotting out the spots upon his character, and gaining moreover a heavenly crown.

CHAP. 5.—Eudoxius, according to Philostorgius, promoted Eunomius to the diaconate. But Eunomius refused to undertake the office of a deacon before he had arrived at an accurate knowledge of the doctrines of that party.

CHAP. 6.—When the administration of the church at Antioch was put into the hands of Eudoxius, Philostorgius relates that Basil of Ancyra bore the disappointment with great impatience. For he had himself cast an ambitious eye towards that see, and carried it about fixed in his breast as the one desire of his heart.

CHAP. 7.—Constantius, when his wife Eusebia,³ whom he dearly loved, was afflicted with a disease of the womb, found it necessary to recall Theophilus from exile, for the latter was

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 25.

² There is a mistake in the chronology of Philostorgius here; Eudoxius was translated not after the lapse and restoration of Liberius, but A. D. 367, the year following that event.

³ She was barren all her life, as Ammianus Marcellinus (Hist. b. xvi. ch. 11) asserts. She did not long survive the cure worked on her by Theophilus, as in the year A. D. 360 Constantius married Faustina, having already lost his wife some time, *amissâ jam pridem Eusebiâ*. Ammianus Marcellinus, b. xxi. ch. 6.

celebrated for his divine skill in healing diseases. Accordingly Constantius implored his pardon for all the injuries which he had inflicted upon him, and earnestly entreated him to cure his wife. And his request, as Philostorgius testifies, was not made in vain, for as soon as Theophilus had laid his healing hands upon the empress, she was set free from her malady.

CHAP. 8.—He says that Basil, having taken with him Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and other leaders of the churches, brought charges before the emperor against Aetius and Eudoxius, alleging against them, among other matters, that they had been privy to the conspiracy of Gallus, and actual participators in it. Theophilus too was implicated in the same series of charges. The emperor believed the story of Basil,¹ which was supported by the women, whom Basil had already brought over to his side, and accordingly sentenced Theophilus to exile, and banished him to Heraclea on the Pontus, while he ordered Eudoxius to quit Antioch, and to keep himself within his own house. Afterwards he gave up Aetius and the rest of his party into the power of his calumniators. But Basil had held a disputation concerning the faith in the presence of the emperor. In this disputation he maintained that the Son was like to the Father in all things,² but he made no mention of the question of substance, and totally avoided the term. They also endeavoured to get this opinion confirmed by the sentence and signature of the senate. And not long afterwards, as soon as the news of what Basil had done reached Antioch, Eunomius undertakes the ordination of a deacon, and being sent as an ambassador to Constantius to get the decrees rescinded, he was taken prisoner on his road by the followers of Basil, and was banished to Midæus in Phrygia. Aetius, however, fell into the hands of Basil and his party, and was sent into banishment at Pepuza, a small village of the same country: at the same time Eudoxius retired into Armenia, his native country. Other individuals also, to the

¹ Basil of Ancyra was the leader of the middle or Semi-Arian party.

² The records are not to be taken from the creed which was thirdly composed at the synod of Sirmium, and to which the names of the consuls were prefixed; for the events here described took place the year after that synod was held. They would seem, therefore, rather to be taken from the formula adopted at the synod of Ancyra, to which Liberius of Rome subscribed. See Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 15. *Lowth.*

[PHILOSTORGIUS.]

number of seventy, were condemned by the voice of Basil and his party, and were sent into exile.

CHAP. 9.—The victorious party, upon accomplishing the above-mentioned matters, traversed the country in every direction, confirming men everywhere in the Homoiousian belief, that is, in the *likeness* of substance between the Father and the Son; and when many flocked over to their opinion, they drew over to their side Macedonius,¹ the bishop of Constantinople, although he had previously been more inclined to the sentiments of Eunomius. Many other bishops also they induced to join their party, being drawn over partly by their speeches and partly by the force which they added to their persuasions.

CHAP. 10.—He says that Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, and Narcissus, of Irenopolis, together with some others, came to Singidunum, a city of Mæsia, and brought back to Constantius news of what had been fraudulently done by Basil. Constantius was amazed and confounded with grief, and recalled the condemned from exile, ordering at the same time two synods to be convened, one at Rimini, for the bishops of the West, and the other at Nicomedia, to assemble together the bishops of the East, and Libya, and Thrace, in order that the arguments alleged by either side might be diligently weighed and sifted. But the impious Philostorgius asserts that an earthquake put a stop to the holding of the synod at Nicomedia, because the greater part of the bishops there were favourably inclined to the Homoousian creed; this earthquake, he says, killed Cecropius, bishop of Nicomedia, and fifteen other bishops, who had arrived before the rest, shattering the church in which they were assembled. But the synod of Rimini, at which three hundred bishops were present, entirely rejected the use of the term “substance,” but declaring the Son to be *like to* the Father according to the Scriptures, it confirmed that belief with the signatures of the bishops present.

CHAP. 11.—Nicomedia being thus overthrown, as Philostorgius says, by the earthquake and a consequent conflagration and inundation of the sea, a synod was at length convened at Seleucia, Basil² and his party having refused to meet at Nicæa, and Eudoxius and Aetius to adopt Tarsus. But the

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 6.

² Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 26.

party of Basil, having contrived by their artifices to divide the synod into two factions, and having met together apart from the rest, declared the Son to be like to the Father in substance; they also proceeded to depose such as entertained the opposite opinion, condemned the doctrine which asserts the Persons to be unlike, and finally by themselves ordained An-nianus bishop of Antioch. But Eudoxius and Aetius, having subscribed their names to the doctrine of *unlikeness*, sent their letters about in every direction.

CHAP. 12.—But the emperor, on being informed of these matters, ordered the whole of the bishops to assemble at Constantinople. Accordingly they meet together, nearly all the episcopate, as well from the West as from the East and from Libya, Basil and Eustathius¹ being the leaders of those who professed to hold that the Son was like to the Father in substance. These then had a great number of supporters present, and among them a second Basil, who even at that time was only of the order of deacon; he was superior to many in his powers of speech, though from natural timidity² and shyness he shrunk from public discussions. But of those who professed their belief in the unlikeness of the Persons, Aetius and Eunomius were the leaders, so far as concerned power and influence, each of them being only of the rank of a deacon. Next to these came the bishops Maris and Eudoxius, who at that time was bishop of Antioch, but was afterwards promoted to the see of Constantinople, as likewise Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who pretended that he was of their party in order to cause pain to Basil, because the latter treated with marked respect Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, whom he had deposed. Acacius, moreover, was bold in discussion, most acute in discerning the point in matters of business, and very eloquent in enforcing his opinion. Hence also the acts of this synod, which are not few in number, were digested and arranged by him. Accordingly, as soon as both parties had come into conflict concerning their respective dogmas, Basil was the patron of those who professed to believe that the Son was like in substance to the Father. But those who asserted

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 27.

² Gregory of Nyssa (contr. Eunomium, lib. i.) mentions that this accusation was often brought forward against Basil by the party of Eunomius, and he defends him from it most satisfactorily.

the *dissimilarity* of substance, put forward Aetius and Eunomius as the champions of their cause. Moreover, Basil and his partisans, when they saw Aetius pitted against him as his adversary, in fear of his eloquence, avowed that it was indecorous for bishops to contend with a deacon concerning the doctrines of the faith. But when the leaders of the opposite cause shrunk back from the contest, saying that the matter at stake was not their dignity, but the question of the truth, Basil¹ came forward to the contest, though unwillingly; and, as he writes, he was entirely overcome by his eloquence. So that he not only confessed that the substance of the begotten Son differed from that of the Father who begot him, and was like him in no respect; but also, as Aetius demanded, he confirmed his profession by the subscription of his signature. When the emperor learned these tidings, and still bore in his mind all fresh the calumny of Basil against Aetius, he took advantage of that event to gratify his anger. Accordingly, he ordered both of them to appear in his presence, and asked Basil what were the charges which he brought against Aetius. Basil answered, that he asserted the Son to be unlike the Father in substance. Upon this Aetius said, "I am so far from thinking or asserting that the Son is unlike the Father, that I confess him to be like without any difference." But Constantine, laying hold of that word, "without any difference," and not even enduring to learn in what sense Aetius used that term, gave orders that he should be expelled from the palace. But afterwards, with the assistance of Acacius, he brought about the judicial deposition of Aetius from the episcopate; and it was not only the orthodox who subscribed his degradation, but also those who were of his own opinion; of whom some had changed their former opinion, while others defended, under the name of economy,² what they had been unwillingly compelled to do. Further, Constantius, bringing into the midst of the synod the epistle of the Western bishops, ordered it to be confirmed by the subscription of the bishops who were present. Now, in the letter were contained the following words, "That the Son is like to the Father accord-

¹ Two Basils are mentioned in this chapter. The one was Basil the Great, afterwards bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was only a deacon at this period; and the other Basil was bishop of Ancyra. The latter is the one here intended.

² See note below, p. 473.

ing to the Scriptures." Then also, by the artifice of this same Acacius, who always had one thing hidden in his bosom and another ready upon his tongue, both all the bishops who were present, and also those who hitherto had professed to believe the Persons to be unlike in substance, added their subscriptions.

EPITOME OF BOOK V.

CHAP. 1.—UPON this Acacius, having drawn over the emperor to his own sentiments, assailed Basil, Eustathius, and many other bishops with various accusations, and deposed them from their sees. He also stripped of his sacerdotal dignity Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople; and after his degradation it was with the consent of the emperor that Eudoxius was translated from the see of Antioch and chosen in his room.¹ Those who were deposed were also sent into banishment: Basil went into Illyria, and the rest were dispersed in various places. When they were led into exile, they revoked the subscriptions with which they ratified the faith of the council of Rimini: and the latter party preached the doctrine of consubstantiality, while the others renewed the opinion of a similarity of substance in the Persons. Aetius, however, being deposed for the introduction of his term "without any difference," which was manifestly at variance with the rest of his public teaching, is banished to Mopsuestia in Cilicia, though most of his followers and partisans had not only set their signatures to the condemnation of himself, but also of his doctrine; some casting entirely away the opinion which they had previously embraced; others, again, playing the part of mere time-servers, and reverencing the will of the emperor as paramount to the truth. Moreover, Acacius, having got Basil deposed and banished from motives of private hostility, and Aetius on account of his difference of opinion, returns to Cæsarea and appoints professors of the Homoöusian faith, as bishops of the sees of those churches which were deprived of their pastors. Thus, at Nicomedia, he consecrated Onesimus in the place of Cecropius, and substituted Athanasius² in the

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 27.

² This Athanasius, bishop of Ancyra, is, of course, a distinct individual

room of Basil at Ancyra, while he set another Acacius over the church at Tarsus in the room of Silvanus. But at Antioch, all the clergy who had formerly agreed with Basil in the ~~line~~ which he pursued against Aetius and Eudoxius, were driven into banishment without an opportunity of defending themselves. Meletius, too, was summoned from Sebastia, a city of Armenia, and placed in the see of Antioch by the same Acacius in the place of Eudoxius, who had ascended the throne of Constantinople. But Meletius, though previously he had professed his belief in the unlikeness of substance between the Father and the Son, suited his views according to the will of the emperor, and subscribed the epistle of the Eastern bishops. But after his elevation to the see of Antioch, he came forward as a most valiant defender of consubstantiality. The same Acacius also consecrated Pelagius bishop of Laodicea. And, to speak briefly, wherever force and influence seconded his design, he used all possible zeal in placing those who most strenuously professed the consubstantial creed in the place of those who were expelled.

CHAP. 2.—The emperor, having learned from Acacius that Aetius was treated by Auxentius, bishop of Mopsuestia, with all possible care and kindness, ordered him to be removed to Ambdala,¹ that he might there bring his life to a miserable close on account of the fierce and savage character of its inhabitants. And when, on account of the heat, that place was infected with a very terrible pestilence, this impious forger of lies declares that Aetius appeased the Divinity and warded off these calamities, and was treated in consequence by the barbarians with the greatest kindness and respect.

CHAP. 3.—After the deposition of Eustathius, Eusebius, and Eleusius, Maris and Eudoxius consecrated Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus,² with the full consent of Constantius. Eunomius, however, refused to submit to their consecration until he had received from them a pledge that Aetius should be set

from the great Athanasius. As to the deposal of Basil, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 42.

¹ Artemidorus, and after him Strabo, say that this place is a town of Pisidia, near the base of Mount Taurus.

² It is to be observed, that Socrates (Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 7) and Sozomen (Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 8) make Eunomius to have been bishop of Cyzicus under the emperor Valens. Theodoret is probably more correct in representing him as bishop under Constantius, as Philostorgius does here.

free from his sentence of banishment and deposition. A period of three months was specified for the performance of this stipulation.

CHAP. 4.—Constantius had previously been in the habit of gaining victories over his enemies; but after he had stained his hands with the blood of those who were near of kin to him,¹ and had been driven on by the calumnies of Basil to punish Aetius, Theophilus, and Serras with banishment, he was forced to retreat in disgrace from a battle which he fought with the Persians.

CHAP. 5.—The impious Philostorgius declares that Meletius, bishop of Antioch, was banished by Constantius, who happened at that time to be staying at that city, to Meletina, his native country, as though he had been convicted of perjury, because while he was most ardent in preaching the doctrine of consubstantiality, he pretended to embrace the doctrine of an unlikeness of Persons.² After this, Constantius summoned from Alexandria Euzoius, the partner of the heresy of Arius, and, ordering the bishops to lay their hands on him, appointed him to the see of Antioch.

EPITOME OF BOOK VI.

CHAP. 1.—SOME individuals of the clergy of the city of Cyzicus accused Eunomius before Eudoxius as though he asserted the Son to be unlike the Father, because he denied that he was like him in substance, from which they drew the inference that he held the Son to be really unlike the Father. Moreover, they accused him of changing the established rites, and of casting out those who would not join with him in his impious designs. On this account a tumult was raised in the church of Constantinople, which was strenuously agitated by a certain presbyter of that church named Hesychius. Eudoxius forthwith summoned Eunomius to his presence.³ Upon

¹ Allusion is made to Constantius, Dalmatius, Anniballianus, and Galus; all of whom had suffered death under Constantius and by his consent.

² Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 31.

³ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 29.

his arrival he accused Eudoxius of sloth and carelessness in the performance of his promises. Eudoxius answered that he had by no means neglected to perform them, but that first the tumult ought to be quieted which had been roused on his account. Accordingly, Eunomius began to plead his defence before the clergy of Constantinople, and so conciliated the minds of those who were previously excited against him, that he was induced not only to come over to his own opinions, but also to offer a ready testimony to the piety of Eunomius. For not only was he never detected in asserting the Son to be unlike the Father in those sermons which he delivered,¹ but he also freely professed to teach that he was like him according to the Scriptures. That he was like in substance was a position which he by no means admitted;² for he said that it was equally impious to declare the Son to be like in substance to the Father, and not to confess that he was entirely like, according to the relation existing between the only-begotten Son and the Father, who had begotten him without passions. And he infected with these views not merely the great body of the clergy, but also the entire congregation of the church; for the style of his discussions on these points struck them with admiration, not only of his wisdom, but also of his piety. On this account Eudoxius was rejoiced above measure, and exclaimed, "Mine answer to them that do examine me is this."³ And the people applauded Eudoxius, because he had quoted the words of Holy Scripture so effectively and opportunely.

CHAP. 2.—The impious Philostorgius declares that the hateful Eunomius delivered to the people, at the command of Eudoxius, on the feast of the Epiphany, a sermon in which the abominable and detestable doctrine of that school was openly taught. For those detestable individuals ventured to assert, that after the ineffable birth of her Son, Joseph had conjugal intercourse with the Virgin Mary; and what is still more audacious, they did not hesitate to declare that the Son was but the minister of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son.

¹ ἔδημηγόρησε. This must be the correct reading here. The word ἔδημιούργησε in the received text is unintelligible.

² The text here is far from being clearly ascertained: we have followed the emendations of Valesius, which are necessary and satisfactory.

³ These words are taken from those of St. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 3.

Moreover, the very style which they used at that time was far removed from that of graceful panegyric, being turgid, with obscure and superfluous expressions, and the employment of words of impurity, tending to a speech at once distasteful, ridiculous, and confused; declaring that God had openly visited them with the punishment of a mind darkened and confounded.

CHAP. 3.—After heaping many praises on Eunomius, Eudoxius not only brought himself to perform no part of his promises to him, but also endeavoured to persuade him to subscribe to the deposition of Arius, and to the exposition of the creed adopted at Rimini, excusing to them, under the pretext of “economy,”¹ his unlawful and involuntary crime. By these doings Eunomius was grievously enraged, and would not perform either of them; but he leaves them² in possession of Cyzicus, first in promise, and afterwards confirming the grant by letter, and retired into his native country of Cappadocia.

CHAP. 4.—Acacius, being grievously indignant against Eunomius because he had been appointed bishop of Cyzicus, accused him and Eudoxius of having consecrated as bishop, without the common consent, the disciple of Aetius, a person who vied with and even surpassed his master in the fervency of his zeal for heresy. And by his calumnies he managed to make so much way that Constantius lent him his ear, and recalled Eunomius to Antioch. On his arrival thither, Constantius ordered him to be examined, and to plead his cause in the judicial assembly. But when the assembly demanded a prosecutor, no one appeared against him; for Acacius was struck dumb with fear, and persevered in keeping a most profound silence, for he thought that his adversary would be entirely overwhelmed by the mere force of calumny with the emperor. As soon as Constantius learned this, he regarded Acacius with suspicion, as one who had instituted the charges

¹ The term *oikonomia*, as Valesius remarks, is usually taken in a good sense. “Notandum, nunquam locum esse œconomix seu dispensationi, nisi salvâ prorsus atque illibatâ permanente fidei doctrinâ. His positis, Eulogius triplex distinguit genus œconomix ecclesiasticæ. Primum consistit in rebus: secundum in nominibus ac verbis; tertium in personis.”
Vales.

² Valesius understands the word *αὐτοῖς* to refer to Eudoxius; Lowth more correctly refers it to the clergy of Cyzicus, who were on anything but friendly terms with Eudoxius. See above, ch. 1.

against Eudoxius rather out of spiteful motives than from any real uprightness of character. Accordingly he bade him return at once to his church, and reserved for a larger assembly all further inquiry into the present business.

CHAP. 5.—While Constantius was pondering in his mind over these matters, news was brought to him of the rebellion of Julian.¹ Accordingly he seized at once upon Constantinople, and convened by proclamation a synod at the city of Nicæa for the purpose of examining into the doctrine which declared the Son to be of a different substance from the Father. But upon his arrival at a place called Mopsi Crene, he was struck with a fatal disorder, and being there baptized by Euzoius, he died, leaving behind him his royalty and the synods to be held for the purpose of confirming a heresy.

CHAP. 6.—When the body of Constantius was being carried out to burial, Julian entered Constantinople, and walked before the bier without his crown, thus paying honour to the corpse of one whose life he had so shortly before endeavoured to take away.

CHAP. 7.—Julian, having thus seized upon the empire, recalled Aetius as one who had been sent into banishment on account of Gallus; and restored to their sees not only him, but also all the other prelates who had been banished on account of the contested doctrines of the church.

EPITOME OF BOOK VII.

CHAP. 1.—JULIAN having thus seized upon the imperial purple, and issued edicts permitting all possible licence to the heathen, and allowing them to practise all that they had learnt, involved the Christians in the most grievous and inexplicable persecutions, by allowing the heathen everywhere to inflict upon them every kind of death, accompanied with every sort of tortures and torments, unheard of until then.

CHAP. 2.—When George, bishop of Alexandria, presided over the council,² and compelled those who were of the senti-

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. the last chapter.

² *συνίδριον*. This word does not signify the college of presbyters, but

ments of Aetius to subscribe the epistle¹ against Aetius, the heathen suddenly attacked him and seized him: and after inflicting many indignities upon his body, at last they committed it to the flames. Further, this impious writer asserts that they were incited to this act by the counsel of Athanasius.² For the latter recovered his see upon the death of George, and the people of Alexandria received him back with open arms.

CHAP. 3.—Concerning an image³ of our Saviour erected by the faith of a pious woman in grateful remembrance of her cure from a bloody flux, Philostorgius writes, that it was placed near the fountain in the city among other statues, and presented a pleasant and agreeable sight to the passers-by. And when a certain herb, which grew up at the foot of this statue, was found to be a most effectual remedy against all diseases, and especially against consumption, men naturally began to inquire into the cause of this matter; for by lapse of time all memory of the fact had been lost, and it was even forgotten whose statue it was, and on what account it had been erected. Inasmuch as the figure of our Saviour had long stood exposed in the open air, and a great part of it was covered over by the earth which was perpetually carried down against the pediment, especially during seasons of heavy rain, the notice contained in the inscription upon it was well nigh obliterated. A diligent inquiry was consequently made, and the part of the statue which had been covered up being brought to light, the inscription was discovered which explained the entire circumstances of the fact; and the plant thenceforth was never again seen either there or in any other place. The statue itself they placed in the part of the church which was allotted to the deacons,⁴ paying to it due honour and respect, yet by no means adoring or worshipping it; and they showed their love for its great archetype by erecting it in that place

the assembly of the Egyptian bishops, who had been convened by George at Alexandria.

¹ *τόμον*. The epistle composed by the synod held at Constantinople. Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 28.

² This is a manifest calumny of the Arian party against Athanasius. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 3, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 7.

³ For a further account of this image, see Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 19, Rufinus, b. vii. ch. 14, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 21.

⁴ *ἐκκλησιαστικόν*. Better known as the Sacristy.

with circumstances of honour, and by flocking thither in eager crowds to behold it. During the reign of Julian, however, the heathen¹ who inhabited Paneas were excited by an impious frenzy to pull down this statue from its pediment, and to drag it through the midst of the streets with ropes fastened round its feet; afterwards they broke in pieces the rest of the body, while some persons, indignant at the whole proceeding, secretly obtained possession of the head, which had become detached from the neck as it was dragged along, and they preserved it as far as was possible. This transaction Philostorgius declared that he witnessed with his own eyes. But the district of Paneas was formerly called Dan, from Dan the son of Jacob, who was the head of one of the twelve tribes, which was situated in those parts. But in the course of time it came to be called Cæsarea Philippi,² and later still, when the heathen erected in it a statue of the god Pan, its name was changed to Paneas.³

CHAP. 4.—The heathens perpetrated everywhere many atrocities against the Christians, and more particularly the following disgraceful deed they committed in Palestine. The bones of the prophet Eliseus and of John the Baptist⁴ were dug up out of their sepulchres where they were buried, and being mingled with the bones of beasts, they were thrown into the flames, reduced to ashes, and scattered to the winds. In some places, too, they seized upon the Christians and placed them as victims on the heathen altars; and many other fearful atrocities did they commit, impelled, as it would seem, by some supernatural frenzy. When Julian learned these tidings, he not only felt no indignation against their authors, but even rejoiced at their doings; as though the infamy belonging to such deeds attached itself to others, while his own wishes were in concert with their acts. But as soon as he perceived

¹ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. We have adopted this necessary emendation of Vallesius for the old reading, τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς.

² Compare the statement of Josephus, de Bell. Jud. b. ii. ch. 13, and of Pliny, b. v. ch. 15.

³ This derivation of Paneas from Pan is not supported by any other writer, and rests on the mere imagination of Philostorgius.

⁴ With respect to the bones of St. John the Baptist, Philostorgius is supported in what he here says by Rufinus, b. xi. ch. 28, and Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 7. As to the bones of Eliseus, we have no passages of other writers to adduce.

that none of his desires were realized by all these atrocities, inasmuch as the spirit of the Christians, whom he specially persecuted, did but gather fresh strength daily, he contrived to bring into open collision¹ the bishops who had been banished for various reasons and those who had been substituted in their room. Accordingly he gave to both parties full licence of doing whatever they could to obtain their restoration and to defend their possessions respectively. And on this account they were so brought into open contest with each other as to cause our religion great disgrace and opprobrium,—a point which the Apostate had especially at heart. He added also another insult to this malignant contrivance, for he pressed those who were already enrolled among the clerical body to undertake the public functions of the Decurios, and assigned the revenues of the churches to the ministers of the heathen deities. In fine, he did not cease to employ every effort and contrivance to cause the superstitions of the heathens to flourish in every quarter, and, as he hoped, entirely to extinguish our religion.

CHAP. 5.—While matters were in this state, Eudoxius, recalling to mind the oath and pledges in which he had bound himself before Eunomius in favour of Aetius, wrote letters to Euzoios, bishop of Antioch, commanding him to convene a synod, in order to absolve Aetius from the sentence of condemnation which had formerly been passed upon him. But Euzoios took no account of this request, but was especially loud in his censures of Eudoxius for not having sooner set himself to do what he now enjoined others to execute. But when Eudoxius persevered in his command, Euzoios at length promised to comply.

CHAP. 6.—While Aetius and Eunomius were staying at Constantinople, they were joined by Leontius, bishop of Tripolis, and Theodulus of Chæretapa, as also by Serras. Theophilus and Heliodorus from either Libya,² and all who embraced the like opinion, and who had not ventured to subscribe

¹ Comp. Ammianus Marcellinus, b. xxii. ch. 5; and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 5.

² There were two Libyas in Egypt, the one called Pentapolis, the other Libya Sicca. Parætonium, the see of Serras, was in the latter district. That of Heliodorus was in the former.

either the condemnation of Aetius or the letter of the Western¹ bishops. These therefore assembled together and consecrated Aetius as bishop,² and Aetius and Eunomius were all in all with them. They also consecrated other bishops, Eudoxius not only not being indignant on the occasion, but also giving his vote in favour of those who were to be ordained even more readily than the partisans of Aetius. During the same period Euzoius too, having collected a synod of nine bishops, reversed the measures which had been originally adopted against Aetius.³ He also reversed the six months of licence at the expiration of which Serras had been condemned to deposition from his priesthood, as a punishment in case of his refusing to subscribe the deposition of Aetius and the letter of the Western bishops. Accordingly, when the two measures which I have mentioned above had turned out thus, Euzoius contemplated sending letters to Eudoxius, but it so happened that the persecution of the Christians, which at that time was past all endurance, checked his attempt.

CHAP. 7.—When the apostate Julian found himself after many ineffectual attempts unable to detach from the faith Valentinian, the commander of a regiment in the army, he stripped him of his dignity and banished him to Thebes in Egypt.⁴ He was Comes of the band called “Cornuti,” and while Constantius was emperor one of the school of the Silentarii is said to have seen him with flames issuing out of his mouth about mid-day, just at the time when we take our meal, and to have reported the sight to Constantius. Being sent by him to summon Valentinian to his presence on some business or other, he happened to witness the event; and as soon as he learned the tidings of it, Constantius was seized with suspicion and alarm, though he did nothing to Valentinian by way of punishment. But to calm his fears, he sent

¹ By this term must be understood the formula of faith agreed upon at the synod of Ariminum. Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 4; and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 18, compared with ch. 23. *Lowth.*

² Concerning the episcopate of Aetius, there is a document in the 31st epistle of the emperor Julian, which is addressed to him before he was actually promoted to the episcopate. It is uncertain of what see he was created bishop.

³ Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 28.

⁴ Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iii. ch. 16.

him to the fortresses of Mesopotamia, with instructions to keep garrison there and to check the incursions of the Persians.

CHAP. 8.—Philostorgius does not differ much from other writers in his narration concerning the martyr Babylas,¹ the number and greatness of the indignities with which Julian treated his body, what the devils were compelled to speak, how the shrine together with the image of Apollo² was burnt down by lightning, and as to all the other wondrous events which happened, both natural and supernatural. He says moreover that the holy Babylas³ was put to death together with three boys of a very tender age, and that his martyrdom arose from the following cause. Babylas was bishop of Antioch; by inspiration of the devil, Numerian the Roman emperor, or as others say, Decius, was led to desire to enter the church of the Christians at the time when a very large concourse of people had assembled together. But the priest of God stood at the entrance porch and forbade his entry, declaring that, so far as in him lay, he would not suffer a wolf to climb into the fold. But the emperor immediately desisted from his effort, either because he feared a popular outbreak, or because he changed his mind on some other account. But as to the bishop, he first accused him of insolence, and afterwards commanded him to sacrifice to the heathen deities, as being the only sacrifice by which he could at once wash out his offence, and gain honour and glory from posterity. Babylas having resisted the proposals of the emperor with a stout and noble heart, received the crown of martyrdom.

CHAP. 9.—The apostate Julian endeavouring to convict of falsehood the prophecies of our Saviour, in which he declared that Jerusalem should be so utterly overthrown that “one stone should not be left upon another,”⁴ not only failed in his attempt, but also was compelled against his will to give a

¹ Concerning Babylas the martyr, see the Oration of St. Chrysostom in his praise, and compare Suidas *in voce* Babylas. *Lowth.*

² In the year A. D. 362. The relics of St. Babylas were transferred from Antioch to Daphne, a place consecrated to the impure worship of Apollo and Diana. It is said that the oracle of Apollo thenceforth would give no answer to those who came to consult it, and that the indignities with which Julian treated the saint's remains arose from this cause. See below, chap. 12, and comp. Rufinus, *Eccl. Hist.* b. i. ch. 35, Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iii. ch. 10, and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. v. ch. 20.

³ Comp. Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 294, n. a.

⁴ *Matt.* xxiv. 2.

most irrefragable proof of their truth. For having collected together all the Jews¹ from every quarter, and having supplied them with money from the imperial treasury and with other resources, he enjoined upon them to set about the rebuilding of their temple. But a panic repeatedly inspired in their minds, such as no tongue of eloquence can describe, put a check to their attempts, and also covered with shame and disgrace as well the emperor as the Jews, and drove them into the greatest straits. Hence flames came down and destroyed those who dared to set a hand to the work; hence an earthquake came and swallowed them up, while others perished again by some other calamity. So the audacity which dared to cast discredit upon the prophecies of our Lord, was overruled to show their venerable truth and efficacy.

CHAP. 10.—When many of those who had been most furious against the Christians and our holy religion had thus suffered the well-merited penalty of their sins, Julian, the count of the East, the uncle of the apostate emperor,² and Felix, the count of Largesses, and Elpidius, the prefect of the palace, whom the Romans are accustomed to call Counts of the Privy Chamber, paid the most manifest and conspicuous penalty of all. These three were among those who apostatized from our faith in order to gain favour with the emperor. Felix, indeed, without any apparent predisposing cause, suddenly burst one of the largest of the interior veins, when a torrent of blood flowed from his mouth. He afforded a most horrible spectacle to all who were present, and did not survive the stroke an entire day, for towards the same evening, when the blood ceased to flow any longer, he breathed his last. But Julian, being seized with a severe disorder, the nature of which was unknown, lay prostrated on his bed for forty days without speech, and almost without showing signs of consciousness. But afterwards, when he began to mend in a slight degree, he condemned the impious deed which he had committed, and confessed that his disease was sent upon him as a punishment for it; and recovering so far as to become a witness against his own impiety, he breathed his last in great tortures from the ulcers which tore his intestines in pieces. Last of all, Elpidius, at a somewhat later period than the rest, having

¹ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 20.

² Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 12, 13.

been detected favouring the conspiracy of Procopius, who had rebelled against Valens, was despoiled of his goods, and being condemned to perpetual imprisonment, finished his life in the deepest disgrace, amid the execration of all, who called him Elpidius the Sacrificer. Moreover, another of them, who went with the above-mentioned individuals into a church which they were pillaging and plundering, robbing it of its sacred vessels and shrines, and insulting the God who was honoured in those sacred rites, this very man, I say, insolently lifted up his robe and made water upon the altar, whereupon he suffered an immediate and sudden penalty. For those very parts which he had thus insolently abused began to putrify into his very bowels, and produced a vast multitude of worms, so that he died by a miserable end, and one which deserves to be kept in silence. Others, and many too, who had dared to perpetrate similar crimes, paid a like penalty for their sin.

CHAP. 11.—The Roman emperor Hadrian, who was called *Ælius*, named the city of Jerusalem *Ælia*, after himself, in order entirely to banish and exclude thence the Jewish race, that they might not find in the name of the city a pretext for claiming it as their country.¹ Hadrian was in reality afraid of their hot and impetuous disposition as a nation, and especially dreaded lest they should meet in that city under the pretext of performing their sacrifices, and cause the Romans trouble.

CHAP. 12.—After the translation of the relics of the martyr Babylas, the heathen oracles, beginning with that at Delphi, gave forth some predictions and prophecies; the good providence of God permitting them to speak, but turning to shame the reverence and respect paid to them by their worshippers.² For the more diligently the heathen sought to get answers from their deities in order to find a just cause for paying to them divine honours, the more they were compelled by Divine Providence to discover their weakness and powerlessness for truth; for the answers which they uttered were shown to be false and without fulfilment. In truth, when all the oracles had given their answer, that Julian, the emperor's uncle, who at that time lay ill, would recover and not

¹ Compare Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 6.

² Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iii. ch. 10.

die, he breathed out his wretched soul while those very responses were being read by the people.

CHAP. 13.—A certain man named Heron, a native of Thebes in Egypt, and who had borne the episcopal office, having afterwards gone back to heathen superstitions, was suddenly seized by a putrid disorder, which affected his entire body, and rendered him loathsome to the sight. Being brought then into great straits, he lay about in the streets, unpitied by any one, for the Christians turned aside from him in disgust, while the heathen knew him only so far as they had led him into their errors. Heron, indeed, died a bitter and miserable death. A certain Theotecnus, also, having passed over to the same superstition, suddenly became putrid in his body, which became a mere receptacle of worms, which eat out his eyes, and he was reduced by madness to the very last extremity. His very tongue was gnawed out and eaten by them; and after undergoing these painful tortures, he was reserved for even a severer penalty. God displayed many of these miracles at that time upon those who had impiously apostatized from religion, exacting from them a penalty commensurate with their crimes.

CHAP. 14.—When Julian bade the city of Jerusalem to be rebuilt in order to refute openly the predictions of our Lord concerning it, he brought about exactly the opposite of what he intended. For his work was checked by many other prodigies from heaven; and especially, during the preparation of the foundations, one of the stones which was placed at the lowest part of the base, suddenly started from its place and opened the door of a certain cave hollowed out in the rock. Owing to its depth, it was difficult to see what was within this cave; so persons were appointed to investigate the matter, who, being anxious to find out the truth, let down one of their workmen by means of a rope. On being lowered down he found stagnant water reaching up to his knees; and, having gone round the place and felt the walls on every side, he found the cave to be a perfect square. Then, in his return, as he stood near about the middle, he struck his foot against a column which stood rising slightly above the water. As soon as he touched this pillar, he found lying upon it a book¹ wrap-

¹ See above, ch. 9.

ped up in a very fine and thin linen cloth;¹ and as soon as he had lifted it up just as he had found it, he gave a signal to his companions to draw him up again. As soon as he regained the light, he showed them the book, which struck them all with astonishment, especially because it appeared so new and fresh, considering the place where it had been found. This book, which appeared such a mighty prodigy in the eyes of both heathens and Jews, as soon as it was opened showed the following words in large letters: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."² In fact, the volume contained that entire Gospel which had been declared by the divine tongue of the (beloved) disciple and the Virgin. Moreover, this miracle, together with other signs which were then shown from heaven, most clearly showed that "the word of the Lord would never go forth void,"³ which had foretold that the devastation of the Temple should be perpetual. For that book declared Him who had uttered those words long before, to be God and the Creator of the universe; and it was a very clear proof that "their labour was but lost that built,"⁴ seeing that the immutable decree of the Lord had condemned the Temple to eternal desolation. The city of Jerusalem itself was formerly called Jebus, and was inhabited by some of the tribe of Benjamin, before King David took it by the aid of Joab. The army promised him the throne of Israel if he could only get possession of that city, and when he captured it, the army faithfully observed its promises. He then built a new city on the same site, and chose it as the metropolis of the entire Hebrew race.

CHAP. 15.—The apostate Julian undertook an expedition against the Persians, relying upon the prophecies of the heathen oracles in different quarters, that his might would prove irresistible. But a certain old man, who had long since been discharged from the Persian service, contrived by fraud and treachery to insnare the Apostate as he was making war in Persia.⁵ And when he had brought the Romans into the greatest straits by leading them into a pathless desert, in which a very great portion of the army perished, he gave the

¹ ἡμίτριβιον. The word occurs in classical writers. See Aristophanes, Plut. 729.

² St. John i. 1.

³ Isa. xlv. 23.

⁴ Psal. cxxvii. 1.

⁵ Compare Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. iii. ch. 21—25.

enemy, like the prey of a hunter, into the hands of his countrymen. For the Persians rushed upon the Romans, having joined to their forces as allies some Saracenic horsemen who were armed with spears. One of them hurled a spear against Julian, which struck him on the thigh near the groin; and when the spear was drawn out, it was followed by a quantity of dung and blood also. One of the body-guard of the emperor immediately attacked the Saracen who had wounded the king, and cut off his head: while the Romans immediately placed Julian, thus mortally wounded, on a shield, and carried him off into a tent. Many even thought that the fatal blow was struck by Julian's own friends, so sudden and unexpected was it, and so much at a loss were they to know whence it proceeded. But the wretched Julian took up in his hands the blood which flowed from his wounds, and cast it up towards the sun, exclaiming, "Take thy fill;" and he added curses upon the other gods as villains and destroyers. In his train was a most distinguished physician, one Oribasius, a native of the Lydian city, Sardis. But the wound was far beyond all medical art, and carried Julian off after three days of suffering, after he had enjoyed the dignity of Cæsar for five years, and the imperial throne two years and a half from the death of Constantius. Philostorgius in this passage writes, that Julian sprinkled his blood towards the sun and cursed his gods. But most historians write that he used this act as an expression of hatred against our Lord and only true God, Jesus Christ."¹

¹ It was from the same motive that he caused the cross and symbols of the name of Jesus Christ to be struck out of the Labarum, (see note on b. i. ch. 6.) and reduced the standard to its original form under the Pagan emperors. It was for the same reason also that he favoured the Jews, remitting the tribute exacted from them by his predecessors, burning the records, and casting the odium of these imposts upon the Christians themselves. He also wrote a book against the Christians. Fleury adds, that in his last moments the emperor Julian "spoke in a lofty strain to those about him, saying, that he was content to die; adding, that it was an indignity to bewail a prince who was about to be re-united to heaven and the stars, and discoursed for some time concerning the immortality of the soul, with the philosophers Maximius and Priscus, till death put an end to his sufferings."

EPITOME OF BOOK VIII.

CHAP. 1.—ON the next day after Julian's death, the soldiers proclaimed Jovian emperor. He found that there was no other means left of escape, for the whole army had been reduced to a tenth of its original numbers ; so he concluded a truce for three years with the Persians, on the condition of surrendering to them Nisibis and all the fortresses which had been erected by the Romans as means of defence against the Persians, even as far as Armenia. Moreover, Merobaudes¹ and his fellow-comrades, as they were carrying the corpse of Julian into Cilicia, placed it by accident, and not by design, opposite to the tomb which contained the bones of Maximin, so that the coffins of both were separated from each other only by the highway.

CHAP. 2.—Euzoius and the bishops of his party compiled a book in defence of Aetius² and his doctrines, but they took no pains to get the matter brought to a satisfactory termination.³ Accordingly Aetius and Eunomius stayed some time in Constantinople, and busied themselves with looking after their own affairs ; and having arranged other matters as seemed to them most advantageous, they ordered certain bishops, among whom were Candidus⁴ and Arrianus, who were

¹ Ammianus Marcellinus (Hist. b. xxv. ch. 9) makes out that this was done by Procopius. The emperor Julian died at Tarsus. See Euseb. p. 458, note a.

² Concerning Aetius, see above, b. vii. ch. 5 and 6.

³ The sense of the passage, according to Valesius, is as follows: "When Euzoius, and the synod held at Antioch during the reign of Julian, had written its synodical epistle concerning the restoration of Aetius and his confederates, they omitted to send it to Eudoxius and the rest of the bishops, (as we learn from above, b. vii. ch. 6,) on account of the persecution of the Christians which was then raging. But when peace was restored after the death of Julian, they transmitted their letter to Eudoxius and the other bishops, but took no pains to carry matters into effect. Accordingly Aetius and Eunomius, who happened to be at Constantinople at the time, perceiving the indolence of Euzoius, sent Theophilus the Indian to Antioch with the special design of urging Eudoxius to help matters forward, and to put the sentence of the synod into execution ; or, if not, of engaging him as leader of Aetius's faction there.

⁴ Concerning Candidus and Arrianus, see below, ch. 4, 6, 7 of this book, and b. ix. ch. 1.

set over the churches of Lydia and Ionia, while Theodulus¹ was promoted from the see of Chæretapa to the bishopric of Palestine. At Constantinople too they chose Pæmenius as bishop of their church, for many seceders from the party of Eudoxius and other sects in that city had swelled the adherents of Aetius and Eunomius. By this act, however, they contrived to incur the hostility of Eudoxius, who had hitherto cherished the hope of cementing a friendship with them. And when Pæmenius died, soon after this, they substituted Florentius in his place, at the same time appointing Thallus bishop of Lesbos, upon the death of the existing bishop. Euphronius,² too, they set over Galatia, on the shores of the Euxine, and Cappadocia, as bishop, and Julian over Cilicia. Theophilus the Indian not long afterwards betook himself to Antioch in Cœle-Syria of his own accord, for the special purpose of rousing Euzoius to carry into execution the decrees which had been passed in favour of Aetius; and, if he could not accomplish this point, at all events to preside over the people who adhered to his own views of doctrine. But the care of both parts of Libya, and all who professed their doctrines throughout Egypt, was placed in the hands of Serras and Stephen and Heliodorus. In relating all these matters, Philostorgius exceeds all bounds of moderation in praising their eloquence and their sanctity of life to the skies.

CHAP. 3.—Philostorgius makes mention of a certain bishop named Theodosius,³ a most zealous supporter of the Eunomian tenets, but a follower of wanton women, and one who added some other impious tenets to the ancient creed, and especially this, namely, that the nature of Christ was subject to change, but that by the most perfect practice of the Christian virtues he was raised to a state not subject to change; and also that God neither speaks nor hears, for else he would have material hands and ears. Many other impious assertions of the same Theodosius are also related by him.

¹ Concerning Theodulus, see above, b. vii. ch. 6, and below, b. ix. ch. 18; and as to the others, see b. ix. ch. 1 and 18.

² This is the probable orthography of the name, and not Euphranius. See below, b. ix. ch. 18.

³ This Theodosius is mentioned by Socrates, (Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 40,) as bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia.

CHAP. 4.—Aetius, indeed, went into Lydia to set Candidus and Arrian over the districts of that province. But the aforesaid Theodosius, fearing that their life would be the condemnation of his own, took up hostilities against Aetius, although previously he had refused to put his signature to the synodical epistle¹ against him; ² and having communicated his design to Phœbus,³ who was himself of the number of those who had declined to condemn Aetius, and who was inclined to regard Theodosius in the more friendly manner from early remembrance of him, and from being like to him in the immorality of his life,—the two joined forces with Auxidianus, who, like themselves, had been a bishop, and laid their plans against Aetius and Candidus, collected together six other bishops, and having formed themselves into a synod, sent letters by common consent to Eudoxius and Maris. In these letters they condemned the ordination of Aetius as illegal, especially on the ground that after his being deposed from the diaconate, and while as yet he was still under the censure of those who had deposed him, still, though degraded from the lower office, he had been promoted to the higher rank. They also assailed the ordination of Candidus and Arrianus, on the ground that they had been hastily performed without the common consent, and likewise other ordinations which had been held by Aetius. Eudoxius, however, having very readily received this letter, never took the pains to call back to mind the sacred oaths by which he had pledged himself to Eunomius, and the letters which he had written to Euzoius, and the many and various pledges by which he had ratified his promises. But he wrote back to Theodosius and his companions, urging them to carry on the matter with promptness, and exhorting them to reserve their punishments for those who had held ordinations, rather than visit those who had been ordained with penalties.

CHAP. 5.—The emperor Jovian restored the churches to their original uses,⁴ and set them free from all the vexatious

¹ τὸν κατ' Ἀέτιον τόμον. This word is clearly the correct reading, and not νόμον. Compare above, b. vii. ch. 2.

² See above, b. vii. ch. 2.

³ Valesius reads Phœbus for Phobus; the individual himself was probably bishop of a place in Lydia called Polychalandus.

⁴ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κόσμον. Gothofred asserts that these words refer, not merely to ecclesiastical purposes and ornaments, but that they mean that

persecutions inflicted on them by the apostate Julian. He also called back from exile all whom he had banished because they refused to abandon their faith: among their number was Valentinian,¹ who at that time returned from Thebes in Egypt.

CHAP. 6.—Philostorgius says, that Candidus and Arrianus, relatives of Jovian, came to him while he was staying at Edessa, and resisted him in his efforts to conciliate the goodwill of the emperor towards Athanasius. But the emperor referred what was said on either side to be decided by the common voice, and meantime showed no sign as to which of the two sides he regarded with favour.

CHAP. 7.—Eudoxius addressed to Euzoios certain letters against Candidus and Arrianus. Euzoios felt indignant at this step, so he joined forces with Elpidius, and wrote back to Eudoxius, partly in censure of his opinion, and partly, on the other hand, exhorting him the rather to give up opinions of such a nature. At the same time he visited him with a gentle censure for the long delay which he had made in performing the promises which he had made Eunomius in favour of Aetius.

CHAP. 8.—The emperor Jovian, having arrived at Ancyra, on his way to Constantinople, gave the title of “most noble” to one of his two sons, named Varronianus, who was then quite a child. Thence he set out with his army on a further expedition, though it was the very depth of winter, and lost many of his men upon the road; reaching Dadastana itself together with a few survivors.² Having put up at a certain station on the way, he laid down to take his rest in a bed-chamber, the walls of which had been recently white-washed; and when a fire was lit, and the heat diffused itself through the room, the moisture of the newly-stained walls began to exude, and being drawn in by the nostrils in breathing, choked up the passages of the lungs, and suffocated the emperor, after he had held the imperial throne about ten months complete.

the new emperor restored to the churches their ancient immunities and supplies of public corn, of which they had been deprived by Julian. Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. 3.

¹ Concerning Valentinian, see above, b. vii. ch. 7, and compare Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. 6.

² See Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 5.

His corpse was afterwards brought to Constantinople. The army on its arrival at Nicæa, after a lapse of twelve days, proclaimed Valentinian emperor, according to a suggestion of Datian the patrician, communicated in letters from Galatia, where he had been left, partly on account of his old age, and partly on account of the severity of the winter. Secundus,¹ prefect of the Prætorium, and Arinthæus, master of the horse, together with Dagalairus, chamberlain of the household, joined in effecting this matter. And when forthwith after his proclamation, the army, as it carried along the emperor on a shield,² demanded of him that he would choose some one to share with him the imperial power,³ Valentinian lifted up his hand and commanded them to hold their peace; and no way alarmed, he thus addressed them with all the firmness of an emperor. "It was your own free choice and vote, my soldiers, which raised me from a private state to the dignity of emperor. Henceforth, however, to discern and to arrange what is to be done, is the place of the emperor only, and not that of his subjects." As soon, however, as he had entered Constantinople, he took his brother Valens to share his throne, and having made this appointment, went as far as Sirmium in the regions of the West; here he divided with his brother all the imperial ornaments, and the other insignia of state and court, and sent him back to Constantinople, assigning to him all those parts of the East which had been formerly subject to Constantius. The emperor himself, however, took in hand the other two portions of the empire, and so possessed himself of the entire West. And not long afterwards he began to train up, in imitation of his own character, his son Gratian, whom he advanced to the regal dignity at a very early age.

CHAP. 9.—Philostorgius says, that Hypatia,⁴ the daughter of Theon, was so well educated in mathematics by her father, that she far surpassed her teacher, and especially in astronomy, and taught many others the mathematical sciences. The impious writer asserts that, during the reign of Theo-

¹ It is doubtful whether or not this Secundus is the same with the person elsewhere mentioned as prefect, under the name of Sallust.

² Hence we find constantly in the annals of this period the phrase "imperator levatus" and "renunciatus."

³ That is, as Augustus. See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. 13.

⁴ See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vii. ch. 15.

dosius the younger, she was torn in pieces by the Homoöusian party.

CHAP. 10.—The author here relates that there was a Philostorgius living in the days of Valens and Valentinian, who was the most illustrious physician of his time. He had two sons, Philagrius and Posidonius. Of these two, he relates that he saw Posidonius, who was also eminent as a physician. This Posidonius, however, used falsely to assert that men do not grow fanatic by the agency of evil spirits, but merely by the superfluity of certain evil humours; and that there is no power in evil spirits to assail the human race. At the same period also flourished Magnus, who practised the same art at Alexandria.

CHAP. 11.—This impious writer, though against his will, expresses his admiration of the wisdom of Basil the Great and Gregory the theologian; whose country Nazianzum he calls Nadiandum. But he prefers to both the one and the other Apollinaris of Laodicea, as far as regards the literature of the Scriptures, though he admits that in panegyrical discourses the latter is surpassed by Basil; while Gregory, as compared with the other two, had a much more rounded style of composition; he was also more fluent in speech than Apollinaris, and more stately than Basil.

CHAP. 12.—He says that not only Basil the Great, but also Apollinaris, wrote against the Apology of Eunomius; but that Eunomius replied to him in five books, and that when he had read only the first of these, he was struck with such profound remorse that he died. Thus does this writer show how much more highly he values falsehood than truth.

CHAP. 13.—He openly calumniates these same most holy men, Basil and Gregory. For he makes out that they said that the Son was not made man, but dwelt in a human frame; and on this account Apollinaris joined their party. He also not only accuses him on account of those matters for which he is deservedly censured by pious individuals, but he also relates that he was carried away into another strange belief. For among other things, he asserts that he denied the resurrection of the body.¹

¹ It is not true that he actually "denied" the doctrine of the resurrection, like the Sadducees of old; but it is certain that he taught such strange doctrines as these concerning it; that at the resurrection the dead

CHAP. 14.—In the books which he wrote against Porphyry, Apollinaris far surpassed all that had been written against the same Porphyry by Eusebius. He also left far behind the books of Methodius on the same subject.

CHAP. 15.—He says further, but I know not whence he derives his information, that Apollinaris was a bishop, and that Novatus was of Phrygian descent.

CHAP. 16.—He also asserts that Cibates was the birth-place of Valens and Valentinian.

CHAP. 17.—He says that among those who professed the doctrine of the likeness of the Son in substance to the Father, the most celebrated were Theodore, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, and George, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, an Alexandrian by origin, who had previously devoted himself to the study of philosophy. Next to these in esteem and in point of time came the elder Eustathius, a man held in high veneration by the people, and most powerful in his method of persuasion. To these must be added Basil and Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, and Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, as well as Marathonius and Maximin, presbyters of the church at Constantinople.

CHAP. 18.—In his comparison of Eunomius and Aetius, Philostorgius prefers the latter in respect to the force of his demonstrations, and his ready faculty of reply to objections, saying that everything seems to lie ready for use at the tip of his tongue. But as to perspicuity in teaching, and a style well suited to learners, he prefers Eunomius.

EPITOME OF BOOK IX.

CHAP. 1.—THE ninth book of Philostorgius contains some wonderful miracles wrought by the hands of Aetius, Eunomius, and Leontius,—inventions of the author; as likewise some others wrought by Candidus, Evagrius, Arrianus, and Florentius; but above all, by Theophilus the Indian, and of certain other persons, whom their zeal rendered more vehe-

would return to the old law, and to circumcision, and the temple, and all other Jewish rites and ceremonies, for a thousand years. This we learn from Basil the Great, Epist. 74. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 46.

ment than others in their profession of the same impiety. When Philostorgius was compiling these fictions, it would seem that no idea of their absurdity came into his mind to keep him in check.

CHAP. 2.—Philostorgius says that, when Moses punished Jannes and Jambres with wounds inflicted by heaven, he also condemned to death the mother of the latter.

CHAP. 3.—According to Philostorgius, Valens, upon his return from Illyricum to Constantinople, paid especial honours to Eudoxius;¹ and when Eudoxius had it in his power without difficulty to fulfil his promises to Eunomius, he lacked the will to do so. Euzoius² also had, in like manner, an opportunity of ordering to be put into execution the resolutions which he had carried on their behalf in the synod held at Antioch. But both the one and the other were so far from remembering their promises, that Euzoius began to abuse the very persons whose cause he had espoused, calling in mockery the followers of Aetius and Theophilus the Indian,³ “Heaven-goers,” as though it were not religion and the faith that was at stake, but merely the choice of colours or genera. Eudoxius, too, heaped upon them other reproaches, and also used this very term “Heaven-goers”⁴ against them in the church. I indeed do not call those men impious, says Philostorgius, as they wish to be called, lest their apostasy should seem to the world to have a show of reason; but I call them pests and plagues.

CHAP. 4.—Aetius and Eunomius now broke off entirely from Eudoxius and Euzoius, and intrusted the church of Constantinople to Florentius, Aetius at the same time leaving the city, and sailing to Lesbos. Here he lived in a certain rural

¹ Philostorgius enters minutely into the speeches and acts of Eudoxius and Euzoius against Aetius and Eunomius, for the purpose of showing more clearly the perfidiousness of their conduct, and lay at their doors the blame of the schism, because Eunomius seceded from Eudoxius, because the latter would not accept of Aetius as his teacher and master. Concerning Aetius, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 35; Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 13; Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. b. ii. ch. 27.

² See above, b. vii. ch. 6.

³ *Αἰθιοπα*. See above, note on b. ii. ch. 6.

⁴ *οὐρανοβάται*. Valesius suggests *οὐρανόβοσκοι*, “qui in cœlis pascua habent.” So Socrates is derided in the “Clouds” of Aristophanes, as *Μετρωροφρονιστής*. So also we find the word *μετρωρολίσχει* used below, b. x. ch. 1.

district near Mitylene, receiving with kind speeches such as repaired to him. This very district the emperor Julian had given to Aetius as a sign of his good-will and affection. Eunomius, however, passing over to Chalcedon, lived there in a garden close to the sea walls, which was his own property, taking especial care of his revenues, as Aetius did, though neither of them thenceforth had the charge of any particular church. But the followers of their sect considered them as their common fathers and leaders. Eunomius certainly, since he had left the city of Cyzicus, never celebrated the holy mysteries¹ of the altar during the remainder of his life, although there was no bishop of the same sect who transacted any ecclesiastical matters without consulting his opinion.

CHAP. 5.—Upon entering on the third year of his empire, Valens commenced an expedition against the Persians. At the same time² Procopius³ also seized upon the imperial power at Constantinople. He was near of kin to Julian; and many opinions were passed concerning him, which said that the empire ought to be offered to him; and these opinions from time to time were spread publicly abroad. On this account, as soon as Jovian was raised to the empire, Procopius took to flight and left Mesopotamia with his wife. Being obliged to conceal himself, by changing about from place to place, which he did with great difficulty and distress, weary at length of his wanderings and concealment, at last he threw, as men say, his last stake. Accordingly he went to Chalcedon, and, in the absence of Eunomius, took refuge in the land belonging to him outside the town. Hence he passed over to Constantinople, and seized upon the imperial power without bloodshed. And not long afterwards, having engaged in battle with Valens, he was overcome by the treachery of his generals, Goma-

¹ *ιερουργία*. As Valesius observes, this is generally the ecclesiastical signification of the term; though Philostorgius below (ch. 10) uses it for "ordination." Gothofred, in accordance with his own peculiar views, refers it to handling the sacred vessels. Compare Eusebius, Life of Constantine, b. iv. ch. 45. *θυσίαις ἀναίμοις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἱερουργίαις τὸ θεῖον ἰλάσκοντο*. "They propitiated the deity with unbloody sacrifices and the mystic oblation."

² Against the chronology of Philostorgius here, it should be mentioned that Gothofred considers that Procopius made his attempt A. D. 365.

³ Concerning Procopius himself, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 3, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 8.

rius and Agelius, and, taking to flight, he retreated to Nicæa. Next day, while he was meditating to take his departure thence, he was seized by Florentius, who was in charge of the garrison of that town, and was carried in chains to Valens. Procopius soon afterwards was beheaded, having had possession of his power for about the space of six months. But his betrayal of Procopius did not avail to insure the life of Florentius; for his soldiers delivered him to be burnt, being enraged with him on account of a former grudge, because, when he had been sent by Procopius to garrison Nicæa, he had treated several of them with indignity as favourers of the side of Valens.

CHAP. 6.—Whilst Procopius was still exercising the imperial power, Eunomius came to him during his stay at Cyzicus. The arrival of Eunomius seemed to demand the liberation of those who were illegally detained in prison by Procopius, where they had been cast into chains, because they had embraced the part of Valens. These relations had constrained Eunomius to undertake this embassy: he accordingly took it in hand, and immediately returned as soon as he had set them free from chains. About the same time the person who had been sent by Procopius to administer the island of Lesbos,¹ brought Aetius also into public disgrace, by getting the inhabitants to accuse him of favouring the side of Valens. And beyond a doubt a violent death would have ensued, had not one of the most influential persons in the court of Procopius come up at the time and saved Aetius from the sword. For the person who had been sent by Procopius was a relative of Herennianus and Gerresianus, two brothers, who had lived much in company with Eunomius, and who had been joined with him in the indictment. Accordingly, in pursuance of the authority with which he had been invested, having severely threatened the judge who had condemned them, and having rescinded the capital sentence passed upon them, he sent them away freely and fully acquitted of the crimes alleged against them. Aetius, however, took them along with himself and sailed for Constantinople, where he lived with Eunomius and Florentius for a short space of time, after which he died. Eunomius closed his eyes and mouth, and carried out

¹ The place to which Aetius had sailed on leaving Constantinople. See above, ch. 4.

in the most splendid style the other ceremonies appertaining to the funeral conjointly with the followers of the same sect.

CHAP. 7.—Whilst Eudoxius was staying with Valens at Marcianopolis, the clergy of the church at Constantinople resolved that Eunomius should be banished from the royal city. Accordingly the latter went to Chalcedon, and wrote and told Eudoxius what had happened. Eudoxius was not only not moved by the contents of the letter, but also showed openly his indignation at his not having had to bear a more severe sentence.

CHAP. 8.—Some persons, says Philostorgius, censured Eunomius, because he had concealed Procopius in his country place, when he was meditating to seize the imperial power. This calumny, and an attempt upon his life on account of it, Eunomius escaped with great difficulty. Yet he was sent into exile in Mauritania; a punishment inflicted on him by Auxonius, the prefect of the Prætorium. Eunomius, indeed, was led off into exile during the continuance of the bad weather of winter. But on his arrival at Mursa, a city of Illyricum,¹ the bishop of which city was a certain Valens,² he was received with great kindness by him and recalled from banishment, Valens having joined Domninus, bishop of Marcianopolis, in an application on his behalf to the emperor, and pleaded the cause of Eunomius with great interest. After recalling Eunomius from exile, the emperor was anxious to admit him into his presence; but Eudoxius contrived by some artifices to prevent this interview. But after this, he went to Nicæa to ordain a bishop in that place, in the room of Eugenius,³ bishop of that city, who had recently died; but before he had brought the matter to a conclusion, he departed this life. Demophilus, however, was translated from Beræa to Constantinople, the emperor approving the decree of the synod.⁴

¹ Or rather of Pannonia, which is a province of Illyria. This city was the scene of the victory over the tyrant Magnentius.

² This Valens was condemned at Rome by Damasus, the then pope, A. D. 369.

³ Concerning Eugenius, see Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. p. 139, note 1. Concerning the date of Eudoxius' death, see Socrates, Eccl. Hist. p. 230, note 2.

⁴ It is to be observed that the election of bishops, and especially of the patriarchal sees, was generally referred to the emperor for confirmation

CHAP. 9.—Philostorgius says that a certain presbyter named Anysius lived at Borissus, a village of the further part of Cappadocia; this man had four sons,¹ and an only daughter, named Eulampia, who was the mother of Philostorgius, the writer of this history. Her husband, Carterius by name, who followed the sect of Eunomius, persuaded his wife to come over to his own opinion; for she was one who, both on her father's and mother's side, inherited an attachment to the substantial faith. The woman was drawn over by the persuasions of her husband, and gained over to the same opinion, first, her brothers, then her father, and lastly, by degrees, the remainder of her relatives.

CHAP. 10.—Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, as Philostorgius relates, had an especial hand in placing Demophilus in the see of Constantinople; for the privilege of this particular consecration seemed to belong to him more particularly. And further, while Demophilus was being placed in the episcopal see, many of the people who were present cried out, not "He is worthy,"² but, "He is unworthy."

CHAP. 11.—Modestus,³ who was promoted after Auxonius as prefect of the Prætorium, being indignant with Eunomius, as Philostorgius says, condemned him unheard, as one who raised disturbances in churches and states, and so he banished him to the island of Naxos.

CHAP. 12.—Cæsarea was originally called Mozoca, from Mosoch, a prince of Cappadocia; but, in process of time, the name was corrupted into Mazaca.

CHAP. 13.—From the day that Eunomius had left Cyzicus, no bishop, according to Philostorgius, had been appointed in his room. But Demophilus, upon his arrival at Cyzicus with Dorotheus and others,⁴ found that he could bring nothing to after the time of Constantine. See the instance given above (b. ii. ch. 11) of the election of Athanasius. Patriarchs were elected in a synod of the bishops of their suffragan sees.

¹ At this period the celibacy of the clergy was partially established. Valesius remarks, however, that this Anysius might have lost his wife before taking holy orders.

² This was the general cry of the people at the election of a bishop. Compare the account given of the election of Fabianus to the see of Rome by Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. 29.

³ Concerning this Modestus, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 231, note a.

⁴ This Dorotheus was bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, the same who consecrated Demophilus to the see of Constantinople. See above,

pass in the matter of ordaining a bishop, because the inhabitants of that city were most zealous in their profession of the similarity of substance, according to the teaching and instruction of Eleusius, who had confirmed them in this opinion. But when Demophilus and his partisans had admitted the protest of the people of Cyzicus, and had condemned and anathematized Aetius and Eunomius, (for this was what their protest amounted to,) and both in their speeches and their public writings had called him a "denier of similarity,"¹ and had subjected to the same anathema both their faith and all the followers of it, at length the people of Cyzicus admitted his ordination, though they suffered no one else to be advanced to the episcopate, except such only as they had preferred by their votes. The individual ordained as bishop straightway preached and taught the consubstantial faith.

CHAP. 14.—Upon the death of Euzoios, bishop of Antioch, Dorotheus² was translated from Heraclea of Thrace to the see which he had held. Philostorgius however is severe upon both Demophilus and Dorotheus; the latter he calls the vainest of men, while he accuses Demophilus of being wont to mix up everything in confusion, and especially the dogmas of the church. So that on a certain occasion, while he was preaching before the people of Constantinople, he said that the body of Christ was mingled with his Divinity, and so entirely disappeared, just as a pint of milk is lost when poured into the vast body of the ocean. Demophilus was a native of the city of Thessalonica,³ and of noble descent. He was also very much enraged with the partisans of Eunomius, and visited them with the severest penalties.

CHAP. 15.—During the time of Valens, the oracles of the heathens gave to those who consulted them, pebbles marked ch. 10. He succeeded to the see of Heraclea on the death of Hypatianus under Valens.

¹ "Anomæus." Gr. *ἀνόμοιος*. No single term can be invented which will be an exact equivalent for this word. It means one who denies that the Son is of *like substance* to the Father.

² The same as Theodore. The two names are constantly interchanged by Philostorgius, as above, ch. 10. See also Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. iv. ch. 35; and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 37, and b. vii. ch. 14.

³ Or more strictly speaking, of Beræa, a neighbouring town, which was also his episcopal see. See chap. 8 and 19 of this book; and for a further account of Demophilus, see the extract from Suidas subjoined to the end of this volume.

with certain letters. These letters, when combined together, seemed to some to make up the name of Theodosius, to others that of Theodulus or Theodore, or of some other individual. For the forms of letters went on regularly as far as D, the dæmons, according to their custom, giving ambiguous responses,¹ to the ruin of those who trust in them, but so as to escape the discredit of having spoken untruly. Hence a certain Theodore among the Syrians, being led aside by deceit to attempt to seize upon the imperial power, was immediately put to death along with those who had followed him. Together with them Valens punished also many innocent persons because their names began with the same letters.

CHAP. 16.—The emperor Valentinian died, after a reign of twelve years, leaving his son Gratian heir to the empire. He left also two other children, his daughter Galla and the younger Valentinian, who was only about four years of age.² His mother Justina and the army in Pannonia straightway caused the child to be proclaimed emperor. Gratian, however, on hearing of this proceeding, withheld his approval from the proclamation of Valentinian, because it had been made without his sanction. He moreover punished some³ of those who had dared to make the attempt. Nevertheless he did not entirely refuse to share the throne with his brother, towards whom also he discharged the duty of a father.

CHAP. 17.—The Scythians who dwelt on the further side of the Rhine were attacked by an invasion of the Huns, and being forced from their settlements, and being driven out of their abodes, they crossed over into the Roman territory under the pretence of friendly intentions. The Huns would seem to be identical with those who were anciently called Neuri; and their settlements were at the foot of the Rhipæan⁴ moun-

¹ See Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 19; and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. 35.

² This date is confirmed by the testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus. Valentinian the younger, then, was born A. D. 371. This Valentinian, son of the elder Valentinian, is not to be confounded with another Valentinian, the son of Valens.

³ Philostorgius is unsupported in this statement. This is probably one of his intentional calumnies against Gratian, whom he hated intensely, to judge at least from below, b. viii. ch. 8, and b. x. ch. 5. Concerning the death of Valentinian the elder, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 31, and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. 36.

⁴ The chain of the Ural.

tains, out of which the river Tanais takes its rise and pours its waters into the Sea of Azof. But the Scythians, having crossed over into the territory of the Romans, at first conducted themselves quietly towards the latter, but afterwards they began to plunder, and finally made open war upon them, without previously sending a herald to proclaim war. As soon as Valens learned these tidings, he straightway quitted Antioch, and reaching Constantinople, made his way with speed into Thrace. Here he encountered the barbarians, and having lost many of his soldiers, he speedily betook himself to flight. At last, being driven to the most extreme necessity, and being wholly destitute of counsel, he hid himself, together with a few of his followers, in a small rural cottage where some hay was stored up. The barbarians who were in pursuit of him burnt everything that came in their way, and among other things, the hut above mentioned, little imagining that the emperor was there. Thus died Valens,¹ losing at the same time the most brave and numerous portion of his Roman soldiery. The barbarians, too, without any fear henceforth overran and devastated the whole of Thrace, under their general Fritigernus. Gratian mourned for his uncle, and shed tears for the calamity which had befallen the empire; and having proclaimed Theodosius emperor, he sent him to govern that part of the empire which was in his uncle's hands. The native country of this Theodosius was Spain, now called Iberia; the river Iberus,² which flows through it, having abolished its former name.

CHAP. 18.—On the death of Theodulus of Chæretapa, who was bishop of Palestine, Eunomius ordained Carterius in his room; and on his death shortly after, John was chosen to supply the vacancy. Eunomius, Arrianus, and Euphronius left Constantinople and went into the East in company with this John, in order to bring Julian thither from Cilicia, and to meet Theophilus the Indian at Antioch, and to regulate the entire state of matters in the East.

CHAP. 19.—The emperor Theodosius met the barbarians

¹ For further particulars concerning the death of the emperor Valens, the reader is referred to Fleury's *Eccl. Hist.* b. xvii. ch. 37. Compare Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. last, and Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vi. ch. last, and Theodoret, b. iv. ch. 36.

² Now known as the Ebro.

near the city of Sirmium,¹ whither he had gone as soon as he had received the imperial purple, on account of the exigencies of the state: then, having defeated the barbarians in battle, he entered the city of Constantinople with great pomp, and intrusted the care of the churches to the consubstantial party, driving out of the city the party of Arius and Eunomius. Among their number was Demophilus, who, on his expulsion, betook himself to his own city Beræa. Hypatius also, being driven out of Nicæa, withdrew to Cyrus in Syria, the place of his birth. Dorotheus, too, being driven out of Antioch, went off into Thrace, whence he originally came. The rest dispersed into their different localities.

EPITOME OF BOOK X.

CHAP. 1.—DOROTHEUS indeed, as we said above, was driven out of Antioch. The presbyters, however, of the same city, Asterius and Crispinus, and the rest of the clergy, convened a council, at which some of the neighbouring bishops were present, and sent to Eunomius and his party, demanding to be admitted into communion by them. These, however, sent letters by way of reply, to the effect that they would receive them into communion on no other conditions except that they should rescind the sentence of condemnation which they had formerly passed on Aetius and his writings; and moreover, they required them to show a reformation in their lives; for they were tainted by some impure actions. The others did not at that time admit the proffered conditions, but afterwards they went so far as to revile Eunomius and his party in the churches, calling them “Men in the clouds;”² and full

¹ Philostorgius is mistaken here. Theodosius was proclaimed emperor at Sirmium, but it was in Macedonia that he met and routed the Goths after his promotion to the purple. Philostorgius is right in asserting that he was already emperor at the time that he gained this victory; though the contrary is asserted by Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. v. ch. 5. Having put the barbarians to flight, Theodosius came to Constantinople, and immediately restored the churches to the orthodox party, towards the close of the year A. D. 380. *Gothofred.*

² μετεωρολέσχαι, “qui in nubibus garriunt.” So also his enemies at

of desperation and madness, because forsooth they had dared to proffer to them such terms as those mentioned above.

CHAP. 2.—Philostorgius brings a charge of impiety against their leader Arius, because he said that the God of the universe consisted of many parts; for he declares that Arius asserted that God can be comprehended, not in his entire magnitude, but so far as each individual is gifted with strength to comprehend him; and that he also gave it as his opinion that God was neither substance nor person, nor any one of those things which are usually predicated of him;¹ and that these assertions are supported by the synods of Ariminum and Constantinople, the latter of which declared that the mode of the generation of the Son was entirely unknown to all, ascribing the knowledge of that generation to him alone who begot him.² Now this is the very synod which passed sentence of condemnation on Aetius.

CHAP. 3.—The Arian party developed their doctrine of the likeness of the only-begotten Son to the Father into a variety of heresies; some of them, for instance, made it to consist in the fact that both of them have a foreknowledge of future events. Others, again, in that both the Father and the Son are born God. Others, again, in the fact that both can create things out of nothing. But, says Philostorgius, these opinions, though they seem to be at variance with each other, all come to one point in the end, namely, in that they declare the Son to be of one substance³ with the Father. Philostorgius, moreover, adds, that this party, after being cut up into a variety of discordant sects, perpetrated many other foul and disgraceful deeds, buying and selling the priesthood⁴ for money, and giving themselves up to the lowest of sensual pleasures.

CHAP. 4.—The Eunomians, according to the testimony of Philostorgius, so utterly abhorred the heresies above mentioned,

Athens termed Socrates a *μετεωροφροντιστής*. See Aristophanes, *Nubes*, *passim*. See also above, note on b. ix. ch. 3.

¹ On this subject the reader will do well to consult Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. iv. ch. 24.

² It is necessary here to adopt the emendation of Valesius, *τῷ γεννήσαντι μόνῳ*. Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. ii. ch. 21, *οὐ τὴν γέννησιν οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ*.

³ *ὁμοούσιον*. The emendation of Valesius for *ὁμοιούσιον*.

⁴ The same thing is predicated of the Arian party by Athanasius, in his *Epist. ad Orthodoxos*, and *Epist. ad Solitarios*.

that they would not admit their baptism or their ordination. Moreover, the Eunomians baptized not with trine immersion, but with one immersion only, baptizing, as they said, into the Lord's death;¹ and this death (they added) he underwent for us once only, and not three times.

CHAP. 5.—The emperor Theodosius invested his son Arcadius² with the imperial purple while he was still very young. And not long afterwards, the emperor Gratian was put to death in Gaul by the treachery of the tyrant Maximus. Philostorgius also forges many calumnies against Gratian, going even so far as to compare him with Nero. For his profession of the right rule of faith did not please Philostorgius in Gratian.

CHAP. 6.—The emperor Theodosius, on finding some of the chamberlains of his court infected with the Eunomian doctrines, expelled them from his palace. Eunomius himself he ordered to be banished from the city of Chalcedon, and to be sent into exile at Halmyris.³ This Halmyris is a place in Mœsia, situate on the Danube; but soon after this it was captured by the barbarians, who crossed the Danube when it was frozen over. Eunomius is dismissed thence to Cæsarea in Cappadocia. But becoming distasteful to the people of Cæsarea, because he had formerly written some books against their bishop, Basil, he was permitted to live in his country place, which was called the Dacoroënian fields. In this place, Philostorgius writes, that when he was twenty years of age, he came to Constantinople and saw Eunomius. He raises him to the very skies with praise, and declares that his prudence and virtue were consummate. He also describes his personal appearance, his countenance, body, and limbs, as full of grace and dignity. He compares also to pearls the speeches which flowed from his lips, though shortly afterwards he confesses him, even against his will, to have lisped. And he is not ashamed to exalt this lisp into a mark of great grace and elegance. Moreover, the white leprosy,⁴ which marked his

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. p. 252, (fol. ed.) note a.

² Arcadius was proclaimed Augustus A. D. 383. See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. p. 272, note b. Gratian was killed the same year. Ibid. p. 277, note b.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 20, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 17. The place was otherwise known as Salmyris.

⁴ ἀλφός. Lat. "Vitiligo." Compare Rufinus, Eccl. Hist. b. x. ch. 25,

face as it were with brands and scars, were an addition to the majesty of his person. And further, although he praises very highly the rest of his writings, still he affirms that his Epistles far surpass the rest of his works in merit.

CHAP. 7.—Upon the demise of his empress Placidia,¹ Theodosius took to wife Galla, the sister of the younger Valentinian, and the daughter of Valentinian the Great, and of Justina, who was created Augusta.² This Justina was a follower of the Arian heresy. By Galla Theodosius had a daughter who was named Placidia.

CHAP. 8.—Theodosius joined his forces with those of Valentinian at Thessalonica, and set out to meet the tyrant Maximus; for the latter, when he had possessed himself of Gratian's share in the imperial purple, endeavoured to obtain possession of that of Valentinian as well. Accordingly, the emperors send against the tyrant,³ Timasius and Richomer, masters of the cavalry, as likewise Promotus and Arbogastes. These surprise him by a sudden attack, and quickly hurl him down from his throne, strip him of the insignia of empire, and bring him before the emperors in the dress of a private citizen. Maximus was then beheaded, having exercised the power of a tyrant for five years.

CHAP. 9.—After gaining this victory over Maximus, and after the arrival⁴ of Theodosius at Rome, when the emperor was on the point of taking his departure thence, a new and strange star⁵ was seen in the sky, which announced the coming of very great calamities upon the world. It appeared first at midnight, near the east, in the very circle which is called the Zodiac. It was large and bright, and in brilliance it was not much inferior to the morning star. After this, a concourse of stars gathered around it on every side, like a swarm of bees gathering in a cluster round their queen. Then, as if impelled by some mutual collision, the light of all the stars min-

interius exteriusque morbo regio corruptus. Compare Gregory Nyssen, *Contra Eunomium*, b. i.

¹ Or, more correctly, Flacilla, which was the name of the wife of Theodosius, as spelt upon ancient coins, and by Gregory of Nyssa.

² See above, b. iii. ch. 28, and Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. v. ch. 19.

³ Compare Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* b. v. ch. 12—15.

⁴ Concerning this journey of Theodosius to Rome, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* b. v. ch. 14; Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* b. vii. ch. 14.

⁵ Concerning this star see below, ch. 11, and b. xi. ch. 7.

gled together, and shone forth in a single flame, assuming the shape of a double-edged sword, huge and terrible. But that one star which first appeared seemed like the hilt of the sword above mentioned, or rather like a root shooting up the large body of light, from what appeared to be a star, surmounted with flowers darting up like the flame from a lamp. Such was the novel and wondrous sight exhibited by the star which then appeared. Its course, moreover, was very different from that of the rest of the stars; for from the time of its first appearing in the place where we have said, and moving on from thence, it began to rise and set together with the morning star. Afterwards, however, receding by little and little, it went up towards the north, advancing slowly and gradually, and following its own course with a slight deflection towards the left of those who beheld it, but in reality it pursued in the same course as the other stars, with which it came into contact from time to time. At length, having completed its course in the space of forty days, it suddenly passed on into the sign of the Great Bear, and was last seen in the very centre of it, where, soon afterwards, it was extinguished. In addition to these particulars, Philostorgius gives us many other wonderful details concerning this star in the shape of a sword.

CHAP. 10.—Philostorgius says that he himself wrote against Porphyry on behalf of the Christians.

CHAP. 11.—At the very time of the appearance of this star in the shape of a sword, there were seen also two human bodies; one in Syria, far surpassing in height the usual stature of man, the other in Egypt, of incredible smallness. The Syrian was five cubits and a palm in height; though his feet were by no means in proportion to the rest of the body, but were turned inwards and crooked. His name was Anthony. The Egyptian, however, was so extremely short, that he gracefully imitated partridges shut up in cages, and that the latter played and strove with him in jest. And what is more wonderful still, he had a stock of practical wisdom by no means commensurate with his bodily stature. His voice was far from unmusical, and his conversation evinced clearly the excellence of his intellectual powers. Both of these lived in the time of Philostorgius, and neither of them was short-lived;¹ the tall one dying after reaching five and twenty years of age, and the

¹ That is, considering the fact that they were monstrous.



diminutive one nearly attaining the same number. In this place Philostorgius makes mention of many other prodigies which had happened either at the same time with, or just before, those above-mentioned.

CHAP. 12.—Philostorgius says, that the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week does not consist in mere abstinence from flesh meat, but that it is laid down by the canons, that no kind of food whatever is to be taken till evening. For concerning Eudoxius,¹ a follower of his own peculiar heresy, who was of the degree of presbyter, though he had lost his genitals, he thus writes, “He was so zealous in keeping the fast, that throughout his life he observed not only those days which the Christians keep, according to the precept of the church, in memory of the Passion of our Lord.”

(Here four pages are wanting, and the 10th book is imperfect.)

*Existed
for
my
the
of day
88*

EPITOME OF BOOK XI.

(The beginning of this book is wanting.)

CHAP. 1.—[VALENTINIAN² the Younger] used to hunt bears and lions; but while he was only in his twentieth year, he was deprived of his life, his imperial purple, and his field-

¹ See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. p. 295, note b.

² See Fleury's Eccl. Hist. b. xvii. ch. 23. He published an edict in favour of the Arians in the following terms: “We give leave to all those to assemble whose opinions are conformable to the exposition of faith which was subscribed to under Constantius in the council of Rimini by the bishops of the whole Roman empire assembled, even by those who are now against it, and which was confirmed at Constantinople. Those, likewise, shall be at liberty to assemble to whom we have given leave, that is to say, the Catholics: but let them know that if they cause any disturbance in opposition to our statute, they shall be punished with death as authors of sedition, disturbers of the peace of the church, and as guilty of high treason. Those, likewise, shall be subject to the same punishment, who attempt openly or in private to make any resistance against this present decree.” Fleury, Eccl. Hist. b. xviii. ch. 43. It would seem that the young emperor was deservedly popular: he is said to have been beloved by all men, and to have profited much by the instruction and example of Theodosius. He had a complete mastery over his passions and appetites, young as he was; and no one, during his reign, was in fear of false accusation or unjust trials. He died beloved by the Romans and respected by the barbarians.

sports. He was also uncontrollable in his rage, and this was the chief cause of his death. For on one occasion, when he was conversing in the palace with Arbogastes, and was roused to anger by something that he said, he attempted to draw a sword against his Master of the Horse. He was checked, however; for the attendant whose sword he endeavoured to draw, held him back, and endeavoured by his words to remove all suspicion from Arbogastes. At the same time he found out from the words of the emperor himself what were his designs, and brought them into light. For on asking what was the motive of so violent an outburst, the emperor answered that he was about to lay violent hands on himself, because, although he was emperor, he was not allowed to do everything that he pleased. Arbogastes at the time made no very curious inquiry. But afterwards, when he had dined one day at Vienne in Gaul, and when he had seen him with some low buffoons, lying down and dipping his lips into the river, he sent some of his attendants to attack him. These laid violent hands upon him and savagely strangled him, while not one of the emperor's servants were at hand, for at that moment they had gone to take their dinner. But that none might straightway make search after the authors of his death, they tied his handkerchief like a noose around his neck, and hung him¹ with it up to a tree, so that it might seem that he had hung himself of his own accord.

CHAP. 2.—After the murder of Valentinian, Arbogastes found himself excluded from the imperial purple by reason of his birth; so he proclaimed as emperor a certain man named Eugenius, who in rank was a magister, but in religion was a heathen. Having discovered this, Theodosius placed the imperial crown on the head of Honorius, one of his two sons, and spent the entire winter in making the necessary preparations for war. But as soon as the spring approached, he commenced his expedition against the usurper: on arriving at the Alps, he seized upon them by a stratagem, and having met the usurper near the river called Frigidus, and having fought with him a severe conflict, in which very many were killed on both sides, at length victory turned aside from the usurper, and placed the crown on the head of the legitimate

¹ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. v. ch. 25; and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 22.

emperor. On this the usurper was captured and beheaded. Arbogastes cast aside all hope of escape, so he fell upon his own sword, and so terminated his life. After this the emperor made his entry into Milan; when he sent for his son Honorius, and gave up into his hands the command of the entire West. After gaining this victory over the usurper, Theodosius died of a dropsical disease after a reign of sixteen years; during which time,¹ as emperor, he had arrived at the highest pinnacle of human felicity. For, having gained fame by his victories, and having obtained the crown of the entire Roman empire, and having seen his two sons raised to the imperial dignity, which he left to them firmly secured and free from conspiracy, he died upon his own bed the happiest of deaths, obtaining, as it seems to me, this reward of the burning zeal which he cherished against the worship of images. When the impious Philostorgius speaks thus concerning Theodosius, he is not ashamed to traduce him at the same time as given to intemperate living and immoderate pleasures, saying that it was by this means that he contracted his fatal dropsy.

CHAP. 3.—In the Eastern parts Rufinus held the highest post of esteem with Arcadius, whilst in the West Stilicho held the same position with respect to Honorius. Both of these generals readily allowed the name and title of emperor to remain² in the hands of the two sons of Theodosius, while they retained in their own hands the actual authority of empire, each of them ruling his own emperor, the one under the title of Master of the Cavalry, the other under that of Prefect. Neither of them, moreover, was content with the place which he held under his emperor. For Rufinus, indeed, spared no artifice to invest himself with the title of emperor, while Stilicho used his efforts to secure the purple for his son Eucherius. But the soldiers who had gone forth to war against the usurper under Theodosius, on their return from Rome, slew³ with their swords Rufinus in the place which is called the Tribunal, at the very feet of the emperor; and this

¹ The Greek text is hopelessly corrupt here. We have followed the judgment of Valesius in our rendering.

² μένειν. This is the reading suggested by Valesius for the commonly received text νέμειν.

³ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 1, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. viii. ch. 1.

they did partly in compliance with the instructions of Stilicho, and partly because they found themselves scornfully treated by Rufinus. And further, it is to be observed that he was put to death on that very day on which the astrologers¹ had all but invested him by anticipation with the purple. Moreover, Rufinus was tall in person and of a manly disposition, according to Philostorgius. The quick glance of his eye and the eloquence of his tongue showed him to be a person of skill and ability. On the other hand, Arcadius was short of stature, and weak in bodily frame; his personal strength was slight, and his complexion dark. The sloth of his natural disposition showed itself in his speech, and in the blinking of his eyes, which remained closed like those of persons asleep, and were kept open with an effort. These points caused Rufinus to miscalculate his chance, for he thought that at the very first sight the army would gladly choose him as emperor, and depose Arcadius. Moreover, the soldiers having cut off Rufinus' head, inserted a stone into its mouth, and carrying it about upon a pole they marched forth in every direction. They cut off his right hand too, and carried it about through all the workshops of the city, adding these words, "Give something to the insatiate one." In this way they collected together a large amount of gold, for they who saw the head, gladly gave their gold on account of the pleasure they derived from the spectacle. The ambition and thirst after power which marked Rufinus met with this end. Stilicho² also, according to Philostorgius, was put to death with his fellow-conspirators by the army, upon a given signal, on account of the plots which he had laid against Honorius.

CHAP. 4.—After the murder of Rufinus, a eunuch named Eutropius, of servile descent, having gained entrance to the court, and having been promoted to the dignity of a Præpositus, still was far from being contented with his present condition. For, since the loss of his genitals deprived him of all hopes of the empire, he persuaded the emperor to appoint him to patrician and consular rank; and thus a eunuch, who

¹ ἀστρολόγοι. We have readily adopted this emendation from Valesius in the place of the received reading, στρατόλογοι; as to the office of whom there is considerable doubt, if indeed the title or term was known at this period.

² Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. ix. c. 4.

could not beget even a common son, became thenceforth the father of the emperor.

CHAP. 5.—According to Philostorgius, Eutropius, who succeeded Rufinus in the office of prefect of the Prætorium, gave orders to transfer Eunomius from the Dacoroënian territory to Tyana, to be there kept by the monks. For he felt envy against the glory of Eunomius, and would not suffer his body even to be laid in the same tomb with the master, though many of the soldiers earnestly entreated him. The very books too of the same Eunomius he commanded to be destroyed by a public edict.¹

CHAP. 6.—The emperor Arcadius, after his father's death, took to wife the daughter of Bauto. Now this Bauto was of barbarian origin, and had discharged the office of Master of the Soldiery in the West. The wife too was quite the opposite of her husband in respect of his sloth and indolence, for she had in her a considerable amount of the audacity which marks barbarians. Arcadius had already had by her two daughters, Pulcheria and Arcadia; and soon afterwards he had another son and daughter, named Theodosius and Marina. But at the time when he had only two children, Eutropius had on one occasion treated his wife with great indignity; for he threatened her that he would straightway turn her out of his palace; accordingly, embracing her two children in her arms, she came to her husband just as she was, and crying and stretching forth her children, she poured forth a flood of tears, adding also those other artifices which women in their anger are wont to adopt with the truly feminine design of exciting their husbands' feelings of pity more vehemently. Then Arcadius was moved with pity for his infants, who by a natural impulse joined their lamentations with those of their mother, and was fired with rage. And then it was that Arcadius showed himself to be an emperor,² while his anger inflamed him, and prompted to him weighty words. Accordingly he forthwith stripped Eutropius of all his dignity, deprived him of his wealth, and banished him to the island of Cyprus. And not long afterwards, when certain persons accused him of

¹ This was sanctioned by a Constitution sent by Arcadius to Eutychian, the successor of Cæsarius, A. D. 398. See lib. iv. Codex Theodos. de Hæreticis.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 5, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. viii. ch. 7.

having made use, when consul, of those very ornaments which no one but the emperor could legally use, he was recalled from Cyprus. And when the judges were seated in the place called Pantichium,¹ and Aurelian the prefect of the Prætorium, and the other magistrates who were in high command, had been appointed to carry on the investigation, Eutropius was convicted of the crime laid to his charge, and suffered the penalty of it by the loss of his head. Thus at all events Philostorgius gives the narrative of the event; others however allege different circumstances as the grounds on account of which Eutropius was stripped of his dignity and command, and eventually put to death.

CHAP. 7.—Philostorgius says that in his day there was so severe a pestilence as had never occurred before within the memory of man, in accordance with the portent of the star which appeared in the form of a sword. For not only was the military force destroyed, as in former wars, nor was it only in one part of the world that signal calamities occurred; but men of every rank and degree perished, and the whole of Europe and a very large part of Asia was entirely ravaged. A considerable portion of Africa also, and especially that part which was subject to the Romans, felt the blow. For the sword of the barbarians carried off large multitudes, and pestilence and famine pressed upon them at the same time together with large herds of wild beasts. In addition to this there were very grievous earthquakes, which overturned houses and entire cities from their foundations, and hurled them into inevitable ruin. Moreover, in certain parts the earth opened and gaped, swallowing up the inhabitants suddenly as in a tomb. There were also in certain other parts deluges of rain from heaven; in other parts fierce droughts and fiery whirlwinds, descending from above, to complete the manifold calamity till it was past endurance. Hail too fell in many places, bigger than a stone which would fill the hand, nay, it was found in some parts of such a size that it weighed no less than eight pounds. Moreover there was a great downfall of snow accompanied by a very severe frost, which seized upon those who had not been carried off by the other calamities, and deprived them of life, most clearly revealing the anger of

¹ Or rather Panteichium. Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 21.

God. But to mention the details of these visitations is a task which surpasses human ability.

CHAP. 8.—The Huns,¹ who had seized upon that part of Scythia which lies across the Ister and laid it waste, afterwards crossed the river when it was frozen over, and made an irruption into the Roman territory: then spreading themselves over the entire surface of Thrace, they laid waste all Europe. But the Eastern Huns crossed the river Tanais, and pouring into the provinces of the East, made an irruption through the Greater Armenia into a district called Melitine. Thence they proceeded to attack the parts about the Euphrates, and penetrated as far as Cœle-Syria, and having overrun Cilicia, destroyed an incredible number of its inhabitants. Moreover the Mazices and Ausorians, who dwell between Africa and Libya, flocking in from the eastern parts, devastated Libya, and at the same time overran a considerable portion of Egypt. On the west they attacked the Africans, and inflicted upon them a similar loss. Besides all these barbarians, Tribigildus,² a Scythian by birth and origin, and one of that tribe which are now called Goths,—for there are several distinct and separate tribes of this race,—this Tribigildus, finding himself surrounded by a large force of barbarians, while he resided at Nacolia in Phrygia, and when he had been rewarded with the title of a Count, (Comes,) suddenly became an enemy of the Romans instead of a friend; and beginning from Nacolia itself, he seized on very many cities of Phrygia, and made great havoc among their inhabitants. Gainas, the Master of the Soldiery, who was himself a barbarian, on being sent against him, betrayed the victory, for he was meditating a similar course against the Romans. Thereupon Tribigildus, as though flying away from Gainas, made an invasion into Pisidia and Pamphylia, and laid them waste; when at last, after having suffered many losses through the difficulty of the various places, and in his battles in Isauria, he escaped at length to the Hellespont, and crossing thence into Thrace, he died not very long afterwards. Gainas after his revolt assumed the dignity of Master of the Soldiery, returned to Constantinople, and endeavoured to seize upon it. But a

¹ Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. viii. ch. 1.

² Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vi. ch. 6, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. viii. ch. 4.

heavenly army, seen by those who had endeavoured to put the affair into execution, deterred his troops, and freed the city from all fear of a siege; while on the other hand it caused the opposing party to be caught, and gave them over into the hands of their foes. Accordingly a vast slaughter followed: Gainas too was seized with such alarm, that immediately upon night-fall, he broke through the guards of the gates by a sally and left the city, attended by a small band which he was able to rally round him. But since Thrace had been laid entirely waste, and could afford no means of sustenance or offer any rewards for another predatory incursion, Gainas crossed over into the Chersonese, contemplating to cross over thence into Asia by means of boats. As soon as this plan of his was made known to the emperor, Fravitas, the Master of the Soldiery, was sent against him. This person was a Goth by descent, and a pagan by religion; but he was faithful to the Romans, and most skilled in military tactics. Accordingly while Gainas was transporting his army in vessels to the opposite continent, he came against him with some ships of war, and after a light encounter destroyed all who were being carried in the transports. Hereupon Gainas, seeing that all hope was lost, fled away into the higher regions of Thrace. And not long afterwards certain Huns made an attack upon him and killed him: his head was seasoned with salt and carried to Constantinople. Besides these calamities, the tribe of the Isaurians inflicted several disasters on the Romans. For in the East they overran Cilicia and the neighbouring parts of Syria, and not only what is called Cœle-Syria, but all that tract which stretches on till it joins Persia. But towards the north and north-west¹ they invaded Pamphylia and laid waste Lycia. They also devastated the island of Cyprus, and likewise carried off the Lycaonians and Pisidians into slavery; and having driven the Cappadocians out of their settlements, and taken them captive, they pushed on as far as Pontus, and treated their captives far more savagely than was customary among the other barbarians.

¹ Iapyx. Compare Horace, iii. Od. xxvii. 20.

EPITOME OF BOOK XII.

CHAP. 1.—PHILOSTORGIUS severely censures Stilicho on many other grounds, and more especially accuses him of having aimed at seizing the empire. He also relates how a certain magister named Olympius, seized with his own hand the sword which had been drawn against the emperor in his own palace, and so saved the emperor's life at the cost of great bodily injury, and lent him his aid and assistance in putting Stilicho to death while he was staying at Ravenna. Others call this man not Olympius but Olympiodorus; and they relate not that he came to the assistance of the emperor, but that he laid plots against Stilicho, who deserved well at his hands, and falsely accused him of aiming at the empire. They also state that, at this time, he was not a magister at all, but that he attained this dignity after the unjust murder of Stilicho, as the reward of his crime, and that not long afterwards he was put to death with clubs, and so paid to Stilicho the penalty of his nefarious wickedness.

CHAP. 2.—About the same period Alaric, a Goth by descent, having collected an army in the upper parts of Thrace, made an incursion into Achaia and took Athens; he also laid waste the regions belonging to Macedonia, and the borders of Dalmatia. Moreover, he made an inroad into Illyricum, and then crossed over the Alps, and overran the north of Italy. According to Philostorgius, he was recalled thence by Stilicho,¹ who at this time was still alive, and who opened to him the passes of the Alps. He says that Stilicho employed against the emperor every possible artifice of treachery, and not only viewed him with an unfavourable eye because he was his son-in-law²—(for he had given him his daughter in marriage)—but also administered to him a potion for the purpose of preventing him from becoming a parent; nor did he perceive that, while he was endeavouring to proclaim his son Eucherius emperor in the teeth of right and justice, he was ruining and destroying, before arriving at his time, his own grandson, and the rightful heir to the imperial throne. And further, he

¹ Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. viii. ch. 25, and b. ix. ch. 4.

² After the death of his empress Eudoxia, Honorius had married first Maria, and afterwards Thermantia, daughter of Stilicho.

[PHILOSTORGIUS.]

writes, that Stilicho assumed the imperial dignity so manifestly, openly, and without scruple, that he even coined money on which nothing was wanting but his image.

CHAP. 3.—Upon the death of Stilicho, the barbarians who were with him took his son and went away. When they had neared Rome, they permitted him to take refuge¹ in a certain temple which enjoyed the privilege of a sanctuary. He laid waste everything that lay around the city, as well in order to avenge the death of Stilicho as because they were severely tried by hunger. But when Eucherius was put to death, in pursuance of letters from Honorius, which were superior to all rights of sanctuary, on this the barbarians joined Alaric, and urged him to lay siege to the city of Rome. He accordingly seizes the port of the city without delay: this was the largest arsenal of the Romans, consisting of three ports, and stretching out till they equalled a small city in magnitude: a large supply of corn belonging to the state was here stored up according to ancient custom. Accordingly, when Alaric had seized upon the port without much difficulty, he took the city of Rome, partly by stress of famine, and partly by his military engines; and by the common voice of the Romans, he proclaimed Attalus emperor, in compliance with the permission of Alaric. This Attalus was a native of Asia Minor; he was a heathen in religion, and the post which he held was that of prefect of the city of Rome. After the nomination of Attalus as emperor, Alaric thenceforth permitted the remaining portion of the Roman people, such in fact as had survived the famine, and had not been devoured by each other, to bring in supplies of corn from the port. Then, taking with him Attalus, to whom he acted as Master of the Soldiery, he advanced to Ravenna with an army to oppose Honorius. Whilst this was going on, Attalus urged Honorius voluntarily to adopt a private life, and purchase the safety of his body by cutting off his extremities. But Sarus, who had succeeded Stilicho as Master of the Soldiery, under Honorius, gave Alaric battle, and overcame him, forcing him to fly far away from the city of Ravenna. Then Alaric seized

¹ ἐφεῖσαν. Concerning this flight of Eucherius to Rome, and his taking refuge of sanctuary in one of its churches, compare Zosimus de Att. et Alar. b. v., and Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 10, and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. ix. ch. 6 and 7.

upon the port¹ himself, and stripped Attalus of the imperial purple; either on the plea that he was accused of being ill-disposed towards Alaric, or (as others say) because he contemplated entering upon a treaty with Honorius, and considered that it would be well first to remove the individual who seemed likely to prove an impediment to his plan. After this Alaric returned to Ravenna, and having offered to make a treaty² with Honorius, he was repulsed by the above-mentioned Sarus, who affirmed that a man who ought long since to have paid the penalty of his audacity, was unworthy to be reckoned among friends. Alaric was enraged at this speech, and a year after his first attack upon the port of the city of Rome, he marched off towards Rome, as an enemy, with a flag of hostility. But the fire of barbarians, and the sword of the enemy, and captivity by aliens, divided, as it were, among them the vast pile of her fame, and the greatness of her glory. For while the city of Rome was lying in ruins, Alaric laid waste Campania, and died of a disorder which seized upon him there.

CHAP. 4.—The brother of his wife,

* * * * *

[*Here two lines of the Greek text are wanting.*]

[named³ Adolphus, succeeded him. He was married to Placidia, the sister of Honorius, whom Alaric had carried off with him from Rome as a captive; to marry whom he had repudiated his former wife,] because she was of Sarmatian origin. According to Philostorgius, it was at this time that the kingdom of iron and the kingdom of clay were united together.⁴ And not then only, but also at a subsequent period, when

¹ τὸν πῶρον. The port of Rome, not of Ravenna, as Gothofred renders it. According to Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. p. 375, Alaric did not seize upon the port of Ravenna (which was called Classis) till a later occasion.

² The learned Gothofred incorrectly understands these words to refer to Attalus, and not to Alaric.

³ The lines within [brackets] are not in the Greek text of Philostorgius, but are given here, according to the Latin version by Valesius, as also in all other places where the original is defective.

⁴ The allusion is to the prophecy of Daniel, ii. 31—45, where the feet of the great image seen by Nebuchodonosor were partly of iron and partly of clay. This prophecy, Philostorgius says, was twice fulfilled in the times of Honorius; firstly, when Adolphus made peace with Honorius, A. D. 412, and, secondly, when he married Placidia, or Flacilla, in the following year.

Adolphus took Placidia to wife ; for then the clay and the iron coalesced.

* * * * *

[*Here about nine lines of the Greek text are wanting.*]

[But¹ since the Scripture says that that alliance should not be lasting, therefore Constantius, who loved Placidia,] had conceived in his mind the hope that if he could conquer Adolphus in war, he would be able to gain her as his wife. Not long after this Adolphus was put to death by one of his own domestics, after he had perpetrated several very foul deeds under the influence of anger. After this, the barbarians concluded a treaty with Honorius, and gave up into his hands both his sister Placidia and Attalus, having themselves first received from the emperor a grant of corn, and a district in Gaul for the purpose of tillage.

CHAP. 5.—After these events, the city of Rome gained a slight respite from its severe misfortunes, and began to be more thickly inhabited again: when the emperor arrived there, he signified both by gesture and by words his wish that the city should be restored; and having ascended the tribunal, he ordered Attalus to come to the lowest step of it. After this

* * * * *

[*Here two lines of the Greek text are wanting.*]

he cut off two of the fingers of his right hand, namely, the thumb and forefinger, and banished him into the island² of Lipara, without inflicting on him any other punishment, and actually supplying him besides with all the necessaries of life.

CHAP. 6.—About this same period Jovian³ rebelled against the emperor, but his insurrection was speedily put down. His brother Sebastian, too, having made a similar attempt, suffered a similar penalty. But Heraclian, who imitated the madness of these men, was raised to a higher pitch of success, from which he had a proportionate notorious fall, the provi-

¹ The lines within [brackets] are supplied, as before, from Valesius.

² This happened A. D. 417.

³ The three usurpers mentioned in this chapter, Jovian, Sebastian, and Heraclian, were all put down in the course of the year A. D. 413, under the consulship of Lucius. Heraclian had been proclaimed consul with Lucius, but, on being proclaimed a public enemy, his name was erased from the public Fasti.

dence of God clearly showing in his case that he allows nothing to pass its due bounds, and that he delights not in usurpers, but that he assists those who strive in defence of their lawful sovereign.

CHAP. 7.—After the death of Arcadius, his son Theodosius,¹ then quite a child, is proclaimed his successor in the Eastern parts of the empire. With him lived in the palace his sister Pulcheria, who administered and directed the imperial re-scripts.²

CHAP. 8.—When Theodosius had entered the years of boyhood,³ on the 19th of July, a little after noon-day, the sun was so completely eclipsed that the stars appeared; and so great a drought followed on this eclipse that a sudden mortality carried off great multitudes both of men and of beasts in all parts. Moreover, at the time that the sun was eclipsed, a bright meteor appeared in the sky, in shape like a cone, which some persons in their ignorance called a comet, for there was nothing like a comet in the phenomena of this meteor as it appeared. For its light did not end in a tail, nor had it any of the characteristics of a star, but it seemed like the flame of a huge lamp, subsisting by itself, with no star below it to answer to the appearance of a lamp.⁴ Its track, too, was far different from that of comets. For it arose first in the east, just where the sun rises at the equinox, and then passing across the lowest star in the constellation of the Bear, crossed gradually over to the west. After measuring the whole expanse of the heavens, it at length disappeared, after it had continued its course for more than four months. Its apex, moreover, at one time was carried up to a high and narrow point, so that the meteor exceeded the length and shape of a cone, while at another time it returned to that particular form. Moreover, it showed to the eye a number of other prodigious appearances, which showed that it was different from common stars in nature. It began about midsummer, and con-

¹ Compare Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. b. ix. ch. 1.

² σημειώσεις. Called, in Latin, "Annotations;" a general term for the edicts and general orders of the emperors.

³ It is agreed on all hands that the eclipse of the sun mentioned below, happened in the twelfth consulship of Honorius, and the eighth of Theodosius, that is, A. D. 418. Theodosius, accordingly, was at this time in his eighteenth year, having been born A. D. 401.

⁴ Σφύαλλις. Compare Aristoph. Nub. 59, 585.

tinued till nearly the end of autumn, and it was the precursor of severe wars and an incredible mortality. In the following year a series of earthquakes commenced, which cannot be easily compared with former ones. At the same time with the earthquakes, fire came down from the skies, which seemed to banish all hope of escape; however, it caused no destruction of life, for the mercy of God sent a violent wind which scattered the fire in every direction, and at length drove it into the sea. Then a new and strange sight was to be seen;—the waves of the sea burning in the day-time, like woods and forests,¹ until at length the flames were extinguished in the waters.

CHAP. 9.—Moreover, in many places, immediately upon the occurrence of the earthquake, the roofs of houses were seen to be shattered with a loud crash and report, so that those who were within their walls beheld the sky above them. After this convulsion, they became joined and compacted again so closely that not a single trace of the occurrence was left. The same thing happened also to the flooring of houses in several places: granaries² falling in upon those who dwelt below, and pouring down upon them large heaps of grain through the sudden openings; then, again, the ground became solid and firm, so that they all began to doubt whence that fatal load of corn had fallen in upon them. Moreover, other strange and unwonted calamities of the same kind happened at this period, showing in the very clearest way that these things do not happen by a mere law and order of nature, as the heathen falsely imagine, but that they are sent down upon mankind as scourges of the Divine wrath.

CHAP. 10.—This same Philostorgius endeavours to show by a variety of proofs that earthquakes are not caused by an inundation of water, nor by the force of winds pent up within the bosom of the earth; nor, again, from any deviation of the earth; but only happen by the will of God, for the purpose of converting sinners and bringing them to repentance. And he says, that he constantly asserts this, because neither of the above-mentioned elements can bring about such effects by any natural power. But if God so will, then even the smallest drop of rain that falls, or the lightest flake of snow,

¹ *λάσια χώρα.* “Regiones quasi arborum comis densæ et horrentes.”

² *σιτοβολῶνες.* The equivalent to “horrea,” according to Hesychius.

can move with the greatest ease Olympus in Macedonia, or any other of the highest mountains, since we see God frequently make use of these events for the correction of the human race. For, although he could have suddenly divided the Red Sea, had he chosen, yet he first lashed it and roused it by a violent south wind, that at length the waters stood on this side and on that;¹ not because there is naturally any such power whatever in the south wind, but because the Divine Majesty chose to make use of it in order to carry out his will. So, also, the stroke of the rod drew fountains of water out of the stony rock,² and the streams of Jordan healed the leprosy;³ not because their natural powers could produce any such effects, but because the Creator has the full and perfect use of changing all his creatures to such uses and purposes as he may please.

CHAP. 11.—After the death of Eudoxius, who had been the ruler of the sect of the Eunomians at Constantinople, Lucian, the son of the sister of Eunomius, is chosen in his room. They say that he fell into avarice and its kindred vices, and fearing that he would be punished for so doing, tore himself away from the rest of the Eunomian party, though he remained at the head of his own band of followers, heading no inconsiderable a multitude, inasmuch as all persons of doubtful character, and who were stained with vices, flocked together to his party.

CHAP. 12.—The emperor Honorius took Constantius, his Master of the Soldiery, as partner of his throne, on account of his near relationship, when Placidia had borne him his son Valentinian.⁴ On this Valentinian the dignity of “Most Noble” was conferred by Honorius. Accordingly, the images of Constantius were sent into the East, in accordance with the ancient custom of those who had been recently raised to the purple. But Theodosius, disapproving of the nomination of Constantius, would not admit his images: and when Constantius was preparing to avenge this insult by arms, death came upon him and freed him from his life and his cares, when he had reigned about six months.

CHAP. 13.—During the tenth consulship of the emperor Theodosius, and the thirteenth of Honorius, the latter was

¹ Exod. xiv. 21, 22.

² Exod. xvii. 6.

³ 2 Kings v. 14.

⁴ Compare Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 24.

Mr. Stephens to
 Mr. Alms 7mo. 5. 87.

carried off by dropsy. John, having seized upon the imperial power, sent an embassy to Theodosius. But they returned without accomplishing their purpose, and, moreover, having been treated with indignity, so they were sent in different directions through Propontis.¹ But Placidia and Valentinian the Third, who had fled to Byzantium after the death of Honorius, were sent by Theodosius to Thessalonica. There he granted the dignity of Cæsar to his cousin, at the same time intrusting the carrying on of the war against the usurper to Ardaburius, Master of the Soldiery, and his son Aspar. These passed across Pannonia and Illyricum, with Placidia and Valentinian in their train, and took by storm Salonæ, a city of Dalmatia. After this, Ardaburius set out with his naval reinforcements to oppose the usurper; while Aspar took under his command the cavalry: anticipating all suspicions by the suddenness of his attack, he seized on Aquileia, a very considerable city, Placidia and Valentinian being still in his train. Here, indeed, he took a very large city without any labour or cost. But Ardaburius was surprised by a violent wind, which threw him, with two of his triremes, into the hands of the usurper, who treated Ardaburius most kindly because he had an eye to a treaty. He enjoyed perfect liberty, and excited against the usurper some of his inferior officers who were already ripe for a revolt. At the same time he sent private instructions to his son Aspar to come to him as if to celebrate an immediate victory. He speedily arrived with his cavalry, and in a light encounter John was taken prisoner, (for he was betrayed by the treachery of those who were about him,) and led away to Aquileia to Placidia and Valentinian. There his right hand was cut off, and soon afterwards he was beheaded; having held his usurped power for about a year and a half, when Theodosius despatched Valentinian to Rome and proclaimed him emperor.

CHAP. 14.—Aetius, one of the generals of the usurper John, arrived three days after the death of the latter, bringing with him much about sixty thousand barbarian troops, whom he had succeeded in hiring as auxiliaries; he at once engaged in battle with the forces of Aspar, and many fell on both sides. After this Aetius made a treaty with Placidia and Valentinian, and was promoted to the dignity of a count.

¹ Socrates, Eccl. Hist. b. vii. ch. 23.

On the payment of a sum of gold, the barbarians laid down their arms and returned to their own homes, after a mutual interchange of hostages and promises of fidelity.

END OF THE EXTRACTS FROM THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF PHILOSTORGIUS.

FRAGMENTS OF PHILOSTORGIUS.

CONCERNING APOLLINARIUS,¹ BASIL, AND GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM, AS GIVEN IN SUIDAS UNDER THOSE NAMES, IN THE WORDS OF PHILOSTORGIUS.

At those times flourished Apollinarius at Laodicea in Syria, Basil at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory at Nazianzum, which is a station on the road through Cappadocia. These three individuals were strenuous in their defence of the substantial faith against the doctrine of dissimilarity of substance, and so wholly confuted all those who previously and up to ny own day were leaders of that heresy, that Athanasius must be judged a mere child in comparison with them. For they were very great proficients in that kind of instruction which is called "external," or "profane," and they had great knowledge of whatever contributed to the deep study and remembrance of the Scriptures; this was the case most especially with Apollinarius, for he was skilled also in Hebrew. Moreover, each of them, in his own particular matter, was excellent in his style of writing and speaking; Apollinarius being first in that kind which is best adapted to commentaries; Basil being the most splendid in panegyrical discourses; while the style of Gregory, as compared with both of them, would rank higher as a composition. Apollinarius was the more copious, Basil the weightier, in his speech. And whilst they were endowed with such talents for speaking and writing,

¹ For further information respecting Apollinarius, Basil, and Gregory of Nazianzum, the reader is referred to Fleury's Eccl. Hist. b. xii. ch. 52; b. xv. ch. 6; b. xvii. ch. 25; b. xiii. ch. 24; and b. xiv. ch. 1. There were two Gregories of Nazianzum, father and son; it is scarcely necessary to remark that it is the son who is here spoken of.

they exhibited in their lives a character well fitted to draw a multitude to imitate themselves ; so that those who beheld them and heard their speech, and read their writings, were all of them drawn over to their communion, as many at least as could easily be persuaded by any of their arguments.

CONCERNING PANEAS AND THE JORDAN.

AT the farthest confines of Palestine, near where Phœnicia commences, there is situated a city formerly called Dan, after the tribe to which it belonged. Here some wanderers, cut off from the rest of their race at a distant period, settled down for some time, taking possession of the district around, built a town at its extreme border, and assumed to themselves the name of Phylarchs. This was the farthest point of Judæa on the side of Phœnicia. Herod the Great, in later times, built this city, and changed its name to that of Cæsarea Philippi ; now, however, it is called Paneas, from a statue of Pan which was placed within its confines. In this town of Paneas rises one of the two fountains of the Jordan, (for it has two sources,) which is even now called "Dan," after the ancient name of the place. The other fountain, which is called "Jor," is about 160 stadia distant, and takes its rise out of the side of a hill. From each of these fountains¹ flows a river, the one called Jorates and the other Danites. Descending from their hills, these rivers descend into a plain, where they join their waters, and, flowing in a single channel, form the river Jordan. This river henceforth mingles together alike the waters and the names of both, and flows through the lake of Tiberias, dividing it in the midst, and finding its way to the opposite continent, maintaining throughout an uniform size and width. Thence it flows through the whole of Palestine, and is at length absorbed in the sea which is called the Dead Sea, where it disappears.

CONCERNING AGAPETUS.

AGAPETUS, bishop of Synada, whom Eusebius Pamphilus² celebrates with the highest praises, commemorating his won-

¹ ὧν ἐξ ἑκατέρου. Gothofred incorrectly renders these words thus : "Ex quo utrinque effunditur fluvius."

² Suidas has here erroneously placed Eusebius for Philostorgius. The former makes no mention of Agapetus.

drous and surpassing miracles, used to change the situation of mountains and the courses of rivers, and to raise the dead to life. He says also, that the emperor Maximin wished to kill him while he was still a soldier, as a Christian, because he had found many who were so taken with admiration of the wonderful works which were done by Agapetus, that he left the worship of heathen gods and came over to the Christian faith.¹

CONCERNING AETIUS.

AETIUS of Antioch in Syria, whose pupil was Eunomius, was born in Antioch, a city of Syria, of parents both poor and humble. His father had been enrolled among the military ranks, and having been unfortunate in his affairs, died early, leaving him quite a child. Reduced to the extreme of penury, he began to practise the art of gilding, and arrived at great eminence in his line. But the bent of genius led him to loftier aspirations, and he applied his mind to the study of logic. At first he was a pupil of Paulinus, who had been shortly before translated to Antioch from the city of Tyre, while Constantine was still emperor. While Aetius was his pupil, he showed no small grasp of intellect in disputations against those to whom he was opposed in the schools, and his attack was almost beyond all endurance. At length Paulinus died, and was succeeded by Eulalius as the twenty-third successor of the apostles² in the see of Antioch. Hereupon many of those who had been convicted by Aetius, feeling indignant at being conquered and defeated by a stripling and a common artisan, formed a combination against him, and expelled him from Antioch. Accordingly, on being rejected, Aetius betook himself to Anazarbus, and in a very short time, having learned all the science and faculty of logic, he continually showed fruits far superior to the rudimental and elementary instructions which he had received from others. Meantime, however, he did not cease to censure and refute his adversaries, though he wore but a thin and scanty cloak, and lived upon very humble and ordinary food.³

¹ See above, b. ii. ch. 2.

² That is, of course, St. Peter, who was the first bishop of Antioch. The use of the plural for the singular in this especial phrase is very common in the ecclesiastical writers.

³ See above, b. iii. ch. 15.

CONCERNING AUXENTIUS.

AUXENTIUS, bishop of Mopsuestia, was one of the confessors. He was one of the number of those who were distinguished as soldiers in the palace of the emperor Licinius, being one of his scribes, or, as the Romans call them, notaries. His confession was made in the following way. In a certain court of the imperial palace stood a fountain, and above it a statue of Bacchus, and around it a large vine which covered and overshadowed the entire place. When Licinius had gone thither for the purpose of mental recreation, followed by a numerous train of attendants from the palace, and among others by Auxentius, he cast his eyes upon the vine, and happening to see a bunch of grapes of prodigious size and beauty, as it hung down from the branches of the vine, he ordered Auxentius to cut it. Forthwith Auxentius, without any suspicion of what was about to follow, cut off the bunch of grapes. Licinius then turned to him and said, "Place this before the feet of Bacchus." To this Auxentius answered, "By no means, O emperor; I am a Christian." On hearing this Licinius said, "Go then away; you are discharged from the service, for one of two things you must do." Auxentius delayed not a moment, but without delay threw aside his belt, and gladly took his departure from the palace, ungirded, just as he was. Not long afterwards, the supervisors¹ appointed him bishop of Mopsuestia. His younger brother was Theodore, who had taught rhetoric at Athens, and who afterwards obtained the bishopric of Tarsus. For Aetius being accustomed even aforetime to teach Eunomius,² and others who were of higher than ordinary talent, as soon as he promoted Eunomius to the degree of a professor, made him act instead of himself as a master and teacher, as well of others as those who were more

¹ ἑφοροί. The heretical bias of Philostorgius obviously discovers itself, as Valesius remarks in his note, in the use of this term for that of ἐπισκοποι. The adoption of the term in this sense is without parallel among ancient Christian writers; and both this term and the praises of Aetius and Eunomius at the end of the chapter, clearly show the genuine character of the fragment, as being the composition of Philostorgius. See above, b. ii. ch. 4.

² Valesius observes that we must read here Eunomius for Eudoxius; as the former was never a pupil of Aetius, but (as we learn above, b. ii. ch. 15) of the martyr Lucian, or perhaps of one of his disciples; possibly of Asterius. Compare b. iv. ch. 4.

perfectly advanced in learning and instruction, while he himself was ever ready to teach others the elements and first principles. But Eunomius was considered as by far his superior in improving and building upon the foundations previously laid, and in giving perspicuous and eloquent interpretations.¹

CONCERNING EUDOXIUS.

EUDOXIUS, bishop of Antioch, came originally from Arabysus, a town of Lesser Armenia. His father, Cæsarius, had obtained the crown of martyrdom during the reign of the emperor Maximin, although previously he had shown himself addicted to vicious pleasures. But he studied to wash out the stains of his early life in the blood of martyrdom. For when his executioners had pierced both of his feet with six huge nails, they cast him on a funeral pile; and because he expired while yet on his way to the flames, his relations carried off his body from the pile, when it was still entire and only partially burnt, and buried it in a field called Subel.²

CONCERNING THEOPHILUS.

THIS Theophilus returned from India and took up his abode at Antioch, without having the care of any particular church as his own, but acting as a common bishop, so that at his will he visited all churches as his own; the emperor exhibiting towards him all possible respect and reverence, and the rest whom he visited receiving him with great alacrity, and admiring the excellence of his virtue. This was so great and so noble, that no one can do justice to it in terms; it was, so to speak, a correct copy of that of the apostles. They say that while he was at Antioch, he raised to life again a certain Jewess: such at least is the assertion of Thalassius, who lived with him for many years, and has never been suspected of falsehood in matters of this nature; and who, moreover, has very many persons who lived at the time, and who were eye-witnesses of the miracle.

CONCERNING LEONTIUS.

LEONTIUS, bishop of Tripolis, a city of Lydia, was sprung from a Mœsian tribe, dwelling on the banks of the Danube,

¹ See above, b. v. ch. 2.

² See above, b. iv. ch. 4.

the same that Homer calls ἀγχιμαχοί,¹ that is, "fighting in close combat." This Leontius is claimed by the impious Philostorgius, in his seventh book,² as inclined to the Arian party, of which he was himself an adherent. He had an only son, and perceiving in him no signs of a good disposition, he obtained by prayer from God that he should depart this life while still very young; judging that it would be better to die, and to be removed from the uncertain dangers and chances of this life, before he could do anything sinful and disgraceful. They also called him the "Rule of the Church," on account of the extreme freedom which he used in his opinions, and in his speech towards all alike. On one occasion, when a synod of bishops was convened, and the empress Eusebia, and wife of Constantius, was saluted by the rest of the bishops, he alone of them all remained at home, and paid no regard to her whatever. The empress being enraged at this, and boiling with indignation, sent to him one of her attendants, with the endeavour to conciliate him, partly by reproaches and partly by enticing promises, and saying that she would build him a large church, and add to it a large sum of money besides, if he would only come to visit her. Leontius answered her in the following terms: "If you have the desire of performing any of these promises which you make to me, my empress, be assured that you will be gratifying your own inclination rather than me. But if you really wish me to come and salute you, I will do so, provided the due and customary reverence for the bishop be shown; I mean, that when I enter the room, you will come down from your lofty throne, and meet me with respect, bending your head down to my hands in order to receive my episcopal benediction. Next, that I shall sit down, and you stand in a respectful attitude; sitting down when I bid you and give you the signal for so doing. If you choose to do all this, I will willingly come to you; but if not, you will never give me presents sufficiently ample and magnificent to induce me to abate one particle of the honour which is due to bishops, and be willing to violate the divine laws of the priesthood." The queen, on receiving this message, grew white with the vehemence of her rage; and would not patiently submit to have such an answer brought back to her from Leontius. And being violently excited with wrath, and agitated in mind,

¹ See Iliad, B. 264.

² See above, b. vii. ch. 6.

and having used those threats which accord with the light and excitable disposition of a woman, she related the matter to her husband, and demanded revenge. He, however, thought that the freedom of speech used by Leontius was rather to be admired; so he calmed down the rage of his wife, and sent her back to her own apartment. Likewise on another occasion, when Constantius was presiding in an assembly of bishops, and wanted to enter all the churches at his will, while all the rest received the words of the emperor with admiration and applause, and said that he had done everything right, Leontius alone held his tongue and was silent. And when the emperor asked him why he alone of all kept silence, Leontius answered thus: "I am astonished that you, who are set over matters of one kind, to administer them, should take in hand the administration of others which are distinct from them: and that when the care of military and civil matters has been intrusted to you, you should dictate to bishops in matters which appertain to the office of a bishop alone." On hearing these words, Constantius was fairly abashed and overcome with shame, and ceased thenceforth to act and to command on behalf of the state in matters of this kind.¹

CONCERNING DEMOPHILUS.

DEMOPHILUS, bishop of Constantinople, was a man who was accustomed to mingle everything together in his mad impetuosity, and who, like some wild and rapid torrent,² rolled along much mud and filth in his discourses, as any one might easily detect from the first sermon which he delivered at Constantinople. Now, in this discourse, it is probable that he would have been more than usually accurate and diligent, considering that these kind of discourses are taken down by notaries. Certainly, in his commentaries extant to the present day, he is very confused and indistinct in his positions; and, discussing concerning the Father and the Son, he thus speaks in learned terms. "The Son was begotten by the will of the Father alone, without time and without means, so that he is the minister and servant of the commands of the Father. For God foresaw that all those things which he was about to create,

¹ See above, b. vii. ch. 6.

² Compare Hor. iv. Od. ii. 5—12, and I. Sat. iv. 11; x. 62.

*note: on Gregory of Nyssa
Oct. 30 1881*

could not exist, inasmuch as they were to be of a kind pure and unmixed, like God himself who created them. And so it was necessary that all created beings should become gods according to the dignity of their Creator; from whence it would follow that there would be a plurality of gods. Or certainly it was necessary that all things should be straightway dissolved as soon as made, just as though they were placed near the hottest fire. On this account, the Son existed as a medium between the creatures who were to be created and the Father from whom he is begotten; so that abasing himself, and joining and uniting himself to those things which were to be created, he might fulfil the Divine will, and become the Mediator between God and us men who are created by him." But Demophilus does not perceive that in these words he falsely attributes weakness and envy to the Supreme God, and that he makes the Son to be of a lower condition than the rest of his creatures. For the Father himself must needs be weak, according to the opinion of Demophilus, inasmuch as though he wished to impart his essence to all created beings, he could not effect his design afterwards. But he would by no means be free from evil will, if, when it was in his power to make all his creatures gods, he studiously abstained from making his creatures of the same condition and dignity with himself. And, moreover, there would be none of his creatures who would not appear to be more perfect and happy than the Son himself, if indeed he was begotten not as his own end, but for the contemplation and use of his own creatures. For whatever exists for the use of something else, must needs be inferior to that for which it is created. And many other mad dreams of the same kind does Demophilus set forth in his writings.¹

¹ See above, b. ix. ch. 14.

THE END.

GENERAL INDEX.

- ACACIUS**, account of, 186; his partisans, 197; virtues of, 357.
Acacius, deposes certain bishops, 469.
Acepsimus killed, 70.
Acesis summoned to the first synod, 46.
Acesius, bishop of the Novatians, 102.
Adolphus, 515.
Aetians, account of, 284.
Aetius, account of, 133, 161.
Aetius, first notice of, 453; early life of, 455, 523; his opinion as to the substance of the Son, 468; banished, 469; kindly treated by Auxentius, 470; retires to Lesbos, 492; his death, 494.
Agapetus, miracles of, 523.
Agelius, 258, 326.
Ajax, virtues of, 357.
Alanicus, death of, 420.
Alaric, account of, 413; obtains possession of Rome by stratagem, 417; invades Greece and Italy, 513; takes Rome and proclaims Attalus emperor, 514; his death, 515.
Alexander, miracle of, 42; death of, 108.
Alexandria, council at, 222.
Ambrose, account of, 278; reproves the emperor, 351.
Ammon, account of, 32; miracles of, 34.
Amphilochius, boldness of, 318.
- Ancyra**, council of, 164.
Anomian, account of, 165.
Antioch, persecutions in, 12; sedition at, 78; synod of, *ib.*; council of, 110; archbishops of, 141; council of, 250, 313; taxes in, 349.
Antiochus, 376.
Antony, a monk, 30; habits of, *ib.*; vision of, 252.
Antony the Great, 76.
Anuphus, account of, 128.
Apelles, miracles of, 288.
Apollinaris, writes against Porphyry, 490.
Apollinarius, 521; account of, 280, 285; his style, 521.
Apollo Didymus, oracle of, 19.
Apollo's temple destroyed by fire, 238.
Apollonius, account of, 128.
Arabia, 443.
Arabia Felix, 452.
Arcadius, invested with the purple, 502; marries the daughter of Bauto, 509; degrades Eutropius, *ib.*; death of, 401, 517.
Archbishops, arrival at Rome, 116; letters of, 117; exile of, 177; list of deposed, 189; why condemned, 190.
Archierarchy, disputes among, 46
Arian heresy, origin of, 35.
Arianism prevails, 313.
Arianism, hymns against, 374.
Arians and Meletians agree, 80.

- Arians, machinations of, against Athanasius, 82; other machinations of the, 157; bishops ejected by, 255; intrigues of, 318; audacity of, 331; divisions among the, 338; communicated with the orthodox, 445.**
- Ariminum, council of, 140.**
- Arius, heresy of, 36; expelled the church, *ib.*; disputes of, 37; his followers condemned, 44; condemned, 45; recalled, 73; restored, 93; his recantation suspected, 95; confession of, 94; refusal of communion, 98; death of, *ib.*; account of his death, 100; procures the election of Alexander, 431; composes heretical songs, 434; his error, *ib.*; accused of heresy by Philostorgius, 501.**
- Armenia, monks in, 130.**
- Armenians embrace Christianity, 63.**
- Arrianus, consecrated bishop by Aetius and Eunomius, 485.**
- Arsacius, account of, 395; death of, 403.**
- Arsenius, accusation of, 89; treatment of, 90.**
- Athanasius distinguishes himself, 41; elected bishop, 74; secretly ordained, 75; calumny against, 84; illegal deposition of, 88; exile of, to Treves, 97; causes seditions, 101; recalled, 107; deposed, 111; at Rome, 114; ejected, 118; letters in favour of, 120; innocence of, 122; return of, 141; letters concerning, 144; again ejected, 147; banishment of, 156; concealment of, 211; again banished, 224; exile of, 262; returns, 263; death of, 270; elected bishop of Alexandria on the death of Alexander, 439; calumnies against, *ib.*; expelled and restored, 453.**
- Athanasius of Ancyra, 469.**
- Attalus, rebellion of, 414; subjection of, 416.**
- Atticus, history of, 403.**
- Authorities used, 10.**
- Auxentius deposed, 276.**
- Auxentius the Confessor, 524.**
- Auxumitæ, the, 446.**
- Babylas's remains removed, 236.**
- Babylas the Martyr, 479.**
- Baptism, account of, 283.**
- Barbarians, account of, 304; conversion of, 305.**
- Bardasanes, account of, 135.**
- Bartholomew, St., 437.**
- Basil invested with the government of the church of Galatia, 103; martyrdom of, 220.**
- Basil, resistance of, 233; made bishop of Cappadocia, 266; account of, 267.**
- Basil of Ancyra, 465.**
- Basil the Great, his character assailed by Philostorgius, 490; his style, 521.**
- Baucalis, 431.**
- Bishops, another dispute among, 77.**
- Bishop of Rome, proceedings of, 119.**
- Bishops, dissensions among, 192.**
- Britain, 16.**
- Britons, march into Italy, 330.**
- Busiris, martyrdom of, 220.**
- Byzantium called Constantinople, 54.**
- Calvary disfigured, 50.**
- Candidus consecrated by Aetius, 485.**
- Canons appointed, 47.**
- Cæsarea, called Mozoca, 496.**
- Celibacy, 48.**
- Celts embrace Christianity, 60; march into Italy, 330.**
- Christ, statue of, 238.**
- Christian doctrine, account of, 138.**
- Christianity, laws in favour of, 16; extension of, 345.**
- Christians, 'evil treatment of, 210; ill-treated, 237; persecution of, 269.**
- Church, troubles in the, 194, 399.**
- Church, destroyed by fire from heaven, 395.**

- Churches, Eastern and Western, separate, 124; troubles in, 249.
- Clergy, laws in favour of, 23.
- Conference held, 57.
- Constans, 419, 443.
- Constans, Cæsar, death of, 146.
- Constantia, 458.
- Constantine, Christ appears to, 13; the cross appears to, *ib.*; priests of Christ expound the Scriptures to, 14; false reports concerning, 16; churches flourish under, 17; his test of fidelity, *ib.*; dominions increase, 18; legalizes Christianity, 19; forbids the combats of gladiators, 21; revokes laws against Christianity, 20; conquers the Sarmatians, 21; reproves Arius and Alexander, 38; is grieved by the dissensions, *ib.*; his speech, 43; honours the bishops, 49; builds Byzantium, 53; builds temples, *ib.*; abolishes superstition, 57; writes to Sapor, 72; his exhortation, 84; letter of, 101; enacts a law to suppress heresies, 102; forbids the Arians to assemble in private, *ib.*; divides the empire, 104; death of, 105; burial of, *ib.*; letter of, 107; his sons, account of, 139; his body removed, 181; conversion of, 432; puts to death Crispus and Fausta, 435; builds Constantinople, 438.
- Constantine, poisoned by his brothers, 442.
- Constantine ordained presbyter, 422; death of, *ib.*
- Constantinople, baths at, 258; bishops assembled at, 467.
- Constantius, his letter to the Egyptians, 143; banishes the Homoousians, 147; in Illyria, 149; arrives in Rome, 154; endeavours to reconcile the churches, 155; his letter, 164; goes to Sirmium, 165; proclaimed emperor, 431; builds a church at Constantinople, 443; expels Athanasius, *ib.*; sends ambassadors to the Homeritæ, *ib.*;
- defeats Magnentius, 460; death of, 200, 474.
- Constantius the younger, 519.
- Consubstantial, dispute concerning the term, 122, 140, 162.
- Contest between bishops, 77.
- Coprus, 287.
- Cornuti, 458.
- Council of Ariminum, proceedings of, 171; letter to Constantius, 173.
- Council, general, the second, 319; decrees of, 322.
- Cross, sign of, on coins and pictures, 22; appears in heaven, 149; appears in garments, 242; the sign of, seen, 432.
- Crosses found near Jerusalem, 50.
- Crucifixion, law of, abolished, 22.
- Customs in the churches, &c., 343.
- Cyril succeeds Maximus, 149; causes of his deposition, 192; restored, 199.
- Cyrinus, 385.
- Decrees of the synod, 45.
- Delphi, the oracle at, 481.
- Demophilus elected bishop, 264; expulsion of, 317.
- Demophilus, bishop of Constantinople, his style, 527; heresy preached by, 497, 527, 528.
- Didymus, account of, 132; vision of, 246.
- Divus, or Devu, the island, 444; irregular customs of its people, 497.
- Doctrinal controversy, 44.
- Donatus, St., 354.
- Dorotheus made bishop of Antioch, 445.
- Easter, festival of, 339.
- Economy, 473.
- Edessa, monks of, 299.
- Edovicus, defeat and death of, 421.
- Egypt, holy men in, 125, 288; disputes in, 377.
- Egyptian monks, persecution of, 271.
- Egyptian dwarf, 504.

- Eleusius, his speech, 184; account of, 225; bishop of Cyzicus, 257. Elias, 287.
- Elpidius the Sacrificer, 481.
- Emmaus, fountain of, 239.
- Empress, statue of, 391.
- Ephraim, the Syrian, 129; account of, 134, 299.
- Epiphanius, account of, 355; at Constantinople, 382.
- Eudoxia, death of, 403.
- Eudoxius, innovations of, 163; endeavours to abolish the Nicæan formularies, 194; zealous in observing fast days, 505; his martyrdom, 525.
- Eugenius, tyranny of, 348.
- Eunomius, the heretic, 257; account of, 282; his heresy, 286; eloquence of, 318; banishment of, 337; praised by Philostorgius, 458; banished, 465.
- Euphrates, 447.
- Eupsyclus, martyrdom of, 220.
- Euripides, 233.
- Eusebius, banished, 46; recalled, 73; retraction of, 73; accusation against, 77; relapses into the same errors, 81; partisans of, writing a confession of faith, 103; renews the controversy, 106; death of, 108.
- Eusebius, surnamed Emisenus, 112.
- Eusebius, martyrdom of, 215; account of 221; disputes of, 265; censure of, 430.
- Eustathius translated to Antioch, 13; deposed, 78; habits of, 130; confession of, 260; banished, 264; why deposed, 437.
- Eutropius, account of, 372; death of, 397.
- Eutropius, the eunuch, 508.
- Eutychius, miracles of, 34.
- Evagrius elected, 264; exiled, *ib.*
- Evagrius, bishop of Antioch, 331.
- Faith, formularies of, 111.
- Felix, account of, 161.
- Flavian, ordination of, 325.
- Flavian and Evagrius, 331.
- Formularies of faith, 151.
- Formulary of faith, compilation of, 123.
- Formulary of the council of Ariminum, 188.
- Fravitas sent against Gaïnas, 512.
- Frumentius in India, 88.
- Gabalis, bishop of, 376.
- Gaïnas, 511; enterprise of, 366.
- Galatia, or Gaul, 431; monks of, 301.
- Galla the younger, 498.
- Gallus receives the title of Cæsar, 149, 459; slain, 153.
- Gaul, 16.
- Gauls embrace Christianity, 60; march into Italy, 330.
- Gentiles, calling of, 9.
- George, persecution of, 148; persecutes the Pagans, 198; death of, 213.
- Gerontius, 371; account of, 420; defeat of, *ib.*; death of, 421.
- Golgotha, temple erected at, 92.
- Goths embrace Christianity, 60; embrace Arianism, 305.
- Gratian proclaimed, 259; death of, 329.
- Gratian, son of Valentinian, 489.
- Gratian, left heir to the throne, 498.
- Greeks persecute the Christians, 102.
- Gregory, installation of, 112; accepts the bishopric of Alexandria, 113.
- Gregory the theologian, 268; receives the government of the churches, 316; abdication of, 320.
- Gregory of Nazianzum, his character assailed by Philostorgius, 490; his style, 521.
- Habakkuk, remains of, 358.
- Hadrian calls Jerusalem Ælia, 481.
- "Heaven-goers," 492.
- Helen builds Helenopolis, 440.
- Helena, the empress, 52; benevolence of, *ib.*; visits Jerusalem, *ib.*
- Heliopolis, virgins of, 218.

- Helles, 287.
 Heraclides, 371.
 Heretics, disputes among, 360.
 Heron, 482.
 Hesychius, 472.
 Hilarion, account of, 128, 217.
 Holy Ghost, debate concerning the, 274; decision concerning, 275.
 Homer, quotation from, 229.
 Homeritæ, the, 437.
 Homoousians persecuted, 259.
 Homoousios and Homoiousios, 433; distinction between, 139.
 Honorius, birth of, 330; account of, 423; death of, *ib.*, 520; successors of, 423.
 Hosius deposed, 121.
 Hosius of Cordova, 433.
 Huns, invasion of 511.
 Hypatia, skilled in mathematics, 489.
 Iberians embrace Christianity, 61; build a church, 62.
 Iberus, the river, 493.
 Idolatry prohibited, 20.
 India, converted by St. Bartholomew, 437.
 Indian bishoprics, origin of, 88.
 Indians converted to Christianity, 86.
 Innocent, epistles of, 400; efforts of, to recall John, 404.
 Inscription found, 50.
 Isaac, prediction of, 311.
 Ishmaelites, account of, 308.
 Italy, a council held in, 154.
 Jerusalem, synod at, 143; originally called Jebus, 482; attempt of Julian to rebuild, 479, 482.
 Jewish nation, 7; restrictions concerning, 138; seditions of, 153; rebuild the temple, 241; prevented from building the temple by a miracle, 242.
 John succeeds Meletius, 101; re-established by the synod of Tyre, *ib.*; prophecy of, 348.
 John Chrysostom, wisdom of, 362; promotion of 364; discourses of, 369; proceedings of, 371; complaints against, 375; deposed, 388; re-installed, 389; machinations against his life, 393.
 John the Baptist, discovery of his head, 346.
 John, Gospel of St., found at Jerusalem, 482.
 Jordan, derivation of the name from "Jor" and "Dan," 522.
 Joseph, impious opinion of Eunomius and Eudoxius about St., 491.
 Jovian, accession of, 346, 485; letter to, 250; rebellion of, 516; death of, 253, 488.
 Jovius, 414.
 Julian, account of, 129; becomes Cæsar, 181; apostasy of, 199; life of, 201; his accession, 204; endeavours to suppress Christianity, 206; promotes Paganism, *ib.*; persecutes the Cæsareans, 208; restores liberty to Christians, 209; his horrible death, 215; attempts to establish Paganism, 227; his letter to Arsacius; 228; his plan of converting, 231; prohibits the Christians from learning, 233; works of, 234; expedition of, 242; slain, 245; his death, vision of, 246; his death, account of, 247; made Cæsar, 463; becomes emperor, 474; encourages persecution of Christians, *ib.*; attempts to rebuild Jerusalem, 479; is checked by prodigies, 482; his expedition against Persia, 483; death, 484.
 Julian Alps, 459.
 Julian, Count, uncle of the emperor, his apostasy and death, 480.
 Julius deposed, 121.
 Justina, account of, 328.
 Kingdoms of iron and clay united, 515.
 Labarum converted into a cross, 15, 432, note.
 Lampsacus, council of, 255.

- Leontius**, 457, 525.
Liberius, bishop of Rome, 160, 463; exiled, 160; returns to Rome, 166; death of, 275.
Libya, two districts so called, 477.
Licinius persecutes the Christians of the East, 13; killed, 19.
Lord's day observed, 22.
Lucian the Martyr, 440.
Lucian, head of the Eunomians at Constantinople, 519.
Lucifer, account of, 133, 221.
Lucius the Arian, 270.
- Maccabees**, Books of, 429.
Macarius cured by the cross, 51.
Macedonius, heresy of, 109; proceedings of, 180; death of, 193; his blasphemy, 194; his heresy propagated, 195; martyrdom of, 219; his partisans' disputes, 224; adopts the Homoiousian opinion, 465.
Magi, priests of Persia, 64.
Magentius, death of, 153; defeated by Constantius, 460.
Manichæans, the, 456.
Marathonius expels the "Consubstantialists," 179.
Marcellus deposed by the bishops, 103; heresy of, *ib.*; his book sought after to be destroyed, *ib.*; innocence of, 122.
Mareotes and Ischyras, 440.
Maris, fidelity of, 209.
Mark, martyrdom of, 218.
Martin, account of, 131.
Martyrius, martyrdom of, 148; account of, 324.
Martyrs, names of, 70.
Martyrs, forty, remains of, discovered, 407.
Mavia, account of, 307; assists the Romans, 312.
Maxentius slain, 18.
Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, 79, 454.
Maximus, account of, 323, 420; tyranny of, 328; defeated by Theodosius and Valentinian, 503.
Meletius ordained, 193; translated, 196; deposed, 197; oath of, 314; account of, 325.
- Melitius**, 48.
Menander, 233.
Meteoroleschæ, 500.
Micah, remains of, 358.
Milan, council at, 155.
Milles, conduct and martyrdom of, 71.
Miracle, bread turned into a stone, 370.
Miracles, 272; even by heretics, 491.
Mithra, occurrence at, 213.
Modestus, 496.
Monasteries called Cells, 296.
Monks, origin of, 27; founders of, 29.
Monsters from the East, 450.
Montius, 461.
Mozoca, the old name of Cæsarea, 496.
- Nails** discovered, 51.
Nazianzum, 490.
Nectarius, letter to, 285; election of, 321.
Nestabis, martyrdom of, 215.
Nicæa, bishops assemble at, 13; synod of, 39; bishops at, *ib.*; council of, ends, 49; council at, proposed, 170.
Nicene faith, defence of, 223; doctrines preached, 273.
Nicomedia, council at, 167; earthquake at, 168, 466; destroyed by fire, 168; synod at, 466.
Nilammon, the ascetic, 390.
Nile, the, 449; overflow of the, 345.
Nisibis, besieged by Sapor, 459; surrendered by Jovian, 485.
Nitria, monasteries of, 296.
Novatians, a numerous sect, 102; of Phrygia, 279; succession of, 330; another heresy of the, 339.
Numerian, 478.
- Oak of Mamre**, 56.
Œdipus, 451.
Olympiade, account of, 397.
Olympius, or Olympiodorus, 513.
Opinion, liberty of, 312.

- Oracle respecting Theodosius or Theodore, 498.
 Oracles, heathen, 481.
 Oribasius, 484.
 Origen, books of, 378.
 Orthodox persecuted, 262.
- Pachomius, rules of, 127.
 Pagans, account of, 416.
 Palestine, monks of, 297.
 Paneas, image of our Saviour at, 475, 476.
 Panteichium, the, 510.
 Paphnutius performs miracles, 24.
 Paradise, its situation, 448; its rivers, 449.
 Passover, 279; kept, 46.
 Paul, the simple, 32.
 Paul, ordination of, 110; ejected, 118; restoration of, 115; and others re-instated, 146; death of, 147; remains of, 325.
 Paulinus, account of, 222; death of, 331.
 Peace established, 423.
 Pelagius of Laodicea, 470.
 Penance, account of, 335.
 People, sedition of, 388.
 Persea, a curious tree, 239.
 Persia, truce with, 410.
 Persians, religion of, 12; embrace Christianity, 63.
 Pestilence, 510.
 Peter seeks refuge in Rome, 270; supersedes Lucius, 310.
 Philo, 29.
 Philosophers converted, 41; exterminated, 301.
 Philostorgius, his life, &c., 427; his mother Eulampia, 496; writes against Porphyry, 504.
 Philostorgius, another person of that name, 490.
 Phœnician customs abolished, 21.
 Phœbus, his proceedings against Aëtius, 487.
 Photinus, heresy of, 150; deposed, 151; disputations of, 152.
 Pindar, 233.
 Plato explores Sicily, 86.
 Priests follow the tents in war, 22.
- Procopius, death of, 257; seizes on the imperial power, 493; is beheaded, 494.
 Pulcheria, account of, 405.
 Pusicius killed, 68.
- Red Sea, the, 446.
 Rhine, the, 16.
 Rimini, synod at, 466.
 Roman empire divided, 108.
 Roman lady, virtue of, 417.
 Romans, war against, 412.
 Rome, bishops of, 115; synod at, 276; deputation to, 365; transactions in, 411; siege of, 413.
 Rufinus slain, 360, 507.
- Sabæans, 437.
 Sapor, king of Persia, 459; is excited against the Christians, 64; kills the Christians, 67.
 Saracens, account of, 308; origin of, 309; conversion of, *ib.*
 Sardica, council of, 121.
 Sarmatians, account of, 303.
 Saros, death of, 422.
 Scetis, monks at, 294.
 Scythians, faith of, 274; invasion of the empire by, 498.
 Secundus of Ptolemais, 433.
 Seleucia, council of, 181; synod at, 466.
 Serapion, the archdeacon, 375.
 Severian, 376.
 Sicily, council of, 261.
 Silvanus, death of, 153; confession of, 260.
 Sirmium, synod at, 465.
 Sisinius, 327; account of, 361.
 Socrates, 303.
 Sozomen's family, account of, 226.
 Spyridion flourishes, 25; benevolence of, 26.
 Statues destroyed, 349.
 Stilicho, account of, 399; death of, 508; censured, 513.
 Sucian Alps, 459.
 Suevi, 419.
 Synod of Nicæa, account of, 177.
 Syria, monks of, 299.
 Syria and Assyria, 447, note.

Syrian giant, 504

Tarbula killed, 69.

Tatian, martyrdom of, 219.

Temples destroyed, 58; demolition of, 332, 345.

Thebais, monks at, 289.

Themistius, oration of, 304.

Theodore, account of, 33, 214, 237.

Theodore of Heraclea, 491.

Theodosiolus, 419.

Theodosius, account of, 313; baptism of, 315; reign of, 316; project of, 326; goes to Italy, 330; triumph of, 331; victory of, 350; successors of, 359; defeats the barbarians, 500; marries Galla, 503; death of, 507.

Theodosius, an Eunomian bishop, 486.

Theodosius the Younger, 517.

Theodulis, martyrdom of, 219.

Theodulus made bishop of Palestine, 486.

Theognis banished, 46; recalled, 73.

Theognis of Nicæa, 433.

Theophilus, 377; confession of, 260; enmity of, 378; arrival of, 385; holds a council, 386.

Theophilus the Indian, 437; converts the Sabæans, 444, 445; exiled by Constantius, 462; recalled, 464; heals the empress, 465; raises to life a Jewess, 525.

Theophrontius, heresy of, 337.

Theotecnus, 482.

Theotimus, 354.

Thessalonica, massacre at, 352.

Thomas, the apostle, 269.

Tigris, the river, 447.

Titus, account of, 226.

Tours, bishop of, 131.

Tribigildus, 511.

Tyane, council of, 261.

Tyre, council of, 88.

Ulphilas, 305.

Urphilas, bishop of the Goths, 435; translates the Bible, 436.

Ursacius, confession of, 145; machinations of, 176.

Usthazanes killed, 66.

Valens, confession of, 145; letter of to Athanasius, 146; machinations of, 176; association of, 254; persecutes, 259; kills eighty priests, 265; expedition of, 311; defeat of, 312; death of, *ib.*

Valens, chosen by Valentinian to share the empire, 489; makes an expedition against the Persians, 493; death of, 499.

Valens, bishop of Mursa, 495.

Valentinian, accession of, 253.

Valentinian the Younger, 258.

Valentinian, refuses to apostatize from the faith, 478, 488; proclaimed emperor, 489.

Valentinian the Younger, proclaimed, 489; his character, 505; his death, 506.

Vandals, 419.

Varronianus, son of Jovian, 488.

Vitalius, the presbyter, 280.

West, rebellion in the, 418.

Wooden tripod, 301.

Zechariah, remains of, discovered, 423.

Zeno, martyrdom of, 216; virtues of, 357.

*L. M.
12*

B. D. DEC 24 1912

