The Bibliotheca or Myriobiblion

Photius of Constantinople (c. AD 810–893)

SermonIndex.net / Church Fathers

Contents

Codices 1-165 — Introduction **1**

Codices 1-165 — 2. [Hadrian the monk] **4**

Codices 1-165 — 3.[Nonnosus, History] **5**

Codices 1-165 — 4. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, Against Eunomius] **7**

Codices 1-165 — 5. [Sophronius] **8**

Codices 1-165 — 6. [Gregory of Nyssa] **9**

Codices 1-165 — 7. [Gregory of Nyssa] **10**

Codices 1-165 — 8. [Origen, De Principiis] **11**

Codices 1-165 — 9. [Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica] **12**

Codices 1-165 — 10. [Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangelica] **13**

Codices 1-165 — 11. [Eusebius, Praeparatio Ecclesiastica] **14**

Codices 1-165 — 12. [Eusebius, Demonstratio Ecclesiastica] **15**

Codices 1-165 — 13. [Eusebius, Refutation and defence] **16**

Codices 1-165 — 14. [Apollinarius, Against the Heathen, On Piety, and On Truth] **17**

Codices 1-165 — 15. [Gelasius of Cyzicus, Acts of the First Council - Nicaea] **18**

Codices 1-165 — 16. [Acts of the Third Council - Ephesus] **19**

Codices 1-165 — 17. [Acts of the Fourth Council - Chalcedon] **20**

Codices 1-165 — 18. [Acts of the Fifth Council - Constantinople] **21**

Codices 1-165 — 19. [Acts of the Sixth Council - Constantinople II] 22

Codices 1-165 — 20. [Acts of the Seventh Council - Nicaea II] 23

Codices 1-165 — 21. [John Philoponus, On the Resurrection] 24

Codices 1-165 — 22. [Theodosius the Monk, Refutation of John Philoponus] 25

Codices 1-165 — 23. [Invectives against John Philoponus] 26

Codices 1-165 — 24. [Acts of a disputation between Tritheites and Hesitators] 27

Codices 1-165 — 25. [Chrysostom, Notes on Death & Homilies] 28

Codices 1-165 — 26. [Synesius of Cyrene, On Providence, On the Kingdom] 29

Codices 1-165 — 27. [Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History] 30

Codices 1-165 — 28. [Socrates, Ecclesiastical History] 31

Codices 1-165 — 29. [Evagrius Scholasticus, Ecclesiastical History] 32

Codices 1-165 — 30. [Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History] 33

Codices 1-165 — 31. [Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History] 34

Codices 1-165 — 32. [Athanasius, Letters] 35

Codices 1-165 — 33. [Justus of Tiberias, Chronicle of the Kings of the Jews] 36

Codices 1-165 — 34. [Julius Africanus, History] 37

Codices 1-165 — 35. [Philip of Side, Christian History] 38

Codices 1-165 — 36. [Cosmas Indicopleustes, Christian Topography] 39

Codices 1-165 — 37. [--, On Government] 41

Codices 1-165 — 38. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on Genesis] 42

Codices 1-165 — 39. [Eusebius, Against Hierocles] 43

Codices 1-165 — 40. [Philostorgius, Ecclesiastical History] 44

Codices 1-165 — 41. [John of Aegae, Ecclesiastical History] 46

Codices 1-165 — 42. [Basil the Cicilian, Ecclesiastical History] 47

Codices 1-165 — 43. [John Philoponus, On the Hexaemeron] 48

Codices 1-165 — 44. [Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana] 49

Codices 1-165 — 45. [Andronicianus, Against the Eunomians] 51

Codices 1-165 — 46. ['Theodoret', Against Heresies] 52

Codices 1-165 — 47. [Josephus, Jewish War] 54

Codices 1-165 — 48. ['Josephus' (Probably Hippolytus), On the Universe] 56

Codices 1-165 — 49. [Cyril of Alexandria, Against Nestorius] 58

Codices 1-165 — 50. [Nicias the monk, Against the Seven Chapters of Philoponus] 59

Codices 1-165 — 51. [Hesychius, On the Brazen Serpent] 60

Codices 1-165 — 52. [Acts of the synod of Side against the Messalians] 61

Codices 1-165 — 53. [Acts of the synod of Carthage, 412 or 411, against the Pelagians] 64

Codices 1-165 — 54. [A Copy of the Proceedings taken against the Doctrines of Nestorius by the Bishops of the West] 66

Codices 1-165 — 55. [John Philoponus, Against the Fourth Council] 68

Codices 1-165 — 56. [Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Against Heresies] 69

Codices 1-165 — 57. [Appian, Roman History] 70

Codices 1-165 — 58. [Arrian, Parthica] 73

Codices 1-165 — 59. [Acts of the Synod of the Oak] 75

Codices 1-165 — 60. [Herodotus, History] 79

Codices 1-165 — 61. [Aeschines, Against Timarchus; On the False Embassy; and Against Ctesiphon] 80

Codices 1-165 — 62. [Praxagoras of Athens, History of Constantine the Great] 83

Codices 1-165 — 63. [Procopius, History] 85

Codices 1-165 — 64. [Theophanes of Byzantium, History] 92

Codices 1-165 — 65. [Theophylact Simocatta, Histories] 95

Codices 1-165 — 66. [Nicephorus, Historical Epitome] 105

Codices 1-165 — 67. [Sergius the Confessor, History] 106

Codices 1-165 — 68. [Cephalion, Historical Epitome] 107

Codices 1-165 — 69. [Hesychius Illustrius, History] 108

Codices 1-165 — 70. [Diodorus Siculus] 110

Codices 1-165 — 71. [Cassius Dio, History] 111

Codices 1-165 — 72. [Ctesias, Persica] 113

Codices 1-165 — 73. [Heliodorus, Aethiopica] 134

Codices 1-165 — 74. [Themistius, Political Orations & Lesbonax, Speeches] 138

Codices 1-165 — 75. [John Philoponus, On the Trinity against John Scholasticus] 139

Codices 1-165 — 76. [Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews] 140

Codices 1-165 — 77. [Eunapius, Chronicle] 143

Codices 1-165 — 78. [Malchus, Byzantine History] 145

Codices 1-165 — 79. [Candidus, History] 147

Codices 1-165 — 80. [Olympiodorus, Histories] 150

Codices 1-165 — 81. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, On Persian Magic and wherein it differs from Christianity] 161

Codices 1-165 — 82. [Dexippus, History; Historical Epitome] 162

Codices 1-165 — 83. [Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Histories] 164

Codices 1-165 — 84. [Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Synopsis of the Histories] 165

Codices 1-165 — 85. [Heraclian, Against the manichaeans] 166

Codices 1-165 — 86. [Chrysostom, Letters] 168

Codices 1-165 — 87. [Achilles Tatius, Adventures of Clitophon and Leucippe] 169

Codices 1-165 — 88. [Gelasius of Cyzicus, Proceedings of the Synod of Nicaea] 170

Codices 1-165 — 89. [Gelasius of Caesarea, Continuation of the History of Eusebius Pamphili] 173

Codices 1-165 — 90. [Libanius] 174

Codices 1-165 — 91. [Arrian, History of the Reign of Alexander] 175

Codices 1-165 — 92. [Arrian, Continuation] 178

Codices 1-165 — 93. [Arrian, Bithynica] 185

Codices 1-165 — 94. [Iamblichus, Dramaticon] 186

Codices 1-165 — 95. [John Scythopolita, Against Schismatics] 194

Codices 1-165 — 96. [George of Alexandria, Life of St. Chrysostom] 195

Codices 1-165 — 97. [Phlegon of Tralles, Collection of Chronicles and List of Olympian Victors] 204

Codices 1-165 — 98. [Zosimus, History] 206

Codices 1-165 — 99. [Herodian, History] 207

Codices 1-165 — 100. [The Emperor Hadrian, Declamations] 209

Codices 1-165 — 101. [Victorinus, Panegyrics on the Emperor Zeno] 210

Codices 1-165 — 102. [Gelasius of Caesarea, Against the Anomoeans] 211

Codices 1-165 — 103. [Philo Judaeus, Allegories of the Sacred Laws, and On the Civil Life] 212

Codices 1-165 — 104. [Philo Judaeus, On the Essenes and Therapeutae] 213

Codices 1-165 — 105. [Philo Judaeus, Censure of Gaius and Censure of Flaccus] 214

Codices 1-165 — 106. [Theognostus of Alexandria, Outlines] 215

Codices 1-165 — 107. [Basil of Cicilia, Against John Scythopolita] 217

Codices 1-165 — 108. [Theodore of Alexandria, Against Themistius] 220

Codices 1-165 — 109. [Clement of Alexandria, Outlines] 221

Codices 1-165 — 110. [Clement of Alexandria, The Tutor] 223

Codices 1-165 — 111. [Clement of Alexandria, The Miscellanies] 224

Codices 1-165 — 115. [Anonymous, Against the Quartodecimans - Metrodorus, On the date of Easter] 227

Codices 1-165 — 116. [Anonymous, A Third Volume on the Holy Easter Feast, in eight books] 228

Codices 1-165 — 117. [Anonymous, In Defense of Origen] 229

Codices 1-165 — 118. [Pamphilus & Eusebius, Defense of Origen] 231

Codices 1-165 — 119. [Pierius] 233

Codices 1-165 — 120. [Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses] 234

Codices 1-165 — 121. [Hippolytus, Against Heresies] 236

Codices 1-165 — 122. [Epiphanius, Panarion] 237

Codices 1-165 — 123. [Epiphanius, Ancyrotus] 238

Codices 1-165 — 124. [Epiphanius, On Weights and Measures] 239

Codices 1-165 — 125. [Justin Martyr, Apology] 240

Codices 1-165 — 126. [Clement of Rome, Letters to the Corinthians - Polycarp, Letter to the Philippians] 241

Codices 1-165 — 127. [Eusebius, Life of Constantine] 242

Codices 1-165 — 128. [Lucian, Dialogues] 244

Codices 1-165 — 129. [Lucius of Patrae, Metamorphoses] 245

Codices 1-165 — 130. [Damascius] 246

Codices 1-165 — 131. [Amyntianus, On Alexander] 247

Codices 1-165 — 136. [Cyril of Alexandria, Thesauri] 248

Codices 1-165 — 137. [Eunomius, ...] 249

Codices 1-165 — 138. [Eunomius, Against Basil and Letters] 250

Codices 1-165 — 139. [Athanasius, Commentary on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs] 252

Codices 1-165 — 140. [Athanasius, Against Arius and his doctrines] 253

Codices 1-165 — 141. [Basil, The Six Days' Work] 254

Codices 1-165 — 142. [Basil, Moral Discourses] 255

Codices 1-165 — 143. [Basil, Letters] 256

Codices 1-165 — 144. [Basil, Ascetica] 257

Codices 1-165 — 145. [Helladius, Lexicon] 258

Codices 1-165 — 146. [--, Lexicon of the 'pure style'] 259

Codices 1-165 — 147. [--, Lexicon of the 'serious style'] 260

Codices 1-165 — 148. [--, Lexicon of the 'political style'] 261

Codices 1-165 — 149. [Valerius Pollio, Lexicon] 262

Codices 1-165 — 150. [Julian, Lexicon -- Philostratus, Lexicon -- Valerius Diodorus, Lexicon] 263

Codices 1-165 — 151. [Timaeus, Lexicon to Plato] 264

Codices 1-165 — 152. [Aelius Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Lexicon of Attic Words] 265

Codices 1-165 — 153. [Pausanias, Lexicon] 266

Codices 1-165 — 154. [Boethus, List of Platonic Words] 267

Codices 1-165 — 155. [Boethus, On the Words of Doubtful Meaning in Plato] 268

Codices 1-165 — 156. [Dorotheus, Of New and Foreign Words in Plato] 269

Codices 1-165 — 157. [Moeris, Attic Words] 270

Codices 1-165 — 158. [Phrynichus the Arabian, Rhetorical Equipment] 271

Codices 1-165 — 159. [Isocrates, Orations, Letters] 274

Codices 1-165 — 160. [Choricius, Declamations] 276

Codices 1-165 — 161. [Sopater, Various Extracts] 278

Codices 1-165 — 162. [Eusebius of Thessalonica, Against the Aphthartodocetae] 282

Codices 1-165 — 163. [Vindanius Anatolius of Berytus, A Collection of Agricultural Precepts] 286

Codices 1-165 — 164. [Galen, On Medical Schools] 287

Codices 1-165 — 165. [Himerius, Declamations] 288

The ”Sic et Non” of Stephanus Gobarus, from codex 232. By Adolf von Harnack 291

Codices 1-165 — Introduction

PHOTIUS BIBLIOTHECA OR MYRIOBIBLON Register and enumeration of the books read by us, 279 in number, of which our beloved brother Tarasius desired to have a summary. Photius, to his beloved brother Tarasius, in the name of the Lord, greeting. MY DEAREST BROTHER TARASIUS,

After our appointment as ambassador to Assyria had been confirmed by the assent of the embassy and approved by the emperor, you asked to be furnished with summaries of those works which had been read and discussed during your absence. Your idea was to have something to console you for our painful separation, and at the same time to acquire some knowledge, even if vague and imperfect, of the works which you had not yet read in our company. We believe that their number is exactly 279. Accordingly, regarding the fulfilment of your request as a sacred obligation, we engaged a secretary, and set down all the summaries we could recollect. No doubt we have not been expeditious enough to satisfy your feverish eagerness and vehement desire, but still we have been quicker than might have been expected. The summaries will be arranged in the order in which our memory recalls them. Certainly, it would not be difficult, if one preferred it, to describe historical events and those dealing with different subjects under separate headings. But, considering that nothing would be gained by this, we have set them down indiscriminately as they occurred to us. If, during your study of these volumes, any of the summaries should appear to be defective or inaccurate, you must not be surprised. It is no easy matter to undertake to read each individual work, to grasp the argument, to remember and record it;

but when the number of works is large, and a considerable time has elapsed since their perusal, it is extremely difficult to remember them with accuracy. As to the commonplaces met with in the course of our reading, so simple that they can hardly have escaped your notice, we have devoted less attention to them, and have purposely refrained from examining them carefully. You will be better able than ourselves to decide whether these summaries will do more than fulfil your original expectations as to their usefulness. Certainly, such records will assist you to refresh the memory of what you have read by yourself, to find more readily what you

want, and further, to acquire more easily the knowledge of what has not as yet been the subject of intelligent reading on your part.

For the life and works of Photius see Introduction to vol. vi. The genuineness of this title is disputed. To the caliph of Bagdad; according to others, to Persia, or one of the Eastern emirs (Bury). πρεσβεία cannot mean ”senate,” as Schott renders it (senatus), but is probably ”the body constituting the embassy,” a number of others nominated for the mission, to whom Photius was persona grata, and who expressed a wish that, he should accompany them. This explanation is due to the kindness of Professor J. B. Bury. The text is corrupt. 1[Theodore the Presbyter, On the Genuineness of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite]

Read the treatise of Theodore the Presbyter, in which he undertakes to prove the genuineness of the works of St. Dionysius. The following arguments against it are refuted: (1) I. they are genuine, how is it that none of the later Fathers cites them or quotes any passages from them? (2) How is it that Eusebius Pamphili, in his list of the writings of the Holy Fathers, does not mention them? (3) How is it that these treatises describe in detail rites and customs which only became established in the Church gradually and after a long time? The great Dionysius, as is clear from the Acts, was contemporary with the Apostles [whereas most of the institutions described only became established gradually and in later times]; it is therefore improbable (says the objector), or rather a clumsy fiction, to assert that Dionysius could have undertaken to describe institutions which were not fully developed till long after his death. (4) How is it that a letter of the divinely-inspired Ignatius is referred to? for Dionysius flourished in the time of the Apostles, whereas Ignatius suffered martyrdom during the reign of Trajan, and wrote the letter referred to shortly before his death. Theodore endeavours to solve these difficulties and does his best to prove the genuineness of the treatises.

These sections are usually alluded to as Codices (manuscripts). Codices were originally wooden tablets (caudex, codex, a block or slab of wood) coated with wax and divided into ”leaves,” which, when wood was superseded by parchment or other writing materials, developed into the book, as contrasted with the roll-form (volumen) of MSS. Nothing further is known of his life or writings. The famous ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius bishop of Caesarea (c. 260-340), who assumed as his surname the name of his intimate friend, literary adviser and assistant, Pamphilus, presbyter of Caesarea, and martyr (309). xvii. Bishop of Antioch (c. 70-107). These mystical treatises, ascribed to ”Dionysius the Areopagite,” were at one time supposed to be the work of the Dionysius mentioned in the Acts, who was subsequently identified by some with St. Denis, the first bishop of Paris and the patron saint of France But it is now generally agreed that they were written about the end of the fifth century, when the writings of the neo-Platonist Proclus exercised great influence, and that the name is an assumed one.

[. These notes in blue are new to the electronic edition. The original notes are those by J.H.Freese.]

Codices 1-165 — 2. [Hadrian the monk]

Read Adrian's (Hadrian's) Introduction to the Scriptures, a useful book for catechumens. This treatise, probably written by a Greek-speaking Syrian monk, who flourished about 425, is hardly an introduction to the study of the Scriptures in the modern sense. It is rather an aid to the correct understanding of the language of the Bible, dealing with questions of meaning, style, composition and metaphors, and concluding with some rules of interpretation (see edition, with translation and commentary, by F. Goessling, Berlin, 1887).

Codices 1-165 — 3.[Nonnosus, History]

Read the History of Nonnosus, containing a description of his embassy to the Aethiopians, Amerites, and Saracens, then a most powerful nation, as well as to other Eastern peoples. At this time Justinian was emperor of the Romans, and Caisus chief of the Saracens. This Caisus was the grandson of Arethas, himself a chief, to whom Nonnosus's grandfather was sent as ambassador, during the reign of Anastasius, to conclude a treaty of peace. Nonnosus's father Abrames had in like manner been sent on an embassy to Alamundarus, chief of the Saracens, during the reign of Justin, and was successful in procuring the release of Timostratus and John, two Roman generals who were prisoners of war. Caisus, to whom Nonnosus was sent, was chief of two of the most illustrious Saracen tribes, the Chindeni and Maadeni. Before Nonnosus was appointed ambassador, his father had been sent to this same Caisus by Justinian, and had concluded a treaty of peace, on condition that Caisus's son Mavias should be taken as a hostage to Byzantium. After this, Nonnosus was entrusted with a threefold mission: to Caisus, to induce him, if possible, to visit the emperor, to Elesbaas, king of the Axumites, and to the Amerites. Axumis is a very large city, and may be considered the capital of Aethiopia; it lies more S. and E. than the Roman empire. Nonnosus, in spite of the treacherous attacks of tribesmen, perils from wild beasts, and many difficulties and dangers on the journey, successfully accomplished his mission, and returned in safety to his native land.

He relates that Caisus, after Abrames had been sent to him a second time, set out for Byzantium, having previously divided his chieftaincy between his brothers Ambrus and Yezid. He brought a large number of his subjects with him, and was appointed administrator of Palestine by the emperor. He tells us that the ancient name for what are now called σανδάλια (sandals) was ἀρβύλαι, and that φακιόλιον (turban) was called φασῶλις. He tells us that most of the Saracens, those who live in Phoenicon as well as beyond it and the Taurenian mountains,have a sacred meeting-place consecrated to one of the gods, where they assemble twice a year. One of these meetings lasts a whole month, almost to the middle of spring, when the

sun enters Taurus; the other lasts two months, and is held after the summer solstice. During these meetings complete peace prevails, not only amongst themselves, but also with all the natives; even the animals are at peace both with themselves and with human beings. Other strange, more or less fabulous information is also given.

He tells us that Adulis is fifteen days' journey from Axumis. On his way there, he and his companions saw a remarkable sight in the neighbourhood of Aue (Ave), midway between Axumis and Adulis; this was a large number of elephants, nearly 5000. They were feeding in a large plain, and the inhabitants found it difficult to approach them or drive them from their pasture. This was what they saw on their journey. We must also say something about the climatic contrarieties of summer and winter between Ave and Axumis. When the sun enters Cancer, Leo, and Virgo, it is summer as far as Ave, as with us, and the atmosphere is extremely dry; but from Ave to Axumis and the rest of Aethiopia, it is severe winter, not throughout the day, but beginning from midday, the sky being covered with clouds and the country flooded with violent rains. At that time also the Nile, spreading over Egypt, overflows and irrigates the land. But when the sun enters Capricornus, Aquarius, and Pisces, the atmosphere, conversely, floods the country of the Adulites as far as Ave, while it is summer from Ave to Axumis and the rest of Aethiopia, and the fruits of the earth are ripe.

During his voyage from Pharsan, Nonnosus, on reaching the last of the islands, had a remarkable experience. He there saw certain creatures of human shape and form, very short, black-skinned, their bodies entirely covered with hair. The men were accompanied by women of the same appearance, and by boys still shorter. All were naked, women as well as men, except for a short apron of skin round their loins. There was nothing wild or savage about them. Their speech was human, but their language was unintelligible even to their neighbours, and still more so to Nonnosus and his companions. They live on shell-fish and fish cast up on the shore. According to Nonnosus, they were very timid, and when they saw him and his companions, they shrank from them as we do from monstrous wild beasts. Nothing further is known of him. The Homerites (Himyarites) of the Yemen. The name points to the family being of Semitic origin, although he was probably a convert to Christianity. Al-Mundir, chief of the Saracens of Hira.

Modern Axum, now the capital of the Abyssinian province of Tigre. It contains numerous antiquities and inscriptions, and is still regarded as a holy city. Christianity was introduced into Aethiopia as early as the fourth century (see J. T. Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians, 1893). Further particulars of the mission are given in the Chronicle of John Malalas, and in Gibbon, ch. xli. The form of the word is doubtful. Mountainous districts in Anterior Asia and the land of the Saracens. A seaport town, generally identified with modern Thulla or Zula in Annesley Bay on the W. shore of the Red Sea. Town in Aethiopia. The Pygmies.

Codices 1-165 — 4. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, Against Eunomius]

Read the twenty-five books of Theodore of Antioch against Eunomius in defence of St. Basil. His style is somewhat obscure, but the work is full of ideas and sound reasoning, and contains a wealth of evidence taken from the Scriptures. He refutes the arguments of Eunomius almost word for word, and amply proves that he is very ignorant of outside knowledge and still more so of our religion. I believe he is the Theodore who was bishop of Mopsuestia. Theodore (c.350-428), bishop of Mopsuestia (394) in Cilicia, born at Antioch, the greatest exegete of the Antiochean school. He also wrote polemical, dogmatic, and liturgical treatises. Eunomius (d. 393) of Cappadocia, bishop of Cyzicus, deprived of his episcopate for Arianism. St. Basil the Great (330-379), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (370). He is most important as the strenuous upholder of orthodoxy and as the introducer of definite rules and forms of ecclesiastical life, which have maintained themselves to the present day.

Codices 1-165 — 5. [Sophronius]

Read also the attack of Sophronius on Eunomius in defence of St. Basil. His style is clearer and more concise than that of Theodore. He does not traverse all the arguments of Eunomius, but chiefly attacks and refutes those which appear to contain the most essential points of his heresy. The style is aphoristic, the language in general free and simple and not disagreeable, although embellished with over-laboured arguments. Probably the friend of St. Jerome and translator of his works. Ασύνδετος, lit., ”without conjunctions.”

Codices 1-165 — 6. [Gregory of Nyssa]

Read also the attack of Gregory of Nyssa on Eunomius in defence of St. Basil. His style is as brilliant as that of any rhetorician, and agreeable to listen to. He does not refute Eunomius in detail, and is consequently briefer than Theodore, but fuller than Sophronius. He is fond of using enthymemes and arguments from example. But I can say without partiality that the copiousness and fertility of his arguments are as convincing a proof of his superiority to Theodore as the charm, brilliancy, and pleasantness of his style. (332-396). Bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia (372), younger brother of Basil the Great, called Father of the Fathers. The special meaning of an ”enthymeme” is a rhetorical or imperfect syllogism, drawn from probable premises. But here and elsewhere in Photius it seems to mean simply ”arguments.”

Codices 1-165 — 7. [Gregory of Nyssa]

Read another treatise by the same Gregory of Nyssa on the same subject. In this he joins issue with Eunomius by more reasoned arguments and storms the tottering ramparts of his impiety. The beauty of his style, its mingled brilliancy and charm, are equally conspicuous in this work.

Codices 1-165 — 8. [Origen, De Principiis]

Read Origen's four books On First Principles. The first deals with the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. In this his statements are often blasphemous; thus, he asserts that the Son was created by the Father, the Holy Ghost by the Son; that the Father pervades all existing things, the Son only those that are endowed with reason, the Holy Ghost only those that are saved. He also makes other strange and impious statements, indulging in frivolous talk about the migration of souls, the stars being alive, and the like. This first book is full of fables about the Father, Christ (as he calls the Son), the Holy Ghost, and creatures endowed with reason. In the second book he treats of the world and created things. He asserts that the God of the Law and the prophets, of the Old and the New Testament, is one and the same; that there was the same Holy Spirit in Moses, the rest of the prophets, and the Holy Apostles. He further discusses the Incarnation of the Saviour, the soul, resurrection, punishment, and promises. The third book deals with free will; how the devil and hostile powers, according to the Scriptures, wage war against mankind; that the world was created and is perishable, having had a beginning in time. The fourth book treats of the final end, the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and the proper manner of reading and understanding them.

Surnamed Adamantius (184-253), born at Alexandria, died at Tyre. This treatise supplied the chief arguments for the charge of heresy that was brought against him. He was also called Chalcenterus ("brazen-bowelled") from his passion for work. His numerous works comprise Homilies, and the famous treatise Against Celsus. Fragments of his Hexapla (a recension of the Old Testament) have been preserved.

Codices 1-165 — 9. [Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica]

Read fifteen books of the Praeparatio Evangelica of Eusebius, in which he refutes the foolish doctrines of the gentiles, and shows that they were always contradictory. At the beginning and end of the fifteenth book he mentions another treatise, the Demonstratio Evangelica, which follows the Praeparatio. His object in these works is to refute the errors of the gentiles, and to confirm the preaching of the Gospel.

Codices 1-165 — 10. [Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangelica]

Read the twenty books of Eusebius’s Demonstratio Evangelica. Only ten are extant.

Codices 1-165 — 11. [Eusebius, Praeparatio Ecclesiastica]

Read Eusebius’s Praeparatio Ecclesiastica, in ... books in which there are extracts. . . . This work is lost.

Codices 1-165 — 12. [Eusebius, Demonstratio Ecclesiastica]

Read Eusebius’s Demonstratio Ecclesiastica, in … books. This work is lost.

Codices 1-165 — 13. [Eusebius, Refutation and defence]

Read two books of Eusebius's Refutation and Defence, and a second edition of the same, which, while differing in certain passages, agrees in other respects in both style and sentiments with the first. He mentions certain difficulties brought forward by the heathen against our blameless religion, and solves them satisfactorily, though not entirely. His style is neither agreeable nor brilliant; however, he is a man of great learning, although wanting in the shrewdness and firmness of character so necessary for the accurate discussion of questions of dogma. In many passages he utters blasphemies against the Son, calling him second cause, commander-in-chief, and other excrescences of Arian madness. It is evident that he flourished during the reign of Constantine the Great. He was an ardent admirer of the virtuous saint and martyr Pamphilus, from whom he took his surname.

Codices 1-165 — 14. [Apollinarius, Against the Heathen, On Piety, and On Truth]

Read Apollinarius’s Against the Heathen, On Piety, and On Truth. The writer was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia and flourished during the reign of Marcus Antoninus Verus. He deserves mention and his style is excellent. Other writings of his are said to be equally worthy of record, but they have not come into my hands. Also spelt Apolinaris, Apollinaris, or Apollinarius, flourished about 175. His gentile name was Claudius. In Lesser Phrygia. The well-known author of the Meditations, commonly known as Marcus Aurelius.

Codices 1-165 — 15. [Gelasius of Cyzicus, Acts of the First Council - Nicaea]

Read the Acts of the first council in three volumes. It bears the name of Gelasius, but is rather a history than an Acts. The author’s style is poor and mean, but he gives a detailed account of the proceedings of the council. Of Nicaea (325). Of Cyzicus, flourished about 475. Nothing more is known of him than what he states in the work itself, which is still extant.

Codices 1-165 — 16. [Acts of the Third Council - Ephesus]

Read the Acts of the third council, consisting almost entirely of the letters of St. Cyril to Nestorius and that impious man’s replies. Of Ephesus (431). Archbishop of Alexandria (412-444). Patriarch of Constantinople (428-431), deprived of his office by the council of Ephesus on account of his heresy.

Codices 1-165 — 17. [Acts of the Fourth Council - Chalcedon]

XVII Read the Acts of the fourth council in several books. There were fifteen sessions, at which Dioscorus and Eutyches were condemned, and Nestorius excommunicated. St. Flavianwas declared innocent after his death, together with Eusebius of Dorylaeum, Theodoret and Ibas. Other special matters were discussed, and the spirit of piety was strengthened. Of Chalcedon(451). Bishop of Alexandria (444-451). Founder of the sect of the Monophysites (380-456). Bishop of Constantinople (447-449). Bishop of Dorylaeum (mod. Eski Shehr) in Phrygia (400-451). Bishop of Cyrrhus (Cyrus) near the Euphrates, two days' journey from Antioch, theologian and ecclesiastical historian (c. 393-458). Bishop of Edessa (c. 435-457).

Codices 1-165 — 18. [Acts of the Fifth Council - Constantinople]

Read the Acts of the fifth council, at which the three so-called ”chapters” were dealt with, and Origen and his writings excommunicated, together with Diodorus of Tarsus,and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodoret’s answer to the twelve anathematisms of Cyril was also excommunicated. Previous to this, the cases of Zooras and Anthimus, who wormed his way into the patriarchate of Constantinople, and certain other matters were discussed. Of Constantinople (553). The writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; of Theodoret in defence of Nestorius; the letter of Ibas to the Persian Maris. Founder of the exegetical school of Antioch, bishop of Tarsus (378-394). A Monophysite Syrian monk. Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople (535, deposed 536), translated from the episcopate of Trapezus through the influence of the empress Theodora.

Codices 1-165 — 19. [Acts of the Sixth Council - Constantinople II]

Read the Acts of the sixth Council, at the sessions of which Sergius, Cyrus, and Pyrrhus of Constantinople were excommunicated, together with Honorius of Rome, Polychronius, and others, who had ventured to assert that there was only one will and one energy in Christ. The dogma of truth was confirmed. Of Constantinople (680). Patriarch of Constantinople (610-638). Bishop of Phasis, afterwards patriarch of Alexandria (630-641). Friend and successor of Sergius as patriarch of Constantinople (638-641). Pope (625-638). Monothelite presbyter and monk.

Codices 1-165 — 20. [Acts of the Seventh Council - Nicaea II]

Read the Acts of the seventh council, at the sessions of which the iconoclasts were defeated and the orthodox faith shone with increased brightness. The second council of Nicaea (787).

Codices 1-165 — 21. [John Philoponus, On the Resurrection]

Read the treatise of John Philoponus On the Resurrection in ... volumes. In this work, rejecting the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body, he says much that is ill-considered. He also ridicules our blessed and holy Fathers. Of Alexandria, theologian, grammarian, and philosopher, flourished in the first half of the sixth century. His chief work (of which considerable fragments remain), called The Arbitrator, was an attempt to reconcile Monophysitism and Tritheism. Photius (Cod. 55, 75) mentions two other theological treatises. On the Resurrection is lost. Some fragments of notes on Aristotle are preserved. He was called Philoponus from his great industry; his opponents changed this into Mataioponus (vainly industrious).

Codices 1-165 — 22. [Theodosius the Monk, Refutation of John Philoponus]

Read the elaborate Refutation by Theodosius the Monkof the passages cited by John Philoponus as arguments against the Resurrection, including quotations from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, in refutation of John’s vain efforts. A fifth-century monk, of whom nothing is known.

Codices 1-165 — 23. [Invectives against John Philoponus]

Read the invectives of Conon, Eugenius, and Themistius,against the treatise of John Philoponus, in which they pillory his vain efforts. They also violently attack him personally, as a man entirely estranged from the Christian faith. However, they agree with him in refusing to accept the decisions of the council of Chalcedon. Bishop of Tarsus (c. 600). A Cilician bishop in the second half of the sixth century. Deacon of Alexandria (sixth century), leader of the Agnoetae (a Monophysitic sect), who held that the human soul of Christ resembled that of man in all things, even in his ”ignorance” or limited knowledge.

Codices 1-165 — 24. [Acts of a disputation between Tritheites and Hesitators]

Read a volume containing the Acts of a disputation held before John, bishop of the queen city, during the reign of Justin, in which Conon and Eugenius the Tritheites took part on the one side, and Paul and Stephen, the Hesitators,on the other. Conon and Eugenius appear to have sided with Philoponus; for when Paul and Stephen demanded that they should anathematize Philoponus, they were unwilling to do so. On the other hand, they brought forth arguments to prove that his views were in harmony with those of Severus and Theodosius, their own teachers. They indeed in many respects uphold the orthodox views----that the Trinity is consubstantial and of the same nature, that God is one, that the Godhead is one; but they are guilty of blasphemy in asserting that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are partial substances, and have special divinities and natures, thus being at variance with themselves and the truth. Many other opinions of theirs are equally foolish and nonsensical.

John III Scholasticus (the lawyer), bishop of Constantinople (565-577). He was the author of a Nomocanon, a digest of canonical law. Justin II (emperor 565-578). Paul the Black, ”Jacobite” patriarch of Antioch (c. 550-578). ”Jacobite ” bishop of Cyprus. They partly accepted, and partly rejected, the decisions of the council of Chalcedon. Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (512-519).

Codices 1-165 — 25. [Chrysostom, Notes on Death & Homilies]

Read the work by John Chrysostom entitled Notes on Death, twenty-two short homilies. In the same volume there are also twenty-two homilies on the Ascension of the Lord and seventeen on Pentecost. John the Golden-mouthed (347-407), bishop of Constantinople.

Codices 1-165 — 26. [Synesius of Cyrene, On Providence, On the Kingdom]

Read the orations of Synesius, bishop of Cyrene, On Providence, On the Kingdom, and some other subjects. His style is lofty and dignified, but somewhat inclined to be over-poetical. Also read various letters of his, distilling grace and charm, at the same time vigorous and full of closely-packed ideas. He originally belonged to a heathen school of philosophy, but was favourably disposed to the inspired truths of Christianity and ready to accept all its doctrines except that of the Resurrection. Although this was his attitude, he was admitted into our Church and even raised to the episcopate, by reason of his goodness and purity and in the conviction that a man of such holiness of life could not fail to be illuminated by the light of the Resurrection. Nor were these hopes disappointed. For as soon as he became bishop he readily assented to that doctrine. Synesius was an ornament to Cyrene at the time when Theophilus was patriarch of Alexandria.

Neo-Platonist and bishop of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica (378-431). The speech On the Kingdom was delivered at Constantinople before the emperor Arcadius. Also called Egyptian Discourses, a sort of historical romance, in which there are allusions to the history of the time, disguised as the mythical stories of Osiris and Typhon. Perhaps ”massive” might express the idea of ὀγκος. Or ”shrewd.”

Codices 1-165 — 27. [Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the ten books of Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History. Beginning from the birth of Christ, our true God, it carefully describes the period of the tyrants, and ends with the reign of Constantine the Great. A more detailed account is given of the Church institutions established by him during his reign.

Codices 1-165 — 28. [Socrates, Ecclesiastical History]

Read Socrates's Ecclesiastical History, a continuation of that of Eusebius. Beginning with the reign of Constantine, it goes down to the time of Theodosius the Younger. The writer, who had attended the lectures of Ammonius and Helladius the Alexandrine grammarians, even when a boy had been instructed in "grammar" by heathen tutors, who had been banished from their native country for sedition and carried on their profession at Constantinople. The work contains the events of 140 years, and the entire history is included in seven books. There is nothing remarkable in the author's style, and he is not very accurate in matters of doctrine. Socrates of Constantinople (c. 380----439), originally a lawyer. Emperor 408-450. The Greek γραμματικός is equivalent to "a literary man" generally, with special reference to the study of poetry. The same idea appears in γραμματική(grammar). Ammonius and Helladius had fled for refuge to Constantinople, where they taught Socrates.

Codices 1-165 — 29. [Evagrius Scholasticus, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus, an ex-praefect, born at Epiphania in Coele-Syria, in six books. The work begins where those of Socrates and Theodoret end, and goes down to the twelfth year of the reign of the emperor Maurice. The style is not without charm, although somewhat diffuse; in matters of doctrine he is certainly more trustworthy than other historians. The work also contains some passages about images. About 536-600. He was an advocate (Scholasticus). That is, it covers the period from 431 to 593.

Codices 1-165 — 30. [Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the Ecclesiastical History of Salamanus Hermeias Sozomen, in nine books. Dedicated to the emperor Theodosius the Younger, it begins with the consulship of Crispus and his father Constantine, and goes down to the reign of Theodosius the Younger. Sozomen was at one time an advocate in Constantinople. His style is better than that of Socrates, from whom he differs in certain particulars. He was born near Gaza in Palestine, and afterwards settled in Constantinople (c. 400-450). It originally covered the period from 324 to 439, but the history of 425-439 is wanting.

Codices 1-165 — 31. [Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the Ecclesiastical History of Theodoret. Of all the writers mentioned his style is best suited for history. It is generally clear, dignified, and free from redundancies, although he sometimes employs metaphors that are too bold, almost insipid. He gives a fuller account of the proceedings of the second council than other historians, who merely bestow a cursory notice upon them, as if they were unwilling to say much about it. However, even he does not give all the details. He begins his History with the heresy of Arius and goes down to the reign of Theodosius the Younger, and the death of Theodore, at the time when Sisinnius was bishop of Constantinople. See Cod. 27. The first council of Constantinople (381). Of Mopsuestia (see Cod. 4.).

Codices 1-165 — 32. [Athanasius, Letters]

Read various letters of Athanasius, some containing a kind of Apology for his flight. The style is elegant, brilliant, and clear, full of grace and persuasiveness. It is a pleasure to listen to the Apology. (296-373). Patriarch of Alexandria, the father of orthodoxy and the chief opponent of Arianism. He was accused of cowardice by the Arians for taking refuge in the desert.

Codices 1-165 — 33. [Justus of Tiberias, Chronicle of the Kings of the Jews]

Read the Chronicle of Justus of Tiberias, entitled A Chronicle of the Kings of the Jews in the form of a genealogy, by Justus of Tiberias. He came from Tiberias in Galilee, from which he took his name. He begins his history with Moses and carries it down to the death of the seventh Agrippa of the family of Herod and the last of the kings of the Jews. His kingdom, which was bestowed upon him by Claudius, was extended by Nero, and still more by Vespasian. He died in the third year of the reign of Trajan, when the history ends. Justus's style is very concise, and he omits a great deal that is of the utmost importance. Suffering from the common fault of the Jews, to which race he belonged, he does not even mention the coming of Christ, the events of His life, or the miracles performed by Him. His father was a Jew named Pistus; Justus himself, according to Josephus, was one of the most abandoned of men, a slave to vice and greed. He was a political opponent of Josephus, against whom he is said to have concocted several plots; but Josephus, although on several occasions he had his enemy in his power, only chastised him with words and let him go free. It is said that the history which he wrote is in great part fictitious, especially where he describes the Judaeo-Roman war and the capture of Jerusalem.

Contemporary of Josephus, by whom his character and works are violently attacked. He was condemned to death by Vespasian, but his life was spared by Agrippa. He also wrote a history of the Jewish war. The Greek phrase is βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασι, usually translated "crowned kings," but στέμμα more probably here means a genealogical tree. Agrippa II, before whom St. Paul made his defence. The statement that he died in the third year of Trajan's reign (100) is objected to on the ground that Josephus' Autobiography, which gives an account of Justus, was published immediately after the Antiquities (in the reign of Domitian).

Codices 1-165 — 34. [Julius Africanus, History]

Read the History of Africanus, who was also the author of the Cesti in fourteen books. Although his style is concise, he omits nothing worthy of record. He begins with the Mosaic cosmogony and goes down to the coming of Christ. He also gives a cursory account of events from that time to the reign of Macrinus, at which date, as he tells us, the Chronicle was finished, that is, in the 5723rd year of the world. The work is in five volumes. Africanus also wrote a letter to Origen against the authenticity of the history of Susannah, on the grounds (amongst others) that it is not included in the Jewish books, and that the play on words (ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου πρῖσαι ... ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου σχίσαι) is at variance with the genuine Hebrew style. Origen answered and refuted these objections. Africanus also wrote a letter to Aristides, in which he showed that in reality there was no such difference as was generally supposed between the genealogies of our Saviour in Matthew and Luke.

Julius Africanus (c. 170-240), Christian historical writer, was born at Jerusalem (not in Africa) and subsequently lived at Emmaus-Nicopolis in Palestine. He was the author of a Chronicle, a history of the world from the Creation to 221; Cesti (embroidered girdles), a collection of notes on all kinds of subjects; a letter to Aristides on the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke; and a letter to Origen to show that the History of Susannah in the Apocrypha is a later addition from a Greek original. The last has been preserved in full, of the three first only fragments. According to his system of chronology, called the Alexandrian era, there were 5499 years between the Creation and the birth of Christ, which he antedated by three years. The correct number is twenty-four. Emperor 217-218. An extract in Georgius Syncellus, however, shows that the Chronicle really went down a little later. ”Where didst thou see them?” ”Under a mastic tree (σχῖνος).” ”The angel of God shall cleave (σχίσει) thy soul to-day.” ”Under a holm-tree (πρῖνος).” ” The angel of God shall saw thee in two (πρίσει).” Nothing is known of him.

Codices 1-165 — 35. [Philip of Side, Christian History]

Read the work of Philip of Side, entitled a Christian History, beginning with the words ”In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” He gives an account of the Mosaic history, sometimes brief, sometimes full, although wordy throughout. The first book contains twenty-four volumes, like the twenty-three other books, which we have seen up to the present. His language is diffuse, without urbanity or elegance, and soon palls, or positively disgusts; his aim is rather to display his knowledge than to benefit the reader. Most of the matter has nothing to do with history, and the work might be called a treatise on all kinds of subjects rather than a history, a tasteless effusion. Philip was a contemporary of Sisinnius and Proclus, patriarchs of Constantinople. He frequently attacks the former in his history, because, while both filled the same office and Philip was considered the more eloquent, Sisinnius was elected to the patriarchate.

Philip of Side in Pamphylia (fifth century). He was a presbyter in Constantinople, and a friend of John Chrysostom. It originally contained thirty-six books and nearly one thousand volumes. They were both presbyters.

Codices 1-165 — 36. [Cosmas Indicopleustes, Christian Topography]

Read the book entitled the Book of Christians, an interpretation of the Octateuch. The author, who flourished in the reign of Justin, dedicates the work to a certain Pamphilus, It begins with the defence of certain ecclesiastical dogmas by evidence drawn from the Scriptures. The style is poor, and the arrangement hardly up to the ordinary standard. He relates much that is incredible from an historical point of view, so that he may fairly be regarded as a fabulist rather than a trustworthy authority. The views on which he lays special stress are : that neither the sky nor the earth is spherical, but that the former is a kind of vault, and the lattera rectangular plane, [twice as long as broad], to the ends of which the ends of the sky are united; that all the stars, with the help of the angels, are kept in motion; and other things of the same kind. He also mentions the books of Genesis and Exodus, as it were by way of digression; and enters into a lengthy discussion and speculations about the Tabernacle. The prophets and apostles are cursorily treated. He says that the sun is only twice as large as two ”climates”; that the angels do not dwell in heaven, but above the firmament and mingle with us; that Christ at His Ascension entered the space between the sky and the firmament, and that only this is the kingdom of heaven; and similar absurdities. He dedicates the first six books to a certain Pamphilus, of the remaining six (there are twelve in all) the seventh to Anastasius, in which he contends that the heavens are indissoluble; the eighth, on the song of Hezekiah and the retrogression of the sun, to a certain Peter. In this book he also states that he has written a commentary on the Song of Songs. The four remaining books have no dedication.

Cosmas Indicopleustes (”the Indian navigator”), an Alexandrian merchant, who flourished in the sixth century. He visited Arabia and East Africa, but it is doubtful whether he deserves the title of ”Indian navigator.” The title by which the work is usually known is Christian Topography; as its object was to introduce a new sys-

tem of physical geography in harmony with the teaching of Christianity, a physico-astro-nomical interprelation of the Scriptures, Photius gives it the subtitle of Interpretation oj the Octateuch. Fabricius (Bib. Gr., iv. 230) takes it to mean simply "a treatise in eight books," regarding the four other books as a later addition, or it may refer to the "eight books" of Ptolemy's geographical work. Photius says he flourished under "Justin," but as he does not state which Justin, perhaps "Justinian" (527-565) should be read. He certainly may have been born under Justin I (518-527) and died under Justin II (565-578). Before the earth was regarded as spherical, its surface was supposed to "slope" (κλίνω) from S. to N., and this slope was called κλίμα. Later, the word was used for belts or zones of its surface, and then for the temperature of those zones. According to Cosmas, the two "climates" were between the latitudes of Alexandria and Rhodes, and Rhodes and Constantinople (about 635 miles). Isaiah xxxviii.

Codices 1-165 — 37. [--, On Government]

Read an essay On Government, in the form of a dialogue between Menas a patrician and Thomas a referendary. The treatise is in six books, in which is discussed a form of government, called δικαιαρχικόν (just rule), differing from those propounded by ancient writers. The Republic of Plato is deservedly criticised. The interlocutors hold that the constitution which they propose should be a combination of the three forms of government----monarchy, aristocracy, democracy. Each of these is to contribute what is genuine and sincere to the formation of the ideal constitution. There seems no reason to identify this with the treatise of Περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως of Peter Patricius (sixth century), Byzantine historian. There is no clue to the author. Master of requests, a sort of lord-in-waiting; also a Church dignitary, an intermediary between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities.

Codices 1-165 — 38. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on Genesis]

Read the work of Theodore of Antioch entitled A Commentary on Genesis (the history of the Creation), the first book of which contains seven volumes. The style is neither brilliant nor very clear. The author avoids the use of allegory as much as possible, being only concerned with the interpretation of history. He frequently repeats himself, and produces a disagreeable impression upon the reader. Although he lived before Nestorius, he vomits up his doctrines by anticipation. This is that Theodore of Mopsuestia, from whom on several occasions John Philoponus (as the latter himself says) demanded a serious explanation of his method of interpretation in his own work on the Creation. See Cod. 4.

Codices 1-165 — 39. [Eusebius, Against Hierocles]

Read the brief refutation of the discourse of Hierocles in support of Apollonius of Tyana by Eusebius Pamphili. Hierocles of Caria, Roman proconsul, a violent anti-Christian, lived in the time of Diocletian (emperor 284-305). The work referred to is Truth-loving Words to the Christians, in which Apollonius of Tyana is placed above Christ. Of Tyana in Cappadocia (c. 4 B.C.----A.D. 97), magician and wonderworker.

Codices 1-165 — 40. [Philostorgius, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the so-called Ecclesiastical History by Philostorgius the Arian, the spirit of which is different from that of nearly all other ecclesiastical historians. He extols all Arians, but abuses and insults all the orthodox, so that his work is not so much a history as a panegyric of the heretics, and nothing but a barefaced attack upon the orthodox. His style is elegant, his diction often poetical, though not to such an extent as to be tedious or disagreeable. His figurative use of words is very expressive and makes the work both pleasant and agreeable to read; sometimes, however, these figures are overbold and far-fetched, and create an impression of being frigid and ill-timed. The language is variously embellished even to excess, so that the reader imperceptibly finds himself involved in a disagreeable obscurity. In many instances the author introduces appropriate moral reflections of his own. He starts from the devotion of Arius to the heresy and its first beginnings, and ends with the recall of the impious Aetius.This Aetius was removed from his office by his brother heretics, since he outdid them in wickedness, as Philostorgius himself unwillingly confesses. He was recalled and welcomed by the impious Julian. The history, in one book and six volumes, goes down to this period. The author is a liar and the narrative often fictitious. He chiefly extols Aetius and Eunomius for their learning, as having alone cleansed the doctrines of faith overlaid by time, therein showing himself a monstrous liar. He also praises Eusebius of Nicomedia(whom he calls the Great), Theophilus the Indian, and several others, for their lives and wonderful works. He severely attacks Acacius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, for his extreme severity and invincible craftiness, in which, he declares, Acacius surpassed all his fellow-heretics, however filled they were with hatred of one another, as well as those who held different religious opinions.

This was the extent of our reading. Soon afterwards six other books were found in another volume, so that the whole appears to have filled twelve books. The initial

letters of each book are so arranged that they form the name of the author. The work goes down to the time of Theodosius the Younger, when, after the death of Honorius, Theodosius handed over the throne of the West to his cousin Valentinian the Younger, the son of Constantius and Placidia. Notwithstanding his rage against the orthodox, Philostorgius does not venture to attack Gregory the Theologian, but unwillingly accepts his doctrines. His attempt to slander Basil the Great only had the effect of increasing his reputation. He was forced to admit the vigour and beauty of his sermons from actual knowledge, although he timidly calls Basil overbold and inexperienced in controversy, because he ventured to attack the writings of Eunomius.

Of Borissus in Cappadocia, born c. 368, died after 425. The history covered the period from 300 to 425. He supported the extreme Arianism of Eunomius. A considerable number of extracts (also from Photius) have been published as a separate work. Aetius of Antioch, founder of an extreme Arian sect, died at Constantinople (367). He was exiled by Constantius, but recalled by Julian the Apostate. Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 342), supporter of Arianism and a bitter opponent of Athanasius. Bishop of the Church of Aethiopia (358). He was born in the island of Diu (India), but in early youth was taken as a hostage to Constantinople, where he became a Christian (Arian). Surnamed the One-Eyed, succeeded Eusebius (whose pupil and biographer he was) as bishop of Caesarea in 340 and died in 365. Gregory of Nazianzus (329-389), bishop of Constantinople.

Codices 1-165 — 41. [John of Aegae, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the Ecclesiastical History by a certain John. It begins with the reign of Theodosius the Younger, the heresy of Nestorius and his deposition, and goes down to the time of Zeno and the deposition of Peter the heretic, who had usurped the see of Antioch. The style is clear but florid. The author describes in detail the third council held at Ephesus, and also another council held in the same place, the "Robber" council, which he deifies together with its president Dioscorus and his companions. He also gives a slanderous account of the council of Chalcedon. This justifies the conclusion that the author is John, presbyter of Aegae, a heretic who wrote a special attack on the council of Chalcedon. The history, according to his statement, is in ten books. I have only read five, containing (as already stated) a record of events from the heresy of Nestorius to the deposition of Peter the heretic.

Presbyter of Aegae in Cilicia, flourished in the latter half of the fifth century. In Cod. LV. Photius calls him a Nestorian, but it is suggested that this is a mistake for Eutychian. Surnamed the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch (471-488).

Codices 1-165 — 42. [Basil the Cicilian, Ecclesiastical History]

Read the Ecclesiastical History of Basil the Cilician. It begins with the death of Simplicius, bishop of Rome, who wrote to Acacius of Constantinople to have no dealings with Peter surnamed Mongus, who was then corrupting Alexandria by anathematizing, publicly and in church, the holy council of Chalcedon. It was through him that Acacius was deprived of his see; for although Acacius at first was justly incensed against him, he subsequently showed no aversion to his doctrines and thereby incurred the suspicion of being a heretic. This matter came up again during the reign of Zeno. The history begins at this time and goes down to the death of Anastasius, after he had reigned twenty-seven years and three months, Justin the Thracian being proclaimed his successor.The present book finishes about this time, and embraces the period from Zeno to the death of Anastasius and the proclamation of Justin as emperor. The author also states that two other books were written by him, the first and the third; the first beginning with the reign of Marcian and ending with that of Zeno, where the second begins, while the third continues the narrative of the second, beginning with the reign of Justin.

The author’s style is rather slovenly and uneven. He also introduces a large amount of episcopal correspondence, the object of which, he says, is to prove what he writes; these vastly increase the bulk of the book and contain but little history, and that buried under a mass of verbiage. The clearness of the narrative is destroyed by the number of parentheses. (c. 500). Presbyter of Antioch, afterwards bishop of Irenopolis in Cilicia (see Cod. CV1I.). 468-483. Patriarch of Constantinople (471-489). The ”Stammerer,” Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (482). The work therefore covers the period from 450-527.

Codices 1-165 — 43. [John Philoponus, On the Hexaemeron]

Read the treatise of John Philoponus on the Hexaemeron.In this his style is pure and clear and better than usual. He agrees in the main with Basil the Great, but everywhere opposes Theodore of Mopsuestia, who, taking up the same subject, wrote his Interpretation of Genesis, which Philoponus in turn endeavours to refute. The Six Days’ Work of the Creation.

Codices 1-165 — 44. [Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana]

Read the eight books of the Life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus of Tyre. His style is clear, agreeable, concise, and full of charm, due to his fondness both for archaisms and for novel constructions. He tells us that Apollonius visited the Indians, whom he calls Brahmins, from whom he learnt much of their divine wisdom. He also visited the wise men of Aethiopia, whom he calls Gymni, because they pass all their life naked and never wear clothes even in the most trying weather. But he declares that the wise men of India are far superior to those of Aethiopia, since they are older in point of time and their intellect is purer and keener, owing to their living nearer to the rays of the sun. He does not, however, assert that Apollonius worked any wonders such as legend ascribes to him; he merely extols him as leading a philosophic and temperate life, in which he exhibits the teaching of Pythagoras, both in manners and doctrine. Various accounts are given of his death, the circumstances of which are obscure, as he himself desired; for during his lifetime he was in the habit of saying that the wise man should keep his life a secret from others, or, if he could not, should at least keep his death a secret. The place of his burial is unknown.

Philostratus states that Apollonius had a great contempt for riches; he gave up all he possessed to his brother and others, and could never be persuaded to accept money from those in authority, although they pressed it upon him as deserving it. He asserts that he long foresaw the famine at Ephesus and stopped it after it broke out. He once saw a certain lion, which he declared to be the soul of Amasis, king of the Egyptians, which had entered the body of the animal as a punishment for the crimes Amasis had committed during his lifetime. He also exposed an Empusa, which, under the guise of a courtesan, pretended to be enamoured of Menippus.He recalled to life a Roman girl who had apparently just died, and loosed his limbs from his fetters, while bound in prison. Before Domitian he defended himself and

extolled Nerva (Domitian's successor); after which he vanished from the court, and joined Demetrius and Damis as had been arranged, not after a long time, but in a few moments, though they were several days' journey apart. Such are the fictions of Philostratus concerning Apollonius. He denies, however, that he was a wonder-worker, if he performed some of the wonders that are commonly attributed to him, but asserts that they were the result of his philosophy and the purity of his life. On the contrary, he was the enemy of magicians and sorcerers and certainly no devotee of magic.

All that he says about the Indians is a tissue of absurd and incredible statements. He asserts that they have certain jars full of rains and winds, with which in time of drought they are able to water the country, and again to deprive it of moisture, after the rain has fallen, since in these casks they have the means of controlling the alternate supply of wind and rain. He tells similar stories, equally foolish and preposterous, and these eight books are so much study and labour lost. There were three sophists of this name belonging to a Lemnian family : (1) who lived in the second century; (2) son of (1), who lived first at Athens, then at Rome and in the time of Philip the Arab (244-249); (3) nephew of (1), who lived in the time of Caracalla and Elagabalus. The Life of Apollonius is by (2), Flavius Philostratus, who wrote it at the desire of the empress Julia Domna, wife of Septlmius Severus (died 217). The surname Tyrius is probably due to a confusion of Τύριος with Στειριεύς (of the Athenian deme Stiria), or Photius has wrongly identified him with the lexicographer Philostratus of Tyre (Cod. CL.). The naked ones, the Gymnosophists.

The Epicurean maxim, Λάθε βιώσασ, εἰ δὲ μή, Λάθε ἀποθανών. Or, "those possessed of large means." 570-526 B.C. A sort of hobgoblin or ghoul, supposed to devour human beings. Of Lycia. Perhaps the Cynic who lived in Lucian's time. Cynic philosopher of Sunium, who taught at Rome under the emperors Gaius, Nero, and Vespasian. He is said to have met Apollonius in Athens, but considering that his philosophical views were opposed to those of Apollonius, the account of the intimacy is probably untrue. Demetrius had to leave Rome because of the freedom with which he attacked the emperor and the authorities. Of Nineveh, pupil and companion of Apollonius, the reputed author of the life which formed the basis of Philostratus's romance. He is said to have handed over the MS. to the empress Julia Domna, who ordered Philostratus to edit it.

Codices 1-165 — 45. [Andronicianus, Against the Eunomians]

Read two pamphlets by Andronicianus Against the Eunomians. In the preface he promises much that he does not perform, at any rate in the second book. He shows himself a devoted student of philosophy in character, sentiment, and style. By religion he is a Christian. Nothing is known of him.

Codices 1-165 — 46. ['Theodoret', Against Heresies]

Read twenty-seven books by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, against various heretical propositions. The first book is directed against those who assert that the God-Word was one nature and that it took its beginning from the seed of David, and also against those who attribute passions to the Godhead. In the second, he supports his contentions more by arguments from Scripture. The third deals with the same subject. The fourth contains the teachings of the holy Fathers concerning the glorious Dispensation (Incarnation) of our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God. The fifth contains a collection of the opinions of the heretics, which are compared with the opinion of those who do not admit two natures in Christ and shown to be nearly akin. The sixth distinctly states that there is one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. The seventh is in the form of a letter completing the first book. The eighth is written against those who judge the truth only by the opinion of the multitude. The ninth is against those who assert that we should neither seek arguments nor quote from the Scriptures, but that we must be satisfied with our faith. The tenth is against those who malevolently bring forward the argument that "the Word was made flesh. The eleventh is against those who forbid us to assume two natures in the Incarnation. The twelfth is against those who assert that he who says the Word is one thing and the flesh another, assumes there are two Sons.

The thirteenth is against those who say that to regard Christ as a man is to put one's hopes in man. The fourteenth is against those who say, "He suffered without suffering. The fifteenth is against those who say, "He suffered as he willed. The sixteenth is against those who say that we ought to accept the words, without regard to what is signified by them, which is beyond all men's understanding. The seventeenth is against those who say, "The Word suffered in the flesh. The eighteenth is against those who ask what punishment the Jews would have suffered, if they had not crucified God. The nineteenth is against those who declare that he who does not believe that God was crucified is a Jew. The twentieth is against those who assert that the angels who ate with Abraham did not entirely put on the nature of flesh. The twenty-first is against those who depreciate each of the miracles,

by denying the flesh. The twenty-second is against those who injure our race, by denying that the Saviour began with our nature. The twenty-third is against those who bid us simply believe what is said, without considering what is seemly or what is unseemly. The twenty-fourth is against those who do away with the difference of the two natures, after the Passion and the Ascension. The twenty-fifth is a summary of all that has already been stated in detail. The twenty-sixth deals with the subsequently manifested composition or consubstantiation; the twenty-seventh with the example from the ordinary man (applied to Christ).

The subject alone in each case is sufficient to indicate which of the above confirm the orthodox faith, and which are at variance with it.

Read in the same volume three larger works than those mentioned, entitled Eranistes (the Beggar) or Polymorphos (multiform). The first teaches that the Word is unchangeable; the second, that the union is unmixed; the third, that the God-Word is impassible. In a fourth book, these statements are supported by argument. The three books were composed by him in the form of a dialogue, but the rest are in continuous prose. The style is clear, distinct, and pure; not wanting in charm, and the works abound in suitable reflections. Variously ascribed to Theodoret, Athanasius, and Eutherius, bishop of Tyana. Unless γραφικώτερον means simply "more picturesquely," "more vigorously." Οἰκονομία in the Greek. It is in the form of a dialogue between a representative of orthodoxy (Theodoret) and a representative of Monophysitism, compared to a beggar who gathers scraps of all kinds from earlier heretical writings.

Codices 1-165 — 47. [Josephus, Jewish War]

Read the work of Josephus the Jew on The Calamities of the Jews. The capture of Iotapata (at which Josephus himself was taken prisoner) and Gischala, and the desolation of other Jewish fortresses is described, and in the last book the destruction of Jerusalem and the fortress of Masada. The work is in seven books. The author has a pure style, and is apt at expressing his meaning with dignity, with distinctness and charm. In the speeches introduced he is persuasive and agreeable, even when the opportunity invites him to take opposite views; he is clever and prolific in the use of arguments on either side, and is extremely fond of aphorisms. He is also very skilful in introducing the emotional, in rousing the passions and calming them. He relates that many signs and portents preceded the taking of Jerusalem. A heifer that was being led to the sacrifice brought forth a lamb; a light shone in the temple and a voice was heard saying, ”Let us remove hence”; the gates of the temple, which twenty men could hardly open, opened of their own accord; in the evening troops appeared clad in armour. A man named Jesus, son of Ananias, for six years and three months incessantly repeated, like one inspired, the words ”Woe, woe to Jerusalem!” When he was whipped for it, he made no reply, but repeated the same words. He was present at the capture of the city, and while crying out ”Woe, woe, to the city!” he was hit by a stone from one of the enemy’s engines, and gave up the ghost.

Such were the signs that foretold the taking of the city; but it was internal sedition, together with the enemy, that overthrew it. Split up into the factions of Zelotae and Sicarii,they destroyed one another, and thus the body of the state was cruelly and mercilessly torn asunder by the common people. The city suffered so grievously from famine that the inhabitants were driven to all kinds of excesses; a woman even ate the flesh of her own son. Famine was succeeded by pestilence, a clear proof that it was the work of the divine wrath, in fulfilment of the Lord’s proclamation and threat that the city should be taken and utterly destroyed. The well-known historian (37-98), ”the Greek Livy.” The Wars was originally written in Hebrew, and then translated into Greek. His other extant works are : Jewish Antiquities, Auto-

biography, a polemical treatise Against Apion. In Galilee. A Judaean stronghold (mod. Sebbeh). The Zealots and Sicarii (assassins) constituted the fanatical anti-Roman Jewish war party, whose desire was to drive out the Romans and all who favoured them. They did not shrink from murder, and carried small daggers (sicae) to stab those whom they considered the enemies of their country.

Codices 1-165 — 48. [’Josephus’ (Probably Hippolytus), On the Universe]

Read the treatise of Josephus On the Universe, elsewhere called On the Cause of the Universe and On the Nature of the Universe. It consists of two little treatises, in which the author shows that Plato contradicts himself. He also refutes Alcinous,whose views on the soul, matter, and the Resurrection are false and absurd, and introduces his own opinions on the subject. He proves that the Jewish nation is far older than the Greek. He thinks that man is a compound of fire, earth, and water, and also of spirit, which he calls soul. Of the spirit he speaks as follows : Taking the chief part of this, he moulded it together with the body, and opened a passage for it through every joint and limb. The spirit, thus moulded together with the body and pervading it throughout, is formed in the likeness of the visible body, but its nature is colder, compared with the three other substances of which the body is compounded. These views are not in harmony with the Jewish ideas of human physiology, and are below the customary standard of his other writings. He also gives a summary account of the creation of the world. Of Christ the true God he speaks like ourselves, openly giving Him the name of God, and describing, in language to which no objection can be taken, His indescribable generation from the Father. This might, perhaps, cause people to doubt whether the treatise is really by Josephus, although in respect of style it does not differ from the rest of his writings.

I find a marginal note to the effect that the work is not by Josephus, but by one Gaius, a presbyter of Rome, also the author of The Labyrinth, and of a dialogue against Proclus, the champion of the Montanists. The latter, which had no ascription, is attributed by some to Josephus, by others to Justin Martyr, and The Labyrinth to Origen. But there is no doubt that the work is by Gaius, the author of The Labyrinth, who at the end of this treatise has left it on record that he was the author of The Nature of the Universe. But it is not quite clear to me, whether this

is the same or a different work. This Gaius is said to have been a presbyter of the Church at Rome, during the episcopate of Victor and Zephyrinus, and to have been ordained bishop of the gentiles. He wrote another special work against the heresy of Artemon, and also composed a weighty treatise against Proclus, the supporter of Montanus. In this he reckons only thirteen epistles of St. Paul, and does not include the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The author is most probably Hippolytus of Rome, born in the middle of the second century, died soon after 235. Platonic philosopher, flourished in the first or second century A.D. Lived at the beginning of the third century A.D. Others ascribe this also to Hippolytus. It is a question whether it is identical with The Little Labyrinth mentioned by Theodoret. The founder of the sect was Montanus of Phrygia (latter half of the second century). He was a priest of Cybele, subsequently converted to Christianity and a teacher at Rome. According to his followers, he was the Paraclete or Holy Spirit promised by Christ. Amongst other things they distinguished two classes of sins, those unto death and those not unto death; denied the validity of second marriages; did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, but in memory of Christ's death for mankind; despised the old prophets as possessed by evil spirits; and favoured a highly ascetic life. "All the ascetic, rigorous, and chiliastic elements of the Church combined in Montanism."

Second and third century, Adoptianist, Monarchian or anti-Trinitarian. His views were subsequently developed by Paul of Samosata (flourished 260-272). This work is probably identical with The Labyrinth.

Codices 1-165 — 49. [Cyril of Alexandria, Against Nestorius]

Read the treatise of Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, Against the Blasphemies of Nestorius, in five books. In these he preserves his characteristic style and curious phraseology. But he is clearer than in his letters to Hermeias and his work On Adoration in the Spirit. The language is ornate and elaborate, forced into agreement with its peculiar form, which resembles prose poetry that despises metre. Possibly the author of a treatise Ridicule of the Heathen Philosophers, but the time at which he lived is disputed,

Codices 1-165 — 50. [Nicias the monk, Against the Seven Chapters of Philoponus]

Read the treatise of Nicias the monk Against the Seven Chapters of Philoponus, which he mentioned in his work called the Arbitrator. The style is simple and concise, suitable for controversial writings, and free from redundancies. Also read his attack On the impious Severus and two books Against the Heathen. Flourished c. 600.

Codices 1-165 — 51. [Hesychius, On the Brazen Serpent]

Read the four books by Hesychius, presbyter of Constantinople, On the Brazen Serpent. The work is meant for show, and is a studied attempt to work upon the feelings. It contains speeches to the people put into the mouth of Moses, and fictitious addresses of the people in reply. There are also elaborate speeches of the Deity to Moses and the people, together with their replies, in the form of entreaty and excuse. A great part of the work, which comprises a bulky volume, is devoted to these speeches. The author himself, so far as one can judge from this treatise, is orthodox. Nothing is known of him. It is suggested that he may have been the Hesychius who accused Eunomius of heresy.

Codices 1-165 — 52. [Acts of the synod of Side against the Messalians]

Read the account of the synod held at Side against the sect of the Messalians, Euchites, or Adelphians.Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, presided, supported by twenty-five other bishops. Read in the same a letter of the synod to Flavian, bishop of Antioch, giving him an account of the proceedings. In consequence of this letter, Flavian summoned another synod against these same heretics, assisted by three other bishops, Bizus of Seleucia, Maruthas, bishop of the Sufareni,and Samus. There were also present priests and deacons to the number of thirty. The synod refused to accept Adelphius's profession of repentance or to admit him when he offered to renounce his heresy; for it was shown that neither his renunciation nor repentance was sincere. The founders of this sect were Adelphius, who was neither a monk nor a priest, but one of the laity, Sabas, surnamed Apokopos (castrated), who assumed the garb of a monk, another Sabas, Eustathius of Edessa, Dadoes, and Simeon, the tares of the evil one, and others who grew up together with them. Adelphius and his followers were condemned, although they sought opportunity for repentance, which was refused them, since they were detected communicating in writing, as if they shared their views, with persons whom they had anathematized as Messalians.

Flavian wrote a letter to the Osroenians, informing them of what had been done and giving an account of the punishment and excommunication of the heretics. The bishops who received it wrote back to Flavian, thanking him and expressing their approval. Litoius, bishop of Armenia, also wrote inquiring about the Messalians, and a copy of the decree and sentence of the council was sent to him. The great Flavian also wrote to another Armenian bishop on the same subject; in this second letter he accuses the bishop of sympathy with the Messalians. Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, also wrote to the bishops of Pamphylia, bidding them everywhere

expel the Messalians as accursed and an abomination. He wrote in similar terms to Amphilochius, bishop of Side.

Sisinnius of Constantinople and Theodotus of Antioch sent a joint letter to Verinianus, Amphilochius, and the rest of the bishops in Pamphylia, addressed "To our colleagues, beloved of God, Verinianus, Amphilochius, and the rest of the bishops in Pamphylia : Sisinnius, Theodotus, and all the holy synod which by the grace of God was assembled in the mighty city of Constantinople to consecrate the most holy Sisinnius, beloved of God, and our emperor Theodosius, beloved of Christ, greet you in the Lord." In this letter from the council Neon the bishop declared that if any one, after the excommunication of the Messalians, should at any time be detected saying or doing anything which rendered him suspect of favouring this heresy, he should not be allowed to retain his position, not if he offered to pay ten thousand times the penalty imposed upon those who repent; and that any one who supported him, a bishop or any one else, should be liable to the same penalty. John of Antioch also wrote a letter to Nestorius about the Messalians. The holy oecumenical council, the third, at Ephesus, also issued a decree, exposing the blasphemies and heresies of the Messalian book Asceticus and anathematizing it. Archelaus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, also wrote twenty-four anathematisms against these articles. Heraclidas, bishop of Nyssa, also wrote two letters against them, in the second of which evidence is given of the antiquity of the worship of the holy images.

Some time afterwards, Gerontius, presbyter and superior of the monks at Glitis, wrote to Alypius, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, bringing various charges against Lampetius, a profane impostor, who was the first of the Messalian sect who succeeded in worming his way into the dignity of the priesthood. Alypius, on receipt of the letter, commanded Hormisdas, bishop of Comana, to investigate the charges against Lampetius. The heads of the indictment were : that he had been guilty of unlawful intercourse with women; that he had used obscene language in reference to such matters; that he sneered and scoffed at those who chanted the hours as being still under the law. He and the Messalians were accused of many other impious words and deeds; and we ourselves, while endeavouring, as far as was in our power, to lead them from the error which was lately beginning to spring up again, have seen much festering passion and vice consuming their souls. But this Lampetius, Gerontius the presbyter being his accuser and bishop Hormisdas his judge, convicted partly on the evidence of witnesses and partly out of his own mouth, was unanimously degraded from the priesthood. Alypius of Caesarea who had been misled and had promoted the miscreant to the dignity of presbyter joined in the vote. This thrice sinful Lampetius composed a book called the Testament, in which some of his impious doctrines are inserted; Severus, who usurped the see of Antioch, while still only a presbyter, refuted it. A certain Alpheus, bishop of Rhinocorura, defended Lampetius as innocent in word and deed of the charges brought against him, and although, so far as one knows, he introduces no blas-

phemies in his published work, he was deprived of his office as a supporter of Lampetius. Another Alpheus, who had been ordained presbyter by Timotheus of Alexandria, was removed from office for the same heresy, as we learn from a report made by Ptolemy, also bishop of Rhinocorura, to the same Timotheus.

In Pamphylia (383). Both names mean ”those who pray,” the first being Syriac, the second Greek. They believed that perpetual prayer and asceticism would procure inspiration from the Holy Spirit. From Adelphius, one of the first leaders of the sect. In Mesopotamia. Of Melitene in Lesser Armenia. Bishop of Perga. 431. A Messalian leader, almost as important as Adelphius. His followers were called Lampetians. On the borders of Egypt and Palestine.

Codices 1-165 — 53. [Acts of the synod of Carthage, 412 or 411, against the Pelagians]

Read an account of the proceedings of the synod held at Carthage in the great church, while Faustus Honorius was emperor of the West, against Pelagius and Coelestius.The president was Aurelius, bishop of Carthage and Dotianus of Telepte, chief prelate of the province of Byzacena, supported by distinguished Church dignitaries from different provinces, to the number of 224. This synod excommunicated those who asserted that Adam was created mortal, and that he did not suffer death as a punishment for his sin; also those who declared that infants newly born had no need of baptism, because they were not liable to original sin from Adam; also those who affirmed that there was a place midway between hell and paradise, to which infants dying unbaptized were removed, there to live in a state of blessedness. Six other similar articles, which hold the first place in the heresies of Pelagius and Coelestius, were also anathematized.

The emperors Theodosius and Honorius also wrote to bishop Aurelius condemning these same heretics. After this Constantius, the husband of Placidia and the father of Valen-tinian the Younger, sent a decree to Volusianus, praefect of the city, ordering that Coelestius should be banished. [This Volusianus, uncle of Saint Helena (Melania), at the time was a heathen, but when threatened with death he became converted to the true faith and was baptized by Proclus of Constantinople, where he had been sent on an embassy. Perhaps at the same time he met that holy woman, who had come from Jerusalem to the queen-city.] Leo of Rome also wrote in regard to the converted Pelagians that, if they desired to be received into the Church again, they should anathematize their heresy in writing. In the letter of Coelestine, bishop of Rome, to Nestorius the same heretics are condemned. Coelestine also wrote to the bishops of Gaul in defence of the teaching of St. Augustine and against those who were emboldened to speak rashly by the licence allowed to the heresy. Jerome the priest also wrote to Ctesiphon in refutation of those who held the idea

of impassibility (in other words, against Pelagius). This Pelagius was a monk and Coelestius was his pupil.

412 or 411. If Faustus be taken with Honorius, it will be an epithet corresponding to Felix; others render ”in the great church of Faustus.” c. 370-440. According to some, he was; a Hibernian; according to others, a Welsh monk named Morgan (”sea-born” = Pelagius). He resided in Rome, Africa, and Palestine, where he is said to have died. The Pelagians rejected the doctrine of original sin, but believed in the Trinity and the personality of Christ. Coelestius, a native of Ireland, pupil of Pelagius, younger and more vigorous than his master. It is to him that the influence of Pelagianism was chiefly due. Some authorities make him an Italian. There were two holy women of this name : the elder (350-410), and the younger (383-439). The latter is here referred to. She was born at Rome, but early in life retired to Hippo in Africa, where she became acquainted with St. Augustine, and afterwards to Jerusalem, where she embraced the monastic life and died. Patriarch of Constantinople (434-447).

Bekker states that this paragraph is an addition by a later hand. Leo the ”Great,” pope 440-461. 422-432. St. Jerome. Supposed to have been a Roman, to whom Jerome wrote from Palestine, in reply to his request for advice concerning Pelagianism.

Codices 1-165 — 54. [A Copy of the Proceedings taken against the Doctrines of Nestorius by the Bishops of the West]

Read a work attacking the heresy of Pelagius and Coelestius, entitled A Copy of the Proceedings taken against the Doctrines of Nestorius by the Bishops of the West. It states that the Nestorian and Coelestian heresies were identical without doubt, quoting as its authority a letter of Cyril of Alexandria to the emperor Theodosius. The Coelestians, speaking of the body or the members of Christ, that is, the Church, audaciously deny that it is God (that is, the Holy Spirit) who distributes to each man severally, as He wills, faith and all that is necessary to life, piety, and salvation; according to them, the nature of man as constituted----which by sin and transgression fell from blessedness and was separated from God and handed over to death----both invites and repels the Holy Spirit in accordance with free will. The Nestorians hold and venture to assert the same opinion concerning the head of the body, Christ. Since Christ shares our nature and God wishes all men alike to be saved, they say that every one of his own free will can amend his error and make himself worthy of God; wherefore He who was born of Mary was not Himself the Word, but, by reason of the nobility of His natural will, He had the Word accompanying, sharing the condition of sonship by nobleness alone and similarity of name.

This Pelagian or Coelestian heresy flourished not only in the East, but also spread over the West. At Carthage in Africa it was detected and refuted by Aurelius and Augustine, and publicly condemned at various synods. Those who held these opinions were expelled from the Church as heretics, when Theophilus was bishop of Alexandria and Innocent bishop of Rome, by Roman, African, and other Western bishops. At the synod held in Palestine, however, at which fourteen bishops attended, Pelagius was acquitted. Some of the charges brought against him he ut-

terly denied as foolish and anathematized, while he admitted having made certain other statements, not however in the sense attributed to them by his accusers, but rather in conformity with the doctrines of the Catholic Church. His accusers were Neporus and Lazarus,two bishops of Gaul, who were not present at the inquiry, having obtained permission to absent themselves in consequence of the illness of one of them. So Augustine states in his letters to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage.

After the death of the holy Augustine certain of the clergy began to reassert these impious doctrines. They began to speak evil of Augustine and falsely accused him of denying free will; but bishop Coelestine checked the renewal of this slander, writing to the bishops of the country in defence of that godlike man and against those who had set this heresy on foot again. As time went on, and these heretics, after having abjured their own doctrines, were received again into the Church, the scandal was again revived by them, and had to be put down before it went further by bishop Septimus, who wrote to Leo, pope at that time and a fervent opponent of these impious doctrines. Not long afterwards, when the shameless heresy again sprang up from an evil root, certain persons at Rome openly expressed themselves in favour of it. But Prosper, truly a man of God, in his pamphlets against them, soon crushed them, while Leo still occupied the papal throne. The heresy was also condemned at the holy synod of Ephesus. John, patriarch of Alexandria, in his Apologia to Gelasius, bishop of Rome, anathematized not only the Pelagian heresy, but Pelagius and Coelestius themselves, together with Julian, who was known to have succeeded them in the leadership of this sect.

Archbishop of Alexandria (412-444). 385-412. 402-417. At Diospolis, the ancient Lydda (415). Or rather Heros, bishop of Aries. Bishop of Aix. Bishop of Altinum (mod. Altino) near Venice. Prosper of Aquitaine (403-463). He was the author of two or three valuable Chronicles and a number of theological works. 431. Afterwards bishop of Nola. 492-496. Bishop of Eclana, near Beneventum, a Pelagian leader (fifth century).

Codices 1-165 — 55. [John Philoponus, Against the Fourth Council]

Read the treatise of John Philoponus (or rather Mataeoponus) Against the Holy Fourth Oecumenical Council. The style is characteristic of him. He shamelessly attempts to prove that the council favoured the heresy of Nestorius, and declares that it acquiesced in his excommunication, because it imagined it was doing no harm to the man by ratifying his doctrine, which Nestorius himself, on whom the condemnation fell, fondly cherished and regarded as the most important thing of all; wherein he indulges in fabrications and outrageous statements, on a par with his mental capacity and the unsteadiness of his opinions. The audacious and idle assertions which he makes against the council, a comedy in four parts, are in no way deserving of credit or even sensible. In the same volume read a treatise by another John, a Nestorian, Against the same Holy Fourth Council. The author is John of Aegae, an impious person, but his diction has beauty and charm, and is brilliant and perspicuous.

451. If this is not somewhat ungrammatically for τὸν ἀνθρωπον, the sense may be general, ”to a man,” i.e. a person would not feel injured if the point on which he laid most stress were conceded. Cod. 41. But he is obviously a Eutychian, not a Nestorian, unless the mistake is in Cod. 41., some other John being really the author.

Codices 1-165 — 56. [Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Against Heresies]

Read the treatise of Theodoret of Cyrrhus Against Heresies, from the time of Simon down to those which sprang up in his own age. It is dedicated to a certain Sporacius, who was fond of hearing about such matters. It goes down to Nestorius and his heresy, on which he pours forth unmitigated censure, and even farther, to the heresy of Eutyches. In the last of the five books which the treatise contains, he gives a summary of divine and orthodox doctrine compared with idle heretical talk, showing that it is not to be confounded with the latter, but is pure and irreprehensible. The style is clear and free from redundancies. Magus (see Acts viii.). Count of the domestics (captain of the palace guards), consul 453.

Codices 1-165 — 57. [Appian, Roman History]

Read Appian's Roman History, in three parts and twenty-four books. The first treats of the seven kings, Romulus, Numa Pompilius, Ancus Hostilius, Ancus Marcius (grandson of Numa), Tarquinius (Priscus), Servius Tullius, Lucius Tarquinius, son of Tarquinius, of whose acts and deeds it contains an account. The first of these, the founder and oekist of the city, although his rule was rather patriarchal than tyrannical, was nevertheless assassinated, or, according to others, disappeared from view. The second, in no way inferior as a ruler to his predecessor, or perhaps even his superior, died at the age of ... The third was struck by lightning. The fourth succumbed to disease. The fifth was murdered by shepherds. The sixth was also murdered. The seventh was deposed and driven out of the city for his tyranny. After this, the monarchy was abolished, and its powers transferred to consuls. Such is the contents of the first book, which is entitled The Book of the Kings. The second book, entitled Italica, gives an account of the history of Italy with the exception of that part which is situated on the Ionian Sea. The following book, Samnitica, relates the wars of the Romans with the Samnites, a powerful nation and an enemy difficult to conquer whom it took the Romans eighty years to subdue, and the other nations who fought on their side. The fourth, Celtica, relates the wars of the Romans with the Celts (Gauls). The remaining books are similarly named.

The fifth contains the History of Sicily and the other Islands, the sixth gives an account of Iberian affairs, the seventh of the Hannibalic wars, the eighth of Libyan affairs (dealing with Carthage and Numidia), the ninth of Macedonian affairs, the tenth of Greek and Ionian affairs, the eleventh of Syrian and Parthian affairs, the twelfth of the Mithradatic war. Up tp this point the relations and wars of the Romans with foreign nations are set forth in this order. The books that follow describe the civil wars and disturbances amongst the Romans themselves. They are entitled the first and second books of the Civil Wars and so on down to the ninth, which is the twenty-first book of the whole. The twenty-second book is called Hekatontaetia

(the history of one hundred years), the twenty-third, Dacica, on Dacian affairs, the twenty-fourth, Arabica, on Arabian affairs.

Such are the divisions of the entire work. The account of the civil wars contains first the war between Marius and Sulla, then that between Pompey and Julius Caesar, after their rivalry took the form of violent hostilities, until fortune favoured Caesar and Pompey was defeated and put to flight. Next, it describes the proceedings of Antony and Octavius Caesar (also known as Augustus) against the murderers of Julius Caesar, at the time when many distinguished Romans were put to death without a trial. Lastly, the desperate conflict between Antony and Augustus, accompanied by terrible slaughter, in which victory declared for Augustus. Antony, deserted by his allies, was driven a fugitive to Egypt, where he died by his own hand. The last book of the Civil Wars describes how Egypt came into the power of the Romans, and how Augustus became the sole ruler of Rome.

The history begins with Aeneas, the son of Anchises, the son of Capys, who lived in the time of the Trojan war. After the capture of Troy Aeneas fled, and after much wandering landed on the coast of Italy at a place called Laurentum, where his camp is shown, and the coast is called after him Troja. Faunus, son of Mars, who was at the time ruler of the original Italian inhabitants, gave his daughter Lavinia in marriage to Aeneas and a piece of land 400 stades in circumference, on which Aeneas built a city and called it Lavinium after his wife Lavinia. Three years later, Faunus died, and Aeneas, who succeeded to the throne by right of kinship, gave the aborigines the name of Latins from his father-in-law Latinus Faunus. After another three years, Aeneas was killed in battle against the Rutulians of Tyrrhenia, to whose king Lavinia had formerly been betrothed. He was succeeded by Euryleon, surnamed Ascanius, the son of Aeneas by Creusa the daughter of Priam, who was his wife at Troy. According to others, however, the Ascanius who succeeded him was his son by Lavinia. Ascanius died four years after he had founded the city of Alba with a body of settlers from Lavinium, and Silvius became king. The son of this Silvius is said to have been Aeneas Silvius, and the son of Aeneas Latinus Silvius.

His descendants were Capys, Capetus, Tiberinus, and Agrippa, said to be the father of Romulus, who was killed by lightning, leaving a son Aventinus, who had a son named Procas. All these are said to have been surnamed Silvius. Procas had two children, the elder named Numitor, the younger. Amulius. When the elder succeeded to the throne on the death of his father, the younger got possession of it by force and crime, killed his brother’s son Egestus, and made his daughter Rhea a priestess, so that she might not have children. But Numitor’s mildness and gentleness saved him from the plot against his life. Silvia broke her vows and became pregnant, and was seized by Amulius for punishment, her two sons being given to some shepherds to be thrown into the river Tiber near at hand. The infants, Ro-

mulus and Romus, were descended from Aeneas on the mother's side; the name of their father was unknown.

As already stated, the history begins with a rapid account of Aeneas and his descendants; but from the time of Romulus, the oekist of the city, it gives full details of events to the reign of Augustus, and, here and there, as late as the time of Trajan. Appian was an Alexandrian by birth, and at first an advocate at Rome, being subsequently raised to the dignity of a procurator under the emperors. His style is dry and free from redundancies; as an historian, he is trustworthy to the best of his ability, and an excellent authority on military matters; the speeches which he introduces are admirably calculated to encourage soldiers when dispirited, to restrain them when too ardent, to express and faithfully represent the emotions and feelings. He flourished in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. Of Alexandria, lived at Rome during the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius (between 98-161). Of the twenty-four books of the Roman History, which Photius had before him, only eleven (besides the Preface) are completely preserved; the others are entirely lost, or only fragments. Usually known as Tullus Hostilius.

Usually known as Tarquinius Superbus. The most important were the three following:. 343-341; 326-304, in which the disaster of the Caudine Forks befell the Romans; 298-290, in which the Samnites suffered a decisive defeat at Sentinum (295). Attempts to identify these people have proved unsatisfactory. The name is variously derived from ab origine, the primeval inhabitants, children of the soil = Gk. αὐτόχθονες; from aberrare, the nomads; or from βορείγενοι, mountain-dwellers. By the god Mars. Remus. One MS. has an enlarged paragraph: "for, detesting their unknown father, they rather prided themselves on descent from Aeneas." The Greek word οἰκιστής (oekist) denotes the founder of a colony and head of a band of colonists. Probably of Egypt. Others render : "He was thought worthy of the management of the affairs of the emperors."

Codices 1-165 — 58. [Arrian, Parthica]

Read Arrian's Parthica (History of Parthia) in seventeen books. He has also written the best account of the campaigns of Alexander of Macedon. Another work of his is Bithynica (History of Bithynia), relating the affairs of his native country. He also wrote an Alanica (History of the Alani). In the Parthica he gives an account of the wars between Parthia and Rome during the reign of Trajan. He considers the Parthians to have been a Scythian race, which had long been under the yoke of Macedonia, and revolted, at the time of the Persian rebellion, for the following reason. Arsaces and Tiridates were two brothers, descendants of Arsaces, the son of Phriapetes. These two brothers, with five accomplices, slew Pherecles, who had been appointed satrap of Parthia by Antiochus Theos, to avenge an insult offered to one of them; they drove out the Macedonians, set up a government of their own, and became so powerful that they were a match for the Romans in war, and sometimes even were victorious over them. Arrian further relates that during the reign of Sesostris, king of Egypt, and landysus, king of Scythia, the Parthians removed from their own country, Scythia, to the land which they now inhabit. The emperor Trajan reduced them to submission but left them free under a treaty, and appointed a king over them.

This Arrian, called the "young Xenophon," a philosopher and one of the pupils of Epictetus, flourished during the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Antoninus. Owing to his remarkable learning he was entrusted with various offices of state, and was finally promoted to the consulship. He was also the author of other works: the Lectures of Epictetus his master, with eight books of which we are acquainted, and the Conversations of Epictetus in twelve books. His style is dry, and he is a genuine imitator of Xenophon. It is said that he was also the author of other works, but they have not come into my hands. Certainly he does not lack rhetorical skill and power. Flavius Arrianus, flourished during the latter half of the second century A.D., and died before 180. He was born at Nicomedia in Bithynia, studied philosophy under Epictetus and distinguished himself as a soldier. He was appointed governor of Cappadocia in 136, and consul in 146. He spent the rest

of his life in his native city, where he held the lifelong office of priest of Demeter and Kore. In addition to the works here mentioned, he was the author of: A Voyage round the Euxine, a treatise on Tactics, the Order of Battle against the Alani (defeated by him while governor of Cappadocia), on the Chase, and an account of India, perhaps a continuation of the Anabasis (the account of Alexander's campaigns), so named after the Anabasis of his model Xenophon. Of which the Order of Battle against the Alani, referred to above, is a section. Rebellantibus in the Latin versions of Schott and Muller (Frag. Hist. Gr. iii. 586). But can καταστραφέντων mean this? The more natural rendering; would seem to be: "which had long been under the yoke of Macedonia, the Persians having been subdued at the same time," i.e. by the Seleucids. Antiochus II (king 261-246 B.C.).

Of Hierapolis in Phrygia (c. A.D. 60-140), Stoic philosopher.

Codices 1-165 — 59. [Acts of the Synod of the Oak]

Read the proceedings of the synod that was unlawfully summoned against St. John Chrysostom. The presidents were Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, Acacius of Beroea, Antiochus of Ptolemais, Severian of Gabala, and Cyrinus of Chalcedon, who were bitterly hostile to Chrysostom, and constituted themselves judges, accusers, and witnesses. There were thirteen sessions: twelve against Chrysostom, the thirteenth against Heraclides, whom Chrysostom had ordained bishop of Ephesus.

Owing to the pressure of other business, however, the deposition of Heraclides could not be ratified. His accuser was Macarius, bishop of Magnesia. The open enemy and chief accuser of Chrysostom was his deacon John. He first charged Chrysostom with having wronged him by ejecting him for having beaten his own servant Eulalius; the second charge was that a certain monk named John had been flogged by order of Chrysostom, dragged along, and put in chains like those possessed; the third, that he had sold much valuable Church property; the fourth, that he had sold the marble which Nectarius had set aside for decorating the church of St. Anastasia; the fifth, that he had reviled the clergy as dishonourable, corrupt, useless in themselves, and worthless; the sixth, that he had called St. Epiphanius a fool and a demon; the seventh, that he had intrigued against Severian, and set the decani against him; the eighth, that he had written a book slandering the clergy; the ninth, that, having called all the clergy together, he had summoned three deacons, Acacius, Edaphius, and John, on a charge of having stolen his hood,and had asked whether they had taken it for any other purpose; the tenth, that he had consecrated Antonius as bishop, although he had been convicted of robbing graves; the eleventh, that he had denounced count John at a seditious meeting of the troops; the twelfth, that he did not pray either when walking to the church or entering it;

the thirteenth, that he ordained deacons and priests without standing by the altar; the fourteenth, that he consecrated four bishops at once; the fifteenth, that he received visits from women by themselves, after he had sent every one else out of the

room; the sixteenth, that he had sold by the agency of Theodulus the inheritance left by Thecla; the seventeenth, that no one knew how the revenues of the Church were spent; the eighteenth, that he had ordained Serapion priest at a time when he was under accusation; the nineteenth, that he paid no heed to those who belonged to the communion of the world, who had been imprisoned by his orders, and when they died in prison did not even condescend to make arrangements for the interment of their bodies; the twentieth, that he had insulted the most holy Acacius, and refused to grant him an interview; the twenty-first, that he had handed over the presbyter Porphyry to Eutropius to be banished; the twenty-second, that he had also handed over the presbyter Venerius and grievously insulted him; the twenty-third, that a bath was heated for him alone, and that after he had bathed, Serapion emptied the bath, so that no one else might use it; the twenty-fourth, that he had ordained many without witnesses; the twenty-fifth, that he ate gluttonously alone, living like a Cyclops; the twenty-sixth, that he himself was accuser, witness, and judge, as was evident from the case of Martyrius the proto-deacon, and Proaeresius, bishop of Lycia;

the twenty-seventh, that he struck Memnon with his fist in the church of the Apostles, and while he bled at the mouth celebrated the communion, the twenty-eighth, that he dressed and undressed on his throne, and ate a lozenge; the twenty-ninth, that he bribed the bishops who were consecrated by him to oppress the clergy.

Such were the charges against this holy man. He was four times summoned, but refused to appear. He declared that, if the synod would remove his open enemies from the list of judges, he was ready to appear and defend himself against any charges brought against him; if they refused to do so, no matter how many times they summoned him, it would be of no avail. The first and second counts were then investigated, after which the synod proceeded to deal with the case of the bishops Heraclides and Palladius of Helenopolis. The monk John, mentioned by the deacon John in the second charge against Chrysostom, presented a memorial accusing Heraclides of being a follower of Origen, and of having been arrested at Caesarea in Palestine for the theft of the clothes of Aquilinus the deacon. Notwithstanding this, he declared, Chrysostom had consecrated him bishop of Epliesus. He further accused Chrysostom himself, whom he blamed for all that he had suffered at the hands of Serapion and Chrysostom owing to the Origenists. After this the ninth and twenty-seventh charges were investigated.

Then bishop Isaac again charged Heraclides with being a follower of Origen, with whom the most holy Epiphanius would hold no communion either at prayers or meals. He also presented a memorial containing the following charges against Chrysostom : (1) That the monk John, already mentioned, had been flogged and put in chains through the Origenists; (2) that Epiphanius refused to hold communion with him on account of his connexion with the Origenists Ammonius, Euthymius,

Eusebius, Heraclides, and Palladius; (3) that he neglected the duties of hospitality and always ate alone; (4) that in church he used such language as ”the table is full of furies”; (5) that he loudly exclaimed, ”I am in love, I am mad”; (6) that he ought to explain what ”furies” he referred to, and what he meant by ”I am in love, I am mad,” expressions unknown to the Church; (7) that he licensed people to sin, since he taught, ”If thou sin again, repent again,” and, ”As often as thou sinnest, come to me and I will heal thee”; (8) that he uttered blasphemy while in the Church, asserting that the prayer of Christ was not heard, since He did not pray in a proper manner; (9) that he stirred up the people to reject the authority of the synod; (10) that he had welcomed a number of heathens who had oppressed the Christians, kept them in the church, and afforded them protection; (11) that he had encroached upon the provinces of others, and consecrated bishops there;

(12) that he had insulted the bishops, and ordered the bishops and . . . to be ejected from his house; (13) that he had subjected the clergy to unheard-of insults; (14) that he had violently appropriated sums of money left to others; (15) that he performed ordinations without a meeting of the clergy and contrary to their wish; (16) that he had received the Origenists, but allowed those who were in communion with the Church and had come to him with letters of recommendation to be cast into prison without obtaining their release, and even if they died there, took no further notice of them; (17) that he had consecrated as bishops foreign slaves not yet emancipated and, in some cases, under accusation; (18) that he himself (Isaac) had often been ill-treated by him.

Of these charges the first, having been already discussed, did not seem to require further examination, but the second and seventh, and then the third of the charges brought by deacon John, were investigated. In this last the archpresbyter Arsacius, the successor of Chrysostom, and the presbyters Atticus and Elpidius somehow or other came forward as witnesses against that holy man. They and the presbyter Acacius also gave witness against him on the fourth charge. After these had been investigated, the above-mentioned presbyters, with Eudaemon and Onesimus, demanded that the synod should hasten its decision. Accordingly, Paul, bishop of Heraclea, called upon all to give their vote. The members present, forty-five in all, then recorded their opinion, beginning with bishop Gymnasius and ending with Theophilus of Alexandria. It was unanimously decided that Chrysostom should be deprived of his episcopate. A letter on his deposition was sent on the part of the synod to the clergy of Constantinople, and a report was made to the emperors. Gerontius, Faustinus, and Eugnomonius also presented three petitions, complaining that they had been unjustly deprived of their episcopates by Chrysostom. The emperors in reply sent an imperial rescript to the synod. These were the proceedings of the twelfth session; the thirteenth, as has been stated, was occupied with the case of Heraclides, bishop of Ephesus.

The synod (403) ”at the Oak,” an estate near Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosporus to Constantinople, belonging to the imperial prefect Rufinus. See Hefele, Conziliengeschichte (Eng. tr.). Αὐτοπαραχρήτους. Another reading is αὐτοπαρακλήτους, ”self-invited.” See CXXII. Monastic officials, who had each ten monks under their control. The name was also given to the Copiatae or Fossarii (grave-diggers, undertakers), who had to bury the poor for nothing. Μαφόριον, a covering for the head, cowl, hood, especially for females. As used by monks, it may possibly be identical with the scapular. Another reading is ὠμοφόριον shoulder-cape (the Latin pallium). Chrysostom advised the communicants to eat a lozenge (or little cake) to avoid spitting out any of the sacrament. The word omitted is ἐκπιγγάτους, the meaning of which the translator has been unable to discover. Ducange explains it by Conciliabulum as specially used of the synod of the Oak.

Codices 1-165 — 60. [Herodotus, History]

Read the nine books of the History of Herodotus, in name and number identical with the nine Muses. He may be considered the best representative of the Ionic, as Thucydides of the Attic dialect. He is fond of old wives' tales and digressions, pervaded by charming sentiments, which, however, sometimes obscure the due appreciation of history and its correct and proper character. Truth does not allow her accuracy to be impaired by fables or excessive digressions from the subject. He begins his history with Cyrus, the first king of Persia, describing his birth, education, manhood, arid reign, and goes down to the reign of Xerxes----his expedition against the Athenians, and subsequent retreat. Xerxes was the third who succeeded Cyrus, the first being Cambyses, the second Darius. Smerdis the Magian is not reckoned among these, as a tyrant who craftily usurped the throne that did not belong to him. Darius was succeeded by his son Xerxes, with whom the history concludes, although it does not go as far as the end of his reign. Herodotus himself, according to the evidence of Diodorus Siculus, flourished during these times. It is said that, when he read his work, Thucydides, then very young, who was present with his father at the reading, burst into tears. Whereupon Herodotus exclaimed, "Oh, Olorus! how eager your son is to learn! "

Of Halicarnassus (c. 484-424 B.c), the so-called "father of history." His history, in nine books, each named after one of the Muses, gives an account of the Persian wars from the reign of Cyrus down to the battle of Mycale in the reign of Xerxes, a period of 126 years. It also contains digressions on the early history and manners and customs of different peoples. It is curious that Photius has not devoted more attention to him. See LXX. To an assembly of the Greeks at Olympia.

Codices 1-165 — 61. [Aeschines, Against Timarchus; On the False Embassy; and Against Ctesiphon]

Read the three orations of Aeschines, Against Timarchus (the first of his speeches), On the False Embassy, and Against Ctesiphon (the third and last). These three speeches and nine letters are said to be his only genuine works; for which reason the orations were sometimes called the three Graces, from their number and the charm of their style, and the letters the nine Muses. Another oration, the Delian law, was known under his name; but Caecilius denies its genuineness and ascribes it to another Aeschines, an Athenian and contemporary.

Aeschines was one of the ”ten” Attic orators. He was accused by Demosthenes of having misconducted an embassy,but was not convicted, since the demagogue Eubulus, in whose service Aeschines had formerly been, sided with him against Demosthenes, and caused the jury to rise before Demosthenes had finished his speech. Subsequently, when he attacked the proposal of Ctesiphon on behalf of Demosthenes as illegal,having himself settled the amount of the fine he was prepared to pay if he did not make good the charge, he failed to do so, and left his country. He first set out for Asia, intending to seek refuge with Alexander, the son of Philip, who was then on his Asiatic expedition, but when he heard of his death and that his successors were quarrelling amongst themselves, he sailed to Rhodes, where he remained for some time, giving young men lessons in rhetoric. When his admirers were at a loss to understand how so great an orator could have been defeated by Demosthenes, he replied, ”If you had heard that beast (meaning Demosthenes), you would not be surprised. He is said to have been the first to compose imaginary speeches and what are called ”declamations” in his leisure hours. In his old age he removed to Samos, where he died. He was of humble origin; his father was Atrometus; his mother Glaucothea, a priestess. He had two brothers,

Aphobetus and Philochares. At first, being possessed of a loud voice, he became a third-rate actor; then he was copying-clerk to the Council;

and soon afterwards came forward as a public speaker. He belonged to the philippizing party at Athens, and was consequently a political opponent of Demosthenes. He is said to have attended Plato's lectures, and to have been the pupil of Antalcidas, statements which are supported by the grandeur of his language and the dignity of his inventions.The sophist Dionysius, when he came across the oration Against Timarchus, after he had read the opening----"I have never yet publicly indicted a citizen nor harassed him when he was rendering an account of his office"----is reported to have said, "Would that you had indicted or harassed many, that so you might have left us more speeches of the kind," so delighted was he with this orator's style.

His language appears natural and extemporaneous, and does not create so much admiration for the writer's art as for his natural gifts. Abundant proofs of his cleverness and ability are to be found in his orations. In his choice of words he aims at simplicity and distinctness, and in the structure of his periods he is neither so feeble as Isocrates, nor so compressed and concise as Lysias, while in verve and energy he is not inferior to Demosthenes. He employs figures of thought and speech, not to create the impression of using artistic language, but in conformity with the necessities of the subject. Hence his style appears direct and straightforward, well adapted for speaking in public and for private conversation; for he does not make constant use of proofs and arguments, and is not over elaborate. Aeschines, the son of Lysanias, called Socraticus, is reckoned by Phrynichus and others one of the greatest orators, and his speeches as models of Attic style, only second to those of its best representatives.

Attic orator (c. 390-314 B.C.), rival of Demosthenes. He had a varied career as secretary, third-rate actor, orator, and statesman. At first an opponent of Philip of Macedon, he was induced by bribery to favour his cause. After his unsuccessful attack on Ctesiphon for proposing to bestow a crown on Demosthenes for his public services, he retired, first to Ephesus, then to Rhodes, and lastly to Samos, where he died. The three speeches have come down to us; the letters are lost. Caecilius Calactinus (from Kale Akte in Sicily), Greek rhetorician, flourished at Rome in the time of Augustus. He wrote a number of rhetorical, grammatical, and historical works, the chief being On the Character of the Ten (Attic) Orators, but none of them has come down to us. To Philip of Macedon. As secretary. Eubulus was a distinguished financier, and a bitter opponent of Demosthenes. The text is corrupt here. The sense required is given in the translation.

According to his own account, he was of good family. The only Antalcidas appears to be the author of the humiliating peace with Persia (387 B.C.), who is not famous as a rhetorician or teacher. Suidas says that Aeschines was a pupil of Alcidamas of Elaea

(in Aeolis in Asia Minor), a pupil of Gorgias. The word πλάσματα perhaps refers here to the ”moulded form” of style, not, as above, to imaginary, fictitious speeches. Of Miletus. He lived in the time of the emperor Hadrian. Pupil of Socrates. He spent some time at the court of Dionysius the Younger of Syracuse, and then settled in Athens and wrote speeches for the law-courts. He also composed a number of Socratic dialogues, of which seven were supposed to be genuine. The three that pass under his name and some letters are certainly not by him.

Codices 1-165 — 62. [Praxagoras of Athens, History of Constantine the Great]

Read the History of Constantine the Great by Praxagoras of Athens, in two books. In this he tells us that Constantine's father, Constantius, was governor of Britain and Spain; Maximin of Rome, the rest of Italy, and Sicily; the other Maximin of Greece, Asia Minor, and Thrace; Diocletian, as the eldest, governed Bithynia, Arabia, Lybia, and that part of Egypt that is watered by the Nile. Constantine was sent by his father to Diocletian in Nicomedia to be educated. At that time Maximin, governor of Asia Minor, who happened to be there, determined to lay a plot against the youth and set him to fight with a savage lion. But Constantine overcame and slew the beast, and having discovered the plot, took refuge with his father, after whose death he succeeded to the throne. Soon after his accession, he subdued the Celts and Germans, neighbouring and barbarous nations. Having learnt that Maxentius, who had made himself master of Rome after Maximin, treated his subjects with cruelty and brutality, he marched against him, to punish him for his conduct. He was speedily victorious and put his enemy to flight, who fell into the pit which he had prepared for others and met the death which he had designed for his enemies. The Romans cut off his head, hung it on a spear, and carried it through the city. This part of the empire with joyful eagerness submitted to Constantine.

In the meantime, Maximin (who had plotted against Constantine) had died and was succeeded in his government by Licinius. Constantine, hearing that he also treated his subjects with cruelty and inhumanity, unable to tolerate such brutality towards those of the same race, marched against him, to put an end to his tyranny and replace it by constitutional government. Licinius, being informed of the expedition, became alarmed, attempted to disguise his cruelty under the cloak of humanity, and took an oath that he would treat his subjects kindly and would strictly keep his promise. Constantine accordingly for the time abandoned his expedition. Soon afterwards, however, since the wicked cannot remain quiet, Licinius broke his oath

and abandoned himself to every kind of villainy. Whereupon Constantine attacked and defeated him in several great battles and shut him up and besieged him in Nicomedia, whence he approached Constantine in the garb of a suppliant. His kingdom was, taken away from him and bestowed upon Constantine, who thus secured and became sole ruler of the different parts of the great empire, which had long desired an emperor worthy of it. He inherited his father's kingdom and that of Rome after the overthrow of Maximin, and obtained possession of Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor by the deposition of Licinius. He further assumed control of that part which had belonged to Diocletian, and had been held by Licinius, who had seized it by right of war from Maximin, Diocletian's successor.

Being thus sole master of a united empire, he founded Byzantium and called it after his own name. Praxagoras says that although Constantine was a heathen, in virtue, goodness, and prosperity he far excelled all his predecessors on the throne. With these words the history concludes. Praxagoras, according to his own statement, was twenty-two years old when he wrote this history. He was also the author of two books on The Kings of Athens, written when he was nineteen, and six books on Alexander King of Macedon, written when he was thirty-one. His style is clear and agreeable, but somewhat wanting in vigour. He writes in the Ionic dialect. Flourished in the fourth century B.C. Both works mentioned by Photius are entirely lost. Should be Maximian (Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus). Should also be Maximian (Galerius Valerius Maximianus). Galerius. Valerius. Should be Maxentius. Valerius Maximinus called Daza or Daia, emperor 311-314.

Codices 1-165 — 63. [Procopius, History]

Read the History of Procopius the rhetorician in eight books. He relates the wars of the Romans in the reign of Justinian against the Vandals, Persians, and Goths, chiefly conducted by Belisarius, whose intimate friend the writer was and whom he accompanied on his campaigns, setting down in writing events of which he was an eye-witness. The following is the contents of the first book. Arcadius, emperor of the Romans, in his will appointed Yezdegerd, king of Persia, guardian of his son Theodosius. Yezdegerd accepted the trust, fulfilled his duties as guardian conscientiously and kept his ward's throne intact. On the death of Yezdegerd, Vararanes his successor made war against the Romans, but after Anatolius, master-general of the East, had been sent by Theodosius on an embassy to Persia, he concluded a treaty and returned home. After this Perozes, king of Persia, who succeeded another Yezdegerd, son of Vararanes, waged war on the Huns called Ephthalites or "White" Huns from their complexions. They are not ill-looking and do not resemble the other Huns. They do not lead a wild or nomadic life, but enjoy the protection of the laws under their kings. They were the neighbours of Persia on the north, which induced Perozes to invade their territory in order to settle the question of boundaries. The Ephthalites cunningly led him into difficult country, from which he barely escaped after concluding a disgraceful peace. He was forced to do homage to the king of the Ephthalites, and was only allowed to depart on taking an oath that he would never attack them again. Subsequently, however, he broke his word and, having again made war upon them, was ignominiously destroyed together with his whole army, which fell into pits and ditches cunningly prepared by the enemy. He died in the twenty-fourth year of his reign, on which occasion the famous pearl which he wore in his right ear was lost.

Perozes was succeeded by his youngest son Cabades, who was accused of violating the laws and imprisoned by the Persians in the fortress of Lethe. Having escaped with the assistance of his wife he took refuge with the Ephthalites, whose ruler betrothed him to one of his daughters and lent him a large army, with which he marched against the Persians and recovered his throne without a fight. His

brother Biases,who was ruling in his stead, was abandoned by his soldiers, seized, and blinded by boiling oil poured into his open eyes, in accordance with a long-established Persian custom. An account of the dispute between Pacurius, king of Persia, and Arsaces, king of Armenia, and the advice hostile to Arsaces, given by the magi to Pacurius, follows next. It seems probable, however, that this story is fictitious. The above-mentioned Cabades, who was heavily in debt to the Ephthalites, endeavoured to obtain a loan from Anastasius, but met with a refusal. Thereupon Cabades, without any further excuse, suddenly overran Armenia and besieged Amida. When he was on the point of abandoning the siege in despair, a gross insult on the part of some women among the besieged induced him to turn back and continue operations. He attacked with furious impetuosity, took the city by storm, and carried off the inhabitants as slaves. A large number of them were subsequently released without ransom, and treated with great kindness by Anastasius.

Anastasius, hearing that Amida was besieged, sent a very large force against the Persians, under four commanders---- Areobindus, master-general of the East (son-in-law of Olybrius, the former emperor of the West), Celer, captain of the imperial household, Patricius the Phrygian, and his own nephew Hypatius. With them were associated Justin, who succeeded Anastasius, and many other experienced soldiers. It is said that so large an army had never been brought into the field against the Persians, but owing to its delay in arriving, the city was taken; further, there was no unity of operation and the different detachments acted independently, with the result that they were ignominiously defeated with heavy loss. At last they reached Amida and besieged the city, but while they wasted time, the Persians within, who were in great straits, concluded a seven years' treaty, which was arranged by Celer and Asperedes as representatives of Persia and Rome.

Mount Taurus in Cilicia first passes through Cappadocia, Armenia, Persarmenia, Albania, Iberia, and all the other independent countries which had become subject to Persia. Just over the frontiers of Iberia there is a narrow path about fifty stades in length, ending in a steep and inaccessible height; there is apparently no way through, except by means of a natural exit which looks as if it had been made by the hand of man, called in ancient times the Caspian gate. Beyond this gate there are plains suitable for riding, and full of natural springs, and there is an extensive tract of gently-sloping country which provides an excellent pasturage for horses; it is nearly all inhabited by Huns as far as the Palus Maeotis. Whenever they invade Persian or Roman territory through the Caspian gate, they ride at full speed on vigorous horses, since all who desire to enter Iberia have only to contend with difficult country for the fifty stades mentioned; if, on the other hand, they choose another passage, it is only with great trouble that they reach their destination. Alexander, the son of Philip, perceiving this, built gates there and erected a fortress. During the reign of Anastasius, this fortress was occupied by a Hun named Ambazuces,

a friend of the Romans and Anastasius, to whom he offered to hand over control of the gates.Anastasius thanked him for his goodwill, but refused to accept the responsibility. After the death of Ambazuces, Cabades forcibly ejected his sons and took possession of the gates. Thereupon Anastasius, after the treaty had been concluded with Cabades, built a stronghold in the neighbourhood of Daras, in spite of the objections of the Persians, and also another city in Armenia, on the frontiers of Persarmenia, which was formerly called Theodosiupolis, since Theodosius had bestowed upon it the rank of a city instead of a village.

On the death of Anastasius, although many of his kinsmen were worthy to succeed him, they were rejected and Justin elected emperor. Soon after his accession, Cabades, in order to secure the throne for his youngest son Chosroes, wrote a letter to Justin proposing that he should adopt Chosroes. Justin and his sister's son Justinian, the heir-presumptive, welcomed the proposal, but in consequence of the advice of Proclus the quaestor, who argued that sons were the lawful heirs and successors of their fathers, they changed their minds and the adoption was not ratified. Subsequently, Seoses (who had once saved the life of Cabades) and Beodes were sent by the Persians, and Rufinus and Hypatius by the Romans, to discuss the terms of peace and the adoption of Chosroes. Seoses was accused of various offences by Beodes, tried by his countrymen and condemned to death. Rufinus also accused Hypatius to the emperor, who deprived him of his office.

The country between Bosporus and Cherson, which are a twenty days' journey apart, is inhabited by Hunnish tribes, who were formerly independent but had recently submitted to Justin, Cherson being the last city in Roman territory. The Iberians also, being ill-treated by the Persians, declared themselves vassals of Justin together with their king, Gurgenes. This was the cause of war between the Romans and the Persians. During his lifetime, Justin had made Justinian his partner in the empire, who, after his uncle's death, became sole ruler. Belisarius and Sittas were the two army commanders under Justinian. Belisarius had been appointed to the command of the troops in Daras, when Procopius, the writer of this history, became his secretary. When Justinian was sole emperor, Belisarius was made general of the East and ordered to undertake an expedition against the Persians. Perozes, the mirran, had been appointed to the command of the Persian army by Cabades. While both armies were encamped near Daras, Perozes sent a message to Belisarius, bidding him prepare a bath in the city, since he intended to bathe there on the following day. The Romans accordingly prepared vigorously for battle. During the engagement, one Andrew, a Byzantine, a gymnastic instructor, master of a wrestling school in Constantinople, and one of the bath-attendants of Buzes (who was associated with Belisarius in the command), when challenged to a duel, made his way through the ranks unnoticed, and defeated and slew his challenger. Then the battle was discontinued. In a subsequent engagement, the Persians, having been completely defeated with heavy losses, decided not to risk

any more pitched battles with the Romans, and both sides confined themselves to skirmishes.

Cabades then sent another army into Roman Armenia, consisting of Persarmenians, Sunites and Sabirites, under the command of Mermeroes. Dorotheus, general of Armenia, and Sittas, who was in command of the whole army, joined battle, and although greatly inferior in numbers, defeated the Persians, who thereupon returned home. The Romans then took possession of some Persian territory, including the district of Pharangium, the gold mines of which furnish a revenue for the king. The Tzani (formerly called Sani), an independent people who lived by plundering their neighbours, were defeated by Sittas and submitted to Rome. They embraced Christianity, and were drafted into the ranks of the Roman army.

After the defeat of both his armies, Cabades was at a loss what to do. Then Alamundarus, chief of the Persian Saracens, an experienced and vigorous soldier, who for fifty years had harassed the Romans, suggested to him that he should attack Antioch, which was unprotected, and ravage the neighbouring country. But Belisarius, hearing of his intention, set out with all speed against him with a force of Isaurians and Saracens, the latter under Arethas, a Saracen chief who was on the side of Rome. Alamundarus and Azarethes retired in alarm, closely followed by Belisarius, who did not intend to force an engagement, but only pretended to be pursuing them. But the soldiers reproached him, at first secretly and then openly, so that against his will he consented to give battle. At first, after both sides had suffered heavily, the issue remained in doubt; but after the forces of Arethas and the Isaurians had given way, the Persians gained a decided victory. Had not Belisarius dismounted and gone to the assistance of those who remained, they would all have been destroyed. Azarethes, the Persian commander, on his return received no thanks from Cabades for his victory. For he himself had lost a large number of men, although the enemy’s losses had been greater, and was accordingly regarded as disgraced.

Belisarius was recalled to Byzantium by Justinian to command the expedition against the Vandals, the protection of the East being entrusted to Sittas. At this time, while the Persians were attacking the Romans, Cabades died and was succeeded by Chosroes. Hearing of this, the Romans sent Rufinus, Alexander, Thomas, and Hermogenes on an embassy to him, with offers to conclude an ”endless peace” and also to pay a sum of 110 centenars. At first the negotiations were unsuccessful, and it was not till later that the ”endless peace” was concluded in the sixth year of the reign of Justinian. According to its terms, the Persians received the money agreed upon, and the district of Pharangium and the fortress of Bolon were restored to them; on the other hand, they abandoned the fortresses captured in Lazica, and exchanged Dagaris, an excellent soldier, for a Persian of rank. Soon afterwards, their subjects conspired against both Chosroes. and

Justinian. The Persians hated Chosroes as turbulent and restless, and were minded to bestow the crown on Cabades, the son of Chosroes' brother Zames. But the plot was discovered, and Chosroes put to death Zames and his other brothers, and all who had taken part in it. Thus the conspiracy was put down. Cabades the son of Zames, who was very young, escaped death through the prudence and compassion of Khanaranges Adergadunbades, who was afterwards put to death on this account by Chosroes.

The people of Rome also rose against Justinian and declared Hypatius, the nephew of Anastasius, emperor against his will. The rising had its origin in the circus factions. Belisarius and Mundus, by order of Justinian, put Hypatius to death together with a number of conspirators and 30,000 of the people. Justinian also had the support of his nephews Boraides and Justus. In the same book Procopius gives an account of the avaricious and wily Tribonian, a Pamphylian by birth, who held the office of quaestor, and also of John, prefect of Cappadocia, notorious for villainy, greed, drunkenness, and vice of every kind. He relates how Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, making use of John's daughter Euphemia, deceived him and convicted him of conspiring against the emperor; also how, when Eusebius, bishop of Cyzicus, was treacherously murdered, John, being suspected of the crime, was scourged and ignominiously banished.

The contents of the second book is as follows. Chosroes, being anxious to break the treaty with the Romans, whose conquest of Libya had roused his jealousy, was further incited by Witigis, king of the Goths, who sent an embassy to him, composed of certain Ligurians and Bassacus, an Armenian chief. The Armenians had revolted from Rome and joined the Persians, and the Roman commander Sittas had been killed while fighting against them. Chosroes thereupon decided to break the "endless" truce and make war on the Romans. When he heard of this, Justinian sent Anastasius to Chosroes to advise him not to do so. In the meantime Witigis had been taken prisoner by Belisarius, and sent to Constantinople. Chosroes, however, crossed the Roman frontiers, took the town of Sura, and made the inhabitants slaves. Soon afterwards, Candidus, bishop of Sergiopolis, having offered to ransom the captives, 1200 in number, he let them go free on receipt of a bond for two centenars. But Candidus, failing to keep his promise, was justly punished. Chosroes next marched against Hierapolis, and was preparing to lay siege to it, when the bishop of Beroea offered him 2000 pounds of silver if he would abandon the blockade. Chosroes consented, and even promised to evacuate the whole of the Roman territory in the East for 1000 pounds of gold. Meanwhile Buzes, general of the East, not thinking himself strong enough to oppose Chosroes, kept moving from place to place.

Chosroes then advanced to Beroea, from whose inhabitants he demanded a ransom of 2000 pounds of silver, afterwards increased to twice that amount; when

they failed to pay, he laid vigorous siege to the city. But Megas, bishop of Beroea, appealed to Chosroes and induced him to let the inhabitants go free, wherever they wished. Most of the soldiers voluntarily went over to Chosroes, because their pay was greatly in arrears. In like manner Chosroes demanded ransom from the inhabitants of Antioch, and when they refused, besieged it. While he was vigorously attacking, Theoctistus and Malatzes, with the soldiers from the Lebanon, secretly made their way out of the city and fled. Thus Chosroes easily compelled Antioch to surrender and reduced the inhabitants to slavery. Ambassadors from Rome were then sent to him, John the son of Rufinus and Julian his private secretary. After a long discussion as to terms, it was agreed that the Romans should pay Chosroes 5000 pounds of gold down, and 500 pounds every year in the future by way of tribute, on his promise to cease ravaging their territory; and that ambassadors should be sent from Justinian to confirm the agreement. But in spite of this arrangement, Chosroes proceeded to Apamea, and demanded a large sum of money from its bishop, Thomas; finally, he carried off all the sacred vessels and offerings and left the town. It was here that the miracle of the precious and life-giving cross took place. Chosroes is also said to have attended the circus games in the same place.

He then went on to Chalcis, and after exacting from the inhabitants 200 pounds of gold, retired without besieging it. He next visited Edessa, from which he exacted the same amount, but, being alarmed by certain divine warnings, left this city also unbesieged. Edessa is the city which is connected with the story of Augarus and the miracle performed by Christ.

Augarus was a great friend of Augustus, at whose court he remained some time, and only succeeded by stratagem in obtaining permission to return to his own country. Chosroes then left Edessa. At the same time Justinian wrote to his ambassadors, expressing himself ready to confirm the treaty. Nevertheless, Chosroes exacted ransom from Constantina, and, going on to Daras, proceeded to besiege it. Its commander, Martin, prepared to defend it, and Chosroes, seeing no hope of taking it by siege, retired to his own country on payment of 1000 pounds of silver. The inhabitants of Antioch were all transferred to a city called Antioch of Chosroes, which he had built in Assyria, a day’s journey from Ctesiphon. He treated them with great kindness and favour, ordered that they should be exempt from all jurisdiction but his own, constructed a hippodrome, and provided them with other amusements.

Belisarius, who had been recalled from Italy to take command, set out against Chosroes at the beginning of spring. On his arrival in Mesopotamia, he armed and encouraged the soldiers, who were almost without equipment and dreaded the name of the Persians. Chosroes, on the invitation of the Lazians, who with their ruler Gubazes had joined the Persians, owing to the extortions and jobbery

of John, Roman commandant, rapidly advanced against Petra, a city of Colchis on the shore of the Euxine. As long as John was in command of the fortress, the siege was unsuccessful, but after he had been killed by a shot in the neck, it surrendered. The inhabitants were allowed to depart unharmed, subject to an agreement. Only the large amount of money accumulated by John through the monopoly was seized by Chosroes. In the meantime Belisarius, after an abortive attack on Nisibis, laid siege to the fortress of Sisauranum and compelled it to surrender. Its commander Blischames and the most distinguished Persians were made prisoners and sent to Byzantium. Arethas also, who had been sent with an army against the Assyrians, ravaged their country; but his companions, who had secured large sums of money, refused to return to Belisarius. The latter, whose army had been attacked by sickness, was in ignorance of what Arethas had done; Recithangus and Theoctistus were eager to return home to defend Phoenicia, which was being ravaged by Alamundarus. Belisarius accordingly withdrew his forces from Persian territory, and was soon afterwards summoned by Justinian to Constantinople.

Of Caesarea in Palestine, died some time after 562. In addition to the eight books of The Wars he was the author of a description of The Buildings erected by Justinian, and of an Anecdota or Chronique Scandaleuse attacking the private life of Justinian and his notorious wife Theodora. The genuineness of the last has been disputed. In style Procopius is an imitator of Herodotus and Thucydides. The title ”rhetorician” given him by Photius better suits Procopius of Gaza, a Christian teacher of rhetoric (465-528). For the history of the period, see Gibbon, ch. 40; J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire; T. Hodgkin, Italy and her Invaders; G. Rawlinson, The Seventh Oriental Monarchy. Also Kobad or Kavadh. Also Balash. According to some, he was the brother, according to others the uncle of Cabades. Authorities differ as to whether he died a natural death; if so, Procopius and others have confused him with Cabades’s brother Zamasp. The Sea of Azov.

On condition of a sum of money being paid to him. He was afraid that, as Justin had no natural son, an adopted son might claim to be his heir and successor. Or Mebodes. Some take this to be a proper name, others the title of the commander-in-chief of the Persian army. 11,000 pounds of gold, about £500,000. A Persian title. The Nika sedition (532). Or Molatzes. Apamea was supposed to be the possessor of a fragment of the true cross. Usually known as Abgar(us), probably a title. The Abgar here referred to ruled from 4 B.C. to A.D. 50, with an interval during which he was deposed. It is said that he wrote a letter to Christ begging Him to cure him of a disease. Christ promised to send one of His disciples after His ascension, and Thaddeus was sent by Thomas, by whom Abgar was cured, Or Gunazes. He had established a monopoly of corn and salt. There are several variants of this name.

Codices 1-165 — 64. [Theophanes of Byzantium, History]

Read the History of Theophanes of Byzantium in ten books. The first book begins with the war against the Persians, which broke out after the treaty concluded between Justinian and Chosroes was renounced by Chosroes himself and Justin the successor of Justinian, at the end of the second year of his reign. The history begins at this point, and goes down to the tenth year of the war. In the first book the author also mentions that he has written another work on the history of Justinian; indeed, it is evident that he added other books to these ten. In this book he narrates how the treaty was annulled. Justin sent Comentiolus to demand the return of Suania from Chosroes, who promised to give it back, but did not keep his promise. At this time there was also a severe earthquake throughout Mesopotamia, a prelude to the calamities that were to come.

The Turks, formerly called Massagetae, and by the Persians Kirmikhiones, who live to the east of the Tanais (Don), at this time sent an embassy with gifts to the emperor Justin, beseeching him not to receive the Avars. Justin accepted the gifts, received the ambassadors kindly, and dismissed them. When the Avars subsequently approached Justin, requesting permission to inhabit Pannonia and desiring to conclude peace, he refused, owing to the agreement he had made with the Turks.

During the reign of Justinian, a certain Persian, a visitor to Byzantium, explained to the emperor the art of rearing silkworms, hitherto unknown to the Romans. This Persian, who had come from the land of the Seres, concealed the eggs of the silkworms in a hollow cane and conveyed them to Byzantium. At the beginning of spring, the eggs were placed upon mulberry leaves, on which the worms fed when hatched, afterwards turning into moths, which spun the silk. When king Justin afterwards showed the Turks how the worms were bred and how silk was made, he greatly surprised them, since at that time they had possession of the markets and harbours of the Seres, formerly held by the Persians. Ephthalanus, king of

the Ephthalites, from whom the tribe derived its name, having defeated Perozes and the Persians, drove them out of their territory and took possession of it, being themselves shortly afterwards in turn defeated and dispossessed by the Turks. Zemarchus, an ambassador sent by Justin to the Turks, entertained them at a magnificent banquet and having been received with every kindness returned home. Chosroes thereupon marched against the Aethiopians (formerly called Macrobii, and at that time Homerites), who were on friendly terms with the Romans; with the aid of Miranes, the Persian general, he captured Sanaturces, king of the Homerites, sacked their city and enslaved the inhabitants. The author also relates how the Armenians, being ill-treated by Surenas, especially in the matter of religion, entered into a conspiracy with Vardanes (whose brother Manuel had been put to death by Surenas) and a certain Vardus, slew Surenas, revolted from the Persians and went over to the Romans, abandoning the town of Dubios where they lived and crossing into Roman territory. This was the chief reason why the Persians broke the treaty with the Romans. Immediately afterwards the Iberians also revolted and with their king, Gurgenes, deserted to the Romans. At that time Tiphilis was the capital of Iberia.

Marcian, cousin of the emperor Justin, who had been appointed commander in the East, was sent against Chosroes in the eighth year of Justin's reign. John, the general of Armenia, and Miranes, the Persian leader (who was also called Baramaanes), collected an army to oppose them. The Armenians were joined by the Colchians, the Abasgi, and Saroes, king of the Alani; Miranes by the Sabiri, Daganes, and the tribe of the Dilmaini. Marcian defeated Miranes at Nisibis and put him to flight; 1200 Persians were killed and seventy taken prisoners, while the Roman loss was only seven. Marcian also laid siege to Nisibis. Chosroes, when he heard of this got together 40,000 cavalry and more than 100,000 infantry, and hastened to its assistance to attack the Romans. In the meantime Marcian was accused to the emperor of aiming at the throne. Justin, persuaded of the truth of the charge, dismissed him from the command and appointed Theodore, the son of Justinian surnamed Tzirus, in his stead. This led to disturbances, the Romans raised the siege, and Chosroes besieged and reduced Daras.

Nothing is known of the author. His history treated of the events of 566-581, containing the reigns of Justin II and Tiberius II. It would seem, from what Photius says, that he gave an account of certain happenings in the reign of Justinian, and also continued the history somewhat later in a supplement to the ten books into the reign of Maurice. The fragment here given is important for the account of the introduction of silkworm breeding into Constantinople during the reign of Justinian, and for the first mention of the Turks (see Gibbon, ch. 45; J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire; G. Rawlinson, The Seventh Oriental Monarchy). This Theophanes is not to be confused with Theophanes the Isaurian (758-818), whose extant chronicle begins with the accession of Diocletian (277) and goes down to 811 (end of the

reign of Michael I Rhangabe). China. The ”long-lived.” Apparently here a proper name, not a title.

Probably the same as the Dilimnitae.

Codices 1-165 — 65. [Theophylact Simocatta, Histories]

Read the Histories of Theophylact, prefect and imperial secretary, in eight books. He was an Egyptian by birth. His style is not without grace, but owing to his excessive use of figurative expressions and allegorical ideas is frigid and shows a puerile lack of taste; further, his frequently ill-timed insertion of moral sentiments betrays a fondness for excessive and superfluous display. In other respects he is less deserving of censure. The history begins with the reign of Maurice, and goes down to the accession of Phocas.

In the first book he gives an account of the proclamation of Maurice by the emperor Tiberius as his successor at the time when John was patriarch of Constantinople. Tiberius bestowed good advice upon Maurice through the mouth of John the quaestor, who was deputed to address Maurice and the people in place of the emperor. Tiberius betrothed his daughter to Maurice and died the day after the proclamation. Just before his death, he saw a vision and heard a voice saying, ”Thus saith the Trinity to thee, O Tiberius; the tyrannous times of impiety shall not come during thy reign.” These words were a prediction of the tragedy of the impious and tyrannical reign of the accursed Phocas. Maurice made peace with the Avars, who a little time before had laid siege to Sirmium, and agreed to pay the barbarians 80,000 pieces of gold yearly in consignments of garments and money. The treaty was kept for two years, but was broken owing to the greed of the barbarians, who demanded 20,000 more pieces of gold. This led to the rupture of the truce : Singidum, Augusta, and Viminacium were taken by the barbarians and Anchialus besieged. Elpidius and Comentiolus, who were sent as ambassadors from Rome to the chagan of the Avars, were treated with insult on the ground that Comentiolus had spoken too freely to the barbarian. In the following year Elpidius was again sent to the chagan with an offer to pay the additional 20,000 pieces of gold, and returned to Byzantium with Targitius, the representative of the Avars, to ratify the

agreement. After the barbarians had plundered much Roman territory, Targitius was banished to the island of Chalcis for six months. Comentiolus was afterwards appointed to command against the Slavs, and greatly distinguished himself. The chagan again violated the truce on account of the affair of Boukolobras the magian, and many Roman towns were devastated.

The battle between the Romans and Persians at the river Nymphius and the marriage of Maurice and Constantina, the daughter of Tiberius, are next described. Then the fire that broke out in the forum at the beginning of Maurice's reign; the execution of Paulinus and the miracle of the basin of Glyceria the martyr; how the patriarch John, when the emperor seemed inclined to leniency, himself insisted that the magician should be given over to the flames, appealing to the words of the apostle; how Paulinus and his son, who had taken part in the crime, were put to death. The affair of the fortresses of Aphumon and Acbas. The battle between the Romans and Persians, and how John was defeated by the cunning of the barbarians. The great earthquake which took place at the beginning of Maurice's reign, and an account of his consulship. The appointment of Philippicus, the husband of the emperor's sister, to be commander in the East, and his valiant deeds. The withdrawal of the Romans from Media, during which the army suffered greatly from want of water. How Philippicus handed over the district of Arzanene to his army to plunder; the bravery of the Romans. The devastation of the country round Martyropolis by the Persians, and their first and second embassy to the Romans. Such is the contents of the first book.

The second book describes mount Izala; the haughtiness of Cardarigan the Persian commander; the battle between the Romans under Philippicus and the Persians under Cardarigan at Arzamon; how Philippicus, carrying the image "not made with hands" marched through the camp and consecrated the army; how the Romans won a glorious victory; how the image was sent with all due reverence to Simeon, bishop of Amida. The territory of the barbarians plundered by the Romans; Cardarigan flees for refuge to Daras, but the inhabitants refuse to admit him for having been defeated. How a Roman soldier belonging to the Quarto-Parthian legion (as those were called who were quartered at Beroea in Syria) was brought into camp dying of wounds. The expedition of the Romans against Azarnene, and the desertion of its commanders Maruthas and Iobius (Jovius) to Philippicus. The private forces raised by Cardarigan to deceive the Romans. The marvellous escape of Heraclius (father of Heraclius who was afterwards emperor), who was sent by Philippicus on a reconnoitring expedition. Zabertas the Persian and the abandonment of the siege of Chlomaron by the Romans. The headlong and unintelligible flight of Philippicus, and the subsequent confusion in the Roman army. Philippicus attacked by disease and the command taken over by Heraclius. The Roman vice-commander attacks the Southern Persians and at the beginning of spring the Romans invade Persian

territory. Comentiolus sets out against the Avars, having under him Martin and Castus, who distinguished themselves against the enemy. Castus taken prisoner.

Ansimuth, commander of the infantry in Thrace, captured by the Avars, who overrun Thrace. Comentiolus hesitates to attack the enemy; speeches for and against at a council of war. A false alarm, which also spread to the ranks of the enemy, frustrates Comentiolus's plan of attacking the chagan. How a soldier named Busas, who had been captured by the enemy while hunting and left to his fate by his countrymen, taught the barbarians to make siege-engines. The unsuccessful siege of Beroea and Diocletianopolis by the chagan. The emperor Maurice insulted by the Byzantine mob because of the calamities brought upon Europe by the ravages of the barbarians. John, surnamed Mystacon, appointed by Maurice to the command in Thrace, with Drocton as second in command, who when Adrianople was besieged by the Avars, attacked them and saved the city. Heraclius attacks a Persian stronghold. The fortress of Beiudaes taken by the distinguished valour of Sapir. The return of Philippicus to the imperial city. The third book begins with the appointment of Priscus to the command of the East in place of Philippicus. The latter, jealous of Priscus, persuades the emperor to announce a reduction of the rations of the army. Priscus, when he approached the camp, did not get off his horse, as was the usual custom, in order to salute the army. This slight and the reduction of their rations caused a mutiny amongst the soldiers.

Priscus then gave the image "made without hands " to Elifredas and endeavoured to calm the soldiers by exhibiting it, but they pelted it with stones. Priscus takes refuge in Constantina, and Germanus against his will is chosen commander by the army. While these disturbances were taking place, the Persians greatly harassed the Romans. The emperor accordingly deprived Priscus of his command and reappointed Philippicus. But the army mutinied against him also. Constantina is besieged by the Persians but relieved by Germanus. At the battle of Martyropolis the Romans gain a brilliant victory over the Persians, their general Maruzas and 3000 being killed, and 1000 taken prisoners. The army is reconciled to the emperor by the efforts of Aristobulus. Gallantry of the Roman prisoners in the fortress of Giligerdon. Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, re-establishes friendly relations between Philippicus and the army. Martyropolis captured by the Persians owing to the treachery of Sittas. Philippicus superseded in the command against Persia by Comentiolus. The Getae or Slavs ravage the borders of Thrace. Rome takes up arms against the Lombards. Libya defeats the Maurusii. Under the command of Comentiolus, the Romans engage the Persians at Sisarbanum near Nisibis; the Romans, fighting with great bravery, are victorious. Heraclius greatly distinguishes himself in the engagement. The Persian commander Phraates is slain and much booty taken from the enemy. The defeat of the Turks by Baram, who secured great and valuable spoil for king Hormisdas. Baram then takes up the sword against Suania.

The Romans under the command of Romanus attack Baram and his army, and inflict a severe defeat upon him. Thereupon, Hormisdas insults Baram by sending him a woman's garment; Baram returns the insult by addressing a letter to Hormisdas as daughter, not son, of Chosroes. The Armenians, prompted by Symbatius, kill their commander John and prepare to go over to the Persians. Comentiolus, being sent by the emperor, puts down the mutiny and carries off Symbatius to Byzantium. He is condemned to be thrown to the wild beasts, but his life is spared by the clemency of the emperor. Hormisdas sends Sarames against Baram. Baram defeats Sarames, causes him to be trampled upon by an elephant, and openly revolts against the king. Baram, before he meditated revolt, had become so powerful that he was considered next in rank to the king and held what the Romans call the office of curopalates. The narrative returns to the events of earlier times, and a brief account is given of what took place in the reigns of Justin and Tiberius, of the cruelty of Hormisdas the Persian king, and the origin of the family. Such is the contents of the third book.

The fourth book relates the spread of civil war amongst the Persians, their victories and successes during the rule of Baram. The murder of Pherochanes. Zadespras goes over to the enemy. Hormisdas; deprived of the throne by Bindoes, is allowed to plead his cause in chains. After, Bindoes has replied, the son of Hormisdas and the queen are put to death and cut to pieces before his eyes; he himself is blinded and subsequently beaten to death by order of his son Chosroes, who was chosen to succeed him. The vigorous rule of Baram. The flight of Chosroes, king of Persia, to Circensium, whence he sends a letter and an embassy to the emperor Maurice. How Baram schemes to get himself made king by the Persians, but, unable to persuade them to elect him, proclaims himself. The emperor removes Chosroes to Hierapolis, accompanied by a suite worthy of his rank. What took place between Baram and Chosroes, before the latter made an alliance with the Romans. The ambassadors sent by Baram to Maurice are dismissed, while those of Chosroes are welcomed. The emperor sends the bishop of Melitene and Gregory, bishop of Antioch, to Chosroes. The treacherous murder of Baram by Zamerdes, Zoanambes, and others. Bindoes, who had taken part in the plot against Baram, flees to Persia. Martyropolis restored by Chosroes to the Romans. The traitor Sittas burnt to death The festal oration delivered by Dometian, bishop of Melitene, on the occasion of the recovery of the city. Such is the contents of the fourth book.

The fifth book relates how Chosroes, king of the Persians, being dejected and sick at heart, sends a message to the shrine of Sergius the martyr, the object of devotion also of the rest of the barbarians, entreating him to show him a way out of misfortune, and promising him the gift of a golden cross set with gems. Zadespras treacherously killed by Rosas at the instigation of Blischames, and other events favourable to Chosroes. Chosroes gives a bond for money lent by the emperor Maurice, and sends an embassy requesting that Comentiolus be dismissed from the command; the appointment of Narses in his stead, and the alliance with the Ro-

mans against the usurper Baram. The royal gifts sent by Maurice to Chosroes. The keys of Daras handed over to the emperor by the Persian ambassador Dol(a)bzas. The speech of Dometian, bishop of Melitene, exhorting the Romans to make an alliance with Chosroes against Baram. The successes of Chosroes before the collision between the Romans and Persians. How Chosroes recovers his throne and the royal treasures with the aid of Bindoes. Junction of the Roman forces in Armenia and the East, battle with Baram, and brilliant victory of the Romans. In this battle, in which Narses was in command, some Turks were taken prisoners who bore on their foreheads the sign of the cross, which they declared they had formerly placed there to deliver them from the ravages of a pestilence. Golinduch the Persian and his severely ascetic life. The return of Chosroes to his own dominions.

The gifts sent by Chosroes to Sergius the martyr. His petition to the saint to bestow pregnancy upon his wife Sirem, who was a Christian. His petition proving successful, he sends valuable gifts to the shrine of the martyr. Chosroes punishes all those who took part in the revolt and puts Bindoes to death, as having lifted his hands against the king. Chosroes predicts that the Romans will revolt against their tyrannical masters. The embassy of Probus, bishop of Chalcedon, the portrait of the Mother of God, and what took place at the embassy. The emperor's visit to Anchialus in Europe, where he is met by a portent in the form of a sow. His return to the palace and the arrival of the embassy of Zalabzas. Such is the contents of the fifth book.

The sixth book relates how Maurice, setting out from the city, is overtaken by a violent storm at sea. During his stay at Heraclea, a monstrous prodigy is born, an infant without hands, eyes, eyebrows, or eyelids, and a fish's tail attached to his thigh. The destruction of the monster. Three Slavs carrying citharae, said to have been sent from the borders of ocean to the chagan, brought before Maurice. Bossus and Bettus sent as ambassadors to Maurice by Theodorich, king of the Franks, proposing an alliance in return for a sum of money. The proposal rejected. How a large stag, one of a herd, being wounded flees to a wood and is pursued by one of the bodyguard and one of the Gepidae. How the former is treacherously slain for the sake of his golden ornaments by the latter, who is convicted of the crime a long time afterwards and burnt to death. The expedition of the Avars against the Romans, the siege of Singidum, the appointment of Priscus as commander and general of the forces in Europe. The church of Alexander the martyr at Drizipera set on fire by the chagan. The Romans shut up in Tzurulum by the chagan. Maurice cleverly deceives the chagan and forces him to raise the siege. The embassy of the Avars to the Romans, the defeat of Ardagast, the affair of Tatimer. The bravery of the tribune Alexander and the Romans, the massacre of the Slovenes, and their counter-attack on the Romans. Concerning the monsters born in the queen-city, a child with four feet, another with two heads. Priscus deprived of his command for sharing with the Persians the booty taken from the Slovenes, and succeeded in

the European command by Peter. An account of the learning and shrewdness of Theodore, who was sent as an ambassador to the chagan by Priscus. Such is the contents of the sixth book.

The seventh book relates the disturbances amongst the soldiers and their bravery against the Slavs (or Getae, as they were formerly called). What happened to Peter and the citizens at the Thracian city of Asemus. How Pirigastus, the Slovene commander, was slain. The bravery of the Romans, although suffering greatly from lack of water. How Peter, being defeated by the Slovenes, is superseded by Priscus. The death of John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople. Concerning the money lent him by Maurice, for which he gave a bond. The great respect shown by the truly pious emperor to the ragged vestments left by the patriarch. The expedition of the Maurusii against Carthage, and how it was stopped by the bravery of Gennadius. Of the comet that was seen for several days. The Turkish civil war. An account of their constitution, manners, and customs. How the chagan of the Turks slew the ethnarch of the Ephthalites, enslaved the people, and also slew 300,000 Ogors and Colchians. How he also slew Turum, who rebelled against him, and sent a letter to the emperor Maurice announcing his victory. He also enslaved the Avars. The inhabitants of Taugast and the tribe of Mucri, with whom the defeated Avars took refuge. Concerning the Ouars and Hunni, a great number of whom have inhabited Europe since the reign of Justinian, and call themselves Avars. The Turkish empire free from earthquakes and pestilence. The mountain of gold and the city of Taugast. Silkworms, the mode of rearing them, and the extensive manufacture of silk at Chubda.

The white Indians. The chagan’s conversation with Priscus concerning the enslavement of the inhabitants of Singidum; Priscus’s answer, and how he saved the city. The ravages of the barbarians in Dalmatia, and the great success of Gunduis, who had been sent against them by Priscus. In the nineteenth year of Maurice’s reign a certain monk prophesies his death and that of his children. Running with a drawn sword from the forum to the vestibule of the palace, he proclaims that Maurice and his children will be slain with the sword. A certain Herodian also foretells what was about to happen. The famine in the Roman camp. How the chagan, with remarkable humanity, granted a suspension of hostilities for five days, during which the Romans were to be supplied by the barbarians with provisions without fear of molestation. How Priscus sent him gifts of spices in return. The chagan’s advance into Moesia. Battle with Comentiolus in Moesia, in which, by the treachery of Comentiolus, the Roman army is cut to pieces by the barbarians. Flight of Comentiolus to Drizipera, but the inhabitants refuse to admit him as being a runaway, and he goes on to the long walls. The barbarians in close pursuit first capture Drizipera, burn the church of Alexander the martyr, drag his body from the tomb and insult it. But divine justice overtakes his insulters; the seven sons of the chagan die of bubo

in one day. During these disturbances Comentiolus resides in Constantinople; the barbarians in the meantime approach the long walls.

The inhabitants of Byzantium are so alarmed that they contemplate abandoning Europe and crossing over into Asia. However, the king sends Harmaton as ambassador to the chagan, who by splendid gifts, to which are added 20,000 pieces of gold, is with difficulty persuaded to make peace, declaring, ”God judge between the chagan and Maurice, between the Avars and the Romans. The monsters in human form seen in the waters of the Nile, and the various opinions as to the rising of the river. Theophylact agrees with Agatharchides of Cnidus. He says that in the countries of Aethiopia there is a heavy and continuous downpour of rain every year from the summer solstice to the autumnal equinox; hence it is natural that the river should contract in winter, since its waters are only fed from its own sources, whereas in summer it is greatly increased by the rains from Aethiopia. Such is the contents of the seventh book.

The eighth book relates how Chosroes, in consequence of the raids of the Saracens who were subject to the Romans, desires to break the treaty, but is persuaded by George, who was sent as ambassador, not to do so. George, however, incurs the displeasure of the emperor, since Chosroes declares that he had kept the treaty unbroken not for the sake of the emperor, but for the sake of George. The charge of treachery against Comentiolus, his reconciliation with the soldiers and reappointment as commander by the emperor. Battle between the Avars and the Romans commanded by Priscus and Comentiolus. The latter excuses himself from taking part in the battle, but the army, under the leadership of Priscus, behaves with the greatest gallantry and slays 4000 of the enemy. In a second engagement, the Avars lose 9000, in a third 15,000 men. In a fourth battle the Romans gain a brilliant victory, in which 30,000 Avars and Gepidae are slain. In a fifth and last battle, the Avars are utterly defeated, 3000 of them being taken prisoners, together with 4000 other barbarians, 2200 of other nations, and 8000 Slavs. The chagan cunningly persuades the emperor to restore the captive Avars. The dejection of Comentiolus, by whose carelessness a number of the soldiers, on the way to Philippopolis, are frozen to death. Peter again appointed to the command in Europe by the emperor. The marriage of Theodosius the son of Maurice to the daughter of Germanus.

The famine in the queen-city, the disorderly conduct of the demes while the emperor was attending divine service, his clemency, the banishment and return of the soldiers on the same day. Peter enjoined by Maurice at all costs to keep the Thracian forces on the other side of the Ister (Danube); the divine voice heard by Peter. Mutiny in the Roman army and a rising against Maurice, Phocas being proclaimed exarch (captain) by the soldiery. Flight of Peter; the emperor informed of the mutiny. The demes, urged on by the demarchs Sergius and Cosmas, for the first time meddle in state affairs, 1500 Greens and 900 Blues. Maurice bestows largess

on the demesmen, and sends an embassy to the mutinous soldiers, who refuse to receive it. Byzantium put in a state of defence. The army sends a message to Theodosius, demanding that either he or his father-in-law should be proclaimed emperor. When Maurice hears of this, suspecting that Germanus is the cause of the revolt, he threatens his life. Germanus, being warned by his son-in-law Theodosius, takes refuge in the church of the Mother of God that had been built by Cyrus. Stephen the eunuch, the tutor of the king's sons, sent to Germanus to induce him to leave the church, but his mission is unsuccessful. Theodosius flogged by his father for informing his father-in-law. Germanus removes from the church of the Mother of God to St. Sophia, and being again summoned to come out, is prevented from leaving the church by Andrew, a constant attendant at the services.

Disturbances in the city and burning of the house of Constantine Lardys the patrician. Perplexity and flight of Maurice, which is hindered by a storm. Mission of Theodosius to Chosroes; his departure from Nicaea on being shown the ring, which his father had arranged should be the sign and signal for his return. The inhabitants of the city, amongst them a certain Hebdomites, go over to the usurper. Vain attempt of Germanus to get himself declared emperor, the Greens refusing to support him on the ground that he favoured the Blues. Phocas proclaimed emperor in the church of St. John in Hebdomon, while Cyriacus was patriarch of the royal city. Entry of Phocas into the palace and proclamation of his wife Leontia as Augusta. Dispute amongst the demarchs about their places during the procession. Cosmas, demarch of the Blues, assaulted by Alexander, who is in his turn insulted. A reminder that Maurice was not yet dead decides the usurper to murder the emperor. Maurice's children killed before his eyes in the harbour of Eutropius. Philosophical resignation of Maurice, and his murder by Lilius. Will of Maurice found during the reign of Heraclius. The bodies of the king and his son thrown into the sea. Funeral oration on Maurice. The soldiers punished by the judgment of divine providence for their crime against Maurice, not one of all those who had taken part in the rising being left alive soon afterwards; they perished to a man, some by disease, others by fire from heaven, others by the sword.

When Heraclius resolved to declare war against Razates, king of the Persians, and mustered his army, he found only two left of those who had supported the usurper. After that the Romans began to show themselves superior to the Persians, whereas as long as any of the mutineers survived, victory always remained with the enemy. Theodosius, Maurice's son, slain by Alexander at the command of Phocas, together with Peter, Comentiolus, and Constantine Lardys. A false report that Theodosius was not put to death. How the statues at Alexandria, in the district called Tychaeum, moving from their places of their own accord, announced what had happened in Byzantium to a copyist, as he was returning home after supper. Maurice said to have remitted the third part of the tribute to his subjects and to have given thirty talents to the Byzantines for the repair of the aqueducts. His generous treat-

ment of scholars and students. The strange things that happened in regard to the bloody flux of Euphemia the martyr; how Maurice, who tested the miracle since he was at first incredulous, found it confirmed. How Phocas shut up the wife of Maurice with her daughter in a private house. His unsuccessful embassy to Chosroes, king of Persia; the treaty with Persia broken by Chosroes, who pretended that it was his solemn duty to avenge Maurice. So Lilius, who was sent as ambassador, returned without having succeeded in his mission.

Murder of Alexander, who had conspired with Phocas against Maurice, on suspicion of having saved the life of Theodosius, whereas he had really murdered him. This ends the history.

Theophylactus Simocatta. The Histories or Oecumenical History contains the reign of the emperor Maurice (582-604), and is the oldest and best authority for the period. The complete work is extant. Simocatta was also the author of a treatise on certain problems of natural history and their solution, and of a collection of rhetorical exercises in the form of letters on various subjects. As Photius says, his style is extremely far-fetched. He has been described as a representative of Byzantine euphuism. For the history see Gibbon, ch 45, 46; J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire; G. Rawlinson, The Seventh Oriental Monarchy. The name given to the princes of the Avars and other Turkish tribes. Or Bucolabra. The holy ointment or oil which trickled from the bones of the martyr, ceased to flow when the basin into which it dripped was exchanged for another one by the bishop of Heraclea. Paulinus was crucified and his son’s head cut off. More probably a Persian title, not a proper name.

Others take the word to mean the image. Elifredas (or Ilifredas) = Wilfrid. The province of Africa. The Moors. Bahram or Varahran. Major-domo of the imperial palace. Also Zadesprates. A celebrated martyr of the Eastern Church who suffered at Sergiopolis or Rasaphe in Syria at the beginning of the fourth century. He and another martyr named Bacchus were considered the patron saints of Syria. Singidon or Singidunum, modern Belgrade. Leader of the Slovenes, who were under the sway of the Avars. One of Priscus’s generals. He was a physician. 582-595. Of humble origin, he was distinguished for his piety and asceticism, but was a man of cruel disposition. His assumption of the title of ”ecumenical patriarch” led to trouble with Pelagius II and Gregory I, bishops of Rome. Four extant works are attributed to him. Name given to the princes or chiefs of the Slovenes and other tribes. Also Guduis or Gudwin. Of Byzantium. Geographer and historian, grammarian . and philosopher, flourished during the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (181-146), but was still living after 131. He wrote on the history of Europe and Asia, and the geography of the Red Sea. Fragments of the history are preserved, and Photius gives excerpts from the geography in Cod. 250.

He purposely mutilated his hand. Deme (δῆμος, people) was the name by which the circus factions were known, their leaders being called demarchs. Prefect of the city, who built the church by order of Theodosius II, emperor 408-450. The Field of Mars near Constantinople. Some authorities place it at Blachernae, others on the Propontis (Sea of Marmora).

Codices 1-165 — 66. [Nicephorus, Historical Epitome]

Read the Historical Epitome of Nicephorus patriarch of Constantinople. It begins with the death of Maurice and goes down to the marriage of Leo and Irene. His style is clear and free from redundancies, his choice of words excellent; and the composition neither too loose nor too compressed, but such as the real and perfect orator would employ. He avoids innovations, but at the same time is too fond of employing what is old-fashioned and affectedly elaborate. His language is pleasant and not without charm. Speaking generally, he throws into the shade all historians who have preceded him; his only fault is excessive brevity, which may appear to some, to prevent his work being completely agreeable. 806-815. He began his career as a civilian, and although a layman, was chosen patriarch. His conciliatory disposition brought upon him the hatred of the extremists. During the campaign of Leo against image-worship, he energetically defended the orthodox view, He was finally deposed and banished. In addition to the historical epitome of events from 602-769 here referred to, he was the author of tables of Universal History from Adam to the death of Nicephorus (829), much used by the Byzantines, and of three Antirrhetici, written against the iconoclasts.

Codices 1-165 — 67. [Sergius the Confessor, History]

Read the History of Sergius the Confessor. It begins with the reign of the emperor Michael, and then goes back to the lawless and abominable acts of Copronymus. Political and ecclesiastical events down to the eighth year of Michael's reign are narrated in order; his military achievements and his views on religious matters are set forth in detail. The style is particularly clear and simple, both as regards the meaning of words, composition, and the general arrangement, which gives the impression of spontaneity. The language, full of natural charm, is not characterised by studied changes of form due to excessive care. In accordance with his design, he has preserved the style best adapted for ecclesiastical history. The work is lost. The name Confessor and the epithets applied to the acts of Copronymus show that Sergius was an opponent of the iconoclasts and a champion of orthodoxy. He is perhaps the Sergius exiled by Leo III. Michael II Balbus, the Stammerer (820-829). "Man of Dung," Constantine V (741-775). An inflexible opponent of image-worship, he was violently assailed by the orthodox, but was in reality a most capable ruler.

Codices 1-165 — 68. [Cephalion, Historical Epitome]

Read the Historical Epitome of Cephalion. It begins with the reign of Ninus and Semiramis and goes down to the times of Alexander the Great. The entire history comprises nine books, called after the nine Muses ---- Clio, Thalia, Polyhymnia, Melpomene, Terpsichore, Euterpe, Calliope, Erato, and Urania, in which the acts of Alexander, king of Macedon, are also related. He writes in the Ionic dialect. The excessive brevity with which he describes the bare facts of history leaves no room for admiration or imitation. He says nothing about his race or family, but passes them over in silence, like Homer, as he himself says. However, it appears that he wrote the work during his exile in Sicily. While saying nothing about his race or family, as he ought to have done, he mentions his exile, an indication of meanness of spirit. His boast of the number of authors consulted by him in compiling his history shows a mind incapable of shaking off a petty and childish love of display. He says that the first book of his history was compiled from 570 books, of 31 of which he gives the authors' names; the second book from 208, with 25 authors' names; the third from 600, with 26 authors' names; the fourth from 850, with 36 authors' names; the fifth from 200, with 26 authors' names, and so on. Such is the History of Cephalion.

Flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138). Some fragments have been preserved in Eusebius and some of the Byzantine chroniclers (e.g. John Malalas, Syncellus). The mythical founder and foundress of Nineveh.

Codices 1-165 — 69. [Hesychius Illustrius, History]

Read the History of Hesychius Illustri(u)s, son of Hesychius and Sophia, a Milesian by birth. It is a sort of synopsis of the history of the world, as is shown by the title ---- History of Roman and General History. It begins with the reign of Belus, king of Assyria, and goes down to the death of Anastasius, emperor of Rome. His style is concise and elegant, the language perspicuous if florid, and the composition elaborate in proportion. He is especially careful in the choice of words. His mode of expression is distinct and emphatic, and he charms the reader by his figures of speech, which, however, do not prevent events from being described as clearly as if he had made no use of figures, or even more clearly. He also declares his intention of adhering strictly to truth.

The work is divided into six parts. The first part contains the narrative of events preceding the Trojan war; the second, events from the capture of Troy to the foundation of Rome; the third, events from the foundation of Rome to the time when the appointment of consuls put an end to the monarchy, in the 68th Olympiad; the fourth, events from the government of the consuls to the 182nd Olympiad, when Julius Caesar became sole emperor and the consuls were abolished; the fifth, events that took place under the rule of Julius Caesar down to the time when the glory of Byzantium reached its height, at the beginning of the 277th Olympiad. The sixth begins with the time when Byzantium to its good fortune had Constantine for its emperor, and goes down to the death of Anastasius, whom the author (I do not know why) praises as superior to many of his predecessors in clemency and mildness. His death took place in the eleventh indiction, when Magnus was sole consul. The period of time embraced by the history is 190 years.

Also read another book by the same author, containing the events of the reign of the emperor Justin. It relates how, on the death of Anastasius, Justin was chosen to succeed him, how Justin was succeeded by Justinian. Various events that occurred during the early years of the reign of the latter. The author was prevented from writing more by the death of his son John, which so deeply affected him that he was

unable to devote himself to study or literary work. Lived during the reign of Justinian. He was the author of a History of the World down to the death of Anastasius (518), of which part relating to the early history of Constantinople is preserved; of works on Justin and the beginning of the reign of Justinian; of an Onomatologos (list) of famous literary persons, a general history of ancient literature. Illustrius is a designation of rank. The reading is uncertain here,

508-505-B.C. 52-49 B.C. Byzantium was made the capital of the empire by Constantine, and its name changed to Constantinopolis in A.D. 330. A period of 15 years, instituted by Constantine the Great in 313 for fiscal purposes, afterwards adopted as a convenient method of chronology generally. To find the year of the indiction, add 3 to any date of our era, divide by 15, and the remainder is the indiction, or if there is no remainder, the indiction is 15.

Codices 1-165 — 70. [Diodorus Siculus]

Read the forty books of Diodorus Siculus, containing a kind of history of the world. He is fuller than Cephalion and Hesychius Illustrius in his description of the same periods. His style is clear, unadorned, and admirably adapted for history. He neither excessively affects atticisms or antiquated modes of expression, nor on the other hand does he altogether descend to the level of everyday language. He rather takes pleasure in a style midway between the two, avoiding figures of speech and the like affectations, and only using the language of fable, after the manner of poets, where he relates the legends of gods and heroes. He begins his history with the mythical ages of the Greeks and barbarians, and goes down to the beginning of the war between the Romans and Celts, at the time when Gaius Julius Caesar (called ”divine” by the Romans on account of his mighty deeds) subdued most, and those the most warlike, of the Celtic nations. He spent thirty years over the history, as he tells us himself, visiting several different countries for the sake of obtaining information, and exposing himself to many dangers. He was a Sicilian from Agyrium; from his long intercourse with the Romans he had become familiar with that people and their language, and diligently collected accounts of all their chief successes and failures.

The entire history is comprised in forty books. In the first six the events preceding the Trojan war and other legends are described; in the next eleven, the events of the world from the taking of Troy to the death of Alexander the Great; in the remaining twenty-three, the events up to the time when war broke out between the Celts and Romans under the leadership of Julius Caesar. He subdued most of, and the most warlike, of their nations and extended the Roman empire to the British islands, at which point the history ends. Of Agyrium in Sicily, flourished in the time of Augustus, and certainly lived till after 21 B.C. His Historical Library in forty books was a history of the world down to Caesar’s Gallic wars. Only books 1-5 and 11-20 are extant. The chief value of the work consists in the employment of authorities whose works are now lost, the preservation of old tradition, and especially of chronological material.

Codices 1-165 — 71. [Cassius Dio, History]

Read the History of Cassianus Coccianus (or Coccius) Dio, in eighty books. He begins with the arrival of Aeneas in Italy from Troy, the foundation of Alba and Rome, and goes down without a break to the murder of Antoninus named Elagabalus, who was also called Tiberinus, Sardanapalus, Pseudantoninus, and Assyrius on account of his vices. He also says something about the reign of Alexander who, after the death of Antoninus, who had adopted him as his colleague in the empire, escaped the danger that threatened him and succeeded to the throne. The writer tells us that this Alexander was consul for the second time together with himself, and that the emperor, desirous of honouring his colleague, himself defrayed the necessary expenses in connexion with his office. The author was appointed governor of Pergamum and Smyrna by Macrinus, and was afterwards commander of the forces in Africa. Soon afterwards he was governor of Pannonia. Elected consul for the second time, he was allowed to return home owing to bad feet, to spend the rest of his life in Bithynia, as his ”genius” had predicted, ”beyond the reach of slaughter, bloodshed, and tumult.”

He was born at Nicaea in Bithynia, which in one part is surrounded by the lake called Ascania. His style is grandiose and bombastic, reflecting the consciousness of mighty events. His language is full of antiquated constructions, and of words in keeping with the importance of the events described. His periods are full of protracted parentheses and ill-timed inversions. The rhythm and the abrupt interruptions, being carefully employed, owing to the general clearness, escape the notice of the casual reader. The speeches, after the style of those in Thucydides, but clearer, are excellent. In almost everything else also Thucydides is his model. Cassius Dio Cocceianus (c. 155-230), born at Nicaea in Bithynia, senator and holder of various offices under Commodus and succeeding emperors, being twice consul. In 229 he retired into private life. His history of Rome in eighty books, starting from the mythical period, goes down to the reign of Alexander Severus (229). Of these eighty books 37-60 have come down almost complete, 36-80 exist in aneleventh-century abridgment by the monk John Xiphilinus. In the tenth century ex-

cerpts were made from it by order of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and Zonaras (twelfth century) made an abridgment of books 1-20. His point of view is that of a loyal imperial official, who does not understand, and has little sympathy with, earlier political struggles. His superstition is pronounced. Iliad, xi. 164. Reading ἂκαιρος for εὖκαιρος.

Codices 1-165 — 72. [Ctesias, Persica]

Read the Persica of Ctesias of Cnidus in twenty-three books. In the first six he treats of Assyrian affairs and of events before the foundation of the Persian empire, and only begins to treat of Persian affairs in the seventh book. In books 7-13 he gives an account of Cyrus, Cambyses, the Magian, Darius, and Xerxes, in which he differs almost entirely from Herodotus, whom he accuses of falsehood in many passages and calls an inventor of fables. Ctesias is later than Herodotus, and says that he was an eyewitness of most of what he describes, and that, where this was not the case, he obtained his information directly from Persians, and in this manner he composed his history. He not only disagrees with Herodotus, but also in some respects with Xenophon the son of Gryllus. Ctesias flourished in the time of Cyrus, son of Darius and Parysatis, brother of Artoxerxes who succeeded to the throne.

He begins by stating that Astyages (whom he also calls Astyigas) was not related to Cyrus; that he fled from him to Agbatana, and hid himself in the. vaults of the royal palace with the aid of his daughter Amytis and her husband Spitamas; that Cyrus, when he came to the throne, gave orders that not only Spitamas and Amytis, but also their sons Spitaces and Megabernes should be put to the torture for assisting Astyigas; that the latter, to save his grandchildren from being tortured on his account, gave himself up and was taken and loaded with chains by Oebaras; that shortly afterwards he was set free by Cyrus and honoured as his father; that his daughter Amytis was treated by him as a mother and afterwards became his wife. Her husband Spitamas, however, was put to death, because, when asked, he had falsely declared that he did not know where Astyigas was. In his account of these events Ctesias differs from Herodotus. He adds that Cyrus made war upon the Bactrians, without obtaining a decisive victory; but that when they learnt that Astyigas had been adopted by Cyrus as his father, and Amytis as his mother and wife, they voluntarily submitted to Amytis and Cyrus.

He also relates how Cyrus made war on the Sacae, and took prisoner their king Amorges, the husband of Sparethra, who after her husband was captured collected

an army of 300,000 men and 200,000 women, made war upon Cyrus and defeated him. Amongst the large number of prisoners taken by the Sacae were Parmises, the brother of Amytis, and his three sons, who were subsequently released in exchange for Amorges. Cyrus, assisted by Amorges, marched against Croesus and the city of Sardes. By the advice of Oebaras he set up wooden figures representing Persians round the walls, the sight of which so terrified the inhabitants that the city was easily taken. Before this, the son of Croesus was handed over as a hostage, the king himself having been deceived by a divine vision. Since Croesus was evidently meditating treachery, his son was put to death before his eyes; his mother, who was a witness of his execution, committed suicide by throwing herself from the walls. After the city was taken Croesus fled for refuge to the temple of Apollo; he was three times put in chains, and three times loosed invisibly from his bonds, although the temple was shut and sealed, and Oebaras was on guard. Those who had been prisoners with Croesus had their heads cut off, on suspicion of having conspired to release him. He was subsequently taken to the palace and bound more securely, but was again loosed by thunder and lightning sent from heaven. Finally Cyrus, against his will, set him free, treated him kindly from that time, and bestowed upon him a large city near Agbatana, named Barene, in which there were 5000 horsemen and 10,000 peltasts, javelin-throwers, and archers.

Cyrus then sent Petisacas the eunuch, who had great influence with him, to Persia to fetch Astyigas from the Barcanians, he and his daughter Amytis being anxious to see him. Oebaras then advised Petisacas to leave Astyigas in some lonely spot, to perish of hunger and thirst; which he did. But the crime was revealed in a dream, and Petisacas, at the urgent request of Amytis, was handed over to her by Cyrus for punishment. She ordered his eyes to be dug out, had him flayed alive, and then crucified. Oebaras, afraid of suffering the same punishment, although Cyrus assured him that he would not allow it, starved himself to death by fasting for ten days. Astyigas was accorded a splendid funeral; his body had remained untouched by wild beasts in the wilder-ness, some lions having guarded it until it was removed by Petisacas. Cyrus marched against the Derbices (Derbikes), whose king was Amoraeus. The Derbices suddenly brought up some elephants which had been kept in ambush, and put Cyrus’s cavalry to flight. Cyrus himself fell from his horse, and an Indian wounded him mortally with a javelin under the thigh. The Indians fought on the side of the Derbices and supplied them with elephants. Cyrus’s friends took him up while he was still alive and returned to camp. Many Persians and Derbices were slain, to the number of 10,000 on each side.

Amorges, when he heard of what had happened to Cyrus, in great haste went to the assistance of the Persians with 20,000 Sacan cavalry. In a subsequent engagement, the Persians and Sacae gained a brilliant victory, Amoraeus, the king of the Derbices, and his two sons being slain. Thirty thousand Derbicans and 9000 Persians fell in the battle. The country then submitted to Cyrus. Cyrus, when near his death,

declared his elder son Cambyses king, his younger son Tanyoxarces (Tanyoxarkes) governor of Bactria, Choramnia, Parthia, and Carmania, free from tribute. Of the children of Spitamas, he appointed Spitaces satrap of the Derbices, Megabernes of the Barcanians, bidding them obey their mother in everything. He also endeavoured to make them friends with Amorges, bestowing his blessing on those who should remain on friendly terms with one another, and a curse upon those who first did wrong. With these words he died, three days after he had been wounded, after a reign of thirty years. This is the end of the eleventh book.

The twelfth book begins with the reign of Cambyses. Immediately after his accession he sent his father's body by the eunuch Bagapates to Persia for burial, and in all other respects carried out his father's wishes. The men who had the greatest influence with him were Artasyras the Hyrcanian, and the eunuchs Izabates, Aspadates, and Bagapates, who had been his father's favourite after the death of Petisacas. Bagapates was in command of the expedition against Egypt and its king Amyrtaeus, whom he defeated, through the treachery of his chief counsellor Combaphis the eunuch, who betrayed the bridges and other important secrets, on condition that Cambyses made him governor of Egypt. Cambyses first made this arrangement with him through Izabates, the cousin of Combaphis, and afterwards confirmed it by his personal promise. Having taken Amyrtaeus alive he did him no harm, but merely removed him to Susa with 6000 Egyptians chosen by himself. The whole of Egypt then became subject to Cambyses. The Egyptians lost 50,000 men in the battle, the Persians 7000.

In the meantime a certain Magian called Sphendadates,who had been flogged by Tanyoxarces for some offence, went to Cambyses and informed him that his brother was plotting against him. In proof of this he declared that Tanyoxarces would refuse to come if summoned. Cambyses thereupon summoned his brother, who, being engaged on another matter, put off coming. The Magian thereupon accused him more freely. His mother Amytis, who suspected the Magian, advised Cambyses not to listen to him. Cambyses pretended not to believe him, while in reality he did. Being summoned by Cambyses a third time, Tanyoxarces obeyed the summons. His brother embraced him, but nevertheless determined to put him to death, and, unknown to his mother Amytis, took measures to carry out his plan. The Magian made the following suggestion. Being himself very like Tanyoxarces, he advised the king publicly to order that his head should be cut off as having falsely accused the king's brother; that in the meantime Tanyoxarces should secretly be put to death, and he (the Magian) should be dressed in his clothes, so that Tanyoxarces should be thought alive. Cambyses agreed to this. Tanyoxarces was put to death by being forced to drink bull's blood; the Magian put on his clothes and was mistaken for him by the people. The fraud was not known for a long time except to Artasyras, Bagapates, and Izabates, to whom alone Cambyses had entrusted the secret.

Then Cambyses, having summoned Labyzus, the chief of Tanyoxarces's eunuchs, and the other eunuchs, showed them . the Magian seated and dressed in the guise of his brother, and asked them whether they thought he was Tanyoxarces. Labyzus, in astonishment, replied, "Whom else should we think him to be?" the likeness being so great that he was deceived. The Magian was accordingly sent to Bactria, where he played the part of Tanyoxarces. Five years later Amytis, having learnt the truth from the eunuch Tibethis, whom the Magian had flogged, demanded that Cambyses should hand over Sphendadates to her, but he refused. Whereupon Amytis, after heaping curses upon him, drank poison and died. On a certain occasion, while Cambyses was offering sacrifice, no blood flowed from the slaughtered victims. This greatly alarmed him, and the birth of a son without a head by Roxana increased this alarm. This portent was interpreted by the wise men to mean that he would leave no successor. His mother also appeared to him in a dream, threatening retribution for the murder he had committed, which alarmed him still more. At Babylon, while carving a piece of wood with a knife for his amusement, he accidentally wounded himself in the thigh, and died eleven days afterwards, in the eighteenth year of his reign.

Bagapates and Artasyras, before the death of Cambyses, conspired to raise the Magian to the throne, as they afterwards did. Izabates, who had gone to convey the body of Cambyses to Persia, finding on his return that the Magian was reigning under the name of Tanyoxarces, disclosed the truth to the army and exposed the Magian. After this he took refuge in a temple, where he was seized and put to death. Then seven distinguished Persians conspired against the Magian. Their names were Onophas, Idernes, Norondabates, Mardonius, Barisses, Ataphernes, and Darius Hystaspis.After they had given and taken the most solemn pledges, they admitted to their counsels Artasyras and Bagapates, who kept all the keys of the palace. The seven, having been admitted into the palace by Bagapates, found the Magian asleep. At the sight of them he jumped up, but finding no weapon ready to hand (for Bagapates had secretly removed them all) he smashed a chair made of gold and defended himself with one of the legs, but was finally stabbed to death by the seven. He had reigned seven months.

Darius was chosen king from the seven conspirators in accordance with a test agreed upon, his horse being the first to neigh after the sun had risen, the result of a cunning stratagem.The Persians celebrate the day on which the Magian was put to death by a festival called Magophonia. Darius ordered a tomb to be built for himself in a two-peaked mountain, but when he desired to go and see it he was dissuaded by the soothsayers and his parents. The latter, however, were anxious to make the ascent to it, but the priests who were dragging them up, being frightened at the sight of some snakes, let go the ropes and they fell and were dashed to pieces. Darius was greatly grieved and ordered the heads of the forty men who were responsible to be cut off.

Darius ordered Ariaramnes, satrap of Cappadocia, to cross over into Scythia, and carry off a number of prisoners, male and female. He went over in thirty penteconters, and among others took captive Marsagetes, the Scythian king's brother, who had been imprisoned by his own brother for certain offences. The ruler of the Scythians (Scytharkes), being enraged, wrote an abusive letter to Darius, who replied in the same tone. Darius then collected an army of 800,000 men and crossed the Bosporus and the Ister by a bridge of boats into Scythian territory in fifteen days. The two kings sent each other a bow in turn. Darius, seeing that the bow of the Scythians was stronger, turned back and fled across the bridges, destroying some of them in his haste before the entire army had crossed. Eighty thousand of his men, who had been left behind in Europe, were put to death by the ruler of the Scythians. Darius, after he had crossed the bridge, set fire to the houses and temples of the Chalcedonians, because they had attempted to break down the bridges which he had made near their city and had also destroyed the altar erected by him, when crossing, in honour of Zeus Diabaterios.

Datis, the commander of the Persian fleet, on his return from Pontus, ravaged Greece and the islands. At Marathon he was met by Miltiades; the barbarians were defeated and Datis himself slain, the Athenians afterwards refusing to give up his body at the request of the Persians. Darius then returned to Persia, where, after having offered sacrifice, he died after an illness of thirty days, in the seventy-second year of his age and the thirty-first of his reign. Artasyras and Bagapates also died, the latter having been for seven years the keeper of the tomb of Darius. Darius was succeeded by his son Xerxes, over whom. Artapanus the son of Artasyras had as great influence as his father had had over Darius. His other confidential advisers were the aged Mardonius and Matacas the eunuch. Xerxes married Amestris, the daughter of Onophas, who bore him a son, Dariaeus, two years afterwards Hystaspes and Artoxerxes, and two daughters, one named Rhodogune and another called Amytis after her grandmother.

Xerxes decided to make war upon Greece, because the Chalcedonians had attempted to break down the bridge as already stated and had destroyed the altar which Darius had set up, and because the Athenians had slain Datis and refused to give up his body. But first he visited Babylon, being desirous of seeing the tomb of Belitanes, which Mardonius showed him. But he was unable to fill the vessel of oil, as' had been written.

Thence he proceeded to Agbatana, where he heard of the revolt of the Babylonians and the murder of Zopyrus their satrap. Ctesias's account is different from that of Herodotus. What the latter relates of Zopyrus is attributed by Ctesias, with the exception of his mule giving birth to a foal, to Megabyzus, the son-in-law of Xerxes and the husband of his daughter Amytis. Babylon was taken by Megabyzus, upon whom Xerxes bestowed, amongst other rewards, a golden hand-mill, weighing six

talents, the most honourable of the royal gifts. Then Xerxes, having collected a Persian army, 800,000 men and 1000 triremes without reckoning the chariots, set out against Greece, having first thrown a bridge across at Abydos. Demaratus the Spartan, who arrived there first and accompanied Xerxes across, dissuaded him from invading Sparta. His general Artapanus, with 10,000 men, fought an engagement with Leonidas, the Spartan general, at Thermopylae; the Persian host was cut to pieces, while only two or three of the Spartans were slain. The king then ordered an attack with 20,000, but these were defeated, and although flogged to the battle, were routed again. The next day he ordered an attack with 50,000, but without success, and accordingly ceased operations. Thorax the Thessalian and Calliades and Timaphernes, the leaders of the Trachinians, who were present with their forces, were summoned by Xerxes together with Demaratus and Hegias the Ephesian, who told him that the Spartans could never be defeated unless they were surrounded. A Persian army of 40,000 men was conducted by the two leaders of the Trachinians over an almost inaccessible mountain-path to the rear of the Lacedaemonians, who were surrounded and died bravely to a man.

Xerxes sent another army of 120,000 men against Plataea under the command of Mardonius, at the instigation of the Thebans. He was opposed by Pausanias the Spartan, with only 300 Spartiates, 1000 perioeki, and 6000 from the other cities. The Persians suffered a severe defeat, Mardonius being wounded and obliged to take to flight. He was afterwards sent by Xerxes to plunder the temple of Apollo, where he is said to have died from injuries received during a terrible hailstorm, to the great grief of Xerxes. Xerxes then advanced against Athens itself, the inhabitants of which manned 110 triremes and took refuge in Salamis; Xerxes took possession of the empty city and set fire to it, with the exception of the Acropolis, which was defended by a small band of men who had remained; at last, they also made their escape by night, and the Acropolis was fired. After this, Xerxes proceeded to a narrow strip of land in Attica called Heracleum, and began to construct an embankment in the direction of Salamis, intending to cross over on foot. By the advice of the Athenians Themistocles and Aristides archers were summoned from Crete. Then a naval engagement took place between the Greeks with 700 ships and the Persians with more than 1000 under Onophas. The Athenians were victorious, thanks to the advice and clever strategy of Aristides and Themistocles; the Persians lost 500 ships, and Xerxes took to flight. In the remaining battles 12,000 Persians were killed.

Xerxes, having crossed over into Asia and advanced towards Sardes, despatched Megabyzus to plunder the temple at Delphi. On his refusing to go, the eunuch Matacas was sent in his place, to insult Apollo and plunder the temple. Having carried out his orders he returned to Xerxes, who in the meantime had arrived in Persia from Babylon. Here Megabyzus accused his wife Amytis (the daughter of Xerxes) of having committed adultery. Xerxes severely reprimanded her, but she declared

that she was not guilty. Artapanus and Aspamitres the eunuch, the confidential advisers of Xerxes, resolved to kill their master. Having done so, they persuaded Artoxerxes that his brother Dariaeus had murdered him. Dariaeus was taken to the palace of Artoxerxes, and, although he vehemently denied the accusation, he was put to death. Thus Artoxerxes became king, thanks to Artapanus, who entered into a conspiracy against him with Megabyzus (who was bitterly aggrieved at the suspicion of adultery against his wife), each taking an oath to remain loyal to the other. Nevertheless, Megabyzus revealed the plot, the guilty conduct of Artapanus came to light, and he met the death which he had intended for Artoxerxes. Aspamitres, who had taken part in the murders of Xerxes and Dariaeus was cruelly put to death, being exposed in the trough. After the death of Artapanus there was a battle between his fellow-conspirators and the other Persians, in which the three sons of Artapanus were killed and Megabyzus severely wounded. Artoxerxes, Amytis, and Rhodogune, and their mother Amestris were deeply grieved, and his life was only saved by the skill and attention of Apollonides, a physician of Cos.

Bactra and its satrap, another Artapanus, revolted from Artoxerxes. The first battle was indecisive, but in a second, the Bactrians were defeated because the wind blew in their faces, and the whole of Bactria submitted. Egypt, under the leadership of Inarus a Libyan, assisted by a native of the country, also revolted, and preparations were made for war. At the request of Inarus the Athenians sent forty ships to his aid. Artoxerxes himself was desirous of taking part in the expedition, but his friends dissuaded him. He therefore sent Achaemenides his brother with 400,000 infantry and eighty ships. Inarus joined battle with Achaemenides, the Egyptians were victorious, Achaemenides being slain by Inarus and his body sent to Artoxerxes. Inarus was also successful at sea. Charitimides, the commander of the forty Athenian ships, covered himself with glory in a naval engagement, in which twenty out of fifty Persian ships were captured with their crews, and the remaining thirty sunk.

The king then sent Megabyzus against Inarus, with an additional army of 200,000 men and 300 ships commanded by Oriscus; so that, not counting the ships' crews, his army consisted of 500,000. For, when Achaemenides fell, 100,000 of his 400,000 men perished. A desperate battle ensued, in which the losses were heavy on both sides, although those of the Egyptians were heavier. Megabyzus wounded Inarus in the thigh, and put him to flight, and the Persians obtained a complete victory. Inarus fled to Byblus, an Egyptian stronghold, accompanied by those of the Greeks who had not been killed in battle. Then all Egypt, except Byblus, submitted to Megabyzus. But since this stronghold appeared impregnable, he came to terms with Inarus and the Greeks (6000 and more in number), on condition that they should suffer no harm from the king, and that the Greeks should be allowed to return home whenever they pleased.

Having appointed Sarsamas satrap of Egypt, Megabyzus took Inarus and the Greeks to Artoxerxes, who was greatly enraged with Inarus because he had slain his brother Achaemenides. Megabyzus told him what had happened, how he had given his word to Inarus and the Greeks when he occupied Byblus, and earnestly entreated the king to spare their lives. The king consented, and the news that no harm would come to Inarus and the Greeks was immediately reported to the army. But Amestris, aggrieved at the idea that Inarus and the Greeks should escape punishment for the death of her son Achaemenides, asked the king [to give them up to her], but he refused; she then appealed to Megabyzus, who also dismissed her. At last, however, through her constant importunity she obtained her wish from her son, and after five years the king gave up Inarus and the Greeks to her. Inarus was impaled on three stakes; fifty of the Greeks, all that she could lay hands on, were decapitated. Megabyzus was deeply grieved at this, and asked permission to retire to his satrapy, Syria. Having secretly sent the rest of the Greeks thither in advance, on his arrival he collected a large army (150,000 not including cavalry) and raised the standard of revolt. Usiris with 200,000 men was sent against him; a battle took place, in which Megabyzus and Usiris wounded each other. Usiris inflicted a wound with a spear in Megabyzus's thigh two fingers deep; Megabyzus in turn first wounded Usiris in the thigh and then in the shoulder, so that he fell from his horse. Megabyzus, as he fell, protected him, and ordered that he should be spared. Many Persians were slain in the battle, in which Zopyrus and Artyphius, the sons of Megabyzus, distinguished themselves, and Megabyzus gained a decisive victory. Usiris received the greatest attention and was sent to Artoxerxes at his request.

Another army was sent against him under Menostanes the son of Artarius, satrap of Babylon and brother of Artoxerxes. Another battle took place, in which the Persians were routed; Menostanes was shot by Megabyzus, first in the shoulder and then in the head, but the wound was not mortal. However, he fled with his army and Megabyzus gained a brilliant victory. Artarius then sent to Megabyzus, advising him to come to terms with the king. Megabyzus replied that he was ready to do so, but on condition that he should not be obliged to appear at court again, and should be allowed to remain in his satrapy. When his answer was reported to the king, the Paphlagonian eunuch Artoxares and Amestris urged him to make peace without delay. Accordingly, Artarius, his wife Amytis, Artoxares (then twenty years of age), and Petisas, the son of Usiris and father of Spitamas, were sent for that purpose to Megabyzus. After many entreaties and solemn promises, with great difficulty they succeeded in persuading Megabyzus to visit the king, who finally pardoned him for all his offences.

Some time afterwards, while the king was out hunting he was attacked by a lion, which Megabyzus slew as it reared and was preparing to rush upon him. The king, enraged because Megabyzus had slain the animal first, ordered his head

to be cut off, but owing to the entreaties of Amestris, Amytis, and others his life was spared and he was banished to Curtae, a town on the Red Sea. Artoxares the eunuch was also banished to Armenia for having often spoken freely to the king in favour of Megabyzus. After having passed five years in exile, Megabyzus escaped by pretending to be a leper, whom no one might approach, and returned home to Amytis, who hardly recognized him. On the intercession of Amestris and Amytis, the king became reconciled to him and admitted him to his table as before. Megabyzus died at the age of seventy-six, deeply mourned by the king.

After his death, his wife Amytis, like her mother Amestris before her, showed great fondness for the society of men. The physician Apollonides of Cos, when Amytis was suffering from a slight illness, being called in to attend her, fell in love with her. For some time they carried on an intrigue, but finally she told her mother. She in turn informed the king, who left her to do as she would with the offender. Apollonides was kept in chains for two months as a punishment, and then buried alive on the same day that Amytis died. Zopyrus, the son of Megabyzus and Amytis, after the death of his father and mother revolted against the king. He visited Athens, where he was well received owing to the services his mother had rendered to the Athenians. From Athens he sailed with some Athenian troops to Caunus and summoned it to surrender. The inhabitants expressed themselves ready to do so, provided the Athenians who accompanied him were not admitted. While Zopyrus was mounting the wall, a Caunian named Alcides hit him on the head with a stone and killed him. The Caunian was crucified by order of his grandmother Amestris. Some time afterwards, Amestris died at a great age, and Artoxerxes also died after having reigned forty-two years. Here the seventeenth book ends.

Artoxerxes was succeeded by his son Xerxes, his only legitimate son by Damaspia, who died on the same day as her husband. The bodies of the king and queen were conveyed by Bagorazus to Persia. Artoxerxes had seventeen illegitimate sons, amongst them Secydianus by Alogune the Babylonian, Ochus (afterwards king) and Arsites by Cosmartidene, also a Babylonian. Besides these three, he also had a son Bagapaeus and a daughter Parysatis by Andria, also a Babylonian, who became the mother of Artoxerxes and Cyrus. During his father’s lifetime, Ochus was made satrap of Hyrcania, and given in marriage to Parysatis, the daughter of Artoxerxes and his own sister. Secydianus, having won over the eunuch Pharnacyas, who had the greatest influence over Xerxes next to Bagorazus, Menostanes, and some others, entered the palace after a festival, while Xerxes was lying in a drunken sleep and put him to death, forty-five days after the death of his father. The bodies of both father and son were conveyed together to Persia, for the mules which drew the chariot in which was the father’s body, refused to move, as if waiting for that of the son; and when it arrived, they at once went on rapidly.

Secydianus thus became king and appointed Menostanes his azabarites. After Bagorazus returned to court, Secydianus, who cherished a long-standing enmity against him, on the pretext that he had left his father's body in Persia without his permission, ordered him to be stoned to death. The army was greatly grieved, and, although Secydianus distributed large sums amongst the soldiers, they hated him for the murder of his brother Xerxes and now for that of Bagorazus. Secydianus, then summoned Ochus to court, who promised to present himself but failed to do so. After he had been summoned several times, he collected a large force with the obvious intention of seizing the throne. He. was joined by Arbarius, commander of the cavalry, and Arxanes, satrap of Egypt. The eunuch Artoxares also came from Armenia and placed the crown on the head of Ochus against his will. Thus Ochus became king and changed his name to Dariaeus. At the suggestion of Parysatis, he endeavoured by trickery and solemn promises to win over Secydianus. Menostanes did all he could to prevent Secydianus from putting faith in these promises or coming to terms with those who were trying to deceive him. In spite of this Secydianus allowed himself to be persuaded, was arrested, thrown into the ashes, and died, after a reign of six months and fifteen days.

Ochus (also called Dariaeus) thus became sole ruler. Three eunuchs, Artoxares, Artibarzanes, and Athous had the greatest influence with him, but his chief adviser was his wife. By her he had had two children before he. became king, a daughter Amestris and a son Arsaces, afterwards called Artoxerxes. After his accession she bore him another son, called Cyrus from the sun. A third son was named Artostes, who was followed by several others, to the number of thirteen. The writer says that he obtained these particulars from Parysatis herself. Most of the children soon died, the only survivors being those just mentioned and a fourth named Oxendras. Arsites, his own brother by the same father and mother, revolted against the king together with Artyphius the son of Megabyzus. Artasyras was sent against them, and, having been defeated in two battles, gained the victory in a third, after he had bribed the Greeks, who were with Artyphius, so that only three Milesians remained faithful to him. At length Artyphius, finding that Arsites did not appear, surrendered to the king, after Artasyras had solemnly promised him that his life should be spared. The king was anxious to put Artyphius to death, but Parysatis advised him not to do so at once, in order to deceive Arsites and induce him also to submit; when both had surrendered, she said they could both be put to death. The plan succeeded, Artyphius and Arsites surrendered, and were thrown into the ashes. The king wished to pardon Arsites, but Parysatis by her importunity persuaded him to put him to death. Phar-nacyas, who had assisted Secydianus to kill Xerxes, was stoned to death. Menostanes was also arrested and condemned, but anticipated his fate by suicide.

Pissuthnes also revolted, and Tissaphernes, Spithradates, and Parmises were sent against him. Pissuthnes set out to meet them with Lycon the Athenian and a body

of Greeks, who were bribed by the king's generals to desert him. Pissuthnes then surrendered, and, after having received assurances that his life should be spared, accompanied Tissaphernes to the court. But the king ordered him to be thrown into the ashes and gave his satrapy to Tissaphernes. Lycon also received several towns and districts as the reward of his treachery. Artoxares the eunuch, who had great influence with the king, desiring to obtain possession of the throne himself, plotted against his master. He ordered his wife to make him a false beard and moustache, that he might look like a man. His wife, however, betrayed him; he was seized, handed over to Parysatis, and put to death. Arsaces the king's son, who afterwards changed his name to Artoxerxes, married Statira, daughter of Idernes, whose son Teritukhmes, who had been appointed to his father's satrapy after his death, married the king's daughter Amestris. Teritukhmes had a half-sister Roxana, of great beauty and very skilful in bending the bow and hurling the spear. Teritukhmes having fallen in love with her and conceived a hatred of his wife Amestris, in order to get rid of the latter, resolved to put her into a sack, where she was to be stabbed to death by 300 accomplices, with whom he had entered into a conspiracy to raise a revolt. But a certain Udiastes, who had great influence with Teritukhmes, having received letters from the king promising to reward him generously if he could save his daughter, attacked and murdered Teritukhmes, who courageously defended himself and slew (it is said) thirty-seven of his assailants.

Mitradates, the son of Udiastes, the armour-bearer of Teritukhmes, took no part in this affair, and when he learnt what had happened, he cursed his father and seized the city of Zaris to hand over to the son of Teritukhmes. Parysatis ordered the mother of Teritukhmes, his brothers Mitrostes and Helicus, and his sisters except Statira to be put to death. Roxana was hewn in pieces alive. The king told his wife Parysatis to inflict the same punishment upon the wife of his son Arsaces. But Arsaces by his tears and lamentations appeased the wrath of his father and mother. Parysatis having relented, Ochus spared Statira's life, but at the same time told Parysatis that she would one day greatly regret it. In the nineteenth book the author relates how Ochus Dariaeus fell sick and died at Babylon, having reigned thirty-five years. Arsaces, who succeeded him, changed his name to Artoxerxes. Udiastes had his tongue cut out and torn out by the roots behind; and so he died. His son Mitradates was appointed to his satrapy. This was due to the instigation of Statira, whereat Parysatis was greatly aggrieved. Cyrus, being accused by Tissaphernes of designs on the life of his brother Artoxerxes, took refuge with his mother, by whose intervention he was cleared of the charge. Disgraced by his brother, he retired to his satrapy and laid his plans for revolt. Satibarzanes accused Orontes of an intrigue with Parysatis, although her conduct was irreproachable; Orontes was put to death, and his mother was greatly enraged against the king, because Parysatis had poisoned the son of Teritukhmes. The author also mentions him who

cremated his father contrary to the law, Hellanicus and Herodotus being thus convicted of falsehood.

Cyrus having revolted against his brother collected an army composed of both Greeks and barbarians. Clearchus was in command of the Greeks; Syennesis, king of Cilicia, assisted both Cyrus and Artoxerxes. The author then reports the speeches of the two princes to their troops. Clearchus the Spartan, who was in command of the Greeks, and Menon the Thessalian, who accompanied Cyrus, were always at variance, because Cyrus took the advice of Clearchus in everything, while Menon was disregarded. Large numbers deserted from Artoxerxes to Cyrus, none from Cyrus to Artoxerxes. For this reason Artabarius, who meditated desertion, was accused and thrown into the ashes. Cyrus attacked the king's army and gained the victory, but lost his life by neglecting the advice of Clearchus. His body was mutilated by Artoxerxes, who ordered his head and the hand with which he had struck him to be cut off, and carried them about in triumph. Clearchus the Spartan withdrew during the night with his Greeks, and after he had seized one of the cities belonging to Parysatis, the king made peace with him.

Parysatis set out for Babylon, mourning for the death of Cyrus, and having with difficulty recovered his head and hand sent them to Susa for burial. It was Bagapates who had cut off his head by order of Artoxerxes. Parysatis, when playing at dice with the king, won the game and Bagapates as the prize, and afterwards had him flayed alive and crucified. At length she was persuaded by the entreaties of Artoxerxes to give up mourning for her son. The king rewarded the soldier who brought him Cyrus's cap, and the Carian who was supposed to have wounded him, whom Parysatis afterwards tortured and put to death. Mitradates having boasted at table of having killed Cyrus, Parysatis demanded that he should be given up to her, and having got him into her hands, put him to death with great cruelty. Such is the contents of the nineteenth and twentieth books.

The twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third books conclude the history. Tissaphernes began to plot against the Greeks, with the assistance of Menon the Thessalian, whom he had won over. In this manner, by cunning and solemn promises, he got Clearchus and the other generals in his power, although Clearchus suspected and was on his guard against treachery and endeavoured to avert it; but the soldiers, being deceived by the words of Menon, compelled the unwilling Clearchus to visit Tissaphernes. Proxenus the Boeotian, who had been already deceived, also advised him to go. Clearchus and the other generals were sent in chains to Artoxerxes at Babylon, where all the people flocked to see Clearchus. Ctesias himself, Parysatis's physician, bestowed every attention upon Clearchus while he was in prison and did all he could to mitigate his lot. Parysatis would have given him his freedom and let him go, had not Statira persuaded the king to put him to death. After his execution, a marvellous thing happened. A strong wind sprang up and

heaped a quantity of earth upon his body, which formed a natural tomb. The other Greeks who had been sent with him were also put to death, with the exception of Menon.

The author next tells us of the insults heaped by Parysatis on Statira, and the poisoning of Statira, which was brought about in the following manner, although she had long been on her guard against this kind of death. A table knife was smeared with poison on one side. One of the little birds, about the size of an egg, called rhyndace, was cut in half by Parysatis, who herself took and ate the portion which had not been touched by the poison, at the same time offering Statira the poisoned half. Statira, seeing that Parysatis was eating her own portion, had no suspicions, and took the fatal poison. The king, enraged with his mother, ordered her eunuchs to be seized and tortured, including her chief confidant Ginge. The latter, being accused and brought to trial, was acquitted by the judges, but the king condemned her and ordered her to be tortured and put to death, which caused a lasting quarrel between mother and son.

The tomb of Clearchus, eight years afterwards, was found covered with palm-trees, which Parysatis had had secretly planted by her eunuchs. The author next states the cause of the quarrel of Artoxerxes with Evagoras, king of Salamis. The messengers sent by Evagoras to Ctesias about the receiving of letters from Abuletes. The letter of Ctesias to Evagoras concerning reconciliation with Anaxagoras prince of the Cyprians. The return of the messengers of Evagoras to Cyprus and the delivery of the letters from Ctesias to Evagoras. The speech of Conon to Evagoras about visiting the king; and the letter of Evagoras on the honours he had received from him. The letter of Conon to Ctesias, the agreement of Evagoras to pay tribute to the king, and the giving of the letters to Ctesias. Speech of Ctesias to the king about Conon and the letter to him. The presents sent by Evagoras delivered to Satibarzanes; the arrival of the messengers in Cyprus. The letters of Conon to the king and Ctesias. The detention of the Spartan ambassadors to the king. Letter from the king to Conon and the Spartans, delivered to them by Ctesias himself. Conon appointed commander of the fleet by Pharnabazus.

The visit of Ctesias to Cnidus, his native city, and to Sparta. Proceedings against the Spartan ambassadors at Rhodes, and their acquittal. The number of stations, days, and parasangs from Ephesus to Bactria and India. The work concludes with a list of the Assyrian kings from Ninus and Semiramis to Artoxerxes. This writer’s style is clear and very simple, which makes the work agreeable to read. He uses the Ionic dialect, not throughout, as Herodotus does, but only in certain expressions, nor does he, like Herodotus, interrupt the thread of his narrative by ill-timed digressions. Although he reproaches Herodotus for his old wives’ tales, he is not free from the same defect, especially in his account of India. The charm of his history chiefly consists in his manner of relating events, which is strong in the

emotional and unexpected, and in his varied use of mythical embellishment. The style is more careless than it should be, and the phraseology often descends to the commonplace, whereas that of Herodotus, both in this and other respects as far as vigour and art are concerned, is the model representative of the Ionic dialect.

Of Cnidus on the coast of Caria in Asia Minor. He was for seventeen years (401-384) court physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, whom he treated for a wound received at the battle of Cunaxa. He accuses Herodotus of being a liar, but often lays himself open to the same charge. It should be remarked that in writing his Persica Clesias had the opportunity of consulting the Persian archives and natives, whereas in regard to the Indica he had no such advantages. He was also the author of an account of the Persian imperial revenues, and of some books of travel and geographical works. More commonly Artaxerxes. For the historical events see G. Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, iii (1871), and for an estimate of Ctesias as an historian his translation of Herodotus, i. 71. Ecbatana. ”Vaults” is used to express the sense generally, not as a translation of the various readings : κρίσκρανα, explained as ”house of refuge”; κιόκρανα, ”epistyle”; κιονόκρανα ”capitals” of columns in the form of ”rams ’” heads. Peltasts, light-armed troops, who carried the small shield called pelta. Variously called Smerdis, Mergis, Merdis.

This seems a possible meaning of θριαμβεύσας, combined with the idea of a personal triumph. Herodotus gives the names as: Intaphernes, Otanes, Gobryas, Hydarnes, Megabyzus, Aspathines, Darius. Herodotus, iii. 85. On the tomb of Darius, see Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, iii. 320. A penteconter was a ship carrying fifty oars. The Danube. Zeus as the god of crossing. The ”altar” was probably a column set up to commemorate his passage. Belus or Bel. For the story see Aelian, Var. Hist., xiii. 3. The 9000 full citizens of Sparta, who formed a kind of nobility. The free inhabitants of the towns (except Sparta) who enjoyed civil but not political liberty. Apparently to hinder the construction of the embankment. The criminal was exposed to the heat of the sun in two boat-like troughs closely fitted together with head, arms, and legs hanging out until he died eaten by insects (see Plutarch, Life of Artaxerxes, 16). Referring to the efforts of Megabyzus and Amytis on behalf of the Greek prisoners.

Reading Ἀρτοξέρξης not Ξέρξης. Κατέλαβε. Others render ”when it (i. e. death) overtook him,” when the son also died. A Persian title, perhaps identical with Azarapates, a sort of gentleman-usher of the court. Κίταρις, the citaris, cidaris, or tiara. Valerius Maximus (ix. 2. ext. 6) thus describes this punishment. ”He (Ochus) filled an enclosure surrounded by high walls with ashes; a beam projected over it, on which he placed his victims, having first given them plenty to eat and drink; then, overcome by sleep, they fell from it into the treacherous heap below.” In modern Persian the sun is Khur, in Zend Hware. Ionic form of Mithradates. The excessive brevity of Photius’s abstract makes it uncertain what the allusion is,

and how Hellanicus and Herodotus are convicted of falsehood. Perhaps there is a reference to the statement of Herodotus that Croesus was burnt on the funeral pile. The expedition forms the subject of Xenophon's Anabasis, In Cyprus. The orator Isocrates composed a panegyric on this Evagoras.

The punctuation and meaning are obscure. History of India. Also read the same author's History of India, in one book, in which he employs the Ionic dialect more frequently. In regard to the river Indus, he says that, where it is narrowest, it is forty, where it is widest, two hundred stades broad. He declares that the population of India is almost greater than that of the whole world. He also mentions a worm found in this river, the only living creature which breeds there. Beyond India there are no countries inhabited by men. It never rains there, the country being watered by the river. He says of the pantarba, a kind of seal-stone, that 477 seal-stones and other precious stones, belonging to a Bactrian merchant, which had been thrown into the river, were drawn up from the bottom, all clinging together, by this stone. He also speaks of elephants which knock down walls, of little apes with tails four cubits long, and of cocks of very large size; of the parrot about as large as a hawk, which has a human tongue and voice, a dark-red beak, a black, beard, and blue feathers up to the neck, which is red like cinnabar. It speaks Indian like a native, and if taught Greek, speaks Greek.

He next mentions a fountain which is filled every year with liquid gold, from which a hundred pitcherfuls are drawn. These pitchers have to be made of earth, since the gold when drawn off becomes solid, and it is necessary to break the vessel in order to get it out. The fountain is square, sixteen cubits in circumference, and a fathom deep. The gold in each pitcher weighs a talent. At the bottom of the fountain there is iron, and the author says that he possessed two swords made from it, one given him by the king, the other by his mother, Parysatis. If this iron be fixed in the ground, it keeps off clouds and hail and hurricanes Ctesias declares that the king twice proved its efficacy and that he himself was a witness to it. The Indian dogs are very large and even attack lions. There are great mountains, from which are dug sardonyx, onyx, and other seal-stones. It is intensely hot and the sun appears ten times larger than in other countries; large numbers of people are suffocated by the heat. The sea is as large as that of Greece; it is so hot on the surface and to a depth of four fingers that fish cannot live near it, but keep on the bottom.

The river Indus flows across plains and between mountains, where the so-called Indian reed grows. It is so thick that two men can hardly get their arms round it, and as tall as the mast of a merchant-ship of largest tonnage. Some are larger, some smaller, as is natural considering the size of the mountain. Of these reeds some are male, others female. The male has no pith and is very strong, but the female has. The martikhora is an animal found in this country. It has a face like

a man's, a skin red as cinnabar, and is as large as a lion. It has three rows of teeth, ears and light-blue eyes like those of a man; its tail is like that of a land scorpion, containing a sting more than a cubit long at the end. It has other stings on each side of its tail and one on the top of its head, like the scorpion, with which it inflicts a wound that is always fatal. If it is attacked from a distance, it sets up its tail in front and discharges its stings as if from a bow; if attacked from behind, it straightens it out and launches its stings in a direct line to the distance of a hundred feet. The wound inflicted is fatal to all animals except the elephant. The stings are about a foot long and about as thick as a small rush. The martikhora is called in Greek anthropophagos (man-eater), because, although it preys upon other animals, it kills and devours a greater number of human beings. It fights with both its claws and stings, which, according to Ctesias, grow again after they have been discharged. There is a great number of these animals in India, which are hunted and killed with spears or arrows by natives mounted on elephants.

Observing that the Indians are extremely just, Ctesias goes on to describe their manners and customs. He mentions a sacred spot in an uninhabited district, which they honour under the name of the Sun and the Moon. It is a fifteen days' journey from mount Sardo. Here the Sun is always cool for thirty-five days in the year, so that his votaries may attend his feast and after its celebration may return home without being scorched. In India there is neither thunder, lightning, nor rain, but winds and hurricanes, which carry along everything that comes in their way, are frequent. The sun, after rising, is cool for half the day, but for the remainder is excessively hot in most parts of the country. It is not the heat of the sun that makes the Indians swarthy; they are so naturally. Some of them, both men and women, are very fair, though they are fewer in number. Ctesias says that he himself saw five white men and two white women. In support of his statement that the sun cools the air for thirty-five days, he mentions that the fire which streams from Aetna does no damage to the middle of the country through which it passes, because it is the abode of just men, but destroys the rest. In the island of Zacynthus there are fountains full of fish, out of which pitch is taken. In the island of Naxos there is a fountain from which sometimes flows a wine of very agreeable flavour. The water of the river Phasis, if allowed to stand a day and a night in a vessel, becomes a most delicious wine. Near Phaselis in Lycia there is a fire which never goes out, but burns on a rock both night and day. It cannot be extinguished by water, which rather increases the flame, but only by throwing earth upon it.

In the middle of India there are black men, called Pygmies,who speak the same language as the other inhabitants of the country. They are very short, the tallest being only two cubits in height, most of them only one and a half. Their hair is very long, going down to the knees and even lower, and their beards are larger than those of any other men. When their beards are full grown they leave off wearing clothes and let the hair of their head fall down behind far below the knees, while

their beard trails down to the feet in front. When their body is thus entirely covered with hair they fasten it round them with a girdle, so that it serves them for clothes. They are snubnosed and ugly. Their sheep are no bigger than lambs, their oxen, asses, horses, mules, and other beasts of burden about the size of rams. Being very skilful archers, 3000 of them attend on the king of India. They are very just and have the same laws as the Indians. They hunt the hare and the fox, not with dogs, but with ravens, kites, crows, and eagles.

There is a lake 800 stades in circumference, the surface of which, when riot ruffled by the wind, is covered with floating oil. Sailing over it in little boats, they ladle out the oil with little vessels and keep it for use. They also use oil of sesamum and nut-oil, but the oil from the lake is best. The lake also abounds in fish. The country produces much silver and there are numerous silver mines, not very deep, but those of Bactria are said to be deeper. There is also gold, not found in rivers and washed, as in the river Pactolus, but in many large mountains which are inhabited by griffins. These are four-footed birds as large as a wolf, their legs and claws resembling those of a lion; their breast feathers are red, those of the rest of the body black. Although there is abundance of gold in the mountains, it is difficult to get it because of these birds.

The Indian sheep and goats are larger than asses, and as a rule have four young ones, sometimes six, at a time. There are neither tame nor wild pigs. The palm trees and dates are three times as large as those of Babylon. There is a river of honey that flows from a rock. The author speaks at length of the Indians' love of justice, their loyalty to their kings and their contempt of death. He also mentions a fountain, the water from which, when drawn off, thickens like cheese. If three obols' weight of this thick mass be crushed, mixed with water, and given to any one to drink, he reveals everything that he has ever done, being in a state of frenzy and delirium the whole day. The king makes use of this test when he desires to discover the truth about an accused person. If he confesses, he is ordered to starve himself to death; if he reveals nothing, he is acquitted.

The Indians are not subject to headache, ophthalmia, or even toothache; to ulcers on the mouth, or sores in any other part of the body. They live 120, 130, 150, and some even 200 years. There is a serpent a span in length, of a most beautiful purple colour, with a very white head, and without teeth. It is caught on the burning mountains, from which the sardonyx is dug. It does not sting, but its vomit rots the place where it falls. If it is hung up by the tail it discharges two kinds of poison, one yellow like amber, when it is alive, the other black, when it is dead. If one drinks only as much of the former as a grain of sesamum dissolved in water, his brain runs out through his nose and he dies immediately; if the other poison is administered, it brings on consumption, which does not prove fatal for at least a year.

There is a bird called dikaerum (meaning in Greek ”just”), the size of a partridge’s egg. It buries its excrement in the ground in order to hide it. If any one finds it and takes only a morsel of it about the size of a grain of sesamum in the morning, he is overcome by sleep, loses consciousness, and dies at sunset. There is also a tree called parebum, about the size of an olive, which is only found in the royal gardens. It bears neither flowers nor fruit, and has only fifteen very stout roots, the smallest of which is as thick as a man’s arm. If a piece of this root, about a span in length, be put near any body of matter, gold, silver, brass, stones, in fact, everything except amber, it attracts it; if a cubit’s length of it be used, it attracts lambs and birds, the latter being generally caught in this way. If you wish to solidify a gallon of water, you need only throw in a piece of the root the weight of an obol; the same with wine, which can be handled like wax, although on the next day it becomes liquid again. The root is also used as a remedy for those suffering from bowel complaints.

There is a river that flows through India, not large, but about two stades broad. It is called Hyparchus in Indian, meaning in Greek ”bestowing all blessings.” During thirty days in the year it brings down amber. It is said that in the mountains there are trees on the banks of the river where it passes through, which at a certain season of the year shed tears like the almond, fir, or any other tree, especially during these thirty days. These tears drop into the river and become hard. This tree is called in Indian Siptakhora, meaning in Greek ”sweet,” and from it the inhabitants gather amber. It also bears fruit in clusters like grapes, the stones of which are as large as the nuts of Pontus. On these mountains there live men with the head of a dog, whose clothing is the skin of wild beasts. They speak no language, but bark like dogs, and in this manner make themselves understood by each other. Their teeth are larger than those of dogs, their nails like those of these animals, but longer and rounder. They inhabit the mountains as far as the river Indus. Their complexion is swarthy. They are extremely just, like the rest of the Indians with whom they associate. They understand the Indian language but are unable to converse, only barking or making signs with their hands and fingers by way of reply, like the deaf and dumb. They are called by the Indians Calystrii, in Greek Cynocephali (”dog-headed”). [They live on raw meat.] They number about 120,000.

Near the sources of this river grows a purple flower, from which is obtained a purple dye, as good in quality as the Greek and of an even more brilliant hue. In the same district there is an animal about the size of a beetle, red as cinnabar, with very long feet, and a body as soft as that of a worm. It breeds on the trees which produce amber, eats their fruit and kills them, as the woodlouse destroys the vines in Greece. The Indians crush these insects and use them for dyeing their robes and tunics and anything else they wish. The dye is superior to the Persian. The Cynocephali living on the mountains do not practise any trade but live by hunting. When they have killed an animal they roast it in the sun. They also rear numbers of sheep, goats,

and asses, drinking the milk of the sheep and whey made from it. They eat the fruit of the Siptakhora, whence amber is procured, since it is sweet. They also dry it and keep it in baskets, as the Greeks keep their dried grapes. They make rafts which they load with this fruit together with well-cleaned purple flowers and 260 talents of amber, with the same quantity of the purple dye, and 1000 additional talents of amber, which they send annually to the king of India. They exchange the rest for bread, flour, and cotton stuffs with the Indians, from whom they also buy swords for hunting wild beasts, bows, and arrows, being very skilful in drawing the bow and hurling the spear. They cannot be defeated in war, since they inhabit lofty and inaccessible mountains. Every five years the king sends them a present of 300,000 bows, as many spears, 120,000 shields, and 50,000 swords.

They do not live in houses, but in caves. They set out for the chase with bows and spears, and as they are very swift of foot, they pursue and soon overtake their quarry. The women have a bath once a month, the men do not have a bath at all, but only wash their hands. They anoint themselves three times a month with oil made from milk and wipe themselves with skins. The clothes of men and women alike are not skins with the hair on, but skins tanned and very fine. The richest wear linen clothes, but they are few in number. They have no beds, but sleep on leaves or grass. He who possesses the greatest number of sheep is considered the richest, and so in regard to their other possessions. All, both men and women, have tails above their hips, like dogs, but longer and more hairy. They are just, and live longer than any other men, 170, sometimes 200 years.

It is said that beyond their country, above the sources of the river, there are other men, black like the rest of the Indians. They do no work, do not eat grain nor drink water, but rear large numbers of cattle, cows, goats, and sheep, whose milk is their only food. When they drink milk in the morning and then again at mid-day, they eat a sweet root which prevents the milk from curdling in the stomach, and at night makes them vomit all they have taken without any difficulty.

In India there are wild asses as large as horses, or even larger. Their body is white, their head dark red, their eyes bluish, and they have a horn in their forehead about a cubit in length. The lower part of the horn, for about two palms distance from the forehead, is quite white, the middle is black, the upper part, which terminates in a point, is a very flaming red. Those who drink out of cups made from it are proof against convulsions, epilepsy, and even poison, provided that before or after having taken it they drink some wine or water or other liquid out of these cups. The domestic and wild asses of other countries and all other solid-hoofed animals have neither huckle-bones nor gall-bladder, whereas the Indian asses have both. Their huckle-bone is the most beautiful that I have seen, like that of the ox in size and appearance; it is as heavy as lead and of the colour of cinnabar all through. These animals are very strong and swift; neither the horse nor any other animal

can overtake them. At first they run slowly, but the longer they run their pace increases wonderfully, and becomes faster and faster. There is only one way of catching them. When they take their young to feed, if they are surrounded by a large number of horsemen, being unwilling to abandon their foals, they show fight, butt with their horns, kick, bite, and kill many men and horses. They are at last taken, after they have been pierced with arrows and spears; for it is impossible to capture them alive. Their flesh is too bitter to eat, and they are only hunted for the sake of the horns and huckle-bones.

In the river Indus a worm is found resembling those which are usually found on fig-trees. Its average length is seven cubits, though some are longer, others shorter. It is so thick that a child ten years old could hardly put his arms round it. It has two teeth, one in the upper and one in the lower jaw. Everything it seizes with these teeth it devours. By day it remains in the mud of the river, but at night it comes out, seizes whatever it comes across, whether ox or camel, drags it into the river, and devours it all except the intestines. It is caught with a large hook baited with a lamb or kid attached by iron chains. After it has been caught, it is hung up for thirty days with vessels placed underneath, into which as much oil from the body drips as would fill ten Attic kotylae. At the end of the thirty days, the worm is thrown away, the vessels of oil are sealed arid taken as a present to the king of India, who alone is allowed to use it. This oil sets everything alight---- wood or animals----over which it is poured, and the flame can only be extinguished by throwing a quantity of thick mud on it.

There are trees in India as high as cedars or cypresses, with leaves like those of the palm-tree, except that they are a little broader and have no shoots. They flower like the male laurel, but have no fruit. The tree is called by the Indians karpion, by the Greeks myrorodon (unguent-rose); it is not common. Drops of oil ooze out of it, which are wiped off with wool and then squeezed into stone alabaster boxes. The oil is reddish, rather thick, and so fragrant that it scents the air to a distance of five stades. Only the king and his family are allowed to use it. The king of India sent some to the king of Persia, and Ctesias, who saw it, says that he cannot compare the perfume with any other. The Indians also have very excellent cheese and sweet wine, both of which Ctesias tested himself. There is a square fountain in India, about five ells in circumference. The water is in a rock, about three cubits' depth down, and the water itself three fathoms. The Indians of highest rank----men, women, and children----bathe in it [not only for cleanliness, but as a preventive of disease]. They plunge feet foremost into the water, and when they jump into it, it throws them out again on to dry land, not only human beings, but every animal, living or dead, in fact, everything that is thrown into it except iron, silver, gold, and copper, which sink to the bottom. The water is very cold, and agreeable to drink; it makes a loud noise like that of water boiling in a caldron. It cures leprosy and scab. In Indian it is called ballade, and in Greek ophelime (useful).

In the mountains where the Indian reed grows there dwells a people about 30,000 in number. Their women only have children once in their life, which are born with beautiful teeth in the upper and lower jaw. Both male and female children have white hair ,on the head and eyebrows. Up to the age of thirty the men have white hair all over the body; it then begins to turn black, and at the age of sixty it is quite black. Both men and women have eight fingers and eight toes. They are very warlike, and 5000 of them----bowmen and spearmen---- accompany the king of India on his military expeditions. Their ears are so long that their arms are covered with them as far as the elbow, and also their backs, and one ear touches the other. [In Aethiopia there is an animal called crocottas, vulgarly kynolykos (dog-wolf), of amazing strength. It is said to imitate the human voice, to call men by name at night, and to devour those who approach it. It is as brave as a lion, as swift as a horse, and as strong as a bull. It cannot be overcome by any weapon of steel. In Chalcis in Eubbea there are sheep which have no gall-bladder, and their flesh is so bitter that even the dogs refuse to eat it. They also say that beyond the gates of Mauretania the rain is abundant in summer, arid that it is scorching hot in winter. Among the Cyonians there is a fountain which gives out oil instead of water, which the people use in all their food. In Metadrida there is another fountain, some little distance from the sea, the flow of which is so violent at midnight that it casts up on land fishes in such numbers that the inhabitants, unable to pick them up, leave most of them to rot on the ground.]

Ctesias relates these fables as perfect truth, adding that he himself had seen with his own eyes some of the things he describes, and had been informed of the rest by eye-witnesses. He says that he has omitted many far more marvellous things, for fear that those who had not seen them might think that his account was utterly untrustworthy. See translation by J. W. McCrindle with Introduction and Notes (1882), to which the present translator desires to acknowledge his obligations; H. H. Wilson, ”Notes on the Indica of Ctesias” (Ashmolean Society Transactions, i-xi. 1838). A stade is about an English furlong. Supposed to be the hydrophane (also called oculus mundi, eye of the world), a kind of opal which absorbs water on immersion and exhibits a changing play of colours. Rather read μακρῶν (large) for μικρῶν (small). The text is corrupt here. The magnet may be referred to. Persian mardikhora. It is not clear whether Sardo is merely a proper name or means the ”mountain of the sardo” (a precious stone). During an eruption, two brothers, Amphinomus and Anapus of Catana, carried off their parents on their shoulders, and were untouched by the lava. The spot where this took place was afterwards called ”the land of the pious.”

The name means ”a fist long.” Persian aver-khosh (”bringing good ”). Persian shiftehkhor (”agreeable to eat”). The Hyparchus. The cochineal insect is meant. Perhaps the rhinoceros, although the description is not altogether suitable. About five pints. The jackal or hyena. This passage is probably not by Ctesias.

Codices 1-165 — 73. [Heliodorus, Aethiopica]

Read the Aethiopica of Heliodorus. The work is dramatic, and the style employed is suited to the subject, being full of simplicity and charm. The narrative is diversified by actual, expected, or unexpected incidents that appeal to the feelings, by strange escapes from danger, by clear and pure diction. If, as is only natural, there is a tendency to use figures of speech, they are easy to understand, and vividly illustrate the subject matter. The periods are symmetrical., and concisely arranged with a view to brevity. The composition in other respects corresponds to the subject. The story is about the love of a man and a woman, and shows a desire for the strict observance of propriety.

The characters are Theagenes and Chariclea, two chaste lovers who, through all their wanderings and frequent captivities, keep their modesty intact. Their names, and a brief account of their fortunes and sufferings, are given. The Athenian festival, at which Chariclea is a priestess and Theagenes a competitor in the stadium. How they fall in love with each other at sight; Chariclea's consequent illness; how she is carried off, with her consent, by Theagenes and Calasiris from the house of her reputed father Charicles. Voyage to Zacynthus, during which the captain of the ship is smitten with love for Chariclea; Calasiris pretends to accept his offer of marriage. Chariclea and her party are hospitably received on shore, and informed by the fisherman who gives them lodging that Trachinus, the captain of a band of robbers, intends to carry her off. The flight of Calasiris and Chariclea, the pursuit and capture of the ship by Trachinus. He falls in love with Chariclea, who pretends to be willing to marry him. Calasiris and Theagenes, pretending to be her father and brother, request [that they may be allowed to remain on the vessel], and their request is granted. Storm at sea; their narrow escape from shipwreck, and landing on the coast of Egypt. Trachinus speaks of his intended marriage to Chariclea. The stratagem of her supposed father, Calasiris, and arrangements for the wedding-feast. Pelorus is persuaded by Calasiris that Chariclea is in love with him, which leads to a quarrel between Pelorus and Trachinus about her.

A regular battle takes place, in which many of the pirates are slain by themselves, and several by Chariclea. Her grief at seeing Theagenes covered with wounds. Attack by Egyptian brigands. Their astonishment at the sight of Chariclea, whom they carry off with Theagenes to Thyamis, the captain of the Bucoli, as the brigands were called. He also falls in love with Chariclea, who again pretends that Theagenes is her brother. The Bucoli are in turn attacked and routed; flight of Thyamis and Hermuthis, followed by Cnemon and Theagenes. Chariclea remains in the cave, at the entrance of which lies the dead body of Thisbe, the sight of which plunges Theagenes into unbearable grief, until Chariclea addresses him from the cave. The mystery of the, death of Thisbe; grief of Hermuthis. Departure of Cnemon and Hermuthis, Chariclea and Theagenes. Cnemon, leaving Hermuthis, meets Calasiris. They tell each other their adventures. Cnemon tells the story of Thisbe and Demaenete his stepmother, his banishment, and other misfortunes; Calasiris that of Charicles, Chariclea, and Theagenes. Both lament their misfortunes. Then Cnemon imparts the welcome news that Theagenes and Chariclea are still alive, since he himself has been a fellow-prisoner with them in the hands of Thyamis. Nausicles, with whom Calasiris is living, brings in Chariclea in the name of Thisbe. Hearing this, name, Cnemon, knowing that Thisbe is dead, is puzzled; but his perplexity changes to joy at the discovery that Chariclea is alive. First search for Theagenes, and marriage of Cnemon and Nausiclea. Calasiris sets out with Chariclea to find Theagenes.

An old woman is found lamenting over her son who has fallen in battle, and addressing him with the aid of magic arts, Calasiris and Chariclea meanwhile looking on. The old woman entreats the corpse to tell her whether her other son will return. The son, cursing his mother as guilty of violent and unlawful acts, informs her that her son will be killed, but that she will die before him, for having insulted the dead. Her death from accidentally falling on a fragment of a spear.

Thyamis, Theagenes, and the rest of the robber band set out for Memphis, the first-named desiring to recover the priesthood which his younger brother, Petosiris, has seized. This causes a great disturbance in the city. Arsace, who is in command of the city, endeavours to put an end to the strife by ordering the two brothers to contend in single combat, the priesthood to be given to the victor. The combat takes place against the wish of Petosiris, who is unskilled in the use of arms, whereas Thyamis is an experienced soldier. Thyamis at once scares his brother, who flings away his arms and takes to flight, being twice pursued round the walls of the city by his brother. Theagenes----with whom Arsace, the wife of Oroondates, has fallen in love----is attending on Thyamis. Calasiris and Chariclea come on the scene. Calasiris, seeing his sons engaged in mortal combat, runs up to them with a shout and with difficulty succeeds in stopping the fight, since they do not recognize him. Chariclea falls into the arms of Theagenes. The brothers lay down their arms,

and Thyamis is appointed to the priesthood by his father, who soon afterwards dies.

Plot of Arsace against Theagenes and Chariclea, in which she is zealously assisted by her maid Cybele, who invites them to the palace. Arsace's uncontrollable love for Theagenes, her schemes, methods of ill-treatment, allurements, and plots. Cybele, who intends to give a cup of poisoned wine to Chariclea, by mistake drinks it herself and dies. Theagenes and Chariclea are cruelly treated and tortured because Theagenes rejects the advances of Arsace. Chariclea is condemned to be burnt, but the flames are extinguished by the stone pantarbe. Thus Chariclea escapes for the moment, but Arsace, in her rage, prepares to have her put to death the next day. Arsace's husband, Oroondates, sends [his eunuch Bagoas] to bring the lovers by night to his camp, Cybele's son, disappointed in his desire to marry Chariclea, having hastened to inform his master of his wife's misconduct.

Attack by the Aethiopians; Theagenes and Chariclea carried off to Hydaspes, king of Aethiopia. Their consecration for sacrifice----Theagenes to the sun, Chariclea to the moon. Games and sacrifices in the presence of Sisimithres, chief of the gymnosophists, and Persine, the king's wife. Chariclea demands to be allowed to plead her cause before the king. Her demand is granted, Sisimithres being appointed judge; it is proved by the evidence of witnesses that Chariclea is really the daughter of Hydaspes and Persine. Hydaspes is with difficulty persuaded of the truth of this, but in obedience to the custom of the country is still determined that she shall be sacrificed. Opposition of the people and release of Chariclea, to the joy of all. Chariclea threatened with another danger. Theagenes is still bound for the sacrifice and in spite of her earnest entreaties and various pleas, her father refuses to release him. Chariclea, in great distress of mind, tells her mother all that has happened to herself and Theagenes. The latter's exploit with the bull and the delight of the people. He also defeats the mightiest wrestler among the Aethiopians amidst shouts of applause. Nevertheless, he is crowned and led to the sacrifice. Charicles, who happens to be present, having come from Athens, begs the king to restore to him his supposed daughter. The king promises to do so if he can find her, but he is unable to do so. Charicles seizes Theagenes and drags him before the king, exclaiming, "This is the man who stole my daughter from Athens." An investigation is held, Theagenes is declared not guilty with the approval of Sisimithres, who secures the abolition of human sacrifice for the future, amid general rejoicing. Thus Theagenes and Chariclea, after all their trials and perils, become man and wife. Chariclea crowned with the mitre of the priesthood by her mother, and Theagenes by his father-in-law. Sacrifice offered and preparations made for the mystic nuptial rites.

This romance was written by Heliodorus, son of Theodosius, a Phoenician of Emesa. It is said that he was afterwards a bishop. Heliodorus of Emesa in Syria, belonging

to a family of the priests of the Sun, flourished in the third century A. D. This view is supported by the mention of the Blemmyes (first prominent in 250), traces of neo-Pythagorean influence, and the stress laid on Sun-worship. The ecclesiastical historian Socrates wrongly identifies him with a bishop of Tricca in the reign of Theodosius, the latter probably confused with Theodosius the father of the author of the Aethiopica. The standard work on the Greek romance-writers is K. Rohde, Der griechische Roman (1914); see also Blackwood's Magazine, xliv. (1892). The whole work is preserved, and it would be difficult to understand the complicated plot from Photius's abstract. Some taking the side of Trachinus, others that of Pelorus, the second in command.

The name of a robber "shepherd-people" inhabiting the N.W. part of the Nile delta in the neighbourhood of Alexandria. Or Thermuthis. A young Athenian who had been detained by the brigands. To which she had been carried off. Thinking it was Chariclea. Her husband, Oroondates, being absent on a military expedition. Which she wore on her finger (see Ctesias, Indica, p. III). An Indian sect of philosophers who lived an extremely ascetic life. Their doctrine was a kind of Pantheism, and they believed in the transmigration of souls. By mortifying the body they hoped to purify their souls. They wore no clothing, hence their name (gymnos, naked, sophistes, wise man). Their influence in the oriental (and even in the Greek world) was great, and Alexander the Great, during his campaigns, endeavoured to persuade them to join his suite. [Note to the online edition. F. A. Wright's translation into English is online now with amendments by Susan Rhoads]

Codices 1-165 — 74. [Themistius, Political Orations & Lesbonax, Speeches]

Read the thirty-six political orations of Themistius. Some are addressed to the emperor Constantius, others to Valens, the younger Valentinian, and Theodosius, and contain encomiums and panegyrics of these emperors. The style is clear, free from redundancies, but somewhat florid. The language is official, with a tendency to solemnity. Themistius flourished in the reign of Valens, as is clear from his works. He was still a young man in the time of Constantius, by whom he was elected a member of the senate, as is evident from the letter addressed by the emperor himself to that body on behalf of Themistius. His father, who was also a philosopher, was named Eugenius. We have seen his commentaries on all the works of Aristotle, and concise and useful paraphrases of the Analytics, the Soul, the Physics, and similar works. He also did something for the interpretation of Plato, and, in fact, was a lover and student of philosophy.

Also read the sixteen speeches of Lesbonax. This Lesbonax ... Called Euphrates (”beautiful speaker”), neo-Platonist and sophist (c. 317-390), born in Paphlagonia, then resident at Constantinople, where he entered the service of the state, finally becoming prefect of the city. One of his special duties was to deliver official orations greeting the emperors, under six of whom he lived. In addition to the orations here referred to, he was a prolific writer on philosophical subjects. When quite a young man, he gained considerable reputation as the author of a commentary on Aristotle. He was on friendly terms with famous literary men, orators and philosophers, Christian as well as heathen, and Gregory of Nazianzus calls him ”the king of arguments.” Of the thirty-six speeches mentioned by Photius, we possess thirty-four (one only in a Latin translation), and some of his work on Aristotle. ”State-paper-like” (T. Hodgkin). Probably Lesbonax of Mytilene, the author of three extant declamations. It is uncertain when he lived, probably in the first century A.D.

Codices 1-165 — 75. [John Philoponus, On the Trinity against John Scholasticus]

Read the little treatise of John Philoponus against the divinely-inspired doctrine of the holy and consubstantial Trinity, set forth by John Scholasticus, archbishop of Constantinople, in his catechetical speech, delivered at the first indictionduring the reign of Justin. The style is what one would expect from the author, being clear but altogether lacking in energy and dignity. His arguments are not only blasphemous, but utterly unsound and feeble, and he shows himself unable to give even a superficial colouring of truth to his fallacious arguments against the true faith. Inventing natures, substances and godheads, like the insolent babbler that he is, he pours forth a stream of blasphemy against the Christian faith, going minutely into such points as ”how many does one mean?” Thus, in his ingenious trifling, as he considers it, or rather his puerile want ot taste, he insolently boasts that he despises the mystical rites of our Church. It is not only in these particular arguments that he appears weak and silly, but in all the other works he has written, with the exception of those in which he has plagiarized from, others, while falsely laying claim to originality. He is far removed from those writers who know how to distinguish the true from the false, and are capable of attaining subtlety of thought. As for the writings falsely claimed by him as his own, they have generally preserved the character of their authors, except that in some cases his vicious style and equipment have destroyed the noble manliness of the original writers. They resemble those compounds which, naturally excellent, owing to the manner in which they are reared and nourished, show signs of spuriousness and degeneracy. In this work he introduces quotations from the holy Fathers, such as Gregory the Theologian, Basil the Great, the sorely-tried Athanasius and Saint Cyril, but they in no way assist his impious design.

See Cod. 21. See p. 89, note 4.

Codices 1-165 — 76. [Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews]

Read the Antiquities of the Jews, by Flavius Josephus, in twenty books. He begins with the Mosaic cosmogony, and although his account agrees in the main with that generally accepted, he sometimes differs. The work ends with the war between the Jews and Romans, at the time when Agrippa, son of the great Agrippa, who deprived Jesus, son of Gamaliel, of the high priesthood, and bestowed it upon Matthias, son of Theophilus, was king of the Jews. Antiochus and his general Lysias were the first to introduce a bold innovation in reference to the tenure of the high priesthood. They removed Onias named Menelaus from that office, put him to death, and deprived his son of the right of succession, appointing in his place Alcimus called Iacimus, of the tribe of Aaron, but belonging to a different family. Before this it had been the law from the time of Aaron that the high priest should hold office for life, and that the son should succeed the father. But when Alcimus died, after having been high priest for three years, the office remained in abeyance for seven years. After Matthias and his sons of the Asmonean family were entrusted with the leadership of the Jewish people, and made war on the Macedonians, Jonathan was appointed high priest. To this family also belonged Judas, who was called Aristobulus, who first placed the diadem on his head, thus filling the office of both high priest and king.

A year later he died, and left his brother Alexander his successor in the kingdom and priesthood, who held these dignities for twenty-seven years. From. this time the kingship and priesthood combined remained in the Asmonean family until the time of Hyrcanus, whom Pompey, after the conquest of Jerusalem, deprived of his kingdom, but allowed him to hold the office of high priest. After thirty-three years he was taken prisoner by the Parthian generals Barzapharnes and Pacorus, who appointed as king Antigonus, the son of the brother of Aristobulus. After Antigonus had reigned three years and three months, the Roman general Sosius and Herod the First, the son of Antipater, a priest of Ascalon, and of Cypris the Arabian, overthrew him, and took him to Antioch, where he was put to death by Antony. This was the end of the Asmonean dynasty, and Herod was made king of the Jews by the Ro-

mans. He bestowed the high priesthood upon any one without distinction, setting an example for his successors to follow. As stated above, the author, in his twenty books, beginning from the creation of the world, goes down to the beginning of the last war between the Jews and the Romans, at the time when Agrippa, son of Agrippa, had been appointed king of the Jews by the Romans and Gessius Florus had succeeded Albinus as governor of Judaea. The Jews, unable to endure Florus's wickedness and cruelty, revolted, thinking it better to perish at once together in freedom than gradually and in slavery.

It was in the second year of Florus's governorship and the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, that the war broke out, with which the history of Josephus ends. Of his style we have already spoken.

Josephus was by birth a Jew and a priest, belonging to a family descended from a long line of priests on the father's side. On the mother's side he was of royal blood, for the children of Asmoneus, from whom her family was derived, had for a long time held both the high priesthood and the rank of king. His father's name was Matthias. He was born in the first year of the reign of the emperor Gaius, and from boyhood was an earnest student. In his sixteenth year, he began to devote his attention to the three sects of the Jews, and conscientiously examined them, so that after having tried them all he might be able to choose the best. These sects are the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. Having gone through them all, he retired into the wilderness, living there for three years with a man who led a solitary and ascetic life. This man's clothes were made of the leaves of trees, his food consisted of natural herbs and fruit, and he bathed frequently both by night and day, to keep himself chaste. When he was nineteen, Josephus returned to the city and joined the sect of the Pharisees, which is said to resemble the sect called Stoic among the Greeks. In his thirtieth year, he was sent by the people of Jerusalem to investigate the condition of affairs in Galilee, where there was great confusion and things were in a very unsettled state. He was then appointed commander-in-chief of Galilee, and showed himself an efficient administrator.

He successfully escaped plots of different kinds laid against him by his political rivals, and by showing a spirit of moderation in dealing with his enemies often brought them over to his side. Having taken up arms against the Romans against his will, after a brave resistance at Iotapata he was taken prisoner by Vespasian, who treated him kindly at the time and still more so after he became emperor. Not only Vespasian, but his sons and successors, Titus and Domitian, entertained the highest regard for him; the Roman citizenship was bestowed upon him, and he became very wealthy. He finished his History in the fifty-sixth year of his age, in the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian.

Cod. 47. 27-100. He is the Agrippa before whom St. Paul was brought. Grandson of Herod the Great. He is notorious for his persecution of the Christians (44). He

is said to have died of a terrible disease (Acts xii. 23). Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria 175-164. He was a determined advocate of eradicating Judaism and of the hellenization of the people. 64-65. Caligula, emperor 37-41. According to Josephus, his name was Banus.

Codices 1-165 — 77. [Eunapius, Chronicle]

Read the new edition of the continuation of the Chronicle of Dexippus by Eunapius, in fourteen books. It begins with the reign of Claudius Caesar, when the history of Dexippus ends, and goes down to the time of Honorius and Arcadius, the sons of Theodosius. The work actually ends at the time when Arsacius, after the banishment of John Chysostom, was raised to the archbishopric of Constantinople, and the wife of Arcadius died of a miscarriage. This Eunapius was a native of Sardes in Lydia, and an impious heathen. He slanders and abuses in every way and without restraint all who have adorned the empire by their piety, especially Constantine the Great; on the other hand, he extols the impious, above all Julian the Apostate. Indeed, it almost seems as if the work was written as an elaborate panegyric upon him. His style is elegant, if one cuts out terms and expressions such as ”fowl-like,” ”more deer-like,” ”more swine-like,” ”hawk-like,” ”crow-like,” ”ape-like,” ”a tear like a river,” and so on, which vitiate and debase the nobility of the rest of the language. He also makes use of figures of speech capriciously, a fault which the rule of historical writing forbids, but in general his forcible style combined with urbanity palliates the offence. His method of composition, his clearness and his use of periods are exactly suited, and appropriate to historical narrative; sometimes, however, the style is wordy with a tendency towards forensic rather than historical language. In construction he introduces numerous innovations, but not so as to cause unpleasantness nor to afford an excuse for attacking his methods.

He wrote two volumes, covering the same period. In the first, he bespatters with abuse the pure faith of us Christians, glorifies the heathen superstition, and attacks many pious emperors. In the second volume, which he calls a ”new edition,” he has cut out the insults and brutal abuse which he had showered upon Christian piety, and, having connected the rest of the body of the work, calls it, as we have said, a ”new edition,” although it still shows considerable traces of the original frenzy. We have come across old copies of both editions, both in separate volumes and combined, and, having read both, are in a position to estimate the difference. The result is that in the new edition many passages, owing to the omissions, are

mutilated and obscure, although generally the author shows a great regard for clearness. Somehow or other in this second edition he has not connected the narrative with due regard to the omissions, and so has spoiled the meaning.

See Cod. 82. Of Sardes (c. 345-420), educated at Athens, andspent the rest of his life in his native town as a physician and rhetorician. His ”historical memoirs” deal with events from 270 to 414. He was also the author of some extant Lives of the Sophists. He was a bitter enemy of Christianity, and a devoted adherent of neo-Platonism. In the ”second edition” of the Chronicle much that was offensive to Christianity was omitted. 404-405. Μεθόδοις.Another reading is περιόδοις, ” periods.”

Codices 1-165 — 78. [Malchus, Byzantine History]

Read the Byzantine History of Malchus the sophist in seven books. It begins with the final illness and death of the emperor Leo in the seventeenth year of his reign. The author gives an account of the proclamation and accession of Zeno, his expulsion from the throne and life as a private individual, the accession and abdication of the usurper Basiliscus. The restoration of Zeno to the throne and the murder of Basiliscus, his wife and children being unjustly put to death at the same time. Harmatius, who had restored Zeno, met with a similar recompense, being put to death by Onulphus. The author also gives an account of the rebellion of Theodoric the son of Triarius; the friendship of Theodoric the son of Malamir, and his war with Theodoric the son of Triarius; the second revolt against Zeno, the rebellion of Marcian, the conspiracy of Zeno's mother-in-law, and the banishment of Marcian for life. Verina's plot against Illus, the treacherous seizure of Epidamnus by Theodoric the son of Malamir. Having described these events the author then touches upon Roman affairs. The seventh book ends with the death of Nepos, who, having driven out Glycerius, assumed the imperial power, ordered Glycerius's hair to be cut like a cleric's and made him chief priest instead of emperor. Nepos himself was subsequently slain at the instigation of Glycerius. These seven books show that the author had already written an account of preceding events, as also appears from the beginning of the first book of the seven.

The end of the seventh book further shows that he had intended to continue the history, if his life had been spared. Malchus, a native of Philadelphia, is a most admirable historian. His style is pure, free from redundancies and easy to understand; the language is ornate and explicit, if somewhat pompous; he does not hesitate to employ unfamiliar expressions characterized by emphasis, euphony, and sublimity. Speaking generally, his language is a model for the historian. A sophist by profession, and one of the greatest of rhetoricians, he appears to have been a member of the Christian Church.

Of Philadelphia in Syria. According to Suidas, the History began with the reign of Constantine the Great, according to Photius with the seventeenth year of Leo's reign (473), being a continuation of that of Priscus. It ended with the murder of the West Roman emperor Nepos (480). For the history of the period, see Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. 36; Bury, Later Roman Empire, i. 227 (1889). Or Valamir. Against Zeno.

Codices 1-165 — 79. [Candidus, History]

Read the History by Candidus in three books. It begins with the accession of Leo, a native of Dacia in Illyria, military tribune and in command of the troops in Selymbria, who obtained the throne by the aid of Aspar. Aspar was an Alan and a soldier from his early years. He had been three times married, and had three sons, Ardaburius, Patricius, and Ermenarichus. The narrative goes down to the proclamation of Anastasius as emperor. The author was a native of Isauria Tracheia, as he himself tells us, and by profession clerk to certain influential Isaurians. By religion he was an orthodox Christian, as appears from his eulogy of the fourth synod and his well-justified attack on innovators. His style is not suited for history. He makes use of poetical expressions that are insipid and childish; the composition is harsh and discordant, inclined to dithyrambic bombast or degenerating into carelessness and inelegance. He introduces new constructions, which do not, as in the case of other writers, lend additional smoothness and charm to the work, but make it disagreeable to read and utterly unattractive. While here and there his style shows improvement, his history is obviously a medley of most different materials. He maintains that the name Isauria is derived from Esau.

The first book describes the influence of Aspar and his sons, the election of Leo to the throne by Aspar, the great fire that broke out in Constantinople, and Aspar’s measures for the general welfare. Of Tatian and Vivian; the dispute of Aspar and the emperor concerning them, and what they said to one another. How this led to an alliance of the emperor with the Isaurians through Tarasicodissas, the son of Rusumbladeotes, whose name was changed to Zeno when he became Leo’s son-in-law, after the death of his first wife. How Ardaburius, to oppose the emperor, also endeavoured to win over the Isaurians. How a certain Martin, the friend of Ardaburius, informed Tarasicodissas of Ardaburius’s plot against the emperor; how mutual suspicion was aggravated until finally the emperor Leo decided to put to death Aspar and his sons Ardaburius and Patricius the Caesar. Aspar was killed; Patricius, however, unexpectedly recovered from his wounds, and Aspar’s other son Ermenarichus, who happened not to be with his father at the time, also escaped.

Leo gives Tarasicodissas the hand of his daughter Ariadne in marriage, changes his name to Zeno, and appoints him general of the East. The successes and reverses of Basiliscus in Africa. How Leo desired and schemed to secure the election of his son-in-law Zeno as emperor, but could not prevail upon his subjects to consent.

A little before his death, however, he proclaimed his grandson Leo, the son of Ariadne, who, after his grandfather's death, with the assent of the senate placed the crown upon the head of his father. Then follows a detailed genealogy of the Isaurians, in which the author does his best to prove that they were descendants of Esau. How Zeno, deceived by Verina, fled with his wife and mother, abandoning the city and the throne. How Verina, hoping that Patricius the magister would marry her and make himself emperor, by treachery drove out her son-in-law, but was deceived in her hopes, for those in authority raised her brother Basiliscus to the throne. The terrible massacre of Isaurians in Constantinople. Nepos, the emperor of Rome, succeeded by Augustulus, the son of Orestes. Such is the contents of the first book.

The second book relates how Patricius the magister, who had carried on an intrigue with Verina, was slain by her indignant brother Basiliscus. How Verina conceived a hatred of her brother on this account, assisted Zeno with money to recover the throne, was persecuted by her brother, and, had not Armatus secretly got her away from the church, would probably have lost her life. Armatus, who had carried on an intrigue with the wife of Basiliscus, obtained great influence and was entrusted with the conduct of the war against Zeno; but subsequently entered into an agreement with Illus and went over to Zeno. Armatus was held in great esteem by Zeno, and his son was raised to the rank of Caesar. Nevertheless, he was afterwards put to death, and his son, deprived of the rank of Caesar, became one of the readers at Blachernae. Basiliscus before this had declared his son Marcus Caesar and afterwards emperor. Illus, having become reconciled to Zeno, prepared to help him to recover the throne. Basiliscus, against whom his own adherents revolted, fled with his children and his wife Zenonis, was treacherously induced by Armatus to leave the church in which he had taken refuge, and banished to Cappadocia, where he was put to death with all his family. When the impious Peter was disturbing the Churches of the East, Zeno sent Calandion to be consecrated patriarch of Antioch. The emperor being in want of money succeeded in obtaining some by methods suggested to him.Many who conspired against him were seized and put to death.

Illus rendered great services to the empire by his valour in war and military successes, by his ambitiouspolitical measures and by his just dealings. After the death of the Roman emperor Nepos and the expulsion of his son Augustulus, Odoacer obtained possession of Italy and the city of Rome itself. But the western Gauls rebelled against him, and both they and Odoacer sent ambassadors to Zeno, who rather favoured Odoacer. A certain Alan who attempted to kill Illus, after he had

wounded him, declared that he had been bribed by Epinicius, an intimate of Verina. Epinicius was handed over, to Illus, and after obtaining a promise that he should be forgiven and rewarded, disclosed Verina's designs against Illus. Zeno hands Verina over to Illus, who banished her to a fortress in Cilicia, and thus secured his safety. Illus, who had become very intimate with the impious Pamprepius, to whom he had been introduced by Marsus, gradually became ruined. Civil war against Zeno begun by Marcian and Procopius, sons of the Roman emperor Anthe-mius. After they had been defeated, Marcian was ordained a priest, and Procopius took refuge with Theodoric in Thrace. Marcian, in banishment in Cappadocia, escaped and stirred up revolt in Ancyra in Galatia until at length he was captured and banished to Isauria. The origin of the emperor's increasing hatred of Illus. This is the contents of the second book. The third book, amongst other things, relates how Illus rose in open revolt against Zeno, declared Leontius emperor and Verina empress;

how the revolt failed, and Illus and Leontius were besieged, captured, and beheaded. It also contains an account of events to the death of Zeno.

Nothing more is known of his life than what Photius tells us. For the period of history (457-491) see Gibbon and Bury referred to in note on Cod. 78. Ermenaric. Tracheotis, a district of Asia Minor between Cilicia and Pisidia. Zeno. Harmatius, magister militum, nephew of Basiliscus, a young man of fashion. Peter, surnamed the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch 471-488, a Monophysite. Or, "by denunciations," "extortion." The word φιλότιμος is generally used in a bad sense, but not apparently here. Odovacar, king of the Heruli, who conquered Rome in 476, thus bringing about the so-called fall of the Western empire. Of Panopolis (Chemmis) in Upper Egypt, professor of grammar (philology) at the University of Athens. He was said to have written an Isaurica and a treatise on etymology. He was a neo-Platonist and bitter opponent of Christianity. In the castle of Papirius in Isauria. It was betrayed by Illus's sister-in-law.

Codices 1-165 — 80. [Olympiodorus, Histories]

Read the Histories of Olympiodorus, in twenty-two books. They begin with the seventh consulship of the emperor Honorius and the second of Theodosius, and go down to the time when Valentinian, the son of Placidia and Constantius, was proclaimed emperor of the Romans. The author, a heathen, was a native of Thebes in Egypt, a poet by profession, according to his own account. His style is clear but loose and wanting in vigour, and sometimes degenerates into commonplace vulgarity, so that the work does not deserve to be considered a history. Perhaps that is the reason why the author himself, conscious of these defects, declares that his work is not a history, but a collection of materials for a history, so destitute of regular form did he himself consider his style and phraseology. He is not distinguished for form, except so far as one might assert that he now and again approaches simplicity; but even in this, owing to the excessive meanness and paltriness of his diction, he is unsuccessful and gradually descends to vulgar mannerism. He calls his work Silva, but divides it into books and strives to embellish it with prefaces. It is dedicated to the emperor Theodosius, the son of Arcadius, and nephew of Honorius and Placidia.

The rise of Stilicho to power; his appointment by Theodosius the Great to the guardianship of his children Arcadius and Honorius, his marriage to Serena, betrothed to him by her uncle the emperor himself. Marriage of his daughter Thermantia to Honorius, and his rise to the height of his power. His many successful foreign wars. His death at the hands of the cruel and inhuman Olympius, whom he had himself recommended to the emperor. Alaric, chieftain of the Goths, whom Stilicho had previously sent for that he might retain Illyricum for Honorius (to whom that prefecture had been assigned by his father Theodosius), in consequence of the murder of Stilicho, and because the promises made to him had not been kept, besieges and sacks Rome. He carries off an enormous amount of booty together with Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who was in the city at the time. Before its capture he declares emperor a distinguished citizen named Attalus, the city prefect. Another reason for Alaric’s conduct was that Sarus, also a Goth, captain of a small

band, not more than 200 or 300 in number, and a brave and invincible warrior, had been offered an alliance by the Romans as being hostile to Alaric, who thus became their irreconcilable enemy.

During the siege of Rome the inhabitants were reduced to cannibalism. Alaric, while Stilicho was still alive, received 4000 pounds of gold for the expenses of his expedition. After the death of Stilicho his widow Serena is strangled, it being thought that she might haye been responsible for Alaric's attack on the city. His son Eucherius had already been put to death. During the reign of Honorius the name Bucellarii was given not only to Roman, but also to foreign soldiers; and similarly, the name Foederati to a mixed and irregular body of troops. Olympius, who intrigued against Stilicho, appointed master of the offices, but afterwards deprived of his post. He recovers it and is again deprived of it. He is beaten to death by order of Constantius, the husband of Placidia, after his ears have first been cut off. Thus the impious wretch meets with due punishment at last.

The chief men of the Goths with Radagaisus, about 12,000 in number, called Optimati, are defeated by Stilicho, who enters into an alliance with Radagaisus. Illness and death of Alaric, who is succeeded by his wife's brother Ataulf. The author says that dry bread was called bucellatum, and jestingly suggests that the soldiers were called bucellarii for this reason. Constantine, having made himself tyrant in Gaul, sends ambassadors to Honorius, excusing himself on the ground that he had been forced to assume the purple by the soldiers, and asking forgiveness and recognition as his colleague. Honorius, being in great straits, agrees to his request. This Constantine had been declared emperor during a revolt of the soldiers in Britain, where, before the seventh consulship of Honorius, they had proclaimed a certain Marcus emperor. He was soon removed by them and Gratian appointed in his stead. After four months, they grew tired of him also, and put him to death, Constantine being promoted to the rank and title of Augustus. Having appointed Justin and Neobigastes to the command of his forces, he left Britain and crossed over to Bononia, a town on the coast, the first in Gallic territory. There he spent some time, gaining over all the soldiery of Gaul and Aquitaine, and occupied the whole of Gaul as far as the Alps which separate Italy and Gaul. He had two sons, Constans and Julian, the former of whom he raised to the rank of Caesar and bestowed the dignity of Nobilissimus upon the latter.

Attalus, created rival emperor to Honorius, marches towards Ravenna, where Jovian, praetorian prefect and patrician, Valens, magister utriusque militiae, Potamius the quaestor, and Julian primicerius notariorum, are sent to him as envoys by Honorius. They inform Attains that they have been sent by Honorius to discuss the question of admitting him to a partnership in the empire. He refuses, but offers to allow Honorius to retire unharmed to some island or anywhere else he pleased. Jovian gladly accepts this proposal, further proposing that Honorius

should be mutilated. Attalus rebukes Jovian, saying that there is no reason for mutilating Honorius, if he voluntarily abdicates. Jovian, after several unsuccessful embassies, remains with Attalus as his patricius. Meanwhile, the command of Ravenna devolves upon the praepositus Eusebius, who, soon afterwards, by the cruelty of Allobich and by public decree is flogged to death in the sight of the emperor. After a considerable time, Attalus, who does not remain loyal to Alaric (chiefly owing to Jovian, who had betrayed the ambassadors of Honorius), is deprived of the throne, and afterwards joins the suite of Alaric as a private individual. He is subsequently restored, but again compelled to abdicate. Finally, he sets out for Ravenna, is captured, and, after the thumb and forefinger of his right hand have been cut off, is banished.

Soon afterwards, Allobich pays the penalty for the murder of the praepositus Eusebius, and is put to death before the emperor. The tyrant Constantine, when informed of the death of Allobich, sets out in haste for Ravenna, to make a treaty with Honorius, but being alarmed, turns back. Rhegium was the chief town of Bruttii, whence the historian says Alaric intended to cross over to Sicily, but was prevented from doing so by a sacred statue. This statue is said to have been consecrated by the ancients as a protection against the fires of Aetna and the passage of barbarians from over seas. In one foot it contained a fire that was never extinguished, in the other a supply of water that never failed. When it was subsequently destroyed by Asclepius, the manager of Constantius and Placidia’s Sicilian property, the inhabitants suffered greatly from Aetna and the barbarians.

The tyrant Constantine and his son Constans, who was first Caesar and afterwards Augustus, having been defeated and put to flight, his general, Gerontius, gladly makes peace with the barbarians and proclaims Maximus, one of the domestics and his own son, emperor. He then pursues Constans, puts him to death, and sets out after Constantine. While these events are taking place, Constantius and Ulphilas are sent by Honorius against Constantine; having reached Arelate,where Constantine was living with his son Julian, they lay siege to it. Constantine takes refuge in a church and is ordained priest, having been solemnly promised that his life should be spared. The city gates are thrown open to the besiegers, and Constantine and his son taken to Honorius. But the emperor, bearing a grudge against them for the murder of his cousins by Constantine, orders them to be put to death in violation of his oath, thirty miles from Ravenna. Gerontius, on the arrival of Constantius and Ulphilas, takes to flight, and is seized by his mutinous troops, who resented his severe discipline. The house where he seeks refuge is set on fire, but he offers a brave resistance to the mutineers, together with one of his servants, an Alan by birth. At last, he slays the Alan and then his wife, at their earnest request, and then stabs himself. His son Maximus, on hearing of this, takes refuge with friendly barbarians.

Jovinus, meanwhile, is proclaimed emperor at Moguntiacum in upper Germany, with the aid of Goar the Alan and Guntiar,a Burgundian chieftain. On the advice of Attalus, Ataulf joins him with his forces. But Jovinus, being offended at the presence of Ataulf, in mysterious language blames Attalus who had advised Ataulf to join him. Sarus also is on the way to join Jovinus, but Ataulf, hearing of this, collects a force of 10,000 men and waylays Sarus, whose followers numbered only twenty-eight. Sarus fights with marvellous heroism, and is with difficulty taken alive by a soldier, who threw a bag over his head, and afterwards slain. Sarus had revolted from Honorius, who had treated the murder of Sarus's servant, Bellerides, as a matter of indifference and had refused to find out and punish his murderer. Donatus and the Huns, and the skilfulness of their kings in shooting with the bow. The author relates that he himself was sent on a mission to Donatus, and gives a tragic account of his wanderings and perils by sea. How Donatus, being deceived by an oath, was unlawfully put .to death. How Charaton, the first of the kings, being incensed at the murder, was appeased by gifts from the emperor. Such are the events of the first decade of the history.

The second begins as follows. Jovinus, contrary to the advice of Ataulf, proclaims his own brother Sebastian Augustus. Ataulf, deeply offended, thereupon sends envoys to Honorius, promising to send him the heads of the tyrants and offering to make peace. Oaths having been exchanged, the envoys return, and the head of Sebastian is sent to the emperor. Jovinus, besieged by Ataulf, surrenders, is sent to the emperor and executed by the praetorian prefect Dardanus with his own hand. Both heads are exposed outside Carthage, where those of Constantine and Julian, of Maximus and Eugenius, who had aspired to the throne during the reign of the great Theodosius and had met with the same fate, had already been exposed. The restoration of Placidia to her brother Honorius is urgently demanded from Ataulf by Constantius, who afterwards became her husband. But as the promises made to him remain unfulfilled, especially in regard to the supply of corn, he refuses to give her back and prepares for war instead of peace.

Ataulf, when requested to restore Placidia, asks for the corn promised him. Although those who had promised it are unable to supply it, they agree to do so if Placidia is restored; the barbarian makes a similar pretence of complying. In the meantime he sets out for Massilia, hoping to capture it by treachery. But having been severely, almost mortally, wounded by the most noble Boniface, he returns to his own quarters, abandoning the city which joyfully acclaims and extols Boniface. Ataulf, determined to marry Placidia, in spite of the request of Constantius for her restitution, raises his demands so that, if they are not granted, he may appear to have a good excuse for detaining her. Constantius, who was formerly consul elect, is created consul at Ravenna, Constans being at the same time made consul at Constantinople. Sufficient gold was found among the property of Heraclian, who had been put to death as aspiring to the throne, to defray the expenses of the con-

sulship, although the amount was not so great as had been expected. The amount in gold which was found was about £4600, and the value of the real estate 2000 litrae (£92,000). All this was made over to Constantius by Honorius ”at one asking.” Constantius, as he rode along, had a dejected and sullen appearance, with his great eyes and neck and broad head; his whole body was bent over his horse and he looked askance on either side, in order as the old expression has it, ”to appear worthy of empire.” At feasts and banquets, however, he was agreeable and sociable, and often even condescended to vie with the mimes who performed at table.

On the advice and with the assistance of Candidian the marriage of Ataulf with Placidia was celebrated at the beginning of January in the city of Narbo (Narbonne), in the house of Ingenius, one of the most distinguished citizens. Placidia sat in the inner apartment dressed in Roman style and in royal robes, with Ataulf by her side, wearing a woollen tunic and Roman costume. Amongst other wedding presents Ataulf gave his bride fifty beautiful youths dressed in silk, each bearing in his hands two very large dishes, one filled with gold, the other with precious, or rather priceless, stones, the spoils of Rome when it was sacked by the Goths. Then wedding-songs were sung, Attalus leading the chorus, accompanied by Rusticius and Phoebadius. The ceremony ended with great demonstrations of joy and games, in which Romans and barbarians alike took part. After the capture of Rome by the Goths, Albinus, the city prefect, when the normal condition of things was restored, reported to the emperor that the amount of corn distributed to the people was insufficient, since their number was increasing, as many as 14,000 strangers having passed, through in one day.

Ataulf, after Placidia had borne him a son whom he called Theodosius, courted the friendship of the Romans still more, but the opposition of Constantius and his supporters made his and Placidia’s efforts vain. The son soon died and his parents, deeply grieved, buried him in a silver coffer in a church near Barcino (Barcelona). Soon afterwards Ataulf himself was murdered, while looking after his horses in the stable, as he had been in the habit of doing. He was slain by a certain Goth in his service, named Dubius, who had long been on the watch for an opportunity to satisfy an old-standing hatred. Dubius’s master, chief of a Gothic tribe, had been killed by Ataulf, who had taken Dubius into his own household. Dubius, to avenge his first master, slew his second. Ataulf, before he died, ordered his brother to give back Placidia and, if possible, to cultivate the friendship of Rome. He was succeeded by Singeric, the brother of Sarus, who secured the throne by violence and intrigue rather than legally or on the score of relationship. He put to death Ataulf’s children by a former marriage, tearing them from the arms of bishop Sigesarus, and by way of insult compelled Placidia to walk in procession in front of his horse with other captives as far as the twelfth milestone from the city. After he

had reigned seven days Singeric was slain and succeeded by the Gothic chieftain Walia.

The historian relates that he heard from a person of distinction named Valerius about certain silver statues that were consecrated to keep off the barbarians. In the reign of Constantius, when Valerius was governor of Thrace, he received information of the whereabouts of a treasure. He proceeded to the spot and learnt from the inhabitants that it was regarded as sacred, and that certain statues had been consecrated there in accordance with ancient rites. Valerius reported this to the emperor, who gave him written permission to remove them. The spot was excavated, and three statues of solid silver were found, lying in barbaric guise, with arms akimbo, clothed in parti-coloured barbaric raiment, with long hair, turned towards the north, the country of the barbarians. When these statues were removed, the Goths a few days afterwards first overran and ravaged Thrace, and a little later Huns and Sarmatians made inroads into Illyricum and Thrace itself; for these consecrated districts lay between Thrace and Illyricum, and from the number of the statues consecrated, they appear to have been intended as a protection against these barbarous nations.

The historian tells us of the sufferings and perils of his voyage. He says also that he landed at Athens, and that by his support and efforts Leontius was appointed to the chair of sophistic, although he did not desire it. Concerning the philosopher's cloak, he says that no one in Athens, particularly a stranger, was allowed to wear it, unless permitted to do so by the general vote of the sophists, and unless his right had been confirmed by their rules and regulations. The following were the rites on such occasions. All newcomers (novices), young and old, were taken to the public baths. Those who were by age fit to wear the cloak were brought forward by the scholastics who escorted them; then, while some ran in front and pushed them back, others, running behind, pushed them forward and resisted them, amid shouts of "Stop, stop, he must not wash." Those who pushed back those who tried to hinder the progress of the novice were considered to be victorious in the contest. After a considerable time, and after a long disputation had taken place in accordance with custom, he who was being escorted was taken into a warm room and washed. Having dressed himself, he received permission to wear the cloak on his way from the bath, being accompanied by a numerous and distinguished throng. Large sums are voted for the presidents of the schools, who are called Acromitae.

The Vandals call the Goths Truli, because, when they were hard pressed by famine, they bought a trula of wheat from the Vandals for a gold coin. The trula does not contain more than a third of a pint. When the Vandals were ravaging Spain, the Romans who took refuge in the fortified cities were so destitute of food that they were driven to cannibalism. A woman who was the mother of four children ate them all, in each case pretending that she did so to provide some food for the rest

and save their lives, but when she had eaten them all she was stoned to death by the people. Euplutius the chamberlain is sent to Walia, king of the Goths, to make a treaty of peace with him and to recover Placidia. Walia receives him kindly and on receipt of 600,000 measures of corn, Placidia is released and handed over to Euplutius to be escorted to her brother Honorius.

When a discussion arose in Athens how books could be fastened together and people wanted to know how much glue should be used, Philtatius, the writer's companion, who was well acquainted with all matters connected with literature, showed them what to do. A statue was erected in his honour by the grateful citizens.

About the oasis the author relates much that appears incredible. First, the climate is so healthy, that not only do none of the inhabitants suffer from epilepsy, but those who come from other parts are cured of it. Next, he speaks of the vast tracts of sand, and the wells, dug 200, 300, sometimes even 500 cubits deep, which spirt up a stream of water, from which the husbandmen who have taken part in the work in turn draw water to irrigate their fields. The trees bear fruit perpetually, and the corn which grows there is finer than any other and whiter than snow. There are sometimes two crops of barley in a year and three of millet. The inhabitants water their little plots of land every third day in summer, every sixth day in winter, which makes the soil very fertile. Clouds are rarely, if ever, seen. About the clocks made there. The author says that the oasis was formerly an island, which had been detached from the mainland, and that it is called by Herodotus the islands of the blest, but that Herodorus (who wrote the lives of Orpheus and Musaeus) calls it Phaeacis. He argues that it was an island, first, from the fact that sea shells are found adhering to stones upon the mountain which leads to the oasis from the Thebaid, and, secondly, because of the vast quantity of sand, which fills three oases.

For he tells us that the oases are three in number, two large, an outer and an inner, opposite each other but a hundred miles apart, while the third is small and a great distance from the other two. A further argument that it was an island is that fish are often found that have been carried there by birds, and the remains of fish that have been eaten, so that one may conjecture that the sea was not far off. The author says also that Homer's family belonged to the Thebaid.

During the eleventh consulship of Honorius and the second of Constantius, the marriage of Placidia was arranged. She herself was greatly opposed to it, which incensed Constantius against her household. Nevertheless, on the first day of his consulship, her brother the emperor Honorius took her by the hand and, although she protested, delivered her over to Constantius, and the wedding was celebrated with great magnificence. They had two children, a daughter Honoria and a son Valentinian, who at the urgent request of Placidia received the title Nobilissimus during the lifetime of Honorius. After the death of the latter and the suppression

of the usurper John, he became emperor. Honorius unwillingly agreed to accept Constantius as his partner in the empire, and Placidia received the title of Augusta from her brother and her husband. Theodosius the cousin of Honorius and emperor of the East, to whom an embassy was sent to inform him of the elevation of Constantius, refused to receive it. Constantius soon became tired of the throne, since he could no longer come and go when and where he pleased, and his dignity forbade him to indulge in his customary amusements. This seriously affected his health and, after he had been on the throne six months, a vision appeared to him and addressed him with the words, ”Six are gone, the seventh begins.” He died of pleurisy, and with him died the indignation aroused by the refusal to acknowledge his accession. The projected attack on the East abandoned. Walia, king of the Goths, dies and is succeeded by Theodoric.

The author relates various perils at sea from which he barely escaped with his life. While talking of a marvellous star (called Urania by the sailors), he was leaning heavily against the mast, which nearly gave way and precipitated him into the water. He also tells of a parrot, with which he himself lived twenty years, which mimicked nearly all the acts of a human being. It used to dance and sing, call people by their names and the like. He also relates that, when he was staying at Thebes and Soene for the sake of gathering information, the chiefs and prophets of the barbarians at Talmis, called Blemmyes, were eager to meet him owing to his reputation. ”They took me as far as Talmis,” he says, ”that I might examine the country, which is distant five days’ journey from Philae as far as the city called Prima. This was the nearest city of the Thebaid to barbarian soil, and was hence called by the Romans Prima (first), the name being still preserved although it has long been in possession of the barbarians with four other cities, Phoenicon, Chiris, Thapis, and Talmis.” In this district he heard that there were emerald mines, which furnished an abundant supply of those precious stones for the Egyptian kings. The prophets of the barbarians invited him to inspect them, but this was impossible without the king’s permission.

He tells a wonderful story about a certain Libanius, an Asiatic, who appeared at Ravenna during the reign of Honorius and Constantius, a most consummate magician. He declared that he could work wonders and promised to perform them against the barbarians without the aid of soldiers. After his promise had been put to the test, the report reached the ears of Placidia, who threatened to apply for a divorce against Constantius, unless the magician and infidel were removed. Libanius was accordingly put to death. Constantius was an Illyrian from Naisus in Dacia, who, having served in numerous campaigns from the time of Theodosius the Great, was afterwards raised to the throne. In many respects he was worthy of praise and of a generous disposition, until his marriage with Placidia, when he became grasping and covetous. After his death, numerous petitions against him from those who had been financially injured by him were presented at Ravenna. But the indif-

ference of Honorius and Placidia's intimacy with him made these petitions useless and thwarted the power of justice.

After the death of Constantius, Honorius lavished the greatest affection upon his sister, which, however, soon turned to mistrust and hatred, aggravated by the intrigues of Spadusa and Elpidia (Placidia's nurse), in whom she had the greatest confidence, and Leontius her steward. There were frequent riots in Ravenna, where a large number of barbarians, who sided with her in consequence of her marriage with Ataulf and with Constantius, frequently came to blows with the imperial guards. At length the quarrel became so bitter that, as the result of the hatred instead of love which her brother now felt for her, Placidia, finding herself unable to resist, retired with her children to Constantinople. Boniface alone remained loyal to her, sent her money when he was able from Africa where he was governor, and rendered her every service in his power. He also subsequently assisted her to regain the throne. Honorius died of dropsy on the 27th of August, and an announcement of the news was sent to the East. In the meantime, a certain John seized the throne. While his inauguration was taking place, a voice was heard, as if proceeding from some oracle uttering the words, "He falls, he does not stand," whereupon the people, as if to break the spell, shouted, "He stands, he does not fall."

Boniface was an heroic soldier, who often distinguished himself against the barbarians, sometimes with large, sometimes with small forces, sometimes even in single combat; in a word, he entirely freed Africa from many barbarous nations. He was a lover of justice and despised wealth. The author says that each of the large houses in Rome contained all the conveniences of a well-arranged city----a hippodrome, fora, temples, fountains, and baths. This leads him to exclaim : "One house is a town; a city has ten thousand towns." There were also public baths of great size; those called Antoninianae had 1600 seats for the convenience of bathers, made of polished marble; those called Diocletianae twice as many. The wall of Rome, according to the measurement of Ammon the geometrician, at the time when it was first overrun by the Goths, was twenty-one miles in circumference. Many Roman families received yearly incomes from their property to the amount of about forty centenarii of gold (£160,000), not mentioning the corn and wine and other produce, which, if sold, would equal a third of the above amount. Families next in rank enjoyed an income of fifteen or ten centenarii (£60,000-£40,000). Probus, the son of Olympius, who was prefect of the city during the tyranny of John, spent twelve centenarii of gold (£48,000). Before the taking of Rome, Symmachus the orator, a senator of moderate rank, and a certain Maximus, one of the wealthy citizens, spent twenty (£80,000) and forty (£160,000) centenarii respectively on their sons' praetorships. The shows given by the praetors lasted a week.

The author says that the scene of the wanderings of Odysseus was not the coast of Sicily, but the farthest shores of Italy; that, after crossing the ocean, he descended into Hades and made many perilous voyages over that sea; an opinion which he attempts to confirm by various arguments. I have read many other writers who agree with him. Placidia is sent back with her children from Constantinople by Theodosius to oppose the tyrant John. She is confirmed in her title of Augusta, and Valentinian in that of Nobilissimus. They set out accompanied by an army, both horse and foot, under the command of Ardaburius, his son Aspar, and Candidian. At Thessalonica Helion, the master of offices, who had been sent by Theodosius, put the royal robes on Valentinian, then only five years old. On his way home, Ardaburius is captured by the soldiers of John and taken to the tyrant, with whom he becomes on friendly terms. His son Aspar and Placidia were meanwhile overwhelmed by grief and anxiety; but Candidian, by capturing many towns and winning great renown, dispelled their grief and raised their spirits. The tyrant John was put to death, and Placidia with the Caesar her son entered Ravenna. Helion, the master of offices and a patrician, took possession of Rome, and in the midst of a vast throng of people arrayed the seven-year-old Valentinian in the royal robes. At this point the history ends.

A native of Egyptian Thebes, and ambassador in 412 to the Hun prince Donatus. He was a heathen. The History, dedicated to Theodosius II, contained an account of events from 407 to 425. It is an important contemporary guide, and its loss, except for Photius's abstract, is much to be regretted. On the period see Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chs. 30-32; Bury, Later Roman Empire, i.; Hodgkin, Italy and her Invaders, bk. i. pt. 2; E. A. Freeman, Western Europe in the Fifth Century, 1904. The name is said to have originally meant a body of soldiers who accepted any one's "bread" in return for attendance upon him. They would thus have formed a kind of bodyguard (Ducange). One of the "themes" or military divisions of the empire was also called the Bucellarian. Especially the Goths. They were nominally tributaries, but the tribute was often diminished or remitted altogether. Gradually, they came to be looked upon as a frontier defence force and received pay (Hodgkin, The Visigothic Invasion, i. 311-315). The most important officer of the civil administration. He united in his person most of the chief secretaryships with the duties of private secretary to the emperor.

Another suggested derivation is bucula, the part of a helmet that covers the mouth and cheeks. Boulogne. This title was bestowed on the brothers, sisters, and children of the emperor, the official hierarchy by which he was surrounded being nobiles. Or Jovius. The praetorian prefects were the most important personages next to the emperor. Under the empire hardly any of the old exclusive patrician families survived; Constantine re-introduced the name not as that of an order with hereditary privileges, but as a personal honour and dignity. Commander of both infantry and cavalry. Chief of the secretaries. Praepositus cubiculi sacri, president or su-

perintendent of the sacred bedchamber, the grand chamberlain. Reggio. Modern Calabria. The domestici were the household troops, the imperial bodyguard. All the other authorities make him merely Gerontius's "dependent." The word pai~j may be used in the sense of "servant." Or Arelatum (mod. Arles). According to some accounts, he took refuge in Spain.

Mainz. Or Gundicar. According to Bury, New Carthage in Spain. Marseilles. Distinguished Roman general, count of Africa, rival of Aetius, and friend of St. Augustine. In 413. Others take προόδοις to mean, "as he walked." Euripides, Aeolus (frag. 2). Reading τετάχθαι. Τετεέχθαι would mean that 14,000 children were born in one day in Rome, which is absurd. Sarus (see p. 138 above). Gregory of Nazianzus (Or. 20). Photius's account is rather obscure. Must mean "sophists" here, not, as so often in later Greek, "lawyers." The lexicon of Hesychius interprets the word as οἱ μείζονες ("the greater"), that is the higher classes who are entitled to wear the cloak. It is suggested that the reference is to senior pupils, rather than to teachers. The aureus, worth about twelve shillings. He was primicerius notariorum. The first important representative of the name, a West-Goth, not of course to be confounded with the famous East-Goth (Dietrich). The present Theodoric was king of the West-Goths from 418-451. He was killed fighting with the Romans against Attila at the battle of Chalons. According to some, St. Elmo's fire.

Modern Assouan. On the left bank of ihe Nile. An Aethiopian people, mod. Barabras. Small island in the Nile with a town of the same name, where Isis and Osiris were said to be buried. Mod. Nissa, Nisch in Serbia. Quintus Aurelius S., flourished about 400. He was prefect of Rome and consul, and the author of letters and speeches, the former of which and some fragments of the latter are extant. It was by the aid of this Aspar that Leo I obtained the empire of the East (457), and afterwards ungratefully murdered him. His father and son were both named Ardaburius. One of Honorius's generals. He pretended to be false to Placidia.

Codices 1-165 — 81. [Theodore of Mopsuestia, On Persian Magic and wherein it differs from Christianity]

Read three short treatises by Theodore On Persian Magic and wherein it differs from Christianity, dedicated to Mastubius, an Armenian and suffragan bishop. In the first book the accursed doctrine of the Persians, introduced by Zarades,concerning Zuruam, whom he makes the beginning of all things and calls Fortune, is expounded; how that, having offered a libation to beget Hormisdas, he begot both him and Satan. Of the mixing of blood. Having set forth this impious and disgraceful doctrine in plain words he refutes it in the first book. In the other two books he discusses the Christian faith, beginning from the creation of the world and at the same time rapidly going down to the law of grace. This Theodore is believed to be Theodore of Mopsuestia, since he mentions with approval the heresy of Nestorius, especially in the third book. He also foolishly talks of the restoration of sinners to their former condition.

Cod. XXXVIII. They were directed against Zoroastrianism, which was making some way at the time. Zoroaster (Zarathustra). Zervan, the principle of infinite time, from which both Ormuzd and Ahriman, the good and evil spirits, were supposed to have emanated. The sect of the Zervanists thus endeavoured to avoid Zoroastrian dualism. Ormuzd. Supposed to be a reference to Gnostic supporters of Zoroastrianism. The Christian era.

Codices 1-165 — 82. [Dexippus, History; Historical Epitome]

Read the History of the events that happened after the death of Alexander the Great, by Dexippus, in four books; also his Historical Epitome, a chronicle going down to the time of Claudius. Also read his Scythica, describing the wars between the Scythians and Romans and other things of note. His style is free from redundancies, massive, and dignified; he might be called a second Thucydides, although he writes more clearly. His characteristics are chiefly shown in his last-mentioned work. In his record of events after the death of Alexander, he relates how the throne fell to his brother Arrhidaeus, the son of Philip of Macedon and Philinna of Larissa. The yet unborn child of Roxana by Alexander, should it be a son, was to be associated with him in the government, together with Perdiccas, who was chosen by the Macedonians to administer the affairs of the empire. The division of Alexander’s empire. In Asia, Ptolemy Lagus obtained the government of Egypt, Libya, and the country beyond adjacent to Egypt, Cleomenes, who had been appointed by Alexander satrap of this district, being made subordinate to him. Laomedon of Mytilene obtained Syria; Philotas Cilicia; Pithon Media; Eumenes Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and the shores of the Euxine as far as Trapezus (Trebizond); Antigonus Pamphylia and Cilicia as far as Phrygia; Asander Caria; Menander Lydia; Leonnatus the Phrygian Hellespont. In Europe, Lysimachus obtained Thrace and the Chersonese; Antipater the whole of Macedonia, Greece, Illyria, the country of the Triballi and the Agrianes, and all the mainland over which he had been appointed sole commander from the time of Alexander. The general charge of affairs and the defence of the kingdom was entrusted to Craterus; Perdiccas obtained the chiliarchy of Hephaestion, the highest dignity amongst the Macedonians.

Porus and Taxilus were rulers of India, to Porus being allotted the country between the Indus and the Hydaspes, the rest to Taxilus. Pithon received the country of the neighbouring peoples, except the Paramisades. The districts near the Caucasian mountains, conterminous with India, were given to the Bactrian Oxyartes, the father of Roxana, whose son, born after his father’s death, was also called Alexander. Siburtius ruled the Arachosians and Gedrosians; Stasanor of Soli the Arei

and Drangi; Philip the Sogdiani; Radaphernes the Hyrcanians; Neoptolemus the Carmanians; Peucestes the Persians. Oropius was ruler of Sogdiana, not by inheritance from his father, but by favour of Alexander. When in consequence of a revolt he was accused and threatened with the loss of his kingdom, he held it in conjunction with Philip. Babylon was given to Seleucus, Mesopotamia to Archelaus. Such were the countries and their rulers as distributed by Perdiccas after the death of Alexander. In this and other parts of his narrative Dexippus is generally in agreement with Arrian.

Publius Herennius D. (flourished 254-278), rhetorician, statesman, and historian, a native of Athens, who distinguished himself against the Goths (269) when they attacked that city. Of the fragments preserved the chief is an address to the soldiers of Athens (see Gibbon, ch. 10, i. 265, 266, Bury's edition). 268. The Goths. Or ” grave ” (ὀγκος), ”dignified.” Commandership of the select cavalry corps called Ἑταιροι, a sort of bodyguard. See Cod. 92.

Codices 1-165 — 83. [Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Histories]

Read the twenty books of the Histories of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He begins with the arrival of Aeneas in Italy after the capture of Troy, describes in detail the foundation of Rome, the birth of Romulus and Remus, and other events down to the war of the Romans with Pyrrhus, king of Epirus. The work ends at the third year of the 128th Olympiad, where, the author says, the history by Polybius of Megalopolis begins. Dionysius flourished in the Augustan age, since he tells us that he sailed to Italy after the end of the civil war between Antony and Augustus, and lived there for twenty-two years. During this time he acquired an accurate knowledge of the Latin language and of Roman antiquities, and, having thoroughly equipped himself with materials, he began to write his history. His style and diction are marked by innovation, which drives the narrative out of the beaten track, but his fondness for detail produces a certain simplicity of sentiment, so that the language does not seem to be carried away into harshness and unpleasantness. He is fond of digressions which relieve the reader and prevent his becoming tired of history, and refresh and revive him. In a word, the elegance of his style, the admixture of detail and digression, soften the composition, which has a tendency to harshness.

Rhetorician and historian. He came to Rome in 30 B.C. and remained there till his death (7 B.C.). He was the author of numerous ihetorical works, several of which are extant, the most important being that on the ancient Greek orators. Of the twenty books of the History (Roman Antiquities) eleven have been preserved, going down to 441 B.C., the period of the decemvirs. It is a rhetorical production, the chief object of which is to represent the Romans as superior to the Greeks, while at the same time he soothes the vanity of the latter by insisting upon the Greek origin of the former.

Codices 1-165 — 84. [Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Synopsis of the Histories]

Also read the same author’s Synopsis of the above twenty books in five volumes. In this his style is more elegant but not nearly so agreeable; at the same time the work is more useful, since nothing is inserted except what is absolutely necessary. From his style, concise and free from redundancies, he may be described as a king laying down the law; his composition and diction send forth a sound which reaches the ears of the hearer somewhat more harshly. His manner is not unsuitable for synopsis, but by no means adapted for a perfect and complete history. It is evident that the writer lived before Dion Coccaeus and Appian of Alexandria, who also wrote on Roman history. Dio Cassius; see Cod. 71. Cod. 57.

Codices 1-165 — 85. [Heraclian, Against the manichaeans]

Read the twenty books of Heraclian, bishop of Chalcedon, Against the Manichaeans. His style is concise, free from redundancies, lofty, not wanting in clearness, at the same time tempered with dignity. He combines atticism with ordinary language, like a teacher of boys entering into a contest of superatticism. He refutes the Gospel, Book of the Giants, and the Treasures of the Manichaeans. He also gives a list of those who wrote against the Manichaean impiety before him---- Hegemonius, who wrote out the disputation of Archelaus against Manes; Titus, who was supposed to be an opponent of the Manichaeans, whereas he rather attacked the writings of Addas; George of Laodicea, who uses nearly the same arguments as Titus against the impious heresy; Serapion, bishop of Thmuis; lastly, Diodorus, who wrote twenty-five books against the Manichaeans, in the first seven of which he imagines that he is refuting the Living Gospel of Manes, instead of the work of Addas named Modion, as is really the case. In the remaining books he explains and clears up the meaning of certain passages in the Scriptures which the Manichaeans were in the habit of appropriating to support their own views. Such is his account of Diodorus. Any statements in the works of these Fathers (as the pious Heraclian calls them) that do not appear to be sufficiently emphatic, he briefly confirms, carefully supplies what is missing, and quotes with approval in their entirety passages which are adequate for the purpose, adding further reflections of his own.

The man is full of philosophical vigour, and is admirably equipped with the theoretical knowledge of other branches of learning. Hence he energetically combats and overthrows the trifling fables of Manichaeus, and from the consideration of what exists refutes the fabulous nonsense about Being (that which is). This treatise against the Manichaeans was written at the request of a certain Achillius, whom the author calls his faithful and beloved son. This Achillius, seeing that the Manichaean heresy was growing, begged that it might be publicly refuted, and this work was written, an unexceptionable triumph over impiety. This most pious Heraclian flourished in ... Nothing seems to be known of him. Their system was dualistic, recognizing

two principles, good and evil; the first the author of man's spiritual, the second of his corporeal nature. Man had two souls, one intellectual and rational, the other evil. They held that the souls of men, animals and plants were co-eternal with God; that baptism was useless; that man was not free; that Christ was the material sun enlightening the world; that all religions were indifferent,

Bishop of Bostra in Arabia Auranitis (362-371), One of the three first disciples of Manes, 335-347. In Egypt. The work is still extant. Presbyter of Antioch and bishop of Tarsus. The chief "founder of the rational school of Scriptural interpretation." " Bushel," referring to St. Mark iv. 19. Manes (c. 240-274), or Mani, the founder of the sect.

Codices 1-165 — 86. [Chrysostom, Letters]

Read the Letters written by the holy Father St. John Chrysostom to different people after his unjust and inhuman banishment. The most useful of them are the seventeen addressed to the pious deaconess Olympias, and those to Innocent, pope of Rome, in which he relates all that had happened to him, as far as he was able to do so in the form of letters. These letters are characteristic of the man. The style is brilliant, clear, persuasive, somewhat florid, and agreeable. The letters to Olympias, however, seem to have been written with greater care; the importance of the matters discussed, to which the epistolary style is not adapted, necessitates a corresponding dignity of composition. O. the younger (c. 368-before 420), deaconess of Constantinople. After Chrysostom’s final expulsion, she seems to have left the city, and to have led a wandering life, being subjected to much persecution on account of her friendship with him. Innocent I, bishop of Rome (402-417).

Codices 1-165 — 87. [Achilles Tatius, Adventures of Clitophon and Leucippe]

Read the Adventures of Clitophon and Leucippe by Achilles Tatius, of Alexandria, in eight books. It is a dramatic work, introducing some unseemly love episodes. The diction and composition are excellent, the style distinct, and the figures of speech, whenever they are employed, are well adapted to the purpose. The periods as a rule are aphoristic, clear and agreeable, and soothing to the ear. But the obscenity and impurity of sentiment impair his judgment, are prejudicial to seriousness, and make the story disgusting to read or something to be avoided altogether. Except for the names of the characters and his abominable indecency, the story, in method of treatment and invention, has a great resemblance to the Aethiopica of Heliodorus. Probably lived in the third century A.D. The complete work is extant.

Codices 1-165 — 88. [Gelasius of Cyzicus, Proceedings of the Synod of Nicaea]

Read an account of the Proceedings of the Synod of Nicaea, in the form of a history, in three volumes. The author states that Hosius, bishop of Cordova, and Viton and Vincent, two Roman priests, were present as legates on the part of Silvester, pope of Rome, together with Eustathius, patriarch of Antioch, while Alexander the priest represented Metrophanes of Constantinople; Silvester, who was more than a hundred years old, in consequence of his great age was unable to be present. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, also attended, together with Athanasius, who afterwards succeeded him in the episcopate, Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, and a number of other bishops and priests. The synod was summoned in the sixteenth year of the reign of Constantine, and its proceedings lasted six years, until he had reigned twenty-one years and six months.

The author relates that Arius was condemned and anathematized, but again endeavoured to obtain admission to the Church, in which he was supported by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Eutocius the Arian, an ordained priest, whom the emperor’s sister Constantia commended to her brother on her deathbed. Although these endeavoured to bring back Arius to the Church, divine justice did not permit its enemy to insult its temple and its shrine. He was condemned to die in the latrines on the very day when he and his supporters had resolved to profane the Church of God and His holy rites. by his entrance. His death took place in a public place, the latrines being near the forum. The author states that Constantine the Great rejoiced that the incorruptible judge God had solved the question by his sentence, and wrote a number of letters, recording his opinion of the justice of the end that had overtaken Arius. In this the author’s account agrees with those of Athanasius the Great, Theodoret, and many others. Some, however, think that Arius came by his disgraceful end, not in the reign of Constantine, but in that of his son Constantius.

Such is the contents of this book. In another copy, containing the same account, the title gives the name of the author as Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine. The style is mean and common. Who this Gelasius was, I have been unable to discover for certain, since up to the present I have met with three bishops of Caesarea named Gelasius, and have at least read the works of two. One of these works is a polemic Against the Anomoeans, the two others, one of which we have just referred to, deal with ecclesiastical matters. The title, where we have found it, is Three Books of Ecclesiastical History by Gelasius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine.

The work begins as follows : The proceedings of the holy, great, and universal synod of bishops, assembled, so to speak, from all the provinces of the Roman empire and Persia, and so on. It ends with the death of Constantine the Great, at the time when he received remission of sins by divine baptism, whereby the stains of guilt such as all men contract in life were washed off. The author says that he was baptized and initiated into the holy mysteries by an orthodox priest, not, as some state, by a heretic. His baptism was delayed, because he had earnestly desired to be baptized in the waters of Jordan. The writer states that he lived in the time of Basiliscus, who seized the throne after Zeno had been driven out, and that he found and read the account of the proceedings of the council written on an old parchment, while living in his father's house. From his recollections of this, and with the aid of other writings which supplied him with useful information, he compiled his history. He also mentions and cites some passages from a certain Gelasius, whom he also calls Rufinus. He says that he was a native of Cyzicus, and that his father was a priest in the same place. So says the author of this work, and such is its contents.

By Gelasius of Cyzicus, who probably flourished in the second half of the fifth century. The work, which is still extant, is considered valueless as an historical authority. Appointed about 300, died about 358. He was sent by Constantine in 324 to Alexandria, on a mission to reconcile Arius and Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. He was Constantine's adviser on theological matters, and is supposed to have taken an important part in drawing up the symbol of faith at the synod. 314-335. Born at Side in Pamphylia and died at Philippi in Macedonia (337), formerly bishop of Beroea. He was exiled in consequence of a false charge brought against him by the Arians, of whom he was a bitter opponent. Patriarch of Alexandria (312-326). He excommunicated the Arians and caused their doctrines to be condemned af the synod. Bishop from about 311 to between 331 and 335. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, visited Jerusalem during his episcopate (325). Successively bishop of Berytus, Nicomedia, and Constantinople. Exiled by Constantine, he was recalled through the influence of the Arians, and became the bitter enemy of Athanasius, whose banishment he procured, he became bishop of Constantinople in 341, his advancement being due to the patronage of Constantia, the emperor's sister. He drew up nearly all the Arian formulae.

The question of the Gelasii is very obscure (see also Cod. 102). Those who taught that the Son was ”dissimilar” and of different substance from the Father. The leaders of the sect were Aetius and Eunomius. Emperor 475-477.

Codices 1-165 — 89. [Gelasius of Caesarea, Continuation of the History of Eusebius Pamphili]

The other book, which I have referred to above, is entitled Preface of the Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine to the Continuation of the History of Eusebius Pamphili. It begins, as follows : Others who have applied themselves to writing and have determined to hand down to posterity a record of historical events, and so on. The author states that he was encouraged to write the work by his uncle Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem. I have read elsewhere that this Cyril and Gelasius translated the history of Rufinus the Roman into Greek, but did not compose any history of their own. It is evident that this Gelasius was older than the other, if he flourished in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem. He also certainly differs from him in the greater eloquence of his language, although both are inferior to the author of the treatise Against the Anomoeans, also called bishop of Palestine. For the latter Gelasius, by his diction, learning, and logical methods, his use of which, however, is somewhat inept, leaves the other two far behind, whose style appears to be much inferior. I have not yet been able to learn whether any of these is the author of the work referred to, or who compiled it and supplemented it by his own additions.

315-386, bishop 348. He was exiled for several years by Arian intrigues, but re-called by Julian the Apostate. His extant Catecheses contain the oldest and most concise abridgement of Christian doctrine. Rufinus Tyrannius or Toranus (345----410), born at Concordia, a small town in Italy. He is called ”of Aquileia,” where he was baptized, and entered a monastery. He is chiefly known for his quarrel with Jerome about his translation of various works of Origen. He was condemned by pope Anastasius, and died in Sicily. He was the author of a large number of translations and other works.

Codices 1-165 — 90. [Libanius]

Read two volumes of Libanius. The author's imaginary speeches, written for the purpose of giving practice in oratory, are more useful than the rest. The excessive elaboration and over-nicety of the latter impair their native and so to say spontaneous grace and charm, and destroy their clearness. Much obscurity is also caused by parentheses, and sometimes by the omission of what is indispensable. In other respects he is a canon and model of Attic style. His letters also have a considerable reputation. Several other works of different kinds are also ascribed to him. Famous sophist (314-393). Brought up at Athens, he was professor of rhetoric at Constantinople, where he had as pupils St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. Much of his work is extant, consisting of purely rhetorical exercises and instructions, actual speeches on various subjects, a life of Demosthenes and arguments of his speeches, and extensive correspondence. He was a pagan.

Codices 1-165 — 91. [Arrian, History of the Reign of Alexander]

Read the History of the Reign of Alexander by Arrian in seven books. It relates how he made a treaty with the Athenians and the rest of the Greeks with the exception of the Lacedaemonians; how he crossed over into Asia and defeated the Persians in three battles. At the Granicus he routed the satraps of Darius, who had an army of 20,000 horse and almost as many infantry; at Issus he put Darius himself and his army to flight and captured his wife and children; at Arbela (or Gaugamela) Darius was finally defeated, and while trying to escape was seized and put to death by his own soldiers. Bessus, who succeeded him, was mutilated and slain by Alexander for his treason tovvards Darius. How Alexander was wounded seven times in battle and how he carried off the royal treasure at Pasargadae. Being persuaded that Philotas was conspiring against him, he put him to death with his father Parmenio. Alexander conquers Sogdiana and defeats the Asiatic Scythians. How Clitus was murdered by him in a fit of drunkenness; his remorse when he became sober. Conspiracy of the royal pages against Alexander and their punishment. The capture of the Sogdian rock and the wife of Oxyartes, the chief of the district, with his daughter Roxana, afterwards the lawful wife of Alexander. How Alexander set out from Bactria against the Indians, defeated them in several battles, and besieged and captured several of their cities. Storming of the rock of Aornus and invasion of the country of the Ascanians.

Having bridged the Indus, Alexander crossed over, defeated Porus, king of India, in a single engagement and took him prisoner. He was generously treated by Alexander, who not only allowed him to keep his kingdom, but actually enlarged it. How the rivers of India, like the Nile, are swollen in summer, but subside in winter. There was also another Porus, an Indian ruler, a man of bad character, in pursuit of whom Alexander crossed the Hydaspes and subdued the neighbouring Indian tribes, took by siege their large and populous towns, and went on to the Hypha-

sis.While he was preparing to cross this river, the soldiers began to show signs of discontent, complaining of their toils and endless marches, in consequence of which Alexander left India. Here the fifth book ends.

In the sixth book, the numerous battles and brilliant victories of Alexander on his way home are related. In these engagements he received two wounds besides those already mentioned, and although the seventh wound seemed likely to prove fatal, he eventually recovered. He returned from India by land, Nearchus, with part of the army, being sent back by sea. Both divisions met in Carmania, whence Alexander marched into Persia, Nearchus being ordered to sail to Susiana and the mouth of the Tigris. The voyage of Nearchus is described by Arrian in his Indica, written in the Ionic dialect.

Alexander repairs the neglected tomb of Cyrus, and allows the gymnosophist Calanus, who was attacked by illness, to put himself to death on the funeral pile. His splendid marriages and those of his generals. His wives were Roxana, Arsinoe, the eldest daughter of Darius, and Parysatis, the youngest daughter of Ochus. Drypetis, another daughter of Darius, was given to Hephaestion; Amastrine to Craterus; Artacana and Artone, daughters of Artabazus, to Ptolemy and Eumenes; the daughter of Barsine and Mentor to Nearchus : the daughter of Spitamenes to Seleucus. The rest of his friends received in marriage the daughters of the most distinguished Medians and Persians, to the number of eighty. The discharged Macedonian soldiers were sent home, Antipater being ordered to bring back some of the new levies in their place. Harpalus takes to flight with a large sum of money from the treasury. The death of Hephaestion and the great grief of Alexander; his splendid funeral obsequies. At the same time ambassadors arrived from Libya and Carthage, and even from Italy, to Alexander, who, when he saw the Italians, predicted the future greatness of their country. When he wished to advance to Babylon, the seers foretold his death, and when an unknown person unexpectedly sat down on his throne, his end was regarded as still more certain. Nevertheless, he equipped a fleet to operate against the numerous Arabian tribes who believed in only two gods, Uranus and Dionysus. While preparations were being made he was seized with illness and died. Many contradictory stories are told of his death. He lived thirty-two years and eight months, and reigned twelve years and eight months. Arrian extols him as possessed of almost every virtue. The seventh book ends here, being continued by the Indica, in one book.

Cod. 58. 334 B.C. 333 B.C. 331 B.C. The earliest capital of Persia (now Meslied-i-Murghab), where Cyrus was buried. Mod. Bokhara. ”Birdless,” so high that birds could not fly to the summit. The name is given by the Greeks to many high Indian rocky mountains. Mod. Behat or Jhelum. Mod. Sutlej. Alexander’s admiral and one of the chief navigators of ancient times. The Persian coast-land on the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean as far as Gedrosia, now Kerman. Large Persian province,

the same as Elam, the only town of importance being Susa. See p. 123, note. This was their regular custom when ill (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια). Alexander's early friend and untrustworthy treasurer. He fled from Babylon with 5000 talents before Alexander's return to India, and went to Athens, where by gifts of corn and money he succeeded in gaining the favour of the inhabitants and protection against Antipater, who demanded his surrender. He took refuge finally in Crete, where he was killed.

Codices 1-165 — 92. [Arrian, Continuation]

The same author also wrote an account of what took place after Alexander's death, in ten books. He describes the sedition in the army, the proclamation of Arrhidaeus (the son of Alexander's father, Philip, by a Thracian woman named Philinna) on condition that Roxana's child, when born, if it were a son, should share the throne with him. Arrhidaeus was then again proclaimed under the name of Philip. A quarrel broke out between the infantry and the cavalry. The chief and most influential commanders of the latter were Perdiccas the son of Orontes, Leonnatus the son of Anthes, Ptolemy the son of Lagus, Lysimachus the son of Agathocles, Aristonus the son of Pisaeus, Pithon the son of Crateuas, Seleucus the son of Antiochus, and Eumenes of Cardia. Meleager was in command of the infantry. Communications passed between them, and at length it was agreed between the infantry, who had already chosen a king, and the cavalry, that Antipater should be general of the forces in Europe; that Craterus should look after the kingdom of Arrhidaeus; that Perdiccas should be chiliarch of the troops which had been under the command of Hephaestion, which amounted to entrusting him with the care of the whole empire; and that Meleager should be his lieutenant. Perdiccas, under the pretence of reviewing the army, seized the ringleaders of the disturbance, and put them to death in the presence of Arrhidaeus, as if he had ordered it. This struck terror into the rest, and Meleager was soon afterwards murdered.

After this Perdiccas became the object of general suspicion and himself suspected everybody. Nevertheless, he made appointments to the governorships of the different provinces, as if Arrhidaeus had ordered him. Ptolemy, son of Lagus, was appointed governor of Egypt and Libya, and of that part of Arabia that borders upon Egypt, with Cleomenes, formerly governor of Egypt under Alexander, as his deputy. The part of Syria adjacent was given to Laomedon; Cilicia to Philotas; Media to Pithon; Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and the country on the shore of the Euxine as far as Trapezus (a Greek colony from Sinope), to Eumenes of Cardia; Pamphylia, Lycia, and greater Phrygia to Antigonus; Caria to Cassander; Lydia to Menander; Phrygia on the Hellespont to Leonnatus. This Phrygia had formerly been given by

Alexander to a certain Galas and subsequently handed over to Demarchus. Such was the distribution of Asia.

In Europe, Thrace and the Chersonese, together with the countries bordering on Thrace as far as Salmydessus on the Euxine, were given to Lysimachus; the country beyond Thrace, as far as the Illyrians, Triballians. and Agrianians, Macedonia itself, and Epirus as far as the Ceraunian mountains, together with the whole of Greece, to Craterus and Antipater. Such was the division of Europe. At the same time several provinces remained under their native rulers, according to the arrangement made by Alexander, and were not affected by the distribution. Meanwhile, Roxana bore a son, who was immediately acclaimed king by the soldiers. After the death of Alexander there were numerous disturbances. Antipater carried on war against the Athenians and the rest of the Greeks commanded by Leosthenes. He was at first defeated and in great straits, but was subsequently victorious. Leonnatus, however, who came to his assistance, fell in battle. Lysimachus also, recklessly fighting against Seuthes the Thracian with an inferior force, was defeated, although his troops greatly distinguished themselves. Perdiccas also made war upon Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, because he refused to give up his kingdom to Eumenes, upon whom it had been bestowed. .Having defeated him in two battles and taken him prisoner, he hanged him and reinstated Eumenes. Craterus, by the assistance he rendered to Antipater against the Greeks, chiefly contributed to their defeat, after which they unhesitatingly obeyed Craterus and Antipater. This is the contents of the first five books.

The sixth book relates how Demosthenes and Hyperides, Aristonicus of Marathon and Himeraeus, the brother of Demetrius of Phalerum, fled to Aegina, and, while there, were condemned to death by the Athenians on the motion of Demades, and how Antipater carried out the sentence. How Archias the Thurian, who put them to death, died in the utmost poverty and disgrace. How Demades was soon afterwards sent to Macedonia, where he was put to death by Cassander, after his son had been murdered in his arms. Cassander alleged in excuse that Demades had once insulted his father, Antipater, in a letter which he wrote to Perdiccas, begging him to rescue the Greeks, who were only held together by an old and rotten thread, as he abusively called Antipater. Dinarchus of Corinth was the accuser of Demades, who paid the just penalty for his venality, treachery, and unfaithfulness. The author also relates how Harpalus, who during,the lifetime of Alexander had stolen money belonging to him and fled to Athens, was slain by Thibron the Lacedaemonian. Thibron seized all the money that remained, and set out for Cydonia in Crete, whence he crossed over to Cyrene with a body of 6000 men, at the request of some exiles from Cyrene and Barca. After many engagements and mutual intrigues, in which he was sometimes successful and sometimes unsuccessful, he was finally captured during his flight by some Libyan drivers, and taken to Epicydes the Olynthian at Teuchira, which had been entrusted to him by Ophelias

a Macedonian, whom Ptolemy the son of Lagus had sent to help the Cyrenians. The inhabitants, by permission of Ophelias, first tortured Thibron and then sent him to the port of Cyrene to be hanged. But since the Cyrenaeans still persisted in their revolt, Ptolemy in person visited the place, and after having restored order, sailed home again.

Perdiccas, intriguing against Antigonus, called him to judgment, but Antigonus, aware of the plot, refused to appear. This led to enmity between them. At the same time Iollas and Archias came to Perdiccas from Macedonia, accompanied by Nicaea, the daughter of Antipater, with a proposal of marriage. Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, also sent to him, offering him the hand of her daughter Cleopatra. Eumenes of Cardia favoured Cleopatra, but his brother Alcetas persuaded him to accept Nicaea. Soon afterwards Cynane was put to death by Perdiccas and his brother Alcetas. This Cynane was the daughter of Philip, the father of Alexander, her mother being Eurydice, the wife of Amyntas, whom Alexander put to death just before he set out for Asia. This Amyntas was the son of Perdiccas the brother of Philip, so that he was the cousin of Alexander. Cynane brought her daughter Adea (afterwards called Eurydice) to Asia and offered her hand to Arrhidaeus. The marriage subsequently took place, with the approval of Perdiccas, to appease the increasing indignation of the soldiery, which had been aroused by the death of Cynane. Antigonus, in the meantime, took refuge with Antipater and Craterus in Macedonia, informed them of the intrigues of Perdiccas against him, declaring that they were directed against all alike. He also described the death of Cynane in such exaggerated terms that he persuaded them to make war on Perdiccas. Arrhidaeus, who kept the body of Alexander with him, contrary to the wish o Perdiccas, took it from Babylon by way of Damascus to Ptolemy the son of Lagus in Egypt; and though often hindered on his journey by Polemon, a friend of Perdiccas, nevertheless succeeded in carrying out his intention.

Meanwhile, Eumenes conveyed gifts from Perdiccas to Cleopatra at Sardes, since Perdiccas had decided to repudiate Nicaea and to marry Cleopatra. When this became known to Antigonus through Menander the governor of Lydia, he informed Antipater and Craterus, who were more than ever determined to make war on Perdiccas. Antipater and Craterus, starting from the Chersonese, crossed the Hellespont, having previously sent messengers to deceive those who guarded the passage. They also sent ambassadors to Eumenes and Neoptolemus, who supported Perdiccas; Neoptolemus went over to them, but Eumenes refused. Neoptolemus being suspected by Eumenes, war broke out between them, in which Eumenes was victorious. Neoptolemus fled with a few men to Antipater and Craterus, and succeeded in persuading the latter to join him; so both made war against Eumenes. Eumenes did his best to prevent his own men from knowing that Craterus was fighting against him, being afraid that, influenced by his great reputation, they might either desert to him, or, if they remained faithful to him,

might lose heart. Successful in scheming, he was also successful in battle. Neoptolemus fell by the hand of Eumenes ”the secretary” himself, after having proved himself a brave soldier and commander. Craterus, who fought boldly against all who opposed him and showed himself openly in order to be known, was slain by some Paphlagonians before he was recognized, although he had thrown off his hat. However, the infantry escaped and returned to Antipater, which considerably reassured him.

Perdiccas, setting out from Damascus to make war upon Ptolemy the son of Lagus, reached Egypt with the kings and a large force. He made many charges against Ptolemy, who publicly cleared himself, so that the accusations appeared ill-founded. Perdiccas, notwithstanding the opposition of his troops, decided to carry on the war. He was twice defeated, and, having treated those who were inclined to go over to Ptolemy with great severity, and in other respects behaved in camp more arrogantly than became a general, he was slain by his own cavalry during an engagement. After his death Ptolemy crossed the Nile to visit the kings, upon whom he bestowed gifts and treated them with the utmost kindness and attention, as well as the other Macedonians of rank. At the same time he openly showed sympathy with the friends of Perdiccas, and did all he could to allay the apprehensions of those Macedonians who imagined they were in peril, so that at once and ever afterwards he was held in great esteem.

At a full council of war, Pithon and Arrhidaeus having been appointed commanders-in-chief of all the forces for the time being, about fifty of the supporters of Eumenes and Alcetas were condemned, chiefly because Craterus had met his death in civil strife. Antigonus was summoned from Cyprus, and Antipater ordered to repair with all speed to the kings. Before they arrived, Eurydice refused to allow Pithon and Arrhidaeus to do anything without her permission. At first they did not demur, but afterwards told her that she had nothing to do with public affairs, and that they themselves would look after everything until the arrival of Antigonus and Antipater. When they arrived, Antipater was placed in chief command. When the army demanded the pay that had been promised them for the campaign, Antipater replied straightforwardly that he had no money, but that, to avoid incurring their censure, he would thoroughly search the treasury and other places where money might be hidden. These words aroused the displeasure of the army. When Eurydice joined in the accusations against Antipater, the people were indignant, and a disturbance took place. Eurydice then delivered a speech against him, in which she was assisted by Asclepiodorus the scribe and supported by Attalus. Antipater barely escaped with his life, after Antigonus and Seleucus, at his earnest request, had addressed the people on his behalf and nearly lost their lives in consequence. Antipater, having thus escaped death, withdrew to his own army, where he summoned the cavalry commanders, and after the disturbance had been put down with difficulty, he was again reinstated in his command.

He then made a division of Asia, partly confirming the earlier one and partly altering it as circumstances necessitated. Egypt, Libya, the large tract of country beyond it, and all the territory that had been conquered towards the west, was given to Ptolemy; Syria to Laomedon the Mytilenean; Cilicia to Philoxenus, who had held it before. Of the upper provinces, Mesopotamia and Arbelitis were given to Amphimachus, the king's brother; Babylonia to Seleucus. To Antigenes, commander of the Macedonian argyraspidae, who had first attacked Perdiccas, was given the whole of Susiana; to Peucestes Persia; to Tlepolemus Carmania; to Pithon Media as far as the Caspian gates; to Philip Parthia; to Strasander the territory of the Arei and Drangeni; to Stasanor of Soli, Bactria, and Sogdiana; to Siburtius Arachosia; to Oxyartes the father of Roxana Parapamisus; to Pithon the son of Agenor the part of India bordering on Parapamisus. Of the adjacent provinces, that on the river Indus, together with Patala, the largest city of India in those parts, to king Porus, and that on the river Hydaspes to Taxilus the Indian, for it would have been no easy matter to displace them, since they had been confirmed in their government by Alexander, and their strength had greatly increased. Of the countries to the north of Mount Taurus, Cappadocia was assigned to Nicanor; Greater Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pamphylia, and Lycia, to Antigonus as before; Caria to Asander; Lydia to Clitus; Phrygia on the Hellespont to Arrhidaeus.

Antigenes was appointed to collect the revenues in the district of Susa, 3000 of the Macedonians who were mutinously inclined being sent with him. As the king's bodyguard Antipater appointed Autolycus the son of Agathocles, Amyntas the son of Alexander and brother of Peucestes, Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy, and Alexander the son of Polysperchon. He made his own son Cassander chiliarch of the cavalry, while Antigonus received command of the forces which had formerly been under Perdiccas, together with the care and custody of the kings' persons and, at his own request, the task of finishing the war against Eumenes. Antipater, having secured the general approval of all that he had done, returned home. With this the ninth book concludes.

The tenth book relates how Eumenes, having heard what had befallen Perdiccas, and that he himself had been declared an enemy by the Macedonians, made all preparations for war; how Alcetas, the brother of Perdiccas, took refuge with him on that account; how Attalus, who had been one of the ringleaders in the insurrection against Antipater, also joined the exiles with a force of 10,000 foot and 800 horse; how Attalus and his troops attacked Cnidus, Caunus, and Rhodes. The Rhodians, under their admiral, Demaratus, completely repulsed them. How Eumenes nearly came to blows with Antipater on his arrival at Sardes, but Cleopatra, Alexander's sister, to prevent the Macedonian people accusing her of being the cause of the war, persuaded Eumenes to leave Sardes. Notwithstanding, Antipater reviled her for her friendship with Eumenes and Perdiccas. She defended herself more vigorously than a woman could have been expected to do, brought countercharges

against him, and in the end they parted amicably. Eumenes, having unexpectedly attacked those who did not acknowledge his authority, collected much booty and money, which he distributed amongst his soldiers. He also sent messages to Alcetas and his friends, begging them to assemble all their forces in one place so that they might unitedly attack the common enemy. But differences of opinion arose amongst them, and they finally refused. Antipater, not yet daring to engage Eumenes, sent Asander against Attalus and Alcetas; after the battle had long remained undecided, Asander was defeated.

Cassander was at variance with Antigonus, but by command of his father, Antipater, he abandoned his opposition. Nevertheless, Cassander, when he met his father in Phrygia, advised him not to get too far from the kings, and to keep watch on Antigonus; but the latter, by his quiet behaviour, courtesy, and good qualities, did all he could to remove suspicion. Antipater, being appeased, appointed him to the command of the forces which had crossed over with him to Asia----8500 Macedonian 'infantry, and the same number of foreign cavalry, together with half the elephants (that is, seventy) ----to assist him in ending the war against Eumenes. Thus Antigonus began the war. Antipater, with the kings and the rest of his forces, pretended to be going to cross over into Macedonia, but the army again mutinied and demanded their pay. Antipater promised that he would pay them when he reached Abydos, or let them have, if not the whole, at least the greater part of it. Having thus encouraged their hopes, he reached Abydos without disturbance, but having deceived the soldiers, he crossed the Hellespont by night, with the kings, to Lysimachus. On the following day the soldiers also crossed, and for the moment made no further demand for their pay. With this the tenth book ends.

This author is second to none of the best historical writers. He is very strong in concise narrative, and never impairs the continuity of the story by ill-timed digressions or parentheses; he is novel rather in arrangement than in diction, which he employs in such a manner that it would be impossible for the narrative to be set forth more clearly and perspicuously. His style is distinct, euphonious, and terse, characterized by a combination of smoothness and loftiness. His novelties of language are not merely far-fetched innovations, but are obvious and emphatic, figures of speech in reality, and not simply a change of ordinary words. The result is that not only in this respect is clearness secured, but also in the equipment, order, and nature of the narrative, which is the artistic essence of perspicuity. For straightforward periods are used even by those who are not specialists, and if this is done without anything to relieve them, the style degenerates into flatness and meanness, of which, in spite of his clearness, there are no traces in our author. He makes use of ellipsis, not of periods but of words, so that the ellipsis is not even noticed; any attempt to supply what is omitted would seem to indicate a tendency to unessential additions, and would not really fill up the gap. The variety of his rhetorical figures is admirable; they do not deviate at once altogether from simple

form and usage, but are gradually interwoven from the beginning, so that they neither offend by satiety nor create confusion by sudden change. In a word, any one who compares him with other historians, will find that many classical writers are his inferior in composition.

Consult J. P. Mahaffy, Alexanders Empire (1887) in ”Story of the Nations” Series, and E. R. Bevan, The House of Seleucus (1902). See p. 149, note . Καυσία, a light, broad-brimmed felt hat, worn by the Macedonians, to keep off the burning heat (καῦσις) of the sun. Arrhidaeus and the young Alexander, the son of Roxana. The ”silver-shield” division of the Macedonian army. More correctly Polyperchon. Or ”well-rounded.”

Codices 1-165 — 93. [Arrian, Bithynica]

Read the same author’s Bithynica in eight books, containing a detailed account of the mythical and general history of Bithynia. It is a history of his own country, dedicated to it as a patriotic offering. For he tells us definitely in this work that he was born in Nicomedia, brought up and educated there, and held, the office of priest of Demeter and her daughter, to whom the city was sacred. He mentions various works of his on other subjects, such as the career of the Corinthian Timoleon in Sicily, and the memorable deeds of Dion the Syracusan, who freed Syracuse and the whole of Sicily from the second Dionysius, the son of the first, and from the barbarians,- whom Dionysius had introduced to support his tyranny. It appears that the history of his country was the fourth work he wrote, being written after the histories of Alexander the Great, Timoleon, and Dion. Certainly from the time when he first took to a literary career he had intended to treat of this subject, but the work took some time to complete owing to the lack of material; at least, this is the reason he himself gives for the delay in its production. He begins, as stated, with mythical history and goes down to the death of the last Nicomedes, who at his death left his kingdom to the Romans, who had never had a king since the expulsion of the Tarquins.

The first independent king of Bithynia was Nicomedes I (278 B.C.); the Nicomedes here referred to is Nicomedes IV, who bequeathed his kingdom to Rome in 74 B.C.

Codices 1-165 — 94. [Iamblichus, Dramaticon]

Read the Dramaticon of Iamblichus, a narrative of love adventures. The author makes less show of indecencies than Achilles Tatius, but he is more immoral than the Phoenician Heliodorus. Of these three writers, who have all adopted the same subject and have chosen love intrigues as the material for their stories, Heliodorus is more serious and restrained, lamblichus less so, while Achilles Tatius pushes his obscenity to impudence. The style of Iamblichus is soft and flowing; if there is anything vigorous and sonorous in it, it is less characterized by intensity than by what may be called titillation and nervelessness. Iamblichus is so distinguished by excellence of style and arrangement and the order of the narrative that it is to be regretted that he did not devote his skill and energies to serious subjects instead of to puerile fictions. The characters of the story are a handsome couple named Rhodanes and Sinonis, united by the tie of mutual love and marriage. Garmus, king of Babylon, having lost his wife, falls in love with Sinonis and is eager to marry her. Sinonis refuses and is bound with chains of gold, while Rhodanes is placed upon the cross by Damas and Sacas, the king’s eunuchs. He is taken down through the efforts of Sinonis, and the lovers take to flight, one thus escaping death, the other a hated marriage. Sacas and Damas have their ears and noses cut off and are sent after the fugitives. They take different routes to carry out the search. Rhodanes and Sinonis are nearly surprised by Damas in a meadow. For a fisherman had told him of some shepherds who, being put to the torture, at last show him the meadow where Rhodanes had discovered a treasure, revealed to him by the inscription engraved on a cippus surmounted by a lion.

A spectre in the form of a goat becomes enamoured of Sinonis, which obliges the lovers to leave the meadow. Damas finds a garland of flowers dropped by Sinonis and sends it to Garmus as a consolation. In their flight, the lovers come across an old woman at the door of a hut; they, hide themselves in a cave, thirty stades long and open at both ends, the mouth of which is concealed by thick bushes. Damas comes up with his companions, and questions the old woman, who is terrified by the sight of the naked sword. The horses on which Rhodanes and Sinonis had

ridden are captured. The soldiers surround their hiding-place; the brazen shield of one of those who were keeping watch is broken on the cave; the hollowness of the echo discloses the whereabouts of the fugitives; the soldiers begin to dig, and Damas's shouts reach the ears of those within. They retire farther into the cave and make their way to the second opening. Here a swarm of wild bees attacks the diggers, drops of honey falling also upon the fugitives. The bees as well as the honey are infected with poison from their having eaten certain venomous reptiles, so that the diggers whom they sting either lose a limb or die. Rhodanes and his companion, hard pressed by hunger, lick up some drops of the honey, are seized with colic, and fall on the road as if dead.

The soldiers, worn out by the attack of the bees, take to flight but renew the pursuit of the lovers. Seeing Rhodanes and Sinonis prostrate in the road, they pass them by, taking them for two dead strangers. Sinonis, while in the cave, had cut her hair, and made a rope with it to draw water : Damas finds it and sends it to Garmus, as an earnest of the speedy capture of the fugitives. The soldiers who passed by where Rhodanes and Sinonis were lying in the road pay respect to them as if they were really dead, according to the custom of the country; some cover them with their tunics, others throw over them anything they have at hand, even pieces of bread and meat, and then go their way. The lovers recover from the drowsiness caused by the honey; Rhodanes had been roused by some crows quarrelling over some pieces of meat, and woke Sinonis. Getting up, they go in the opposite direction to the soldiers, so as to be less easily recognized. They meet two asses and mount them, having first loaded them with part of what the soldiers, thinking them dead, had thrown over them, and which the lovers had carried away. They stop at an inn, but soon leave it for another, in the neighbourhood of a full market-place. Two brothers have died and they are accused of their murder, but acquitted. The elder of the two brothers, who had poisoned the younger and who had accused them, poisons himself, thereby proving their innocence.

Rhodanes gets possession of the poison without being seen. They put up at the house of a brigand who robbed passers-by and ate them. Soldiers sent by Damas capture the brigand and set fire to his house; Rhodanes and Sinonis, enveloped by the flames, with great difficulty escape with their lives, after they have killed the asses and thrown them on the fire to make a bridge across. The soldiers who fired the house, meeting them during the night, ask them who they are. "We are the ghosts of those murdered by the brigands," they reply. Their thin, pale countenances, the weakness of their voice, persuade the soldiers that they are speaking the truth, whereat they are greatly alarmed. The lovers resume their flight, and meeting a young girl who is being carried to the grave, join the throng of spectators. An old Chaldaean comes up and stops the funeral, saying that the girl is still alive, and so it turns out to be. He predicts to Rhodanes and Sinonis that they will attain royal rank. The girl's grave is left empty, and a great part of the robes

which were to be burnt and of the food and drink is left behind. Rhodanes and Sinonis make a good meal, take some of the clothes and sleep in the grave. In the morning, the soldiers who had fired the house find they have been deceived, and set out in pursuit of Rhodanes and Sinonis, imagining that they are accomplices of the brigand.

Having traced them as far as the grave and seeing them lying there motionless, overcome by wine and sleep, they imagine they are looking on corpses and so leave them, although they hesitated since their footsteps guided them thither. Rhodanes and Sinonis leave the grave and cross the river, the waters of which are sweet and clear and reserved for the king of Babylon alone to drink. Sinonis, when trying to sell the clothes she has taken, is arrested for sacrilege and brought before Soraechus, the son of Soraechus the tax-gatherer and named the Just. Owing to her beauty, he is minded to send her to king Garmus; whereupon Rhodanes and Sinonis mix a dose of poison, considering death preferable to the sight of this king. Their intention is revealed by a female slave to Soraechus, who secretly empties the cup containing the deadly potion and fills it with a sleeping draught; after they have drunk it and are in a deep sleep they are placed in a carriage to be taken to the king. A little way from Babylon, Rhodanes is frightened by a dream and cries out; this wakes Sinonis, who takes up a sword and wounds herself in the breast. Soraechus wants to know their history, and the lovers having received a solemn promise from him, tell him everything. He sets them at liberty and shows them a temple of Aphrodite on a little island, where Sinonis can be healed of her wound.

By way of digression the author relates the history of the temple and the little island, which is formed by the surrounding waters of the Euphrates and Tigris. The priestess of Aphrodite had three children, Euphrates, Tigris, and Mesopotamia, the last, who was born ugly, being changed into a woman so beautiful that three suitors quarrelled for her hand. Bochorus, the most famous judge of the time, was chosen to decide their claims, and the three rivals pleaded their cause. Now Mesopotamia had given one of them the cup from which she drank, had crowned the second with a garland of flowers from her own head, and had kissed the third. Bochorus decided that she belonged to the one whom she had kissed, but this decision only embittered the quarrel, which ended in the death of the rivals by one another’s hands. In another digression the author gives details of the temple of Aphrodite. The women who visit it are obliged to reveal in public the dreams they have had in the temple; this leads to minute details of Phar-nuchus, Pharsiris and Tanais, from whom the river is named. Pharsiris and Tanai’s initiated those who dwelt on the banks of the river into the mysteries of Aphrodite. Tigris died in the little island just mentioned, after having eaten of some roses in the buds of which, not yet full blown, lurked a poisonous little beetle. His mother believed she had made him a demi-god by her enchantments.

Iamblichus then describes different kinds of enchantments ----by locusts, lions and mice. According to him, the last is the oldest, the mysteries being called after the name of these animals. There are also enchantments by hail, snakes, necromancy and ventriloquism, the ventriloquist being called by the Greeks Eurycles, and by the Babylonians Sacchuras. The author calls himself a Babylonian and says that, after having learnt the art of magic, he devoted himself to the study of the Greek arts and sciences. He flourished in the reign of Soaemus, son of Achaemenides the Arsacid, who occupied the throne of his fathers, and was afterwards a Roman senator and consul, and king of Greater Armenia. At this time Marcus Aurelius was Roman emperor. When Aurelius sent Verus, his adopted brother and son-in-law and colleague in the empire, to make war against Vologaesus the Parthian king, Iamblichus predicted the beginning, the course, and end of the war. He also tells how Vologaesus fled over the Euphrates and Tigris, and how the kingdom of Parthia became a Roman province.

Tigris and Euphrates, the children of the priestess, were very like each other, and Rhodanes was like both. Tigris, as has been mentioned, had been poisoned by eating roses, and when Rhodanes crosses over to the island with Sinonis, the mother of Tigris, when she sets eyes on Rhodanes, declares that her son has come back to life, accompanied by Kore.Rhodanes falls in with the deception, highly amused at the credulity of the islanders. Damas is informed of what has happened to Rhodanes and Sinonis and of what Soraechus has done for them, his informant being the physician whom Soraechus had secretly sent to attend to Sinonis’s wound. Soraechus is arrested and taken to Garmus, and at the same time the informer is sent with a letter to the priest of Aphrodite, ordering him to seize Rhodanes and Sinonis. The physician, in order to cross the river, hangs himself round the neck of a camel in the usual manner, having first deposited the letter in the animal’s right ear. He is drowned in the river, the camel alone reaches the island, and Rhodanes and Sinonis, taking Damas’s letter out of its ear, become aware of the danger that threatens them.

They accordingly take to flight, and on the way meet Soraechus, who is being taken to Garmus, and put up at the same inn. During the night Rhodanes bribes certain persons to slay the guards of Soraechus, who takes to flight with the lovers, being thus rewarded for his previous kindness. Damas arrests the priest of Aphrodite and questions him about Sinonis; the old man is condemned to change his ministry for the office of executioner; the manners and customs relating to this office. Euphrates, whom the priest his father takes for Rhodanes and calls him by this name, is arrested, and his sister Mesopotamia takes to flight. Euphrates is taken before Sacas and questioned about Sinonis, being taken for Rhodanes and examined as such. Sacas sends a messenger to Garmus to inform him that Rhodanes is captured and that Sinonis soon will be. For Euphrates, when questioned in the name

of Rhodanes, being obliged to call his sister Mesopotamia by the name of Sinonis, declares that Sinonis fled when she saw him arrested.

The fugitives Rhodanes, Sinonis and Soraechus, put up at the house of a farm-labourer. He has a beautiful daughter, who has just lost her husband, and out of her affection for him has cut her hair. She is sent to a goldsmith to sell the golden chain which Sinonis had brought from her former prison. The goldsmith, seeing the beauty of the young woman, and recognizing part of the chain which he happened to have made himself, and noticing that she has her hair cut, suspects that she is Sinonis. He accordingly informs Damas and has the labourer's daughter secretly watched. Suspecting what is afoot, she takes refuge in an empty house. The story of the young girl named Trophime, of the slave who was both her lover and murderer, of the golden ornaments, of the lawless conduct of the slave, of his suicide, of the blood that spirted over the labourer's daughter when the murderer was committing suicide, of the fear and flight of the young woman, of the terror and flight of those who were keeping watch on her, of the young woman's return to her father, of the story of her adventures, of the departure of Rhodanes, and of the letter sent by the goldsmith to inform Damas that Sinonis has been found. To confirm his letter, he sends the chain which he has bought, and mentions the other suspicious circumstances connected with the labourer's daughter.

Rhodanes, at the moment of leaving, kisses the labourer's daughter. Sinonis is furiously jealous; at first she had only suspected this kiss, but her suspicions were confirmed when she wiped off the marks of blood with which his lips were stained. Sinonis makes up her mind to kill the young woman and hastens back like a mad-woman, followed by Soraechus, who is unable to calm her passionate fury. They put up at the house of a wealthy man of dissolute habits, named Setapus, who falls in love with Sinonis and tries to seduce her. She pretends to return his love and, at night, when Setapus is intoxicated, stabs him with a sword, orders the servants to open the door, leaves Soraechus, who is ignorant of what has happened, and sets out in haste to find the labourer's daughter. Soraechus, when he hears of her departure, starts in pursuit, having hired some of the slaves of Setapus to accom-pany him, so as to prevent the murder of the labourer's daughter. He overtakes her, makes her get into a carriage which had been prepared beforehand, and turns back with her. On their return, the servants of Setapus, who had found their dead master, filled with rage rush upon them, seize Sinonis, bind her, and take her to Garmus to be punished as a murderess. Soraechus, having sprinkled his head with dust, and rent his cloak, announces the sad news to Rhodanes, who would have killed himself, but is prevented by Soraechus.

Garmus, having received the letters from Sacas and the goldsmith, informing him of the capture of Rhodanes and Sinonis, rejoices greatly, offers sacrifice to the gods, orders preparations to be made for the marriage, and issues a decree that

all prisoners should be unbound and set free. Sinonis is accordingly released from her bonds by the servants of Setapus. Garmus orders Damas to be put to death and he is handed over to the priest whom he himself had deprived of his priesthood and made executioner. Garmus was wroth with Damas, because he had allowed others to have the honour of arresting the supposed Rhodanes and Sinonis. Damas is succeeded in his office by his brother Monasus. The story of Berenice, daughter of the king of Egypt, of her disgraceful amours, of her intimacy with Mesopotamia, who was afterwards seized by Sacas and, as Sinonis, sent to Garmus with her brother Euphrates. Garmus, hearing from the goldsmith that Sinonis has escaped, orders him to be put to death, and the guards, who had been deputed to watch the pretended Sinonis and to bring her to him, to be buried alive with their women and children.

An Hyrcanian dog, belonging to Rhodanes, finds in the ill-omened inn the bodies of the unhappy girl and of the slave, her infatuated lover and murderer. It has already devoured the body of the slave and half eaten that of the young girl, when the father of Sinonis comes on the scene. Recognizing the dog as belonging to Rhodanes and seeing the half-eaten body of the girl, he first kills the dog as a sacrifice to Sinonis and then hangs himself, having first buried the remains of the girl and written on her tomb with the blood of the dog, ”Here lies the beautiful Sinonis.” Meanwhile Rhodanes and Soraechus come up, see the dog lying dead by the tomb, Sinonis’s father hanging by a rope, and the epitaph written on the tomb. Rhodanes stabs himself and adds to the epitaph on Sinonis the words: ”and the handsome Rhodanes,” written in his own blood. Soraechus puts his head in the noose, and Rhodanes is preparing to give himself the death blow, when the labourer’s daughter rushes in, shouting loudly, ”Rhodanes, she who lies here is not Sinonis.” She runs, and cuts the rope by which Soraechus is hanging, and snatches the dagger from the hand of Rhodanes. At last she manages to convince them by relating the story of the unhappy girl, and of the buried treasure, which she had come to carry off.

Meanwhile Sinonis, released from her bonds, hastens to the labourer’s house, still furious with his daughter. Unable to find her, she asks her father where she is, and on his telling her the way she has taken, she immediately sets out in pursuit with drawn sword. At the sight of Rhodanes lying on the ground and her rival sitting alone by his side, endeavouring to staunch the wound in his breast (Soraechus having gone to fetch a physician) her rage and jealousy know no bounds and she rushes upon the young woman. But Rhodanes, forgetting his wound at the sight of her violence, musters up strength to throw himself in front of Sinonis and hold her back, at the same time snatching the sword from her hands. Sinonis, transported with rage, rushes out of the inn and running like a madwoman shouts to Rhodanes: ”I invite you to-day to Garmus’s wedding.” Soraechus, on his return, hearing what

has taken place, consoles Rhodanes, and after his wound has been dressed, the labourer's daughter is sent back with money to her father.

Euphrates and Mesopotamia, the supposed Rhodanes and Sinonis, together with Soraechus and the real Rhodanes are taken before Garmus. Garmus, seeing that Mesopotamia is not Sinonis, delivers her to Zobaras with orders to cut off her head on the banks of the Euphrates, to prevent any one else in future taking the name of Sinonis. But Zobaras, who has already drunk at the fountain of love, is smitten with Mesopotamia; he spares her life and sends her back to Berenice, who had become queen of Egypt after her father's death, and from whom she had been taken.Berenice is again united to Mesopotamia, on whose account Garmus threatens war. Euphrates is handed over to his father, now executioner, by whom he is recognized, and his life is spared. He takes the place of his father, whose hands are not soiled with human blood, and afterwards, disguised as the daughter of the executioner, escapes from the prison and regains his freedom.

Such was the state of affairs when Soraechus is condemned to be crucified. The place of execution appointed was the meadow with the fountain where Rhodanes and Sinonis had first rested during their flight, where Rhodanes had discovered the hidden treasure of which he informs Soraechus when the latter is being led away to execution. A body of Alans, indignant at not receiving their pay from Garmus, who had halted at the place where Soraechus was to be executed, drive away the guards of Soraechus and set him free. Soraechus, having found the treasure of which he had been told, and having cleverly removed it from its hiding-place, persuades the Alans that he has learnt this and other things from the gods. Having gradually gained their confidence, he induces them to elect him their king, makes war upon Garmus and defeats him. But this happened later.

While Soraechus is on his way to execution, Garmus, crowned with garlands and dancing, orders Rhodanes to be taken to the place where he was to have been executed before, and to be placed upon the cross. While Garmus, drunk with wine and dancing round the cross with the flute-players, abandons himself to joy and revelry, he receives a letter from Sacas, informing him that Sinonis has just married the young king of Syria. Rhodanes is rejoiced, Garmus at first wants to kill himself, but, changing his mind, makes the unwilling Rhodanes, who would have preferred death, come down from the cross. Garmus then appoints him to the command of an army which he decides to send against the king of Syria, so as to pit the lover against the rival. Rhodanes is treacherously received by the army in a friendly manner, Garmus having privately instructed the generals under Rhodanes that, if their army is victorious and Sinonis is captured, they are to put Rhodanes to death. Rhodanes gains the victory, recovers Sinonis, and becomes king of Babylon, as a swallow had foretold. For when Garmus in person came to see Rhodanes set out on

the expedition, an eagle and a kite pursued this swallow, which escaped the eagle but became the prey of the kite. Such is the contents of the sixteen books.

Syrian romance-writer, probably lived about the middle of the second century A.D. The complete work is no longer extant (see Cod. 73). A monumental pillar or monument generally marking the site of a grave. Or, ”being uncertain whether their footsteps led thither,” Deriving μυστήριον from μῦς. A.D. 164. Or Vologases III (148-190). Reading Κόρην with capital K. Kore or Persephone, daughter of Demeter (Ceres), wife of Pluto, and queen of the lower world. If κόρην be read, we must translate ”and bids her daughter follow him.” By Sacas (p. 174 above).

Codices 1-165 — 95. [John Scythopolita, Against Schismatics]

Read the work of John Scythopolita the Scholasticus Against Separatists from the Church, or Against Eutyches and Dioscorus and those who held the same ideas, and denied that there were two natures in Christ. The work, in twelve books, was written at the request of a certain patriarch named Julian. The writer’s style is clear and pure and he uses words suited to the historic style. He vigorously combats heresy and makes full use of evidence from Scripture, not neglecting logical methods, when they are appropriate to the subject. The author of this separatist treatise attacked by Scythopolita has concealed his name, but has craftily entitled it Against Nestorius, in order to induce the more simple-minded to read it. Perhaps it is Basil of Cilicia, who afterwards wrote against John a dramatic dialogue worthy of the religion he professed. See Cod. 17. Supposed to be Julian, patriarch of Antioch (471-476). See Cod. 42.

Codices 1-165 — 96. [George of Alexandria, Life of St. Chrysostom]

Read the work by George, bishop of Alexandria, entitled The Life of St. Chrysostom. Who the author is, I cannot state with certainty. The style is simple, at times degenerating into meanness and vulgarity, and the proper construction of nouns and verbs, usually observed even by the grammarians, is neglected. The author says that he has compiled his history from material taken from bishop Palladius, who has written an admirable and careful life of Chrysostom in the form of a dialogue, from Socrates, and other writers. According to the author, the great John was born at Antioch of noble parents, Secundus and Anthusa. Meletius the Armenian, then head of the Church at Antioch, initiated them into the rites of Christianity and prepared them to receive the saving grace of baptism, having first initiated and baptized their son. At an early age, John went to school. From boyhood he was distinguished for his modesty, showed none of the effeminacy common to wealthy and high-born children, and would not even ride on horseback. At Antioch he attended the lectures of Libanius on grammar and rhetoric, and of Andragathius on philosophy. After his father's death, he was the comfort of his mother, and, abstaining from all pleasures and amusements, devoted himself entirely to study.

He visited Athens to improve his knowledge, and in a short time showed himself so superior to all other students that Anthemius, the priest of the temple of Athena, who was reputed the wisest man in Athens, was jealous of him. Demosthenes, the prefect of the city, sent a most complimentary summons to him, in answer to which John presented himself with great humility. In a discussion that took place between them, John showed himself superior in learning, intelligence, and piety. A marvellous result of this was, that Anthemius, finally convinced by John's divine eloquence and prayers, was baptized with all his household by the bishop of the city. The prefect, who had been already baptized, received instruction in the doctrines of Christianity, together with a large number of heathen. The bishop of the city

wanted to ordain John and to leave him bishop of the city in his place, but John, when he became aware of this, secretly set sail in haste for his own country.

His friends and acquaintances wished him to enter the legal profession, but he was himself inclined to a monastic life, although only eighteen years of age. Two of his fellow-students, Theodore, afterwards bishop of Mopsuestia, and Maximus, afterwards bishop of Seleucia, rejected a public and mercenary career and chose a private and simple lifer He was very intimate with Basil the Great (not the other Basil, as some assert), who was ordained deacon by Meletius and whom John esteemed more highly than any other of his friends. Basil took farewell of John and tried to persuade him to adopt the same kind of life, but for the time his mother stood in the way. Bishop Zeno came from Jerusalem and appointed John reader in the church at Antioch. Soon afterwards his mother died, John distributed his father's property amongst the poor, left the city, entered a monastery in the neighbourhood, and showed himself a model and pattern monk.

Hesychius, a Syrian monk, who was reputed to have a knowledge of the future, saw two men in white raiment, the one holding a book and the other some keys, both of which they gave to John. The latter declared that he was the apostle Peter, the former that he was John the theologian. Hesychius told this to the inmates of the monastery, having taken care that it should not reach the ears of John, for fear lest, owing to his great modesty, he might leave the monastery. John also went through severe religious exercises and composed several monastic treatises. He also wrought miracles while in the monastery. One of the citizens had such a pain on one side of his head that his right eye hung out, but when he consulted John he was immediately cured. A certain Archelaus, a wealthy and distinguished person, suffering from leprosy in the face, was ordered to wash in the pool out of which the brethren drank, and became well; after this, he distributed his wealth, said farewell to the world, and entered the monastery, his example being followed by many others. Another person named Eucleus, who had lost his right eye through the influence of an evil spirit, applied to the monastery for admission; his head was shaved while the man of God prayed, and he recovered his sight. A woman also who had an issue of blood seven years was healed. A lion, which was said to have carried off a number of travellers, after John had impressed the sign of the cross upon others, was killed by its influence.

After four years, owing to the number of people who applied to him, he left the monastery, and spent two years in a cave seldom sleeping and not lying down during the whole of the time. Having contracted a chill in the stomach and kidneys, he was compelled to return to Antioch, where he was ordained deacon by Meletius and looked after the altar. At that time he wrote the three treatises to Stagirius and those On the Priesthood and On the Incomprehensible. After the death of Meletius at Constantinople, the holy John returned to the monastery. Flavian, who had suc-

ceeded Meletius, in consequence of a divine revelation brought him back to the city from the monastery and ordained him priest. A command had been given to Flavian in a vision that John should be ordained and that Flavian himself should ordain him. A dove that hovered over his head during the ceremony was abundant proof of the divine grace with which he was to be filled. He spent twelve years in the sanctuary. From his early years, owing to his zeal for virtue he was harsh and severe, and rather given to wrath than to consideration for others. He wrote several commentaries while at Antioch, and at the bishop's urgent request addressed the people extemporaneously in the pulpit.

The son of a woman named Euclaea, suffering from a violent fever, whose life had been despaired of, was healed by being sprinkled with some water which John had blessed. A certain woman belonging to the sect of the Marcionists, whose husband held some office in the city, was in a desperate condition from dysentery; but having been healed by John, she, her husband, and all her household, with several other Marcionists, returned to the true faith. On the death of Nectarius, archbishop of Constantinople, John was sent for from Antioch, in spite of the opposition of the inhabitants, who claimed him as their own special blessing. But the emperor's command prevailed; John was consecrated by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, who was reluctant to perform the ceremony, but was forced to do so, certain papers containing charges against him being held over him as a threat if he did not consent. While John was being consecrated amid general approval, a man possessed was freed by him from an evil spirit.

The great Chrysostom then immediately abolished the custom of receiving spiritual sisters and delivered long discourses against the unjust, the gluttonous, and the pleasure-loving. He was very charitable, so that many called him the Almsgiver. In a word, he taught all virtue and dissuaded from all vice. He also sent monks to Phoenicia to redeem from error those who were given over to idolatry; these monks, armed with the imperial authority, overthrew the idolatrous temples, the expenses being defrayed by certain pious women. A band of Celts, infected by Arianism, was brought back to the true faith by missionaries who spoke their language. He also brought back the nomad Scythians voluntarily to Christianity. He utterly rooted out the Marcionite heresy which was raising its head again in the East. He increased the number of nightly services with chanting. He took his food alone for three reasons; he was a total abstainer from wine because it affected his head (except when he drank it flavoured with roses in summer), he suffered from a weak stomach so that he often could not eat the food put before him, but asked for something else, and when at leisure he often refrained from food all day. The clergy considered him very harsh and austere. His deacon Serapion was also the cause of great hatred against him. John expelled several clergy from the Church for various reasons. Serapion also quarrelled with Severian, bishop of Gabala, who conceived a great and lasting hatred of John. John was greatly loved by the people owing to his

discourses. He himself was very fond of commenting upon the epistles of St. Paul, who, according to John's friend Proclus, visited him for three nights and inspired him with the interpretation of his epistles.

John also offended the empress in the case of Theodoric the patrician, whom he had succeeded in freeing from her unjust exactions. Theodoric gave the greater part of his property to the Church poorhouse as a thankoffering to God, which inflamed Eudoxia with anger and malice. Eutropius introduced a law that criminals who fled for refuge to the churches should not enjoy the privilege of asylum. But when, soon afterwards, he himself took refuge there, he reaped the fruits of his own legislation. While he lay prostrate at the altar, the great John delivered a speech full of reproach, which set many against him, who thought that he rebuked the unhappy wretch too cruelly. He deprived the Arians of their churches and with the emperor's consent drove them out of the city. Since they had composed antiphons to deceive the simple-minded he outdid them, with the assistance of the empress, by displaying silver crosses while the antiphons were being sung. It is said that the God-inspired Ignatius first introduced antiphons, in imitation of the angels who in this manner sang the praises of God. The influential Arian Gainas demanded a church from the emperor, but John who was present expressed his disapproval with great freedom, and persuaded the emperor to refuse. Soon afterwards, when Gainas rebelled, John, without delay, at the general request, went on an embassy to the barbarian, and repressed the revolt.

Eusebius, who succeeded Celbianus as bishop of Valentinopolis. presented a document containing seven charges against Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus. The three first accused him of sacrilege; the fourth was that he had retained in his service without rebuking him a youth who had committed murder; the fifth, that he had taken possession of and sold some land which had been left by Basilina, the mother of Julian, to the Church; the sixth, that he had resumed intercourse with his wife after he had said farewell to the world, and that he had had a child by her; the seventh, that he accepted fees for consecration. The last charge, being regarded as the most serious, was investigated. The trial was protracted to great length, since the accuser himself purposely neglected his duty, and Antoninus died before it ended. John therefore went to Ephesus, and removed from their sees six bishops who had paid fees to secure consecration and confessed their guilt. He also deposed six others in Asia for the same offence. In place of Antoninus he consecrated Heraclides his own deacon, which created a disturbance. In place of the six bishops others were appointed who were distinguished by greater piety and virtue. When Chrysostom was banished all these were deprived of their sees, while those who had been ejected were restored.

Severian, bishop of Gabala, having heard that Antiochus was in Constantinople and had obtained considerable sums of money by his discourses went there himself.

John, when he set out for Ephesus, recommended him as his deputy in the pulpit, and in this manner Severian became known to the emperor and all the people.

Callitrope, the widow of a shipmaster, had been unjustly taxed, and Paulacius, the prefect of Alexandria, harshly pressed the poor woman for the amount (500 gold pieces). She appealed to the empress, who fined Paulacius 100 pounds of gold, of which the sorely afflicted woman only received thirty-six pieces. She accordingly took refuge with the general ”port in a storm,” the great John, who brought an action against Paulacius for the payment of 500 pieces to the widow. This roused the hostility of Eudoxia, who was anxious for Paulacius to be let off. She was not listened to, however, and the just man claimed and restored to the ill-treated woman that of which she had been unjustly defrauded. Then a wonderful thing happened. When Eudoxia sent to rescue Paulacius in despite of John, an angel appeared bearing a spear and frightened her messengers, so that their mission was unsuccessful. In consequence of these and similar acts of John, Acacius of Beroea, Theophilus, Antiochus, and Severian, and many others, whom he had offended by his reproaches, with the assistance and at the instigation of Eudoxia, began to plot against him. Theophilus accused Peter, chief presbyter of Alexandria, of having administered the sacrament to a woman who was a Manichaean; his defence was that she had been converted and that it was by his permission that she had been admitted by him to the communion. In proof of this he called to witness Isidore the presbyter and hospitaller of Alexandria.

This Isidore, owing to his blameless character, had formerly been sent to Damasus by Theophilus, and had brought from Rome to Flavian an offer of friendship and alliance, after the two Churches had been at variance for twenty years. The evidence of Isidore roused the anger of Theophilus, who expelled Peter from the Church and falsely accused Isidore of gross immorality. When the falsehood was discovered, Theophilus was roused to further villainy, which was increased by the following incident. A certain rich woman named Theodota had given Isidore 1000 pieces of money to distribute amongst the poor without consulting Theophilus, which Isidore had done. To avoid the wrath of Theophilus he fled to the mountain of Nitria, where he had formerly lived in a cell. The chief of the Egyptian monks were Dioscorus, Ammonius, Euthymius, and Eusebius, four brothers, called ”the long” from the height of their stature. At that time a quarrel had broken out with the Anthro.pomorphite heretics. When some ignorant and coarse monks created a disturbance in Egypt, Theophilus, apparently alarmed when they abused him, attempted to deceive them by flattery, saying, ”I have seen your faces as the face of God. But when they further demanded that Origen, because he asserted that the divinity was without human form, should be anathematized, he consented, and so escaped death.

Seizing hold of this pretext against the ”long brethren” (since they would no longer associate with him as before, and denied that God had a human form), he accused them to the monks and stirred up that ignorant herd against them and also against Isidore, on whose account he was the more hostile to them. At last; after having been the victims of intrigue and ill-treatment, and their cells having been set fire to, they fled to Constantinople. John received them kindly and sympathetically, but did not admit them to communion for fear of offending Theophilus, to whom he wrote a letter proposing reconciliation, but Theophilus paid no attention. In the meantime the ”long brethren” presented documents containing charges against Theophilus, and were in turn accused by others at his instigation. When these latter were unable to prove anything they were thrown into prison and flogged, some of them died and the rest were condemned to banishment in the island of Proconnesus. John informed Theophilus of the charges against him, to which Theophilus angrily replied : ”I believe you are acquainted with the canons of the council of Nicaea, by which it is ordained that no bishop shall exercise jurisdiction beyond his own province. If you are not, then make yourself acquainted with them and do not interfere with the charges against me. Notwithstanding, the same Theophilus who wrote these words afterwards condemned John, although he belonged to another diocese. As the monks did not desist from their accusations against Theophilus, the emperor ordered him to present himself for trial.

But the animosity against John increased to such a degree that, on his arrival, Theophilus was appointed judge of John himself.

The wife of the senator Theognostus, who had been proscribed and died in exile, had been deprived by the empress of a field that had been left her. She accordingly had recourse to John, the champion of widows, but although he spoke with great freedom on her behalf his efforts were unsuccessful and only roused the hatred of the empress. He accordingly ordered that, on the day of the Exaltation of the Cross (the 14th of September), when the unjust empress was about to enter the church, the gates should be shut against her. His order was carried out, and the empress retired in shame and anger, and from that time began to plot John’s deposition, banishment, and every other degradation that her indignation suggested. When, as she drew near, she found the gates of the church being closed, one of her suite drew his sword against those who were shutting them; whereupon his hand suddenly withered, but was afterwards restored on his doing homage to John.

The great Epiphanius, whom Theophilus had beguiled and stirred up against John, on his arrival in Constantinople created a disturbance. He ordained a deacon at Hebdomon in St. John’s Church contrary to the law, performed the service without the permission of Chrysostom, and demanded that he should condemn the writings of Origen. Our author relates (as is also stated in the life of Epiphanius), that he by no means approved of the deposition of Chrysostom, as others believed he did,

in spite of the empress's importunity. He also mentions their prediction to each other, that neither should see his throne again. Before his condemnation John, having heard that Eudoxia was angry with him, delivered a lengthy discourse against women generally, which the people interpreted as an attack on the empress. On the arrival of Theophilus, the intrigues against the great combatant John began. When he did not appear at the synod, Theophilus and his party pronounced sentence against him, although he loudly protested that he was ready to appear and defend himself, if his avowed enemies were removed from the council. Forty bishops were ready to support John against Theophilus and his party, but when they loudly protested he comforted them, and begged them not to cause dissension in the Church. After his deposition, he was banished to Hieron, but, in consequence of a severe shock of earthquake which was ascribed to the divine wrath, he was brought back to the city and again seated, against his will, on the episcopal throne.

He declared that he did not wish to resume his pastoral office until the unjust sentence against him had been submitted to investigation. Soon afterwards, Eudoxia being again enraged because John had attacked her in reference to the statue which had been erected in her honour near his church and was the cause of disturbance inside, intrigues were again set on foot against him. Theophilus, although this was an unexpected piece of good fortune for him, being afraid of the hatred of the citizens, did not appear. The cause of their hatred against him was that, after the deposition of John, he had communicated with the "long brethren," by whose means he had plotted against him, and that he did not himself abstain from reading the writings of Origen, on account of which he had accused John. He did not, therefore, attend in person, but sent others to declare that John ought not even to be brought to trial, since after his deposition he had ventured to perform the services of the Church, whereas the synod of Antioch left no room for defence to one who did so after he had been deprived of office. Those who sided with John declared that both the canon and the synod were tainted with Arianism, and that the canon had been aimed at Athanasius; that the council of Sardicarepudiated the validity of the synod, and not only allowed Athanasius to defend himself but also to perform the duties of the priesthood with Marcellus.

Chrysostom was accordingly prohibited from officiating in the church and even from entering it. The festival of the Birth of Christ was at hand, and until the feast of Pentecost and for five days afterwards he took ho part in the services. He was then finally expelled from the city and the church and was banished to Cucusus. At that time a fire broke out in the pulpit and spread to the rest of the building. Many of the enemies of John were made an example, being carried off by filthy diseases or heaven-sent calamities. John, after he was deported to Cucusus, both lectured in public and consecrated several bishops, priests, and deacons. He also performed many miracles during his banishment and after his death, which Basiliscus, bishop of Comana and martyr, having appeared to him, foretold. He was buried in the

same grave as the martyr. Theophilus and his party condemned Heraclides, bishop of Ephesus, in his absence, and, after suffering cruel indignities, Serapion was deprived of the bishopric of Heraclea, to which he had been consecrated by John after his first return from exile. A eunuch of the tribune Victor, a man of disgraceful character, was elected in his stead. Other bishops, about twenty in number, were driven from their sees, together with a large number of priests, deacons, and laymen, who were accused of favouring John, including some pious women, the most distinguished of whom were Olympias,Pentadia, Procle, and Silvane.

Innocent, bishop of Rome, strongly supported the cause of John, although without success. He sent messengers who were dismissed with contumely and wrote letters, but his efforts were unavailing. Subsequently, Arsacius was with difficulty induced to enter his name on the diptychs. Some time afterwards, Proclus transported his remains to Constantinople. This writer appears to relate much that is contrary to the truth of history, but there is nothing to prevent the reader from picking out what is useful and passing over the rest. 616-630. The work, which is extant in a complete form, is regarded as worthless (see biography of Chrysostom by W. R. W. Stephens, 1872). Γραμματικοί must here mean those whose education is elementary. It more generally = philologist in the sense of a student of literature. c. 364-431, Bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia, author of the Lausiaca., biographies of ascetics. See Cod. 28. About 360. Add : ”would not allow such to accompany him.” He was bishop of Majuma, the port of Gaza, famous for his ascetic life and devotion to the duties of his calling.

A young friend of Chrysostom who, after having led a dissipated life, entered a monastery. He was at first unable to endure the restrictions, became subject to convulsions (regarded as demoniacal attacks), but gradually attained to a more religious and meeker frame of mind. The treatises contain Chrysostom’s advice to his friend. So called from Marcion of Sinope, an heresiarch of the second century A.D. His followers believed in two Christs, one sent by an unknown God to save the whole world, the other whom the Creator would one day send to save the Jeus. They denied the resurrection of the flesh, and maintained that the body of Christ was like ours only in appearance, not in reality. He succeeded Gregory of Nazianzus, and was archbishop from 381 to 397 (398). 385-412 Roman general, a Goth by birth, commander of the troops of Arcadius. He afterwards revolted, was declared an enemy of the state, and retaliated by ravaging the territory of the empire. He was killed fighting against the Huns (401), who sent his head to Constantinople.

Mod. Valenza in Liguria. The Apostate. Priest and monk (fifth century A.D.). He was a great friend and champion of Athanasius. Pope 366-384; a Spaniard by birth. His secretary was St. Jerome. In the district of lower Egypt, so called from the natron lakes. Mod. Marmara (from its marble) in the Propontis (Sea of Marmora). See p. 85, note . At the mouth of the Euxine. The modern Sofia, capital of Bulgaria.

The council was held in 343 or 347. A village on the borders of Armenia and Cilicia.
312. See p. 152, note . Literally, ”a double-folded tablet” of wood, ivory, or metal. In the early Church, the tablets on which were written the names of those specially commemorated at the celebration of the Eucharist.

Codices 1-165 — 97. [Phlegon of Tralles, Collection of Chronicles and List of Olympian Victors]

Read the Collection of Chronicles and List of Olympian Victors by Phlegon of Tralles, a freedman of the emperor Hadrian. The work is dedicated to a certain Alcibiades, one of the emperor’s bodyguards. It begins with the 1st Olympiad, because, as nearly all other writers affirm, there are no careful or accurate accounts of preceding periods, but different writers make different statements, and even those who have been eager to obtain the credit of writing about them contradict themselves. For this reason, as we have said, the author begins with the 1st Olympiad, and goes down, as he himself says, to the times of Hadrian. I have read as far as the 177th Olympiad, in which Hecatomnus of Miletus was victor in the stadium and diaulos, and in the race of men in armour three times; Hypsicles the Sicyonian and Gaius of Rome in the long race; Aristonymidas of Cos in the pentathlum; Isidore of Alexandria in wrestling; Aptotus in the periodos; Atyanas the son of Hippocrates, a native of Adramyttium, in boxing; Sphodrias the Sicyonian in the pancratium. Among the youths Sosigenes of Asia in the race; Apollonius of Cyparissus in the wrestling-match; Sotericus of Elis in the boxing-match; Galas of Elis in the pancratium; Hecatomnus of Miletus in the armoured race (he was crowned three times in the same day. in the stadium, the diaulos, and the armoured race); Aristolochus of Elis in the four-horsed chariot race; Hagemon of Elis with his race-horse; Hellanicus of Elis with his pair of horses, and his four-horsed chariot; Cletias of Elis with his pair; and Callippus of Pelion with his race-horse.

At that time Lucullus was besieging Amisus, but having left Murena with two legions to carry on the siege, he himself set out with three others against the territory of the Cabiri, where he went into winter quarters. He also ordered Hadrian to make war against Mithradates, who was defeated. An earthquake in Rome did much damage, and many other events happened during this Olympiad. In its third

year the population according to the census was 910,000. Sinatruces, king of the Parthians, was succeeded by Phraates Theos, and Phaedrus the Epicurean by Patron. Virgilius Maro was born on the 15th of October in this year. In the fourth year of this Olympiad Tigranes and Mithradates, having collected an army of 40,000 foot and 30,000 horse, who were drawn up in the Roman order of battle, engaged Lucullus and were defeated; Tigranes lost 5000 killed, a large number of prisoners, besides a promiscuous rabble. Catulus dedicated the Capitol at Rome. Metellus set out against Crete with three legions and occupied the island; having defeated Laosthenes and shut up the inhabitants within their walls, he was rewarded with the title of imperator. The pirate Athenodorus enslaved the people of Delos and insulted the images of the so-called gods; but Gaius Triarius having repaired the damaged parts of the city, fortified the island.

We have read five books as far as this Olympiad. The author's style, though not too mean and ordinary, does not always preserve the Attic character. But his ill-timed, if laborious, diligence in reckoning the Olympiads, his lists of names of the victors and their achievements, and his accounts of the oracles, not only disgust the reader, since they do not allow a glimpse of anything else to appear, but also make the language disagreeable and rob it of all charm. He also attaches undue importance to oracles of all kinds. Of Tralles in Lydia, lived till the reign of Antoninus Pius. His treatises On Wonderful Things and On Long-lived Persons are extant. 776 B.C. 72-69 B.C. Racing, a single course, the diaulos being a double course. The "five exercises," running, leaping, wrestling, boxing, discus-throwing. The period embraced all the games, so that "to conquer in the period" meant to be victorious in all. A contest combining both wrestling and boxing.

Lucius Licinius Lucullus (c. 110-57), Roman general, conqueror of Mithradates. He was famous for his luxurious banquets, which have become proverbial. Mod. Samsun, on the coast of Pontus. Lucius Licinius Murena, consul 63 B.C. He was accused of bribery, defended by Cicero in a speech still extant, and acquitted. Phraates III. President of the Epicurean school at Athens, died 70 B.C. Cicero draws freely from his work On the Gods (a fragment of which was discovered at Herculaneum) in his De Natura Deorum. Quintus Lutatius Catulus. The Capitol had been destroyed during the civil wars of Sulla's time. Quintus Caecilius Metellus, consul 69, conqueror of Crete after a three years' campaign. He received the title of Creticus for his services.

Codices 1-165 — 98. [Zosimus, History]

Read the History of count Zosimus, ex-advocate of the fisc, in six books. Being an impious heathen, he frequently yelps at those of the true faith. His style is concise, clear, and pure, and not devoid of charm. He begins his history almost from the time of Augustus, and glances rapidly at the emperors down to Diocletian, merely mentioning their proclamation and the order of succession. From Diocletian he treats at greater length of his successors in five books. The first book contains the emperors from Augustus to Diocletian and the sixth book ends at the time when Alaric, who was besieging Rome for the second time, when the citizens were reduced to desperate straits, raised the siege and proclaimed Attalus emperor. Soon afterwards he deposed him because of his incapacity, and sent an embassy to Honorius, who was then at Ravenna, with proposals for peace. But Sarus, himself a Goth and an enemy of Alaric, with about 300 men attached himself to Honorius, and, promising to do his utmost to assist him against Alaric, succeeded in making the negotiations unsuccessful. Here the sixth book ends.

It may be said that Zosimus did not himself write the history, but that he copied that of Eunapius, from which it only differs in brevity and in being less abusive of Stilicho. In other respects his account is much the same, especially in the attacks upon the Christian emperors. I think that both these authors brought out new editions, although I have not seen the first edition, but it may be conjectured from the title of the ”new edition,” which I have read, that, like Eunapius, he published a second edition. He is clearer and more concise, as we have said, than Eunapius, and rarely employs figures of speech. His history, probably written between 450-501, really begins with the death of Commodus (192) and ends at 410, just before Alaric’s siege of Rome. He is an extremely bigoted heathen, fond of the old mythological legends, oracles, prodigies, and everything marvellous, ignorant of geography, and pays no attention to chronology. But the work is valuable as mainly compiled from trustworthy contemporary authorities (see Cod. 80). Cod. 77.

Codices 1-165 — 99. [Herodian, History]

Read the eight books of the History of Herodian. Beginning from the death of Marcus Aurelius, he relates how his son Commodus, who succeeded him, having shown himself utterly degenerate and completely under the influence of flatterers, was put to death by his concubine Marcia as the result of a plot by Laetus and Eclectus. He was succeeded by Pertinax, an old man of high character; but the praetorian guards, who hated virtue, slew him in the palace. Julian, who obtained the throne by bribing the praetorians, was soon afterwards put to death by them. Niger, who appears to have been an estimable man, was declared emperor, while Julian was still alive. Severus, keen witted, astute, and resolute in the presence of dangers, having defeated and put to death his rival, ascended the throne, and removed all who resisted him by open violence or ensnaring craft. He treated his subjects with the greatest haughtiness. He died of illness while waging war against the Britons. Antoninus,the elder of his two sons, having made a treaty with them, returned to Italy. He unwillingly accepted his brother Geta as his partner in the empire, and soon afterwards murdered him in his mother’s arms. Eager to surpass all in vice and cruelty, he fell a victim in Syria to a plot set on foot by Macrinus, who was himself threatened with death by the emperor and was anxious to prevent it. Macrinus, an old man, dilatory and lacking in self-control, but in other respects a worthy person, became emperor after the death of Antoninus.

Moesa, the sister of Julia, had two daughters, Soaemis and Mamaea; the former had a son named Bassianus, the latter a son named Alexinus, both reputed sons of Antoninus. The army, on some slight pretext, proclaimed Bassianus emperor in the camp, and bestowed upon him the name of Antoninus. Macrinus, defeated in battle, fled from the borders of Phoenicia and Syria and retired to Chalcedon, intending to make his way from there to Rome; but he was intercepted by the emissaries of Antoninus, who cut off his head and carried it back with them.

Antoninus, as long as he followed the counsel of his mother, ruled with moderation, adopted Alexinus----whose name he changed to Alexander ----as his son, and

created him Caesar. But after he fell under the influence of flatterers, there was no excess of vice and intemperance of which he was not guilty. His attempted plot against Alexander was frustrated by the soldiers, and when he decided to punish them, they put him to death. Alexander, the son of Mamaea, reigned fourteen years to the best of his ability with goodness and clemency and without bloodshed; but owing, it is said, to the avarice and meanness of his mother, they were both put to death, and Maximin was proclaimed emperor.

Maximin, a brutal and oppressive tyrant, a man of enormous stature and extremely cruel, reigned nearly three years. The soldiers in Africa revolted and slew the governor, a man of like character appointed by Maximin, and elected the proconsul Gordian (a man eighty years of age) emperor against his will. Rome joyfully accepted his election, deprived Maximin of all his honours, and at the same time declared the proconsul's son, Gordian, joint-emperor with his father. While Maximin was preparing for war, Gordian, who had occupied Carthage together with his son, seeing that his position was desperate, hanged himself; his son was defeated by Maximin, and fell on the field of battle. The Romans, deeply grieved at their death, hating and at the same time fearing Maximin, proclaimed Balbinus and Maximus emperors at Rome. The soldiers created a disturbance and demanded that Gordian, the grandson of the elder Gordian, and his daughter's son, quite a boy, should be associated with them in the empire. While Maximus was advancing against Maximin, the latter was murdered by his own soldiers, his head was taken to Maximus, and thence to Rome. Soon afterwards, the soldiers again revolted, dragged Maximus and Balbinus from the palace and, after inflicting every insult upon them, put them to death and bestowed the throne upon Gordian alone, now about thirteen years of age. Here the eighth book ends.

The writer's style is clear, brilliant, and agreeable; his diction avoids extremes, being neither too much given to atticism, which violates the natural charm of ordinary language, nor so careless as to degenerate into meanness to the sacrifice of all the rules of art. He does not take a pride in what is superfluous, nor does he omit anything that is necessary; in a word, he is inferior to few in all the good qualities of an historian. Flourished about A.D. 238. His history embraces the period from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the death of Gordian.(180-238). His geography and chronology are defective. For the history of the period see Gibbon, chs. 4-7. Gaius Pescennius Niger. Lucius Septimius Severus. At Eboracum (York). More commonly known as Caracalla. Varius Avitus Bassianus (afterwards Marcus Aurelius Antoninus) more commonly known as Heliogabalus (more correctly Elagabalus). Alexander Severus.

Codices 1-165 — 100. [The Emperor Hadrian, Declamations]

Read several of the Declamations of the emperor Hadrian,distinguished by moderation of style, and not disagreeable to read. Emperor A.D. 117-138. He was a great patron of literature, and wrote several works himself, both prose and verse. His address to the soul is famous (see Life, by F. Gregorovius, Eng. tr. by M. E. Robinson, 1898).

Codices 1-165 — 101. [Victorinus, Panegyrics on the Emperor Zeno]

Read the consular and imperial orations of Victorinus, the son of Lampadius of Antioch, in honour of the emperor Zeno, in whose reign he lived to a great age. His style is distinguished by clearness, absence of redundancy, and the use of ordinary language.

Codices 1-165 — 102. [Gelasius of Caesarea, Against the Anomoeans]

Read the treatise of Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, Against the Anomoeans, in one volume. His style is free from superfluities, and vigorous; he makes frequent use of Attic words, his principles are carefully worked out, and he is not at a loss for arguments; in all respects he is a good writer, except that he childishly employs the rules and terms of logic till they become wearisome, as if he had just peeped into dialectical text-books, and uses his words wrongly. Certainly he inserts an apology for this ill-timed language, but what he intended to excuse he ought never to have used at all. In addition, the arrangement of the work is somewhat faulty. The same little volume contained the various arguments by Diodorus of Tarsus Concerning the Holy Spirit, in which he shows that he is already infected by the taint of the Nestorian heresy. See Cod. 88.

Codices 1-165 — 103. [Philo Judaeus, Allegories of the Sacred Laws, and On the Civil Life]

Read the Allegories of the Sacred Laws, and On the Civil Life, by Philo Judaeus. c. 20 B.C.-A.D. 40. The most important Jewish Hellenist, called the Jewish Plato, born at Alexandria of a priestly family. Hardly any particulars are known of his life. In the year 40 he was head of a deputation of his countrymen to the emperor Caligula at Rome, to protest against the persecution of the Jews in Alexandria. He was the author of numerous works, purely philosophical, exegetical (on the Pentateuch), historical, and apologetic. Amongst them are: On the Indestructibility of the World; That every Good Man is Free; Allegories of the Sacred Law, full of allegorizing and constant attempts to combine Judaism and Hellenism; On the Contemplative Life; Against Flaccus (governor of Egypt); and The Embassy to Gaius. His philosophy is a sort of neo-Platonism----an endeavour to reconcile the teaching of Plato and of the Bible. There are two worlds, an intelligible and a sensible, the latter formed by God on the model of a world of ideas, invariable and coeternal, personified under the name of logos (Reason), an emanation from God. ”The Logos, intermediate between God and the world, dwells with God as His wisdom, and as the abiding place of the Ideas.”

Codices 1-165 — 104. [Philo Judaeus, On the Essenes and Therapeutae]

Read, also, his description of the lives of those amongst the Jews who led a life of contemplative or active philosophy, the Essenes and Therapeutae. The latter not only built monasteries and holy places (semneia, to use their own word), but also laid down the rules of monasticism followed by the monks of the present day. They were divided into practici (active), who lived in common, and theoretici (contemplative), who lived alone. In Egypt and Greece the latter w ere called therapeutae.

Codices 1-165 — 105. [Philo Judaeus, Censure of Gaius and Censure of Flaccus]

Read, also, his two tractates, Censure of Gaius and Censure of Flaccus in which, more than in his other writings, he shows vigour of expression and beauty of language. But he frequently errs by changing his ideas and in describing other things in a manner at variance with Jewish philosophy. He flourished in the times of the emperor Gaius, to whom he states that he sent a deputation on behalf of his own people, while Agrippa was king of Judaea. He was the author of numerous treatises on various subjects, ethical discussions, and commentaries on the Old Testament, mostly consisting of forced allegorical explanations. I believe that it was from him that all the allegorical interpretation of Scripture originated in the Church. It is said that he was converted to Christianity, but afterwards abandoned it in a fit of anger and indignation. Before this, during the reign of the emperor Claudius, he had visited Rome, where he met St. Peter, chief of the apostles, and became intimate with him, which explains why he thought the disciples of St. Mark the evangelist, who was a disciple of St. Peter, worthy of praise, of whom he says that they led a contemplative life amongst the Jews. He calls their dwellings monasteries, and declares that they always led an ascetic life, practising fasting, prayer, and poverty.

Philo came of an Alexandrian priestly family. He was so admired amongst the Greeks for his power of eloquence that it was a common saying amongst them : ”Either Plato philonizes or Philo platonizes.” Roman emperor A.D. 37-41, more commonly known as Caligula. Avillius F., governor of Egypt, and persecutor of the Jews.

Codices 1-165 — 106. [Theognostus of Alexandria, Outlines]

Read the work by Theognostus of Alexandria, entitled The Outlines of the Blessed Theognostus of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Scriptures, in seven books. In the first book he treats of the Father, and endeavours to show that He is the creator of the universe, in opposition to those who make matter coeternal with God; in the second, he employs arguments to prove that it is necessary that the Father should have a Son; and when he says Son, he demonstrates that He is a creation, and has charge of beings endowed with reason. Like Origen, he says other similar things of the Son, being either led astray by the same impiety, or (one might say) eager to exert himself in his defence, putting forward these arguments by way of rhetorical exercise, not as the expression of his real opinion; or, lastly, he may allow himself to depart a little from the truth in view of the feeble condition of his hearer, who is, perhaps, entirely ignorant of the mysteries of the Christian faith and incapable of receiving the true doctrine, and because he thinks that any knowledge of the Son would be more profitable to the hearer than never to have heard of Him and complete ignorance of Him. In oral discussion it would not appear absurd or blameworthy to use incorrect language, for such discussions are generally carried on according to the judgment and opinion and energy of the disputant;

but in written discourse, which is to be set forth as a law for all, if any one puts forward the above defence of blasphemy to exculpate himself, his justification is a feeble one. As in the second book, so in the third, in treating of the Holy Spirit, the author introduces arguments by which he endeavours to show the existence of the Holy Spirit, but in other respects talks as much nonsense as Origen in his Principles. In the fourth book, he talks similar nonsense about angels and demons, attributing refined bodies to them. In the fifth and sixth, he relates how the Saviour became incarnate, and attempts, after his manner, to show that the incarnation of the Son was possible. Here, also, he trifles greatly, especially when he ventures

to say that we imagine the Son to be confined now to this place, now to that, but that in energy alone He is not restricted. In the seventh book, entitled On God's Creation, he discusses other matters in a greater spirit of piety----especially at the end of the work concerning the Son.

His style is vigorous and free from superfluities. He uses beautiful language, as in ordinary Attic, in such a manner that he does not depart from the ordinary style in composition and does not sacrifice its dignity for the sake of clearness and accuracy. He flourished . . . Flourished about the middle of the third century A. D.

Codices 1-165 — 107. [Basil of Cicilia, Against John Scythopolita]

Read the work of the presbyter Basil of Cilicia, written against John Scythopolita, whom he calls ”pettifogger” and several other names, and otherwise abuses. For instance, he asserts that he was suspected of being a Manichaean; that he limited the sacred forty days to three weeks, and during them did not even abstain from eating fowl; that he took part in heathen rites; that he was greatly given to gluttony, and never communicated while the sacred office was being performed, but after the Gospel took part in the holy mysteries with the boys, and immediately hurried to the holy table. Such insulting and brutal remarks are scattered broadcast throughout the work. The work is dramatic in character, in the form of a dialogue, dedicated to a certain Leontius, who had asked the author to write it. The characters are Lampadius, who defends Basil, and Marinus, who defends John. Marinus, during the course of the discussion, is represented as condemning his client and going over to Lampadius, a certain Tarasius being then introduced as interlocutor. The disputants are represented as asking and answering questions intended to benefit themselves and to censure and perplex the opponent’s advocate. The whole work is divided into sixteen books : the first thirteen are in the form of a dialogue in which the author has expended great energy and labour in attacking John’s first book alone, while the remaining three are directed against the statements in the second and third books.

In the first book, after the preface is concluded, he takes his stand against two chief points, the first that ”The word suffered in the flesh,” the second, ”To say Christ is the same as saying God. In the second book he attempts to show that he has been unjustly blamed and that John has misunderstood the words, ”There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse. In the third book he asks how the words, ”Now the son of man was glorified and God was glorified in him,” and the rest of the passage are to be understood. In the fourth book, he inquires how the

body is said to be peculiar to God, about His unity, the words, ”God, thy God hath anointed thee,” and ”I sanctify myself. In this book Marinus, abandoning the role of opponent, goes over to Lampadius. In the fifth book, where Tarasius is introduced as taking up the part of Marinus, the author makes more bitter accusations against John, with which nearly the whole book is taken up. In the sixth book he attacks more severely the union of Christ our Saviour. He also discusses the words ”God, thy God, hath anointed thee,” and the attitude of the Church towards the expression ”He was made flesh.

In the eighth book, he falls headlong into numerous absurdities in discussing ”The Word was made flesh” and also ”No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”In the ninth book he speaks of ”That Rock was Christ,” ”Thy life shall hang in doubt before thee,” and ”This gate shall be shut,” to all of which he gives an impious interpretation. The tenth book deals with ”To you is the word of this salvation sent” and ”He who spared not his own Son” and ”Of the Word of life,” which your hands have touched, and ”God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son” and so on. In the eleventh book he discusses, ”This is our God, there shall none other be accounted of in comparison of him,” and ”Afterwards did he show himself upon earth and conversed with men,” and ”Arise, O God, and judge the earth,” and ”He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,”’ and against those who asserted that the apostles could not teach the truth owing to the weakness of their hearers. In the twelfth book he teaches that one of the Trinity suffered, and discusses ”Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. He puts forward a weak and sinful plea for our denying that there are two Christs, in which his defence is prompted by his wishes.

In the thirteenth book he inquires how it is that there are not two Sons, and indeed it would seem from his defence that there must be. Tarasius, as if unable to meet the arguments against him, remains silent, and Basil (or Lampadius) discontinues his zealous questions and answers. The last three books are more detailed, and attack the statements of John in the second and third books.

This Basil, as he himself tells, us, was a presbyter of the Church at Antioch, when Flavian was bishop there, and Arcadius emperor of Rome. His style is poor, and especially in the dialogues differs little from the language of the common people. Nor is he accurate in composition, but frequently makes mistakes and uses solecisms; at the same time, he endeavours to be clear. His arguments against the orthodox are keen and show the practised logician; in fact, he seems to have wasted his whole life in his idle attacks upon the true faith. Although he is tainted with Nestorianism, he does not defend Nestorius, but praises the fathers Theodore and Diodorus. He does not openly use so much blasphemous language against the divine Cyril. He declares that John, the object of his attack, relies for support on nothing but

the twelve ”chapters” of Cyril, especially the twelfth, in which he introduces the suffering of God. With this he concludes his idle labours. As mentioned above, the work is dedicated to a certain Leontius, whom he pompously calls most holy, most beloved of God, and Father.

See Cod. 42. I Peter iv. 1. Isaiah ii. 1. John xii. 31. Psalm xlv. 7. John xvii. 19. John i. 14. John iii. 13. I Cor. x. 4. Deuter. xxviii. 66. Ezekiel xliv. 2. Acts xiii. 26. Romans viii. 32. John iii. 16. Baruch iii. 36-38.

Psalm lxxxi. 8. John xiv. 9.
I Cor. ii. 8.

Codices 1-165 — 108. [Theodore of Alexandria, Against Themistius]

Read the work of Theodore the monk Against Themistius, entitled : ”A brief refutation of the old rash and absurd attacks of Themistius on the Fathers, now worked out by us in view of the questions and propositions put forward by him against the truth, and a clear and accurate arrangement of the subject under discussion.” This title is more like a book than the title of a book. Both Theodore and Themistius are heretics, adherents of Severus, and belonging to the Theopaschitae. Themistius (or Calonymus, as he also calls himself) was the chief of the sect called Agnoetae, on whom he wrote a work called, An Apology for the Holy Theophobius by Calonymus or Themistius, in which he also attacks Severus, whose devoted adherent he is. Such is falsehood and such are the lovers of falsehood. He challenges Themistius to argue and shows that his four arguments, intended to prove ignorance in Christ, which he deals with one by one, involve countless absurdities. Then again Themistius, to make good his defeat, wrote a single book against Theodore. Theodore again refutes his objections in three volumes, and sets forth his own real opinion on the subject. Both of them are skilful writers, aiming at clearness, combined with earnestness and sedateness.

Who added the words ”One of the Trinity was crucified” to the Trisagion. According to them, Christ had only one, and that a divine nature, and therefore the divine nature suffered at the Crucifixion. They taught that the human soul of Christ was like our own, even in its imperfect knowledge and ignorance.

Codices 1-165 — 109. [Clement of Alexandria, Outlines]

Read three volumes of the works of Clement, presbyter of Alexandria, entitled Outlines, The Miscellanies, The Tutor. The Outlines contain a brief explanation and interpretation of certain passages in the Old and New Testaments. Although in some cases what he says appears orthodox, in others he indulges in impious and legendary fables. For he is of opinion that matter is eternal and that ideas are introduced by certain fixed conditions; he also reduces the Son to something created. He talks prodigious nonsense about the transmigration of souls and the existence of a number of worlds before Adam. He endeavours to show that Eve came from Adam, not as Holy Scripture tells us, but in an impious and shameful manner; he idly imagines that angels have connexion with women and beget children; that the Word was not incarnate, but only appeared so. He is further convicted of monstrous statements about two Words of the Father, the lesser of which appeared to mortals, or rather not even that one, for he writes : ”The Son is called the Word, of the same name as” the Word of the Father, but this is not the Word that became flesh, nor even the Word of the Father, but a certain power of God, as it were an efflux from the Word itself, having become mind, pervaded the hearts of men.” All this he attempts to support by passages of Scripture. He talks much other blasphemous nonsense, either he or some one else under his name. These monstrous blasphemies are contained in eight books, in which he frequently discusses the same points and quotes passages from Scripture promiscuously and confusedly, like one possessed. The entire work includes notes on Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, St. Paul’s epistles, the Catholic epistles, and Ecclesiasticus. Clement was a pupil of Pantaenus, as he himself says. Let this suffice for the Outlines.

Titus Flavius Clemens (c. 150-213). A Platonic philosopher who embraced Christianity, and succeeded Pantaenus as head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Amongst his pupils were Origen and Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem. His chief works are those mentioned here by Photius. To these may be added his Hortatory Address to the Greeks, showing the superiority of Christianity to the heathen and

other religions. In consequence of the persecution of Severus, he fled to Palestine, where he died.

Codices 1-165 — 110. [Clement of Alexandria, The Tutor]

The Tutor is an elaborate work in three books, containing rules for behaviour and conduct. It was preceded by and combined with another work, in which he refutes the impiety of the heathen These discourses have nothing in common with the Outlines, since they are entirely free from idle and blasphemous opinions. The style is florid, rising at times to an agreeable and moderate loftiness, while the display of learning is not inappropriate. In the last book something is said about images.

Codices 1-165 — 111. [Clement of Alexandria, The Miscellanies]

The Miscellanies, in eight books, contain an attack upon heresy and the heathen. The material is arranged promiscuously and the chapters are not in order, the reason for which he himself gives at the end of the seventh book in the following words: ”Since these points have been thoroughly discussed, and our ethical formula has been sketched summarily and fragmentarily, as we promised, teachings calculated to kindle the flame of true knowledge being scattered here and there, so that the discovery of the sacred mysteries may not be easy to any one of the uninitiated,” and so on. This, he himself says, is the reason why the subject-matter is so unsystematically arranged. In an old copy I have found the title of this work not only given as Miscellanies, but in full as follows : Miscellany of Gnostic Notes in accordance with the True Philosophy, books 1-8. The first seven books have the same title, and are identical in all the copies. The title of the eighth, however, varies, as does the subject-matter. In some copies it is called Who is the Rich Man that is saved? and begins, ”Those who . . . laudatory speeches,” etc.; in others it is called The Miscellanies, the eighth book, like the other seven, and begins, ”But not even the oldest of the philosophers,” etc. The work in some parts is unsound, but not like the Outlines, some of whose statements it refutes.

Clement is said to have written several other works, of which the following are mentioned by other writers: On Easter; On Fasting; On Evil-speaking; On the Ecclesiastical Canons, and against those who follow the Erroneous Doctrine of the Jews, dedicated to Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem. He flourished during the reign of Severus and his son Antoninus at Rome. Stromateis (Στρωματεῖς), bed-coverlets, ”patch-work quilts.” 112, 113. [Clement of Rome, Apostolic Constitutions and Recognitions]

Read two volumes of the works of Clement, bishop of Rome. One is entitled The Apostolic Constitutions by Clement, containing the synodical canons ascribed to the assembled Apostles. The other, in the form of a letter, is dedicated to James the Lord’s brother and contains what are called The Acts of the Apostle Peter, His

Conversations with Simon Magus, The Recognition of Clement and his Father and his two Brothers. Hence in some copies it is entitled The Recognition of Clement of Rome. As we have said, a letter is prefixed as sent to James the Lord's brother, but not always the same nor from the same person, according to some copies being sent by Peter the apostle, according to others by Clement to James. In the first case, Peter would seem to have compiled an account of his own acts and sent it to James at his request; in the second, Clement compiled it by command of Peter and sent it to James, after Peter had passed to immortal life. It may be conjectured then that there were two editions of the Acts of Peter, and that when one in course of time perished that of Clement alone survived. For in all the copies which I have seen----by no means a few----after those different epistles and titles I have unvaryingly found the same treatise beginning, "I, Clement," etc. The work is full of countless absurdities .and of blasphemy against the Son in accordance with the Arian heresy. The Constitutions appear to be liable to censure on three counts:

clumsy fiction, which it is easy to remove; the abusive charges against Deuteronomy, which can easily be met, and its Arianism, which can be refuted by a vigorous attack. But the book of the Acts of Peter, in its distinctness and earnestness, its purity, vehemence, its general linguistic excellences, and its great learning, is so superior to the Constitutions that, as far as language is concerned, no comparison between the two works is possible.

It is this Clement of whom St. Paul speaks in the Epistle to the Philippians, "With Clement also, and other my fellow-labourers, whose names are written in the book of life."He also wrote an important letter to the, Corinthians, which was so highly thought of that it was read in public. A second letter to the same is rejected as spurious, as also the lengthy discussion, a dialogue between Peter and Ap(p)ion. Some say that Clement succeeded Peter as bishop of Rome, others that he was the fourth bishop, Linus and Anacletus intervening, and that he died in the third year of Trajan's reign. Lived during the first century A.D. According to tradition he was one of the first successors of St. Peter as bishop of Rome. Numerous works, such as the Homilies and Recognitions, the Apostolic Constitutions, which are ascribed to him, are spurious, the only writing bearing his name which is admitted to be genuine being the First Epistle to the Church of Corinth (the second is spurious). On the whole question see edition (1890) by Bishop Lightfoot. iv. 3. Clement being a very common name, this identification is by no means certain.

Apion, Alexandrine grammarian, commentator on Homer, flourished in the middle of the first century A.D. He was notorious for his hatred of the Jews and of Jewish Christianity. 114. [Lucius of Charinus, Circuits of the Apostles: Acts of Peter, Acts of John, Acts of Andrew, Acts of Thomas, Acts of Paul]

Read a book entitled Circuits of the Apostles, comprising the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul, the author being one Lucius Charinus, as the work itself

shows. The style is altogether uneven and strange; the words and constructions, if sometimes free from carelessness, are for the most part common and hackneyed; there is no trace of the smooth and spontaneous expression, which is the essential characteristic of the language of the Gospels and Apostles, or of the consequent natural grace. The contents also is very silly and self-contradictory. The author asserts that the God of the Jews, whom he calls evil, whose servant Simon Magus was, is one God, and Christ, whom he calls good, another. Mingling and confounding all together, he calls the same both Father and Son. He asserts that He never was really made man, but only in appearance; that He appeared at different times in different form to His disciples, now as a young, now as an old man, and then again as a boy, now taller, now shorter, now very tall, so that His head reached nearly to heaven. He also invents much idle and absurd nonsense about the Cross, saying that Christ was not crucified, but some one in His stead, and that therefore He could laugh at those who imagined they had crucified Him. He declares lawful marriages to be illegal and that all procreation of children is evil and the work of the evil one. He talks foolishly about the creator of demons. He tells monstrous tales of silly and childish resurrections of dead men and oxen and cattle. In the Acts of St. John he seems to support the opponents of images in attacking their use. In a word, the book contains a vast amount of childish, incredible, ill-devised, lying, silly, self-contradictory, impious, and ungodly statements, so that one would not be far wrong in calling it the source and mother of all heresy.

Or ”Travels.” Also Leucius, or Leontius. His date is uncertain, perhaps in the fifth century A.D.

Codices 1-165 — 115. [Anonymous, Against the Quartodecimans - Metrodorus, On the date of Easter]

Read an anonymous work entitled A Disputation against the Jews and those who hold the same Heretical Views, and those called Quartodecimans, who do not celebrate the Holy Easter Feast in the first month as the Hebrews do. The style is concise and free from redundancies, but somewhat bombastic. The author asserts that our Lord Jesus Christ did not partake of the regular Paschal feast on the holy fifth day, for that day was not laid down, but on the following day; that He did not even then lawfully eat what He did eat; for He ate neither lamb, nor unleavened bread, and observed none of the practices which those who keep Easter according to the law are in the habit of observing. He asserts that He partook of a private, mystic feast, from which He gave bread and wine to His disciples. Another tractate is also included, by a certain Metrodorus, a list of twenty-eight cycles of nineteen years for calculating the holy Paschal feast. This Metrodorus, whoever he was (for I have not been able to learn anything about him), beginning with Diocletian, has collected the Easter days for 533 years, according to the received and accurate computation of the fourteenth day. For neither the Church nor ancient tradition appears to have observed those days.

They celebrated Easter or the Paschal Feast on the day of the Jewish Passover (the 14th of Nisan, the first month of the Jewish year, corresponding to March-April), whatever day of the week it fell on. See the exhaustive account in Hefele, History of Christian Councils, i, 298, (1871). The Jewish Passover. i.e. For a cycle of 532 years (28 X 19) and one year more, when a new cycle should begin. Metrodorus possibly lived in the sixth or seventh century. On this difficult subject, see article ”Easter” in Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

Codices 1-165 — 116. [Anonymous, A Third Volume on the Holy Easter Feast, in eight books]

Read another anonymous work entitled A Third Volume on the Holy Easter Feast, in eight books. The style is simple and very clear, and contains many sensible ideas. In the fourth book the author often refutes Metrodorus, and while supporting himself with evidence from the Scriptures, works into his discussion of Easter some useful remarks on the Creation by way of interpretation. It is dedicated to one Theodore, whom he calls his beloved brother. He was the author of other treatises on the same subject, but this is the fullest and most useful, since he amply discusses everything bearing on the subject. He gives a clear and detailed account of leap-year and the intercalary month, the epacts of the sun and moon, the nineteen days and the method of finding them, the months, the new moon, the week and its days, which years are called cyclical and which intercalary. He also discusses the twenty-eight years of the solar cycle, the nineteen years of the lunar cycle and its fourteenth day, the lunar and solar months, the new moon of the lunar and solar month, the lunar month and the exact month, the calculation of the years of the world. He says that according to the other years of His advent our Lord and God Christ partook of the prescribed Easter feast, but not on the day which was reported. This is worthy of consideration, since Chrysostom and the Church teach that He partook of the regular feast before the mystic supper.

The Jewish Passover.

Codices 1-165 — 117. [Anonymous, In Defense of Origen]

Read an anonymous work defending Origen and his abominable writings, in five volumes. The style is neither clear nor pure and contains nothing deserving of mention. The author brings forward on behalf of Origen and his dogmas Dionysius of Alexandria, Demetrius, Clemens, and several others, but chiefly relies upon Pamphilus the martyr and Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine. This apology is not a refutation of the charges against Origen for the most part, but rather supports the accusation, since he is not altogether free from his blasphemous opinions. Thus, he asserts that souls existed before bodies, supporting this nonsense by passages from the Scriptures and Fathers, and imagines the taking up of other bodies. In regard to the Holy Trinity, however, he is orthodox; he asserts that Origen was not guilty of error in his opinions on the subject, but that he was opposing the Sabellian heresy, which at that time had spread extensively, and that, in his endeavour to show that the Trinity of Persons was quite clear and differed in many ways, he allowed himself to be carried away beyond what was right in the opposite direction. However, in regard to Origen’s other dogmas, to which he does not even venture to give a specious assent, and to which he does not think it possible to adapt his defence, he takes great trouble to prove that they were only intended as a rhetorical exercise, or that they were foisted into his writings by certain heterodox persons.

In proof of this he quotes Origen himself as loudly protesting, for he says that even when he was alive he discovered that such reckless statements were made against him. The counts on which he asserts that he was falsely accused are fifteen in number, which he declares to be mere slanders, proving it by quotations from his writings in his fourth book, and refuting them by the evidence of others on his behalf in the fifth. The counts are as follows. He is charged with teaching that prayer should not be offered to the Son, and that He is not absolutely good; that

He does not know the Father as Himself; that rational natures enter into the bodies of irrational beings; that there are migrations from one body into another; that the soul of the Saviour was the same as the soul of Adam; that there is neither eternal punishment nor resurrection of the flesh; that magic is not an evil; that astronomy is the cause of events; that the Only Begotten has no share in the Kingdom; that the holy angels came into the world by falling down from heaven, not to render service to others; that the Father is unseen by the Son; that the Cherubim are the ideas of the Son; that the image of God, in reference to him whose image it is, qua image, is untrue. He rejects these charges, as already stated, as slanders on Origen, and does his utmost to prove that he is an orthodox member of the Church.

But, my dear sir, if any one is shown to be not altogether impious, this is no reason why he should escape punishment for obvious blasphemies.

Bishop of Alexandria (247-264), called ”the Great,” a pupil of Origen. Bishop of Alexandria (189-232). He was at first on friendly terms with Origen, who offended him by publicly expounding the Scriptures although unordained (see also Cod. 118). A sect named after Sabellius (second----third century A.D.). While denying that the Son was subordinate to the Father, they denied His real personality, and regarded the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as not real and eternal, but temporal and modalistic (different modes of the manifestations of the Divine Nature).

Codices 1-165 — 118. [Pamphilus & Eusebius, Defense of Origen]

Read the Defence of Origen by Pamphilus the martyr and Eusebius. It is in six books, five of which were written by Pamphilus when in prison in the company of Eusebius. The sixth is the work of Eusebius alone, after the, martyr, having been deprived of life by the sword, was removed to God for whom his soul longed. Many other distinguished persons at that time also wrote in defence of Origen. It is said that Origen, during the persecutions in the reign of Severus, wrote to his father Leonides, urging him to martyrdom, and that he ran nobly in the race and received the crown. It is added that Origen himself made ready with all zeal to enter into the same struggle, but that his mother checked his ardour in spite of his protestations, as he himself testifies in a letter. Pamphilus the martyr and many others who have written an accurate account of Origen, as given by those who knew him, assert that he quitted this life by a glorious martyrdom at Caesarea during the cruel persecution of the Christians by the emperor Decius. Others say that he lived till the times of Gallus and Volusianus, and that he died at Tyre in the sixty-ninth year of his age and was buried there. This is the truer account, unless the letters supposed to have been written by him after the Decian persecution are spurious. They say that he studied and taught every branch of knowledge. He is said to have been also called Adamantius, because his arguments were linked together like chains of adamant. He attended the lectures of Clement, the author of the Stromateis, and succeeded him as head of the catechetical school at Alexandria. It is said that Clement was the pupil of Pantaenus and his successor as head of his school, and that Pantaenus heard teachers who had seen the apostles, and had even heard them himself.

It is said that the movement against Origen originated as follows. Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, had a high opinion of Origen and admitted him to his intimate friendship. But when Origen was about to leave for Athens without the

permission of the bishop, he was ordained by Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, contrary to the rule of the Church, with the approval of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem. This incident changed the love of Demetrius to hate and his praise to blame. A synod of bishops and some presbyters was summoned to condemn Origen. According to Pamphilus, it was decided that he must not remain in Alexandria or teach there, but that he should be allowed to retain his priesthood. But Demetrius and some Egyptian bishops, with the assent of those who had formerly supported him, also deprived him of his sacred office. After he had been banished from Alexandria, Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, welcomed him, allowed him to live at Caesarea, and gave him permission to preach. Such are the reasons which Pamphilus gives for the attack upon Origen.

The Apology for Origen was composed, as we have said, by Pamphilus when imprisoned together with Eusebius, and addressed to those who were condemned to the mines for the sake of Christ, the chief of whom was Patermythius, who shortly after the death of Pamphilus ended his life at the stake with others. Pierius was the teacher of Pamphilus, the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria. It is said that he suffered martyrdom together with his brother Isidore, and that a church and houses of prayer were built in his honour at Alexandria. The holy Pamphilus was a presbyter, and is said to have copied most of Origen’s commentaries on Scripture with his own hand. Book I exists in a Latin version by Rufinus. Emperor 249-251. He was notorious as a relentless enemy and persecutor of the Christians. Emperor 251-253. His son Volusianus was associated with him in the empire.

Codices 1-165 — 119. [Pierius]

Read a work by Pierius the presbyter, who is said to have suffered martyrdom with his brother Isidore, and to have been the teacher of the martyr Pamphilus in theology and head of the catechetical school at Alexandria. The volume contains twelve books. The style is clear and brilliant, and, so to say, spontaneous; there is nothing elaborate about it, but, as it were unpremeditated, it flows along evenly, smoothly and gently. The work is distinguished by a wealth of argumentation. It contains much that is foreign to the present institutions of the Church, but is possibly in accordance with older regulations. In regard to the Father and the Son his statements are orthodox, except that he asserts that there are two substances and two natures, using these terms (as is clear from what follows and precedes the passage) in the sense of hypostasis, not in the sense given by the adherents of Arius. But in regard to the Holy Ghost his views are dangerous and impious; for he declares that His glory was less than that of the Father and the Son. There is a passage in the treatise entitled On St. Luke's Gospel, from which it can be shown that the honour and dishonour of the image is the honour and dishonour of the prototype. It is hinted, in agreement with Origen's absurd idea, that souls have a pre-existence. In his work on Easter and the homily upon the prophet Hosea, the author discusses the Cherubim made by Moses and Jacob's pillar; he admits that they were made, but talks nonsense about their being providentially granted, as if they were nothing, or something else, or as if what was made was something else; for he says that they did not exhibit any sort of form, but absurdly asserts that they only had wings of a kind.

This Pierius was presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, when Theonas was bishop, and Carus and Diocletian were emperors of Rome. It is said that he was so distinguished for love of work and learning, and that his discourses to the people were so agreeable and instructive, that he was called "the young Origen," since Origen at that time enjoyed a very high reputation. They say that he was well versed in dialectic and rhetoric, and that he voluntarily practised temperance and poverty. According to some, he suffered martyrdom; according to others, he spent the rest of his life at Rome after the time of the persecution. During the persecution of Diocletian (303).

Codices 1-165 — 120. [Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses]

Read the work of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, entitled the Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called or Against Heresies, in five books. The first, in which Valentinus and his impious heresy are discussed, begins as far back as Simon Magus and goes down to Tatian, who, at first a disciple of Justin Martyr, afterwards fell headlong into heresy. It also deals with those who are properly called Gnostics and the Cainites, setting forth their abominable doctrines. Such is the contents of the first book. In the second the impious dogmas of the heretics are refuted. The third quotes all kinds of testimony from the Scriptures against them. The fourth answers certain difficulties put forward by the heretics. The fifth shows that all that was said and done by the Lord in the form of parables, derived both from His saving doctrine and from the apostolic epistles, is suited for the refutation of the claptrap of the heretics.

St. Irenaeus is said to have been the author of many other works of various kinds including letters, in some of which it should be observed that the exact truth of the doctrines of the Church appears to be falsified by spurious arguments. It is said that he was a pupil of the holy martyr Polycarp,bishop of Smyrna, and was presbyter to Pothinus, whom he succeeded in the bishopric of Lyons. At that time Victor was pope of Rome, whom Irenaeus frequently exhorted by letter not to excommunicate any members of the Church on account of a disagreement about Easter. c. 120-140 to 202, bishop of Lyons 177. He was born in Asia Minor, near Smyrna, and removed to Rome about 155. He is said to have been martyred under Severus, but this is not regarded as certain. He was an ardent opponent of the Valentinian Gnostics, and earnestly endeavoured to prevent a quarrel between the Eastern and Western Churches on the question of the date of Easter. His great work only exists in a barbarous Latin version, though parts of the original can be re-constructed from quotations in later writers. Simon the Magician, flourished about the year A.D. 37, when he gained great influence in Samaria by his witchcraft (see Acts viii. 9-24). An Assyrian, student of Greek philosophy, who became converted to Christianity at Rome about 150 by reading the Bible. A Christian apologist, he later

adopted Gnostic views. He retired to Mesopotamia and is supposed to have died at Edessa, c. 180. In addition to an Apology for Christianity, he was the author of a Diatessaron, a sort of harmony of the Gospels. c. 103-164. Born in Palestine, Greek philosopher and convert to Christianity. He is said to have been scourged and beheaded for refusing to offer sacrifice to the pagan divinities. Gnostic sect of the second century, followers of Carpocrates of Alexandria.

Martyr (c, 155) under Marcus Aurelius.

Codices 1-165 — 121. [Hippolytus, Against Heresies]

Read the tractate of Hippolytus, the pupil of Irenaeus, entitled Against the Thirty-two Heresies. It begins with the Dositheans, and goes down to the heresies of Noetus and the Noetians, which he says were refuted by Irenaeus in his lectures, of which the present work is a synopsis. The style is clear, somewhat severe and free from redundancies, although it exhibits no tendency to atticism. Some of the statements are inaccurate, for instance, that the epistle to the Hebrews is not the work of the apostle Paul. Hippolytus is said to have addressed the people after the manner of Origen, with whom he was very intimate and whose writings he so much admired that he urged him to write a commentary on the Bible, for which purpose he supplied, at his own expense, seven shorthand writers and the same number of calligraphists. Having rendered this service, he persistently demanded the work, whence Origen, in one of his letters, calls him a ”hustler.” He is said to have written a large number of other works.

Flourished during the third century. He was a pupil of Irenaeus and an active opponent of the Gnostics. He was a presbyter of Rome, and became anti-bishop in opposition to Calixtus (Callistus), an adherent of Monarchianism (denial of the doctrine of the Trinity). The treatise Against Heresies was first discovered in a convent on Mount Athos in 1842. A Jewish sect, so called from Dositheusof Samaria (first century A.D.), who killed himself by fasting. Me insisted on a rigorous observance of the Sabbath. Died about A.D. 200, born at Smyrna or Ephesus. According to him ”Christ was the Father, and the Father was born, suffered, and died.”

Codices 1-165 — 122. [Epiphanius, Panarion]

Read the Panaria of the most holy bishop Epiphanius,against eighty heresies, in three volumes containing seven books. It begins with barbarism and goes down to the Messalians. The author writes more fully and effectually against heretics than any of his predecessors, since he has not omitted any useful argument of theirs, and has added any others that he himself could find. His style is poor, like that of one who is unfamiliar with Attic elegance. He is chiefly weak in his conflicts with impious heresies; sometimes, however, he is excellent in attack, although the character of his language and composition is by no means improved at the same time. c. 316-403, born near Eleutheropolis in Palestine, bishop of Constantia (Salamis) in Cyprus. He was a vigorous opponent of Origen and Chrysostom. Panaria is the Latin equivalent of the Greek Ἀρτοφόρια (breadbaskets). See Cod. 52.

Codices 1-165 — 123. [Epiphanius, Ancyrotus]

Read the same author’s Ancoratus, a sort of synopsis of the Panaria. Rather Ancyrotus (Gk. Ἀγκύρωτος), ”secured by an anchor,” the anchor of faith amidst the storms of heresy.

Codices 1-165 — 124. [Epiphanius, On Weights and Measures]

Read the same author’s treatise On Weights and Measures.

Codices 1-165 — 125. [Justin Martyr, Apology]

Read Justin Martyr’s Apology for the Christians, written against both Jews and gentiles; also a treatise Against the First and Second Books of the Physics, or against form, matter, and privation, a collection of dialectical, vigorous, and useful arguments; also, Against the Fifth Essence and Eternal Motion, which Aristotle has created by the aid of his clever reasoning, and, finally, Summary Solutions of Doubts Unfavourable to Christianity. He is thoroughly versed in our own and especially in heathen philosophy, overflowing with learning of all kinds and a wealth of historical knowledge; but he has not endeavoured to colour the natural beauty of his philosophy by rhetorical arts. Wherefore his diction, in other respects vigorous and preserving the scientific style, is not seasoned with rhetorical condiments, nor does it attract the crowd of hearers by seductive and alluring language. He wrote four discourses against the heathen----the first dedicated to Antoninus Pius, his sons, and the senate; the second to his successors. The third discusses the nature of demons, The fourth book, also written against the heathen, is called a Refutation. He also wrote On the Sole Government of God, Psaltes, some works Against Marcion which should be read, and a useful treatise entitled Against all Heresies.

He was the son of Priscus (grandson) of Bacchius, and was a native of Neapolis in the province of Palestine. He resided for some time at Rome, where his discourses, manner of life, and dress showed the true philosopher. As he was a fervent lover of piety, his life and religion incurred the hostility of a certain Crescens of the sect of the Cynics. Being falsely accused by him, he patiently endured his persecution in a manner worthy of his whole career. Making it an excuse for martyrdom, he nobly and joyfully died for Christ.

Codices 1-165 — 126. [Clement of Rome, Letters to the Corinthians - Polycarp, Letter to the Philippians]

Read the little book containing Clement’s two Epistles to the Corinthians. The first accuses them of having disturbed the peace and harmony proper to civil life by sedition, disturbance, and schism, and exhorts them to desist from such evil ways. The style is simple and clear, in its absence of elaboration approaching that of ecclesiastical writers. The author, however, deserves censure for putting certain worlds beyond the ocean, for using the phoenix as an incontrovertible argument, for calling our Lord Jesus Christ chief priest and president, not even using the loftier terms that befit God, although he nowhere openly blasphemes Him. The second letter, containing advice and exhortation to a better life, at the beginning proclaims Christ as God, although certain foreign expressions, from which even the first letter is not altogether free, are introduced as if from Holy Writ. Certain passages are strangely interpreted. The sentiments are somewhat poor and at times inconsistent.

In the same little work also read Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians, full of good advice, combined with clearness and simplicity, after the ecclesiastical method of interpretation. The author also says that he sent the letters of the God-inspired Ignatius to them, asking to be informed if they had heard anything of him.

Codices 1-165 — 127. [Eusebius, Life of Constantine]

Read the Life of Constantine the Great Emperor by Eusebius Pamphili, a eulogy in four books. It contains the whole manner of life of the man, and describes all those acts of his that have to do with ecclesiastical history, from his earliest years till the day when he departed this life, at the age of sixty-four. Even here the author preserves his characteristic style, except that his language is obliged to be somewhat more brilliant, and words are inserted here and there that are more flowery than usual; he does not, however, exhibit much charm and grace in explanation, which is also a defect of his other works. A large number of passages from all the ten books of his Ecclesiastical History are scattered over this work in four books. He says that the great Constantine was also himself baptized in Nicomedia, having put off his baptism till that time since he desired to receive it in the waters of Jordan. He does not state definitely who baptized him. As to the Arian heresy, he does not make it clear whether he still adhered to that doctrine or whether he had changed, nor does he state whether Arius's views were right or wrong, although he ought to have mentioned this, seeing that a great part of the deeds of Constantine has to do with the synod, which again claims a detailed account of them.

But he mentions that a "dispute" (as he calls the heresy, to conceal its real nature) arose between Arius and Alexander, and that the pious emperor was very grieved at the "dispute," and strove, by letters and through Hosius, bishop of Cordova, to induce the disputants to abandon mutual strife and such questions, and to restore friendship and harmony amongst them; that, being unable to persuade them, he called together a synod from all parts, and so put an end to the strife that had broken out, and made peace. His account, however, is neither accurate nor clear. Wherefore, as if ashamed and unwilling to make public the facts concerning Arius and the decree of the synod against him or the just punishment of his companions in impiety who were cast out with him, he says nothing about this. He does not even mention the just punishment of Arius inflicted by heaven and seen by every eye. He brings none of these things to the light, and says little about the synod and its proceedings. For this reason, when about to speak of the divine Eustathius, he

does not even mention his name, nor the audacious and successful intrigues against him. Attributing these also to sedition and tumult, he again refers to the calmness of the bishops who had assembled at Antioch as the result of the emperor's zeal and co-operation and changed sedition and tumult into peace.

Similarly, where he speaks of the intrigues against the much-tried Athanasius, in his desire to include these things in his history, he says that Alexandria was again filled, with sedition and disturbance, which were calmed by the presence of the bishops, supported by the emperor. But he does not make it clear who started the sedition, nor its nature, nor how it was put down. He preserves almost the same method of concealment in his narrative of the quarrels of the bishops about dogma or their disagreements in other matters.

See p. 154. See p. 153, note .

Codices 1-165 — 128. [Lucian, Dialogues]

Read Lucian’s declamation On Phalaris and his various Dialogues of the Dead and Courtesans, and other works on different subjects, in nearly all of which he ridicules, the ideas of the heathen. Thus he attacks their silly errors in the invention of gods; their brutal and ungovernable passions and lack of restraint; the monstrous fancies and fictions of their poets; their consequent errors in statesmanship; the irregular course and changes and chances of their life; the boastful behaviour of the philosophers, full of nothing but pretence and idle opinions; in a word, his aim is, as we have said, to hold up the heathen to ridicule in prose. He seems to be one of those persons who regard nothing seriously; ridiculing and mocking at the opinions of others, he does not state what opinions he himself holds, unless we may say that his opinion is that one can know nothing for certain. His style is excellent, his diction clear, suitable and expressive; he shows a special liking for distinctness and purity united with brilliancy and appropriate dignity. His composition is so well fitted together that the reader does not seem to be reading prose, but an agreeable song, whose nature is not too obtrusive, seems to drop into the listener’s ears. In a word, as already said, his style is charming, but not in keeping with the subjects which he himself has determined to ridicule. That he was one of those who held that nothing could be known for certain is shown by the following inscription in the work:

”I, Lucian, wrote this, I who am skilled in what is old and foolish; For what men think wise is foolish. So then nothing that the mind of man can conceive is certain; What you admire, seems ridiculous to others.” The well-known sophist and humorous writer (c. A.D. 125----180). He was a native of Samosata in Syria, and, after a wandering life, settled down in Athens, whence he removed to Egypt, where he died. His True History was the original of works like the Gulliver’s Travels of Swift, with whom and with Voltaire he has much in common.

Codices 1-165 — 129. [Lucius of Patrae, Metamorphoses]

Read the various stories of Metamorphoses by Lucius of Patrae. The style is clear, pure, and agreeable; avoiding innovations in language, the author carries to excess his tales of marvels, so that he may be called a second Lucian. The first two books are almost translations from Lucian's Lucius or The Ass, unless Lucian borrowed from Lucius, which, if I may hazard the conjecture, is the case, although I have not been able to find out for certain which wrote first. For it seems that Lucian, having cut down the more copious work of Lucius and removed all that seemed unsuitable for his purpose, combined what was left into a single composition, in which the words and arrangement of the original were preserved, and gave the title of Lucius or The Ass to what he had borrowed. Both works are full of mythical fictions and disgraceful indecency. The only difference is that Lucian, as in all his other writings, ridicules and scoffs at heathenish superstitions, whereas Lucius, taking quite seriously and believing the transformations of men into other men and brutes, and of brutes into men, and all the idle talk and nonsense of ancient fables, set them down in writing and worked them up into a story.

Both the Λούκιος ἢ Ονος (Lucius or the Ass) of Lucian and the Metamorphoses of Apuleius go back to one Greek original, here called Lucius of Patrae in Achaea (mod. Patras).

Codices 1-165 — 130. [Damascius]

Read a work by Damascius in four books, the first of which, in 352 chapters, is entitled, On Incredible Events; the second, in 52 chapters, On Incredible Stories of Demons; the third, in 63 chapters, On Incredible Stories of Souls that have appeared after Death; the fourth, in 105 chapters, On Incredible Natures. They all contain impossible, incredible, and clumsily invented tales of wonderful things, foolish and worthy of the impious and godless Damascius, who, while the light of the true religion spread over the world, remained steeped in the thick darkness of idolatry. The style is concise, clear, and agreeable, which is not usually the case in such stories. Neo-Platonist philosopher of Damascus, flourished in the fifth-sixth century A.D. He taught philosophy and rhetoric in Alexandria and Athens. His treatise Doubts and Solutions in regard to First Principles is extant.

Codices 1-165 — 131. [Amyntianus, On Alexander]

Read a work On Alexander by Amyntianus, dedicated to the emperor Marcus. The author claims to describe the deeds of Alexander in a befitting manner, but the course of his narrative proves him to be too ready and audacious in his promises, but backward and timid in performance. For he is far inferior to those who have previously written of Alexander, and his style, although clear, is characterized by lack of vigour and energy, and much that is of the greatest importance is omitted. Amongst other works Amyntianus also wrote parallel lives of Dionysius and Domitian, and of Philip of Macedon and Augustus, both in two books. A life of Olympias, the mother of Alexander, is also attributed to him. Marcus Aurelius. 132. [Palladius the Sophist, Declamations] 133. [Aphthonius, Declamations] 134. [Eusebius the Sophist, Declamations] 135. [Maximus of Alexandria, Declamations] Read various Declamations by Palladius the sophist, Aphthonius, Eusebius the sophist, and Maximus the sophist of Alexandria. Palladius is far superior to the others in excellence of style.

Of Methone, lived in the time of Constantine. Of Antioch (fourth century A.D.). Pupil of Libanius and author of an extant Progynirasmata (literary exercises). There were two sophists of this name, one of Antioch, the other of Alexandria. Nothing more is known of them, nor of Maximus.

Codices 1-165 — 136. [Cyril of Alexandria, Thesauri]

Read the Thesauri of Cyril. The work is dialectical, and attacks the madness of Arius and Eunomius with vigorous and manifold arguments. By logical methods he skilfully refutes their folly and by combining and introducing evidence from Holy Writ he completely exposes the unsoundness of their doctrine. He quotes the simple evidence from Scripture, thus everywhere closing their insolent mouths so that they are unable to answer. This work is the clearest of all Cyril's works, especially to those who are able to grasp the significance of his logical methods. Of Alexandria (see Cod. 49). The work deals with "the holy and consubstantial Trinity."

Codices 1-165 — 137. [Eunomius, ...]

Read a little work by Eunomius, entitled . . . , which is a clear proof of his impiety. It was much admired by his adherents, and the greatest efforts were made to keep it secret and prevent its becoming known to others; but the great Basil managed to secure it, and by his brilliancy and vigour and the force and excellence of his arguments overthrew and refuted it. It was as if he had taken a Babylonian child and dashed it against the granite rock of truth, showing that what was once so much admired was a mere carcase and only deserving of ridicule. Of Cappadocia, head of an extreme Arian sect. He was bishop of Cyzicus, but was deposed and exiled, and died at the end of the fourth century. He asserted that the Son of God was God only in name, and that He was united to humanity not in substance, but only by His virtue and operations.

Codices 1-165 — 138. [Eunomius, Against Basil and Letters]

Read a work by the same impious man in three books, which is, as it were, a confutation of the absurdities shown by St. Basil to be contained in his blasphemous writings. It is said that while he was in labour with this work he spent several Olympiads shut up in his chamber, and only after an interval of several years brought forth the abortion and evil monstrosity with which he had become pregnant by secret intercourse. Not without difficulty he reared and exhibited the wretched offspring to his fellow-initiates, being especially afraid lest it might somehow fall into the hands of Basil and be torn in pieces before it obtained consistency, and might prematurely wither away and perish before it came to maturity. Wherefore, carefully and, like another Kronos in the fable who swallowed his offspring, he hid and concealed it as long as Basil’s mortal life lasted and inspired him with dread. But after that saint had left his temporary habitation and had ascended to his own inheritance in heaven, being relieved of this great apprehension, although late in the day, Eunomius ventured to bring out the work, not for the eyes of the general public, but for his own friends. Theodore, Gregory of Nyssa, and Sophronius (whom I have already mentioned) came across the work, lashed it unmercifully like his earlier one and flung it back in the face of its parent, a corpse and smelling of all uncleanness. Thus he paid the penalty of impiety.

The style is marked by such absence of grace and charm that the author does not seem to have any idea of the existence of such things. He displays prodigious ostentation and produces discordant sounds by the heaping up of consonants, and by the use of words, difficult to pronounce and containing several consonants, in a poetical, or, to speak more accurately, dithyrambic style. The composition is forced, compressed, and harsh, so that the reader of his works is obliged to beat the air vehemently with his lips, if he wishes to utter clearly words which the author, by excessive roughening, compressing and condensing, interpolating and mutilating,

has with difficulty composed. His periods are sometimes spun out to an inordinate length, and the entire work is pervaded by obscurity and want of clearness, his object being to persuade the majority by the force of his eloquence that he goes beyond their capacity, and also to cover up the weakness of his thoughts (which is by no means inconsiderable) by this very obscurity and unintelligibility, and to conceal the poverty of his ideas. He seems to have great faith in logical arguments, attacking others on this count and showing great eagerness to employ them himself, although, since he took up the study late and did not acquire a thorough knowledge of the subject, he can often be convicted of errors in reasoning.

Also read his Letters to different people, 40 in number. While in these he affects the same subtlety of form, since he is ignorant of the laws of the epistolary style and has had no practice in them, he has been publicly branded and exposed. Periods of four years. Saturn. He had heard that he would be killed by one of his sons, and accordingly devoured his children as soon as they were born. Zeus, Poseidon and Pluto were saved, their mother Rhea having substituted stones for them, which Saturn swallowed with equal avidity.

Codices 1-165 — 139. [Athanasius, Commentary on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs]

Read the Commentary on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs by the great Athanasius. The style is clear, like that of all his writings. But neither this nor any other of his works with which I am acquainted approaches the grace and beauty of the letters containing an apology for his flight and an account of his exile.

Codices 1-165 — 140. [Athanasius, Against Arius and his doctrines]

Read the same holy man’s Against Arius and his Doctrines, in five books. The style, as in all his works, is clear, free from redundancies and simple, but vehement and deep, and the arguments, of which he has an abundant store, are extremely forceful. He uses logical arguments, not with the very words taken straight from them, after the fashion of children and those whose knowledge of a subject is recent, who are always eager to make a childish display, but in the imposing and dignified manner of a philosopher, using simple ideas and these well set forth. He also strongly fortifies himself with evidence and proofs from Holy Writ. In a word, this work alone is a complete refutation of Arianism. If any one were to say that Gregory the theologian and the holy Basil drew from it as from a fountain the limpid and beautiful stream of their own works written against the same heresy, he would not be far wrong.

Codices 1-165 — 141. [Basil, The Six Days' Work]

Read the work of St. Basil on The Six Days' Work. He is admirable in all his writings. More than any one else he knows how to use a style that is pure, distinct, suitable, and, in general, political and panegyrical; in arrangement and purity of sentiment he is second to none. He is fond of persuasiveness and sweetness and brilliancy, his words flow on like a stream gushing forth spontaneously from a spring. He employs probability to such an extent, that if any one were to take his discourses as a model of political language, and practise himself in them, provided he had some acquaintance with the rules connected with it, I do not think he would need to consult any other author, not even Plato nor Demosthenes, whom the ancients recommend those to study who desire to become masters of the political and panegyrical style.

Codices 1-165 — 142. [Basil, Moral Discourses]

Read also his Moral Discourses, especially distinguished by the excellence of the language mentioned above.

Codices 1-165 — 143. [Basil, Letters]

Read also his Letters, the canonical and those written to various people. They clearly show the admirable nature of the man’s character, and any one might take them as a model of letter-writing, if he has no other.

Codices 1-165 — 144. [Basil, Ascetica]

Read also his Ascetica or Regulations for a Monastic Life. He who follows these rules will inherit a heavenly kingdom. In this work, contrary to his usual custom, he makes much use of headings in many chapters.

Codices 1-165 — 145. [Helladius, Lexicon]

Read the Lexicon of Helladius, arranged in alphabetical order. It is the most comprehensive of the lexicons that I know, the collection consisting not only of words, but also of some most agreeable short clauses, which frequently become perfect members. The words are for the most part taken from prose writers, not from the poets, like the compilation of Diogenianus; the alphabetical order is not preserved in all the syllables, but only in the first. The collection is very large, so that the whole could not be comprised in five fair-sized volumes. Our copy is in seven. It is a useful work for those who are engaged in literary work and are desirous of acquiring a variety of knowledge. For it contains quotations from the orators and from famous poets. Of Alexandria, flourished under Theodosius II (408-450). See p. 224, note . Grammarian of the time of Hadrian.

Codices 1-165 — 146. [--, Lexicon of the ’pure style’]

Read a Lexicon of the pure style in alphabetical order. The work is large and copious, and more like a number of books. It is extremely useful to those who study the subject.

Codices 1-165 — 147. [--, Lexicon of the ’serious style’]

Read a Lexicon of the serious style. It is of great length, and this labour of love would be more convenient for readers if it were in two or three volumes. It is arranged in alphabetical-order, and is useful for those who desire to raise their style of writing to the sublime and dignified.

Codices 1-165 — 148. [--, Lexicon of the ’political style’]

Read a special Lexicon of political style, in three large volumes. This very copious work will materially assist a man to success, and affords a ready supply of counter-arguments. For the reader will not have to learn, but merely to note in it the words he requires, if he is not altogether without knowledge of the ancient writers. This work also is in alphabetical order.

Codices 1-165 — 149. [Valerius Pollio, Lexicon]

Read the Lexicon of Pollio in alphabetical order. It contains many poetical words, but not so many as that of Diogenianus, whose work is twice as large. Valerius Pollio of Alexandria.

Codices 1-165 — 150. [Julian, Lexicon -- Philostratus, Lexicon -- Valerius Diodorus, Lexicon]

Read the Lexicon of Julian, containing the words used by the ten orators, arranged in alphabetical order. This book also is of very great size, and contains an explanation of all legal terms used by the Athenians, words used by the orators in reference to private matters or adopted by them after the fashion of the country. It is clear that the work will be of very great service in reading speeches together. I also came across a work of Philostratus of Tyre on the same subject, no mean performance, although Julian's Lexicon is better. A similar work of Diodorus is in no way inferior to that of Julian, except that the latter makes more use of quotations. I cannot say which of them was the earlier or which borrowed from the other, for it is evident that they are not independent compilations. Nothing is known of him. Not to be confused with the author of the Life of Apollonius of Tyana (Cod. 44). Valerius Diodorus, son of Pollio (Cod. 149).

Codices 1-165 — 151. [Timaeus, Lexicon to Plato]

Read the Lexicon to Plato by Timaeus, dedicated to Gentianus, a little work in one book, arranged in alphabetical order. About the beginning of the fourth century A.D. The lexicon is extant.

Codices 1-165 — 152. [Aelius Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Lexicon of Attic Words]

The same volume contains the five books of the first edition of the Lexicon of Attic Words by Aelius Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in which the words are arranged alphabetically from the first to the last letter. It is dedicated to a certain Scymnus and will be, very useful to those who wish to write correct Attic as well as to those who intend to study the works of Attic writers. It contains all the words in use by the Athenians, at festivals and in the law courts, and it is easy to find special and idiomatic expressions, especially if one consults not only the first, but also the second edition (also in five books), containing words not included in the first, or, if included, not supported by sufficient examples, whereas the second edition is fuller and the quotations are more numerous. If any one were to combine the two editions, which would not entail much labour, the usefulness of the work would be greatly increased.

Not the author of the Roman Antiquities (Cod. LXXXIII).

Codices 1-165 — 153. [Pausanias, Lexicon]

Read in the same volume the Lexicon of Pausanias in alphabetical order, quite as useful as the preceding, if not more so, for the study of Attic authors. For although the illustrative quotations are not so numerous, it contains more words under some of the letters, so that by itself it is as large as the two editions of Aelius Dionysius of Halicarnassus, although, as we have said, it contains fewer examples. If any one were to combine the two editions of Dionysius and the work of Pausanias, which could be easily done, the result would be an admirable work and one most useful in reading Attic literature. Flourished in the time of Hadrian.

Codices 1-165 — 154. [Boethus, List of Platonic Words]

Read in the same volume the List of Platonic Words by Boethus in alphabetical order. It is dedicated to a certain Melant(h)as, and is far more useful than the collection of Timaeus. His identity is uncertain.

Codices 1-165 — 155. [Boethus, On the Words of Doubtful Meaning in Plato]

Boethus was also the author of another little work addressed to Athenagoras, entitled On the Words of Doubtful Meaning in Plato. If any one were to combine the words in these two little works with those included in the work, of Timaeus, he would confer a great benefit on all who are desirous of studying Plato.

Codices 1-165 — 156. [Dorotheus, Of New and Foreign Words in Plato]

Read in the same volume a list Of New and Foreign Words in Plato by Dorotheus, arranged in alphabetical order. It will clearly be useful to the student. Possibly Dorotheus of Ascalon, a Greek grammarian often referred to by Athenaeus.

Codices 1-165 — 157. [Moeris, Attic Words]

Read also the Atticist of Moeris.This little work also isin alphabetical order. Second century A.D. His lexicon, called Λέχεις Ἀττικαὶ (Attic words), is extant.

Codices 1-165 — 158. [Phrynichus the Arabian, Rhetorical Equipment]

Read the Rhetorical Equipment of Phrynichus the Arabian in thirty-six books. It contains a collection of words and clauses, some of which, gracefully expressed and arranged in a novel manner, are enlarged into complete members. Many of these are to be found in the collection of Helladius, but there they are dispersed throughout the bulky work, whereas here they are all collected together, the aim of Phrynichus being to make a list of special words, while Helladius, being simply a lexicographer, added them to the common stock and included them amongst the rest. The writer flourished during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, to whom the work is dedicated and inscribed, ”Phrynichus to Commodus Caesar, greeting.” In the preface he exhorts Commodus to the pursuit of learning, at the same time praising his own work, of which he says that he had already composed thirty-seven books and dedicated them to the emperor, and promising to write as many more if his life should be spared. As we have said, we have only read thirty-six books, containing words beginning with the first down to the last letter of the alphabet.

In spite of his assertion that he dedicated the work to the emperor, he appears to have inscribed the separate books to different persons. Thus, the first, second, and third books are addressed to a certain Aristocles, in the hope that it may serve as an amusement and source of recreation for him on his birthday; the fourth to a certain Julian, a fellow-citizen and friend. The author adds that he had at first intended to dedicate the whole to Aristocles, but after by the royal decree he became a member of the great council at Rome, he decided to adopt Julian instead as his friend and associate in his labours and to make use of his services as the judge and critic of his writings. In spite of this promise, he dedicates the fifth book to a learned friend of his, named Menodorus, who had previously censured him for not having adequately investigated the inflexion of words. The author says that the present

book was written at the request of Menodorus, and excuses the delay in completing it on the ground that he is suffering from strangury, a common complaint of old age, long and serious mental affliction, haemorrhage of the stomach, and several other ailments. If, however, he should regain his health, he promises to complete the present commission, and any other work his friend may suggest that bears upon learning and good taste, and has not yet been attempted. Nevertheless, the sixth book again is dedicated to a different person----Tiberinus;

the seventh to another Menophilus, who he says is a consummate scholar and has supplied whole passages in illustration of the matter of the sixth book, and exhorts him to collect as many of these words as possible in his writings. The eighth book is again dedicated to Julian, whom the author asks to be good enough to correct any of his statements which are unsatisfactory, for which illness must be his excuse. Inscribing the ninth to Rufinus, he says that Aristocles first prompted him to begin the book, but that he (Rufinus) will be responsible for its completion, because, having seen the rest of it, he recognized its usefulness and approved of his labours. Turning back again he dedicates the tenth book to Aristocles, the next to Menodorus, in which he states that he had just come across the orations of Aristides, who flourished at the time, and speaks very highly of him. He also says that Marcianus the critic, neglecting Plato and Demosthenes, expresses his preference for the letters of the Roman Brutus to all others and declares him to be the model of stylistic excellence. The author says that he quotes this remark not because he approves of this judgment, but to prevent any one being surprised if some people think this man’s repute inferior to that of Aristides, despite his splendid oratory; for Aristides also, like other men distinguished for learning, has been assailed by some who were jealous of his achievements. The eleventh book is also dedicated to Menodorus;

of the rest----that we may not incur the charge of garrulity----one to Rheginus, another to Aristocles, another to Basilides of Miletus, the sophist, in which he says that, as soon as he found respite from disease, he wrote this book for him, and begs him to correct the mistakes that may be due to illness. All the other books, down to the end, which we have read, are dedicated to Menophilus.

The work will no doubt be useful to aspiring authors and orators. The compiler says that he has divided the words collected by him into such as are adapted for oratory, written composition, and conversation, for a derisive, contemptuous, or amatory style. The best models, norms, and standards of undiluted and pure Attic speech are considered by the author to be Plato, Demosthenes and the other nine Attic orators, Thucydides, Xenophon, Aeschines the son of Lysanias the Socratic, Critias the son of Callaeschrus, and Antisthenes with his two orations in praise of Cyrus and Odysseus; of writers of comedy, Aristophanes and his band, where they use Attic; of tragedians, Aeschylus the mighty-voiced, Sophocles the sweet, and

the all-wise Euripides. While preferring these to all other authors, orators, and poets, he again puts first those whom (as he says) Momus himself would not blame and, even if the fabled Corycian god made grimaces at them, would not rejoice; these are Plato, Demosthenes, and Aeschines the son of Lysanias because of the excellence of his seven dialogues, which some consider not to have been written by him, but ascribe them to Socrates. So much for these matters.

The writer displays great learning, but is verbose and excessively prolix. For the work, without omitting anything of importance, could have been reduced to a fifth of its size, whereas the author, by an ill-timed use of words, has spun it out to an unmanageable length, and while collecting material for elegance and beauty of style, fails to translate his own precepts into example. Of Bithynia, flourished under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. He was a great stickler for purity of style. Only extracts and the present summary of the Equipment have been preserved, but a shorter work called the Atticist, in which rules are given for the use or avoidance of various expressions, is extant. ”Members” (κῶλα, membra), as distinct from ”clauses” (κόμματα, incisa). The original distinction is one of length, 4 to 6 syllables being a ”clause,” 7 to 10 a ”member” (cp. the use of our own comma and colon). According to Quintilian, incisum is a complete sense in which the numbers or rhythm are not yet complete, membrum is a complete sense and a complete rhythm, but while perfect as a limb, in relation to its body (the given whole of which it forms part) it is incomplete and has no meaning (see Sandys on Cicero, Orator, 212). Of Pergamum, Greek philosopher and sophist, consul under Marcus Aurelius, author of declamations and technical writings on rhetoric.

Publius Aelius Aristides (c. 129-189) famous rhetorician, born at Hadrianutherai in Mysia, friend of Marcus Aurelins. He was a priest of Asclepius (Aesculapius) at Smyrna. More than fifty of his orations and declamations are extant. Marcus Junius Brutus (85-42 B.C.), the conspirator. Lived in Syracuse, at the court of Dionysius the Younger(356 B.C.), and afterwards wrote speeches for the law-courts at Athens. He is, of course, not identical with the rival of Demosthenes (see p. 62, note). One of the most hated of the Thirty Oligarchs or Tyrants at Athens (404 B.C.). He was a pupil of Socrates, and a poet and orator of no mean order. c. 440-370 B.C., founder of the Cynic school. He was first a pupil of the famous sophist Gorgias of Leontini, then of Socrates. The personification of blame or censure. According to Suidas, the inhabitants of Corycus (a promontory in Pamphylia), to avoid being plundered by pirates, used to go and listen in other harbours to find out where certain vessels were bound, and then informed the pirates. He adds that the comic poets introduced a Corycian god, one who was always listening. Ephorus gives a somewhat different story. The text is unsatisfactory here and the meaning is not very clear. J. H. Leich’s suggestion, Χωρίσειεν (segregaret), in his essay on the Bibliotheca (1748), does not mend matters.

Codices 1-165 — 159. [Isocrates, Orations, Letters]

Read the twenty-one Orations and nine Letters of Isocrates. His ”deliberative” speeches are those To Demonicus and To Nicodes, containing useful advice; a second to Nicocles, and one On the Peace. The object of the Panegyricus is the consideration of the means of ensuring harmony amongst the Greeks themselves, and of the best methods for carrying on war against the barbarians, but by far the greater part is devoted to a glorification of the Athenians. The Areopagiticus is also one of the ”deliberative” speeches, inciting the Athenians to virtue by the praise of their ancestors, .and by censuring their descendants. The Plataicus and the Archidamus are also ”deliberative”; in the latter he urges the Spartans to make war against the Thebans on the question of the Messenians. In the oration Against the Sophists he attacks his political opponents. The next speech is an Encomium of Busiris, as the title indicates. The eleventh is an Encomium of Helen. The twelfth, Evagoras, is a eulogy of that king, dedicated to his son Nicocles. The Philippus is a ”deliberative” speech, recommending Philip to endeavour to promote harmony amongst the Greeks and devote his attention to a united advance against the barbarians in Asia. The Panathenaicus is a eulogy of Athens and the ancestors of the Athenians, which he says he began to write when he was ninety-four years of age, but was prevented by a three-years’ severe attack of illness from completing it until he was ninety-seven.

The speech called Antidosis (exchange of properties) appears to belong to the class of ”forensic” speeches and contains a defence against the slanders of one Lysimachus against him. This speech, the longest of those of this class, was composed when he was eighty-two years of age, and the matter is more mixed and varied than that of the rest; he inserts extracts from his other speeches, in order to show that he is not corrupting the young men, but promoting the common welfare. The speech Against Callimachus, as also the Aegineticus (dealing with a claim to inheritance), the speech Against Euthynus on behalf of Nicias, the Trapeziticus (an action against a banker), and Against Lochites (a claim for damages for outrage and assault) are also ”forensic. These are the twenty-one orations of Isocrates that

we have read. Of his nine Letters, one is addressed to Dionysius the tyrant of Sicily, another to Archi-damus, two to Philip, one to Alexander, one to Antipater, one to Timotheus, and the ninth to the Archons of Mytilene.

This writer preferred to give instruction in rhetoric rather than take part in the management of public affairs, like the other nine orators, of whom Demosthenes was one; although even before their time he had a great reputation as a rhetorician, and, later, was in no way considered their inferior. His chief characteristics, as at once becomes obvious to the reader, are purity and distinctness, and excessive care in the workmanship of his speeches, which frequently degenerates into superfluous orderliness and over-elaboration. His infinite capacity for taking pains generates want of taste rather than of resourcefulness in argument He lacks impressiveness, sincerity, and liveliness, but in his political orations he makes admirable use of dignity and perspicuity in equal proportions. His style is feeble, and the use of evenly-balanced clauses ad nauseam, as much as anything else, shows his excessive attention to petty detail. But we acknowledge the general excellence of his language, and only make these criticisms to point out where it has gone astray and does not do justice to itself. For, in comparison with some of those who undertake to compose speeches, even his faults appear, virtues.

436-338 B.C. One of the ”ten” Attic orators. The political object of his speeches was to unite the Greek world against its hereditary enemy, Persia. His twenty-one extant speeches are distinguished by high artistic finish, and are most carefully elaborated. The news of the battle of Chaeronea (338), in which the Athenians were utterly defeated by Philip of Macedon, is said to have killed the aged orator---”killed with report that old man eloquent” (Milton). He was too timid to speak in public himself, and opened a school of rhetoric, which was largely attended. Speeches were divided into deliberative, forensic, and epideictic (show speeches). Egyptian prince who put to death strangers arriving in his country. He was slain by Hercules. King of Salamis in Cyprus (see p. 109). The letter to the children of Jason of Pherae completes the nine. Opinions are divided as to the genuineness of the letters. Or, ”delineation of character” (Van Hook).

” Fiery earnestness ” (Jebb).

Codices 1-165 — 160. [Choricius, Declamations]

Read the Declamations and Orations of different kinds by the sophist Choricius of Gaza. He is a lover of clearness and purity of style, and if he expatiates for any useful purpose, the clearness of his thoughts is in no way impaired, since the expansion is not ill-timed and never reaches the length of a complete period. In his writings, character and sincerity are combined, while at the same time he does not neglect the inculcation of moral lessons. As a rule he uses carefully selected words, although not always in their proper sense; for sometimes, owing to his unrestricted use of figurative language, he falls into frigidity, and sometimes is carried away into the poetical style. But he is at his best in descriptions and eulogies. He is an upholder of the true religion and respects the rites and holy places of the Christians, although for some reason or other, contemptuously and without any excuse, he unjustifiably introduces Greek myths and heathen stories in his writings, sometimes even when discussing sacred things. Many writings by him of various kinds are in circulation; one meets with fictitious, laudatory, and controversial speeches, monodies, nuptial songs, and many others. He flourished in the time of the emperor Justinian, and was a pupil of the rhetorician Procopius, not him of Caesarea, a most distinguished man, who at that time, by the composition of his useful and valuable historical works, left behind an undying renown amongst all lovers of learning.

In his own country he was connected with the other Procopius as his teacher in rhetoric, who, when he reached old age, had the pleasure of seeing his pupil take his place at the head of his school. Many of his orations of all kinds are in circulation, all deserving of careful study and imitation. Indeed, the whole book called Translations of Homeric Verses, in which the form is completely changed in various styles, is sufficient to show his vigorous rhetorical powers, which, as far as a pupil can, Choricius has imitated. Both were Christians, and in their orations they frequently, and not perfunctorily, discuss the making of sacred images. The death of his master supplied Choricius with the subject of a funeral oration.

Flourished at the beginning of the sixth century A.D., pupil of Procopius of Gaza. He was nominally a Christian, but his point of view and manner of expression are pagan. Several of his panegyrics, funeral orations, wedding speeches, and school declamations are extant. Procopius of Gaza (465-528).

Codices 1-165 — 161. [Sopater, Various Extracts]

Read the Various Extracts of the sophist Sopater, in twelve books, compiled from the works of different historians and writers. The first book gives an account of the fables of the gods from the third book of Apollodorus, an Athenian who taught grammar, On the Gods. The selections are not from the third book alone, but also from the fourth, fifth, ninth, first, twelfth, fifteenth, and sixteenth, down to the twenty-fourth. The collection includes the mythical tales and fictions concerning the gods and whatever else is of any historical value, such as the stories of the heroes, the Dioscuri, and those in Hades, and the like. The compiler has also drawn upon the second book of Juba On Painting, and upon the Deipnosophists of Athenaeus of Naucratis. Such are the sources and contents of the first book. The second book is from the first book and onwards down to. the tenth book of the Epitomes of Pamphila, the daughter of Soteridas, and from Artemon of Magnesia's On Remarkable Deeds of Women, the Apophthegms of Diogenes the Cynic, the eighth book of Sappho, and various other writers. Such is the second book of the extracts.

The third book is from the Various History of Favorinus,from books N, C, and the rest in order, with the exception of T, up to W. These contain various histories, the reasons and origins and meanings of words and names, and the like. This ends the third book. The fourth book is compiled from an anonymous work entitled a Collection of Wonderful Things, from the sixteenth book of the Miscellaneous Notes of Aristoxenus, and from the eighth book of the Dramatic History of Rufus. Here are to be found many improbable and incredible things, various tragic and comic incidents, dialogues and speeches, manners and customs, and the like, with which the fourth book ends. The fifth book consists of extracts from the first, second, and third books of Rufus's Musical History. It contains an account of different comedians and tragedians, of writers of dithyrambs, players on the flute and cithara, of nuptial songs and song accompanied by dance, of dancers and others who took part in theatrical contests, the origin and family antecedents of those among them who became famous, whether men or women; which of them were known as the origina-

tors of what practices, which of them were the friends and intimates of emperors and kings; what the contests were and whence derived, in which each exhibited his art. The general festivals celebrated by the whole Athenian people are also described. All these things, and the like, the reader will find in the fifth book.

The sixth book is from the fourth and fifth books of the Musical History by the same Rufus. It gives an account of flute-players, of the songs sung to the flute by men and women, of the poets Homer, Hesiod, and Antimachus,and most of the other poets belonging to their school, and tells us something about female soothsayers, who the so-called Sibyls were and whence they came, all borrowed from Rufus. The second book of tiie Halieutica of Damostratus, and the first, fifth, ninth, and tenth books of the Lives of the Philosophers by Diogenes Laertius are also drawn upon. We have an account of the philosophers and of the origin of the divine study---- philosophy; how it flourished, who were the heads and champions of the different schools, who were their followers or rivals, the character exhibited by each, their birth and origin, their manner of life from the beginning, and the time in which they flourished. The book also contains information about rhetoric and rhetoricians, extracts from Aelius Dionysius's work On Alexandria, and from the Aegyptiaca of Hellanicus,and concludes with various mythical and fictitious stories and other things.

The seventh book is a kind of anthology from the History of Herodotus. The eighth book consists of extracts from an old and anonymous work. It gives a list of women who rose to fame and made a brilliant name, of the deeds of certain men and their meetings for the study of rhetoric, of the excellence of friendship, and the maxims of worthy men. There are also selections from Plutarch's essays on How a Young Man should Listen to the Poets and on Nature and Labours, showing how many, often with great difficulty, have reformed a vicious nature, while others through carelessness have allowed a good one to become corrupted; how some who in their younger days were looked upon as slow and unintelligent, when they grew up were distinguished by brilliant qualities, quick-witted-ness, and intellectual gifts. Also from the treatises On Shamefacedness, On Garrulity, On Anger, On How One should Obtain Benefit from One's Enemies, On Cheerfulness, On Political Precepts, On Wealth, How One can be Conscious of Progress in Virtue, On Rules of Health, On Marriage Precepts. Amongst these extracts is to be found much that is worthy of being remembered, both words and deeds, which will be found serviceable in many respects. Such is the contents of the eighth book.

The ninth book consists of extracts from Plutarch's The Slow Vengeance of the Gods, the Lives of Demetrius and Of Brutus the Roman, the book entitled Apophthegms of Famous Men, the little treatise On Rivers, and How to Distinguish the Flatterer from the Friend, the Lives of Crates, Daiphantus, and Pindar, and the work entitled Apophthegms of Kings and Generals, and the first to the eighth of the Convivial Discourses. Such is the matter supplied by Plutarch. The author

has also borrowed from the first, second, third, and fourth books of Rufus's Roman History, in which will be found much that deserves mention although mixed up with fables and long-winded nonsense. Such is the contents of the ninth book. The tenth book is compiled from the Erato of Cephalion,and describes the life and deeds of Alexander the Great; from the treatise of Apollonius the Stoic ; concerning women who have been philosophers or have achieved fame by anything else, or by whose mediation families were reconciled; from the History of Macedon by Theagenes; from Plutarch's Lives of Nicias, Alcibiades, Themistocles, Theseus, Lycurgus, Solon, and Alexander the son of Philip, Cimon, [Lysander, Demosthenes], Pericles, Pelopidas, Phocion, and Aristides, containing much that is worthy of being narrated and recorded. Such is the contents of the tenth book.

The eleventh book is in like manner compiled from Plutarch's Lives of Epaminondas, Dion, Agesilaus, Agis, Cleomehes, Eumenes of Cardia, Philopoemen, Aratus, who when general of the Achaean league commanded the forces seventeen times and greatly distinguished himself in the field, and Pyrrhus, king of Epirus; from the first and second books of Aristophanes the grammarian's work On Animals, and the seventeenth book of king Juba's Theatrical History. Such is the contents of the eleventh book. The twelfth book is taken from various sources : Callixenus's Catalogue of Painters and Sculptors, Aristonicus's On the Museum at Alexandria, the Constitutions of Aristotle, dealing with those of the Thessalians, Achaeans, Parians, Lycians, Chians, and of all the peoples whom he has mentioned in his political writings, the usefulness of which is evident. Such is the contents of the twelfth book. The work is very useful to the reader. For although it is not free from fabulous, monstrous, false and improbable statements, as I have already mentioned more than once, yet from those which are as it were contributions from the storehouse of learning, one may gather much that promotes virtue and honesty. For the student of rhetoric and sophistic, as he himself says to his friends in the introduction, they are of considerable importance and will be very serviceable. The diction is varied, not confined to one style, although clearness is the distinguishing feature of the entire work.

Perhaps Sopater of Apamea, who was at first intimate with Constantine the Great, but was put to death by him on account of his pagan propaganda. Flourished about 140 B.C. Castor and Pollux. King of Mauretania, born c. 50 B.C., died c. A.D. 20. He was a most prolific writer on all kinds of subjects. Of Naucratis, in Egypt; flourished at Rome during the reign of Commodus and his successors. His Doctors at Dinner (Sandys) is a kind of encyclopaedia, in which are preserved numerous quotations from some 700 ancient authors, especially of the Middle and New Comedy. Learned female grammarian of the time of Nero; author of a work bearing upon the history of literature (see Cod. 175). Nothing further is known of him. 403-323 B.C. Of Eresus or Mytilene in Lesbos. Two complete poems and numerous fragments remain, increased by the papyrus-finds in Egypt. Of Arelate (Arles); sceptic;

author of. numerous popular philosophical worlds, epideictic declamations, and speeches. He chiefly resided in Rome, and was patronised by Hadrian. Of Tarentum; flourished 318 B.C. He was a great authority on music and rhythm (he was called ὁ μουσικός), and wrote on almost every subject. It is uncertain whether he is identical with the author of the Musical and Roman Histories mentioned below, or whether the author of the last is an orator of whose rhetorical work a fragment has been preserved.

Of Colophon or Claros, contemporary of Plato. His elegy Lyde, on the death of his mistress, was famous. He also wrote a long-winded epic, Thebais, and was the author of an edition of Homer. Roman senator; lived a little earlier than Aelian (c. A.D. 170-230). Besides the Halieutica (On Fishing), he wrote on aquatic divination, and marvellous things. His date is unknown, possibly the second half of the third century A.D. The Lives is an undigested and uncritical compilation from different works. Of Mytilene (died c. 405 B.C.). He wrote several genealogical works, and the history of various countries and peoples, amongst them an Atthis (history of Attica), and Troica (History of Troy). See Cod. 68. First century B.C. His date is uncertain. The work was much used by Stephanus of Byzantium, the geographer. Add Timoleon. Of Byzantium (c. 257-180 B.C.), successor of Eratosthenes as librarian of Alexandiia. He is famous for his editions of Homer and other poets, in which he introduced accents and other marks to be used in the criticism of the text. Of Rhodes, end of third century B.C. Wrote on art and a descriptive account of Alexandria.

Of Alexandria, contemporary of Strabo (who died c. A.D. 24). He wrote on the critical marks used in the Iliad and Odyssey, and commentaries on Homer and Pindar.

Codices 1-165 — 162. [Eusebius of Thessalonica, Against the Aphthartodocetae]

Read a work by a certain Eusebius, a bishop of the orthodox faith, in ten books, written against a monk named Andrew, and called forth by his behaviour. He wrote a letter to Eusebius, which he calls a pastoral letter, imploring him to read it. Eusebius, having done so, first reprimands Andrew for his ignorance and temerity, showing that he had made many mistakes in spelling and could not write a line without making a blunder, but that notwithstanding he had had the audacity to write, forgetting his profession and the repose of a monastic life. He then refutes Andrew's heretical opinions at length, for he was one of the sect called Aphthartodocetae, from the impious doctrine that they held. He first points out that Andrew must explain why he used the word fqora& (corruption) in only one sense, thinking that it referred to sin only, whereas our Holy Fathers, in their usage of words, have traditionally applied it to different things. Secondly, he reproves him because he ventured to declare, like Julian, that the body of the Lord was immortal, impassible, and incorruptible from the union (of the two natures), although in this very letter he asserts that he has undertaken to oppose Severus and Julian, since they deny that there are two natures or two substances, two properties or two energies, in Christ.

Thirdly, because he insisted that the body of Adam before the fall was neither formed entirely mortal nor corruptible by nature, from which, according to him, it would follow that Christ had assumed from the very union an incorruptible and impassible body; whereas, in reality, he ought to have thought and said that the body of Adam was by nature mortal and passible, but by divine grace was kept immortal and impassible, until his trangression deprived him of that protection. Such is the unanimous opinion of the Holy Fathers. Fourthly, because he called the present world incorruptible and indestructible, whereas he ought to hold that it is corruptible and changeable. In his first reply the bishop exhorted Andrew

to retract his opinion on many other points, at the same time convicting him of obscurity and of blasphemy in his language.

Andrew, after he had received this exhortation to mend his ways, went from bad to worse, and wrote another work in which he again set forth at greater length the views he had previously expressed and, as he imagines, establishes their truth. As we have said, the pious Eusebius wrote ten books to combat these propositions, in which he shows that Andrew, not content with the definition of faith marked out by the holy synods, has audaciously drawn up an exposition of faith of his own; that he has wrenched many passages from the Fathers, and falsified and violently pressed them into the support of his views; that he contradicts both the New and Old Testament and our Holy Fathers in asserting that the world is incorruptible and indestructible; that he says that change, transformation, flux, can easily be misrepresented, just like the sufferings which have their origin in vice, and that our Lord Jesus Christ assumed a body that was unchangeable, impassible, incorruptible, and without flux. Again, he censures him because he asserts that the world is eternal, incorruptible, and ungenerated, and does not admit the transformation of the elements which contributes to its eternity, since he teaches that it is one of the passions which can easily be misrepresented; that the body of Adam was formed incorruptible, immortal, and impassible by nature, and not only this, but that the clay of which it was formed is incorruptible.

Eusebius also censures him for taking the word ”corruption ” in only one sense, whereby he shows that God is not the author of corruption or death or any vicious passion, but not even of sinful thoughts, although He is the author of corruptible and mortal substances, for these do not belong to existing things and have no subsistence in themselves. He also rebukes him for saying that the Lord’s body from the very union is impassible, incorruptible, and unchangeable, and in order to prove this, as he imagines, he shows that he has to rely upon his other nonsenical ideas about the world and Adam. In the same work Eusebius shows in what and how many meanings the words φθορά and καταφθορά and διαφθορά are used in the Scriptures: of physical affections that are by no means reprehensible, and of those that result from labour, fatigue, and old age, old age being the corruption of youth, as labour and fatigue of bodily tone; of bodily humiliation in ascetic and spiritual struggles, for the apostle says, ”Although our outer man be corrupted, our inner body is renewed”; of the affliction and wasting away of the body by blows and punishment; of the injury, partial or entire, in the case of animals, seeds, and plants; even of death itself, and, besides this, of the dissolution and flux of the bodies which take place in the grave; lastly, of vicious affections or sins.

Since then the words for ”corruption” could be used in so many ways, Eusebius is justified in stating that Andrew is wrong in attaching only one meaning to these words.

He confirms his arguments by passages from the Old and New Testament, from certain select Fathers, Athanasius and the three Gregories (Thaumaturgus, Theologus, and of Nyssa), Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus of Constantinople, Methodius the holy martyr, and Quadratus, from some of whose writings Andrew had wrenched and falsified passages and by explaining them either with deliberate malice or through ignorance, so as to support his own view, imagined that he was confirming his own mistaken opinions. But he pays the penalty of all that has been mentioned to Eusebius, for his tampering with the letter, his wickedness, and folly, and for putting together certain passages from heretical writings and venturing to ascribe them to our Holy Fathers.

From Andrew's foolish utterances Eusebius also shows that he is of opinion that our Lord Jesus Christ, not being changed by resurrection from corruption to incorruption, is equally impassible in his manhood and divinity; that he dared to call those blasphemers who thought and said that our Lord Jesus Christ lived on earth with a mortal and passible body, while he himself is not ashamed, after His victory over sufferings and the abolition of death and corruption, monstrously to assert that the body of the Lord is passible, forgetting that, while insulting the orthodox by calling them Phthartolatrae he himself is clearly convicted of being Pathetolatrae. He then again adds some passages from the Fathers, and shows that the Lord's body was passible, mortal, and consequently corruptible until His glorious resurrection, and that then by itself it became immortal and impassible. He also shows that Andrew talks idly in calling the orthodox Phthartolatrae, a name which is fitting and suitable for Arius, Aetius, Eunomius, Apollinarius, and Nestorius, but not for orthodox Christians. Eusebius also lays down the doctrine that our Lord and God, since He, as the architect of ”nature, assumed our natural and by no means reprehensible ”passions” (which are not properly called ”passions” but might more fitly be called ”works of nature”), was incapable of taking upon Him ”passions” properly so called, originating from vice; that He ate and drank with His disciples after the Resurrection not in the same manner as He ate and drank before the Resurrection;

in the latter case He acted according to the law of nature, refreshing and controlling the perishable flesh by food and drink, in the former He performed the act supernaturally by way of dispensation, to inspire the disciples, and through them all the faithful, with the belief that the body that suffered and was crucified rose again from the dead, the same and not a different body, although it had been transformed and had become incorruptible and impassible. Having laid down these doctrines in a manner acceptable to God, Eusebius finishes his tenth book. The style is clear, simple, pure, and characterized by distinctness where it is required.

Bishop of Thessalonica, c. 600. A Monophysite sect, which held that the one nature of Christ was not subject to corruption (ἀφθαρτος), understanding by corruption (φθορά) not only the corruption following on death and moral depravity, but all

needs of the body, sufferings, and weaknesses, against which no reproach could be made (ἀδιάβλητα). The docetae part of the compound seems to mean that Christ's body was not what it appeared, for it does not appear that they regarded it as a phantasm, a body in appearance only. They admitted it was real and substantial. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Patriarch of Constantinople, died 447. He was a friend and pupil of Chrysostom; some of his sermons and letters are extant. Bishop of Olympus and Patara in Lycia in the fourth century. It is not certain that he suffered martyrdom. See Codd. 234-237. Christian apologist during the reign of Hadrian. From φθαρτός (corruptible)and λατρεία (worship). They held that the human body of Christ was subject to ordinary natural corruption. Who believe in a passible Christ.

Codices 1-165 — 163. [Vindanius Anatolius of Berytus, A Collection of Agricultural Precepts]

Read the work of Vindanius Anatolius of Berytus, entitled A Collection of Agricultural Precepts, compiled by him from the works of Democritus Africanus, Tarantinus, Apuleius, Florentius, Valens, Leo, and Pamphilus, and the Paradoxa of Diophanes. It is in twelve volumes, and, as our own experience has shown us in many instances, is useful for the cultivation of the land and agricultural works, perhaps the most useful of all treatises on the same subject. However, it contains some marvellous and incredible tales, full of Greek fables, which the/pious husbandman should pass over while gathering up what is useful in the rest of the work. All other writers on agricultural matters, so far as I know, express nearly the same opinions about the same things and differ little from one another; where they do, the experience of Leo is to be preferred to all the rest. Fourth or fifth century A.D. About the middle of the tenth century a selection was made from it and similar works by command of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Of Nicaea, lived in the time of Cicero. The statement that he wrote a volume on Paradoxa is probably an error.

Codices 1-165 — 164. [Galen, On Medical Schools]

Read the work of Galen On Medical Schools. The author, discussing the schools that have been formed in the medical profession, declares that the three chief are : the logical, which he also calls dogmatic and analogistic; the empirical, also called observant or memorial; the methodical. They differ in the method of invention and in other respects. The dogmatic physician bases his art upon the use of methods of reasoning for the discovery of remedies; the empirical relies upon experiment and observation; the methodical, while professing to employ both reasoning and experiment, makes no careful use of either, and is rightly distinguished from the other two. The present work is divided into three sections. The first contains a description of the empiric and dogmatic schools, and sets forth the nature of each; the second introduces these two schools hotly discussing their respective claims to superiority; the third introduces the methodical school quarrelling with the other two, each of them putting forward its own claims and endeavouring to overthrow its rival. With this the third book ends.

It is evident that this work should be preferred to all other medical writings, if one would learn which is the best school to belong to. But it cannot properly be regarded as a medical work, but rather as a philosophical introduction to medicine. The diction and composition are pure and distinct; Galen everywhere pays especial attention to these qualities, although in many works he confuses and obscures the meaning of what he has written by overloading his treatises with unseasonable discourses, digressions, and spun-out periods. These seem, as it were, to chop up the context, and his tedious nonsense makes the reader indifferent. The present treatise, however, is free from these faults. Claudius Galenus, A.D. 129-199, the most celebrated physician of antiquity. Born at Pergamum, he studied at Alexandria, and was summoned to Rome by Marcus Aurelius, who had the greatest confidence in him. He wrote numerous treatises on medicine and other scientific subjects, grammar, and literary criticism.

Codices 1-165 — 165. [Himerius, Declamations]

Read the Declamations and Various Discourses of Himerius the sophist. Two of the former are deliberative, and three forensic, all with introductions. Of the deliberative speeches the first is supposed to be delivered by Hyperides in support of Demosthenes, the second by Demosthenes, on behalf of Aeschines. Of the other three, the first is in the form of an attack on Epicurus, who is supposed to be on trial for impiety; the second is written against a rich man who had exhausted the substance of a poor man by his abominable actions, and introduces the poor man pleading his cause; in the third Themistocles declaims against the king of Persia, who had made many promises in the hope of ending the war.

These speeches, more than the others, are written in such a manner as to show what can be done by excellence of style and brilliancy and vigour of ideas. The author often heaps up periods, in imitation of Demosthenes, in a variety of forms; although he specially affects an elevated style, he cleverly modifies his language by introducing other forms. His diction, at least in the matter of phraseology and the meaning and the force of words, is by no means wanting in perspicuity. The frequent breaking up of words sounds strange to the ear but is not disagreeable, although it renders the sense less intelligible to the ordinary reader. Another reason for the author’s general clearness of style is that he uses expressions that make for distinctness. As I have said, he uses heaped-up periods in argumentation and at other times, but by illuminating them by vigorous figures of speech he clears his language of any obscurity that might arise from them. He makes frequent and clever use of hyperbaton and other figures of speech, although not to the same extent as of periods. He is vehement and earnestly vigorous where needed. Such he shows himself in the speeches mentioned.

Next to these speeches comes the Polemarchicus, a eulogy of those who fell in battle fighting for freedom against the Persians, and also in praise of war; the Areopagiticus. claiming citizenship for his son Rufinus, not a fictitious declamation; a monody on the death of the same son; on the marriage of his friend Severus,

also obviously not fictitious, with an introduction; Diogenes or Propempticus, a send-off speech, also furnished with an introduction, and written in the form of a dialogue: Syntacterius, a farewell speech to his friends on starting for Corinth; a Propempterius to Flavian, on his promotion to the consulship of Asia; to a new student named Piso; another Diogenes or Propempticus; an impromptuon a dispute which arose in the school; on the arrival of some Cyprians; on his first hearer from Cappadocia; a show-speech,which he at first refused to deliver when asked, in which the thesis "Beautiful things are rare" is discussed; on Musonius, proconsul of Greece; on the new pupil Severus, who came on the scene during the scuffle; a short address; on count Ursacius; on another Severus; on Scylacius, proconsul of Greece; on some new pupils, Ephesians and Mysians and citizens of Leon; on companions from his fatherland; on count Athenaeus; on the Roman Privatus, tutor of the son of Ampelius the proconsul; on his return from Corinth; on Phoebus the son of Alexander the proconsul; on count Arcadius a physician. Hortatory speech to his pupils just arrived and a propemptic to Flavian; on the marriage of Panathenaeus; two short addresses;

a discourse when leaving Philippi in obedience to a summons from the emperor Julian; an oration delivered in Constantinople on the city itself, the emperor Julian, and the rites of Mithras; a discourse on the prefect Sallust, with an argument; on the proconsul Flavian; on his friend's birthday; short address on his friend's recovery; on intriguers; on Basil the proconsul (two); on Hermogenes, Plocianus, Ampelius, Praetextatus, proconsuls of Greece, and their companions; on his departure to the emperor Julian; speech delivered in Nicomedia at the exhortation of Pompeianus the prefect; a speech on the new students; on a new student; on his companion Zeno; on Aphobinus, a new student; on one who entered the school in consequence of an oracle of Poseidon; on those who had arrived from Ionia; on the Ionian strangers; an extempore oration to his hearers; a speech in honour of a friend in Constantinople; a discussion with his pupils after his return from his country; an extempore oration on his (poor) lecture-room; rebuke of those who listened indifferently to speeches; an extempore speech on some who attended his lectures and were inclined to be restive; on Cytianus and his companions who behaved in a disorderly manner when he was speaking extempore; exhortation on the necessity of endeavouring to secure variety in discourse; discussion after the healing of his wound;a speech after his return from Corinth; on the stylus (pencil) and his pupils; on Amyclae, a city of the Lacedaemonians, which, in obedience to a dream, he visited to offer prayer to the God;

that lectures should not be delivered in public; speech on the necessity of taking exercise; another speech delivered at Corinth.

I think that these are all the orations of Himerius, nearly seventy in number, which you patiently and laboriously read while I was present. In all of them, while preserv-

ing the same type of diction and the same kind of style, he uses heaped-up periods and figures of speech in such a manner that a feeling of satiety is prevented by their cleverness and the way in which they are adapted. So far as I know, I am of opinion that no one has ever used figures of speech so admirably or pleasantly. His writings are full of, all kinds of historical and mythical examples, either for purposes of demonstration, or for drawing parallels, or for affording pleasure, or for the embellishment of the subjects discussed, by which he guides aright and diversifies his language, and by which his exordia, epilogues, and arguments are constructed. He also often gives a preliminary outline of the matter and manner of the discussion. But while such is the character of his orations, it is obvious that he held impious views on religion and imitates the dogs who yelp against us in secret. He flourished in the time of Constantius and the most impious Julian, and was head of the rhetorical school at Athens.

Μελεταί, elaborate fictitious speeches written for practice in the schools of rhetoric. Born at Prusa c. A.D. 315, died c. 386. Lived at the court of the Emperor Julian and after his death at Athens. He was the teacher of Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil. Of the twenty-four extant Declamations some are school exercises, others inaugural orations (see Cod. 243). Themistocles dissuaded the Athenians from accepting his offers. The word used (περιβολή) expresses the combination in a single period of a variety of diction, sentiments, and figures of speech. The Latin equivalent is circumducta or circumjecta oratio: cp. Quintilian, ix. 4, 124: cum sensus unus longiore ambitu circumducitur ("when a single thought is drawn out by a lengthy period"). Αἰτιολογία, giving the causes or reasons of things. Γοργός, "vigorous," "fiery," opposed to "languid," "spiritless." The inversion of the usual order of words or clauses in a sentence, chiefly for the sake of emphasis.

A send-off speech (like Propempterius). Σχέδιον, a short extempore discourse. Ἐπίδειξις, a speech delivered in the theatre or a public place to exhibit the composer's rhetorical powers. In the school. To read Συμπληγάδι (with capital S) and translate "prefect of Symplegada" seems absurd. Λαλιά, a short complimentary address to a real personage. The text cannot be right (τοῦ Λέοντος). Τοῦ Λέγοντος, "of the speaker" (i.e. Himerius himself) is another reading. Διάλεξις, a private lecture or dissertation for the instruction of pupils. Received during the disturbance (συμπληγάς) in the school. See also the Eclogue by Photius (Cod. 243) and the Orationes, ed. F. Dubner in the Didot series (Paris, 1849).

The ”Sic et Non” of Stephanus Gobarus, from codex 232. By Adolf von Harnack

THE ”SIC ET NON” OF STEPHANUS GOBARUS

ADOLF VON HARNACK University of Berlin In the older, as well as in the current, books on church history, and at some points in New Testament introduction, patristics, and the history of doctrine, a certain work is referred to under the name of ”Stephanus Gobarus.” The problems arising out of the quotations from this book are of great interest; but we are given virtually no information about the author beyond his name, and the book itself remains a complete mystery. Only the industry of Walch, in Part VIII of his ”Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereien” (1778, pp. 877 ff.) has analyzed it, or, rather, made unsatisfactory and incorrect extracts from it, to which he has added a few observations of his own. With this exception, it seems as if ever since the tenth century scholars had entered into a conspiracy to maintain complete silence about this work, or at least to content themselves with a few scanty remarks.

In the following pages I shall endeavor to come closer to the work and its author. I do not undertake to give a commentary, for that would require a book; but shall confine myself to the main points, going into detail only with reference to passages that relate to the literature of the first three centuries. |206 All we know about Gobarus is contained in Codex CCXXXII of the ”Bibliotheca” of Photius (ed. Bekker); at least I have not yet succeeded in finding so much as his name in any other writer. Since Photius’s excerpts are of moderate compass, it is desirable to give them in full; and in my translation I have condensed only a few passages where Photius is unduly verbose, together with certain unimportant formal statements and others where he repeats himself. Photius’s opinions, reflections, and other additions are indicated by square brackets; to him are also due the epitheta ornantia (ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις, ὁ μέγας, ὁ εὐλαβέστατος, οἱ ὅσιοι μυσταγωγοί, οἱ

τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι, κ. τ. λ.) attached to the names of ancient Fathers----at any rate we have no assurance that these come from Gobarus himself.

Codex CCXXXII Read (ἀνεγνώσθη) the book of a certain Stephanus, a tritheist with the surname Gobarus. [The book gives evidence of wide studies, but the result does not correspond to the great industry applied. The author evidently aimed rather at honor and fame than at usefulness. The number of chapters which he has elaborated, and which are contributions to general ecclesiastical questions„ amounts to almost fifty-two; a few, more special, chapters are added to these. The general ecclesiastical chapters comprise pairs of sentences, presented not only in pairs but as contradictory; yet the sentences are not substantiated by argument or proof-texts, but merely by the utterances, as the author holds, of divergent Fathers. Of these utterances one set maintain the view of the church, the other that which the church rejects. But the wrong view is cherished only in ancient utterances, or by men of ancient times, who had not yet accurately (πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν) weighed and tested everything, and indeed by some of these it is cherished only in the mistaken opinion of the compiler. On the other hand, the view of the church is supported by the testimonies of holy men who have arrived at the truth with complete precision (οἱ μάλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξακριβώσαντες). The chapters in which the arrangement with double or contradictory utterances presents itself are as follows :]

(1) The "idiom" and the "character" and the "form" are the "hypostasis," but not so is the combination of being and "idiom," nor the "authypostatic." [The sayings first adduced by Gobarus maintain this; those next |207 given, the opposite, namely that the "idiom" and the "form" and the "character" are not the "hypostasis" but the "character" of the hypostasis.] (2) John the Baptist was conceived in October. ---- He was conceived in November. (3) The conception of the Lord was announced to the Virgin in the first month, April, which the Hebrews call Nisan; and she bore our Lord Jesus Christ after nine months, that is on the 5th of January, in the middle of the night of the eighth day before the ides of January. ---- The Annunciation took place not in April but on the 25 th of March, and our Saviour was born, not on the 5th of January but on the eighth day before the calends of January.

(4) At the resurrection we shall receive the same body in every respect which we now have, without distinctive addition in respect of incorruptibility. ---- We shall not receive the same body as this corruptible one. (5) We shall rise in the same form (σχῆμα).-----We shall rise in another form. (6) In the resurrection every one will be of the same age as at his death. ----No, on the contrary even children will rise in mature form, and not rise all together but singly. (7) At the resurrection we shall receive a tenuous body, airy, ethereal, and spiritual. ---- No, rather one earthy, substantial, and solid (γήϊνον καὶ παχὺ καὶ ἀντίτυπον). (8) The Deity has a form and soul like man; and the phrase "in the image" refers to his bodily appearance, with reference to which man was fashioned in the semblance of the archetype ;

and the angels have bodies like those of men; and from the being and nature of God the human soul has proceeded. ---- The Deity has not a form like man, neither is fashioned in a form at all; nothing of what is said above is true of him; neither are the angels corporeal beings, but are incorporeal; and the human soul does not proceed from the being and nature of God.

(9) Before the fall the human body was one thing, like a beam of light, they say; and after the fall it was another, as we have it now, a body of flesh, and this is what is meant by the "coats of skin." ---- The "coats of skin " do not mean our flesh. (10) The just will rise from the dead first, and all beasts with them, and they will revel for a thousand years in eating and drinking and having children; and then will follow the general resurrection. ---- There is no preliminary resurrection of the just, nor any revelling for a thousand years, nor marriage. (11) After the resurrection paradise will be the abode of the just. ---- Not in paradise but in heaven; and paradise is neither in heaven nor on earth, but between the two. (12) Paradise is the Jerusalem which is above, and it is in the third heaven, and the trees there are endowed with mind and have intelligence and logos, and man was thrust down thence to earth after the fall. ---- Paradise is not in the third heaven but on earth. |208

(13) The good things prepared for the just, eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man. ---- Hegesippus, however, an ancient and apostolic man (?), says in the fifth book of his Hypomnemata [I do not know how he arrived at this] that this is an idle saying, and that those who say it speak falsely, since the Scriptures and the Lord say, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear," etc. (14) Those sinners who are given up to punishment are thereby purified of their wickedness and after their purification freed from punishment; moreover not all those given up to punishment are purified and freed, but only some. ---- No one [and this is the true view held by the church] is freed from punishment. (15) To be burned and not consumed is an indestructible self-destruction.Titus, bishop of Bostra, however, writing against the Manichees, says in his first book: "How can destruction be destruction of itself? For it destroys solely and alone something else, not itself. But if it destroyed itself, it could not have subsisted from the start; for it will destroy itself, and will not so much 'be' as 'destroy' itself, for an indestructible destruction is, by universal common sense, an impossible conception." [It is evident that this holy man calls "indestructible destruction" an impossibility in a different sense from that of the divinely inspired John. The latter understands by it a destruction that will last forever and will always continue, but the former thinks that destruction can not be indestructible, that is, cannot be passionlessness and indestructibility and a preserving force. Such being the relation of the two views, the author of the work before us, Gobarus, has not understood the different conceptions, and has set up the two propositions as contradictory.]

(16) The coining age is the eighth. ---- It is the ninth. (17) The body of our Saviour Jesus Christ after the resurrection was of tenuous consistency, spiritual and heavenly and light of weight and that could not be touched, and hence he could pass even through closed doors; while the palpable body, of gross consistency, is something other than that, solid and of different nature. ---- Our Lord Jesus, the Christ, after the resurrection had neither an impalpable body nor one of tenuous consistency, nor a spiritual body, but through his miraculous power, not because of the nature of his body, he passed through closed doors. (18) Christ did not put off the flesh after the resurrection, but sits at the right hand of the Father in the flesh. ---- He will come to judge the quick and the dead not in the flesh but in a body answering to his divinity.

(19) Not in the flesh but in pure deity does the Lord come at his second advent. [Gobarus puts this as a "chapter," and adduces for it sayings of Titus, bishop of Bostra, but he neglects all the countless contrary sayings which he might have cited, mentioning none of them, and thereby, as |209 everywhere, exhibits his impiousness, which, denying the flesh, sliamelessly makes a dogmatic statement of "the one nature."] (20) The body that cannot suffer and be wounded and die is of another nature and another kind than ours, and the perishable and mortal undergoes a transformation of nature when the change to imperishability and immortality befalls it. (21) Every definition, if it is complete, preserves the nature of the things defined; but if anything is taken away from or added to the definition, the thing defined is dissolved. [These two chapters, as well as the 19th, consist of a single member, and do not contain any contrary statement.]

(22) The Logos of God is completely in the All and over the All, and. it is completely in the body which it united to itself hypostatically. In a word, the being and nature of deity fills all things physically and dynamically and energetically, and pervades everything that is, by virtue of the mingling in relation to the All. ----It is not so; but God is by his nature outside of the All; he is, however, in all through the powers which he possesses. (23) Before the world came into existence God created the angels. ---- It is not so, rather on the first day of creation. (24) The angels and demons have bodies. ----Neither the former nor the latter have bodies. (25) Angels and rational souls and all intelligent creatures are by nature and in the order of nature imperishable. ---- On the contrary, not by nature but by grace are they immortal; God alone is so by nature.

(26) The angels that came down from heaven to earth had flesh and organs of reproduction, and coinpanying with the women they begat the giants and taught them arts and evil arts; but the giants, uniting themselves with beasts, begat horrible creatures in human form, and demons male and female, but those angels have their place of punishment where fire and hot springs start from the earth; and the souls of sinners become demons. ---- On the contrary, the fallen angels, being without

flesh, did not themselves unite with the women, but through the medium of men, or rather neither themselves nor through the medium of men; and human souls do not change into demons. (27) The heaven is spherical and revolves. ---- Neither is it spherical nor does it revolve. (28) The Spirit which "brooded over the water" was the Holy Ghost. ----It was not the Holy Ghost, but one of the four elements.

(29) The Lord's Day is both the eighth and the first. ---- It is not. (30) Human souls are rational bodies shaped like the external corporeal form and appearance of man. ---- The soul is incorporeal and not subject to bodily shapes. (31) Souls existed before the foundation of the world and descended from heaven into bodies, such as Moses and the prophets, and Socrates and Plato, and John the Baptist, and the souls of the Apostles, but especially that of the Lord. ---- Souls were not in heaven before they had bodies, but entered upon existence at the time of origin of the body: the body preceded, then came the soul; or rather, there is neither priority nor posteriority, but simultaneity. (32) God formed the body of Adam from earth. ----Not from earth, but from water and spirit. |210 (33) The breath which God breathed into Adam's face was temporal, and not, like the spirit, eternal. ---- It was not temporal, but an immortal soul.

(34) . . ., since man is composed of three parts, mind and soul and body, and no one of these was the inbreathed breath, but that was the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost did not become soul or mind, but made the soul. (35) Earth and water and the other elements change into fruits and plants, and food changes into flesh and sinews and other parts of the body. ---- The earth does not change into plants and fruits, nor food into our body. (36) After death the soul departs neither from the body nor from the grave. ---- The soul does not remain with the body nor in the grave. [Here, out of numberless easily found statements, Gobarus has adduced only those of Severian of Gabala and Irenaeus.] (37) Every originated thing is corruptible and mortal, but by the will of God it persists as if indissoluble and incorruptible. ---- That which is by nature corruptible cannot be incorruptible by the will of God, for whoever affirms that contradicts himself, and ascribes to the Creator that which is impossible. [For this opinion he has quoted a statement of Justin Martyr; but with Greek opinion on this point a conflict had arisen, and he gives a refutation from Plato, who said; "Since you have been originated, you are by no means immortal or indissoluble; nevertheless, you will not be dissolved nor partake of death, for my will is stronger, of which you have partaken." The Martyr, refuting Plato's idea, shows that Plato, in introducing the demiurge, contradicts himself, and does not bring what he says into harmonious unity; for cither that which is originated must, by earlier definition, be corruptible, or else he makes a false statement who declares everything originated to be corruptible. Gobarus insists that the refutation of the Greek idea must serve also to overthrow the view of the church.]

(38) [He now returns to the propositions with one member and shows (of the whole series it is the 38th chapter) what Saint Eustathius, archbishop of Antioch, held concerning the incarnation of our Lord; then (39) what the most holy Cyril, Alexandrian high-priest, and next (40) what the doctors of the church thought about the saying, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, neither the angels nor the Son, but the Father only," and (41) what Severus thought about it.] (42) [He now returns to the contrasted arrangement of utterances, and presents as his 42d chapter the statements] that our Lord Jesus, the Christ, was suckled by Mary, the Mother of God, ---- and that he was not suckled by her. (43) "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist." The Saviour applied this to himself. ---- No, to John the evangelist.

(44) Our Lord Jesus, the Christ, was crucified at the age of thirty years. ----Not thirty but thirty-three. ---- Not thirty-three but forty. ---- No, neither thirty nor forty, but still older, almost fifty. (45) When the Lord handed to his disciples the mystery of the new covenant, he ate the passover prescribed by the law. ---- No, he did not then eat this passover. |211 (46) The brazen serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness was a type of the Lord. ---- No, not a type, but an antitype. (47) He who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant was Thomas. ----No, it was not Thomas but Peter. (48) In the time of the passion the Deity departed from the body of Christ. ---- The Deity departed neither from his soul nor from his body. (49) The Saviour gave his blood as ransom for captive mankind to "the Enemy," since the latter had made that his condition. ---- On the contrary, not to "the Enemy" but to God and the Father did he offer it.

(50) Christ rose in a better and more wonderful fashion than the transfiguration on the mount. ----No, at the resurrection he did not change his body to correspond to the glory due him, but showed it such as it was before his death; the former is said by Cyril, the opposite by Dionysius of Alexandria. (51) On the 12th day of the first month Mary anointed the Lord with ointment in the house of Simon the leper; on the 13th the Lord handed to his disciples the mystical Supper; on the 14th he suffered his saving passion; on the 15th he rose from the dead; and ascended on the 10th. ---- No, on the 14th he ate the mystical Supper, on the 15th he was crucified, and rose on the 10th. ---- Not so either, but on the third day, and on Sunday, the resurrection of the Lord took place, and after forty days he ascended.

(52) From the fifth evening, when the Lord handed the mystic Supper to his disciples, his body had been sacrificed. [So far the author has treated with few exceptions of the general teachings and questions of the church, for the most part with contrasted utterances ----supplying both members of the antithesis, but framing besides a few chapters with single testimonies. From this point on, however, he takes up particular topics, eighteen in number:] (1) What the views of Severus were on the mystagogues of the church; and (2) what his attitude was in his letter

to Thomas, bishop of Germanicia, toward what had been said by Cyril and John of Antioch; and (3) that he did not approve the utterances of St. Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, on the apokatastasis, nor (4) Papias, bishop of Hierapolis and martyr, nor (5) Irenaeus, the saintly bishop of Lyons, in so far as these assert that the kingdom of heaven consists in the enjoyment of certain material foods.

(6) Basil, the saint, in many passages does not approve of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, especially in so far as he leans toward the party of the Arians. Yet he apologizes for him as not moved by impious purpose, but as having been brought, by arguing against Sabellius, to the expression of bad views in the opposite direction; also he says that his language concerning the Spirit is not perfectly correct. (7) But the great Athanasius also makes a strong defense of Dionysius: "Dionysius," he says, "neither at any time held the views of Arius nor failed to see the truth; for neither was he charged with impiety by other bishops, nor did he use Arian language in his teaching." (8) But Theodoret too said the same of him. |212 (9) In addition he adduces testimonies as to the attitude of Theophilus and his synod toward St. John Chrysostom, (10) and what view Atticus and (11) Cyril took of this holy man; (12) what opinions the very discreet Isidore of Pelusium held concerning the Alexandrian bishops and St. John Chrysostom, how he complained of the former for his hatred of Chrysostom, but praised and admired the latter. (13) Severus, starting out to blame St. Isidore but having no good grounds, invented the charge of "Origenism," but again, convinced of the truth, withdrew it of his own accord.

(14) Further, the opinions of Hippolytus and Epiphanius concerning Nicolaus, one of the seven deacons, and their severe charges against him. Ignatius Theophorus, however, Clement, author of the Stromata, Eusebius Pamphili, and Theodoret of Cyrus, while they bring charges against the Nicolaitan sect, declare that Nicolaus himself was not a man of that kind. (15) Hippolytus and Irenaeus say that the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not by him, but Clement and Eusebius and many other theophoric fathers count it in among his other epistles and say that the aforesaid Clement translated it from the Hebrew. (16) The great Athanasius of Alexandria approved Origen and Theognos-tus in many points of doctrine, Titus of Bostra does the same, and the theologian Gregory in his letters calls Origen "friend of beauty and goodness," and he of Nyssa brings him to remembrance with praise. But also Dionysius of Alexandria praises him in a letter addressed to him, as well as in a second letter, after Origen's death, to Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea. And Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem and martyr, likewise in a letter to Origen, becomes most friendly. Theophilus and Epiphanius detest Origen.

(17) The opinion of the most holy Hippolytus on the sect of the Montanists, and that of St. Gregory of Nyssa. [The above comprise the more special chapters. Once more he turns to a more general question, and cites statements on the theme] (18) that every departed soul has great advantage from the prayers and sacrifices and

alms offered in his behalf; ---- on the contrary that it does not. [As far as this we find that Gobarus brought his work.] § 1. The Person and Work of Gobarus Photius appears to know the author only from the work from which he presents excerpts (Στέφανός τις). The surname Gobarus bids us seek the author in Syria; at least he must have been held in repute among Syrian Monophysites; for the word is not Greek, and may probably be traced back to gebar (meaning 'man,' 'hero'). The express designation of the author as a "tritheist" Photius may have derived from the work itself; but this is not evident from his excerpts. The designation makes it certain that the terminus a quo for the date of the work is to be set not long before the middle of the sixth century. The authors whom Gobarus quotes in his work afford no certain indication of the province in which Gobarus worked and wrote. Walch (l. c, p. 883) feels justified in reckoning him among Egyptian teachers, "since he seems best acquainted with the Alexandrian controversies and church fathers." The observation is correct, but whether it suffices to determine the locality will have to be investigated.

It is evident from the whole nature and learned attitude of the book that Gobarus was what was called both in the sixth century and at other times a 'grammaticus.' It is possible indeed that the surname 'Gobarus' may be explained by this fact; perhaps it meant 'doctor irrefragabilis.' In a search among the countless 'Stephani' with whom ours might be identified, Stephan Bar Sudaili is certainly not to be considered, because of his date and his peculiar doctrine; on the other hand it is tempting to suggest an identification with the Alexandrian sophist, Stephanus Niobes, the extreme Monophysite, concerning whom we have a certain amount of information from |214 Timotheus and Dionysius Telmaharensis, and who worked in the last third of the sixth century. But since the surnames are different and cannot be identified without violence, since furthermore no positive testimonies support the identification, and since it cannot be certainly proved that Gobarus thought precisely as did his namesake in matters of christology (even though I, 19 does suggest this), this identification is probably inadvisable.

The work from which Photius quotes bore no title ---- otherwise he would have mentioned it; moreover it contained nothing as to its purposes, and these are not obvious at first glance. Was it perchance mutilated at the beginning and perhaps also at the close? The latter as well as the former is abrupt, and Photius seems to have felt the abrupt conclusion (τὸν μὲν οὖν Γόβαρον μέχρι τούτων τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸν πόνον εὕρομεν ἀναδεξάμενον). But if he had been dealing with a doubly mutilated work, he would have so stated. Everything is explained if we assume that Photius had before him not a book from the hand of the author himself, but a compilation by another, possibly a disciple of Gobarus, who made this collection for himself and others on the basis of the master's lectures or disputations, perhaps with the latter's knowledge. This hypothesis is supported by the observation that, so far as we know, this unique work remained unnoticed down to Photius, while on

the contrary one would have expected it to create the greatest sensation; and is confirmed by the lack of orderly arrangement which we observe in it. To be sure, disorder is by no means unfamiliar in the literature of question and response, nor is it surprising there, because the questions were answered as they came; in this work, however, the questions obviously serve a single definite purpose and are put by the author himself, or rather |215 they are not questions and answers at all, but theses and antitheses. Why then this lack of order? Or is the disorder purposed? Did Gobarus mean thereby to indicate that he could at will dip into the tradition and always find what he sought?

One further observation must be noted. Photius states at the outset that the work embraces about fifty-two chapters in theses and antitheses relating to general ecclesiastical controversies, ---- "about," because a few chapters of more special content (merikw&tera) are appended. Photius does not number the chapters; but there are in fact fifty-two. Yet in fact, after the fifty-second chapter, he quite unexpectedly informs us that there are eighteen further special chapters (ἰδικὰ κεφάλαια), and gives excerpts from these also. Did he fail to notice these in the beginning? We have no light on the matter. Photius's distinction, however, between general ecclesiastical controversies and special questions (which does not coincide with the other distinction between two-membered and one-membered chapters) is merely imposed externally upon the work, although according to Photius it is intended to explain the plan of the two parts. For, as Photius himself remarks, the first part contains not only several one-membered sections, but also numerous ἰδικὰ κεφάλαια, and the second part has a chapter (No. 18) dealing with a general ecclesiastical controversy. The distinction between the two parts ---- though it is not carried through consistently ---- lies rather in the fact that the second part contains numerous personally determined problems, including (1) a group of Severus's judgments upon older church fathers, and (2) contradictory judgments of the fathers on Dionysius of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Origen, the Nicolaitans, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Montanists. To these there are no parallels in the first part.

Since the work from which Photius made excerpts was probably not edited by the author himself; since it has no title; since it makes no direct statement of its purposes; since Photius likewise gave no account of these purposes; and, finally, since in the excerpts of the first and more extensive part it is |216 hardly ever stated which church fathers supported the thesis and which the antithesis, or on which side the author himself stands, it is uncommonly hard to reach a satisfactory notion of the author's purpose and of the man himself. § 2. Theological and Philosophical Position To determine the theological position of Monophysite teachers of the sixth century is well known to be difficult, for the subject of christology had become extremely complicated. It was weighted down with theological, trinitarian, cosmological, anthropological, and eschatological questions, and the combinations led to

differences of position, even with theologians who were on the main question not far apart. A teacher could thus stand on the extreme right in one group of questions and in others be "liberal." We must be constantly on our guard here against an undue requirement of "consistency."

In his introduction to the work of Gobarus Photius remarks that, of the theses and antitheses, one always contains the ecclesiastical view, the other, the view to be rejected. This assertion is misleading, both because in many cases there was no "ecclesiastical" view of the problem in question, and because it is often hard to say which the ecclesiastical view is. And it is very often obscure what Gobarus's own view is. The hypothesis that it is always the thesis or always the antithesis that contains his theology, breaks down; indeed, a careful reading speedily leads to the suspicion that in many chapters he was interested in neither the thesis nor the antithesis, but solely in the contradiction itself. The difficulty of discovering his own theological position from such evidence is plain. Nevertheless it is possible to reach some clear conclusions with regard to Gobarus's theology and christology: 1. Photius terms him a "tritheist."

2. The famous Monophysite Severus was an authority of first rank for Gobarus. In I, 41 Gobarus sets his interpretation of the saying, "But of that day and hour," etc., over against that of all other teachers, whom Photius calls "the doctors of the church" (that is, the Chalcedonians). In II, 1-5 Gobarus |217 gives Severus's judgments on "the holy mystagogues of the church," and on Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, Papias, and Irenaeus; for no other teacher has he shown such clear preference. He does, to be sure, in II, 13 admit a change of opinion on the part of Severus, but he remarks that it came about δι' ἐαυτοῦ, and so is not to the discredit of the great teacher, since he allowed himself to be conquered by the truth. 3. II, 13, however, proves that Gobarus was no Origenist,and that consequently in the Origenistic controversies he is not to be reckoned among the apologists of the famous theologian. He even considers it a reproach to be an Origenist.

4. Chapters I, 19, 20, with one member each, show that in regard to the body of Christ Gobarus taught "that the immortal body of Christ, incapable of suffering or of being wounded, is of another nature and another kind than ours, further that Christ will come again, not in the flesh, but on the contrary in pure deity, and finally that the perishable and mortal (i.e. our flesh), will undergo an essential transformation when the change to imperishability and immortality befalls it." In connection with the second of these statements Photius remarks that in support of it Gobarus has adduced only sayings of Titus of Bostra, neglecting the countless contrary sayings, "here, as everywhere, revealing his impiousness, which by shamelessly and dogmatically denying the flesh gives expression to 'the one nature.'" Evidently Gobarus represents the same view as the Emperor Justinian, Stephanus Niobes, and

others with reference to the incorruptibility of Christ's body and its merely relative homogeneousness with our body (first statement), and further the doctrine of Johannes Philoponus that everything created (including the human body) really perishes, being fqarto&n, and attains imperishability only through an essential transformation (re-creation), as |218 set forth in the third statement. By I, 37 the doctrine of Gobarus is made still clearer. Following Pseudo-Justin (Cohortatio 23) in his polemic against Plato (Timaeus 41 B)----whom he misunderstands ---- he asserts that God by his will can not make imperishable the naturally perishable, even God's omnipotence being powerless in the face of this contradictory antilogy. A real re-creation is necessary ---- exactly as Philoponus teaches.

5. Gobarus was an Aristotelian; for (a) the proof that in spite of the doctrine just sketched the resurrection of the body can nevertheless be held could only be successfully advanced by the means of Aristotelian philosophy; (b) the chapters I, 21 and 37 (likewise I, 1 and 15) reveal this philosophy clearly, and the whole work (including its tritheism) dwells in the cool scientific atmosphere of Aristotle. 6. The affinity with Philoponus having been established ---- by tritheism, by the doctrines of the body and the resurrection, and by Aristotelianism, we recall the fact that this teacher composed a work Peri\ tou~ pa&sxa with the purpose of proving, on the basis of the Gospel of John, that the mystical Supper was not the passover supper, but that it took place on the 13th day of the month and that Jesus was crucified on the 14th. With this I, 45b, 51a, (52) should be compared; we see that on this question, too, Gobarus agreed with Philoponus.

7. On the basis of I, 19, 20, we may also claim I, 4b, 5b, 7a, 10b, 17a, 18b, 48b, 50a, as representing the opinion of Gobarus. This makes his theological position still clearer. It thus appears that as a philosopher Gobarus was an Aristotelian, as a theologian he stood very close to Philoponus, but also to that other famous Monophysite, Severus, whose position was markedly different from that of Philoponus. Origen he rejected. It is worth mentioning that Photius did not repudiate as heretical any of the fathers cited by Gobarus. The latter, |219 although a Monophysite, must have succeeded in giving his work such a form that Chalcedonian orthodoxy could not completely reject it. But, as is well known, the "heresy" of Monophysitism was a ticklish thing in the Eastern Empire in the sixth century. § 3. The Date of the Work From Photius's introduction it appears that Gobarus cited "ancient" and "later" fathers. So far as we can judge from the excerpts, the oldest were Ignatius (but it is Pseudo-Ignatius that is cited), Hegesippus, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria; the latest was Severus of Antioch, a leader of the Monophysites. Since Severus figures as an authority side by side with the ancient fathers, he cannot have been still alive; his death falls about the year 540. But this date brings us no new information beyond what has been established above, namely, that the terminus a quo is to be set shortly before the middle of the sixth century. Let us look further.

1. The teacher upon whom Gobarus is most dependent, Philoponus, was not mentioned by name in the work. That may be definitely affirmed; for if Photius had found this man in Gobarus among the "fathers," he would, with his deep repugnance to "Mataioponus " (see Photius, Bibl. LV, LXXV, XXI, XXIII), have animadverted upon this. Nor may it be asserted that Gobarus failed to mention Philoponus because the latter passed with Chalcedonian orthodoxy as a heretic, for not until much later, at the sixth Council, was he condemned as such. We can only infer that Philoponus was not mentioned by Gobarus because he was still alive. Since Philoponus attacked the patriarch of Constantinople, Johannes Scholasticus (565-577), he was certainly still living about the year 570. Hence our work is to be assigned to the period ca. 540 to ca. 570 (or even later). |220 2. Gobarus regarded Origenism (II, 13) as an actual heresy. This renders it probable that he wrote after the fifth Council, and presumably brings the terminus a quo for our work to the years 553-ca. 570 (ca. 580?).

3. It is striking that no reference to tritheism is made in the work (unless perhaps in I, 1 ?), while nevertheless the sole theological characterization which Photius makes of Gobarus is "tritheist." Now it will appear in the sequel that the chief intent of the work was to overthrow church tradition as such. In a Monophysite who revered Severus and claimed to be a conservative this purpose can have been evoked only by some strongly felt dogmatic aim (or by some burning ecclesiastical question of the day). No aim of that kind is to be gathered from the work itself; hence the probability that Gobarus's purpose was the defence of tritheism by overthrowing tradition in general, and that for this reason he said nothing of tritheism itself. In that case the work probably belongs to the time of Justin II (565-578). This dating combines excellently with the one given above, and we thus gain for our work the date 565 -ca. 570, or, in case Philoponus attained a very advanced age and Gobarus took part in the earliest stages of the tritheistic controversy, 553-ca. 580. The date ca. 600, given in many books, |221 lacks, so far as I know, all foundation. Of the dogma of energies and wills, which came to the front as early as about 600, no trace is found in the work. It remains surprising that our book is not mentioned in the work of John of Ephesus; but it has already been remarked that we are but imperfectly acquainted with John's work and that the work of Gobarus was probably not "edited."

§ 4. Plan, Contents, and Purpose of the Work The peculiar character of the work resides in the fact, first, that it shows little trace of arrangement and order; secondly, that it does not contain a statement of its purpose; thirdly, that according to Photius's testimony the author refrained both from dogmatic reflections and from citing biblical proof-texts; and, fourthly, that he merely put together citations from the church fathers, usually in theses and antitheses. Which church fathers Gobarus cited, almost entirely eludes our inquiry so far as the first and larger part of the work is concerned, for in only a few places has Photius named them in his short

excerpts. In I, 13, he mentions Hegesippus's Hypomnenata; in I, 15, 19, Titus of Bostra (Against the Manichees); in I, 36, Severian of Gabala and Irenaeus; in I, 37, Pseudo-Justin (Cohortatio); in I, 38-41, Eustathius of Antioch, Cyril of Alexandria, "the doctors of the church," Severus of Antioch; in I, 50, Cyril and Dionysius of Alexandria. In these few cases the mention of the names had its motive in special considerations in the mind of Photius. In the second and shorter part, the situation is different. Here all the fathers whom Gobarus cited are named by Photius, except |222 in II, 18. He had to name them here, because it was a matter of ἰδικὰ κεφάλαια.

It therefore remains obscure on what scale, or with what thoroughness, Gobarus adduced citations from the church fathers in the first part. But if his procedure was here as thorough as in II, 14 (concerning the Nicolaitans), we must form a very favorable judgment of his erudition, for in this instance he has mentioned with approximate completeness all the fathers who in any way came into consideration on this question. And Photius in his introduction has paid tribute to the author's industry. |223 With reference to their subject-matter the chapters may be divided into the following groups: (1) Christology and the life of Jesus, I, 1-3, 17-20, 22, 38-52. (2) The doctrine of the resurrection and eschatology, I, 4-7, 10-16, 36, 37; II, 18. (3) The doctrine of the being of God, of man, and of creation, I, 8, 9, 23-35. (4) Logic, I, 21. (5) Judgments on men of the church, and on controversies connected with their names, and related matters, II, 1-17.

The classification under the first three groups as given above is, however, modern, and hardly in accord with the views of Gobarus himself, for in all three are included chapters which in the view of that age were closely related, treating as they do the question as to the nature and mutual relation of the divine and the human, of the psychical and the corporeal, of the celestial and the earthly, of the uncreated and the created, of |224 the imperishable and the perishable. If we allow to this question the extraordinary latitude that it possessed in the cosmological and the nearly related christological speculation of the time, then the following chapters belong more or less closely together: I, 1, 4-15, 17-20, 22-26, 28-43, 48, 50 (probably also 45, 51, 52, and the chapter on logic, I, 21). Thus in the first part only eight chapters remain which no art can contrive to subordinate to that main topic, viz., I, 2, 3, 16, 27, 44, 46, 47, and 49. To these are to be added the seventeen κεφάλαια ἰδικά of the second part, together with chapter II, 18.

With reference to these twenty-six pieces of utterly varied content there can be no doubt that Gobarus adduced them solely for the purpose of showing how the church fathers contradict each other; for what other motive can be discovered for this juxtaposition of unrelated topics? With reference, however, to the forty-four first-mentioned pieces it is equally beyond doubt that„ parallel with the main interest of discrediting tradition by laying bare its contradictions, a second interest was

present. The author desired, namely, to enounce the Aristotelian-Monophysite conception (represented by Philoponus) of the relation of the uncreated to the created (of the indestructible to the perishable), and so to give expression to the appropriate doctrine of the incarnation and of the one nature of the Redeemer (with special reference to his body).Photius himself reproaches Gobarus here with partisan choice of his witnesses and with misunderstanding (I, 15, 19, 36, 37). |225 The aims of the work are thus disclosed. In an ecclesiastical controversial question ---- presumably that of tritheism ---- the tritheist Gobarus, confronted by the very embarrassing appeal of his opponents to the authority of tradition, resorted to the violent expedient of discrediting tradition itself, and in the process he gave vigorous expression to his Aristotelian-Monophysite theology and christology.

The work of Gobarus is unique in the whole literature of the Greek church. When one considers what tradition signifies in the Greek church, and that the whole dogma is built up on traditional proof, the boldness of Gobarus is amazing. From |226 the time of the heretic Marcion no one in the church had undertaken any such thing. It was precisely in the tritheistic controversy that the chief rôle was played by proof from the testimonies of the fathers ---- and just at that moment Gobarus wrote his "Sic et Non," and uncovered the contradictions to be found in the works of the most celebrated church fathers.

How did he come to do it? Where did he get the courage and the capacity for such an undertaking? It is to be remembered that since the end of the fifth century Aristotelianism had regained ascendancy in learned study. Gobarus believed in the controlling significance of ratio and dialectic, looked with scorn upon the traditionalists, and believed himself able to dispense with their weapons. This is where Gobarus belongs; but he alone among the teachers of the church was consistent. The others clung to the principle, "ratio et autoritas", but Gobarus took his stand on ratio alone, and annihilated tradition. How much this meant in that age, we can scarcely realize today. Nor do we know whether Gobarus made his murderous book accessible to wider circles or only communicated it to friends and disciples; the boldest are not always the most courageous, and we hear nothing of a controversy, and consequently nothing of a success. The further fact is important, and shows his caution, that he formulated no conclusions; he simply let the facts speak for themselves by placing them side by side in the form of theses and antitheses. Thus he remained protected as to his own person, and further proved his caution by not exposing himself to criticism in the collection and combination of his patristic citations. Photius has scarcely anywhere found occasion to reproach him with partisanship, still less with untrustworthiness or falsification. He assumed the mask of a calm "reviewer," but who can doubt that he intended to discredit tradition in all fields by demonstrating its contradictions with reference to the doctrines of God and Christ, of the perishable and the imperishable, of heaven, paradise, and hell, of the Bible, history, and chronology? |227

Many things have been repeated in history, including the history of ecclesiastical thought; but so perfect a parallel as that between Abaelard, with his work "Sic et Non," and Gobarus and his nameless work is not likely to be found again. In one hundred and fifty-eight chapters Abaelard, without adding anything or drawing conclusions of his own, combines theses and antitheses in reference to the most varied doctrines ---- with precisely the same purpose as Gobarus, to undermine the authority of tradition and so clear the way for the royal ratio, that is, for doubt and science (Wissenschaft). But it was because at the opening of the twelfth century the situation of thought was much like that of the sixth century, that this second Gobarus then appeared. Since the middle of the eleventh century Aristotelianism with its ratio and its confidence in dialectic had again been on the scene, opposing the musty "science" that relied on tradition, exactly as it had opposed it in the sixth century in the person of Gobarus. The only difference is that Abaelard placed at the head of his work a "Preface " which is a masterpiece of courage and shrewdness, and at the same time a supreme achievement of mediaeval thought.

That Abaelard was ignorant of the work of Gobarus makes their agreement the more striking, and serves to enhance confidence in the conclusion that in the two cases alike the inner logic of the development of events has led through the |228 intervention of Aristotelianism to the same phenomena. It even happens that a few chapters are alike in content : cf. Abaelard, chapter 23 ("quod 'Spiritus domini ferebatur super aquas' intelligendum sit de Spiritu Sancto, et non") with Gobarus I, 28; Abaelard, chapter 46 (the angels created before the world, et non) with Gobarus I, 23, etc. "Hoc genus literarum [the patristic tradition] non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate legendum est " ---- this liberating utterance of Abaelard (Praefatio, p. 14) expresses, we may be sure, the opinion of Gobarus as well. Appendix Gobarus's Contributions to the Exegesis of New Testament Passages and to the Church History of the first three Centuries

(a) New Testament. On I, 2: According to the traditional reckoning based on Luke 1, 26, etc., the Baptist was born on the 24th of June, and was conceived on the 24th of September. This corresponds to December 25 as the date for the birth of Jesus. If the fifth (sixth) of January is taken for the birth of Jesus, and John's birth put six months earlier, the conception of John will be moved forward into October. Thus neither thesis nor antithesis here contemplates December 25 as the date of the birth of Jesus. This is very remarkable. Those who shifted the conception of John to November proceeded from January 6 as the date of the birth of Jesus (conception on the 6th of April) and reckoned back not six, but only five, months, because Luke 1, 26 says that Gabriel was sent to Mary in the sixth month. This brought them to the month of November. So far as I know, such a calculation does not appear elsewhere in the tradition.

On I, 3: The two familiar dates for the birth of Jesus stand here, just as they stood opposed to each other in the fourth, and the third, century. On I, 10: The thousand years belong to the Apocalypse of John, the resurrection of beasts to Isaiah 11; but the revelling |229 for one thousand years and marriage go back to Papias or his sources of information in Asia Minor. Cerinthus (Eusebius, H. E. iii. 28) was certainly not cited by Gobarus, since the latter left heretics unnoticed. On I, 15: Photius has not adduced the antithesis here, for he forthwith criticizes the thesis; but in the antithesis the eternity of the punishments of hell must have been affirmed, with an appeal to the Apocalypse, in which endless punishment is taught. On I, 43 (Matthew 11, 11): The application of mikro&teroj to Jesus is found in many fathers ; with that to John the Evangelist I am not otherwise acquainted. It is a curiosity, and bears witness to the special esteem for the Evangelist; perhaps it is to be found among the Syrians.

On I, 44 (Jesus' age) : It is interesting at so late a date to meet with the view that Jesus lived to be almost fifty; the idea goes back to Irenaeus, whom Gobarus had read (Adv. haer. ii. 22 and Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, chapter 74, on the basis of John 8, 57 and the testimony of the Asia Minor presbyters). On I, 45 : This relates to the well-known question on which the Synoptics and John part company; Philoponus accepted the date as given by John. On I, 46 (John 3, 14) : This, like chapters 44, 45, 47, relates to passages from the Gospel of John, which the Monophysites specially esteemed (see above, on I, 43). The interpretation of the brazen serpent received much attention from the fathers, and with precisely the formulation of the problem here given. On I, 47: So far as I know, the tradition that it was Thomas who struck off Malchus's ear is not found elsewhere. The statement perhaps stood as a gloss in a Synoptic gospel (John alone mentions Peter) ; and presumably in Greater Syria, for in this patriarchate Thomas played the chief rôle.

On I, 51, 52: Since no antithesis stands in chapter 52, we must assume that Gobarus himself shared the view held by Monophysites, that the sacrifice of the body of Christ took place in the breaking of the bread at the celebration of the Last Supper. ---- With reference to the last dates in the history of |230 Jesus Gobarus states not merely two, but three views, the third being that of the church. The other two have this in common, that the resurrection is assigned to the day after the crucifixion; but they differ in two other points: (1) the first follows John, the second the Synoptics; (2) the first puts the ascension one day after the resurrection, the second is silent about it. Both the dating of the resurrection but one day after the crucifixion and the dating of the ascension one day after the resurrection are otherwise unknown, or at most there are only uncertain testimonies for the assignment of the resurrection to the day after the crucifixion; see W. Bauer, Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 1909, pp. 158 ff., 253 ff., 306 ff., and E. Preuschen in the Protestantische Realencyclopädie, XIV, pp. 725 ff. I cannot here enter upon an investigation of these remarkable statements of dates,

and will merely remark that those who assigned the resurrection to the day after the crucifixion followed a peculiar reckoning of the nights. On II, 14:

In the question of the tradition concerning the Nicolaitans Gobarus has not only apprehended the salient point but also cited almost all the material (noting even the passage hidden away in Pseudo-Ignatius, Trall. 11, who, it should be noted, was read with special diligence among the Monophysites, and regarded as a high authority). Of the witnesses for the innocence of the Nicolaitans only Const. Apost. vi. 8 is lacking. It is to be further observed that Gobarus has produced the witnesses in proper chronological order. Whether Hippolytus's Syntagma or his Refutatio is meant can not be decided. The question whether the deacon Nicolaus himself turned into a wild Gnostic was destined to disquiet the church more and more.

On II, 15 (Epistle to the Hebrews) : It is remarkable that Gobarus entirely omits the view that this epistle, in its extant form, was written by Paul. That not only Hippolytus and Irenaeus but also the Latin tradition concerning the epistle receives no mention from him was to be expected. The failure of Hippolytus to accept Hebrews as a Pauline epistle, can be shown from Eusebius, II. E. vi. 20 and Photius, Bibliotheca XLVIII; in both cases the name Hippolytus is wrongly |231 interchanged with the name Caius ; Gobarus is thus independent of Eusebius. That Irenaeus did not reckon the epistle a part of the New Testament, we know indirectly; Gobarus, however, must have had positive information that Irenaeus recognized only thirteen Pauline epistles, otherwise he could not have expressed himself so definitely. The statement about Eusebius came from H. E. iii. 38; and the slip of the pen (confusing the Roman and the Alexandrian Clement) is thereby explained. Gobarus has combined Eusebius's statement with that of the Alexandrian Clement, although they do not entirely agree in their views about the origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

After I, 40, 41, Gobarus gave the interpretation of the doctors of the church and Severus for the difficult passage in Matthew 24, 36; unfortunately Photius has given us neither the interpretations nor the names of these doctors. (b) Fathers of the First Centuries. On II, 4 : Severus of Antioch still knew the work of Papias, unless he derived from Irenaeus v. 33, 3 f. the statement that according to Papias the kingdom of heaven consists in the enjoyment of certain material foods. This derivation is, however, very probable, since (II, 5) Severus mentioned Irenaeus in the same breath with Papias. From I, 10 it follows (see above) that Gobarus was acquainted with Papias, but here too the acquaintance may have been merely indirect.

On I, 13 : From the historical point of view the most interesting statement made by Gobarus is the quotation from Hegesippus. It reads: τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίος ἀγαθὰ οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν Ψπομνημάτων, μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα

φαμένους, τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος· Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, καψ ἐξῆς. The statement "in the fifth book" gives to the quotation a special degree of certainty. That Hegesippus |232 attacked Paul is extremely unlikely, first because he gives the citation in a form different from that of Paul in 1 Corinthians 2, 9, secondly because he speaks of more than one who use (or misuse) the saying, and finally because in Paul himself it is a quotation, and we know numerous passages in which it is cited as a word of Scripture or of the Lord. The real state of things can only be as follows: Hegesippus had in mind in his polemic heretics who misused the saying for their celestial fantasies, and did not remember that it is found in Paul as well. But Gobarus knew the saying only as Pauline, and, finding it rejected in Hegesippus, seized on it in order to show that even an ancient and apostolic man had contradicted an apostle. Could there be a stronger testimony to the uncertainty of tradition? Whether Gobarus had the citation at first or second hand, cannot be certainly determined; but the exactness of the formula of citation favors the former assumption.

On I, 36: That Gobarus made direct or indirect use of Irenaeus, see above on I, 44, II, 4 f., 15; but from I, 36 it follows that he also mentioned a view of Irenaeus as to the abode of the soul after its departure from the body. The reference is to Irenaeus v. 31, 2: αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν ἀόραντον τόπον τὸν ὡρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, κτλ. On II, 17: Among the quotations from Hippolytus is found also his judgment on Montanism, at least it is stated that this was different from that of Gregory of Nyssa. Since Gregory, like Basil, did not concede the validity of the Montanists' baptism, Hippolytus must have acknowledged it, which, in the light of Refutatio viii. 19, is very probable.

On I, 9, 12, 14, 31; II, 3-5,16: So far as we can see, Gobarus never quoted Origen as a witness for a thesis or antithesis. The |233 chapters here grouped together relate to teachings of Origen which were supported by orthodox teachers also (especially by Gregory of Nyssa). ---- I, 12: Since Origen taught that after the fall man was thrust down from paradise (situated in the third heaven), he must also have taught that "the trees of paradise are endowed with reason and with intelligence and logos," although I do not recall having read this in Origen. (Is it perhaps to be found in Gregory of Nyssa?) -----I, 14: The doctrine that punishments purify, and that finally even the wicked, having been purified by their punishments, are redeemed, is as much the teaching of Origen as is the doctrine of the preexistence of souls, the doctrine of the investment with flesh after the soul's fall (I, 30), the view that the "skins" are the bodies (I, 9), and the doctrine of apocatastasis, for which Gobarus (II, 3) cites Gregory of Nyssa. It is worthy of note that in I, 31 the souls of Moses, the prophets, Socrates, Plato, John the Baptist, the Apostles, and, above all, that of the Lord are enumerated as eminent souls ---- a "liberal" grouping which is certainly that of Origen, but which Gobarus must have read also in Gregory of Nyssa or in some other admittedly orthodox admirer of Origen. ---- The catalogue of Origen's

partisans and opponents in II, 16 gives us no new information (but see the following paragraph) ; it is based in part on Eusebius's Church History (see Alexander of Jerusalem, Eus., H. E. vi. 14).

On I, 50; II, 6-8, 16: Our knowledge of the literary activity of Dionysius of Alexandria is really enlarged by Gobarus. That Dionysius addressed a letter to his old teacher Origen at the time of the latter's martyrdom (II, 16) is, indeed, mentioned by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 46) ; similarly the judgments (II, 6, 7) of Athanasius, Basil (compare the thorough exposition in Feltoe, "The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria," 1904), and Theodoret (II, 8) on Dionysius are well known; but only from Gobarus (II, 16) do we learn that Dionysius wrote to Theotecnus of Caesarea in praise of Origen, and further, that he taught that the body in which the risen Lord appeared was of the same nature as before (I, 50), and hence not yet transformed into its future glory, nor such as it was at the |234 transfiguration. In what work (or letter) Dionysius taught this, cannot be determined. (If I am not mistaken, Feltoe has overlooked this statement.) It is surprising to meet this realistic view in an Alexandrian.

On I, 37: Gobarus cited the infrequently quoted Cohortatio of (Pseudo-) Justin (chapter 23; there from a passage from Plato), perhaps under the name Ἔλεγχος (see my Altchristliche Literatur-Geschichte, II, 2, pp. 151 ff.). [Footnotes moved to the end] 1. This title I have supplied. The manuscript tradition gives only the name of the author. 2. Cave does not mention the writer, and there is no article on him in either the Protestant or the Catholic Realencyclopädie, or in the Dictionary of Christian Biography. In Fabricius-Harles, vol. X, p. 757, we find only a misleading list of the authors named in Photius's extracts from the work; and Krumbacher barely alludes to it. Bardenhewer (Patrologie, 2d ed., 1901, p. 479) says: "Among the famous writers of the tritheistic party [for this 'fame' I have found no evidence, unless it be the surname 'Gobarus'] was numbered Stephanus Gobarus, about 600 [for this date there is no evidence], now known only through extracts from his chief work [but we know of no other works] in Photius."

3. He is not found either in Leontius or in Severus (although not all the writings of Severus are accessible in print). Mention of him is lacking also in the church histories of Evagrius and of John of Ephesus (although we do not possess the whole of the latter's great work). In later writers also my search has so far been in vain. For a possible identification, see below. 4. That is, of Gobarus. 5. καὶ οὐκ ἀθρόον πάντες, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μέρος. I am not sure about the understanding of this sentence. 6. That is, God. 7. That is, for the risen. 8. This remark is by Photius, since he never makes Gobarus speak in the first person. 9. I am not quite sure of the translation; τὸ καίεσθαι καὶ μὴ κατακαίεσθαι φθοράν ἐστιν ἄφθαρτον φθείρεσθαι. 10. And hence eternal. 11. Walch (l. c. p. 881) renders ὁ μέλλων αἰών by "the coming century," a translation which seems to me impossible.

12. The reading should be: καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὸ πνεῦμα αἰώνοις (Mss. αἰώνιον). 13. ὅτι οὐ πρόσκαιρος ἦν οὔτε ψυχή, ἀλλὰ νοῦς: corrupt text, but how emend it? 14. He refers to Pseudo-Justin, Cohortatio. 15. That is, Basil. 16. μάλιστα δὲ ἐν οἷς τὸ ἀριανῶν ἔθνος ἐπερείδεται. I am not sure of the translation I have given; τῷ ἔθνει would be expected. 17. Pseudo-Ignatius. 18. While the numbers 1-52 are certain (since Photius counted up the total, and in one instance [38] has given the number of the chapter), in the second half of the book the reader is in doubt as to how to arrive at the number 18 given by Photius. The system adopted above for numbering the single pieces is not satisfactory, but I can find no better one. The surmise that chapters were here missing, I have considered, and rejected. 19. Nevertheless the 'o' is not satisfactorily explained.

20. Yet the designation may have been based on I, 1. (References to the fifty-two chapters of Gobarus's first, and "general," series are denoted by I; those to the eighteen chapters of his second, and "more special," series by II.) 21. Photius has named comparatively few of these in his extracts. 22. Gobarus's reputation must, however, have been limited to a local circle; otherwise he and his work could not have remained in such obscurity. 23. For Dionysius Telmaharensis consult Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis, II, pp. 72 ff. 24. Cf. Walch, 1. c, pp. 778 ff.; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, II. (2d ed), pp. 575 f.; Krüger, Protestantische Realencyklopädie, XIII, pp. 400 f. He became the founder of the Niobites (Adiaphorites), who attributed to Christ in the strictest sense only one nature. 25. In some places cognate material is grouped together; but this is the exception rather than the rule. 26. On the great difficulty in the numbering here see what has been said above.

27. This designation is due to Photius, not to Gobarus; what men are actually meant is uncertain. 28. From II, 16 this is not evident. 29. This inference is to be drawn also from II, 3-5 : in matters of eschatology Gobarus took a correct intermediate position, rejecting both apocatastasis and chiliasm. 30. See Walch, 1. c, VIII, pp. 771 ff., Schönfelder, Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus, 1862, pp. 301 ff., Dictionary of Christian Biography, III, pp. 425 ff. The controversy as to the resurrection ended about the year 582. 31. The preference for Titus of Bostra (I, 15, 19; II, 16) likewise certainly results from the latter's Antiochian and rational, Aristotelian character, as does perhaps the preference (if one may call it such) for Severian of Gabala (I, 36). 32. That Photius did not reject Clement is not surprising. Thomas of Germanicia, Severus's letter to whom is mentioned in II, 2, was banished in 520 under Justin I as a Monophysite. He died in exile at Samosata about 541. Severus's letter to him is preserved (Wright, Catalogue, pp. 730, 567).

33. Philoponus's literary activity began at latest in the year 529. 34. The obscurity which long covered the date of Philoponus has been dispelled by recent investigations (Ritter, Geschichte der Philosophie, VI, pp. 501 ff.; Stöckl, in Wetzer and Weite, Kirchenlexikon, VI, columns 1748ff.; Dictionary of Christian Biography, p.

420). Nevertheless the year of his death can be given only approximately. The tradition that he was still alive in the first quarter of the seventh century as a contemporary of Georgius Pisides or of the emperor Heraclius is incompatible with the certainly determined dates. 35. For the course of the Origenistic controversies see Diekamp, Die Origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Konzil, 1899; and Jülicher's review, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1900, No. 6. 36. Cf. Schönfelder, 1. c, pp. 267 ff. ("der Tritheistenstreit"; the author has paid scant attention to chronology) ; Dictionary of Christian Biography, p. 426. The beginnings of the Aristotelian-tritheistic movement (Askusnages) fall in the first half of Justinian's reign, and Philoponus taught his tritheism before 550, but only under Justin II did matters develop into a public controversy which agitated the church, and into that memorable disputation between the two groups of Monophysite teachers (the tritheists and the antitritheists) which the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, Johannes Scholasticus, held by order of the emperor (Photius, Bibliotheca XXIV; Evagrius, H. E., v. 4). By a chance coincidence one spokesman of the antitritheistic party was named Stephanus.

37. Where Gobarus is to be looked for, remains problematical. Statistically a preponderance of references in the citations relate to Alexandria in Egypt; but since almost all these cases relate to great ecclesiastical persons and actions (Origen, Dionysius, Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril), and since we do not know whether Gobarus's citations are at first or second hand, the result is after all a non liquet. Nevertheless the interest in Isidore of Pelusium inclines the balance in favor of Egypt, and the close relationship to Philoponus supports this conjecture. On the other hand, the surname Gobarus points to Syria, as has been said above. The question is of slight importance, for the reason that in the second half of the sixth century the Syrian and the Alexandrian Monophysites maintained an intimate intercourse with one another, and there were always many Syrians in Alexandria. 38. The Catalogue of Fabricius-Harles has confused the fathers (and other persons) actually quoted by Gobarus and those only mentioned in his citations, with the result of a distorted image. In the following paragraphs the two groups are distinguished.

(a) Fathers cited by Gobarus (whether at first or second hand cannot be determined) : Alexander of Jerusalem (probably taken from Eusebius's Church History), II, 16 Athanasius, II, 7, 16 Atticus of Constantinople, II, 10 Basil, II, 6 Clement of Alexandria, II, 14, 15 (probably quoting from Eusebius) Cyril of Alexandria, I, 39, 50 and II, 11 Dionysius of Alexandria, I, 50 and II, 16 "The doctors of the church," I, 40 Epiphanius, II, 14, 16 Eusebius of Caesarea, II, 14, 15 Eustathius of Antioch, I, 38 Gregory of Nazianzus, II, 16 Gregory of Nyssa, II, 16, 17 Hegesippus, I, 13 Hippolytus, II, 14, 15, 17 Pseudo-Ignatius, II, 14 Irenaeus, I, 36, 44 and II, 15 Isidore of Pelusium, II, 12 Pseudo-Justin, I, 37 Severian of Gabala, I, 36 Severus of Antioch, I, 41 and II, 1-5, 13 Theodoret, II, 8, 14 Theophilus of Alexandria, II, 9, 16 Titus of Bostra, I, 15, 19 and II, 16.

The Apostle John is cited in I, 15 and 43, as are the Apostles Peter and Thomas in I, 47, John the Baptist in I, 2, the Mother of God in I, 3 and 42, and another Mary in I, 51. Photius says in his introduction that for the "non-ecclesiastical" half of his sentences Gobarus had cited only (?) ancient fathers as authorities (in accordance with contemporary use of language he means pre-constantinian fathers). Thus we should probably have had many other citations from lost ancient writings, as well as that from Hegesippus, if Photius's excerpt were more detailed. As it is, we can only show that of pre-constantinian fathers Gobarus cited Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Alexander of Jerusalem, Hippolytus, and Dionysius of Alexandria (besides Pseudo-Ignatius and Pseudo-Justin). (b) Fathers and other persons mentioned in Gobarus's citations: Bishops of Alexandria, II, 12 Clement of Rome, II, 15 Dionysius of Alexandria, II, 6-8 Gregory of Nyssa, II, 3

Irenaeus, II, 6 Isidore of Pelusium, II, 13 John of Antioch, II, 2 The Montanists, II, 17 "Mystagogues of the church," II, 1 Nicolaus and the Nicolaitans, II, 14 Origen, II, 13 and 16 Papias, II, 4 Sabellius, II, 6 Theognostus, II, 16 Theotecnus, II, 16 Thomas of Germanicia, II, 2. Furthermore, Socrates, I, 31; Plato, I, 31 and 37. In I, 31 Moses, the prophets, Socrates, Plato, John the Baptist, and the Apostles are cited together. The Epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned in II, 15. 39. For even such a question as, for instance, that mentioned in I, 42, whether Mary suckled the Lord or not, is in the last analysis not only a question touching Mary (virginitas post partum), but also a question pertaining to the problem of the incarnation and the relation of the divine to the human. Similarly some mystery is certainly concealed behind I, 43, and at the bottom of the passover problem (I, 45, 51, 52) lies ultimately the problem of the body of Christ, and behind this the problem of the imperishable and the perishable.

40. Back of these two also may have lain for the author a problem of metaphysical christology. 41. This is shown in particular by the chapters in which Gobarus has given theses only, without antitheses. 42. If Gobarus had been guided exclusively by the purpose of discrediting tradition, it would remain obscure why in two-thirds of the cases he selected the contradictory utterances of tradition from a single field, however extensive. 43. In the second century there were indeed highly esteemed fathers who were tritheists; but they did not intend to be such ---- and they were subordinationists. The tri-theists of the sixth century had great difficulty in maintaining their ground in the face of tradition.

44. See my Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, II (4th ed., 1909), pp. 84 ff. Even so cautious a work as the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lerinum could not have been written in the East, for the idea of tradition was even more rigid here than in the West. Even the greatest theologian of the East and father of theological science in the Greek church took his stand firmly on the ground of ecclesiastical tradition. No one was permitted to depart from it. When the great Cappadocians were forced to

recognize that there was no certain proof from tradition for the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Ghost, they invented for this doctrine a παράδοσις ἄγραφος, being unable to believe that a tradition could be lacking. From the fifth century on the proof from tradition became the most important proof, for the biblical and the speculative proof yielded precedence to it. In the controversy that lasted for centuries between the orthodox party and the Monophysites and between the Monophysites among themselves, proof from tradition dominated all endeavors. Ere long mutual recrimination naturally broke out, with charges of partisan bias in the selection of evidence, of the misinterpretation, and even the falsification and invention of evidence. Thus Philoponus was reproached (Photius, Bibliotheca LXXV) with misusing for his tritheism the utterances of the fathers, in particular of Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Athanasius, and Cyril;

John of Ephesus tells us (Church History v. 10) that the tritheists had "put together a great book out of the living body of those writings of the holy fathers which they supposed to confirm and corroborate their heresy. "That," says John, "is what the law forbids: 'That which is torn with beasts he shall not eat' (Lev. 22, 8). So they too tore away dead members out of the discussions (arguments) of the holy fathers, thinking to prove that these likewise taught and enounced a number of deities and many gods, like the heathen. Especially interesting is the story told of Severus of Antioch (in Anastasius, Hodegos 6). It is said that in order to escape from the patristic proof-passages quoted by his opponents, which he was not able to refute, he repudiated these passages as forgeries in his work "Philalethes" (against John of Caesarea). This work was so highly esteemed by his adherents that they placed it even above the Gospel of John, and accepted only such utterances of the fathers as Severus had approved.

45. Cf. the preceding note. 46. Petri Abaelardi "Sic et Non" primum integrum ed. Henke et Lindenkohl, 1851. 47. Hence the judgment upon the work: "aeternis tenebris potius dignum quam luce" (Martène et Durand, Thesaurus nov. anecdotorum, V, Praefatio). 48. Cf. the opening sentence: "Cum in tanta verborum multitudine nonnulla etiam Sanctorum dicta non solum ab invicem diversa, verum etiam invicem adversa videntur," etc., and this from the concluding sentences: "Philosophus ille omnium perspicacissimus Aristoteles in praedicamento 'ad aliquid' adhortatur dicens: 'Fortasse autem difficile est de hujusmodi rebus confidenter declarare, nisi pertractatae sint saepe; dubitare autem de singulis non erit inutile.' " 49. One difference between Abaelard and Gobarus consists in the fact that the latter has also included in the scope of his antithetical work the mutually contradictory judgments of the fathers on leading persons and circumstances of church history. Abaelard refrained from this. But on the other hand both were careful not to quote in their citations "apocryphal" sayings (Abaelard, Praefatio, p. 17), and, like Gobarus, Abaelard too let Holy Writ alone; indeed, he expressly emphasized its certainty in contrast to tradition (Praefatio, pp. 10 ff.). The sugges-

tions in Abaelard's preface as to how the contradictions of tradition can be obviated are of no great consequence.

50. This characterization of Hegesippus must be due to Gobarus; Photius had no cause to characterize him in this way. 51. The following words: οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ παθών, belong to Photius (see above). 52. It was formerly held that this confirmed the Jewish Christianity of Hegesippus; but Hegesippus was not a Jewish Christian. 53. Neither τοῖς δικαίοις nor τὰ ἀγαθά is found in the verse from Paul. 54. Cf. Resch, Agrapha, 1889, pp. 102 ff., 154 ff.; also his Agrapha, 1906, pp. 25 ff.; Zahn, Forschungen, VI (1900), pp. 247 ff. τὰ ἀγαθά is also found in this saying in Athanasius, De virginitate 18, and in Origen, Hom. xviii. 15 in Jerem.; in Origen are also the words οἱ δίκαιοι; see also Const. Apost. vii. 32 and Epiphanius, Haer. 64, 69. On the apocryphal sayings compare also Acta Petri Vercell., p. 98 (ed. Lipsius) and my discussion in Texte und Untersuchungen, XLII, Heft 4, pp. 43, 49.

Source. English translation: an out-of-copyright translation as transcribed, or commissioned and given to the public domain, by Roger Pearse for his collection *Early Church Fathers – Additional Texts* (tertullian.org/fathers). SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. Footnotes are left out, and Greek or Latin words, square brackets and any transcription error are as the source prints them. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made.

Licence. published 1923; translation by J. H. Freese, 1920.