

# UC Riverside

## UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

Christian Communities in Late Antiquity: Luciferians and the Construction of Heresy

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wd9s8s8>

### Author

Whiting, Colin M.

### Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
RIVERSIDE

Christian Communities in Late Antiquity:  
Luciferians and the Construction of Heresy

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

by

Colin M. Whiting

December 2015

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Michele R. Salzman, Chairperson

Dr. Thomas Scanlon

Dr. Denver Graninger

Dr. Piotr Gorecki

Copyright by  
Colin M. Whiting  
2015

The Dissertation of Colin M. Whiting is approved:

---

---

---

---

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

## *Acknowledgments*

As with any major project, this work would not have been possible without the support, advice, and care of many others.

First and foremost is Michele Salzman, who has spent seven years as a mentor, guide, and friend. No thanks could ever express sufficient gratitude for her tireless work on my behalf over my entire career in graduate school and the countless opportunities she offered me while I was at UC Riverside. She is everything one could ask for in an advisor and more. I am proud to have been her student.

Second is my partner, Heather Van Mouwerik. Her love and patience in spite of long distances and heavy workloads has been an immeasurable source of support. She has been understanding beyond reason and my cornerstone. This dissertation would never have been completed without her; that it is dedicated to her is paltry compensation for the meaning that she has given my life.

There are others I would like to acknowledge as well. My committee members, Thomas Scanlon, Denver Graninger, and Piotr Gorecki, have provided me with advice and suggestions not only in the course of the dissertation but throughout my academic career. I have benefitted from knowing many others at UC Riverside, and while I cannot name them all here, Randolph Head, Lucille Chia, Ray Kea, and Georg Michels all deserve special mention as both keen scholars and good friends.

Outside of UC Riverside, I would like to thank Elizabeth Digeser at UC Santa Barbara, who set me on this journey in the first place and whom I am always happy to encounter. The late Thomas Sizgorich of UC Irvine was the first scholar outside of UC

Riverside who read any of my work and provided valuable comments; he is dearly missed. Shane Bjornlie at Claremont McKenna College and Amanda Podany at CSPU Pomona also deserve mention for their efforts on my behalf.

My parents (all four of them!) have always been supportive of me and never questioned my decision to enter the strange world of academia. Years of sometimes sporadic contact have done nothing to diminish their love of me. I cannot imagine what my world would look like without their love and encouragement. My friends, too numerous to name individually, have left me with good memories even in difficult times. These include my fellow graduate students at UC Riverside, many friends made in Athens, and my coworkers at the Princeton office of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens.

My work as a graduate student could not have been completed without the support of the staff of the Department of History at UC Riverside, and I would like to mention the work of Iselda Salgado and Christina Cuellar in particular. Furthermore, the Interlibrary Loan office at UC Riverside was invaluable. Their ability to rapidly manage scores of requests made the otherwise impossible task of obtaining obscure books, articles, and dissertations quite easy.

I was fortunate to receive generous financial support from the Department of History at UC Riverside throughout my tenure there. I also received funding from the Graduate Student Association in order to travel to present my ideas at conferences on several occasions. I also received travel funding from the Mediterranean Seminar/University of California Multi-Campus Research Project.

From 2013-2014, I was the Lucy Shoe Meritt fellow at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. It would be impossible in this small space to describe how the experiences of that year and the individuals I met there have changed me both as a scholar and as a person. It will suffice to say that anyone who has had the opportunity to spend a year in the company of Margaret Miles, Jeremy McInerney, and Richard Janko has led a privileged life.

Three of the translations that serve as appendices to this dissertation were presented in my M.A. Thesis in 2011. They have been substantially revised in some places. The standard caveat applies: none of the individuals mentioned above are to be blamed for any mistakes that appear in this dissertation; errors are mine and mine alone.

*for Heather*



## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Christian Communities in Late Antiquity:  
Luciferians and the Construction of Heresy

by

Colin M. Whiting

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in History  
University of California, Riverside, December 2015  
Dr. Michele R. Salzman, Chairperson

The so-called Luciferians were a community of Christians that flourished in the late fourth century. They emerged following the Council of Alexandria in 362 as a rigorist Nicene community. However, by the early fifth century, they had apparently completely dissipated. The classic interpretation of how the Luciferians emerged is that they were led by a bishop named Lucifer of Cagliari. A more modern approach has seen the ‘Luciferians’ as a community constructed by rigorists in Rome in the 380s, reaching out to other dissatisfied Christians. I instead argue that this community was neither led by Lucifer nor a later coalescing of dissident Christians, but rather emerged in the 360s out of a network of clerics dissatisfied with the decisions of the Council of Alexandria.

Furthermore, no convincing explanation has yet been provided for this brief florescence and sudden disappearance. This dissertation draws upon the *Libellus precum*, an understudied petition written by two Luciferian presbyters, in order to examine the internal mechanisms of the community and propose an explanation as to why they

dissolved so suddenly. The community is examined in comparison with two other rigorist Nicene communities, the Novatians and the Donatists, who remained vibrant over a much longer period of time.

I argue that the Luciferians dissolved not for any one reason, as some scholars have suspected, but owing to a combination of factors. These factors included the consequences of their initial geographic distribution; a lack of clear doctrinal differences with their opponents; a failure to define their opponents as doctrinally deviant while they themselves fell prey to such attempts; a promotion of asceticism while lacking male ascetics; and an insistence upon suffering as a means of proving one's faith combined with an end of persecution of Luciferians. These factors in combination, not individually, led to the dissolution of the Luciferian community.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Origins and Continuity	49
Chapter 2: The Consequences of Geography	111
Chapter 3: Doctrine and Practice	163
Chapter 4: Naming and Belief	212
Chapter 5: Ascetics and Asceticism	269
Chapter 6: Violence	325
Conclusion	395
Bibliography of Primary Sources	407
Bibliography of Secondary Sources	417
Preface to the Appendixes	443
Appendix 1: <i>Confessio fidei</i>	446
Appendix 2: <i>Libellus precum</i>	448
Appendix 3: <i>Lex Augusta</i>	499
Appendix 4: <i>De Trinitate</i>	502

## Abbreviations

<i>AJT</i>	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
<i>AntAfr</i>	<i>Antiquités africaines</i>
<i>BLE</i>	<i>Bulletin des littéraires ecclésiastique</i>
<i>Byz</i>	<i>Byzantion</i>
<i>ByzStud</i>	<i>Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>CA</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Scriptorum Latinorum</i>
<i>CGSO</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
<i>CF</i>	<i>Classical Folia</i>
<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller</i>
<i>GCS NF</i>	<i>Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge</i>
<i>Historia</i>	<i>Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>

<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LCL</i>	<i>Loeb Classical Library</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Edited by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. 9 <sup>th</sup> edition.
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>MGH</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia cursus completes. Series prima (Graeca)</i> . Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 161 vols. Paris: 1857-1866.
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia cursus completes. Series secunda (Latina)</i> . Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 217 vols. Paris: 1841-1855.
<i>PLRE</i>	<i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Rivista di archeologia Cristiana</i>
<i>REAug</i>	<i>Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastiques</i>
<i>RHT</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire des textes</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RIASA</i>	<i>Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
<i>SIFC</i>	<i>Studi italiani di filologia classica</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>ZNF</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

*ZPE*

*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

## Introduction

### *The Problem*

Sometime in 383 or 384, two presbyters, Faustinus and Marcellinus, delivered a petition they had composed to Emperor Theodosius I in Constantinople. The emperor was already aware of their intention; he had previously requested that one of the presbyters, Faustinus, draft a short confession of faith for him, presumably to guarantee that the emperor was not wasting his time on non-Nicene Christians. In their petition, the presbyters claimed to represent a handful of communities across the Mediterranean whom they describe as the true Christian church of the Roman Empire. They describe their Nicene Christian beliefs and their refusal to hold communion with any bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds and later rejected these creeds in favor of the Nicene faith or those who held communion with such bishops. They ask that they be left alone, that other Nicene Christians cease to persecute them for refusing to hold communion with the broader Nicene world.

The opponents of these presbyters called them “Luciferians,” after the fiery bishop Lucifer of Cagliari, who had so vigorously supported the Nicene party against the Arians in the 350s. The Luciferians provoked deep anxiety in their contemporaries. Ambrose, for instance, writes that the Luciferians tear the body of Christ into pieces by their schism.<sup>1</sup> Despite the fear of some of Theodosius’ contemporaries, he granted these presbyters their wish in a law addressed to his Eastern Prefect, Cynegius.

---

<sup>1</sup> *De excessu fratris sui Satyri* 1.47 (PL 16.1345-1414): *nam etsi fidem erga Deum tenerent, tamen erga Dei ecclesiam non tenere, cuius patiebantur velut quosdam artus dividi et membra lacerari. etenim cum propter ecclesiam Christus passus sit et Christi corpus ecclesia sit, non videtur ab his exhiberi Christo fides, a quibus evacuatur eius passio corpusque distrahitur.*

And yet, despite the anxiety of their opponents and the support of the emperor himself, only about 15 years later Rufinus could describe their community as “a schism, although only a few still circle around.”<sup>2</sup> Augustine, writing not long after, speaks of Lucifer’s disagreement with the Council of Alexandria as a historical event rather than something with ramifications in his present.<sup>3</sup> The latest documents we have from the Luciferians themselves come from the mid-380s. They appear in no further imperial legislation that is preserved. For the Christians of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, the Luciferians quickly became relegated to the past tense if they were mentioned at all.

The extinction of this community in such a short period of time raises many questions. Why did this community not last? Why did individuals find this community so compelling, or so threatening, but only for a few short decades? What had changed within that community, and what had changed within the broader Roman world, that removed these Luciferians from relevance to obscurity in a quarter century? Why did other rigorist communities, such as the Novatians and Donatists, not suffer the same fate? The answers to these questions are the subject of this dissertation. Their answers help us draw conclusions not only about the Luciferians but also about the mechanics behind the formation and dissolution of religious communities in Late Antiquity in general.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.28 (*Tyrannii Rufini Opera*, ed. M. Simonetti, CCSL, 20 [Turnholt: Brepols, 1961]): *...schisma quod licet per paucos adhuc volvitur.*

<sup>3</sup> *Epistula* 185.10.46-47 (*S. Aureli Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Epistulae*, ed. Al. Goldbacher, CSEL 57 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1911]): *Habeant [Donatistae] ergo isti de praeterito detestabili errore, sicut Petrus habuit de mendaci timore amarum dolorem, et veniant ad Ecclesiam Christi veram, hoc est matrem Catholicam; sint in illa clerici, sint episcopi utiliter, qui contra illam fuerant hostiliter...Sic multitudinibus per schismata et haereses perventibus subentire consuevit. Hoc displicuit Lucifero, quia factum est in eis suscipiendis atque sanandis qui veneno perierant Ariano; et cui displicuit in tenebras cecidit schismatis, amisso lumine charitatis.*



## *Historical Background*

To fully understand this community's origins it is necessary to start, as Faustinus and Marcellinus' petition does, with the Arian controversy and the Council of Nicaea.<sup>4</sup> The Council of Nicaea was convened in 325 at the behest of the emperor Constantine, who was increasingly short on patience with his squabbling Christian subjects.<sup>5</sup> In previous years, Christians in Alexandria, Egypt, had been divided over the question of the relationship between God as the Father and God as the Son, i.e., Christ. Alexander of Alexandria and his fiery archdeacon Athanasius believed that the two were equal in all respects. In their view, the Son had always existed, and was not created by the Father; the two were of the same 'substance (*ousia*);' they had the same power and majesty. One of Alexander's presbyters, Arius, disagreed; he believed that the Son was inferior to the Father, had been created by the Father and thus had not always existed, and was of a similar, but not identical, 'substance.' What began as a relatively esoteric theological

---

<sup>4</sup> The standard works on the Arian controversy are Michel Meslin, *Les Ariens de l'Occident* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1968); Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 1975); and R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> On the Council of Nicaea in general, see Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). The ancient sources are numerous, but good accounts are found in Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, 3.6-14 (*Eusebius Werke* 1.1<sup>2</sup>, ed. F. Winkelmann, GCS 7, [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991]); Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.2-6; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.7-14 (= *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Günther Christian Hansen, GCS NF 1 [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995]); Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 1.16-25 (*Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres I-II*, ed. Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah, trans. André-Jean Festugière, SC 306 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983]; *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres III-IV*, ed. Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah, trans. André-Jean Festugière, Sources chrétiennes 418 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996]; *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres V-VI*, ed. Guy Sabbah, trans. André-Jean Festugière and Bernard Grillet, Sources chrétiennes 495 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2005]; *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres VII-IX*, ed. Guy Sabbah and Laurent Angliviel de la Beaumelle, trans. André-Jean Festugière and Bernard Grillet, Sources chrétiennes 516 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008]); Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.6-11 (= *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Léon Parmentier, GCS NF 19 [Leipzig, 1911]).

disagreement had, by the 320s, devolved into chanting and riots in Alexandria; bishops throughout the eastern Roman Empire were beginning to take sides.

Constantine had already seen the potential dangers of factionalism among his subjects. Christian communities in North Africa had been split between the followers of the Carthaginian bishops Caecilian and Majorinus, whose successor was the very popular Donatus.<sup>6</sup> In short, the ‘Donatists’ claimed that the ‘Caecilianists’ had handed over Scriptures in the Great Persecution of 303-311 and refused to hold communion with them. Constantine had initially tried to solve this problem by convening a council of Italian bishops to adjudicate the dispute, and, after the Donatists questioned the process of this council (the bishop of Rome had packed the court), he convened another council at Arles in 314 composed of Gallic bishops. Although this council also ruled against the Donatists, the Donatists refused to yield. Constantine, increasingly concerned about his divided subjects, decided to enforce the council’s decisions by legal coercion. But after a few years of ineffective persecution, Constantine threw up his hands and left North Africa to its own devices as he set his sights toward his rival Licinius in the East.

It is understandable then that in 324, after finally making himself sole master of the Roman world, Constantine was nervous about the civic unrest throughout his new holdings caused by these theological disputes in Alexandria. Although the Council of Arles had not led to the unity Constantine had hoped for, perhaps he was more hopeful that a council could reach a satisfactory conclusion in this case because the question was

---

<sup>6</sup> The standard works on the Donatists are W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952); Maureen Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997); Brent Shaw, *Sacred Violence: Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

one that could be reasoned out. He does not seem to have cared much what the outcome was, just that it was agreed upon by all. And Constantine did in fact mean all – hundreds of bishops were invited to the Council of Nicaea, mostly eastern but some western as well.

In 325, although a handful of Arius’ supporters, so-called ‘Arians,’ offered fierce resistance on his behalf, the council decidedly sided with Alexander. The Father and Son were said to be *homoousios*, ‘of the same substance.’ Constantine exiled six supporters of the opposition, including Arius, and ordered his writings be burned and any who possessed them to be executed.<sup>7</sup> Constantine’s experience in North Africa may have made him wary about the effectiveness of this council in the long term, but up until he passed away in 337, the peace generally held.<sup>8</sup>

Following his death, however, supporters of the *homoousios* formulation found themselves in a delicate situation. They were indeed the victors in 325, and Constantine’s sons Constantine II and Constans supported his formulation to the extent that they paid any attention at all to Trinitarian theological disputes.<sup>9</sup> However, Constantine’s middle son, Constantius II, did not personally support the *homoousios* doctrine.<sup>10</sup> Under him,

---

<sup>7</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 1.9, quoting a letter of Constantine: Ἐκεῖνο μέντοι προαγορεύω, ὡς εἴ τις σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ Ἀρείου συνταγὸν φωραθεῖ κρύψας, καὶ μὴ εὐθέως προσενεγκῶν πυρὶ καταναλώσῃ, τούτῳ θάνατος ἔσται ἢ ζημία· παραχρῆμα γὰρ ἀλοὺς ἐπὶ τούτῳ, κεφαλικὴν ὑποστήσεται τιμωρίαν.

<sup>8</sup> Undoubtedly because of Constantine’s later leniency toward Arius and his supporters, spurred on by Eusebius of Nicomedia: see T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 17-18.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.18. D.H. Williams, “Defining Orthodoxy in Hilary of Poitiers’ Commentarium in Matthaëum,” *J ECS* 9, no. 2 (2001): 151-171 describes the general lack of attention paid to these disputes in the western half of the Roman Empire.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.2; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 3.1, 18; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.2. All blame an Arian presbyter who was in favor with Constantine and his half-sister Constantia for promoting Arian beliefs to Constantius; see also Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002 [3<sup>rd</sup> edition]), 74-75; Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 264 n. 103.

Arians were once more able to publicly declare their support for their beliefs, and the number of Christians who agreed with them continued to grow; Constantius himself gave them support, including persecuting Nicene Christians, but was limited to his half of the empire.<sup>11</sup> In 353, at the death of Constans at the hands of an usurper (Constantine II having died in 340),<sup>12</sup> Constantius became sole ruler of the Roman Empire.<sup>13</sup>

Constantius II then immediately began to promote other formulations of the relationship between the Father and Son, using the state and a series of councils to promote his own beliefs. In 353/4, a council at Arles deposed and exiled Paulinus of Trier, a strong western supporter of the *homoousios* formulation.<sup>14</sup> Constantius was present in Arles at the time and in all likelihood directed the bishops there to remove Paulinus.<sup>15</sup> In a major upheaval, Constantius II used a council convened at Milan in 355 at the request of the bishop of Rome, Liberius, to depose and exile Athanasius, who had succeeded Alexander in 328.<sup>16</sup> The scene was dramatic. A few eastern bishops attended,

---

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.7-8, 13; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 3.7; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae* (= *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. Wolfgang Seyfarth with Liselotte Jacob-Karau and Ilsa Ulmann, 2 vols. [Leipzig: Teubner, 1978]), 14.10.2; Ath. *Hist. Ar.* 7.1 (= *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 7, *Die apologien 4: Apologia secunda (80-schluss)*, 5. *Epistola Encyclica*, 6. *De morte Arii*, 7. *Ep. ad monachos*, 8. *Historia Arianorum (1-32)*, ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin, 1940]; *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 8, *Die apologien 8: Historia Arianorum 32-schluss, De synodis (1-13)*, ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin, 1940]); Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 212-213.

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.5; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 3.2; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.3.

<sup>13</sup> After defeating the usurper, Magnentius. See, e.g., Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.25-26; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.1; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.9, 12; Robert M. Frakes, "The Dynasty of Constantine down to 363," in Noel Lenski, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 100-102.

<sup>14</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, *Ad Constantium*, 1.8 (= *Fragmenta*, ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65 [Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1916]): *... Valens calamum et chartam e manibus eius violenter extorsit, clamans non posse fieri, ut aliquid inde gereretur.*

<sup>15</sup> H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 133-146.

<sup>16</sup> The council plays a prominent role in a number of ancient sources: Hil. *Ad Const.* 1.8; Ath. *Hist. Ar.* 31-34; Jerome, *Chronicon*, 359/Olymp. 284 (*Eusebius Werke 7: Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, ed. R. Helm, GCS 47 [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956]); Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.20; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.36; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.8-

but most were westerners who generally supported Athanasius. Liberius himself was absent, represented by his appointed legates, Lucifer, the bishop of Cagliari, and two deacons, Hilarius and Pancratius. Eusebius of Vercelli provided a copy of the Nicene Creed and asked Dionysius of Milan to sign it; a prominent Arian, Valens of Mursa, violently slapped the stylus and parchment out of Dionysius' hand and cried out "Nothing from that can be upheld!"<sup>17</sup> This caused a great tumult among the bishops; those who supported the Nicene Creed went to the people, while the Arians went to the palace. Constantius wasted no time. He threatened the bishops at Milan and compelled them to condemn Athanasius, which for Nicene Christians was akin to a declaration of war. Supporters and opponents knew that Athanasius was well known across the Roman world as the leading supporter of the *homoousios* doctrine.<sup>18</sup> The three leading Nicene bishops were exiled: Eusebius of Vercelli, Dionysius of Milan, and Lucifer of Cagliari.<sup>19</sup> Lucifer, for his part, spent his exile in a number of cities writing vitriolic treatises directed at Constantius.<sup>20</sup>

---

11; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.12; Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.39. See also Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 116-118. The following recounting of the events of the Council and its aftermath incorporates all of these sources.

<sup>17</sup> Hil. *Ad Const.* 1.8.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., Michel Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident* (Patristica Sorbonensia 8; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1968), 273: "Mais la tension était telle, entre partisans et adversaires d'Athanase, que les connotations doctrinales devinrent l'argument majeur de la polemique, par quoi chacun tentait de discréditer l'adversaire. En réalité, on se battait plus pour le respect d'un droit canon encore mal fixé que pour la théologie: Tyr contre Nicée."

<sup>19</sup> According to Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicon* 2.39 (= *Sulpicii Severi libri qui supersunt*, ed. Carolus Hahn, CSEL 1 [Vienna, 1866]), Dionysius in fact had agreed to condemn Athanasius if theological matters were discussed, but Valens' actions precluded such a discussion from taking place.

<sup>20</sup> The classic work on Lucifer and the Luciferians remains Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calarius und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf und Härtel, 1886). The best modern edition of Lucifer's writings is *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt*, ed. G.F. Diercks, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, 8 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1978). Concerning their quality, Barnes (*Athanasius and Constantius*, 6) writes, "...violent and often hysterical diatribes of Lucifer contain distressingly little of real historical value." Hanson (*The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 508, n. 4) likewise writes, "We have already had occasion to form no very high opinion of the subtlety of thought or elegance of

Constantius continued his policy of exiling bishops whom he could not coerce into agreeing to condemn Athanasius. The next victim was Hilary of Poitiers, deposed the next year by a council at Béziers.<sup>21</sup> Like Lucifer, he spent his exile writing “venomous invective” against Constantius.<sup>22</sup> Next on Constantius’ list was Liberius of Rome, a natural target given that his legate Lucifer had been perhaps the most ardent supporter of the Nicene Creed in the West.<sup>23</sup> Rhodanius of Toulouse was also deposed and exiled despite having condemned Athanasius simply because he was popular and a friend of Hilary’s.<sup>24</sup>

The situation looked, and indeed was, dire for the Nicene party. Constantius remained relentless. Having by 357 exiled nearly all the major supporters of the Nicene formula, he convened a new council at Sirmium.<sup>25</sup> The creed published by this council contained no mention of the word *ousia* at all; Hilary refers to it as the *blasphemia* of Sirmium.<sup>26</sup> Constantius, having driven away almost all of his enemies, counted another

---

language of Lucifer of Calaris...Almost everybody who writes about Lucifer finds him an intolerable bore and bigot.”

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Fortunatus, *Vita Hilarii Pictaviensis* (PL 88.439-454) 5. The precise reasons for Hilary’s exile are actually a matter of some scholarly debate. For a major overview of the arguments, see T.D. Barnes, “Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile,” *VC* 46, no. 2 (1992): 129-140; Paul C. Burns, “Hilary of Poitiers’ Road to Béziers: Politics of Religion?,” *J ECS* 2, no. 3 (1994): 273-289; Carl L. Beckwith, “The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers at the Synod of Béziers (356 C.E.),” *J ECS* 13, no. 1 (2005): 21-38; Mark Weedman, *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers* (*VC* Suppl. 39; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 10-13. The disagreement hinges on whether Hilary was exiled consciously supporting Athanasius or merely because he produced a confession of faith that sufficiently anti-Arian for Constantius to have him deposed, and then he later connected himself to the Athanasian party.

<sup>22</sup> As described by Mark Humphries, “In Nomine Patris: Constantine the Great and Constantius II in Christological Polemic,” *Historia* 46, no. 4 (1997): 448. The example to which Humphries points is *Contra Constantium* (=PL 10.571-605; not to be confused with his *Ad Constantium*).

<sup>23</sup> Amm. Marc. *Res Gest.* 15.7.6-10; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.11-12.

<sup>24</sup> Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.39; Hil. *C. Const.* 11; Barnes, “Hilary of Poitiers,” 134-135.

<sup>25</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.30-31; Hilary of Poitiers, *De Synodis*, 10-11 (= PL 10.471-546); Athn. *De Syn.* 28.

<sup>26</sup> In addition to Socrates and Hilary, see also Meslin, *Les Ariens d’Occident*, 276-281.

coup: Hosius of Cordoba, a staunch supporter of the Nicene formula and Constantine's close advisor at Nicaea, finally gave in to the Arian party and signed this *blasphemia*.<sup>27</sup>

Not content with the Sirmian formulation, and eager to claim his victory in both halves of his empire rather than just in the West, Constantius finally convened two major councils in 359, one at Rimini in the West and the other at Seleucia-in-Isauria in the East.<sup>28</sup> These councils were very well attended; their events and outcomes were very predictable. Nicene and Arian bishops found themselves at an impasse until the Arian bishops rushed to Constantius' palace and Constantius compelled bishops at both councils, by threatening them once more, to accept a variation of a formula devised earlier that year by Constantius and a small group of bishops at Sirmium.<sup>29</sup> In this creed, rather than *homoousios* ('of the same substance') or even *homoiousios* ('of a similar substance'), the Father and Son were simply described as *homoios* ('similar'). The Nicene party had crumbled. "The whole world," as Jerome famously put it, "groaned and was shocked that it was Arian."<sup>30</sup> One final insult remained: Liberius, the exiled bishop of Rome, conceded to Constantius' demands later in 359 and was reinstated as the bishop

---

<sup>27</sup> See Victor de Clerq, *Ossius of Cordova: A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954), 459-530; this 'fall' of Hosius (often spelled Osius or Ossius) is discussed at length in Chapter 6.

<sup>28</sup> Frequently just described as the singular "Council of Rimini," these councils provoked a great deal of reflection in late antique sources as well: see Hil. *C. Const.* 12-16; Ath. *De Syn.* 10-12; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.37-40; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.17-22; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.16-22; Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, 17-18 (= *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe*, ed. and trans. Aline Canellis, Sources chrétiennes 473 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003]); Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.41-45.

<sup>29</sup> The formula is often called the "Dated Creed" because its preamble claimed that 'the catholic faith' was published on the 11<sup>th</sup> of the kalends of June in the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius, i.e., 359. Nicene bishops quickly leapt on this gaffe as an example of Arian arrogance. The more proper name is the Fourth Sirmian Creed. See Ath. *De Syn.* 8 and Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 363-364.

<sup>30</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 19: *Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est.*

of Rome.<sup>31</sup> Constantius' victory was, for all intents and purposes, complete by the year 360.

In 361, Constantius grew ill and died while marching against his rebellious cousin Julian. There being no real alternative, Julian took the throne. The differences between the *homoousios*, *homoiousios*, and *homoios* formulas were academic to Julian, as he was a pagan; he allowed all Christian bishops to return to their sees and permitted anyone to

---

<sup>31</sup> Ath. *C. Ar.* 89.3; *Hist. Ar.* 41.2; Jer. *Chron.* 359/Olymp. 284; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.37; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.15; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 2.17.1. The incident was deeply distasteful to many Nicene Christians; many authors, including Jerome, Socrates, and Theodoret only say that he returned to Rome without saying why. See also T.D. Barnes, "The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers," *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (1992), and Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 340-341, 358-362. When Liberius died in 366, there were conflicts between Ursinus, who had supported Liberius while he was in exile, and Damasus, who had supported Liberius' temporary replacement Felix, over who would be the next bishop of Rome (see Amm. Marc. *Res gest.* 27.3). Damasus would emerge victorious in the struggle. A tendentious account entitled *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos* (the first document in the *Collectio Avellana = Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio*, ed. Otto Guenther [Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: 1898]) recounts affairs between Liberius and Felix and their successors from the perspective of a supporter of Ursinus; it is discussed further below. It was a bloody affair. Amm. Marc. *Res Gest.* 27.3 says that 137 supporters of Ursinus died in the basilica of Sicininus; *Quae gesta sunt* 7 says that many such supporters were killed in the basilica of Julius, 160 died in the basilica of Liberius on one day, and more died in the basilica of Agnes. There are a great number of competing explanations of these discrepancies. Some argue that these refer to the same event, and the basilicas are the same despite their names (such as, e.g., Rita Lizzi Testa, *Senatori, popolo, papi: Il governo di Roma al tempo dei Valentiniani* [Bari: Edipuglia, 2004], 153-154) and that the numbers are close enough (e.g., Charles Pietri, *Roma christiana: Recherches sur l'église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)* [Rome: École Française, 1976], 412, n. 2). Others assume that these are two separate events (e.g., Adolf Lippold, "Ursinus and Damasus," *Historia* (1965): 122-125; Neil McLynn, "Damasus of Rome: A Fourth-Century Pope in Context," in *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike. Repräsentation städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur, und Kunst*, ed. Therese Fuhrer [Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011] 309-310) and even that the *basilica Sicinini* in Ammianus is actually a third basilica, the *basilica Juli* (e.g., André Chastagnol, *La Préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960), 152-153). J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, et al., *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69-71, argue that these are two separate events and that the *basilica Sicinini* in Ammianus does not even refer to a Christian church but to a public government building (see Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.29, where Socrates reports that Ursinus was ordained "not in a church, but in an obscure part of the basilica called the Sicinum" [οὐκ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ τόπῳ τῆς βασιλικῆς τῆς ἐπικαλουμένης Σικίνης]). But Ammianus specifically describes the *basilica Sicinini* as a place where Christian gatherings are held, so the question remains open.



worship in whatever way they pleased.<sup>32</sup> All the bishops Constantius had exiled to the East were free to return to their sees in the West.

Before they did, however, they and Athanasius convened a council at Alexandria in 362. They did so to reaffirm the Nicene Creed, for which they had already endured so much, and to decide what should be done about the hundreds of bishops who had been compelled to sign Constantius' Arianizing creeds.<sup>33</sup> They had a simple choice: the clerics who had signed these creeds could be reduced to laymen and undergo penance or they could undergo a laying-on of hands and be readmitted to Nicene communion as clerics. The council decided on the latter, more moderate approach, arguing (according to Jerome) "not that those who had been heretics could be bishops, but that it was clear that those who were being readmitted had not been heretics."<sup>34</sup> Regional councils in Greece, Spain, and Gaul upheld this decision.<sup>35</sup>

Not everyone was particularly pleased with this leniency. Faustinus and Marcellinus in the 380s refer to these 'fair-weather' bishops as *praevaricatores*, 'liars' or 'traitors.' In the 360s, numerous bishops were angered by this laxity.<sup>36</sup> Lucifer of Cagliari in particular was incensed even though he had not been present (he had sent two deacons in his stead), having traveled from the Thebaid on to Antioch while the council

---

<sup>32</sup> Amm. Marc. *Res Gest.* 22.5.3-4; Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.27; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.4; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 5.5; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 3.2. Ammianus claims that Julian's intention was to sow disorder among Christians.

<sup>33</sup> This major council is described in Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.28-29; Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* 20; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.7; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 5.12; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.

<sup>34</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 20: *...non quo episcopi possint esse qui heretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur haereticos non fuisse.* This problem is only mentioned by our earliest sources, Jerome and Rufinus; later sources only mention the reaffirmation of the Nicene Creed. On the competing accounts of this council, see Duval, "La place et l'importance du concile d'Alexandrie."

<sup>35</sup> Athanasius, *Epistola ad Rufinianum* (= PG 26.1179-1181); Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158.

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* 19; the passage is discussed further in Chapter 1.

gathered.<sup>37</sup> At Antioch, while the council was deliberating, Lucifer ordained Paulinus as the new Nicene bishop of Antioch while the other Nicene bishop of Antioch, Meletius, was returning from exile.<sup>38</sup> Some Nicene Christians in Antioch followed Paulinus even after Meletius' return, because Meletius had been ordained by an Arian and Paulinus had been ordained by the unquestionably orthodox Lucifer.<sup>39</sup> Eusebius of Vercelli was distraught over the split at Antioch but took no action out of deference to his friend and ally Lucifer.

Following this Council of Alexandria in 362, there is no great clarity in our sources as to the actions of Lucifer himself. All that we know for certain is that in 383 or 384, the 'Luciferians' Faustinus and Marcellinus were delivering their petition to Theodosius. How they received this name, and their relationship to the events described above, are the subject of Chapter 1. The remaining chapters seek to explain why this community was apparently defunct by the early years of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

#### *A Note on Terminology*

A persistent problem in modern scholarship is how the historian names his or her subjects. The most common problem in modern scholarship has come with the term 'pagan.' Traditionally, the term has been questioned on the grounds that it was (a) considered an insult when used by Christians, indicating that pagans were "bumpkins,"

---

<sup>37</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.5 writes that Lucifer and Eusebius agreed that Lucifer would go to Antioch and Eusebius to Alexandria; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 3.4.6 states that Eusebius begged Lucifer to go to Alexandria with him.

<sup>38</sup> Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.30; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.9, 5.5; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 5.12-13, 7.3; Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.1. Jerome (*Dial. c. Luc.* 20) makes passing mention of the incident as well. According to Socrates, the Arian bishop of Antioch, Euzoïus, still controlled the actual church structures in Antioch (though he permitted Paulinus to use one for his Nicene congregation). When Meletius returned, he and his followers seized the largest basilica in the city for themselves. See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 155-158.

<sup>39</sup> Athanasius refused to hold communion with Meletius up to his death; see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158.

and (b) it was unfair to group together a variety of beliefs and practices stretching from England to southern Egypt under the same heading.<sup>40</sup> This problem also exists for those studying Christian communities. For example, Shaw uses the appellation “Catholic” for the dominant party in Africa in the late 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> centuries (led by Aurelius and Augustine) since that party was in communion with the bishop of Rome and had the support of the imperial state. “Donatist” he rejects as a “Catholic” term of derogation and instead prefers terms such as ‘dissident’ or phrases like ‘dissident party.’<sup>41</sup> Sometimes, furthermore, these communities are linked to one another only in the imaginations of scholars. For example, the famous ‘gnostics’ who were supposed to believe in esoteric doctrines exemplified by the texts of the Nag Hammadi Library have been shown to have never been a community at all; older scholars simply created a community they called the ‘gnostics’ where there was a multitude of communities.<sup>42</sup>

In this study, I have decided to use the following terms. I use “Luciferian” to describe the members of the community represented by Faustinus and Marcellinus in their petition, though they explicitly reject this term. While the temptation to follow Shaw is strong, “Luciferian” has been retained for the sake of the reader. There were many dissident communities across the Mediterranean, and this study spends so much time

---

<sup>40</sup> For a discussion of these views and a thorough critique of them, see Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press), 14-32.

<sup>41</sup> *Sacred Violence*, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003). See, e.g., 168: “The problem with variety is not variety itself; the problem is trying to force multifarious, irregularly shaped objects into square essentialist definitional holes.” David Brakke discusses modern approaches to the term, which include dispensing with it all together, using it to describe only groups that Irenaeus describes as ‘gnostic,’ or using it to identify differing communities that nonetheless shared certain fundamental beliefs; see “Self-differentiation among Christian groups: the Gnostics and their opponents,” in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, eds., *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1: Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 247-248.

discussing them that in trying to provide unique, neutral terms for all these communities would result in unnecessary and potentially confusing verbiage. For the same reason, I have retained “Donatist” and “Novatian.” I use the term “catholic” to describe the broad, Nicene-communion-based community that stretched across the Roman world. The use of lowercase is meant to suggest to the reader that while this was a large community, it was certainly not organized in the sense that the modern Catholic Church is. Likewise, I use the term “church” only to refer to structures, not to communities. Lastly, for the same reasons, I use the term “pagan” to denote polytheists of many stripes living across the Roman Empire who shared similar views about how the universe and its gods worked, without intending any slight against them and without denoting an organized group of pagans or a specific form of pagan worship.

### *Sources*

We are uniquely suited to discuss the Luciferian community due to the survival of a number of documents written by Luciferians rather than their enemies, a rare treasure trove for the historian interested in dissident Christian communities in general. These documents are the presbyter Faustinus’ short *Confessio fidei*; the *Libellus precum*, a petition written by the presbyters Faustinus and Marcellinus; the *De Trinitate*, Faustinus’ theological treatise; and a handful of forged letters written by Luciferians in the guise of Athanasius.<sup>43</sup> In addition to numerous references in other historical sources, the

---

<sup>43</sup> The best edition of the *Confessio fidei*, *Libellus precum*, and *Lex Augusta* is *Supplique aux empereurs: Libellus precum et lex augusta. Precede de Faustin, Confession de foi* (SC 504, ed. and trans. Aline Canellis; Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 2006); the former two also appear in *Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera* (CCSL 69, ed. Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti; Turnholt: Brepols, 1967), which also contains the best modern edition of the *De Trinitate*, and the latter two appear as the second and third entries, respectively, within the so-called *Collectio Avellana*. The two forged letters

Luciferians are the subject of the *Lex Augusta*, Theodosius' response to their petition, and the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, a polemical dialogue written by Jerome.<sup>44</sup>

By far the most important of these documents is the *Libellus precum*, in which Faustinus and Marcellinus describe the origins and fortunes of their community starting with the events preceding the Council of Nicaea. The petition was written in either 383 or 384 on the basis of its addressees: Valentinian [II], Theodosius, and Arcadius.<sup>45</sup> The absence of Gratian puts the *terminus post quem* in late 383; Gratian was assassinated in August of that year. The text also treats Damasus as a living person.<sup>46</sup> Damasus died in December of 384, thus providing the *terminus ante quem*. The *Libellus precum* actually contains two alternate requests: that Theodosius recognize the Luciferians as the true Christian community (the *vera ecclesia*) or, if he should hesitate to cause such a major upheaval in the Roman world, to simply grant them legal protection from persecution at the hands of other Nicene Christians.<sup>47</sup>

While the *Libellus precum* is indeed addressed to these three emperors, the political situation and elements within the text demonstrate that it was aimed at

---

can be found in *PG* 26.1181-1185.

<sup>44</sup> The best edition of the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* is Canellis' *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe*, cited above. The work appears sometimes as the *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*; I have retained the title *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* to better reflect Jerome's purpose.

<sup>45</sup> *Lib. prec.* 1.

<sup>46</sup> *Lib. prec.* 78-85.

<sup>47</sup> The former request is implicit throughout the work, e.g., *Lib. prec.* 114: *Quomodo enim non falsi sacerdotes sunt qui iam, non solum ob causam praevaricationis supra expositam devitandi sunt sed etiam quod plurimi quique eorum proprias etiam nunc haereses vindicant sub ementita apud uos catholici nominis professione?* The authors make the latter request explicitly at *Lib. prec.* 121: *Liceat saltem veritati, vel inter ipsa vilissima et abiecta praesepia, Christum Deum pie colere ac fideliter adorare, ubi et aliquando natus secundum carnem idem Christus infans iacere dignatus est.* It was a common tactic to save face in antiquity (and beyond) by making two requests rather than one, with one of them being relatively painless to the addressee, so that the addressee was not forced to simply publicly reject the one making the request. See Schor, "Performance and Social Strategy," 292-294.

Theodosius alone. Toward the end of the work, Theodosius alone is addressed, and the authors begin to slip more and more readily into the second-person singular rather than plural in their pleas.<sup>48</sup> Faustinus says that it is Theodosius who requested the *Confessio fidei* and the *De Trinitate* was written at the request of Theodosius' wife Flacilla; both suggest a closeness between Faustinus and the eastern court.<sup>49</sup> It is, of course, Theodosius who wrote the response to the petition as well. The authors seem to have recently been installed as priests for a population of Luciferians at Eleutheropolis in Palestine, much closer to Theodosius' capital of Constantinople than the western capital at Milan, though they were not originally from Palestine.<sup>50</sup> The absence of the western usurper Magnus Maximus' name from the addressees serves as yet another indication that the Luciferians were attempting to gratify Theodosius, not the western court. Valentinian II, who is addressed instead, was 14 years old at the time; his mother Justina still held Arian beliefs, and the vehemently anti-Arian tone of the *Libellus precum* would have done nothing to help the Luciferians achieve their goals if she was the intended recipient.<sup>51</sup> The inclusion of Valentinian II and Arcadius (Theodosius' very young child) is a mere formality.

---

<sup>48</sup> E.g., at *Lib. prec.* 120 they use *sitis* to address the emperors, but then at 123, just before their signatures, make their case directly: *Maxime sub te, religiosissime Auguste Theodosi...*

<sup>49</sup> *Conf. fid. pr.*; *De Trin.* 1: *...sublimitatibus non contenta terrenis, sacra in Deum fide caelestia desideras possidere...sollicita interrogatione perquiris quomodo capita illa [sc. Ab Arrianis scripta] solvantur...*

<sup>50</sup> *Lib. prec.* 107: *Ubi autem idem beatus Ephesius, invitatus fidelium litteris, in Africam navigavit, nobis apostolico more dans praeceptum ut circa sanctam fraternitatem divinis et ecclesiasticis officiis incubaremus, id ipsum sancta illic fraternitate poscente...* This is the only instance in the petition where Faustinus and Marcellinus speak of themselves in relation to the individuals they discuss. The fact that the Luciferian bishop of Rome, Ephesius, sets the two to watch over the population at Eleutheropolis, and that the populace there requested it, suggests that the two were not native to the city. Did Ephesius know them as fellow Romans?

<sup>51</sup> On Justina, see Theod. *Hist. eccl.* 5.13; Augustine, *Confessiones*, 9.7.15-16 (= *Confessions*, vol. I. *Introduction and Text*, ed. James J. O'Donnell [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992]). Augustine describes Ambrose's discovery of the bodies of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius as a blow *ad coercendam rabiem femineam sed regiam*. See too Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 209-219, and on the revival of western Arianism

Unlike the *Libellus precum*, the *De Trinitate* was written by Faustinus alone. He penned the treatise at the request of Theodosius' wife, Flacilla, as noted above.<sup>52</sup> It thus must have been written before her death in 386, thus roughly the same time that the *Libellus precum* was authored. Unfortunately, we have no indication as to which text came first, and thus no knowledge of whether Faustinus gained access to Theodosius through some pre-existing relationship between himself and Flacilla or made a reputation for himself as an ardent supporter of the Nicene formula while at court presenting the petition.

According to Faustinus, Flacilla had received some Arian 'chapters' (*capitula*) that she asked Faustinus to refute.<sup>53</sup> Rather than simply setting out refutations to individual arguments, however, Faustinus explains the foundations of what Arians believe and why and then proceeds to dismantle these foundations.<sup>54</sup> He describes the *De Trinitate* as akin to a debate rather than a book, asking forgiveness for its hasty execution

---

in the 380s in general, see D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 185-210.

<sup>52</sup> Most manuscripts (including the oldest, from Coloniensis) offer the names Faustinus and Flacilla; one Vatican manuscript instead offers Gregory of Elvira, with Galla Placidia (Theodosius' daughter) as the addressee. The *editio princeps* split the difference and printed Faustinus as the author and Galla Placidia as the addressee. But the Vatican manuscript is surely incorrect in both respects. Galla Placidia was not born until 388, and Gregory of Elvira, as we shall see in Chapter 1, was already very old (if even alive) in the mid-390s. It does not make much more sense to have Faustinus, presumably some decades after delivering the *Libellus precum*, penning a treatise to the emperor's daughter. Furthermore, our one ancient testimonium to the work, Gennadius of Marseilles (late 5<sup>th</sup> century), ascribes the work to Faustinus and names the addressee as Flacilla: *De viris illustribus* 16 (= *Hieronymus, Liber de viris inlustribus; Gennadius, Liber de viris inlustribus*, ed. Ernest Cushing Richardson [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1896]).

<sup>53</sup> *De Trin.* 1: ...*sollicita interrogatione perquisis, quomodo capitula illa solvantur, quae ab Arianis adversus Catholicos sacrae legis interpretationibus opponuntur,*

<sup>54</sup> *De Trin.* 1: *Sed quia in his quae scribere dignata es ex persona haereticorum, vidi plurima esse confusa, ut videreris mihi non plenius nosse quae asserant Ariani; melius opinatus sum si primum liquido palam facerem quomodo credant, et quomodo sub ambiguitate sermonis simplices animas capiant...*

and poor style.<sup>55</sup> The tone of the treatise is unsurprisingly dismissive and patronizing toward his opponents and flattering toward the empress. As a historical source, its major value comes in the first and last sections, in which we get some hints of how imperial patronage of theologians might work and how these theologians might rework their tasks to better suit their own aims (the treatise, ostensibly against Arians, ends with a lengthy, vitriolic condemnation of bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds in the 350s and returned to Nicene communion as clerics in 362). As a theological tract it is clearly reliant on the writings of Gregory of Elvira, Hilary of Poitiers, Athanasius of Alexandria, and even Ambrose of Milan. Still, Faustinus' ability to synthesize the arguments of these various authors into a single, cohesive work is appreciable.

What little we know of Faustinus and Marcellinus comes mainly from the *Libellus precum* and the *De Trinitate*. That they are both presbyters is clear enough.<sup>56</sup> As noted above, they are not from Eleutheropolis, though their origins are unclear. Their Latin is generally simple but can at times be quite baroque, indicating some degree of education.<sup>57</sup> It is unclear what their relationship to each other was. The style of the *Libellus precum* is not appreciably different from that of the *De Trinitate*; Canellis even

---

<sup>55</sup> *De Trin.* 3: *Hoc autem non ut librum scribimus, sed quasi cum praesente adversario certis disputationibus dimicamus*. References to his poor style (a gross exaggeration) are rhetorical and found passim, starting at 1.

<sup>56</sup> Marcellinus says as much: *Lib. prec.* 124. Faustinus is a little more florid at *Lib. prec.* 124: *Ego Faustinus qui non possum dignus vocare presbyter*. But this is just a rhetorical flourish. He identifies himself as a presbyter in *Conf. fid. pr.*: *Faustini presbyteri confession verae fidei quam breviter scribe et sibi transmitti iussit Theodosius imperator*. And, as noted above, Ephesius set Faustinus to watch over the community at Eleutheropolis.

<sup>57</sup> See the discussion in Chapter 5. They make numerous biblical references but typical learned references to classic pagan authors, e.g., Cicero or Virgil, are conspicuously absent.



lists the authors of the *Libellus precum* as “Faustin (et Marcellin).” They were apparently known and welcome at court, although how this came to pass is unclear as well.<sup>58</sup>

Theodosius’ response, the *Lex Augusta*, surely followed shortly after the petition was delivered. Honoré, examining the style of the document compared to similar laws of the same period and other texts, suggests that was written or heavily influenced by Theodosius himself rather than a lawyer within his chancellery.<sup>59</sup> It is not addressed to the presbyters, but to Cynegius, his *praefectus oriens* from 384 to 388. Cynegius had a reputation for extreme enforcement of the emperor’s increasingly stringent legislation against heretics and pagans;<sup>60</sup> this law stands out as unusually tolerant.<sup>61</sup> But it is not openly so. The moment the verdict is revealed, Theodosius’ reply also tellingly contains

---

<sup>58</sup> Of the numerous scenarios one can imagine, the most appealing is that Marcellinus had the means or connections to have a petition heard at court and appended his name to Faustinus’ petition to give it weight; Theodosius then requested Faustinus’ confession of faith as proof that the petition should even be heard (there is no extant confession from Marcellinus); later, Flacilla, impressed by the presbyter, requested he compose his arguments concerning the Trinity.

<sup>59</sup> Tony Honoré, *Law in the Crisis of Empire, 379-455 A.D.: The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 53.

<sup>60</sup> On Theodosius’ increasingly intolerant legislation, see Jean Rougé, “La législation de Théodose contre les hérétiques. Traduction de *C. Th.* XVI, 5, 6-24,” in *Epektasis: Mélanges offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972). For Cynegius in particular, see Libanius, *Oratio* 30 (= *Libanii opera*, vol. 10, ed. R. Foerster [Leipzig: Teubner, 1921]), passim, but esp. 30.8, 12, 15-16, 21-23, 44-46; *Or.* 49.3; Zosimus, *Historia nova*, 4.39 (= *Histoire nouvelle*, 3 vols., ed. and trans. François Paschoud [Paris: Les belles lettres, 2000; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.]); J. F.-M. Marique, “A Spanish Favorite of Theodosius the Great: Cynegius, Praefectus Praetorio,” *CF* 17 (1963); J.F. Matthews, “A Pious Supporter of Theodosius I: Maternus Cynegius and His Family,” *JTS* 18 (1967); Raban von Haehling, *Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amtsträger des Römischen Reiches seit Constantins I: Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der Theodosianischen Dynastie (324-450 bzw. 455 n. Chr., Antiquitas 3* (Bonn: Habelt, 1978), 72-73; Szymon Olszaniec, *Prosopographical Studies on the Court Elite in the Roman Empire (4<sup>th</sup> Century AD)*, trans. Jacek Welniak and Małgorzata Stachowska-Welniak (Torun: Nicolaus Copernicus University Press, 2013), 100-107, and the numerous laws from the *Codex Theodosianus* cited there.

<sup>61</sup> This law does not appear in the *Codex Theodosianus*; could this absence be a reflection of more strictly anti-heretical ideals of the 430s, when the *Codex Theodosianus* was composed? As we shall see, the *Lex Augusta* was still available in the 6<sup>th</sup> century. Its survival may be the exception rather than the rule; many other such laws may have been lost if the compilers of the *Codex Theodosianus* were only interested in anti-heretical legislation of previous periods rather than potentially more tolerant laws. Scholars should take this *Lex Augusta* as another warning against treating the laws of the *Codex Theodosianus* as though they reflected the full and complete legal situation of any emperor’s reign.

an implicit warning to the presbyters: “We judge both that the petition which has been brought forward be honored, and that in our judgment, we wish – or rather, we order – that nothing be added to the faith.”<sup>62</sup> Theodosius orders Cynegius to protect “Gregory and Heraclida, priests of the holy law, and the rest of the priests that are similar to them.”<sup>63</sup> True, this qualification grants Cynegius broad leeway in judging who exactly is “similar” to these two bishops and does not explicitly name, for example, the Luciferian bishop of Rome, Ephesius. But it creates a much more open requirement for orthodoxy than Theodosius’ famous law of 380 that demanded all Christians hold the same faith as Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria.<sup>64</sup> Theodosius seems open to promoting these Nicene Christians, no doubt as part of his broader push against Arians, but also seems to have recognized the potential dangers of doing so.

Interestingly enough, the transmission history of these documents may indicate something about the way they were used in antiquity.<sup>65</sup> The *Libellus precum* appears in two manuscript traditions. In the first, the *Libellus precum* and the *Lex Augusta* appear in the *Collectio Avellana* among numerous other documents. This collection has been the

---

<sup>62</sup> *Lex Aug. 2: Atque ideo ita utrumque moderamur ut petitionem quae est oblata ueneremur, fidei autem nihil ex nostro arbitrio optemus uel iubeamus adiungi.*

<sup>63</sup> *Lex Aug. 8: Sublimitas tua praeceptum nostrae serenitatis, quo catholicam fidem omni fauore ueneramur, sine qua salui esse non possumus, ita iubeat custodiri ut Gregorium et Heraclidam, sacrae legis antistites, ceterosque eorum consimiles sacerdotes...*

<sup>64</sup> *Codex Theodosianus* 16.1.2 (= *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, ed. Th. Mommsen and Paulus M. Meyer [Berlin, 1905]). See, e.g., J.F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364-425* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 121-122; Stuart G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), 161-162.

<sup>65</sup> For the details of the following two manuscript traditions, see *Collectio Avellana*, i-xciii (ed. Guenther); *Libellus precum = Supplique aux empereurs*, 97-99 (ed. Canellis); *De Trinitate = Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt*, 292-294 (ed. Simonetti).

subject of much recent academic discussion; it probably dates to the 6<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>66</sup> Why were these documents compiled? The purpose of the *Collectio Avellana* is not entirely clear, but it seems to have been compiled by someone interested in more clearly defining the role of the emperor in regards to the bishop of Rome.<sup>67</sup>

In the second tradition, three documents are transmitted together: the *Confessio fidei*, the *Libellus precum*, and the *Lex Augusta*. While scholars have discussed the purpose of the *Collectio Avellana*, no one has similarly asked: who originally compiled this packet of three documents, and why? It seems to me that a Luciferian is most likely to have done so (perhaps Faustinus himself following receipt of the emperor's rescript to Cynegius). In any case, why create this arrangement of documents? Although the emperor might issue laws, it was up to his subordinates to enforce them; these subordinates could be very uneven in their application.<sup>68</sup> A packet like the *Confessio/Libellus/Lex* would serve as ready proof that Luciferian communities were legally protected in the eyes of the state (or would at least provoke local authorities to consult with the emperor before taking any action against local Luciferian communities).

---

<sup>66</sup> See Günther's introduction to his edition of the *Collectio Avellana* at II. The location of its composition is unclear; Günther believes it is eastern, but this has been questioned by speakers in two recent conferences held in Rome in 2011 and 2013, respectively entitled *Emperors, Bishops, Senators: The Significance of the Collectio Avellana, 367-553 AD* and *East and West, Constantinople and Rome: Empire and Church in the Collectio Avellana, 367-553 AD*.

<sup>67</sup> See the bibliographies and discussions in Kate Blair-Dixon, "Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome: The *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*," in K. Cooper and J. Hillner, eds., *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 59-76, and R. McKitterick, "Roman Texts and Roman History," in C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick, and J. Osborne, eds., *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and Exchanges of Ideas c. 400-1400* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 19-34.

<sup>68</sup> Jill Harries, *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77-98, esp. 93-96. At 95, for example, she writes, "What happened to temples or those engaging in forbidden sacrifices seems to have depended on local attitudes, rather than active enforcement of the closure of temples by the central authority, which in many respects was responding to, rather than initiating Christian oppression of opponents." The same could be said for the enforcement of anti-heretical legislation.

The ability for late antique advocates to find and then produce imperial laws on behalf of their clients at court was one of their central responsibilities.<sup>69</sup> Private collections of legal rulings were maintained for this very reason.<sup>70</sup> It is also worth noting that late antique authors also commonly used collections of documents related to specifically ecclesiastic disputes.<sup>71</sup> The fact that these three documents were copied together indicates that they were intended to function as a unit; surely placing a petition and the imperial reply to it together had a legal function. There are clear instances of Arians under Theodosius using rescripts they had received from other emperors to maintain their possessions in the face of Nicene attempts to utilize anti-heretical laws to confiscate their basilicas.<sup>72</sup> A similar need to use this rescript to justify their community's orthodoxy in the eyes of Theodosius is the most sensible explanation for how this Luciferian 'packet' came to be arranged in the way that it was.

One other source provides some information about the Luciferians. Sometime perhaps in the late 370s in Syria, Jerome, one of the great personalities of late antique Christianity, penned an early polemic against these Luciferians. In this early *Dialogus*

---

<sup>69</sup> Harries, *Law and Empire*, 109-110: "The production of a genuine and preferably recent imperial rescript could prove decisive [in court]."

<sup>70</sup> Harries, *Law and Empire*, 21, 109-110.

<sup>71</sup> In addition to the *Collectio Avellana*, the most famous example is the so-called "dossier" of documents relating to the Donatist schism appended to the end of Optatus, *De schismate Donatistarum = Libri VII*, ed. Carolus Ziwsa, CSEL 26, (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1893); see also Jean-Louis Maier, ed., *Le Dossier du Donatisme*, 2 vols, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur 134-135 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987, 1989). Aug. *Ep.* 141.9 complains that the Donatists even used Optatus' collection against his own party. Another Donatist collection was circulated to help pastors create sermons: see Richard Rouse and Charles McNelis, "North African Literary Activity: A Cyprian Fragment, the Stichometric Lists, and a Donatist Compendium," *RHT* 30 (2000). Ecclesiastic canons could similarly be collected to buttress arguments: see Hamilton Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 124-129, for one such collection in North Africa. Eduard Schwartz argues that an Arian collection of ecclesiastic canons was circulated in the East in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century: "Die Kanonensammlungen der alten Reichskirche," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 25, no. 1 (1936).

<sup>72</sup> R.M. Errington, "Church and State in the Early Years of Theodosius I," *Chiron* 27 (1997): 48-50.

*contra Luciferianos*, Jerome constructs a debate scene in which a Luciferian named Helladius argues with, but is gradually worn down by, his catholic opponent.<sup>73</sup> The first half of the dialogue is a somewhat evenly matched debate, but after Helladius concedes victory to his opponent the dialogue devolves into little more than Jerome simply explaining why he thinks the Luciferian position is incorrect. While perhaps not Jerome's most nuanced work, it is nevertheless of incredible importance as the only lengthy criticism of Luciferians written by one of their opponents. Our other references to the Luciferians from catholic sources are numerous but rarely exceed two or three sentences.

One final document also deserves brief discussion: the first document in the *Collectio Avellana*, entitled *Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos*. Despite its title, the emphasis is not on Liberius or Felix so much as Damasus. As noted above, Liberius first resisted Constantius' coercion but later gave in and swore to an Arian creed. Upon his death in 366, there was a great deal of violence between supporters of Ursinus, who had always stood by Liberius, and Damasus, who had stood by Constantius' temporary replacement bishop of Rome, Felix. The author of the *Quae gesta sunt* is a vehemently partisan supporter of Ursinus who describes Damasus as a depraved sinner who committed numerous crimes to ensure that he would be the next bishop of Rome.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> The opponent is named, naturally enough, Orthodoxus; the terminology used in this debate is discussed in Chapter 4.

<sup>74</sup> Damasus is deceitful and ambitious (*Quae gesta sunt* 2), bribes lower-class individuals to commit acts of violence on his behalf (5, 6), violently suppressed opposition and exiled those who did not accept him as bishop of Rome (6, 7, 12), bribes imperial agents (11), and is even described as an "ear-tickler of the matrons" (9: *matronarum auriscalpius diceretur*), that is, someone who charms elderly women into including the church in their wills. See Jerome, *Epistulae* 22.28 (= *Epistulae* I-LXX, ed. Isidore Hilberg, CSEL 54 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1910]; *Epistulae* CXXI-CLIV, ed. Isidore Hilberg, CSEL 56, no. 1 [Vienna, 1918; repr. 1996]); H.O. Maier, "Heresy, Households, and the Disciplining Diversity," in *Late Ancient Christianity: A People's History of Christianity*, vol. 2, ed. V. Burrus (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 232-233; Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, 185-187. Concerning the final allegation, *CTh* 16.2.20 was a law

Some scholars have seen this as another Luciferian document owing to the hatred of Damasus shared by its authors and Faustinus and Marcellinus, but this is unlikely to be the case.<sup>75</sup> It is true that both despised Damasus, and in general also held in contempt those who supported Constantius in the 350s only to turn around and promote the Nicene party after his death. One major problem is that the author of the *Quae gesta sunt* describes Liberius' return to Rome thus:<sup>76</sup>

After two years, Emperor Constantius came to Rome. He was asked by the people for Liberius. He was soon in agreement, and said 'You will have Liberius, who will come back better than he was when he set out...'  
Liberius [after Felix died] was merciful toward those clerics who had broken their oaths and returned them to their former positions.

The author of the *Quae gesta sunt* thus essentially presents Liberius' return as Constantius' giving in to the will of the Roman people, not a reward for Liberius' capitulation as all of our other sources have it. Moreover, Liberius' clemency towards individuals the author calls *periuri* is a marked contrast to the Luciferians, whose opposition to such mercy toward *praevaricatores* was their *raison d'être* in 362; that such an action passes without comment in the *Quae gesta sunt* should give one pause. In fact, the Luciferians seem hesitant to even mention Liberius; when Lucifer is sent to the

---

promulgated in 370 that prohibited clerics from visiting widows and, tellingly, the subscription indicates that the law was read aloud at Rome.

<sup>75</sup> The most prominent of these is M.R. Green, "The Supporters of the Antipope Ursinus," *JTS* 22 (1971). Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 383, agrees, as does McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 56. While I disagree with McLynn in general, I do agree that Ursinus is unlikely to have joined up with the Arian party in Milan while in exile by virtue of his base of support in 366. A later article by McLynn, "Damasus of Rome," explores the conflict in depth but makes no mention whatsoever of the *Libellus precum* or the Luciferians in doing so; the only reference to the Luciferians (at 315) does not mention them by name. Blair-Dixon, "Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome," mentions Green's hypothesis but does not explicitly agree with him. Canellis is silent throughout her works on the Luciferians.

<sup>76</sup> *Quae gesta sunt* 3-4: [3] *post annos duos uenit Romam Constantius imperator; pro Liberio rogatur a populo. qui mox annuens ait 'habetis Liberium, qui, qualis a uobis profectus est, melior reuertetur...'* [4] *Liberius misericordiam fecit in clericos, qui periurauerant, eosque locis propriis suscepit.*

Council of Milan in the *Libellus precum*, he is tellingly sent *a Romana ecclesia* rather than *a Liberio*. Perhaps the Luciferians found his close relationship with Lucifer of Cagliari in the mid-350s somewhat unsettling given the later events of the decade.

In fact, the Luciferians do not mention Liberius' would-be successor Ursinus in the *Libellus precum* at all, though they do mention two bishops of Rome of their own, Ephesius and his predecessor Taorgius.<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, Ursinus was still alive in 381 when the urban prefect of Rome requested his return to the city from Milan,<sup>78</sup> yet the Luciferians describe two of their own bishops of Rome by the time the petition was delivered only two years later in 383/4 and make no mention of Ursinus. Furthermore, Jerome tells us of another non-Luciferian in Rome at the time, the deacon Hilarius, who also refused to admit *praevaricatores* into his communion (and, additionally, anyone baptized by an Arian).<sup>79</sup> So it is by no means necessary that the Nicene rigorists in Rome all fell into a single faction, and thus it is likely that the Luciferians did not mention Ursinus because he was simply not their leader.

There are other small indications that this document was not penned by a Luciferian. The author of the *Quae gesta sunt* has no criticism of Hilary of Poitiers, whom they simply describe as resisting Constantius' call to condemn Athanasius,

---

<sup>77</sup> *Lib. prec.* 84, 104. Nor do the Luciferians mention the two deacons named at *Quae gesta sunt* 10, Amantius and Lupus. The name Taorgius is quite strange, but the manuscript tradition offers no help: for *Taorgio* at 84, there are *Tahorgio* and *Toargio*; for the same at 104 are *Tauorgio*, *Toargio*, and *Georgio*. *Georgius* is naturally tempting, but so radically different from the other names that the *lectio difficilior* should be retained. That reading also comes from a very late manuscript (16<sup>th</sup>-century).

<sup>78</sup> Ambrose, *Epistulae extra collectionem* 5[11] (= *Epistularum liber decimus. Epistulae extra collectionem*, ed. Michael Zelzer, CSEL 82 [Vienna, 1982]).

<sup>79</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 21.

whereas the Luciferians do take issue with Hilary's later, more reconciliatory stance.<sup>80</sup> The *Quae gesta sunt* calls the followers of Damasus the *periuri*, or "oath-breakers," whereas the *Libellus precum* and *De Trinitate* use *praevaricatores*, or "liars."<sup>81</sup> The supporters of Ursinus, while he was in exile, worshiped in a cemetery without clergy; the Luciferians worshiped in a house with a presbyter.<sup>82</sup>

Considering the sum of these minor pieces of evidence, it seems very unlikely that the supporters of Ursinus should be identified with the Luciferians of the *Libellus precum*. Rome was teeming with Christians of every variety, and Damasus had plenty of enemies;<sup>83</sup> we should be wary of being too eager to conflate individuals and communities that were separate from one another.

In sum, there is a relative abundance of sources that can be deployed in studying a Christian community from its own point of view rather than that of outsiders. We have documents specifically outlining the Luciferian conception of their community's origins and foundations as well as their theological beliefs. Nor is this richness in a vacuum; we also possess an imperial law written in defense of them and a lengthy treatise written against them. These sources provide an unparalleled opportunity for examining the internal mechanics of Christian communities in Late Antiquity.

---

<sup>80</sup> *Quae gesta sunt* 1; *Lib. prec.* 24.

<sup>81</sup> *Quae gesta sunt* 2, 4-6; *Lib. prec.* passim; *De Trin.* 51.

<sup>82</sup> *Quae gesta sunt* 12; *Lib. prec.* 78-80.

<sup>83</sup> At the very least, Damasus had direct, known conflicts with the Luciferians; Ursinus' supporters represented in the *Quae gesta sunt*; Isaac, a converted Jewish supporter of Ursinus who apparently returned to the Jewish faith, who dragged Damasus to court (*Ambr. Ep. extra coll.* 7.8-9); Novatians, for whom see Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 372-377, and Marianne Sághy, "Scinditur in partes populos: Pope Damasus and the Martyrs of Rome," *Early Medieval Europe* 9, no. 3 (2000). And in 378, some 12 years after Damasus' elevation, eastern bishops still had reservations about his adherence to the Nicene formula: see Lester L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis XL*, *Studies and Texts* 145 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2004), 127.



*Historiography: Heresy and Christian Communities*

This relative abundance of sources only makes the lack of scholarly attention to the Luciferians more puzzling. Before discussing recent scholarship on the Luciferians, however, we should consider the broader trends in the field concerning the study of heresy (and the related terms schism, orthodoxy, and catholicity) that inform the present study. To quote Fergus Millar, “It perhaps hardly needs to be stated that the characterization, and naming, of groups within Christianity as ‘heretical’ represents a process of construction by others, and, as expressed by contemporaries (and indeed by moderns), can never be taken as constituting simple reports on observable realities.”<sup>84</sup> Averil Cameron quotes this passage in her discussion on “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” in which she writes, “Not so long ago, it was possible to write about heresy as though it was something that really existed and to debate whether ‘it’ was a social or religious phenomenon.”<sup>85</sup> She continues: “In a world in which we no longer speak of Christianity but of Christianities, the forging of identity and the processes of self-definition have become the key topics of discussion.”<sup>86</sup> But how did we get to such positions?

The development of scholarly understanding of heresy must begin with the 19<sup>th</sup>-century and early 20<sup>th</sup>-century German historian Adolf von Harnack and his explanation for the development of Christian dogma. In Harnack’s view, ancient authors, consciously or unconsciously, interpreted the Gospels through the lens of Greek thought. “Dogma, in its conception and development,” he writes, “is a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of

---

<sup>84</sup> Fergus Millar, “Repentant Heretics in Fifth-Century Lydia: Identity and Literacy,” *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23 (2004): 112n4.

<sup>85</sup> Averil Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. E. Iricinschi and H. Zellentin (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 102.

<sup>86</sup> Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” 103.

the Gospel.”<sup>87</sup> Ancient authors could not interpret or even comprehend ‘Christian elements’ such as the resurrection apart from Hellenic culture, particularly Greek philosophy, in which they were steeped.<sup>88</sup>

Yet, although he does not equate dogma and philosophy, Harnack did draw a clear distinction between particularly Christian elements (monotheism, the person of Christ) and the philosophical system used to comprehend these elements and their context. Harnack was writing from a Lutheran standpoint, which comes through clear enough in this belief that it might be possible to see Christianity’s primitive elements separately from these philosophical elements. Yet of greater significance for future scholarship was that Harnack opened the door for a reassessment of the orthodoxy of all Christian doctrines. If the doctrines passed down through the centuries were actually Hellenizing accretions that could be stripped away, they might be in no way categorically different from heterodox doctrines. Since Hellenizing interpretations were not equivalent to the Christian ‘soil,’ all of them were thus potentially equal before the eyes of the historian.

Even some Catholics, who were generally opposed for obvious reasons to Harnack’s explanation of the development of Christian dogma in general, could adapt some of these ideas. Louis Duchesne, a Catholic priest, was not interested in finding

---

<sup>87</sup> *History of Dogma*, 7 vols., trans. Neil Buchanan (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1901; trans. from 3<sup>rd</sup> German ed., 1894-1898), 1.17.

<sup>88</sup> That having been said, Harnack did not outright object to these Hellenizations. He responded to critics in the second volume of his *History of Dogma*: “The foolishness of identifying dogma with Greek philosophy never entered my mind...the peculiarity of ecclesiastical dogma seemed to me to lie in this very fact that, on the one hand it gave expression to Christian Monotheism and the central significance of the Person of Christ and, on the other hand, comprehended this religious faith and the historical knowledge connected with it in a philosophical system.” See *History of Dogma* 2.22.

some 'primitive' Christianity. He was, however, interested in describing the development of Christian doctrine through a historical lens. His explanation was that defining doctrines and dogma over the many centuries of the history of the Catholic Church was a process that moved not from 'error' to 'truth' (or, as a Protestant might have formulated it, from 'truth' to 'error'), but rather from 'less clear' to 'more clear.' In other words, the more doctrinal disputes occurred, the more Christian doctrines were clarified by their resolutions. There was nothing being added to the teachings of the Catholic Church, just pre-existing doctrines becoming explicitly defined.<sup>89</sup>

These new approaches to understanding the development of Christian doctrine came to a peak with Walter Bauer.<sup>90</sup> He was the first scholar to decisively demonstrate that in many cases, ancient heresies were not deviations from some pre-existing doctrine or dogma, nor additions to some primitive Christianity, nor deviations away from previously unclear doctrines. By 1934, Bauer agreed with contemporary scholars who understood that ecclesiastic doctrines did not exist in the lifetime of Jesus and who were not so willing to accept that heretics were morally deviant. Nevertheless, he complained, they still held on to the primacy of what had become orthodoxy. In his work, Bauer demonstrated that in many places, such as Phrygia and Egypt, what contemporary scholars considered heresies pre-existed what they considered orthodoxy. Instead, for Bauer, the form of Christianity that became orthodox developed at Rome and from this

---

<sup>89</sup> Italian Catholics attacked Duchesne, arguing that, despite Duchesne's insistence that heretics like the Arians were truly heretics, Duchesne was attributing to the work of men doctrinal revelations that ought to be attributed to God. In 1912, his *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1907-1910) was placed on the Catholic Church's *Index librorum prohibitorum*.

<sup>90</sup> *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. and trans. R. Kraft and G. Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

powerful center exerted its influence over other Christian centers in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. Bauer also significantly provided a socio-historical explanation for Rome's eventual dominance. The success of these Roman Christians was due not to divine intervention or the power of their orthodox beliefs, but rather their superior organization in the face of numerically superior heretics.<sup>91</sup>

Much could be said – and has been said – about Bauer's orientalizing of Christianity as it appears in the eastern Roman Empire and his conclusions about the vigor with which the community at Rome imposed its particular brand of beliefs onto Christian communities throughout the Mediterranean.<sup>92</sup> Upon its publication the book was addressed by no fewer than 23 reviewers (two of whom even remained anonymous) within 3 years who held a variety of opinions (though Protestants generally held the work in higher esteem than their Catholic counterparts).<sup>93</sup>

Regardless of the validity of his specific conclusions, Bauer's work represented something of a sea change in understanding the development of heresy as an idea. Bauer did not align himself with either the tradition in which Christianity's orthodoxy can be discovered by stripping away whatever has been added to dogma over time or the tradition in which additions to dogma over time reflect growing clarity. Bauer instead suggested that the growth and the development of 'orthodoxy' was the result not of deviation from one doctrine to another but as the result of various doctrines 'competing,'

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 231: "The form of Christian belief and life which was successful was that supported by the strongest organization – the form which was the most uniform and best suited for mass consumption – in spite of the fact that, in my judgment, for a long time after the close of the post-apostolic age the sum total of consciously orthodox and anti-heretical Christians was numerically inferior to that of the 'heretics.'"

<sup>92</sup> His view of the importance of Rome was criticized as early as 1934, the year of publication, in a review by J. Moffat, *The Expository Times* 45: 475-476.

<sup>93</sup> Georg Strecker, appendix to Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 286-316.

as it were, with one eventually becoming paramount over another.<sup>94</sup> Bauer's significance is not only in determining the a certain 'heresy' might predate what eventually became 'orthodoxy,' but also in suggesting that a certain doctrine might attain pre-eminence over another not for any theological reason, or its appeal to certain religious sensibilities, but due to social factors such as the strength of an organization. Orthodoxy did not triumph because it was orthodox; it only became orthodoxy because it triumphed, and it did so through decidedly human processes.

Unfortunately, as Daniel J. Harrington points out, "Because of the political conditions prevailing in Germany during the late 1930s and the very technical style in which the book was written, the German original did not receive the attention that it deserved."<sup>95</sup> But its 1971 translation into English, carried out by the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, led to increased popularity throughout the scholarly world.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955): 2.137: "W. Bauer has shown that doctrine which in the end won out in the ancient Church as the 'right' or 'orthodox' doctrine stands at the end of a development or, rather, is the result of a conflict among various shades of doctrine, and that heresy was not, as the ecclesiastical tradition holds, an apostasy, a degeneration, but was already present at the beginning – or, rather, that by the triumph of a certain teaching as the "right doctrine" divergent teachings were condemned as heresy."

<sup>95</sup> "The Reception of Walter Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* during the Last Decade," *HTR* 73, no. 1/2 (Jan-Apr., 1980): 290.

<sup>96</sup> While the same criticisms emerged concerning the specific conclusions of Bauer's work, reviewers described the general framework he established with words like "revolutionary" (W.H.C. Frend) and "seminal" (R.A. Markus). Quotes taken from *ibid.*, 291. Harrington adds to the 23 reviews of the 1930s some 15 American and British reviews following the 1971 publication. The impact of Bauer's work, particularly following this English translation, has been felt up to the present. Bart Ehrman, one of the most prolific authors on the subject of early Christianity, paints a rather melodramatic picture while accurately describing the importance and reception of Bauer's thesis in later authors: "The argument is incisive and authoritative, made by a master of all the surviving early Christian literature. Some scholars recoiled in horror at Bauer's views, and others embraced them fiercely, but no one in the field has been untouched by them." *Lost Christianities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 173. Criticism has continued up to the present, but generally in two forms. In the first, and most common, pattern, specific points wherein Bauer was incorrect are used to criticize the thesis of the work as a whole: see, e.g., H.E.W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1954); Jerry Rees Flora, "A Critical Analysis of Walter Bauer's Theory of Early Christian Orthodoxy and Heresy" (PhD diss.; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1972); I. Howard

A somewhat concurrent and longtime trend in studies of ancient heresy and schism was to see in heretical movements an expression of local nationalism and anti-Roman sentiments. This was in a sense closely related to Bauer's appreciation of the importance of social (as well as political and economic) factors in the success or failure of a given doctrine (or, rather, that doctrine's supporters). The earliest suggestion of this nationalist argument can be found in *Kirche und Kirche, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat*. Written by the Catholic German Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, he suggested, "Der Donatistischen Spaltung mischte sich bald ein nationales Element bei," pointing out in particular that the Donatist church remained limited to North Africa.<sup>97</sup> However prescient these suggestions might have been, they remained only that – suggestions. Nowhere did von Döllinger elaborate further. Other German authors, however, did.<sup>98</sup>

One of the earliest English-language scholars to pick up on these ideas and apply them to heretical communities across the Mediterranean was E.L. Woodward. His

---

Marshall, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity," *Themelios* 2 (1976): 5-14; Brice L. Martin, "Some Reflections on the Unity of the New Testament," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 8 (1979): 143-152; James McCue, "Orthodoxy and Heresy: Walter Bauer and the Valentinians," *VC* 33.2 (June, 1979): 118-130; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994); Ivor J. Davidson, *The Birth of the Church: From Jesus to Constantine, A.D. 30-312*, Baker History of the Church vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004): 157-159. The second pattern is from an explicitly confessional standpoint. See, e.g., Andreas J. Köstenberger and Michael J. Kruger, *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010). At 16, e.g., the authors write, "'The Heresy of Orthodoxy' is more than a catchy title of a ploy concocted to entice potential readers to buy this book. It is an epithet that aptly captures the prevailing spirit of the age whose tentacles are currently engulfing the Christian faith in a deadly embrace..." The true villain (discussed at 234) is modern love of diversity.

<sup>97</sup> He also states, similarly, that "In ähnlicher Weise wars sich die Aegyptische Nationalität in den großen christologischen Kämpfen seit dem fünften Jahrhundert der monophysitischen Lehre in die Arme, und brachte es zu einer eignen national-koptischen Kirche...": *Kirche und Kirche, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat* (Munich, 1861), 4. On the papacy's waning power in the face of Italian nationalism and its relationship to Döllinger's thinking at this time, as well as the reaction of the nuncio, see, e.g., the brief obituary penned by the editors of *The Quarterly Review*, vol. 172 (January and April, 1891), 38.

<sup>98</sup> See, e.g., W. Thümmel, *Zur Beirtheilung des Donatismus: Eine kirchengeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Halle, 1893), who notes that Donatists were more likely to speak Numidian languages and support usurpers compared to Catholics.

*Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire*, an early though sometimes superficial articulation of this argument, was published near the beginning of his career in 1916 (tellingly at the height of World War I). In it, for example, he writes about the Donatists that “The problem of the *lapsi*, the cases of Caecilian and Felix of Aptunga, the personal quarrels and intrigues of unprincipled or foolish people, the simple inertia whereby schisms live on, amid the debris of past enthusiasm, when the circumstances that gave them a meaning have all passed away, are not sufficient to explain the duration and intensity of Donatism.”<sup>99</sup> Woodward argues instead that we should consider that the Donatists were most prominent in “those parts of the country where non-Roman blood and civilisation predominated.”<sup>100</sup> Woodward makes reference to their “anti-imperialism,” “numbers who, though not educated enough to have any separatist political theories, were comparative strangers to Roman ideas and civilisation,” and so on.<sup>101</sup> The Donatists, in Woodward’s eyes, did not attach themselves to Donatist doctrines because of the doctrines themselves (many of which the majority of Donatists would not have known or understood) but because they gave those who were Roman in neither blood nor culture a way to express latent anti-Roman feelings.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> E.L. Woodward, *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1916), 32-33.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 36; 38.

<sup>102</sup> Nor was this phenomenon limited to North Africa. Monophysitism in Egypt became “a national creed,” the peoples of Egypt as well as Syria “were nationalist, and therefore anti-imperial in character,” and the Goths found in Arianism a way by which “they could satisfy at once their liking for the civilisation and their contempt for the inhabitants of the Empire. The fact that in Arianism the Goths had a Christianity which was not that of their subjects naturally made devotion to Arianism synonymous with Gothic patriotism” (*Ibid.*, 44; 47; 70).

This point of view instantly became quite popular.<sup>103</sup> Perhaps the fullest and most eloquent elaboration of this thesis in connection with the work done by Bauer and his successors is W.H.C. Frend's *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*. In it, Frend constructs his problem as "a comparative study of economic and social conditions in these two provinces [Proconsular Africa and Numidia], and of the popular religion which flourished there."<sup>104</sup> For Frend, then, the secret to the longevity and vigor of the Donatists is not to be found in the doctrines of Parmenian or Augustine, but in the social, political, and economic circumstances in which the Donatist schism emerged. In the course of this examination, Frend makes many of the same arguments of his predecessors.<sup>105</sup> But Frend also added in, beyond nationalism, these economic and social factors, particularly class.<sup>106</sup>

The most potent argument against this nationalist line of thought came from A.H.M. Jones. In a landmark article, Jones asked the simple question: "Were ancient heresies national or social movements in disguise?"<sup>107</sup> Jones asks whether or not these supposed heretic-nationalists ever connected in their minds their supposedly anti-Roman

---

<sup>103</sup> A.H.M. Jones, "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?" *JTS* 10 (1959): 314 provides an extensive list of works inspired by Thümmel, Woodward, and others.

<sup>104</sup> *The Donatist Church*, 23-24. Frend is citing Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 93 (= *Hieronymus, Liber de viris illustribus*; Gennadius, *Liber de viris illustribus*, ed. Ernest Cushing Richardson [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1896]) for 'nearly all of Africa.'

<sup>105</sup> The importance of Numidia is still highlighted (143-144); the language of so many Donatists, now identified as Libyan rather than Punic, and the respective ethnicities of the speakers, play a significant role as well (66).

<sup>106</sup> E.g., at 66, Frend points to both ethnic nationalism and class intertwined: "There was thus the tendency for society to be divided into a small romanized group and a considerable native element. The Donatist sermon was addressed particularly to this latter group, while the Catholics found the majority of their supporters among the urban middle and upper classes," and at 77, to historical circumstances: "The position of the African provincials in the time of Valentinian III seems to have been infinitely worse than it had been under Constantine. The form which revolt took was not merely flight and brigandage...but was bound up with religious questions." For social structures, see, e.g., 319.

<sup>107</sup> *JTS* 10 (1959): 280-298.



feelings and their religious sentiments.<sup>108</sup> “If they felt like this,” Jones writes, “the heretics fairly certainly did not put their sentiments into writing.”<sup>109</sup> Jones rightly points out that in the vast amount of controversial literature, these disputes never seem to be framed as nationalist rather than doctrinal affairs. To suggest that while they *wrote* about doctrinal matters but *thought* about nationalist ones is, as he dryly states, “difficult to prove.”<sup>110</sup> Frend, among others, began to back off of their more nationalist claims.<sup>111</sup>

And so scholarship moved into the 1970s with certain aspects of the study of heresy understood and relatively well agreed upon. Heresies were not deviant from some prior orthodoxy but instead reflect the conclusion of doctrinal disputes; their success or failure in regards to other doctrines could be explained not just through appeal to theological elements but also to social, political, and economic circumstances; heresies themselves were not typically nationalist in character but could be tied in with other broad social problems, particularly as concerns poverty and the sometime-rapacity of the Roman government. For Harrington, writing in 1980, the future direction of scholarship

---

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 280, where it is framed as a hypothetical statement from a Copt: “I am an Egyptian and proud of it. I hate the Roman oppressor...I do not know whether Christ has one or two natures, but as the Romans insist on the latter view, I hold the former.” At 281, he also asks whether or not an average Copt would say to himself, “The Romans anyhow are heretics, we Egyptians are clearly right...I will firmly reject any compromise which the Romans may offer, and even if they accept our view I will never be reconciled with them.”

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 281.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid. Jones does offer three criteria that might demonstrate that they did: (1) if opposition to the government continued after the government changed its own theological views; (2) if heretical communities formed their beliefs around pre-existing, pre-Christian religious beliefs; (3) if theological beliefs appear to be held by communities that also shared other ‘national’ qualities such as language. Concerning the heretical groups he discusses, at least, Jones is not convinced they meet any one of these criteria.

<sup>111</sup> See, e.g., W.H.C. Frend, “Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements,” in *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 45-46: “Nor does Donatist support for the African rebel leaders, Firmus and Gildo, necessarily suggest that they aimed at political separation from the Roman empire...Mere change of secular masters was...not high on the Donatist list of priorities.”

was clear: “Where does Bauer’s thesis about orthodoxy and heresy stand as we move into the 1980s? Obviously much of the historical analysis has to be redone and refined in the light of recent textual and archaeological discoveries.”<sup>112</sup> Given the amount of attention that Bauer’s work received in the 1980s (and beyond), this was not only a completely logical prediction for its time and was also, perhaps unsurprisingly, very prescient.

Another major shift in scholarly discourse concerning ancient heresies came with Alain Le Boulluec’s two-volume work of 1985, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe-IIIe siècles*.<sup>113</sup> For Le Boulluec, heresy itself (in the modern, pejorative sense) did not truly exist until Justin Martyr invented it in the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century and Hegesippus, Irenaeus, and others elaborated on the idea in their later works. The concept itself is an entirely relative, man-made construct.<sup>114</sup> In other words, by focusing on the specifics of chronological precedence or the conditions of local churches, Bauer and those following him ignored the development of the very concept of heresy itself, without which it would be anachronistic to speak of heresies as we understand them. One can hardly speak of heretical beliefs or heretical communities before the very concepts of heresy and orthodoxy existed. One might instead conceive of a number of related sects in

---

<sup>112</sup> “The Reception of Walter Bauer’s *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*,” 297.

<sup>113</sup> Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe-IIIe siècles*, 2 vols. (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985), I.13-14, II.547-548.

<sup>114</sup> Le Boulluec was, unlike Bauer, Bultmann, and others, concerned not with actual communities comprised of individuals but with how the processes of naming and locating ‘incorrect’ doctrines also led to their formalized denunciation. Le Boulluec makes the difference between his study and Bauer’s clear: “Mais les enquêtes et les controverses engendrées par la mise à l’épreuve des thèses de Bauer se sont davantage attachées à préciser le rapport chronologique entre hérésie et orthodoxie ou à faire des conjectures sur la nature originelle des diverses Églises locales qu’à décrire les instruments forgés par la lutte antignostique qui ont contribué à la formation du concept d’hérésie.” See *La notion de l’hérésie*, I.15-16, at which he also writes that the need “discerner à quel moment, dans quel milieu et de quelle manière s’est exprimé dans le christianisme le besoin de maîtriser les dissension par l’invention d’un schème régulateur et réducteur commun.”

the same way one might view various schools of philosophy.<sup>115</sup> Scholarly attention to the process of creating new distinctions between ‘heretical’ and ‘orthodox’ communities has not been limited to matters of Christian heresy and orthodoxy, either.<sup>116</sup>

There are thus three major, related ways in which the term ‘heresy’ is used in modern scholarship, though often not consciously. First of all is, naturally, the technical definition: heresy as a theological doctrine that is divergent from some assumed orthodoxy, or, more recently, heresy as a label applied by an individual to describe the theologically different (or supposedly different) doctrines of another. The second meaning of ‘heresy,’ used by modern scholars (and their ancient predecessors), refers to a community of individuals (not the label attached to said community) that espouse, or are said to espouse, heretical beliefs. The last meaning of ‘heresy’ is the very concept of ‘heresy’ in opposition to some given ‘orthodoxy’ itself; while this has played an important role in studies of Christianity in its first centuries and even beyond, by the 4<sup>th</sup> century context of this study, these mechanisms were already largely in place.

---

<sup>115</sup> E.g. Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004), 54: “Simon emphasizes that Marcus Aurelius was to found in Athens four chairs of philosophy, one for each of the great *haireseis*, Platonists, Aristotelians, Epicureans, and Stoics. One could imagine Josephus founding such an academy as well, with a chair of Pharisaism, one of Sadducaism, and one of Essenism.”

<sup>116</sup> Daniel Boyarin’s *Border Lines* has argued that it was the very process of creating heretical identities that created Christianity and Judaism as two separate belief structures. I hesitate to use the phrase “two separate religions” here, because (according to Boyarin) while this process also led to a period in which Judaism acted very much like a ‘religion’ akin to Christianity, i.e. with an emphasis on orthodox beliefs, it was followed by a time in which Judaism became more consciously pluralistic. Judith Lieu has penned several works that look at the process by which Christians, Jews, and pagans in antiquity differentiated themselves from one another. “To the by-now commonplace that early Christianity was marked by its heterodoxy, its pluralism,” she writes, “should be added that this pluralism is not to be set *alongside* the equally pluralistic Judaism and paganism but that it *intersects* with them. Yet all such fluidity, as has also been recognized in recent study, is inherent in the construction of all identities” (*Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004], 299 [emphasis added]). See also her collection of essays, *Neither Jew Nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity* (Edinburgh and New York: T&T Clark, 2002).

When modern scholars speak of the fourth-century ‘Arian heresy,’ for example, one must rely on context to determine whether an author means (A) a set of beliefs, perhaps exemplified by a rejection of the term ὁμοούσιος to refer to the relationship between the substance of the Father and of the Son and the assertion that the Son was a created being, or (B) a community (whether real or imagined) of Christians, led by bishops such as Acacius of Caesarea and Eudoxius of Antioch and theologians such as Aëtius of Antioch. While the two are related, of course – the ‘heretical’ beliefs of Acacius, Eudoxius, and others formed one basis of their ‘heretical’ community – there is a conceptual difference between their beliefs and their community.

The present study, then, examines the Luciferians, with attention to both their beliefs and the historical, social, and economic circumstances in which their community existed. It relies on the methodology of Walter Bauer and his successors. John Gager’s *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* has in particular served as a model study, applying historical principles to the study of early Christian movements.<sup>117</sup> In his work, he makes a clear and important distinction between ‘world-construction’ and ‘world-maintenance,’ that is, between the creation of new social worlds in direct competition with others and the ‘processes whereby a given social world is maintained and legitimated for those who inhabit it.’<sup>118</sup> As we shall see, the same processes that led to ‘world-creation’ were not necessarily sufficient for ‘world-maintenance.’ This study includes regular comparisons to the Novatian and Donatist

---

<sup>117</sup> John Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975).

<sup>118</sup> Gager, *Kingdom and Community*, 10.

communities, and all three are referred to as ‘communities’ rather than ‘heretics’ or ‘schismatics’ due to the unsatisfactory nature of those terms, a point which will be made clear in Chapters 3 and 4 and addressed again in the Conclusion.

*Historiography: The Luciferian Community*

With this distinction in mind, the present study seeks to determine why it was that certain communities, like the Novatians and Donatists, were so much more successful, widespread, and long-lived than these Luciferians. The fierce reactions of authors to those they termed Luciferians, as well as the equally fierce reaction against them on the part of Faustinus and Marcellinus, demonstrate sufficiently that these constructed identities provoked very strong, personal reactions much as calling someone a Donatist or a *traditor* might. Yet, however strong the antipathy between these two communities was from the 360s through the 380s or even into the 390s, by the early years of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, the Luciferians are spoken of as though they were defunct. This provides us with an excellent chance to study the formation – and, apparently, the dissolution – of a heretical identity in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. In essence, I am asking the converse of what Rodney Stark asks in *The Rise of Christianity*. He wondered, “Finally, all questions concerning the rise of Christianity are one: How was it done?”<sup>119</sup> Concerning the Luciferians, I am asking: why was it not done?

Gustav Krüger, the first modern author to produce a monograph on the Luciferians, simply entitled his study *Lucifer Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der*

---

<sup>119</sup> Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 3. For critiques of Stark’s conclusions, see the *Journal for Early Christian Studies* 6.2 (Summer, 1998), which features responses by Todd E. Klutz, Keith Hopkins, Elizabeth Castelli, and a brief rejoinder to these by Stark.

*Luciferianer*.<sup>120</sup> That there was a plain and simple ‘Luciferian schism’ went unchallenged for over a century’s worth of scholarship as scholars continued (and continue) instead to wrangle over questions such as Lucifer of Cagliari’s involvement in starting the schism.<sup>121</sup> While Lucifer’s role in the events of the 360s is indeed important, and will be addressed, these questions have obfuscated much more interesting questions about the Luciferians.

It was not until Javier Perez Mas’ *La crisis luciferiana* that a modern scholar fully considered the complexities of discussing the ways these communities constructed identities for themselves and for each other. For Mas, it is “historia” that has personified the opposition to the Council of Alexandria’s decisions in 362 “en Lucifero de Cagliari y los llamados luciferianos.”<sup>122</sup> Mas is most interested in who exactly the “Luciferians” were – in other words, the distinctions between Faustinus and Marcellinus, the individuals who appear in their petition, and those called “Luciferians” by others.<sup>123</sup> Mas follows these studies with an attempt at a historical reconstruction of this Luciferian “crisis.”<sup>124</sup> In this reconstruction, Mas argues that the Luciferians of the 380s are in fact not part of the same community as many of the individuals described in the petition.

---

<sup>120</sup> Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkop & Härtel, 1886).

<sup>121</sup> See, e.g., Simonetti, “Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiana,” 22-24, and “Lucifero di Cagliari nella controversia arriana,” *Vetera Christianorum* 35, no. 2 (1998): 24; Diercks, in his introduction to the works of Lucifer, xxxii-xxxiii; Antonino Figus, *L’enigma di Lucifero di Cagliari: a ricordo del XVI centenario della morte* (Cagliari: Fossataro, 1973), 132-151; Giuseppe Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari: Una voca nel conflitto tra chiesa e impero alla meta del IV secolo*, Studia patristica Mediolanensia 24 (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2004), 166-174; Canellis, in the introduction to her edition of Faustinus, *Libellus precum*, 22-24; Javier Perez Mas, *La crisis luciferiana. Un intento de reconstrucción histórica*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 110 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008), 8-11;

<sup>122</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 6.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

While I disagree with him on this point, his thorough work has been an invaluable asset in helping me understand how many meanings the term “Luciferian” could have depending on the authors who used it.

The few explanations for the dissolution of the Luciferian community have been incomplete or simplistic. Krüger believes the cause to be the state support of the broader catholic communion, a lack of the monasticism that was so vigorous among other Christians, and a general contradiction in opposing these catholics without opposing them on any theological principles.<sup>125</sup> Simonetti simply writes, “Ma nonostante questa tentativi il movimento non riuscì mai a prender piede e ad assumere una certa importanza.”<sup>126</sup>

While perhaps true (though the vehemence with which other Nicene Christians denounced the Luciferians might give one pause), he nowhere offers an explanation as to why they never became important. Canellis blames the “renouvellement de leur hiérarchie et de leurs cadres.”<sup>127</sup> Mas argues that the Luciferians had impossibly high standards that limited their pool of possible clergy and, with the passing of time, the reasons for their very existence ceased to be relevant to later generations.<sup>128</sup>

While the points made by Krüger, Canellis, and Mas are in many cases valid, none explains why the Novatians and Donatists continued to be so successful. These communities make for an excellent comparison to the Luciferians because they were quite similar, both being Nicene rigorists who emerged in the fallout of times of persecution. So, for instance, Krüger points to a lack of monasticism, but a lack of

---

<sup>125</sup> *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris*, 74-75.

<sup>126</sup> “Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano,” 78.

<sup>127</sup> In her introduction to her edition of Faustinus, *Libellus precum*, 29.

<sup>128</sup> *La crisis luciferiana*, 340.

monasticism did not stop the Donatists from becoming and remaining prevalent in North Africa for centuries; Mas argues that the passing of time made the Luciferians' initial disagreement with the Council of Alexandria irrelevant, but a Novatian remained a Novatian well over a century after Novatian himself had died. The cause of the Luciferians' dissolution must be more complex and is only fully appreciable when they are set alongside other, more successful communities.

By comparing the Luciferians to these other rigorist communities, we can see instead that it was a network of causes that caused the Luciferian community to dissolve. Their initial dispersion across the Mediterranean led to problems of communication and organization and made it difficult for them to substantiate their claim to be the *catholica*, or universal, Christian *ecclesia*. Furthermore, they appear to have lacked doctrinal differences with other Nicene Christians, despite the fact that differences between communities in Late Antiquity were conceived of in religious terms. They also lacked dedicated ascetics, who in Late Antiquity frequently functioned to demarcate boundaries between communities, even as they promoted the virtues of the dedicated ascetics they themselves seem to have lacked. Their emphasis on the virtues of ascetic practice would have also diminished their pool of potentially clergy, which was additionally diminished by their failure to effectively proselytize. Lastly, their community's identity was in large part founded on the willingness to suffer persecution for the Christian faith, and Theodosius' legal tolerance of them meant that persecution would no longer function as a way to distinguish their community from other Nicene Christian communities. It was



these factors in combination – not any alone – that led to the dissolution of the Luciferian community.

That the Luciferian community emerged and disappeared in a short period makes it in no way an unimportant subject for historical inquiry – quite the contrary. In the late fourth century, there was a serious concern over the strength of the more rigorist element within Christianity that compelled some authors to spill a great deal of ink and other Christians to violently persecute those whom they called Luciferians, a threat that modern scholars have often relegated to a footnote (if that). A better understanding of the Luciferians can also shed light on the nature of Christian communities in Late Antiquity in a more general sense. More particularly, the very weakness of the construction of this separate communal identity must undoubtedly shed light on the strengths of other communities such as the Novatians and Donatists. By investigating what was not particularly effective in the creation of a long-lived and vibrant Christian community in Late Antiquity, we can better appreciate what was.

### *Conspectus*

In the first chapter, I address scholars who have argued that Faustinus and Marcellinus were creating a fictional history of their community in the 380s. Rather than extending back to the events of the 350s and 360s, this community was (they argue) instead a recent coalescing or ‘second wave’ of rigorists who held lingering resentment over the Council of Alexandria but did not form a unified community until the Roman rigorists were persecuted by Damasus in the 380s and then reached out to other rigorist communities they know. However, I argue, a thorough analysis of the *Libellus precum*

and other associated material makes it clear that these communities had existed since the 360s. They arose in locations where bishops who had vigorously opposed Constantius were either from or had spent time in exile and had an extensive network of communications and personal visits between each other.

In the second chapter, I turn to the Novatian and Donatist communities to see how those arose and grew as a basis for comparisons with the Luciferians. I then draw conclusions about the ramifications of the origin and spread of the Luciferians, including their particular approach to Christian claims to represent ‘universal’ Christianity, the problems their spread led to in keeping their communities in touch with one another, the difficult they had in organizing councils and the importance of local councils to Christian identity in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, and the relatively small size of their communities at the local level.

In the third chapter, I consider the theological doctrines and practices of the Luciferians compared to the Novatians and Donatists, drawing on the work of Maureen Tilley and others. While none of these rigorists show any theological developments that were at great variance with their fellow Nicene Christians, the Luciferians remained the most similar to the catholic faction. The Novatian attitude toward penance varied slightly – very slightly – from the catholic faction, and Donatist and catholic attitudes toward rebaptism both shifted as the needs of each community changed. The Luciferians, on the other hand, seem to have remained very much in line with typical Nicene beliefs, despite ancient attempts to retroject later theological disputes onto them or modern attempts to paint their theology as outmoded for their time.

In the fourth chapter, I examine how, despite this apparent close similarity between the theologies of the Luciferians (and Novatians and Donatists) and their fellow Nicene Christians, they were nevertheless described by other Nicene authors in much the same way that these authors describe other heretics whose theological beliefs were significantly at odds with theirs. Moreover, the Luciferians and these other rigorists also use this same religiously charged language against their opponents. In Late Antiquity, I argue, disputes were conceived of in religious language whether or not they actually arose from theological differences.

In the fifth chapter, I examine the ascetic tendencies of the Luciferians compared to those of the Novatians, Donatists, and Christians in general in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Luciferians, like their rigorist and catholic peers, promoted ascetic ideals within their community and those who practice said ideals. The Luciferians connected ascetic practice and doctrinal orthodoxy, arguing that they were both while their adversaries were universally both greedy and unorthodox. But this dichotomy quickly breaks down upon even a cursory examination of either the ascetic tendencies among catholic Christians or the well-educated and/or elite members of the Luciferian community. Instead, owing to their small size and the lack of any distinct approach toward asceticism, we can see that the Luciferians had a difficult time attracting new members, as they did not actively proselytize and relied on ascetic virtue (rather than unique theological arguments) to attract converts. They also lacked monasteries that could fulfill the growing desire for many Christians to practice an exclusively ascetic life apart from the world. These points, along with their higher expectations of ascetic practice among their clergy, led to a

general dearth of clergy among the Luciferians with the attendant consequences this lack would have on their community's well being.

In the sixth chapter, I turn toward the issue of violence as it was perpetrated against the Luciferians and other rigorist communities, as it was perpetrated by these communities, and as it was remembered by these communities. I contend that the violence suffered by the Luciferians was not significantly different from the violence suffered by other communities in times of persecution. It was, however, perpetrated against the Luciferians at a time of relative peace for the Novatians and Donatists. I argue that this difference is related to the relatively small size of Luciferian communities, which allowed other Christians to more easily persecute them independent without assistance from the state. Then in the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, when the state-led persecution of Novatians and Donatists began, those two communities faced persecution at the hands of Nicene Christians. Likewise, the Luciferians, unlike the Novatians and Donatists, were unable to offer any significant violent resistance to their persecutors. The violence they suffered did form a bond between members of the community, however; it was remembered in the same ways that violence against Novatians and Donatists (and other Christians) was remembered, particularly in the veneration of martyr's relics and the retelling of martyr stories. The relative peace the Luciferians experienced following their receipt of the *Lex Augusta* meant that their community could no longer rely on persecution as a test of faith and meant that there would be no new martyrs, which I suggest may have been more damaging to their community's identity than the violence of the 380s.

In the conclusion, I offer a brief summation of how these factors led to the dissolution of the Luciferian community in such a short span of time. The comparative approach first of all allows us to see unique factors that have otherwise been overlooked by scholars, such as the lack of councils held by the Luciferians (discussed in Chapter 2). This approach also allows us to see that it was a combination of these factors, not any one, that led to the dissolution of the Luciferian community. The Novatians and Donatists failed in certain respects to distinguish themselves from their catholic contemporaries, but overall were able to maintain separate communities. For example, we know of no Luciferian or Novatian equivalent of the Donatist construction of their communal identity around the *collecta* of Israel, but the Novatians remained a vibrant community; neither the Luciferians or Donatists rejected the idea that there was a *catholica* community, as the Novatians did, but the Donatists remained a vibrant community as well (both points are discussed in Chapter 4). Only by setting these communities side-by-side with the Luciferians do we see that only a number of factors acting at the same time could cause a Christian community in Late Antiquity to dissolve.

When these factors are viewed as a whole, however, we can see how the Luciferians might have been unable to cope with the fact that, more generally speaking, they offered little to potential converts that other Christian communities did not offer. In certain respects, they even offered less of what they considered virtuous than their opponents did (e.g., dedicated ascetics). Their community did not develop the mechanisms by which Christian communities in Late Antiquity distinguished themselves

from others. I argue that this failure to develop ways by which they might distinguish their community from other Nicene Christians was the true cause of their dissolution.

Following the conclusion and the bibliographic references are four documents translated as appendices. These are the Faustinus' *Confessio fidei*, Faustinus and Marcellinus' *Libellus precum*, Theodosius' *Lex Augusta*, and Faustinus' *De Trinitate*. I have included notes and commentary and have indicated the scriptural and patristic sources of the authors throughout the translations. It is hoped that these will aid the reader alongside the text as well as provide a base from which future scholarship might further investigate this fascinating community.

## Chapter 1: Origins and Continuity

The *Libellus precum* describes Luciferian communities of the 380s that were the direct descendants of Christians who disagreed with the Council of Alexandria's decision in 362 to readmit bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds into Nicene communion as clergy. This chapter proposes a model for how this community arose. In it, I argue that various rigorist Nicene communities in the 350s had been in contact and communion with one another during the Arian controversy in the 350s and some of these individuals and communities were dissatisfied with the decisions of the Council of Alexandria in 362, maintained communications with one another after it was held, and finally, kept themselves separate from the broader Nicene communion following the council.

There have been two previous models in modern historiography that seek to explain how the Luciferian communities of the 380s emerged as a discrete community. The first, and earliest (as early as the fourth century), model sees Lucifer himself as an active agent directly responsible for the schism within the broader Nicene communion.<sup>1</sup> As we shall see in this chapter, however, while Lucifer may have instigated anti-Arian and anti-reconciliatory passions among those who would later carry his name, and remained a very important individual within their community, he himself probably played little personal role in the emergence of this community as a broader whole (in stark contrast with his activities in Antioch and Sardinia).

The second model is much more recent. Javier Perez Mas, in his 2008 work *La crisis luciferiana: Un intento de reconstrucción histórica*, has expanded upon a counter-

---

<sup>1</sup> The classic explication of this model is Krüger, *Lucifer von Calaris*, 55-56, 75-76.

narrative to this traditional view of Lucifer first proposed by Manlio Simonetti.<sup>2</sup> In his model, Lucifer played an important role in inflaming anti-Arian sentiment, but these sentiments remained relatively dormant until the 370s. In the 370s, radical pro-Nicene Christians found themselves in direct opposition to the bishop of Rome at the time, Damasus. In the 350s, while a deacon, Damasus had supported Constantius's pro-Arian bishop of Rome, Felix, in opposition to Liberius. Pro-Nicene rigorists believed that this support made him unsuitable for the Roman episcopacy, to which he was elected in 366. Their opposition provoked Damasus into persecuting them as part of a broader crackdown on dissident Christians within Rome. This persecution prompted the rigorists in Rome to reach out to other stringently pro-Nicene communities throughout the Roman Empire in order to form some kind of 'united front' against Damasus. It is this united front that became the so-called 'Luciferian' community. Another historian, Shuve, makes many of the same arguments as Mas, though independent of Mas.<sup>3</sup> Although the two differ on some particulars, the basic model they propose is the same: the Luciferians were a new community in the 380s, formed by the efforts of Roman opponents of Damasus to unify various Nicene rigorists into a single community.

---

<sup>2</sup> I quote here in full, from Mas' conclusion (*La crisis luciferiana*, 363), the fullest statement of his argument: "Estos cismáticos de Roma no se quedan en ser un mero cisma local, como el predecesor hilariano, sino que la necesidad de formar un frente común ante las persecuciones de los adversarios y el aislamiento al que se ven sometidos, les lleva a buscar establecer alianzas, fuera de Roma, con diversas comunidades y personas que pudieran sintonizar con el planteamiento luciferiano, pasando de ser un mero cisma local, a ser un movimiento supra-romano, algo que supone una innovación, y nos sitúa en un momento distinto de esta segunda fase. Se crea así un movimiento relativamente organizado que busca extenderse a otras partes de Occidente y oriente, y que ha dado lugar a lo que propiamente se ha llamado cisma luciferiano." A preliminary version of this model can be found in Simonetti, "Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano," 78.

<sup>3</sup> Karl Schuve, "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," *JEH* 65, no. 2 (2014): 247-262.



The model proposed by Mas and Shuve is unnecessarily reductionist. There is room instead for a model that sees the Luciferians neither as a community led by an individual, nor as a movement of dissidents created in the 380s, but instead as a group of communities linked by a shared, cohesive identity without a single leader that emerged in the aftermath of the Council of Alexandria in 362. I propose that as stringently pro-Nicene bishops traveled throughout the eastern Mediterranean during their exiles under Constantius II in the 350s, they attracted followers and created communities that staunchly opposed any form of perceived Arianism. Some of these communities, particularly those associated with Lucifer of Cagliari and a handful of other clerics, rejected the lenient policy of the Council of Alexandria in 362 that provided for the readmission into the clergy of bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds under Constantius II. These eastern communities, and the western communities associated with the exiled western bishops, remained in contact and communion with each other following the council. The shared dissatisfaction they all had with the Council of Alexandria's decisions developed a single, cohesive community based in this dissatisfaction that we refer to as 'Luciferian.' This independent community existed within the broader Nicene communion until it dissolved in the early fifth century.

*Baetica (Southern Spain)*

Beginning in the far western reaches of the Empire, Faustinus and Marcellinus tell us about two incidents in southern Spain. In one, Gregory of Elvira speaks out against

Hosius of Cordoba's treachery before the *vicarius* of Hispania, Clementine.<sup>4</sup> Gregory was vindicated when, supposedly, God slew Hosius by breaking his neck and throwing him from his seat onto the ground.<sup>5</sup> This incident (if it happened) must have taken place in the late 350s, probably 359, when numerous other sources report Hosius' death.<sup>6</sup> No other ancient source, however, mentions this particular incident. Most instead try to minimize Hosius' Arian leanings late in life, and Declercq's summation of Athanasius' accounts may be taken as exemplary of the competing narrative: "Great stress is laid upon the fact that Osius 'yielded' under duress, while his fault itself is described in rather vague and lenient terms."<sup>7</sup> Mas completely rejects the Luciferian account of Gregory's opposition to Hosius as complete and total fiction designed to delegitimize Hosius in favor of Gregory.<sup>8</sup> Given our relative abundance of sources concerning Hosius' death, none of which come close to mirroring the account written by Faustinus and Marcellinus, Mas is surely correct. Lastly, the Luciferians also describe the divinely inflicted suffering of an Arian bishop named Potamius of Lisbon and a Nicene bishop named Florentius of Merida, who (despite committing no acts of persecution himself) held communion with Hosius.<sup>9</sup>

In the second half of the *Libellus precum*, the Luciferians describe an incident of persecution that occurred when two bishops, Luciosus and Hyginus, persecuted a

---

<sup>4</sup> *Lib. prec.* 32-41. The standard work on Osius is Declercq, *Ossius of Cordova*. His name is variously spelled Hosius, Osius, and Ossius. Clementine is otherwise unknown.

<sup>5</sup> *Lib. prec.* 38.

<sup>6</sup> For other accounts of Hosius' late life and death, see Declercq, *Ossius of Cordova*, 459-530.

<sup>7</sup> de Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova*, 480. De Clercq (*ibid.*, 485) calls the Luciferian account "a typical Luciferian document, full of manifest exaggerations and partisan distortions," and "fictitious."

<sup>8</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 322.

<sup>9</sup> *Lib. prec.* 43-44.

Luciferian community belonging to a presbyter, Vincentius, as well as some local decurions.<sup>10</sup> The presbyter had gotten into trouble with the local bishops “because he held communion with the most blessed Gregory.”<sup>11</sup> Luciosus and Hyginus claimed that they had appealed to the consular governor against the Luciferians, but then led a mob against the Luciferian basilica. Vincentius, forewarned that Luciosus and Hyginus were going to assault his basilica, was absent; the two bishops and their mob proceeded to destroy his church. They additionally had the decurions of the local town arrested, leading to the death of one of these civic leaders. The Luciferians then rebuilt their basilica, but clerics subordinate to Luciosus and Hyginus once again led a mob to destroy it.

This description seems like a clear case of the Luciferians demonstrating how their community was connected to the events of the 350s and 360s and how this led to their persecution by other Nicene Christians – that is, Vincentius was being persecuted because he held communion with Gregory, a staunch Nicene bishop of the 350s. However, Mas argues that the lack of explicit continuity between Gregory’s actions and the later Luciferian movement suggests that Gregory simply refused to hold communion with those whom the Luciferians describe as *praevaricatores*, and he was later incorporated into the Luciferian movement by these Roman rigorists.<sup>12</sup> Shuve, by contrast, tries to distance the community of Vincentius from the Luciferians in general,

---

<sup>10</sup> *Lib. prec.* 73-76.

<sup>11</sup> *Lib. prec.* 73: *...eo quod beatissimo Gregorio communicaret...*

<sup>12</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 330: “De hecho, el silencio del Libellus en narrar contactos concretos, y la falta de testimonios que lo califiquen de cismático, hacen pensar que su actitud fue semejante a la de Luciferio: desde su diócesis de Elvira, en unión con un cierto número de obispos de la Bética, que defendieran la misma intransigencia, se negaría a aceptar la comunión de aquellos obispos prevaricadores de su zona de influencia, rompiendo relaciones con ellos.” Spain was ripe for such a community to form around Gregory which would later be called Luciferian (according to Mas) because of the rigorism often seen in Spanish, and especially Baetican, Christianity: *ibid.*, 330-332.

arguing that there are no clear links between the Luciferian authors of the *Libellus precum* and this community.<sup>13</sup> In this model, Faustinus and Marcellinus have connected themselves to this Spanish community to enhance their own prestige.

But there is no compelling reason to doubt the *Libellus precum* on the role Gregory played in the origins of this Spanish community or on the connection between Vincentius' community and the broader Luciferian community. Faustinus and Marcellinus' knowledge of Vincentius' community seems to suggest that they were in contact with each other. It is unclear how else Faustinus and Marcellinus would have acquired the knowledge they had of these events in Spain. The information within the *Libellus precum* about the experiences of both Gregory and Vincentius implies at least some contact between these Spanish rigorists and the Luciferians. In fact, since their account of Gregory's and Hosius' confrontation appears to be a unique tradition concerning a well-documented historical event, Faustinus and Marcellinus' knowledge of this particular tradition suggests that it was unique to the Luciferians.

This information could have spread three ways, but it seems most likely that it was the result of pre-existing contacts between these communities. Either the Spanish dissidents contacted the Romans without preexisting contact; the Roman Luciferians contacted the Spanish without preexisting contact; or they knew of each other as a result

---

<sup>13</sup> "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 258: "On the grounds of their inclusion within the *Libellus*, scholars have identified these individuals as members of the Luciferian group, but this is to presume that all rigorists identified themselves with – or were identified as members of – a defined ecclesial alliance under the leadership of Lucifer and his successors. The evidence does not bear this out. Vincent the presbyter, for example, was attacked because he held communion with Gregory, with no mention of Lucifer or Luciferians." But it is unclear why the Luciferians should be doubted in the first place, and especially unclear why inclusion in the *Libellus precum* necessitates that these rigorists were members of an alliance led by Lucifer. The *Libellus precum* describes no such alliance in the first place.

of pre-existing lines of communication. Concerning the first two possibilities, Mas cites a letter that Himerius of Tarragona sent to Damasus in the 380s to demonstrate that there were rigorists in Spain at the time and that these rigorists could have been known to Roman Christians in general, including the Luciferians in Rome.<sup>14</sup> But these Spanish rigorists demanded the rebaptism of all Arians, something the Luciferians foreswore. These rigorists must represent a different community than the Luciferians.

Secondly, it was apparently quite rare for the Luciferians to reach out and create new links with others.<sup>15</sup> Severus in Eleutheropolis (discussed below) lived in the 380s near a community of Luciferians to whom he would have been sympathetic – had he known of their existence, which apparently can be traced back to the early 360s.<sup>16</sup> When Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Ephesius’s visit to Severus, they say that he kept apart from other Christians because he ‘had not yet found the holy communion of the catholics’ (by which the Luciferians mean their own communion, as discussed in Chapter 4).<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, as both Severus and his Luciferian neighbor Hermione are described as being elite members of society, one might expect them to have moved in the same circles.<sup>18</sup> In other words, Severus provides a prime example of someone whom the Luciferians should have contacted, but they explicitly state that they did not.

The third possibility remains: that preexisting lines of communication linked the Spanish rigorists described in the *Libellus precum* and other Luciferian communities. Faustinus and Marcellinus in the *Libellus precum* clearly do not shy away from pointing

---

<sup>14</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 332. The letter was answered by Siricius, Damasus’ successor.

<sup>15</sup> The ramifications of this point are discussed in Chapter 5.

<sup>16</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*: ...*nondum qui invenisset catholicorum sacram communionem.*

<sup>18</sup> Hermione is *generosis*, Severus *ex tribunis*: *Lib prec.* 102 and 104.

out times when they made contact with rigorists like Severus who did not otherwise know of their community. Establishing new links was not something they hid to deceive the reader into thinking that their communities had existed for longer than they truly had. Moreover, the Luciferians themselves attribute their existence in general to the exchange of letters between the bishops of the 350s and 360s, an exchange through which these bishops maintained a cohesive resistance against Constantius and their Arian opponents: “Although they were separate in body through the distance of the regions [of their exiles], they were nevertheless organized in spirit into one body through shared letters.”<sup>19</sup> Why should we imagine that these lines of communication were immediately cut after the Council of Alexandria? As we shall see in Chapter 2, Luciferian communities frequently communicated with one another by letter. It thus seems simplest to conclude that the Spanish community and the other Luciferian communities had already been in contact with one another. This pre-existing contact should be traced back to rigorists in Gregory’s see in the 350s.

It is very probable that Vincentius and his community of the 380s were connected to Gregory of Elvira. Faustinus and Marcellinus seem to think so, and betray no hint of intentional deceit on the subject. The Luciferians attribute the direct connection between Gregory and Vincentius as the cause of his persecution: “In Spain, what cruelties did the presbyter Vincentius...not suffer because he did not wish to be an ally of the impious treachery of those men? Because he held communion with the most blessed Gregory, that

---

<sup>19</sup> *Lib. prec. 50: ...licet essent corpore discreti per interualla regionum, tamen spiritu in unum positi per mutuas litteras...*

Gregory whose faith and virtue we related above as best we were able?”<sup>20</sup> The Luciferians admire both Gregory and Vincentius and link the two together.

Moreover, Vincentius and Gregory appear to have been from the same part of Spain. Faustinus and Marcellinus do not explicitly say what part of Spain Vincentius is from, but it is telling that his opponents Luciosus and Hyginus appealed to the governor (*consularis*) of the province of Baetica.<sup>21</sup> The Hyginus they describe is probably the same Hyginus who later supported Priscillian.<sup>22</sup> In the late fourth century, this Hyginus was bishop of Cordoba, which was in the province of Baetica. It thus seems more than likely that Vincentius’ community was also within this same province. Elvira, Gregory’s see, was also in Baetica, as was his enemy Hosius’ see of Cordoba.<sup>23</sup> So at the very least Vincentius and Gregory were in the same geographical area of Spain.<sup>24</sup> It should be noted here that Himerius’ see of Tarragona was far outside the province of Baetica, making it even more unlikely that the rigorists of his letter to Damasus are the same as the Luciferians of southern Spain.

What about the status of Gregory himself? The Luciferians in general seem to consider Gregory one of their own. Gregory appears as an individual against whom Faustinus and Marcellinus measure the holiness of another Luciferian, Heraclida of

---

<sup>20</sup> *Lib. prec. 73: In Hispania, Vincentius presbyter, uerae fidei antistes, quas non atrocitates praeuaricatorum passus est eo quod nollet esse socius impiae praeuaricationis illorum, eo quod beatissimo Gregorio communicaret, illi Gregorio, cuius supra, ut potuimus, fidem uirtutemque retulimus?*

<sup>21</sup> *Lib. prec. 73.*

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Henry Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 6, 25; Raymond Van Dam, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 94. Before he supported Priscillian, Hyginus actually opposed him and harassed clergy who supported him. Perhaps Hyginus’ harassment of the Luciferians reflected a general tendency in the bishop to enforce doctrinal consistency in the sees surrounding his own. See Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.46-47.

<sup>23</sup> Perhaps there was lingering resentment against Gregory on the part of Hyginus, Hosius’ successor.

<sup>24</sup> Nor was Baetica a particularly sizeable province.

Oxyrhynchus.<sup>25</sup> It is also significant that Gregory's interpretation of Noah's ark argues that Noah was saved from damnation by the ark because he was pure just as the wicked will die in the coming judgment day.<sup>26</sup> Not dissimilarly, the Luciferians in the *Libellus precum* argue that the ark represents the true, non-traitorous church.<sup>27</sup> The Luciferian treatment is not nearly as thorough as Gregory's, but both represent a far different interpretation of most of their contemporaries.<sup>28</sup> Both Gregory and the Luciferians provide similar treatments of the subjects, a similarity that suggests the Luciferians may have drawn on Gregory's exegesis. Mas also considers Gregory the linchpin of the community in Spain and the west in general, even if he did not personally consider himself a member of their community, arguing that his resistance to Hosius (even if fictional) served as a model for later rigorism among Luciferians.<sup>29</sup>

The Luciferians also connect Gregory of Elvira with Lucifer of Cagliari, even claiming that Gregory visited Lucifer and approved of his learning, thus further situating him within their community (even if Lucifer himself was in no sense the personal 'founder' of this community).<sup>30</sup> This information led Chadwick to conclude that Gregory was a Luciferian.<sup>31</sup> Mas, on the other hand, describes Gregory's visit as 'improbable,'

---

<sup>25</sup> *Lib. prec.* 98.

<sup>26</sup> *De arca Noe* 4 (= *Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera*, ed. Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti, CCSL 69 [Turnholt: Brepols, 1967]).

<sup>27</sup> *Lib. prec.* 69. The specific interpretation of this passage will be discussed in Chapter Four.

<sup>28</sup> Their contemporaries mainly interpreted the ark in view of sexual chastity or of the relationship between Christians and pagans. For a more detailed discussion of this line of exegesis compared to other late antique Christian authors, see Chapter 4.

<sup>29</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 320-330. Mas argues against numerous scholars who dismiss the link between Gregory and the Luciferians.

<sup>30</sup> *Lib. prec.* 90.

<sup>31</sup> *Priscillian of Avila*, 6.



and is probably correct on that count.<sup>32</sup> No other evidence suggests Gregory traveled (even the Luciferians say he was never exiled), and travel was expensive and dangerous in Late Antiquity. However, we should not rule out such a visit entirely, either. Sardinia was an important center in Late Antiquity for grain production, meaning it saw a good deal of shipping traffic, and in the early sixth century, several important Christian exiles spent their time there.<sup>33</sup> Sardinia was also on major sea lanes between Spain, North Africa, Sicily, and Italy proper. Any traveler in the area, whether Sardinia was his final destination or not, would stand a good chance of stopping there. In fact, if Ambrose's brother Satyrus was shipwrecked off Sardinia (his specific wording is unclear), it demonstrates that a traveler might find himself an unintended visitor of the island!<sup>34</sup> While Gregory probably did not travel to see Lucifer, the idea that he made such a journey is not completely outlandish, either.

---

<sup>32</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 97.

<sup>33</sup> Orosius pays as much attention to Sardinia as to Sicily in his survey of the world: *Hist.* 53.99-102. For Sardinia as a center of grain production, and an important loss to Geiseric in the fifth century, see Paulinus, *Ep.* 49 and Bronwen Neil, "Leo I on Poverty," in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*, ed. Pauline Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2009), 172. For large numbers of amphorae in fourth-century Sardinia, decreasing in the fifth century, see Bowersock, G.W., Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar, eds., *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Post-Classical World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 295. The late antique aristocrat Aemilianus Palladius owned estates on Sardinia: *De re rustica* 4.10.16, 24 (= *Opus agriculturae, De Veterinaria, Medicina, De Insitione*, ed. Robert H. Rogers [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1975]). Mining of iron and gold also continued in Sardinia: Michael McCormick, *The Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce AD 300-900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 49. For early sixth-century bishops exiled from Africa, see Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity (410-590 CE): A Survey of the Evidence from Episcopal Letters*, VC suppl. 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 56-57: "On arrival in Sardinia via Carthage, [Fulgentius] found between 60 and 200 bishops who had already been exiled from North Africa." Neil, "Leo I on Poverty," 186, also describes the efforts of the bishop Symmachus of Rome to send money and clothing to exiled bishops in Sardinia. Symmachus himself was a Sardinian: *Liber pontificalis* 53 (= *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum pars I: Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Th. Mommsen [Berlin, 1898]), as was the mid-fifth century bishop of Rome Hilarius: *Lib. pont.* 48, both of whose episcopacies point to the continued vitality of Sardinia in Late Antiquity.

<sup>34</sup> McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 67, assumes that it is Sardinia.

In any event, not making a trip to Sardinia to speak to Lucifer is not the same as having no contact with him whatsoever. Gregory was in fact embedded in the same network of communication that Lucifer and other rigorist Nicene Christians of the 350s were. Let us briefly survey what this social network looked like in the 350s and 360s. Eusebius of Vercelli wrote Gregory a very intransigent letter in 360 or 361, even though in 362 Eusebius sided with Athanasius and the more charitable party at the Council of Alexandria.<sup>35</sup> Sozomen describes Eusebius of Vercelli along with Paulinus of Trier, Dionysius of Milan, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Rhodanus of Toulouse as those who opposed Constantius together at the Council of Milan.<sup>36</sup> Lucifer and Eusebius had attended the council as the representatives of Liberius, bishop of Rome, himself a staunch pro-Nicene bishop who wrote letters to the exiled Hilary.<sup>37</sup> Eusebius himself was a good friend of Lucifer's until Lucifer ordained Paulinus bishop of Antioch after their shared exile in

---

<sup>35</sup> Found in a fragment of Hilary of Poitiers included within the *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina*, ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1916), A II.1. The evidence for his earlier tone is a letter that Eusebius wrote to Gregory in which Eusebius is rather intransigent, though the letter's authenticity has been questioned (e.g. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 508). Yet Eusebius, in addition to his actions in Alexandria, also supported Hilary against Auxentius of Milan and Hilary (a much less intransigent bishop) quotes the letter in his *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium* (= *Fragmenta*, ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65 [Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1916]), which one would only expect Hilary to do if the letter accurately reflected his ally Eusebius' beliefs. For this argument, see Richard Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 249-250. It is possible that Gregory could have had a change of inclinations similar to Eusebius' upon the death of Constantius II, though we do not hear of one; see Shuve, "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 260.

<sup>36</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.9.

<sup>37</sup> The letter, entitled *Epistula Liberii papae ad Eusebium, Dionysium et Luciferum in exsilio constitutos*, is quoted in full in Hil. *Adv. Val. et Ursac.* B.7.2; Lucifer's role is mentioned at *Lib. prec.* 22. See Michael Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 68-69. Liberius later was exiled by Constantius and swore to an Arian creed in order to return to his see, one of the root causes of the bloody battle between Damasus and Ursinus for his see following his death.

Oxyrhynchus.<sup>38</sup> Hilary, who had already been exiled, was friendly with Paulinus of Trier and complained to Constantius about the distance of his exile.<sup>39</sup> Gregory, in other words, was one of these few bishops in the West who stood by the Nicene Creed under Constantius and who remained in contact with one another. The explanation that best fits the information within the *Libellus precum* and our other knowledge about Gregory is that Gregory was in contact with other pro-Nicene bishops in the West, and this contact continued and developed in the 360s into a community represented by Vincentius, who was in contact with Faustinus and Marcellinus.

It remains possible that Gregory of Elvira was *not* a Luciferian at all, at least not according to the decidedly non-Luciferian Jerome. He only says of Gregory in his *De viris illustribus*, “Gregory, bishop of Elvira in Baetica, composed various tracts even up to an extreme old age in mediocre language, and an elegant book *On the Faith*. He is said to be living even today.”<sup>40</sup> Since Jerome makes note of who exactly was heretical throughout the *De viris illustribus*, the implication of not making such a reference in his entry on Gregory is that he did not consider Gregory heretical. Buckley takes this statement, along with the vague statements about Gregory from the *Libellus precum*, to argue that Gregory was not actually associated with the Luciferians.<sup>41</sup> As for the statements within the *Libellus precum*, which clearly draw connections between the

---

<sup>38</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.5, 3.9; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.9, 5.12-13. Eusebius of Vercelli was apparently born in Sardinia; for how long had he known Lucifer? See Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 507.

<sup>39</sup> Hil. *C. Const.* 11; *Adv. Val. et Urs.* pref.3.6 (CSEL 65, ed. Feder: 102).

<sup>40</sup> *De vir. ill.* 105: *Gregorius, Baeticus, Eliberi Episcopus, usque ad extremam senectutem diversos mediocri sermone tractatus composuit, et de Fide elegantem librum, qui hodieque superesse dicitur.* On the possibility that Gregory may have died earlier than the composition of the *De viris illustribus*, see Shuve, “The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira,” 252.

<sup>41</sup> Francis J. Buckley, *Christ and the Church according to Gregory of Elvira* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964), 15.

Luciferians and Gregory, even Shuve, who argues in general against Gregory's identification as a Luciferian, admits that "Gregory clearly had some marginal involvement with the Luciferians."<sup>42</sup>

On the other hand, Jerome nowhere says that Gregory is *not* a Luciferian. In fact, Jerome makes no mention of Lucifer's role in the origins of the Luciferian movement in the *De viris illustribus* either.<sup>43</sup> But in his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, Jerome *does* explicitly blame Lucifer for the beginning of the movement.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, in his *Chronicon*, Jerome writes for the year 370, "Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, dies, who like Gregory, bishop of the Spanish provinces, and Philo of Libya, never involved himself with the Arian depravity."<sup>45</sup> In this case, then, he even directly connects Lucifer with Gregory, without being prompted to do so. Moreover, he does not call Lucifer a heretic or schismatic here even though he clearly thought of him in such terms in the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. So his failure to call Gregory a heretic in the *De viris illustribus* cannot be taken as indicative of whether or not he believed Gregory to be heretical or schismatic. In fact, while Jerome commonly identifies heretics as such in the *De viris illustribus*, his very vagueness on what exactly made these heretics heretical was a source of criticism from Augustine.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 260.

<sup>43</sup> *De vir. ill.* 95.

<sup>44</sup> *Chron.* 370 C.E./Valentinian and Valens 6.a/287<sup>th</sup> Olympiad; *Dial. c. Luc.* 20.

<sup>45</sup> 370 C.E./Valentinian and Valens 6.a/287<sup>th</sup> Olympiad: *Lucifer Calaritanus episcopus moritur, qui cum Gregorio episcopo Hispaniarum, et Philone Libyae, numquam se Arianae miscuit pravitati.*

<sup>46</sup> *Aug. Ep.* 40.9: *In libro etiam quo cunctos, quorum meminisse potuisti, scriptores ecclesiasticos et eorum scripta commemorasti, commodius, ut arbitror, fieret, si nominatis eis quos haeresiotas esse nosti...subiungeres etiam in quibus cavendi essent.*

Lastly, in his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, Jerome at least hints at the existence of a Spanish rigorist and may well be referring to Gregory: “Doubtless, then, the powerful Adversary conceded the Iberian serpent to Christ.”<sup>47</sup> In other words, Jerome sarcastically says, if the Luciferians believe that Christ’s church exists only in Spain and Sardinia, and Satan’s church in the rest of the empire, Satan (being so powerful) must have given Christ these territories of his own free will. This grant included someone known only as ‘the Iberian serpent.’ It is hard to imagine to whom other than Gregory Jerome might have been referring; the *Dialogus*, as we shall see, was written before either Priscillian or Pelagius had become problematic individuals for western Christians, and the context of the dialogue itself suggests that the person in question should also be a Nicene rigorist.

Faustinus and Marcellinus believed that Gregory’s actions in the 350s were integrally connected to the later actions of Vincentius. There was an intransigent community in southern Spain that believed Gregory to be the critical element in their communal identity and the Luciferian authors of the *Libellus precum* shared this belief. It is hard to see, then, how the nature of the Spanish Luciferian community supports Mas’ broader argument about the role of the Roman community in spreading Luciferianism. With no reason to suppose that the Luciferians had recently welcomed a community of Spanish rigorists into their broader communion, and several reasons to suppose that they had not done so, we should conclude that the Luciferians in Spain existed under Gregory and those associated with him, like Vincentius, from the 360s onwards.

---

<sup>47</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 15: Nimirum Adversarius potens concessit Christo Hiberam excetram.*

## Trier

Faustinus and Marcellinus have far less to say about their community in Trier. The Luciferians note, with little detail, Paulinus of Trier's exile by Constantius in 353.<sup>48</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also spend only one short section describing the Luciferian presbyter there in the 380s. Despite their brevity, here too they draw direct connections between Paulinus' exile and the later persecutions of Luciferians: "But in Trier, the presbyter Bonosus, locked up for a long time though convicted of nothing, paid the price as an old man for heeding that uncontaminated faith for which the famous Paulinus, bishop of the same city, gave his life as a martyr in exile."<sup>49</sup> They are clearly implying that just as there was a rigorist in Trier in the 350s punished by Arians, so too was there was a rigorist in Trier in the 380s punished by *praevaricatores*, and that these two were connected. But here, the Luciferians do not even say that Bonosus held communion with Paulinus, just that they were from the same city and that he suffered for the same faith as Paulinus.

Paulinus, we know, was associated with the struggles of the Athanasian party. He was exiled for supporting the Nicene formula and for refusing to condemn Athanasius, one of the traditional markers of western resistance to Constantius in the 350s.<sup>50</sup> Paulinus was also embedded in the same circle of rigorists as Gregory, described above. As noted

---

<sup>48</sup> *Lib. prec.* 21. The exile of Paulinus (sometimes said to be at at the Council of Arles in 353 and sometimes at the Council of Milan in 355) is also recounted by Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 10.21; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.36; Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 4.9. See, e.g., Frank D. Gilliard, "Senatorial Bishops in the Fourth Century," *HTR* 77, no. 2 (1984): 160, 163, 166.

<sup>49</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77: *Sed apud Triueros, Bonosus presbyter inclusus intestatus ac diu poenas senex dedit propter obseruantiam intaminatae fidei illius pro qua et inclytus Paulinus eiusdem ciuitatis episcopus in exilio martyr animam dedit.*

<sup>50</sup> Hil. *Adv. Const.* 1.8.

above, Hilary complains of the distance of Paulinus' exile, and was clearly familiar with and friendly to him.<sup>51</sup> Paulinus of Trier also provided copies of conciliar letters to Athanasius.<sup>52</sup> Even if Paulinus himself had not established a 'Luciferian' community (and how could he, dying before the Council of Alexandria), he undoubtedly planted the seeds for rigorist dissent that could become such a community.

Bonosus is otherwise unknown, despite attempts by some scholars to link him to another Bonosus in Trier, bishop of Trier from 360-373. Bonosus (the argument goes) struggled against the Arians in Trier after Paulinus' exile until Paulinus' death in 358 and then became bishop of the Nicene community in 360 while Julian was governor in Gaul.<sup>53</sup> If this was so, then the *Libellus precum* is stretching the truth about Bonosus by acting as though this Bonosus was a Luciferian and not just a staunch opponent of the Arians. The Luciferians would thus be creating the idea of a Luciferian community in Trier by linking themselves to anti-Arian stalwarts of the 350s even though they had never actually counted any inhabitants of the city among their community. For Mas, this is typical of the Luciferians: "We have already mentioned the tendency of the *Libellus precum* to present various conflicts which only shared a background of being caused by an intransigent anti-Arian attitude as if they were all caused by the Luciferian

---

<sup>51</sup> Hil. *Adv. Const.* 11; *Adv. Val. et Urs.* pref.3.6. See also Beckwith, "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers," 26 and Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile," 131.

<sup>52</sup> Ath. *Apologia contra Arianos* 58.1 (= *Apologia secunda* = i. *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 5, *Die apologien: 3. Apologia de fuga sua*, 4. *Apologia secunda* (1-43), ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938]. ii. *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 6, *Die apologien: 4. Apologia secunda* (43-80), ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938]. iii. *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 7, *Die apologien: 4. Apologia secunda* (80-schluss), 5. *Epistola Encyclica*, 6. *De morte Aarii*, 7. *Ep. ad monachos*, 8. *Historia Arianorum* (1-32), ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin, 1940]), *Hist Ar.* 26.2.

<sup>53</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 334-335.

controversy.”<sup>54</sup> The Luciferians merely present the sufferings of Bonosus in a way that makes him seem Luciferian; he was never actually part of a dissident communion shared with them.

But it is more likely that the Bonosus of the *Libellus precum* was not in fact the bishop in question. First of all, Faustinus and Marcellinus never refer to this Bonosus as a bishop, only as a presbyter. There is no explanation offered by any modern scholars for why they fail to call him bishop. The most obvious explanation is that Bonosus the presbyter and Bonosus the bishop were not the same individual. It is also worth considering that the *Libellus precum* describes the presbyter Bonosus as dying not just as presbyter, but an old presbyter. His age is even rhetorically emphasized by the placement of the word *senex* in between *poenas* and *dedit*, whereas *presbyterus* is simply placed in apposition to *Bonosus*.<sup>55</sup> While we do not know how Bonosus the bishop died in 373, this happened at a time when Arians were losing influence in the West and it seems unlikely that they were capable of persecuting the Nicene bishop of an imperial capital. Lastly, if the authors were trying to deceive Theodosius by pretending that the persecution of Bonosus as a presbyter in the 350s by Arians was actually a persecution of him as an old man in the 380s by *praevaricatores*, they could have chosen someone he would be less familiar with than the bishop of an imperial capital.

---

<sup>54</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 335: “Ya hemos comentado el intent del *Libellus* por presentar conflictos distintos, que solo tienen en común el trasfondo de estar ocasionados por una actitud intransigente antiarriana, como si fuesen todos ellos provocados por la controversia luciferiana.” Mas does allow for the possibility that a rigorist community in touch with the community at Rome survived under the bishop Bonosus’ successor, Veteranius/Britonius, but of course sees this as a rigorist community associated with the Luciferians later, not as part of a broader coalition of communities that formed immediately after their disagreement with the Council of Alexandria.

<sup>55</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77: *Bonosus presbyter inclusus intestatus ac diu poenas senex dedit...*



The Luciferians do not mention a direct connection between Paulinus and Bonosus the way they do with others, as when they describe Taorgius ordaining Ephesius. This omission suggests a more theoretical or ideological connection between the two rather than a direct line of ordination, as we would expect if Bonosus was Paulinus' immediate successor.<sup>56</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus' vagueness on the connection between Bonosus and Paulinus makes perfect sense if Paulinus were exiled before Bonosus was ordained. There is no reason to assume a presbyter Bonosus could not have lived in the same city as a bishop Bonosus. The name was not particularly uncommon.<sup>57</sup>

It is reasonable to suppose that there was a rigorist presbyter who shared the relatively common name Bonosus and who led a community of dissidents in Trier, and that this community maintained contact with other rigorists it knew about from the contacts established by Paulinus while he was in exile. Just as Vincentius (and others, as we shall see) were persecuted for their refusal to hold communion with *praevaricatores*, so too was this Bonosus. Otherwise we must conclude that the Luciferians were referring to a well-known bishop as an old presbyter, and then claiming that this individual held communion with them, in order to deceive the reader into believing that the persecutions this bishop suffered in the 350s actually occurred later.

---

<sup>56</sup> *Lib. prec.* 84.

<sup>57</sup> Mihail Zahariade, "Personal Names at Halmyris," *Thraco-Dacica* 4-5 (2012-2015): 159-182, at 163, e.g., says of individuals named Bonosus that there were a "sizable number in the western and Danubian provinces." Among the four Bonosi in *PLRE* vol. 1, interestingly, is a Bonosus who held the office of *agens in rebus* in 359 or 361 and who also took a letter from Lucifer to Constantius: Lucifer of Cagliari, *Epistula* 4 (= *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt*).

We might expect the Luciferians to know more about their community in Trier in the 380s, but as Aline Canellis notes, they seem almost completely in the dark about their community there compared to the information they provide about their other communities.<sup>58</sup> Mas interprets this as a result of political reconciliation – that there are no more Luciferians, or rigorists, at least, in Trier.<sup>59</sup> But this may instead be a consequence of the distances between these communities, which would make travel and even the sending of letters between them very costly. The problems caused by this distance and their ramifications are discussed in Chapter 2.

### *Rome*

In Italy, there were at least two Luciferian communities. There was a sizable Luciferian presence in the city of Rome, which no modern scholar denies. Faustinus and Marcellinus describe numerous Luciferians in Rome in the 380s. These include a presbyter, Macarius, whose community was attacked late at night and who died in exile in Ostia, and a bishop, Ephesius, whom the bishop of Rome Damasus dragged before the urban prefect, Bassus. Bassus held the office of urban prefect in 382 and 383, situating the events in question in those same years.<sup>60</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also note the “holy gatherings of the people,” the “holy plebs,” and the “brotherhood,”<sup>61</sup> all of which indicate that there was definitely a community of Luciferians in Rome, not just a few individuals.

---

<sup>58</sup> Canellis, in Faustinus, *Libellus precum* (= *Débat entre un luciférien et un orthodoxe*), 50.

<sup>59</sup> *La crisis luciferiana*, 335.

<sup>60</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77-85. Bassus is Anicius Auchenius Bassus (11) in the *PLRE*, vol. 1. He is well known from inscriptions and the *relationes* of Symmachus (= *Prefect and Emperor: Relationes*, ed. Reginald Haynes Barrow [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973]).

<sup>61</sup> *Lib. prec.* 79: ...*sacros plebis coetus...fraternitatem...plebs sancta...*

Once again, we can see connections between the activities of Lucifer and others in the 350s and 360s and the emergence of this rigorist community in the 370s and 380s. However, in this case, Faustinus and Marcellinus do not explicitly draw these connections for us. Firstly, the Luciferians do not describe any persecutions of Nicene Christians in Rome under Constantius II, only that Lucifer was a legate of the bishop of Rome in the 350s and was exiled as such (Eusebius of Vercelli was a legate as well, but Faustinus and Marcellinus do not mention him).<sup>62</sup> They describe Lucifer's return westward toward Rome in 362 en route to Cagliari but do not describe his activities in Rome at all. Shuve argues that during his stay in Rome he would have invariably attracted a following of sympathetic rigorists.<sup>63</sup> That Faustinus and Marcellinus omit these direct antecedents to the Roman community of the 380s should caution us against assuming that such direct connections did not exist if these are similarly not explicitly described elsewhere.

The first mention of a Luciferian in Rome that Faustinus and Marcellinus make is to a certain Aurelius, a Luciferian bishop of Rome, whom they connect to Gregory of Elvira: "In the city of Rome as well... Where even the blessed bishop Aurelius, holding communion with the most blessed Gregory, was assaulted several times."<sup>64</sup> Communion

---

<sup>62</sup> *Ep. Lib. pap. ad Eus. Dion. Et Luc. in ex. const.*, found in Hil. *Adv. Val. et Ursac.* B.7.2; Faustinus and Marcellinus mention Lucifer, but not Eusebius, at *Lib. prec.* 22. The authors mention only the Roman church, not the bishop of Rome, Liberius, for whom Lucifer was legate to Constantius II to request an ecclesiastic council in 355 – Liberius himself eventually did cave in and swear to an Arian creed (Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 338-341), which the Luciferians would naturally want to avoid mentioning.

<sup>63</sup> *Lib. prec.* 63; Shuve, "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 257.

<sup>64</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77: *In ipsa quoque urbe Rom... Ubi et beatus Aurelius episcopus communicans beatissimo Gregorio, aliquotiens afflictus est.* This Aurelius is otherwise unknown. It is not certain from the text that Aurelius was bishop of Rome, rather than a bishop residing in Rome, but later references to his being persecuted in Rome, but dying peacefully there, make it almost certainly the case. When Taorgius ordains

here need not imply that they were in the same physical space.<sup>65</sup> Thus we know of two Luciferian bishops of Rome, Aurelius and Ephesius. In no other location does the *Libellus precum* describe two bishops. In fact, in Baetica and Trier, the later Luciferians whom Faustinus and Marcellinus describe are only presbyters. Thus the community in Rome was probably a large and important one.

Lucifer and other Nicene rigorists probably played some role in the emergence of a Luciferian community in Rome. But even if there were no direct ancestors of the Luciferians in Rome in the 350s, it is not surprising that we find a strong Luciferian presence there. Rome was a hotbed for dissident Christianities. We know of Novatians and Donatists (about which more will be said in Chapter 2). But there were also rigorists who disagreed with the Council of Alexandria who held communion with the deacon Hilarius. These were not Luciferians proper, because as Jerome confirms, when Hilarius died, his sect died with him.<sup>66</sup> This Hilarius was probably the same deacon who accompanied Lucifer on his embassy to Constantius.<sup>67</sup> There was also a faction at Rome that supported Ursinus against Damasus in the episcopal election of 365 because Damasus had supported Constantius' choice for bishop of Rome, Felix.<sup>68</sup> These are sometimes considered Luciferians as well, but, as discussed in the Introduction, were

---

Ephesius as bishop of Rome (*Lib. prec.* 84), there is apparently already a community there. Was Ephesius Aurelius' successor? It is unclear; the presence of Luciferian communities apparently *without* bishops, as at Baetica and Trier, makes it uncertain.

<sup>65</sup> See, e.g., Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius*, which discusses the role of communion in conciliar formulas throughout.

<sup>66</sup> Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* 21: ...*cum homine pariter interiit et secta.*

<sup>67</sup> Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 [PL 10.562-563]; Jer. *De vir ill.* 95; *Epistula Luciferi, Pancrati, et Hilarii* (= Lucifer, *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt*). See Flower, *Emperors and Bishops*, 240-241 for a translation of the last citation, a letter to Liberius from Lucifer and the two presbyters who accompanied him to Milan. See Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 243-244 for this argument as well.

<sup>68</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 1 is a short, tendentious description of Damasus' election (and character flaws) written by a member of this faction.

most likely a separate community.<sup>69</sup> Rome was a natural locus, given its size and communication networks, for small Christian communities to establish themselves.

### *Sardinia*

Evidence also points to another Luciferian community somewhere else in Italy, either in the Bay of Naples or on Sardinia itself. Faustinus and Marcellinus themselves do not describe any community in either of these locations, but both Jerome and Ambrose suggest that one existed. They are probably referring to a community on Sardinia that descended from Lucifer himself.

Ambrose, in discussing the death of his brother Satyrus, says that Satyrus was in a shipwreck while returning from North Africa.<sup>70</sup> When he made his way ashore to the local church,<sup>71</sup>

He summoned the bishop to him...and thoroughly questioned him as to whether he was united with the catholic bishops, that is, with the Roman community (*ecclesia*). And perhaps the community of that region was in schism up to that time. For Lucifer had divided himself at that time from our communion, and, although he had been an exile for the faith, he had also left heirs of his own faith...

But it is unclear where exactly Satyrus was shipwrecked. All we can say is that it was somewhere between North Africa and Milan, a heavily traveled region. The phrasing in this passage concerning the church of Rome suggests that Satyrus did not shipwreck at the mouth of the Tiber. Moreover, had Satyrus indeed gone to Rome, one would expect Ambrose to explicitly say so (and one would imagine Satyrus could have easily found a

---

<sup>69</sup> See the discussion of the *Quae gesta sunt* in the Introduction.

<sup>70</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.27. Cf. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 68-78.

<sup>71</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.47: ...advocavit ad se episcopum...percontatusque ex eo est utrumnam cum episcopis catholicis, hoc est cum Romana ecclesia conveniret. et forte ad id locorum in schismate regionis illius ecclesia erat. Lucifer enim se a nostra tunc temporis communionem diviserat et, quamquam pro fide exulasset et fidei suae reliquisset heredes...

non-Luciferian church there). The fact that Satyrus was shipwrecked means that typical sailing routes are of little value in assessing his actual (rather than intended) destination. In sum, Satyrus could have ended up just about anywhere between Italy, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and North Africa.

The *Libellus precum* does include some information about Naples, so it is possible, given the pattern we have seen so far, that the Luciferians had a community of theirs at Naples as well. The Luciferians themselves describe the exile of Maximus of Naples in the 350s under Constantius II, an exile from which Maximus would not return, dying in 361.<sup>72</sup> The death of another Neapolitan, a man named Rufinus, at the hands of Epictetus of Centumcellae is subsequently described as well.<sup>73</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus later describe how Zosimus, Maximus' Arian successor, was removed from his episcopate by Lucifer (who was returning from exile to Cagliari) or, rather, by the intervention of God.<sup>74</sup> So once more, the experiences of the 350s might provide a backdrop for later developments.

Interestingly, the Luciferians point out that Zosimus is still alive, and anyone who wishes to investigate the matter can go ask him about it, but do not mention anything regarding a Luciferian community in Naples in the 380s. Mas takes this silence to indicate that there was no Luciferian community in the area.<sup>75</sup> Given their tendency to

---

<sup>72</sup> *Lib. prec.* 25 and 62.

<sup>73</sup> *Lib. prec.* 26.

<sup>74</sup> *Lib. prec.* 63-65. On Zosimus' appointment by Constantius, see Raymond Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, Translated Texts for Historians 6 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), xxvi who suggests that construction projects in Naples under Constantius perhaps reflect an attempt to mollify the local populace after the exile of Maximus.

<sup>75</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 336.

emphasize connections between events of the 350s with their communities in the 380s, he is probably correct.

It is far more likely that the Luciferians Satyrus encountered were in Lucifer's see of Cagliari on Sardinia. McLynn assumes that these Luciferians were on Sardinia but offers no explanation beyond the natural assumption that as Lucifer was from Sardinia, so too would his 'heirs' be in Sardinia.<sup>76</sup> But there are two further pieces of evidence that positively suggest that Sardinia, not Naples, was the location of the Luciferians in Ambrose's funeral speech. Firstly is Ambrose's admittedly vague description of 'that region' (*illius regionis*) being in schism, which need not refer to Sardinia. But Ambrose seems to directly connect 'that region' with Lucifer himself; the church of 'that region' is in schism because Lucifer 'left heirs.' Ambrose may be saying that Lucifer left behind heirs in Naples, or anywhere else on Satyrus' route, but the more natural interpretation is that Lucifer left behind heirs to himself in his see. Secondly, Jerome suggests that the Luciferians were geographically limited to Sardinia. He first of all makes a joke about the Son of God coming to Earth for a 'Sardinian cloak,' a learned reference to a passage in Cicero apparently at Lucifer's expense.<sup>77</sup> He elsewhere asks if Christ's church is only in

---

<sup>76</sup> McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 70.

<sup>77</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 1: At ille e contrario, rationabiliter quidem, sed importuno et loco et tempore, defendebat, non sine causa Christum mortuum fuisse, nec ob Sardorum tantum mastrucam Dei Filium descendisse.* Jerome's characteristic learned reference to Cicero is from *Pro Scauro* 45 (= *Pro Milone. In Pisonem. Pro Scauro. Pro Fonteio. Pro Rabirio Postumo. Pro Marcello. Pro Ligario. Pro Rege Deiotaro*, ed. and trans. N.H. Watts, Loeb Classical Library 252 [Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1931]): *quem purpura regalis non commovit, eum Sardorum mastruca mutavit?*

Sardinia and refers to the Luciferians as ‘Sardinians.’<sup>78</sup> These quips suggest that Jerome saw Sardinia as a central location for Luciferians.<sup>79</sup>

Mas agrees with Jerome that there was a strong rigorist presence on Sardinia but treats Lucifer’s community on Sardinia as separate from the Luciferians of the *Libellus precum*. He argues that Jerome is merely using a rhetorical trick to point out that if the Luciferians think so highly of Lucifer, then Jerome can reduce their claim to the absurdity that Lucifer’s see is the only proper Christian community.<sup>80</sup> If Lucifer’s separation from the broader Nicene communion meant that he had a community of his own on Sardinia while there were other ‘Luciferians’ throughout the Mediterranean, then Jerome must be making another joke when he asks the Luciferians if the ‘True Church’ is to be limited to Sardinia alone.

The question of the nature of the community on Sardinia is, of course, intricately bound to the question of whether or not Lucifer was personally responsible for the emergence of the Luciferian community. As we shall see, the way our authors describe Lucifer’s role in establishing the Luciferian community at large (or not) actually suggests that the community as a broader whole emerged in the 360s as well.

Generally speaking, it seems unlikely that one man started a Mediterranean-wide community by himself; the language of Rufinus, for instance, suggests that while Lucifer was responsible for events on Sardinia, the community arose independently of him. Jerome and Ambrose likewise directly ascribe whatever rigorists there were on Sardinia

---

<sup>78</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 14.

<sup>79</sup> The implications of the appellation ‘Sardinian’ will be discussed in Chapter Two.

<sup>80</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 266-267.



to Lucifer, but not the broader movement. Rufinus, whose translation and addition to Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* was composed around the year 400, states that Lucifer returned to Cagliari and never changed his mind about the Council of Alexandria. He writes:<sup>81</sup>

Thus Lucifer returned to Sardinia, and whether he was prevented by the quickness of death from having enough time to change his mind (for things begun rashly are often corrected with time) or whether he sat with an immoveable heart, I am not sure. Meanwhile, the schism of the Luciferians, which still exists though only among a few, took its beginning from him.

This phrasing only suggests that Lucifer was somehow responsible for the beginning of the Luciferian movement, not that he himself personally led it. There are much more direct ways of ascribing leadership than *ex ipso...schisma...sumsit [sic] exordium*. Equally important is his use of the word 'meanwhile,' *interim*. The inclusion of the word 'meanwhile' suggests that the *exordium* of the Luciferian *schisma* was occurring concurrently while Lucifer was in Sardinia refusing to change his mind, not that Lucifer being obstinate caused the schism to arise. Lucifer died in 370, which means that the *schisma* he describes must come earlier than 370 or right in 370.<sup>82</sup> This also matches its place in the narrative; Rufinus writes that the *Luciferianorum schisma...sumsit exordium* immediately after describing the Council of Alexandria and Lucifer's actions in Antioch, not among the later events of the 370s. If Rufinus' account is accurate, and there is little reason to doubt it, then we must imagine the Luciferians as a community emerging in the

---

<sup>81</sup> Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.30: *Ita regressus ad Sardiniae partes, sive quia cita morte praeventus, tempus sententiae mutandae non habuit (etenim temere coepta corrigi spacio solent) sive hoc animo immobiliter sederat, parum firmaverim. Ex ipso interim Luciferianorum schisma, quod licet per paucos adhuc volvitur, sumsit exordium.*

<sup>82</sup> Jer. *Chron.* 370 C.E./Valentinian and Valens 6.a/287<sup>th</sup> Olympiad.

360s, not the 370s. Rufinus seems to imply that (a) on Sardinia, Lucifer remained obstinate, and (b) at the same time, that is, in the 360s, a community of rigorists around the Mediterranean labeled ‘Luciferians’ arose.

The statements in Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* and Ambrose’s *De excessu fratris sui Satyri* about the community on Sardinia also suggest that the Luciferians in general, not just the community on Sardinia, were continuous with earlier communities. First of all, we should not assume that the Luciferians on Sardinia were unconnected with Faustinus and Marcellinus’ group just because Jerome makes jokes about the Luciferians being limited to Sardinia. This type of name-calling was common against all dissident communities, even ones that were clearly not geographically isolated.<sup>83</sup> Also, as we have seen within the *Dialogus* itself, it is very suggestive that immediately after Jerome asks whether the church is limited to Sardinia he brings up another Luciferian center, that is, the aforementioned, unnamed Spanish rigorist and his province.<sup>84</sup> The reference to Spanish allies suggests that when Jerome asks if the ‘True Church’ should be limited to Sardinia, he is making a joke, not describing a reality.

Moreover, the very composition of the work itself suggests that the Luciferians were more widespread than just Sardinia. As noted above, Sardinia was an important center of trade and travel. But it was of little cultural or political importance. Hanson in fact believes that Liberius made Lucifer bishop of Calaris because “he did not have

---

<sup>83</sup> See, e.g., Augustine, *De haeresibus* 86 (= *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars XIII, 2*, ed. M.P.J. van den Hout, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 46 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1969]), where he calls the Montanist Tertullian a ‘Kataphrygian’: ...*transiens ad Cataphrygas*... when he of all people knew that Tertullian was an African, not Phrygian. This subject will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 2.

<sup>84</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 15.

enough education to fill a more important see.”<sup>85</sup> It seems unlikely that Jerome wrote a book solely for the benefit of a relatively minor province that he never appears to have visited. Jerome was interested in a broader problem among late antique Christians in the West.

The debate is particularly important because the *De excessu fratris Satyri* of Ambrose and the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* of Jerome are our two oldest references to the Luciferians. The *De excessu* has been dated to sometime between 375 and 378. The date of 375 is offered by Palanque.<sup>86</sup> Picard offers 377 instead.<sup>87</sup> Faller thinks it was composed in early 378.<sup>88</sup> McLynn puts it in 378, stating that “Ambrose’s tone far better suits the crisis of the following autumn.”<sup>89</sup> There is no hard evidence in support of any of these dates, but the latest suggestion still puts the passage no later than 378.

Ambrose writes that at that time (*tunc*), the church was divided because Lucifer had withdrawn from catholic communion and left heirs behind. Ambrose must, then, be describing a community of Lucifer’s ‘heirs’ from some time before the composition of the oration, that is, whenever Satyrus’ shipwreck was. And Ambrose does not act like this was some new development; if Lucifer left heirs, this suggests continuity between Lucifer’s actions in the 360s and the community Ambrose is writing about in the 370s. Next, consider the passage in which Ambrose mentions the Luciferians: “And perhaps

---

<sup>85</sup> *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 509.

<sup>86</sup> *Saint Ambrose*, 488-493.

<sup>87</sup> *Le souvenir des évêques*, 604-607.

<sup>88</sup> In his edition of the document, at 73, 81-88.

<sup>89</sup> *Ambrose of Milan*, 69.

the church of that region was in schism *up to that time*.”<sup>90</sup> Again, Ambrose’s language suggests that there is continuity. It is not that the Luciferians had emerged wherever it was that Satyrus was shipwrecked, it is that they were still there.

The dating of Jerome’s *Dialogus* is also controversial, but also supports an interpretation of the Luciferians as a movement that began in the 360s.<sup>91</sup> A date sometime during Jerome’s stay in Rome, that is, from 382-386, is tempting because we know of a Luciferian community in Rome.<sup>92</sup> But sometime in the 370s while Jerome was in and around Antioch, is a much stronger candidate.<sup>93</sup> Canellis prefers a relatively early date, even before 376, mainly based on the similarities between Jerome’s attitude towards Arians in the *Dialogus* and the *Chronicon*. The *Chronicon* was probably composed in 378 as Jerome’s first major work of translation while in Constantinople (the date is further suggested by the death of Valens being the last entry).<sup>94</sup> Kelly does not settle on a hard date for the *Dialogus*, but prefers an earlier date due to its eastern allusions and relative immaturity compared to Jerome’s later writing.<sup>95</sup> Most significantly, both Kelly and Canellis refer to Jerome’s chronologically arranged list of his own literary

---

<sup>90</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.47: *et forte ad id locorum in schismate regionis illius ecclesia erat*. For the phrase *ad id locorum*, see *LSJ* s.v. ‘locus’ II.D: ‘*to that time, till then, hitherto*.’

<sup>91</sup> For the longstanding debate, see Canellis, *Débat entre un luciférien et un orthodoxe*, 28-34, and *ibid.*, “Saint Jérôme et les Ariens.”

<sup>92</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77-85. The classic argument for this date is P. Batiffol, “Les sources de l’Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi de St Jérôme,” in *Miscellanea Geronimiana: Scritti varii pubblicati nel XV centenario dalla morte di San Girolamo*, ed. Vincenzo Vannutelli (Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1920): 97-113.

<sup>93</sup> This date has received support from F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*, 2 vols (Louvain and Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense/Honoré et Édouard Champion, 1922), 1.1.56-58; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1975), 62-64, and Aline Canellis, “Saint Jérôme et les Ariens, Nouveaux éléments en vue de la datation de l’Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi?” in *Les Chrétiens face à leur adversaires dans l’Occident latin du 4ème siècle* ed. Jean Michel Poinssotte (Rouen: Publications de l’Université de Rouen, 2001), 193-194.

<sup>94</sup> Kelly, *Jerome*, 72.

<sup>95</sup> Kelly, *Jerome*, 62-63.

accomplishments, which he offers as the final entry of his *De viris illustribus*. In the list of works he has authored, Jerome places the *Dialogus* after his *Vita Pauli heremitaie* and before his *Chronicon*, which suggests its composition took place before the *Chronicon* as well and thus sometime in the 370s.

Thus the *Dialogus* seems to be from the mid-370s and includes references to Luciferians outside of Sardinia. This is only ten to fifteen years following the Council of Alexandria. Two further factors indicate that the *Dialogus*, like the *De excessu*, confirm the existence of Luciferians considerably earlier. First is Jerome's knowledge of the Luciferians. He clearly is working with a detailed knowledge of their basic arguments, all of which, again, revolve around the Council of Alexandria. A learned man with connections like Jerome obviously could have heard about the Luciferians without personally coming into contact with them. But it is certainly suggestive that Jerome, as one of his earliest literary productions, decided to write against the Luciferians. If these Luciferians seemed so important to Jerome, it suggests at least that they were well established, threatening, and familiar to Jerome. This suggests that Jerome likely lived for a significant amount of time alongside Luciferians or in multiple places where he found Luciferians, not just that he had heard of them.

Jerome could easily have come into contact with Luciferians early on in his life. The Luciferians Jerome describes cannot be the supporters of Paulinus in Antioch, because Jerome himself was a supporter of Paulinus. Jerome must have come into contact with Luciferians somewhere else, and thus somewhere earlier than his stay near Antioch, which began in 372 or 373 and lasted through the time at which he probably composed

the *Dialogus*, that is, the mid- to late-370s. There are two places where we hear of Luciferians and where we know Jerome lived: he was in Rome in the 360s with his friend Bonosus, then the two of them traveled together to Trier. After these locations, Jerome moved where there were no Luciferians like the ones he described: he lived in Aquileia briefly before traveling to Syria where he settled in 372 or 373.<sup>96</sup> This puts the potential matches between Jerome's movements and the locations of Luciferian communities sometime before 373, probably years earlier. This suggests that there were Luciferians, as Jerome knew them, active in the late 360s or early 370s at the latest.

The most important factor in the *Dialogus* that suggests Jerome is describing a pre-existing community is, however, the tone and tenor of the document. Jerome refers to the Luciferians by a variety of names, but never seems to question their emergence in the wake of the Council of Alexandria in 362. In fact, like Ambrose, Jerome directly blames Lucifer for starting a schism, but Jerome even directly connects his activities in doing so to the Council of Alexandria: "The West assented to this decision...At such a turning point for the church, the wolves raging, he deserted the rest of the flock with a few sheep set apart."<sup>97</sup> Jerome's detailed knowledge of Luciferian beliefs concerning ordination also makes it hard to believe that he would be mistaken about the fundamental aspects of their origins.

If, then, both Ambrose and Jerome write in the 370s in such a way that indicates that the Luciferians were an already established community, and apparently starting with

---

<sup>96</sup> On Jerome's early life and movements, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 25-35.

<sup>97</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 20: *Assensus est huic sententiae Occidens...in tali articulo Ecclesiae, in tanta rabie luporum, segregatis paucis ovibus, reliquum gregem deseruit.*

Lucifer himself, the justification for dating the emergence of a ‘Luciferian’ identity too far into the 370s is on shaky ground. It would seem that these Luciferians show continuity in the existence of their communities between the early 360s and the 380s, which means that we should seek their origins in the events of the early 360s (namely, dissatisfaction with the Council of Alexandria, as Faustinus, Marcellinus, and Jerome describe) rather than in the later persecutions of Roman Luciferians under Damasus.

#### *North Africa*

In North Africa, there is only a hint of some Luciferian activity. Faustinus and Marcellinus report that Ephesius, after visiting Eleutheropolis in person in the place of Heraclida, set out for North Africa “invited by letters of the faithful.”<sup>98</sup> This is the only explicit reference the *Libellus precum*, or any other text, makes to the community there. It is, admittedly, not much to go on.

We do have circumstantial evidence to suggest a pre-existing Luciferian community in North Africa. We might wonder if Augustine came into contact with Luciferians personally, since he expresses some surprise that they were not included in Epiphanius’ *Panarion* or Philastrius’ *Diversarum haereseon liber*; but Augustine was well read and was at least aware of Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, even if he had not read it, so his knowledge is in no way conclusive.<sup>99</sup> More interestingly, we have seen so far the importance of exiled bishops such as Paulinus, Eusebius of Vercelli, and of course, Lucifer of Cagliari himself, in creating rigorist communities in their sees at

---

<sup>98</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104-107: ...*beatus Ephesius, invitatus fidelium litteris, in Africam navigavit...*

<sup>99</sup> *De haeresibus* 86. We know he read Jerome’s *De viris illustribus*, in which Jerome included a catalogue of his own works including the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*: *Aug. Ep.* 40 = *Jer. Ep.* 67.

home and while in exile. In a passage of Jerome's *Chronicon*, referenced above, he relates the following under the year 370: "Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, dies, who like Gregory, bishop of the Spanish provinces, and Philo of Libya, never involved himself with the Arian depravity."<sup>100</sup> We know nothing at all about Philo of Libya other than this briefest of mentions. Yet this mention takes on greater importance given the context provided above. We can deduce from the fact that Jerome mentally associated him with these other staunch Nicene Christians that Philo never swore to an Arian creed in the 350s. It is entirely possible that Philo's community in North Africa was linked to the same circle of rigorist communities that came from the confessors of the 350s.

Some scholars have argued that Ephesius was setting out for North Africa to poach Donatists or form some kind of alliance with them.<sup>101</sup> Mas rightly rejects this as a mere possibility without evidence.<sup>102</sup> Given the semi-Arian leanings of the Donatists, the argument should be rejected not only as lacking in evidence but as implausible as well.<sup>103</sup> Ephesius would have found it difficult to convince Donatists to join any Luciferian cause anyways; their conflict with other Christians in North Africa went back for decades and was only superficially similar to the issue the Luciferians had with *praevaricatores*.

But as part of Mas' broader argument about the Luciferian community, he argues that Ephesius was traveling to Africa in order to forge alliances with other pre-existing

---

<sup>100</sup> 370 C.E./Valentinian and Valens 6.a/287<sup>th</sup> Olympiad.

<sup>101</sup> Anne-Marie Labonnardière, "Pénitence et réconciliation des Pénitents d'après saint Augustin - II," *REAug* 13 (1967): 267-8; Y.-M. Duval, "Saint Jérôme devant le baptême des hérétiques. D'autres sources de l'Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi." *REAug* 14 (1968): 152-8, 168, 176.

<sup>102</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 319.

<sup>103</sup> On the Donatist theological leanings, see Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 170. The Donatists attended the semi-Arian Council of Philoppopolis in 342 along with many eastern bishops, whereas the African catholics and the rest of the western bishops attended the pro-Nicene Council of Serdica. Jerome, in his *De vir. ill.* 93, writes that Donatus in his *De spiritu sancto* was '*Ariano dogmati congruens*.'



intransigent communities there.<sup>104</sup> We know of a catholic bishop of Carthage, Restitutus, who presided over the Council of Rimini in 359 and who led the anti-Arian delegation to Constantius' court from that council.<sup>105</sup> Constantius eventually cowed that delegation into signing a creed that contained no mention of the word *ousia*.<sup>106</sup> We also know of a certain Restitutus of Africa who was condemned by a council at Rome in 378, a council that requested Gratian remove this Restitutus from office.<sup>107</sup> Martin and others have suggested that these two are one and the same, and that Ambrose, Damasus, and others were pursuing Restitutus for not fully realigning himself after his capitulation at Rimini to the Nicene party after the Council of Alexandria.<sup>108</sup> Mas suggests that Ephesius was traveling to North Africa to attract rigorists who would be opposed to Restitutus or bishops like him.<sup>109</sup>

But Faustinus and Marcellinus do not write as though Ephesius was heading to North Africa to proselytize. According to the *Libellus precum*, there were already 'faithful' in North Africa who summoned Ephesius. If Ephesius needed to travel to Africa to establish alliances, who was summoning him and how did they know that he would be

---

<sup>104</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 317: "No hay que olvidar, que el motive del viaje de Efesio, es establecer alianzas con comunidades que tuvieran un mismo planteamiento intransigente, y en Cártago fácilmente las habría, de ahí que se pueda pensar que Efesio buscaba entrar en contacto con diferentes sectores rigoristas africanos, con la intención de ganárselos para su causa luciferiana."

<sup>105</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 183. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 377.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 378-379.

<sup>107</sup> Amb. *Ep. extra coll.* 7.6: *Per Africam quoque Restitutum nomine causam dicere apud episcopos iussit vestra clementia. Debuit adquiescere; sed idem saeva et insolentium manu a causae dicendae necessitate diffugit.* See also Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 200 and 206.

<sup>108</sup> Annick Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328-373)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1996), 620-621. Cf. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 200. This probably should not be pushed too far – a quick glance at the *Gesta synodi Carthagenensis* (= *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*, 3 vols., ed. Serge Lancel, Sources chrétiennes 194, 195, 224, 373 [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972-1975, 1991]) of the Council of Carthage in 411 reveals that Restitutus was a very popular name in North Africa.

<sup>109</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 317.

in Eleutheropolis? It seems far more likely that Ephesius was summoned to North Africa to deal with the same kinds of problems that, as we shall see, may have prompted Heraclida of Oxyrhynchus to summon Ephesius and that prompted Hermione to summon Heraclida from Oxyrhynchus.

### *Oxyrhynchus*

The evidence in Oxyrhynchus has a slightly different character than the preceding discussions, because following the elevation of the pro-Arian Valens as emperor in 364, many eastern bishops remained Arian to curry favor with him. In Oxyrhynchus, we once again find Faustinus and Marcellinus depicting persecutions in the 350s that led to pro-Nicene rigorism, which in turn resulted in Nicene rigorists being persecuted by other Nicene Christians in the 380s. In the first half of the *Libellus precum*, the Luciferians describe (with horror) the Arian practice of reordaining Nicene bishops in Egypt if these bishops wished to remain bishops of their sees.<sup>110</sup> Later, the Luciferians describe the emergence of a staunchly Nicene community in Oxyrhynchus. These Nicene Christians opposed the bishop Theodore, a Nicene bishop who swore to an Arian creed and was reordained as an Arian bishop.<sup>111</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus relate that the rigorist community in Oxyrhynchus emerged due to the influence of a certain Paul. Paul was an ascetic whom the petition compares to the well-known Anthony, saying that the two ascetics lived at the same time and that Paul “had no less life, nor zeal, nor divine grace

---

<sup>110</sup> *Lib. prec.* 48.

<sup>111</sup> *Lib. prec.* 94.

than holy Antony.”<sup>112</sup> This Nicene community “later ordained a bishop for itself, the holy Heraclida, through the catholic bishops of that time.”<sup>113</sup> The aforementioned Theodore persecuted Heraclida’s community and had Heraclida jailed; Theodore also received a basilica seized from the Melitians.<sup>114</sup>

The identity of this particular Paul has provoked no small amount of scholarly debate and no amount whatsoever of scholarly consensus. Blumell identifies this Paul as a well-known disciple of Anthony’s, Paul the Simple; Cavallera, identifies him as the famous Paul of Thebes described in Jerome’s biography.<sup>115</sup> Blumell is also correct in saying that Paul was a common name for monks in Egypt at the time, and we may be looking at a Paul unrelated to any others that we know.

In any event, as they do with the Luciferian community at Rome, Faustinus and Marcellinus minimize the influence of Lucifer himself. They nowhere mention that Lucifer spent a considerable amount of time in exile along with Eusebius of Vercelli in the Thebaid; the two even consulted with each other on their plans for re-establishing Nicene orthodoxy, and then traveled together from Oxyrhynchus when Julian relaxed their exiles, until Eusebius stopped in Alexandria and Lucifer continued north to Antioch.<sup>116</sup> However much this Paul, whoever he was, mattered to the establishment of a

---

<sup>112</sup> *Lib. prec.* 93: *Ad hanc obseruantiam plerique eorum eruditi sunt exemplo et motu beatissimi Pauli, qui isdem fuit temporibus quibus et famosissimus ille Antonius, non minori vita neque studio neque divina gratia quam fuit sanctus Antonius.*

<sup>113</sup> *Lib. prec.* 94: *Sed postea etiam episcopum sibi per tunc temporis episcopos catholicos ordinavit sanctum Heraclidam.*

<sup>114</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96, 99, 100-101.

<sup>115</sup> Lincoln H. Blumell, *Lettered Christians: Christians, Letters, and Late Antique Oxyrhynchus* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 152, with reference to Rufinus (*Hist. mon.* 31), Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 22), and Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.* 1.13); F. Cavallera, “Paul de Thèbes et Paul d’Oxyrhynque,” *Revue d’ascétique et de mystique* 7 (1926): 302-305.

<sup>116</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 3.5.

community of rigorists in Oxyrhynchus, Lucifer and Eusebius must have had a great deal of influence within the region as well. Shuve, as noted above, believes that Lucifer's time in Rome was responsible for the rigorist community there.<sup>117</sup> The same would be true of his time in southern Egypt, particularly if he was in the company of another prominent pro-Nicene bishop, Eusebius.

The conflicts between the 'twice' bishop (i.e. a Nicene bishop reordained as an Arian) Theodore and the pious bishop Heraclida in the second half of the *Libellus precum* initially sound like another example of the Luciferians providing an example of the persecution of Luciferians in the 380s. The position of the narrative in the *Libellus precum* suggests as much. But Faustinus and Marcellinus' account may reflect a conflict in the 350s, between an openly Arian and a Nicene Christian.<sup>118</sup> In other words, Faustinus and Marcellinus may be attempting to take events of the 350s and project them into the recent past in order to make it seem like their community suffered this persecution in the 380s.

The argument begins with Theodore. Athanasius initially ordained Theodore in 347.<sup>119</sup> A fragment of papyrus suggests that by 351/2 a certain Dionysius was the catholic Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus.<sup>120</sup> The natural inference is that by the early 350s, Athanasius had appointed a replacement for the now-Arian Theodore.<sup>121</sup> Faustinus and

---

<sup>117</sup> Shuve, "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 257.

<sup>118</sup> *Lib. prec.* 92-101.

<sup>119</sup> Ath., *Epistulae festales* 19.10 (= *S. Athanase, lettres festales et pastorales en copte*, ed. and trans. L-Th. Lefort, CSCO 150 [Louvain: Peeters, 1955]). See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 183-191 on the dating.

<sup>120</sup> P.Oxy. XXII.2344. See Nikolaos Gonis, "Dionysius, Bishop of Oxyrhynchus, and His Date," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 36 (2006): 63-65; Blumell, *Lettered Christians*, 150.

<sup>121</sup> Contra Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 309.

Marcellinus then say that the notorious George of Alexandria (called George of Cappadocia by his non-Arian detractors) reordained Theodore. This George was bishop of Alexandria from 356 until his murder in 361 at the hands of a pagan mob.<sup>122</sup> Thus Theodore would have to have been reordained sometime before 361, which so far aligns with the broader trends towards Arian positions in the 350s. Lastly, Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Paul as a contemporary of Antony, who lived in the early fourth century.

The chronology of Theodore's ordinations suggests that he was active around the 350s and 360s, not the 380s. If Faustinus and Marcellinus were describing a community persecuted in the 380s, it would thus be necessary that Theodore served as a bishop of the city for over three decades. Was Theodore a bishop, in one guise or another, from 347 until the 370s or even the 380s? That would be quite a lengthy career.

Moreover, Dorotheus, not Theodore, was the Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus in 381.<sup>123</sup> The presence of another Nicene bishop under Theodosius, not Theodore, means that Theodore could not have simply returned to Nicene communion as a bishop following the Council of Alexandria. Thus it seems that the Luciferians are bending the timeline of their narrative here to incorporate earlier events into the later portion of the

---

<sup>122</sup> On his death, see Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.2. The mob was stirred up by the Christian discovery of skulls in an abandoned mithraeum, which they claimed were the corpses of humans which they claimed were immolated for the purposes of divination; the Christians proceeded to parade the skulls around Alexandria as proof of the depravity of pagans. The pagans were understandably incensed, and, undoubtedly feeling some security with Julian as the newly-installed emperor, started a riot.

<sup>123</sup> Dorotheus was a signatory at the Council of Constantinople in 381 as the bishop of Oxyrhynchus.

petition. Blumell, at any rate, puts the persecutions of Heraclida at around 360 on the basis of these points (while emphasizing how confusing the Luciferians' narrative is).<sup>124</sup>

But the evidence provided by the *Libellus precum* suggests that Theodore was in fact still bishop in Oxyrhynchus into the 380s. Faustinus and Marcellinus say that Theodore was receiving a basilica that belonged to the Melitian Apollonius of Oxyrhynchus. Epiphanius describes Apollonius as the Melitian bishop of Oxyrhynchus in 359, so the basilica must have been given to Theodore sometime after this.<sup>125</sup> But Apollonius was also a co-conspirator of George, who reordained Theodore, and later an ally of Theodore himself. It makes little sense to imagine that agents of the state were taking a basilica from Apollonius and giving it to Theodore unless Theodore had changed allegiances to the Nicene party. Apollonius also plays little role in the narrative itself; he is only once mentioned as persecuting Christians alongside Theodore before being used simply to identify whose basilica was being given to Theodore.

Nor can we say that Theodore was taking over the basilica while still favoring the Arian party. The phrasing of the *Libellus precum* makes it seem like Theodore was receiving the basilica shortly before they wrote the petition in 383 or 384: "Look at whom, as if to a catholic, the basilica of Apollonius is now handed over to on the authority of your general edict."<sup>126</sup> The word *nunc* certainly suggests that this transfer was ongoing or, given the perfect tenses throughout the section, occurred very recently (as in the English phrase 'just now'). Furthermore, the transfer of the basilica is described

---

<sup>124</sup> *Lettered Christians*, 150-153.

<sup>125</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion haereticorum*, 3 vols., ed. K. Holl, rev. J. Dummer, GCS 25, 31, 37 (Berlin,: Akademie Verlag, 1915, 1922, 1933) 73.26.4.

<sup>126</sup> *Lib. prec.* 101: *Ecce cui, quasi catholico, basilica nunc tradita est Apollonii ex generalis edicti vestry auctoritate...*

as “now being handed over by the authority of your general edict.”<sup>127</sup> But Theodosius was in no position to pass any legislation until Valens’ death in 378; this year thus serves as the *terminus post quem* for the transfer of the basilica of the Meletians to Theodorus. Moreover, Theodosius was staunchly in favor of the Nicene party, which implies that Theodore must have been a member of the same to garner Theodosius’ favor.

Faustinus and Marcellinus furthermore suggest that Theodore received the basilica “as though a catholic” (*quasi catholicus*). This implies that the receipt of the basilica took place not only after the Council of Alexandria in 362 but after Theodore had rejoined the Nicene party. Their phrase *quasi catholicus* suggests that Theodore had been re-admitted to Nicene communion as a bishop despite having sworn to an Arian creed. The government perceived Theodore as *catholicus*, but Faustinus and Marcellinus allege that he was only pretending to be one.

Even more significantly, Theodore would have had no pressing need or desire to change theological allegiances under the pro-Arian emperor Valens, who, again, did not die until 378. Faustinus and Marcellinus even claim that bishops under Valens once again pretended to be Arians to maintain their sees.<sup>128</sup> Thus Theodore’s change to pro-Nicene theology probably came about in the late 370s as an attempt to appeal to the theological beliefs of the new emperor. The actual phrasing of the *Libellus precum* suggests this interpretation of Theodore’s career: “Look at him! He throws out that he is a catholic

---

<sup>127</sup> *Lib. prec.* 101: *Ecce cui, quasi catholicus, basilica nunc tradita est Apollonii ex generalis edicti vestry auctoritate...*

<sup>128</sup> *Lib. prec.* 67: *Et tacemus quod, etiam sub Valente, iterum se quidam haereticis tradiderunt, quos nunc nihilominus uidemus inter catholicos nominari.*

under you pious emperors who came on behalf of the catholic faith.”<sup>129</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus criticize Valens, so by ‘you pious emperors’ they must be referring to the actual addressees of the petition, putting Theodore’s ‘conversion’ in 378 or later.<sup>130</sup> Moreover, Faustinus and Marcellinus are not simply describing the emperors as pious out of politeness; the two often refer to Theodosius in the second-person singular when only addressing him, so their use of the second-person plural here means that they are referring to the current emperors to whom the petition is addressed. We might even take the ablative absolute as having a temporal meaning, thus rendering the clause in translation as “When you pious emperors came on behalf of the catholic faith.” In any event, Theodore’s change of allegiances came after Theodosius’ elevation to the imperial throne in 378.

Not only the transfer of the basilica, but the persecutions that Faustinus and Marcellinus describe must have occurred not in the 350s but in the 380s. Firstly, the evidence within the *Libellus precum* suggests that Heraclida became bishop of a rigorist party in the 360s *after* the Council of Alexandria. The most critical is the way Faustinus and Marcellinus describe the growth of his community in Oxyrhynchus: “...many men from the furthest places came to the point of view of his faith and doctrine and his most holy conduct. They cursed the unspeakable society of traitors and longed for the sacrosanct company of that man.”<sup>131</sup> Just above, they had described how Heraclida was

---

<sup>129</sup> *Lib. prec.* 100: *Ecce qui sub vobis piis imperatoribus et pro fide catholica venientibus iactat se esse catholicum...*

<sup>130</sup> Valens is criticized at *Lib. prec.* 66-67.

<sup>131</sup> *Lib. prec.* 95: *...plerique etiam de longissimis regionibus aduenirent, execrantes nefariam praeuaricatorum societatem eiusque sacrosanctum consortium desiderantes!*



ordained “against heretics and traitors” (*contra haereticos et praevaricatores*).<sup>132</sup> These *praevaricatores* whom some cursed and against whom Heraclida was ordained were those who swore to Arian creeds and then returned to Nicene communion; this was an issue for the Luciferians only after 362. Even if rigorist opposition to Arians had existed in Oxyrhynchus before the Council of Alexandria, it could only crystallize into a community (which felt the need to ordain a bishop) opposed to these *praevaricatores* afterwards. So Heraclida’s episcopacy of the Nicene rigorists in Oxyrhynchus (not the Nicene Christians who favored the more clement party at the Council of Alexandria), and Theodore’s persecution of him, must at the earliest be after the year 362.

Moreover, the phrasing of the *Libellus precum* suggests that it was as the Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus that Theodore continued to persecute them:<sup>133</sup>

Look at him! He throws out that he is a catholic under you pious emperors who came on behalf of the catholic faith. He overturns the community of the catholics [*ecclesiam catholicorum*], persecutes catholic priests and the servants of Christ, and even impiously assaults his holy virgins!

The present tense used throughout the passage suggests that for Faustinus and Marcellinus, it was as the Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus that Theodore has launched his campaign of persecution, not as an Arian bishop. Their explanation for why Heraclida was arrested but then released so often supports this interpretation: “For what law could they have against a catholic bishop?”<sup>134</sup> Under Valens, the Arian party would have had much greater support from state agents. Thus this persecution of Heraclida also seems to

---

<sup>132</sup> *Lib. prec.* 94.

<sup>133</sup> *Lib. prec.* 100: *Ecce qui sub uobis piis imperatoribus et pro fide catholica uenientibus iactat se esse catholicum euertens Ecclesiam catholicorum, persequens catholicos sacerdotes et seruos Christi nec non et sacras eius uirgines impie affligens!*

<sup>134</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96: *Quod enim ius habere poterant contra episcopum catholicum?*

postdate Theodore's change of allegiance. This persecution of Nicene Christians by other Nicene Christians agrees with the events that the two presbyters describe in Baetica as well. Theodore, it seems, was the bishop of Oxyrhynchus for many years, siding with the Arian party or Nicene party when it suited him.

What about Dorotheus? After all, Theodore could not have been the Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus if Dorotheus was. But several scholars believe it is much more likely that Dorotheus and Theodore were in fact one and the same, and that Dorotheus' name – which is attested nowhere other than the record of signatories to the Council of Constantinople in 381 – is just a textual corruption of the very similar name Theodore.<sup>135</sup> The name Dorotheus cannot be taken as compelling evidence against a long episcopacy for Theodore.

It has also been argued that the rigorist community at Oxyrhynchus was persecuted in the 380s, but was separate from the broader Luciferian community until Ephesius visited to incorporate them into the broader Luciferian community.<sup>136</sup> But the description of Ephesius' visit to Oxyrhynchus in the *Libellus precum* supports the interpretation that this community had been a part of the broader Luciferian community for some time. Faustinus and Marcellinus state that Ephesius was in Oxyrhynchus “for ecclesiastic reasons,” *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas*. As they do not describe Heraclida being deceased, it was probably not an ordination that required Ephesius' presence. But it is

---

<sup>135</sup> First proposed by Michael Le Quien, *Oriens christianus: in quatuor patriarchatus digestus*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1740), 2.578-579; elaborated more recently by A. Papaconstantinou, “Sur les évêques byzantins d'Oxyrhynchus,” *ZPE* 111 (1996): 173. This name seems particularly prone to confusion; as Papaconstantinou points out, another document (the *Expositio fidei ecclesiae Ancyrae*) lists the bishop of Oxyrhynchus in 371 as 'Theodoulos.'

<sup>136</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 309.

difficult to see what other ecclesiastic services would require the presence of two bishops. Other uses of the phrase are late and equally vague. Gregory the Great asks the bishop of Corsica to take care so that the *utilitates ecclesiasticae* will be salutary.<sup>137</sup> The 55<sup>th</sup> of the *acta* of the Council of Frankfurt in 794 has Charlemagne request that Hildebald of Worms stay at Aachen, not his own see, just as Archbishop Angilramn had done *propter utilitates ecclesiasticae*.<sup>138</sup> In these cases, *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas* refers to the problems of managing pre-existing Christian communities.

Augustine perhaps provides a model for what this service might have meant. In the introduction to his response to the Donatist Petilian's letter to the clergy at Constantina, he describes how he learned about the letter: "Now, when I was in the church of Constantina, and Absentius was present with my colleague Fortunatus, his bishop, some brothers brought me a letter..."<sup>139</sup> Augustine claims that Fortunatus brought Petilian's letter to his attention upon his arrival, but it seems likely that Augustine was there to shore up support for the catholic faction in Constantina, which must have found something troublingly appealing in the letters of Petilian to justify Augustine's appearance.<sup>140</sup> Are we to imagine Augustine just happened to be in town when this letter

---

<sup>137</sup> *Ep. 78: Ita in his omnibus diligens ac esto sollicitus ut tua dispensatione utilitates ecclesiasticae salubriter modis omnibus Deo valeant auctore disponi.*

<sup>138</sup> *Capitulare Francofurtense 55 (= PL 97.199-200): Dixit etiam dominus rex in eadem synodo, ut a sede apostolica, id est ab Adriano pontifici, licentiam habuisset, ut Angilramnum archiepiscopum in suo palatio assidue haberet **propter utilitates ecclesiasticas**. Deprecatus est eadem synodum, ut eo modo sicut Angilramnum habuerat, ita etiam Hildeboldum episcopum habere debuisset; quia et de eodem, sicut et de Angilramnum, apostolicam licentiam habebat. Omnis synodus consensit, et placuit eis eum in palatium esse debere **propter utilitates ecclesiasticas**.*

<sup>139</sup> *Contra litteras Petiliani*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 54 (Vienna, 1909) 1.1: *Nunc vero cum essem in ecclesia Constantiniensi, Absentio praesente, et collega meo Fortunato, eius episcopo, obtulerunt mihi fratres epistolam...*

<sup>140</sup> On Augustine's information networks, see Claire Sotinel, "Augustine's Information Circuits," in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. Mark Vessey, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), 132-137.

made its appearance as well? Even if the letter itself did not prompt Augustine's visit, this description demonstrates that Augustine regularly traveled throughout his see and beyond, presumably to ensure doctrinal conformity.<sup>141</sup>

Mas argues that the community could not have been associated with the community described by Faustinus and Marcellinus before Athanasius' death in 373, since Athanasius makes no mention of the Luciferians in his writings and the petition makes no mention of their persecution under the name *Luciferiani* as they do for the community at Rome.<sup>142</sup> Mas also states that the community in Oxyrhynchus separated from Theodore because he was reordained, a different circumstance than other Luciferian communities we have seen, which again suggests that this was a separate community that later merged with the broader Luciferian movement.<sup>143</sup> This separate, independent schism in Oxyrhynchus joined with the Roman rigorists when Ephesius visited, "attracted by the fame that Heraclida had acquired by his firm stance against Theodore."<sup>144</sup>

Athanasius' silence could suggest any number of interpretations. More likely is that he was more concerned with Arians than rigorous Nicene Christians and saw any

---

<sup>141</sup> See e.g. *Ep.* 29, 62.1, 124. *Ep.* 22 hopes for a visit by Saturninus; at *Ep.* 84.1 Augustine discusses his failure to send a deacon to Novatus. Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37 (Berkeley: University of California Press), 265; cf. Synesius, *Epistula* 67 (ed. A. Garzya [Rome: Typis Officinae Polygraphicae, 1979]); *Vita Sancti Theodori Syceotae* 75-78 (= *Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*, ed. A.-J. Festugière [Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1970]).

<sup>142</sup> *La crisis luciferiana*, 309.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*: "atraído por la fama que había adquirido Heráclidas por su firmeza ante Teodoro." Shuve, "The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira," 259, states that "[Ephesius] then travelled on alone into Palestine and Egypt, ostensibly in search of Heraclides, whom he never seems to have found." But it is hard to make that argument given that Faustinus and Marcellinus write that Ephesius "had come to the bishop Heraclida" (*Lib. prec.* 104: *qui...ad episcopum Heraclidam...venerat*).

who opposed men like Theodore catholic.<sup>145</sup> After all, Theodosius calls the Luciferians *catholici* in his rescript. A failure on Athanasius' part to explicitly refer to *Luciferiani* makes much sense given the continued problem of Arianism in the East under Valens. That the Luciferians took special exception to Theodore's reordination makes sense given that he seems to be the only bishop who both persecuted them and had been reordained as an Arian. In any event, while the Luciferians do express horror at Theodore's reordination, it is not the reason they explicitly give for the community's growth and Heraclida's ordination, as noted above, both of which are connected with his theological doctrines and a hatred of *praevaricatores*. Lastly, Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Ephesius' motivations for visiting, which have to do with unspecified ecclesiastic services. He does not seem to have been pursuing new allies.

We can, then, paint a picture of what happened in Oxyrhynchus. The Nicene bishop from the 340s was Theodore, who then swore to an Arian creed under Constantius and continued with this allegiance under Valens until 378, when the Nicene Theodosius became emperor. Then Theodore once again changed allegiances to the Nicene party, probably to avoid having his basilica confiscated (a legitimate threat – after all, he was receiving a Melitian basilica in the 380s). Meanwhile, Lucifer and Eusebius, Nicene rigorists, were exiled to the nearby Thebaid in the 350s. These men, and others like this mysterious Paul, inspired a rigorist group of Nicene Christians in Oxyrhynchus. These rigorists, or at least some of them, separated themselves from Theodore's community

---

<sup>145</sup> Note that Athanasius' death came long before Theodore's change of allegiance back to the Nicene party. See, too, Athanasius' own theological rigorism and suspicions about those whom Luciferians called *praevaricatores* in Chapter 3.

and, following the Council of Alexandria in 362, ordained a bishop for their community, Heraclida. Heraclida remained in communion with the rigorists across the Roman Empire. In Oxyrhynchus, these rigorists maintained opposition to Theodore while he was an Arian and, most importantly, after he had changed allegiances under Theodosius. As the local (now Nicene) bishop, Theodore persecuted these rigorists for not accepting him as the legitimate Nicene bishop of Oxyrhynchus (since the rigorists' bishop was Heraclida). The scenario that best explains why Ephesius would be visiting Oxyrhynchus *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas* is that the Oxyrhynchus rigorists remained connected to other communities that were also a part of Lucifer's and Eusebius' staunchly Nicene circle following the Council of Alexandria in 362.

#### *Eleutheropolis*

The last major section of the *Libellus precum* details the affairs of the Luciferian community in the Palestinian city of Eleutheropolis and follows this up with a history of Lucifer's own experience in the city during his exile.<sup>146</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus begin the narrative by discussing the fortunes of the Luciferians Hermione, an aristocrat-turned-ascetic, Severus, a former tribune, and other *fidelissimi servi Dei*.<sup>147</sup> Ephesius, the Luciferian bishop of Rome, visited both of these rigorists after Hermione requested that Heraclida visit them from Oxyrhynchus (Ephesius, as noted above, happened to be in Oxyrhynchus *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas*). Hermione, Severus, and others were also persecuted in Eleutheropolis by a certain Nicene bishop named Turbo, although the *Libellus precum* does not offer any specific descriptions of what this persecution entailed.

---

<sup>146</sup> *Lib. prec.* 102-110.

<sup>147</sup> *Lib. prec.* 107-108.

Faustinus and Marcellinus believed that this community was directly related to one formed while Lucifer was visiting Eleutheropolis in exile in the 350. After concluding their description of Turbo’s crimes against Hermione and Severus, Faustinus and Marcellinus detail persecutions that Lucifer suffered in Eleutheropolis during his exile in the 350s, when Turbo was a deacon of the Arian bishop Eutyches.<sup>148</sup> They also make explicit reference to Lucifer’s role in establishing an intransigent community in Eleutheropolis: “Today, there are still those in Palestine who at that time, with those men coming after them, paid the harshest price because they came together with Lucifer, a bishop of the catholic faith.”<sup>149</sup> The connections that the Luciferians draw here could not be clearer. Just as Turbo as an Arian persecuted Lucifer, so too does Turbo as a ‘catholic’ persecute Hermione and Severus. Once again, Lucifer’s presence helps explain why there are Luciferian communities in such far-flung places as Eleutheropolis, and the Luciferians themselves recognized and emphasized connections between the past and present in the very way they structure their narrative.

By the 380s, this community was long-lived and well organized. Faustinus and Marcellinus say that Hermione was comforted by Ephesius’ visit “along with her holy monastery” (*cum sacro monasterio*).<sup>150</sup> By the 380s, the word ‘monastery,’ both in its Greek form *monasterion* and in early Latin examples of *monasterium*, could suggest

---

<sup>148</sup> *Lib. prec.* 109-110. On early clashes between the staunchly Nicene Epiphanius and Eutyches, see Jer. C. *Ioh.* 4; P. Nautin, “Epiphane,” in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 31 vols., ed. R. Aubert and L. Courtois, cols. 15.617-631. Epiphanius was a native of the area around Eleutheropolis. Eusebius of Vercelli had also spent time in exile in Palestine, but in the northern city of Scythopolis rather than in the southerly Eleutheropolis: Eusebius of Vercelli, *Epistula* 2.1 (ed. Bulhart, CCSL 9 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1957]).

<sup>149</sup> *Lib. prec.* 109: *Sunt adhuc hodie in Palaestina qui illo tempore, istis insequentibus, poenas gravissimas dederunt eo quod cum catholicae fidei episcopo Lucifero convenirent.*

<sup>150</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104.

either communal living or living in individual cells.<sup>151</sup> The use of *cum* here suggests not that Hermione was alone in a cell but that she was with other people. Hermione's monastery seems to have been a collective of Luciferians.

But the Luciferian community at Eleutheropolis was not just a monastery, either. Faustinus and Marcellinus write that when Ephesius visited Eleutheropolis, Severus "had not yet found the holy communion of the catholics."<sup>152</sup> The Luciferians do *not* make this point about Hermione or the other *fidelissimi servi Dei*, the implication being that Hermione and these *servi* had, indeed, found the 'sacred communion of the catholics' – in other words, that they already had some form of community. The *Libellus precum* also uses the word *fraternitas* to describe not only the community at Eleutheropolis, but the community in Rome as well.<sup>153</sup> The word itself suggests an organized group of individuals, and the reference to another *fraternitas* suggests that the Luciferian community in Eleutheropolis was not categorically different than the one in Rome, which all scholars agree began in the 360s.

---

<sup>151</sup> The *Libellus precum* is an early use of *monasterium*. Etymologically one might expect it to refer to solitary living, but the earliest Greek use of the term in a religious context is in the first century, when Philo, *De vit. cont.* 3.25, describes a space in which communities of so-called 'Therapeutae' would study sacred Jewish writings. This passage is cited by Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 2.17.9. Athanasius uses the word *monasterion* throughout the *Vita Antonii*, ed. by G.J.M. Bartelink, SC 400 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994): see, e.g., 15.5, 39.23, 46.4, 47.3, to mean 'cell,' seemingly for an individual, though certainly not one isolated from visitors. While still a priest in Antioch (381-398), not far from Eleutheropolis, John Chrysostom casually refers to monasteries as places of communal worship led by individual holy men: *Homilies in epistulam i ad Timotheum* (= PG 62.501-600) 5:8. This terminology is further discussed in Chapter 5.

<sup>152</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104: ...*sed nondum qui invenisset catholicorum sacram communionem.*

<sup>153</sup> Eleutheropolis: *Lib. prec.* 107: *Ubi autem idem beatus Ephesius, inuitatus fidelium litteris, in Africam nauigauit, nobis apostolico more dans praeceptum ut circa sanctam fraternitatem diuinis et ecclesiasticis officii incubaremus, id ipsum sancta illic fraternitate poscente, egregius Turbo Eleutheropolitanae episcopus ciuitatis, nostram exiguitatem despiciens, in nos coepit uelle consummare quod in sanctum Ephesium consummare non ausus est...* Rome: *Lib. prec.* 79: ...*sanctus presbyter Macarius dat uigilias, in quadam domo conuocans fraternitatem, ut, uel noctu, diuinis lectionibus fidem plebs sancta roboraret.*



Furthermore, when Ephesius leaves Eleutheropolis in their narrative, Faustinus and Marcellinus attribute Turbo's persecution to the fact that their community was growing (*crescere*), not that it had just arisen at that time.<sup>154</sup> The form *crescere* is an inchoative verb based in *creo*, and while some inchoative verbs have a causative or inceptive meaning, *creo* typically functions, as Dilke points out, as the causative form of the verb.<sup>155</sup> *Crescere* does sometimes carry the force of something previously nonexistent coming into being, but this is mainly in poetry.<sup>156</sup> Moreover, Faustinus uses the form *creare* in a causative sense throughout the *De Trinitate*, signifying that in his writing he distinguished somehow between *creare* and *crescere*. The significance, then, is that by using *crescere* Faustinus and Marcellinus are saying that this community was in a process of growing, thriving, or increasing, not that the community was created at that time.

Mas argues that the community at Eleutheropolis only became a Luciferian community after Ephesius came and organized them into one. His argument here rests on four interrelated points: first, that before Ephesius' visit the Luciferians describe individuals, not a community, as they do at Oxyrhynchus; second, that the phrase the Luciferians use to describe the community at Eleutheropolis, *quidam fidelissimi servi Dei*, is indefinite and does not describe any kind of organized community; third, that persecution against this community arose only after the arrival of Ephesius, not before;

---

<sup>154</sup> *Lib. prec.* 108: *Namquam hic Turbo, posteaquam audivit quosdam se integrae fidei copulare et per Dei gratiam rem veri crescere...*

<sup>155</sup> O.A.W. Dilke, "Used Forms of Latin Inchoative Verbs," *CQ* 17 (1967): 400.

<sup>156</sup> *LSJ* s.v. I.

fourth, that after Ephesius' departure, the Luciferians *do* refer to an organized community (*qui nobiscum sacrae communionis consortio*).<sup>157</sup>

While it is true that the Luciferians use the phrase *quidam fidelissimi servi Dei* before Ephesius' visit and *fraternitas* afterwards, it is not the case that they must be referring to a disorganized community. In fact, the Luciferians do refer to the Egyptian community in one place as the *ipsos servos Dei*, and these 'servants of God' were clearly part of an organized community.<sup>158</sup> Secondly, how did Hermione know to summon Heraclida from Oxyrhynchus unless the two were already in contact with one another? Hermione's initial request suggests firstly that the communities in Palestine and Egypt were in contact with each other, and did not rely on the Luciferians of Rome. Her request suggests a pre-existing line of communication between the two communities rather than one emerging in the late 370s with Rome as a central hub. Lastly, Ephesius did not set out for Palestine to rally rigorists to the Luciferian cause, he set out because the rigorists in Palestine had requested the presence of Heraclida. It makes more sense that a community in Eleutheropolis, in need of a bishop, sent for Heraclida; Heraclida, being unable or unwilling to travel to Palestine, sent Ephesius along in his stead. Ephesius hardly seems like an active player in any of his movements; he is in Oxyrhynchus *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas*, is sent to Palestine in the place of Heraclida, and then (as we have seen) is summoned to Africa. These movements suggest that Ephesius was responding the needs of pre-existing communities, not actively forming new ones.

### *Antioch*

---

<sup>157</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 312-313.

<sup>158</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99.

The possible existence of Luciferians at Antioch is particularly confusing due to the terminology used by our ancient authors. The problem begins with Lucifer's ordination (to the chagrin of Eusebius of Vercelli) of Paulinus as bishop of Antioch in 361 in opposition to Meletius of Antioch, who had been ordained by an Arian but had supported the Nicene party.<sup>159</sup> The terminology used by Christian authors for these parties, however, differed substantially. Western authors refer to these parties as 'Melitian' and 'catholic' (they generally supported Paulinus despite their reservations about Lucifer's behavior), whereas eastern authors referred to some of the more intransigent supporters of Paulinus as 'Luciferians,' following the name of the man who ordained him in their eyes illegitimately. Western authors nowhere use 'Luciferian' in this sense.

This change is easiest to see in Socrates' *Historia ecclesiastica*. He relied heavily on Rufinus' translation and extension of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*, but transformed it in many ways. For example, in his extension, Rufinus writes this passage about the dissent at Antioch:<sup>160</sup>

The parties still dissented there, but they were nevertheless hopeful that it might be possible that they might be called back together, if such a bishop were chosen that both, not just one, party would rejoice in him. For them, [Lucifer] too hastily called on Paulinus, a catholic and holy man who was worthy of the priesthood in all things. But nevertheless both parties were unable to agree with the choice.

---

<sup>159</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.6, 3.9.

<sup>160</sup> Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.27: *ibique dissidentibus adhuc partibus, sed in unum tamen revocari posse sperantibus, si sibi talis eligeretur episcopus, erga quem non una plebs, sed utraque gauderet, praeproperus catholicum quidem et sanctum virum, ac per omnia dignum sacerdotio Paulinum episcopum collocavit, sed tamen in quem adquiescere plebs utraque non posset.* See Mas, *La crisis luciferianai*, 119. Interestingly enough, Sulpicius Severus, in his *Chronica* II.445.8, mentions Lucifer in Antioch withdrawing from communion with those who received former heretics into their communion, but not any resulting schism among the Christians in Antioch.

Rufinus never describes the pro-Paulinus party at Antioch as ‘Luciferian,’ though he is given ample opportunity to in the following chapter in which he discusses the various attitudes towards Paulinus, Meletius, and Eustathius of Antioch.<sup>161</sup> Moreover, Rufinus, writing around the year 400, would find it difficult to describe the pro-Paulinus faction as ‘Luciferian’ given the support of western catholics like Jerome and Damasus (as well as Athanasius) for Paulinus rather than Meletius.<sup>162</sup> Instead, Rufinus describes the competing bishops at Tyre this way: “Diodorus...was made bishop by the testimony of Athanasius and the confessors...another was ordained by the factions of Meletius.”<sup>163</sup> For Rufinus, there were catholics and there were the *partes Meletii*.

But when Lucifer returns to Cagliari, Rufinus does describe a group of Christians whom he calls the ‘schism of the Luciferians.’ He writes:<sup>164</sup>

Thus Lucifer returned to Sardinia, and whether he was prevented by the quickness of death from having enough time to change his mind (for things begun rashly are often corrected with time) or whether he sat with an immoveable heart, I am not sure. Meanwhile, the schism of the Luciferians, which still exists though only among a few, took its beginning from him.

Rufinus presents the developments at Antioch as a consequence of Lucifer’s attempt and failure to resolve an already existing division in the populace there by ordaining Paulinus

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid. 1.30.

<sup>162</sup> See Hanson, *The Christian Search for the Doctrine of God*, 643-653. Jer. *Ep.* 15.2, e.g., calls Meletius the *proles Arianorum*, though of course there was little love lost between Jerome and Rufinus by the year 400; cf. Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* 6.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid. 2.21: *Diodorus, unus sane ex antiquis catholicis vir, et tentationem documentis probatus, Athanasii testimonio esset a confessoribus episcopus factus, modestia eius contemta, alius a Meletii partibus ordinatur.* It is worth noting that according to Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.* 6.12), at least, Diodorus’ opponent, Zeno was ordained by 365, at least 13 years prior to Diodorus’ nomination, given that Rufinus seems to suggest that Athanasius was dead by the time Diodorus was ordained.

<sup>164</sup> Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.30: *Ita regressus ad Sardiniae partes, sive quia cita morte praeventus, tempus sententiae mutandae non habuit (etenim temere coepta corrigi spacio solent) sive hoc animo immobiliter sederat, parum firmaverim. Ex ipso interim Luciferianorum schisma, quod licet per paucos adhuc volvitur, sumsit exordium.*

as an indisputably Nicene bishop. But Rufinus does not describe a new schism emerging as a consequence of this ordination, or rather, when he does, he refers to it as the *partes Meletii*. Thus this passage about Lucifer's return to Sardinia and the consequences of his intransigency does not reflect developments at Antioch. Instead, Rufinus is describing the emergence of some other new community, the *Luciferianorum schisma*, which is separate from the occurrences at Antioch.

Socrates' history is a completely different matter. Immediately after discussing the schism at Antioch, and Lucifer's role in it, he writes:<sup>165</sup>

But Lucifer, perceiving that the ordination [of Paulinus] was not accepted by Eusebius, considered it an insult and was terribly irritated. In fact, he separated himself from communion with Eusebius, and wanted to reject the decisions of the council from his love of strife. These things, happening in time of unhappiness, put many off of the church, and another heresy arose then: the Luciferians. But Lucifer did not let his anger fill him, for he had been bound by his own oaths in which he promised to be content with what had been decreed by the council, as he had sent his deacon.

It is not at first clear here whether Socrates is moving from the particular circumstance at Antioch to the emergence of the Luciferians in the broader Christian world, or if he merely means that these Luciferians arose in Antioch because they supported his ordination of Paulinus. Since Socrates describes the emergence of the sect immediately following Lucifer's condemnation of the Council of Alexandria, not his ordination of Paulinus, he seems to be establishing a connection between the two. Sozomen, who heavily relied on Socrates, interprets the events the same way: "And thus for strife,

---

<sup>165</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.5-7: Λούκιφερ δὲ πυθόμενος μὴ δέχεσθαι ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου τὴν χειροτονίαν αὐτοῦ ὕβριν ἠγεῖτο καὶ δεινῶς ἠγανάκτει· διεκρίνετο οὖν κοινωνεῖν Εὐσεβίῳ, καὶ τὰ τῆ συνόδῳ ἀρέσαντα ἀποδοκιμάζειν ἐκ φιλονεικίας ἐβούλετο. Ταῦτα ἐν καιρῷ λύπης γενόμενα πολλοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπέστησεν, καὶ γίνεται πάλιν Λουκιφεριανῶν ἑτέρα αἵρεσις. Ἀλλὰ Λούκιφερ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀποπληρῶσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσεν· ἐδέδετο γὰρ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὁμολογίαις, δι' ὧν ἀποστείλας <αὐτοῦ> τὸν διάκονον στέρξειν τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς συνόδου τυπούμενα καθυπέσχετο.

Lucifer tried to discredit the opinions of the Council of Alexandria, and so he became the cause [or ‘alleged cause’] of the heresy called ‘Luciferians’ after him.”<sup>166</sup> The Luciferians, then, seem to have emerged because of dissatisfaction with the Council’s decisions (which these authors connect to Lucifer’s personal dissatisfaction), not because of the ordination of Paulinus.

Later in book 5, however, Socrates refers to the Luciferians again, but this time as some of the supporters of Paulinus in Antioch. Careful reading demonstrates that Socrates is talking about a community that supported Paulinus, but not a community comprised of *all* the supporters of Paulinus. In the passage, the followers of Paulinus and Meletius have agreed to simply accept both Paulinus and Meletius as bishops of Antioch, and upon the death of one to not ordain anyone else in his place but simply to accept the other as sole bishop. “But,” as Socrates writes, “those of Lucifer separated themselves on account of this, because Meletius, ordained by the Arians, was received into the episcopate.”<sup>167</sup> By referring to “those of Lucifer,” Socrates here seems to suggest that a pre-existing community of Lucifer’s in Antioch rejected this compromise, not that by rejecting this compromise they became known as Luciferians. Even more tellingly, Sozomen writes, “A few of the Luciferians still kept apart;” the word ‘still’ definitely implies that there were Luciferians in Antioch before this compromise.<sup>168</sup> So the Luciferians in Antioch, then, were (apparently) a community of believers who shared

---

<sup>166</sup> Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 5.13.4: ...καὶ ὡς ἐξ ἔριδος τὰ δόξαντα τῇ συνόδῳ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ διαβάλλειν ἐπεχείρει. ὁ δὲ πρόφασις ἐγένετο τῆς αἵρέσεως τῶν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καλουμένων Λουκιφεριανῶν. The δὲ in the second line directly connects Lucifer’s casting aspersions on the Council of Alexandria with the emergence of the αἵρεσις.

<sup>167</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 5.5.7: οἱ δὲ Λουκίφερος διὰ τοῦτο διεκρίθησαν, ὅτι Μελέτιος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν χειροτονηθεὶς εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐδέχθη.

<sup>168</sup> Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 7.3.5: ...ὀλίγοι δὲ τῶν Λουκίφερος ἔτι διεφέροντο...

Lucifer's anger at the Council of Alexandria's decision even before Paulinus and Meletius came to a compromise.

The critical point here is that Socrates read Rufinus, who never described any community at Antioch as 'Luciferian,' but then described the more rigorist supporters of Paulinus in Antioch as 'Luciferian.' Socrates thus directly changed which community was identified as Luciferian, ignoring the original attributions provided by Rufinus and substituting his own. This is perhaps because at the time Socrates was writing, sometime between 438 and 449, the faction at Antioch was still active (and causing trouble!) whereas the disaffected communities across the Mediterranean following the Council of Alexandria had long since died away. It would be perfectly natural for Socrates to read in Rufinus about those who in general dissented with the Council of Alexandria, among whom Lucifer figured prominently, and connect this broad dissent with the dissension in Antioch that was caused by Lucifer.<sup>169</sup> It is also worth noting that while earlier Socrates used the phrase Λουκιφεριανῶν...αἵρεσις to describe those who emerged following Lucifer's anger at the decisions of the Council of Alexandria, in book 5 he instead writes οἱ δὲ Λουκίφερος. It is possible that Socrates himself understood that there were two groups, which he uses different phrases to describe, one in Antioch and one that had existed across the wider Mediterranean; both were related to Lucifer in their origins, but not in their later fortunes.

In sum, though, there were not necessarily members of the Luciferian community represented by Faustinus and Marcellinus in Antioch. Just because Socrates labeled the

---

<sup>169</sup> Sozomen, as a close follower of Socrates, might have merely accepted Socrates' attribution or might have been of a similar mind.

dissenters in Antioch as Luciferians (or ‘those of Lucifer’) does not mean that we need to trust this attribution. Easterners were eager to blame Lucifer for the problem at Antioch when he was probably doing exactly what Athanasius, a longtime enemy of Meletius, wanted.<sup>170</sup> Furthermore, the Luciferians Faustinus and Marcellinus make no reference to any of these events in Antioch. This omission is not surprising at all, as Paulinus was, as noted above, firmly supported by western Nicene Christians such as Jerome and Damasus, who vigorously opposed Faustinus and Marcellinus’ community. Given Paulinus’ compromising stance with Meletius and the communion he surely shared with a number of *praevaricatores*, it is not hard to imagine other reasons for their silence. So it seems that these were separate communities: as the Luciferians did not interact with the Antiochene faction of Paulinus, these western authors did not consider the Paulinian faction in Antioch to be ‘Luciferian.’ With all of these considerations in mind, it seems clear that the Christians in Antioch who supported Paulinus (and opposed his later compromise) and the Christians represented by Faustinus and Marcellinus represent two different communities. Despite the confusing terminology of 5<sup>th</sup>-century authors who sometimes labeled them as ‘Luciferian,’ the supporters of Paulinus in Antioch play no real role in the history of the Luciferian community represented by Faustinus and Marcellinus.

### *Conclusion*

The Luciferians thus appear to be a well-organized community that existed continuously from the 360s to the 380s, when Faustinus and Marcellinus delivered the

---

<sup>170</sup> Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 643-653.



*Libellus precum* to Theodosius. Although some scholars have argued that the *Libellus precum* represents a far different, and younger, community, the evidence for this interpretation is slight. Rather, the *Libellus precum* itself seems to be a product of an integrated movement. Rather than recount the individual cases above, I will now turn to some general observations about the contents of the *Libellus precum* as they relate to the question of their origins.

First, the very structure of the petition suggests that Faustinus and Marcellinus perceived their community as the direct descendants of the rigorists of the 350s. In nearly every location they discuss they present persecutions under the Arians as directly connected to the persecutions they suffer under Nicene Christians. In two cases, the persecutors are the same: Theodore in Oxyrhynchus and Turbo in Eleutheropolis. In another case, they seem related: Hosius of Cordoba persecuted Gregory and his successor Hyginus of Cordoba persecuted Vincentius because of his connection to Gregory. Faustinus and Marcellinus nowhere betray signs of clear deception. If anything, the fact that they do *not* draw similar parallels for their community in Rome, which several scholars believe to be the principal center of the Luciferians, belies the point. If these Roman Luciferians wanted to pretend that their community was descended from rigorists of the 350s or 360s, they surely had ample opportunity to do so, given Liberius' capitulation in the 350s and the violently contested election between Damasus and Ursinus in the 360s.

Second, the very knowledge the *Libellus precum* offers, often in great detail, about events in Spain, Trier, Italy, Egypt, and Palestine suggests that a communication

network existed that linked these communities. The Luciferians themselves believed these connections went back to the rigorists of the previous generation. They describe the continued communication of the rigorists in exile, noted above: “Although they [the *confessores*] were separate in body through the distance of the regions [of their exiles], they were nevertheless organized in spirit into one body through shared letters.”<sup>171</sup> We know that these individuals were in fact close allies of one another, from the testimony concerning the struggles over the Trinity found in other ancient authors (and in Hilary’s case, in his own writing). Communication between communities of rigorists was already going on in the 350s and 360s. Moreover, the Luciferians of the 380s appear to have been in contact with one another the same way. Hermione summons Heraclida to Eleutheropolis explicitly by a letter; Ephesius is summoned to North Africa, again, *invitatus fidelium litteris*. The *confessores* of the 350s communicated with one another by letter; the Luciferians of the 380s in the exact same locations contacted each other by letter.

Lastly, the Luciferians show no hesitation to admit when their communities are growing. Faustinus and Marcellinus explicitly describe the ordination of Heraclida and the growing numbers of his congregation. In Eleutheropolis, they provide a specific example of a new convert, Severus, and they also describe the community in Eleutheropolis as growing. Because Faustinus and Marcellinus are comfortable describing to Theodosius instances in which new converts joined their community, the

---

<sup>171</sup> *Lib. prec. 50: ...licet essent corpore discreti per interualla regionum, tamen spiritu in unum positi per mutuas litteras...*

logical conclusion is that in other instances, individuals had already been a part of their community for some time.

In sum, it is clear that Luciferian communities arose only in locations connected to members of the staunchly pro-Nicene party of the 350s. Despite the varied arguments for inserting a gap into the years between the Council of Alexandria (and the bitterness which followed it) in 362 and the emergence of the Luciferians, this line of thought is unjustified. A thorough examination of the evidence suggests that the Luciferians, in other words, the community represented by Faustinus and Marcellinus, appear as a cohesive unit from the 360s onwards.

Communities arose both in the original sees of these bishops and in the locations of their exiles. Lucifer of Cagliari seems to have played an oversized role, at least according to Faustinus and Marcellinus, having connections with Gregory of Elvira, Maximus of Naples, and the cities of Rome, Oxyrhynchus, and Eleutheropolis. Inasmuch as Lucifer of Cagliari was one of the preeminent leaders of the staunch Nicene party of the 350s and 360s, he had connections to these people and places and thus was responsible for the foundation of the community that came to bear his name. He may have even led his own see of Sardinia in schism.

We should picture the emergence of the Luciferian communal identity as a result of radical Nicene individuals in the 350s and 360s inspiring similar radicalism within their original and host communities which then coalesced as an opposition party to the decisions of the Council of Alexandria in the years following that decision. It cannot be a coincidence that these local communities arose precisely where Lucifer and a small

number of other bishops had spent their exiles or traveled to, yet *not* where other initially stringent, but later more forgiving, pro-Nicene bishops (like Hilary of Poitiers) had. This unique geographic development brought with it unique consequences for the Luciferian communities of the 380s, as we shall see in Chapter 2.

## **Chapter 2: The Consequences of Geography**

The distribution of the Luciferian community across the Mediterranean, as described in Chapter 1, had numerous consequences for the later development of the Luciferian community. This chapter explores those consequences by comparing the historical development of the Luciferians with the developments of the Novatians and Donatists. I first examine the geographic distribution of the Novatian and Donatist communities in order to provide a basis for comparison. The Novatians, while spread across the Mediterranean, also had a central ‘hearth’ in Constantinople and Asia Minor, and the Donatists were predominately located in North Africa. Then, I address four specific consequences of the distribution of the Luciferians: their difficulty in reconciling the limited nature of their community with a Christian belief in a ‘universal’ church that encompassed the whole world, the difficulty of communication between communities spread so far across the Roman world, the difficulty in organizing councils of Luciferians despite the importance of councils for late antique Christians, and the general small size of their communities at the local level.

In general, I argue that the distribution of Luciferian communities across the Mediterranean had an adverse impact on their ability to maintain a cohesive communal identity. The Luciferians, by contrast with these communities, had no response to the broader Nicene community’s better claims to universality, found it difficult to maintain communications between their communities, held no councils, and remained relatively isolated and small in number at the local level. The unique nature of the inception of

Luciferian communities, in some sense, created conditions that were not conducive to a community's ability to maintain itself.

### *The Distribution of the Novatians*

The geographic extent of the Novatians is quite peculiar. They were also spread across the Roman Empire, like the Luciferians. But they also had a central point from which they began, because of their 3<sup>rd</sup>-century origins: Rome, the home of Novatian. Traditionally, Novatian is said to have separated from the Roman church of Cornelius when Cornelius took a relatively lenient attitude towards those who had lapsed during the Decian persecution.<sup>1</sup> Cornelius, for his part, attributes Novatian's ordination to his ambitious desire for the episcopacy – and the overly hasty actions of three country bishops whom Novatian plied with drink.<sup>2</sup> Entertaining, but probably fictional, stories aside, Novatian quickly gained a following of fellow rigorists in Rome. From Rome, the Novatians spread quickly across the eastern Empire, but the crisis was (according to Eusebius, relying on Dionysius of Alexandria) resolved.<sup>3</sup> But this picture of a quick and easy resolution in the third century, pleasant as it was for other Nicene authors, does not explain how or why Novatianism remained so prevalent into the fourth century and

---

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography is vast, but see, e.g., A. D'Alès, *Études de théologie historique: Novatien* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924); W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (New York: New York University Press, 1967), 285-315; T.E. Gregory, "Novatianism, A Rigorist Sect in the Christian Roman Empire," *ByzStud* 2 (1975): 2-3; Hermann Josef Vogt, *Coetus sanctorum: der Kirchenbegriff des Novatian und die Geschichte seiner Sonderkirche*, *Theophaneia* 20 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1968), 37-56; James L. Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of pre-Nicene Orthodoxy* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2012), 58-68.

<sup>2</sup> According to the letter in Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 6.43.3-22. According to one source, the 7<sup>th</sup>-c. *Contra Novatianos* of Eulogius of Alexandria (as reported in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 182 [= *Bibliothèque, Tome II, Codices 84-185*, ed. and trans. René Henry [Paris: Les belles lettres, 2003; 2nd edition]]), Novatian had originally been an archdeacon, and in line to succeed Cornelius, when Cornelius ordained him as a presbyter so that he would no longer be next in line for the bishopric.

<sup>3</sup> Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 7.4.

beyond. Novatians had remained in or spread into Spain, Gaul, Italy, North Africa, Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor by the fourth century. Our information on the Novatians, however, does not paint an equitable picture of all of these locations. We are often dependent on Socrates, and our dependence may color our impression of the geographic distribution of the Novatians. But Socrates should not and cannot, of course, be discarded either.

We can infer that there were Novatians in Spain in the fourth century because Pacian, bishop of Barcelona in the mid- to late-fourth century, penned three letters to a certain Novatian named Sympronian. This Sympronian is otherwise unknown, as are any other Novatians in Spain. According to Jerome's *De viris illustribus* (which, incidentally, was dedicated to Pacian's son Dexter), Pacian was also the author of, among others on related subjects, a work *Contra Novatianos*. It is possible that Jerome is referring to these letters, but it seems unlikely; Jerome refers to a complete work, and the three letters decidedly do not make a coherent whole. Fernández suggests that Jerome's description refers to the third letter alone, but again there is no evidence to support this.<sup>4</sup> Hanson also points out, along with others, that at the end of the third letter, Pacian states that he will be writing a fourth; it is possible (though again lacking in evidence) that this treatise became known to Jerome as *Contra Novatianos*.<sup>5</sup> In any event, that circumstances compelled Pacian to write letters and a treatise implies some degree of concern over how

---

<sup>4</sup> Lisardo Rubio Fernández, *San Paciano: Obras* (Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1958), 12.

<sup>5</sup> Craig L. Hanson, *Pacian of Barcelona and Orosius of Braga: The Iberian Fathers vol. 3, Fathers of the Church* 99 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 7.

threatening the Novatians were in Spain. Yet Pacian offers little in the way of details as to why they would be so, and even emphasizes how few of them there are.<sup>6</sup>

In Gaul, we have likewise little information. The earliest Novatians in Gaul are roughly contemporary with Novatian himself. Marcian of Arles, according to letters sent to Cornelius' successor Stephen in Rome and to Cyprian in Carthage by Faustinus of Lyons, had fallen into Novatian's camp; the Gallic bishops wanted to know what they should do.<sup>7</sup> The next references come in the fourth century. Jerome tells us that Reticus of Autun wrote a work *Adversus Novatianum*, now lost.<sup>8</sup> While Novatian himself would no longer have been a threat to Reticus, as he was long dead by the time of Reticus' episcopacy, the fact that Reticus felt compelled to write a work against Novatian's works indicates that Reticus too felt in some way threatened, which implies an active Novatian presence. This is probably confirmed by a letter of Innocent I to Victricius of Rouen detailing the procedures by which Novatians (and others) might be readmitted to catholic communion.<sup>9</sup> The information is of particular interest because of how far Rouen is from Arles and Autun, which perhaps suggests a wide spread of Novatians across Gaul.

Our information about North African Novatians is also scanty. There was apparently a Novatian bishop installed in Carthage who competed with Cyprian in the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century.<sup>10</sup> Information for the fourth century is completely lacking, but there were still Novatians in North Africa in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. Leo, bishop of Rome, writes

---

<sup>6</sup> Pacian, *Epistula* (= PL 13.1051-1081) 3.54.

<sup>7</sup> Cyprian, *Epistula* (= *Opera omnia*, ed. Guilelmus Hartel, CSEL 3.2 [Vienna, 1871]) 66.

<sup>8</sup> *De vir. ill.* 82.

<sup>9</sup> *Ep.* 2.8.11 (PL 20.475). Vincent of Lérins, in his *Commonitorium* 2.5 and 24.62 (= *The Commonitory of Saint Vincent of Lerins/Adversus profanas omnium novitates haereticorum commonitorium*, ed. and trans. C.A. Heurtly [Sainte Croix du Mont: Tradibooks, 2008]), mentions Novatian but not Novatians.

<sup>10</sup> *Cypr. Ep.* 59.9.2.



to the bishops of Mauretania that a certain Novatian is to be allowed to join the catholic communion without losing his episcopal office, and he specifically notes that this cleric is a Novatian, not a Donatist.<sup>11</sup> There is no indication of whether or not this Novatian was exceptional in joining their communion.

There were likely Novatians in northern Italy for similar reasons. Ambrose authored a treatise entitled *De poenitentia*, which explicitly concerns itself with refuting the Novatians. As with Pacian's works, it is useful in suggesting that there were Novatians near Ambrose and that they were of some concern to him, but Ambrose is even more vague than Pacian on any non-theological specifics concerning their community. That Philastrius of Brescia included the Novatians in his catalogue *Diversarum Hereseon Liber* may be significant, but there is no guarantee that every heresy in a reference catalogue would be present in the immediate area of the catalogue's author.<sup>12</sup>

In Rome, there is firm evidence for the presence of Novatians from Novatian onward. Letters between Cyprian and the bishops of Rome contain numerous references to Novatian and starting with his 72<sup>nd</sup> epistle, he refers to Novatian's community as the *Novatianenses*.<sup>13</sup> In the fourth century, we have much evidence. Socrates is first and foremost, of course, reporting the activities of a bishop Leontius in the 380s.<sup>14</sup> There is also the treatise *Contra Novatianum*, which is often (though not always) attributed to

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ep.* 12.6 (*PL* 54.653).

<sup>12</sup> Judith McClure, "Handbooks Against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries," *JTS* 30, no. 1 (1979): 186-197.

<sup>13</sup> *Ep.* 72.2 (*PL* 3.1156).

<sup>14</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 5.14.

‘Ambrosiaster,’ a Roman author writing in the 370s.<sup>15</sup> The need for a treatise against Novatian implies continuing disputes with Novatians. It also seems like Damasus was concerned with the memory of Novatian and thus probably with continuing problems with Novatians.<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, Damasus did not include the Novatians in the long list of anathemas preserved in a letter quoted by Theodoret.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, in response to two of Damasus’ queries, Jerome simply refers him to the writings of Tertullian and Novatian.<sup>18</sup> One might not expect Jerome to so blithely recommend the works of a known schismatic; he was perhaps just counting on Damasus’ ability to distinguish Novatian’s theology from the Novatian community. Lastly, the provisions of a council under Siricius in 386 also provided for the admittance of former Novatians into catholic communion. The inclusion of this procedure demonstrates that there indeed were Novatians still in Rome at the time.<sup>19</sup>

The evidence for the fifth-century community is likewise firm. Socrates refers to Novatians in Rome twice. The first instance is under Innocent I, whose papacy lasted from 401 to 417. Socrates names him as the first bishop who persecuted the Novatian

---

<sup>15</sup> Caspar René Gregory, “The Essay *Contra Novatianum*,” *AJT* 3, no. 3 (1899): 566-570; Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, x.

<sup>16</sup> See Sághy, “*Scinditur in partes populus*.” On Damasus’ anti-heretical actions, see, also John Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 137-157; Lizzi Testa, *Senatori, popolo, papi*, 129-170; Steffen Diefenbach, *Römische Erinnerungsräume: Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 224-242, argues that these authors have overstated Damasus’ vigor.

<sup>17</sup> Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 5.11. The letter is preserved as being to the bishop Paulinus while he was in Thessalonica, but this must undoubtedly be Paulinus of Antioch.

<sup>18</sup> *Ep.* 36.1: *Verum quia heri diacono ad me misso, ut tu putas epistolam, ut ego sentio, commentarium te exspectare dixisti, brevem responsionem ad ea desiderans, quae singula magnorum voluminum prolixitate indigent, τὰὐτὰ σοι ἐσχεδίασα, duabus tantum quaestiunculis praetermissis: non quo non poterim ad illas aliquid, sed quod ab eloquentissimis viris, Tertulliano nostro scilicet, et Novatiano, latino sermone sint editae, et si nova voluerimus afferre, sit latius disputandum.*

<sup>19</sup> Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils From the Original Documents*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871-1896) 2.387.

community there.<sup>20</sup> This persecution was doubtless in conjunction with rules repeating the 4<sup>th</sup>-century policy of readmitting Novatians to his community's communion by the imposition of hands.<sup>21</sup> His deacon Caelestinus likewise persecuted the Novatians in Rome upon becoming bishop of the city in 422.<sup>22</sup> When Socrates writes of Caelestinus, he also describes a vigorous Novatian community in Rome: "For before this, the Novatians flowered greatly at Rome, having many churches and gathering together large congregations."<sup>23</sup> In Rome, then, there was a large Novatian community into the fifth century.

Evidence for Novatians in the sixth century in Rome is much less convincing. In the mid-sixth century, Cassiodorus relates that he met a Novatian (albeit while in Constantinople, not in the west), a blind man named Eusebius who had memorized a number of religious texts.<sup>24</sup> Gregory takes this feat of memory as evidence of the decline of Novatianism in the West: "Cassiodorus found it remarkable that he had met an aged Novatian from Asia, certainly a sign that the sect had lost much of its impetus at least in the West."<sup>25</sup> But Cassiodorus' wonder is clearly that a blind man should have read so much. His actual description of the man's Novatianism is quite simply put: "Directed by

---

<sup>20</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.9.

<sup>21</sup> Innocent, *Epistula* (= PL 20.463-639) 2.8.11: *Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur...* On this policy, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Innocent I on Heretics and Schismatics as Shaping Christian Identity," in Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer, eds., *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium, VC* suppl. 132, (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 266-290.

<sup>22</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.11.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*: "Ἀχρι γὰρ τούτου Νουατιανοὶ μεγάλως ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἦνθησαν, ἐκκλησίας πλείστας ἔχοντες καὶ λαὸν πολλὸν [lit. 'a great laity'] συναθροίζοντες.

<sup>24</sup> Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937) 1.5.2: *...nisi de partibus Asiae quondam ad nos venire Eusebium nomine contigisset...quem tamen adhuc Novatianaе pravitatis errore detentum...*

<sup>25</sup> "Novatianism," 16.

his instruction, I found many old books which were unknown to me. While he is still held by the error of the Novatian depravity, we believe that he will be filled with the illumination of the correct faith by the help of the mercy of the Lord.”<sup>26</sup> This mention of his Novatianism is very casual, coming in the midst of praise and direct, unproblematic interaction with the man. Given their apparently friendly relationship, the description of the Novatian man’s ‘depravity’ feels like rote recitation that might be repeated against any dissident Christian. The implication is not that Novatianism is unusual, but rather that it was quite normal to the Italian. This normality does not prove that there were Novatians in Rome, however; Cassiodorus spent many years in Constantinople, and as we shall see, they played a central role in the life of the Empire’s second capital.

We have a combination of sources that hint at the presence of Novatians in Egypt, or more properly, Alexandria, but little more. Socrates provides some evidence, briefly describing the persecution of Novatians under Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>27</sup> We also know from Photius that a late-sixth or early seventh-century bishop of Alexandria, Eulogius, wrote a tract *Contra Novatianum* in response to a certain Novatian commentary of indeterminate date (about which Photius has nothing nice to say).<sup>28</sup> Photius relates that this commentary stated that there were bishops around Alexandria (though not the bishop of Alexandria himself) who accepted Novatian as the bishop of Rome, putting Novatians in Alexandria in the third century. Athanasius, in the course of his anti-Arian writings, also makes note

---

<sup>26</sup> *Inst.* 1.5.2: ...cuius etiam instructione commonitus multos codices antiquos repperi, qui apud me habebantur incogniti: quem tamen adhuc Novatianaе pravitatis errore detentum, misericordia Domini suffragante rectae fidei credimus illuminatione complendum...

<sup>27</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.7. Michael A.B. Deakin, *Hypatia of Alexandria: Mathematician and Martyr* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus, 2007), 35, suggests that Cyril’s motivation was plundering the Novatians’ sacred vessels.

<sup>28</sup> *Bibl.* 182.

of Novatians occasionally.<sup>29</sup> And of course, if Eulogius thought it necessary to write such a work, there were probably Novatians still in Alexandria whom he found threatening in some way. Thus we can just barely trace a Novatian presence in Alexandria from the third to the late sixth or early seventh century.

In addressing the Novatians in Syria, we are once more on shaky ground. Jerome tells us that Eusebius of Emesa, an early to-mid-fourth century author, also wrote against the Novatians (as well as against the Jews and pagans; his works are now lost).<sup>30</sup> But we know little else about this community. Vogt is not convinced that Eusebius of Emesa was writing against local Novatians at all, but suggests perhaps that he came into contact with Novatian writings through his own theological studies.<sup>31</sup> This argument would not explain why Eusebius found it necessary to write a treatise in response, but it is at least possible that Eusebius took it upon himself to refute Novatian without any Novatian activity nearby.

Our most extensive information in Socrates concerns Novatian communities in Asia Minor and Constantinople. In Asia Minor, communities seem to have existed throughout the villages of Phrygia and Paphlagonia.<sup>32</sup> Perhaps one reason for the

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ap. c. Ar.* 25 (PG 25:289B); Athanasius, *Oratio contra Arianos* (= *Athanasius Werke* I.2, ed. K. Metzler, D. Hansen, and K. Savvidis [Berlin, 1998]) 1.3.; *Epistula ad Serapionem* 4-12 (= *Athanasius Werke* II.5, ed. H.-G. Opitz [Berlin, 1940]); *Ep. ad Serap.* 4-12 (PG 26:648-656). This does not demonstrate that Athanasius personally knew of any Novatians, but they were certainly on his mind and viewed negatively, even though one would think that rigorously orthodox Christians would be natural allies of his in the midst of the Arian controversy. Athanasius had a substantial information network active in the 350s during his exiles: De Clercq, 476; cf. Ath. *De syn.* 55. Vogt, *Coetus sanctorum*, 204 argues that Athanasius' position on the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the *Epistola ad Serapionem* strongly resembles the Novatian position on the question.

<sup>30</sup> *De vir. ill.* 91.

<sup>31</sup> Vogt, *Coetus sanctorum*, 200.

<sup>32</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28 is the clearest statement of this; the earliest mention of them is at 2.38, in the mid-fourth century, where they are already described as numerous and widespread in the area.

existence of Novatian communities in what seems like a relative hinterland of the Empire is the possibility that, as Philostorgius claims, Novatian himself was from Phrygia.<sup>33</sup> This assertion has not gone unchallenged. Vogt claims that Philostorgius was simply assuming that Novatian came from Phrygia on the basis of similarities between the beliefs of the Novatians and Montanists.<sup>34</sup> It is unclear to what degree Novatian's beliefs were informed by Montanism, although it seems at the very least possible. Regardless of Novatian's personal influence, by the fourth century Socrates describes a very strong and vibrant network of Novatian towns, with enough members to justify convoking regional councils and to have their own policies on, for example, the proper date to Easter.<sup>35</sup>

These smaller communities coexisted alongside larger communities in places like Nicomedia, Nicaea, in Bithynia, and Constantinople.<sup>36</sup> The Novatian Auxanon (who would become a presbyter sometime later in the fourth century) and the ascetic Eutychian under whom he studied both lived in Bithynia during the reign of Constantine.<sup>37</sup> Bithynia apparently remained a stronghold of the variety of Novatianism found at Constantinople rather than the Novatianism of Phrygia and Paphlagonia. Chrysanthus attempted to hide in Bithynia when Sisinnius named Chrysanthus as his successor as bishop of Constantinople while the Easter controversy still split the Novatian communities.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 8.15 (Bidez frg. 21).

<sup>34</sup> *Coetus sanctorum*, 17. Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, x simply says that Philostorgius was wrong. Philip R. Amidon, in his edition of Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 23 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 120 believes that Novatian was a native of Rome.

<sup>35</sup> Once again at *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 4.28. See also Gregory, "Novatianism," 12-13.

<sup>36</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 4.28; 7.12.

<sup>37</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 1.13.

<sup>38</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.12. The Easter controversy arose when the Novatians in Phrygia were convinced by a Jewish convert to celebrate Easter 'in the custom of the Jews,' i.e. either on Nisan 14 or on the Sunday following Nisan 14, but either way relying on the Jewish calendar. The Novatians in Constantinople and Bithynia celebrated Easter 'after the equinox,' presumably on the first Sunday after the vernal equinox or

Chrysanthus' also chose the rhetorician Ablabius to be made bishop of Nicaea in Bithynia.<sup>39</sup> In any event, in both the townships and the cities of Asia Minor, Novatians maintained a strong and relatively well-documented presence.

The evidence for Novatians in Constantinople is even more extensive and once again primarily comes from Socrates. We might ask when the earliest Novatians settled there. Socrates had a personal relationship with Auxanon, a presbyter mentioned above who lived in Bithynia.<sup>40</sup> Socrates relates that Auxanon and Eutychian brought one of Constantine's *domestici* who was suspected of treason to Constantinople (setting the story in 330 or afterwards).<sup>41</sup> Socrates would likely have met Auxanon in Constantinople, where Socrates lived. It is possible that, if Auxanon remained there, he was among the first Novatians to settle in the city. By the mid-fourth century the Novatians had three

---

more likely on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox. The controversy culminated in the so-called Indifferent Creed, which allowed Novatians to celebrate Easter on whichever day their local community chose. See Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 5.21 for the Novatians, as well as Eus. *V. Const.* 3.18 for a letter written by Constantine emphasizing the desire for unity on the question.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. Was there a schism between Novatians in Nicaea? Socrates puts later (7.25.16, immediately following Valentinian III's proclamation as emperor in 425) an incident wherein Atticus, catholic bishop of Constantinople, converses with a certain Asclepiades of Nicaea, a Novatian, who claims to have been a bishop for over 50 years. But if this is the case, Asclepiades would have been bishop from about 375 through 425 and the Novatian Ablabius' ordination occur while Asclepiades was still Novatian bishop in Nicaea. The chronology may still work out, if we imagine that Socrates, in discussing Atticus' character in general terms before relating the story of his death, is relating events out of chronological sequence. The language implies this: 'Ἐν Νικαίᾳ δὲ ποτε διὰ χειροτονίαν ἐπισκόπου γενόμενος...', with ποτε here having the meaning of 'once' in reference to the past. See *LSJ* s.v. III.1 (which also offers "esp. in telling a story, *once upon a time*;" Socrates is of course not telling a fairy tale here but the sense of past is clear.). Atticus was bishop from 406 to 425. Chrysanthus began his episcopacy in Constantinople sometime around the civil unrest between Cyril of Alexandria and the prefect Orestes in 415, as those chapters immediately follow Chrysanthus' ordination. Asclepiades could have been bishop until 415 or thereabouts, conversed with Atticus sometime in the preceding nine years, and then been replaced upon his death by Chrysanthus' choice Ablabius.

<sup>40</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13; 2.38. See Theresa Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 17-18, on Auxanon in particular and Socrates' sources in general.

<sup>41</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.

individual churches in the city.<sup>42</sup> As Auxanon did not become a presbyter until sometime after the persecutions of the 350s, and there were already churches there, Auxanon cannot have been the only one to move to the city.<sup>43</sup> It is likely that the Novatians already had a strong presence in Bithynia when Constantine established his new capital in Byzantium, and, like so many others attracted by the opportunities offered by the new capital, Novatians moved into the city. It is worth noting that Socrates, writing in the mid-fifth century, describes the Novatians as having three churches in the present tense while describing events occurring in the 350s under the Arian Macedonius: "...but assembling into the other three (for the Novatians have this many churches within the city), they joined in prayer with one another."<sup>44</sup> This continuity in the number of churches the Novatians had in Constantinople suggests a very stable population of Novatians within the capital.

Lastly, Socrates briefly mentions a Novatian bishop of Scythia, Marcus, visiting Constantinople.<sup>45</sup> It would seem, then, that the Novatians had spread even outside of the bounds of the Roman Empire, something we do not see with the Luciferians (or the Donatists). But the Arian bishop Ulfilas, at least, had proselytized the Goths, so this type of extension of a Christian community was not unheard of.<sup>46</sup>

In the case of the Luciferians, our evidence is mostly dependent on one source. We are in a similar position with the Novatians, where we have extensive knowledge of

---

<sup>42</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

<sup>43</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38 says Auxanon was not a presbyter when tormented under the Arian Macedonius.

<sup>44</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 2.38.26: ... εις δὲ τὰς ἄλλας τρεῖς (τοσαύτας γὰρ ἐντὸς τῆς πόλεως ἔχουσιν οἱ τῶν Ναυατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας) συνερχόμενοι ἀλλήλοις συνηύχοντο. Note the present tense in ἔχουσιν.

<sup>45</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.46.

<sup>46</sup> On Ulfilas, see, e.g., *Phil. Hist. eccl.* 2.5; *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 4.33-34; *Soz. Hist. eccl.* 6.37; *Theod. Hist. eccl.* 4.33; Hagith Sivan, "Ulfila's Own Conversion," *HTR* 89, no. 4 (1996): 373-386.



their activities in Constantinople and Asia Minor courtesy of Socrates, but only hints and suggestions of their activities in Spain, Gaul, Italy, Rome, North Africa, and Egypt. Were the Novatians an urban phenomenon? It might initially seem as though whatever Novatians were outside of Asia Minor and Constantinople congregated around large cities. Our knowledge of the Novatians in Spain is scant, but the notability of their opponent, Pacian, father of the important political figure Dexter,<sup>47</sup> suggests that Pacian's tract was addressed to someone of education and social standing, that is, more likely a resident of a city, not the countryside. A similar argument could be made for Ambrose's tract, written in Milan, an imperial capital. The Novatians in Rome and Alexandria represent populations in two of the largest cities in the ancient world. On the other hand, it is only natural that our texts would reflect an urban bias. Pacian, for example, might not bother writing against country clerics to begin with.

Were the Novatians particularly prevalent in Asia Minor or is that a consequence of our major source on their activities being from nearby Constantinople? Socrates writes that following Novatian's secession from the Roman church, it was the Paphlagonians and Phrygians who particularly responded well to his policies on penance.<sup>48</sup> There is no need to address his claim that this was they were 'more self-controlled' than other ethnicities.<sup>49</sup> What his description does suggest, though, is that for Socrates, Novatians were particularly associated with Asia Minor. Socrates is also remarkably well informed

---

<sup>47</sup> Jer. *De vir. ill.* 132.

<sup>48</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.9.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid*: Φαίνεται δὲ τὰ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη σωφρονέστερα εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν. On this passage see Benjamin Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 99.

in general. Downey calls him “painstaking and methodical.”<sup>50</sup> Socrates’ thorough reading and investigation of Rufinus’ *Historia ecclesiastica* also demonstrates both an interest in and capability of dealing with western sources and issues. Specifically concerning the Novatians, Walraff writes that Socrates is “extremely well informed” and that he “wrote from an insider perspective.”<sup>51</sup> It is most prudent to trust Socrates and see Novatianism as widespread but with a higher density of adherents in Asia Minor and Constantinople.

This is in some ways reminiscent of what Mas sees as the way Luciferianism spread. The Novatians started in Rome (as Mas argues the Luciferians of the 380s did), but then proceeded to spread from there. Novatianism presumably spread through contacts with the Romans themselves; concerning Marcian in Gaul, for example, we know only that he became associated with Novatian himself. But in the case of the Novatians, there were no latent feelings of dissatisfaction with any decision taken by the Roman church of the 250s – the feelings of dissatisfaction were quite open, and once Novatian broke with the Roman church of Cornelius and Stephen, the split was final and irrevocable. From that point on, there were Novatians. The schism in the Roman church was caused not by later persecutions stoking still-burning embers, but by the persecution itself.

#### *The Distribution of the Donatists*

The distribution of Donatists is much better known and has been written about extensively. The vast majority of Donatists lived in North Africa, and there was an even higher density in the inland area of Numidia and the city of Carthage than the coastal

---

<sup>50</sup> Glanville Downey, “The Perspective of the Early Church Historians,” *GRBS* 6 (1965): 57-70, at 59.

<sup>51</sup> Martin Walraff, “Socrates Scholasticus on the History of Novatianism,” *SP* 29 (1997): 170-177, at 172.

areas of the provinces.<sup>52</sup> The Donatists were so secure in Numidia that Augustine openly admitted their numerical supremacy there.<sup>53</sup> Even in the early fifth century, the Donatists could boast that they had many bishoprics in Numidia where there were no catholic bishops in opposition to them.<sup>54</sup> The prevalence of Donatists in North Africa has even led to the occasional bout of hyperbole:<sup>55</sup>

Donatism was confined to the African provinces, and within that area it was both widespread and persistent, at all times commanding a wide following and at some periods dominating the whole country...its greatest strength lay in the least Romanized areas, especially southern Numidia.

This is an accurate summary insofar as Donatism was quite prevalent, and often preeminent, in Africa, and particularly Numidia. But Donatism was not ‘confined’ to the African provinces – it was neither limited to those areas, as we shall see, nor was it in some way limited by any external factors from becoming as widespread as Novatianism or Luciferianism.

The most famed Donatists outside Africa, of course, were the members of their small community in Rome. The Donatists refused to hold communion with the existing clergy of Rome because they believed that bishop Marcellinus had actually sacrificed during the Great Persecution (on which all sources, not just Donatist ones, do actually

---

<sup>52</sup> Frend, “The Donatist Church,” 48-59 is the classic demonstration of this.

<sup>53</sup> Augustine, *De unitate ecclesiae* (= *Contra Donatistas Vulgo De Unitate Ecclesiae*, PL 43.391-446) 19.51.

<sup>54</sup> *Gesta syn. Carth.* 1.165: ...in Numidia nos ostendimus eos penitus non habere, aut habere certe sed in raris locis. See Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 49.

<sup>55</sup> Jones, “Where Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?,” 282. Jones is citing Frend, and of course thus knew of Donatists outside Africa, but their numbers in the African provinces have always created cause for exaggeration. Frend himself, in “The Donatist Church,” 182, suggests that the Donatists, by limiting themselves to North Africa, had excised themselves from the future development of Christianity, which would thenceforth come from Rome. He seems not to have considered it possible that the Donatists in Rome would ever become significant, or the Donatists in the west in general, despite their presence in Rome and other parts.

agree) and that Miltiades was a *traditor*.<sup>56</sup> With such supposedly tainted clergy at Rome, it is no wonder that some Christians there sided with the Donatists. One early reference is found in Optatus, who mentions a certain Victor of Garba being sent to Rome sometime in the 310s to support a community that had requested a bishop.<sup>57</sup> This community thence had an unbroken chain of bishops until the late fourth century, and Optatus himself reproduces the list of Donatist bishops of Rome: Victor, Boniface, Encolpius, Macrobius, Lucian, Claudian.<sup>58</sup> These were all Africans, and the Roman community of Donatists apparently produced no bishops of its own.<sup>59</sup> We know the most about Macrobius, a catholic presbyter who had become a Donatist at some point prior to the persecution of Macarius (which began in 346), according to Gennadius.<sup>60</sup> Later, according to numerous authors, he became the bishop of the Donatists in Rome (according to Gennadius, ‘in secret,’ *occultus*).<sup>61</sup> If Macrobius himself is the author of the *Passio Maximiani et Isaac*, it suggests that he fled to Rome in the Macarian persecution.<sup>62</sup> This is perhaps exemplary of how Africans found themselves regularly made bishops of the Roman church. For a

---

<sup>56</sup> Marcellinus: Aug. *C. Litt. Pet.* 2.92.202, *De unico baptismo contra Petilianum* (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas* III, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 53 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1910]) 16.27; *Liber Genealogus*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH Scriptores* 9 (Hannover, 1892), 40 (*Ab his [persecutoribus] coacti Marcellinus urbis et Mensurius Carthaginis...*); *Lib. Pont.* 30.1.2. Miltiades: Aug. *C. epist. Parm.* 1.5.10.

<sup>57</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 2.4.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. This is perhaps not too surprising. Consider how long the Roman church had Greek, not native, bishops in the first three centuries C.E.

<sup>60</sup> Genn., *De vir. ill.* 5.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid; Opt. 2.4; Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas* II, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1909]) 2.46.

<sup>62</sup> For the traditional attribution to Macrobius, and his possible flight to Rome at the time of composition, see: Mark Edwards, trans., *Optatus: Against the Donatists*, Translated Texts for Historians 27 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), 17, 33; Maureen Tilley, trans., *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa*, Translated Texts for Historians 24 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996), 61. The idea that this work was composed while he was in exile in Rome is suggested by a short line at the end of the *Passio Maximiani et Isaac* (= PL 8.767-774): *Inveniat apud vos reditus noster unde gloriatur, sicut de his secessio nostra sortita est gaudia gloriarum.*

community that so highly valued trial by persecution, the value of the experiences of African Donatists would have been unparalleled among any in their local community.<sup>63</sup>

One Donatist bishop in Rome worth noting is Claudian. He was formally banished from Rome at Damasus' request in 378 by Gratian, who had his urban prefect, Aquilinus, ensure Damasus' supremacy as the only bishop of the city.<sup>64</sup> As he would some five or six years later with the Luciferian bishop Ephesius, however, Damasus found his ambitions spoiled. Claudian remained in Rome until sometime around 386, when he returned to Carthage and began his own faction within the Donatist church.<sup>65</sup> Our last word on the Donatists from a Roman source comes from Siricius, bishop from 384-399. He wrote to the catholic party in Carthage in 386 informing them of the great numbers of Donatists who were converting to the catholic party.<sup>66</sup> Despite Siricius' claimed success, however, the Council of Carthage in 411 saw Felix, Donatist bishop of Rome, appear as a signatory.<sup>67</sup>

How strong was this Donatist community at Rome? One might point to the unbroken chain of bishops as evidence of some strength, and it does indeed suggest at least that the community was of respectable size. The fact that all of its bishops were African may be more a result of strong connections between members of the dense African Donatist network than any supposed smallness or inability on the part of the

---

<sup>63</sup> For more on the importance of suffering persecution among the Donatists, see Chapter 6.

<sup>64</sup> Gratian, *De rebaptizoribus* (= *Collectio Avellana*, 1.54-58).

<sup>65</sup> As implied by Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 3 vols. ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, CCSL 38-40 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956), 36.20; see Frend, "The Donatist Church," 207.

<sup>66</sup> Siricius, *Epistula ad Episcopos Africae* (= PL 13.1155-1162) 8.

<sup>67</sup> Frend, "The Donatist Church," 283. At the Council of Carthage in 411, his signature was third after the primate of Numidia and the bishop of Carthage: *Gesta coll. Carth.* 2.149 [SC 195.800]. The catholics did not object to his inclusion. But was he there because he had been driven out of Rome?

Roman community itself to find a bishop. Yet Frend also points out that Optatus describes the community as tiny and isolated in Rome.<sup>68</sup> If this community seemed to depend so much on Macrobius, and if the later community similarly depended on the presence of Claudian, it may not be so hard to imagine them easily swayed by a bishop like Siricius, who presented himself as a bane of heretics and whom was likewise described as such by Ambrose and the *Liber pontificalis*.<sup>69</sup> It is regrettable that our only sources for this community, as for so many dissident communities other than those of the Luciferians, come from their enemies.

Beyond North Africa and Rome, there are hints of Donatists in Spain and Gaul. Augustine tells us that the Donatists established a foothold in Spain, which was probably on the estates of Lucilla; Frend is quite dismissive of the idea that there were Donatists in any great number in Spain.<sup>70</sup> While it is true that the Donatists do not seem to have established much of a foothold in Spain, they nevertheless were apparently present, though it seems like it was a community centered around an estate rather than a public space.

In Gaul, the presence of Donatus himself must be considered. Exiled there in 347 during the Macarian persecution, it is likely that a supportive community would form around such a strong personality whom even Augustine calls a ‘precious jewel’ of the

---

<sup>68</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 187. Frend also suggests that when Macrobius arrived in Rome, he found the community there was diminishing in its rigor of practice. Optatus (2.4) mentions the smallness of the size of the community, but the only sin attributed to them by Optatus is causing a schism.

<sup>69</sup> Siricius, *Epistula ad ecclesiam Mediolanensis* (= PL 16.1169-1171); Ambrose, *Epistulae*, (= *Epistulae et acta*, 3 vols., ed. Otto Faller and Michaela Zelzer, CSEL 82.1-3 [Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1968-1990] ) 42; *Liber pontificalis* 40.

<sup>70</sup> Aug. *De un. Eccl.* 3.6 (PL 43.395): ...*et in domo vel patrimonio unius Hispanae mulieris*.... C.f. Aug. *Contra epistula Parmeniani* 1.5.10 (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas* I, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1908]) 2.97.247; Frend, “The Donatist Church,” 164.

church, comparable to Cyprian.<sup>71</sup> Innocent's epistle to Victricius of Rouen includes instructions for dealing with Novatians and *montenses*, possibly referring to Donatists; whether Innocent was speaking in general terms about those he was familiar with in Rome or responding to specific conditions in Rouen is unclear.<sup>72</sup> We hear of no other evidence suggesting that there were Donatists in Gaul.

Lastly, Donatus' successor upon his death around 355 in Carthage, Parmenian, was in fact not even African but a foreigner, perhaps from Spain or Gaul.<sup>73</sup> While this does not mean that there was a Donatist community for certain in either location, it certainly suggests one. It also suggests that the Donatists did not see themselves as particularly 'African' by nature; importance was placed on rigor of practice and an untainted line of ordination.

As with the distribution of the Luciferians, and indeed the Novatians, this geographic spread was the consequence of the earliest origins of the Donatist community, not the result of latent tensions bubbling to the surface. For the Donatists, it was the Caecilianist church that had betrayed Christianity and it was what the Donatists considered the catholic African church, that is, their own, whose responsibility it was to oppose them. The bishops of the rest of the Empire, if they were not *traditores*, were just as catholic as the Donatists were and need not be replaced. Given the historical circumstances of their emergence, it was in some sense intrinsic to the Donatists that they

---

<sup>71</sup> Augustine, *Sermo* (= PL 38) 37.3: *Lapis pretiosus erat Cyprianus, sed mansit in huius ornament. Lapis pretiosus erat Donatus.*

<sup>72</sup> *Ep.* 2.8.11: *Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur...*

<sup>73</sup> *Opt. De schism.* 2.7. See Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa*, 96; however, Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 109n3 writes, "Despite claims made about him being from Gaul or Spain, there is no independent evidence in support of either."

*not* expand beyond North Africa. The primary issue that the Donatists had with the remainder of the North African church was limited in geographic scope in that was a question of who had persevered in the face of persecution and therefore truly represented the catholic church *in Africa*. It was in this way unlike the geographic extent of the Luciferians, whose communities were geographically widespread but located in only a few cities wherever individuals had persevered in the face of compromise.

*The Consequences of Geography: A Universal Church?*

One consequence of these differing models of development was that each of these rigorist communities had to come to terms with the fact that it did not reflect the largest community of Christians in the Roman Empire. This problem took on special meaning because in Late Antiquity, for many Christians, catholicity and orthodoxy went hand-in-hand. For instance, Vincent of Lérins states that proper Christians believe in “that which was believed everywhere, always, by everyone.”<sup>74</sup> Belief was validated by universality; orthodoxy was what was believed *everywhere*.<sup>75</sup>

Thus, although the name of the supposed heresiarch remained the preferred basis for naming heretics (see Chapter 4), geographic extent could be used as well. Montanists, as just one example, are not always called after Montanus; the name in fact does not appear until the fourth century. Apolinarius calls them Kataphrygians and Hippolytus

---

<sup>74</sup> *Comm. 2* (PL 50.640): *In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*

<sup>75</sup> For a reading of Vincent that stresses the inclusive nature of this passage, see Andrew Jacobs, *Christ Circumcised: A Study in Early Christian History and Difference* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 72-99.



calls them “more heretical by nature [than Quartodecimans] and Phrygian by birth.”<sup>76</sup> Even in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Eusebius of Caesarea calls them Phrygian while Augustine refers to them to them as Kataphrygians.<sup>77</sup> Epiphanius does both, calling them both ‘Kataphrygians’ and ‘Montanists.’<sup>78</sup> This geographic terminology circumscribes the influence of a heretical community to a safe, limited area and distinguishes between dissidents, who are geographically limited, and their adversaries, who would naturally claim to represent the Christian community of the entire Roman Empire. Oddly enough, this emphasis on geographic limitation could even be used metaphorically, as when Augustine writes of Tertullian that he became a heretic ‘when he crossed over to the Kataphrygians.’<sup>79</sup> Augustine here represents individuals like Tertullian as ‘different’ in that he is part of a geographically limited community, in this case the Kataphrygians, despite the fact that Tertullian most certainly did not live in Phrygia.<sup>80</sup> The actual geography mattered less than the assumption that heretics were from specific regions.

This line of argumentation naturally had significant ramifications for the Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists. While the Luciferians and Novatians were spread throughout the Empire, they could not for a second imagine that their communities best represented ‘everyone.’ The Donatists, on the other hand, did count the majority of the

---

<sup>76</sup> Apolinarius, in Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 5.16.22; Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, ed. Paul Wendland, GCS 26 (Leipzig, 1916) 8.19.1: καὶ αὐτοὶ αἰρετικώτεροι τὴν φύσιν, Φρύγες τὸ γένος.

<sup>77</sup> Eusebius: *Hist. eccl.* 4.27., 5.16.1, etc.; Aug: *Ep.* 273.

<sup>78</sup> *Pan.* 49, e.g., entitled: Κατὰ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας ἤτοι Μοντανιστῶν καλουμένων.

<sup>79</sup> *De haer.* 86: ...transiens ad Cataphrygas...

<sup>80</sup> The question of whether or not Tertullian was *actually* a Montanist is an entirely different subject (see e.g. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 258 for a discussion of the terms *Tertullianistae* and *Cataphrygae*); what is important for our purposes is that Augustine describes a non-Phrygian as Phrygian.

population as their own – but only in Numidia and certain other towns of Africa. They could hardly imagine that their own community best represented ‘everywhere.’

The Luciferians faced direct accusations that they did not represent all of Christendom. One of these arguments rested on their apparent geographic isolation, despite the fact that they seem to have had communities scattered throughout the Roman Empire. Jerome, as noted in Chapter 1, implied that they were geographically limited to Sardinia, or at least, Sardinia and Spain, throughout his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*.<sup>81</sup> Jerome directly uses this geographic limitation to argue that the Luciferians cannot represent the true *ecclesia*: “If Christ does not have a community (*ecclesia*), or if he only has one in Sardinia, then he has been made very poor. And if Satan possesses Britain, Gaul, the East, the people of India, the barbarian nations, and the whole world at the same time, the how is it that trophies of the cross have been gathered together in a corner of the whole earth?”<sup>82</sup> The argument is clear: the *ecclesia* must be the one that encompasses the whole world, not the one that encompasses Sardinia alone. It is the geographic extent of Jerome’s community group that defines it as the true ‘church.’

To Roman readers, Sardinia also had a reputation in antiquity as a ‘foreign’ place, either because of its Punic heritage or its supposed population of skin-clad mountain-dwellers.<sup>83</sup> It is likely that Jerome was also alluding to this imagery to further marginalize

---

<sup>81</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 1, 14, 15.

<sup>82</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 15: *Si ecclesiam non habet Christus, aut si in Sardinia tantum habet, nimium pauper factus est. Et si Britannias, Gallias, Orientem, Indorum populos, barbaras nationes, et totum semel mundum possidet Satanas, quomodo ad angulum universae terrae crucis tropaea collata sunt?*

<sup>83</sup> See Cicero, *Pro Scauro*, P. van Dommelen, “Ambiguous Matters: Colonialism and Local Identities in Punic Sardinia,” in C. Lyons and J. Papadopoulos, eds., *The Archaeology of Colonialism* (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2002), 121-147, at 138-139, and Stephen L. Dyson and Robert J. Rowland,

the Luciferians as somehow ‘un-Roman,’ in the same way that calling Tertullian a Phrygian called to mind Roman stereotypes about Phrygians.<sup>84</sup>

The Luciferians in the *Libellus precum* do not make any pretense that they represent the bulk of Christians. On the contrary, they are quick to take advantage of the small size of their community: “Secular law is written for this reason: so that the powerful or the many do not prevail over what is true or just, even if it is defended by the insignificant.”<sup>85</sup> They immediately play up this theme again: “Even for the smallest, the law of truth holds sway against force or power.”<sup>86</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also emphasize the small size and isolation of their communities, as we shall see in Chapter 4, in the biblical metaphors they employ to describe their community as a whole.

Furthermore, the Luciferians do use the term *catholicus* to describe themselves and their enemies. The implication of defining themselves as the *ecclesia catholica* is that *catholicus* was not limited to a simple understanding of ‘universal,’ that is, a community that encompassed all believers. Moreover, twice in the petition, Faustinus and Marcellinus sarcastically call their opponents *catholici*, as when they refer to Valens observing the “faith of those notorious catholics.”<sup>87</sup> In these cases, it seems that the Luciferians were drawing a contrast between the great size of the ‘catholic’ church and their less-than-pious behaviors. Thus Faustinus and Marcellinus re-imagined the very

---

Jr., *Archaeology and History in Sardinia from the Stone Age to the Middle Ages: Shepherds, Sailors, and Conquerors* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 139.

<sup>84</sup> For Romans stereotypes of Phrygians, see, e.g., Barbara Levick, “In the Phrygian Mode: A Region Seen from Without,” in Peter Thonemann, ed., *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 41-54, esp. 41-47.

<sup>85</sup> *Lib. prec.* 1: ...*ius saeculi ideo scriptum est ne contra verum aequumve potentia vel multitudo praevaleat, etiamsi ab exiguis vindicetur.*

<sup>86</sup> *Lib. prec.* 2: ...*ut contra omnem vim potentiamve etiam in minimis ius veri obtineat...*

<sup>87</sup> *Lib. prec.* 66 (...*in istis autem egregiis catholicis inconstantiam fidei.*), 75. On this use of *egregius*, see Canellis, “Arius et les ‘Ariens,’” 500.

term that served to distinguish the broader Nicene communion from other Christian communities, diluting the significance of their small size.

While this language is undoubtedly a rhetorical device employed by the Luciferians to influence Theodosius, it is worth noting that they choose to emphasize their smallness rather than their geographic extent. The small size of their communities may have made them vulnerable to the rhetoric of authors like Jerome, or, as we shall see, vulnerable in a much more physical sense, but Faustinus and Marcellinus here use it to their advantage by emphasizing their own weakness. On the other hand, we might also read the structure of the petition itself, canvassing communities across the Roman Empire, as a subtle, unstated argument against authors like Jerome who sought to paint the Luciferians as a very geographically-limited movement.

The enemies of the Novatians did not accuse them of being geographically limited, but at least one did claim that they were not universal. Pacian writes, “By chance, say I should enter a populous city today, when I discern Marcionites, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatians, and the rest of this sort who call themselves Christians. By what name should I identify my own people, if they should not be known as catholic?”<sup>88</sup> The clear implication is that the Novatians, like these other heretics, did not reflect the broader Christian community encompassed by the term *catholicus*. Instead, Pacian’s community did.

---

<sup>88</sup> *Ep. 1.3: Ego forte ingressus populosum urbem hodie, cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinarios, Cataphrygas, Novatianos et caeteros eiusmodi comperissem, qui se christianos vocarent; quo cognomine meae plebis agnoscerem, nisi catholica diceretur?*

For the Novatians, it seems, this problem had a simple resolution. The Novatians simply eschewed the term *catholicus* as it applied to Christian communities in Late Antiquity.<sup>89</sup> Rather than assert that they represented the true *catholica ecclesia*, as the Luciferians did, they simply refused to recognize anything as the *catholica ecclesia*. While we shall discuss the ecclesiological consequences of this rejection further in Chapter 4, it is important to note here that the Novatians simply did not consider a lack of universality as a valid criticism of their community's theology.

For the Donatists, authors frequently referred to their geographic limits as indicative of some deficiency in their community. Augustine regularly claimed that the Donatists believed that the 'true church' was in Africa alone.<sup>90</sup> For example, Augustine asks one Donatist whether the church was "that one which, just as Scripture predicted so long ago, poured itself through the world, or that one which a small part of Africans or Africa retained."<sup>91</sup> Augustine very carefully phrases this to make it the Donatists who are limiting the church to Africa (*quam pars...contineret*) rather than the church limiting itself to Africa (in which case we might expect *quae partem...contineret*).

We might take another passage of Augustine as exemplary of the general catholic attitude towards geographically limited communities:

For if the Holy Scriptures only designated the church [*ecclesiam*] for Africa, and among a few Circumcellions or mountain-men of Rome, and in the home or estate of one Spanish woman, then no matter what else is brought out from other writings, only the Donatists hold the church. If the Holy Scriptures limit it [the church] to a few Moors, one should cross over to the Rogatists. If [the Holy

---

<sup>89</sup> See Pacian, *Ep.* 1 throughout.

<sup>90</sup> Aug: *De unit. Eccl.* 3.6, 19.51; *Ep.* 76 passim.

<sup>91</sup> Aug. *Ep.* 44.2.3: *Deinde quaerere coepimus quoniam illa esset Ecclesia, ubi vivere sic oportet; utrum illa quae, sicut sancta tanto ante Scriptura praedixerat, se terrarum orbe diffunderet, an illa quam pars exigua vel Afrorum vel Africae contineret.*

Scriptures limited the church] to a few residents of Tripolitania, Byzacena, and Proconsularis, then the Maximians attained it. If among the easterners alone, [the church] must be sought among the Arians, the Eunomians, the Macedonians, and any others that might be there. But who could enumerate every individual heresy of individual peoples?<sup>92</sup>

Augustine repeats the assertion that the Donatists conceived of the church as limited to Africa. Augustine also situates the Donatists among a number of other geographically limited heresies (including the Rogatists and Maximianists, two Donatist communities at odds with the broader Donatist communion). The conclusion that the reader draws, then, is that the Donatists are just one of many geographically limited heresies, who all share in common the fact that they are not as extensive as the ‘true’ church.

But all of these arguments were at cross-purposes with Donatist arguments over how they were situated within the ecclesiastic world of Late Antiquity. By the time Augustine was writing, Donatists had believed for nearly 100 years that *they* should be in communion along with the rest of the Christian Roman world, not the Caecilianist party in Africa.<sup>93</sup> In other words, the Donatists made no claim to be the universal church in its entirety. They merely claimed that they represented the universal church *in Africa*. Their opponents were obstinate in refusing to frame the question this way. In 411, the Donatist Emeritus of Caesarea still had to push the Council of Carthage to recognize that the

---

<sup>92</sup> Aug. *De unit. Eccl.* 3.6: *Si enim sanctae Scripturae in Africa sola designaverunt Ecclesiam, et in paucis Romae cutzupitanis vel montensibus, et in domo vel patrimonio unius Hispanae mulieris; quidquid de chartis aliis aliud proferatur, non tenent Ecclesiam nisi Donatistae. Si in paucis Mauris provinciae Caesareensis eam sancta Scriptura determinat; ad Rogatistas transeundem est. Si in paucis Tripolitanis et Byzacenis et Provincialibus; Maximianistae ad eam pervenerunt. Si in solis Orientalibus; inter Arianos et Eunomianos et Macedonianos, et si qui illic alii sunt, requirenda est. Quis autem possit singulas quasque haereses ennumerare gentium singularum?*

<sup>93</sup> See, e.g., Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 286; Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa*, 114; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 5; Michel-Yves Perrin, “The Limits of the Heresiological Ethos in Late Antiquity,” in D.M. Gwynn and S. Bangert, eds., *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 201-227, at 214-215.

question at hand was not which was the ‘true church,’ but which was the church that should be in communion with the rest of the catholic world.<sup>94</sup> Nor was this argument purely academic. The Donatists had the support of at least some bishops in Asia Minor who recognized them as the catholic church in North Africa.<sup>95</sup> Thus for the Donatists themselves, the question was not whether the church was universal but who was a part of that universal church.

These three Christian communities that were more limited in geographic extent than their adversaries thus addressed this potential problem in three different ways: they used their small size to their rhetorical advantage, denied that their small size was relevant, or argued that they in fact were part of the broader Christian communities of the Mediterranean and their opponents were not. It is difficult to say if one was more effective than another. The Luciferians did indeed gain imperial protection, but in the process gave up imperial promotion and any sensible claim towards universality; Christians, including emperors, continued to refer to a *catholica ecclesia* despite Novatian objections; neither Christian communities nor the government accepted the Donatists’ claim to be the *catholica* community in Africa. In this sense, all were failures. But it should be noted that the Novatian and Donatist arguments were somewhat more logical; the Luciferians emphasize their small size while at the same time describing their community as *catholica*. It is unfortunately impossible to say if the internal consistency of the Novatian and Donatist arguments made their communal identities stronger.

#### *The Consequences of Geography: Communication*

---

<sup>94</sup> *Gesta coll. Carth.* 3.99.

<sup>95</sup> Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa*, 113-114.

Another consequence of the distribution of Luciferian communities was that the ability of a given community to interact with other communities across the Mediterranean could be hampered by the long distances involved. While this problem may have potentially affected the Novatians as well, their central hearth in Constantinople and Asia Minor helped mitigate these effects. The Donatists, naturally, had far fewer problems staying in communication with one another by virtue of their geographic limits.

First of all, the Luciferians appear to have relied on the exchange of letters to maintain lines of communication. Hermione asks Heraclida to visit her through a letter, and it is a letter that prompts Ephesius to leave Hermione and head to North Africa.<sup>96</sup> They even attribute a singular importance to letters in describing the activities of their heroes prior to the Council of Alexandria. As related in Chapter 1, the authors of the *Libellus precum* tell us, “Although they were separate in body through the distance of the regions [of their exiles], they [the confessors] were nevertheless organized in spirit into one body through shared letters.”<sup>97</sup> They seem to have emulated these exiled bishops in the contacts that they explicitly describe between their communities. The exchange of letters was a fundamental method by which the Luciferians kept in touch with one another.

If Faustinus and Marcellinus believed the letters shared by bishops in the 350s and 360s were integral in creating a later rigorist movement opposed to the clemency of the Council of Alexandria, Socrates no less believed that the early spread of Novatianism

---

<sup>96</sup> *Lib. prec.* 103, 107.

<sup>97</sup> *Lib. prec.* 50: ...*licet essent corpore discreti per interualla regionum, tamen spiritu in unum positi per mutuas litteras...*



was dependent on letters as well. These came in a different form, however: Novatianism as a movement beyond the man Novatian seems indeed to have begun with something of a mass mailing campaign. According to Socrates, Novatian's first step after ordination was to write a letter outlining his policy on penance to 'the churches everywhere.'<sup>98</sup> It is significant, surely, that Socrates writes of the Paphlagonians and Phrygians that "On this account, rather, it seems to me that they, as well as those who thought in a like matter concerning these things, gave their assent to what was written at the time by Novatian."<sup>99</sup> Socrates' emphasis on Novatian's writings, rather than Novatian, whether intentional or not, clearly demonstrates here the unique power of letters in forming and solidifying communities. Furthermore, Novatian's immediate search for allies suggests that such disputes prompted immediate action, not a delayed response some years later.

Other evidence is inferential, but the fact that the Novatians could organize councils of bishops certainly implies that letters were being exchanged between them.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, while it is not quite a letter, we can see something of the importance of the written word in the story of the Novatian bishop of Constantinople Paul's death. According to Socrates, he indicated his successor to his presbyters by having them swear by his choice, writing his choice down, and then handing over the paper to the bishop of

---

<sup>98</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.3: ...ταῖς πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίαις ἔγραφεν...Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 70 and *Ep.* 10.3) mentions numerous letters of Novatian, including a collection. See Ronald E. Heine, "Cyprian and Novatian," in Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth, eds., *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 152-160, at 157-159, on Novatian's literary output in general.

<sup>99</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.12: Διό μοι δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ἐπινενευκέναι τούτους τε καὶ τοὺς οὕτω φρονοῦντας πρὸς τὰ παρὰ Ναυάτου τότε γραφόμενα...

<sup>100</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 5.21. Councils themselves will be discussed below.

the Scythians (the choice of an obvious outsider for this task is worth noting). Then, upon his death, Marcus revealed the paper along with Marcian's name written inside.<sup>101</sup>

The Donatists also wrote letters to one another, though this is in part an assumption.<sup>102</sup> Allen and Neil's assertion that three letters, hidden among the spurious works of Sulpicius Severus, are "reliably Donatist" is unfounded; one in fact appears to be about the conversion of peasants away from Donatism.<sup>103</sup> The form of letter that we do see among the Donatists is not extant for the Novatians or Luciferians: the disciplinary letter meant to ensure that proper doctrine was maintained by the recipient. The first example of this is Parmenian's warning to Tyconius sometime in the 380s, issued "since he judged him to be in error about what he was bound to confess."<sup>104</sup> Similarly, Augustine based his *Contra litteras Petilian* on a tract that Petilian had addressed to certain catholic presbyters.<sup>105</sup> Augustine quoted so much that Monceaux could produce an attempted reconstruction of Petilian's original *Epistola ad Presbyteros et Diaconos*.<sup>106</sup> In sum, the Donatists were writers of letters meant for internal consumption as well as external.

---

<sup>101</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.46.

<sup>102</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 89: "We can presume that both sides engaged in the same tactics. The first response was embedded in the oral and written communication in which betrayal and conversion were repeatedly glossed and explained in letters, pamphlets, and sermons."

<sup>103</sup> Allen and Neil, *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity*, 121. For the originals, see C. Lepelley, "Trois documents méconnus sur l'histoire sociale et religieuse de l'Afrique romaine tardive retrouvés parmi les *spuria* de Sulpice Sévère," *AntAfr* 25 (1989): 235-262. On the letter itself, see e.g. Peter Brown, *Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman World*, The Tanner Lectures on Human Values (Cambridge, 1993), 156-157.

<sup>104</sup> Aug. *C. ep. Parm.* 1.1.1: ...*cum eum arbitraretur in hoc errare quod ille verum coactus est confiteri...*

<sup>105</sup> *C. litt. Pet.* 1.1.

<sup>106</sup> Paul Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe*, vol. 5 (Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux, 1920), 311-328. That Augustine responded to both Parmenian and Petilian unasked for was characteristic, given the apparent reluctance of Donatists to engage him directly: see Jennifer Ebbeler, *Disciplining Christians: Correction and Community in Augustine's Letters* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 180. See also, e.g., *C. litt. Pet.* 1.1 for Augustine's claim that his quite conciliatory letters were rejected out of hand by (of course) stubborn Donatists.

Shaw suggests that the Donatist (and catholic) clergy in North Africa were relatively poorly educated as a whole, aside from a handful of aristocratic men like Augustine and Petilian, and few wrote.<sup>107</sup> This might suggest that perhaps a few highly educated Donatist bishops held more complete control over matters of doctrine than their comparatively well-educated (and consequently constantly squabbling) counterparts in the eastern Mediterranean. On the other hand, the Donatists themselves were no strangers to schism within their own community, so the point cannot be pressed too far.

There is no reason to suppose that just because we have examples of intra-Donatist communications on matters of doctrine, but not Novatian or Luciferian, that the Donatists were unique in this way. Our knowledge of the Novatians is mostly represented by polemical works against them that no longer survive, and a single history, Socrates', which details the fortunes of their community only in part. Our surviving documents concerning the Luciferians are predominately theological polemics and a petition that may in fact have been circulated among members later.<sup>108</sup> It is a chance of historical survival that we do not possess Novatian or Luciferian letters concerning matters of doctrine and discipline, since in both cases our extant sources do make reference to these.

Letters were in many ways the fundamental method by which disparate individuals (and communities) kept in touch with one another in antiquity, and writing letters was nothing unique to rigorist dissident communities. Thousands of letters survive

---

<sup>107</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 368. Cf. Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London: Faber & Faber, 1967), 144.

<sup>108</sup> On this point, see the Introduction.

between catholic authors on a variety of subjects.<sup>109</sup> Arians too, of various stripes, sent (as one example) letters to both console and fortify their fellows following Theodosius' announcement of support for the homoousians after a consideration of theological statements of each of the major sects which were submitted to him: "Overwhelmed with both helplessness and distress, they departed. And they encouraged their own men with letters, exhorting them not to be troubled on account of those many who left them behind and gave themselves over to the *homoousion*."<sup>110</sup> It is worth noting that these letters were sent to encourage their followers and also to discipline them, that is, to prevent them from changing their party affiliations. The potential power of a mixture of letters and personal visits is clear in Socrates' description of how the so-called Synod at the Oak came to be populated with all of John Chrysostom's enemies: "And many of the clergy, and many of those in office who were influential in the court, reasoning that they had found the right moment in which they might avenge themselves on John, prepared a great council in Constantinople, partly by sending letters, partly without writing anything down [e.g. by

---

<sup>109</sup> In general, see Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 41-48; Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974), 219-225; Allen and Neil, *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity*, *passim*. For specific examples of letters playing an integral role in forming communities focused on specific interpretations of doctrine, see e.g. Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), and Schor, "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch.'" Ebbeler, *Disciplining Christians*, is an excellent study of Augustine's use of letters to enforce doctrinal orthodoxy and proper practices among his recipients. Nor was letter-writing limited to Christians, of course; see e.g. B. S. Bradbury, "Libanius' Letters as Evidence for Travel and Epistolary Networks," in L. Ellis and F. Kidner, eds., *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 73-80, and Michele R. Salzman, "Travel and Communication in the Letters of Symmachus," in L. Ellis and F. Kidner, eds., *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 81-94.

<sup>110</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 5.10.29-30. ...ἀμηχανία τε καὶ λύπη κατασχεθέντες ἀνεχώρουν. Καὶ γράμμασι τοὺς οἰκείους παρεμυθοῦντο παραιοῦντες μὴ ἄχθεσθαι ἐφ' οἷς πολλοὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτοὺς τῶ ὁμοουσίῳ προσέθεντο...

messengers].”<sup>111</sup> This would seem to confirm the importance of letters and personal visitations that one can infer from the activities of the Luciferians.

But as we have seen in the example of Trier, the Luciferians sometimes seem to have had a hard time keeping in touch with one another. Travel on a significant scale between such distances would be prohibitively costly, and besides, was a thoroughly unpleasant experience whether by sea or by land.<sup>112</sup> We can imagine, then, that news from Trier came by letter. But sending a letter to or from Trier, far inland and at the frontiers of the Empire, was more difficult than sending letters between Rome, North Africa, Egypt, and Palestine. Oxyrhynchus was along the route that grain ships took along the Nile, a location that undoubtedly eased communications to and from the Luciferian community there.<sup>113</sup> North Africa and Eleutheropolis had the advantage of being near the coast. Trier was geographically situated in such a way that communication between it and other Luciferian communities would be difficult.

Moreover, even in general, as Casson writes, “...there were never enough carriers to meet the needs, and delays were inevitable...The vast majority of letter writers, of course, had neither couriers nor the pouch available to them. Their only resource was to find some traveller who happened to be heading in the right direction.”<sup>114</sup> Letters were

---

<sup>111</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.10.12: Καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν τοῦ κλήρου, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει κατὰ τὰ βασίλεια μέγιστα ἰσχύοντες, καιρὸν εὐρηκέναι λογιζόμενοι, καθ’ ὃν Ἰωάννην ἀμύνονται, μεγίστην ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει σύνοδον γενέσθαι παρεσκεύαζον, τοῦτο μὲν δι’ ἐπιστολῶν, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἀγράφως διαπεμπόμενοι. The word ἀγράφως here carries a subtle shade of somewhat clandestine meanings such as ‘unregistered,’ ‘off the record.’ See *LSJ* s.v. A.III.2.

<sup>112</sup> See e.g. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, 149-162, 163-196; Salzman, “Travel and Communication in the *Letters* of Symmachus.”

<sup>113</sup> On the size and importance of Oxyrhynchus, see, e.g., E.G. Turner, “Roman Oxyrhynchus,” *Journal of Egyptian History* 38 (1952): 78-93 *ibid.*, “Oxyrhynchus and Rome,” *HSCP* 79 (1975): 1-24, and ger S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 45-54.

<sup>114</sup> Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, 220.

frequently lost even in safe, heavily traveled areas. Augustine, as just one example, resent several letters to Jerome because he was worried that the originals never reached Jerome.<sup>115</sup> Even if Augustine were just making excuses to give Jerome more time to respond to him, it is still noteworthy that this is the excuse that he used.<sup>116</sup> It is also worth noting that letter carriers were frequently friends or associates, not strangers.<sup>117</sup> These hardships would have made it difficult to maintain unbroken lines of communication between any communities, particularly ones spread far and wide. If the Luciferians found it difficult to send and receive letters from such distant places, either from the cost or the difficulty in finding reliable couriers, it may have made it harder to keep their communities united. These letters were important ways for keeping communities organized and doctrinally in line with one another; without them, the Luciferians may have become more and more isolated from one another.

The Luciferians also mention the importance of personal visitation several times in their petition. Hermione, as mentioned, asked Heraclida to visit her in person.<sup>118</sup> But this is no mean task. The trip from Oxyrhynchus to Eleutheropolis, even with the ease of travel along the Nile and eastern coast of the Mediterranean, would take at least six days, if not more.<sup>119</sup> This was the easiest trip that Faustinus and Marcellinus mention. The bishop Ephesius was apparently quite a voyager – ordained by Taorgius for the people

---

<sup>115</sup> *Ep.* 71.2: ...*quia ergo duas epistulas misi, nullam autem tuam postea recepi, easdem ipsas rursus mittere volui credens eas non pervenisse.*

<sup>116</sup> Ebbeler, *Disciplining Christians*, 121-122: “First, it was a clever strategy for reminding Jerome of his epistolary debt – a point that was not lost on Jerome.”

<sup>117</sup> See e.g. *Aug. Ep.* 71.1.2.

<sup>118</sup> *Lib. prec.* 103: ...*ut eius sacris visitationibus iuaretur.*

<sup>119</sup> Calculated using ORBIS, the Stanford Geospatial Network Model of the Roman World, a service that provides travel estimates based on cost, season, etc. The software, as well as a full description of methodology and data, is available here: <http://orbis.stanford.edu/>.

Rome, he was in Oxyrhynchus when Hermione's letter arrived.<sup>120</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus say that Ephesius was in Oxyrhynchus for 'ecclesiastic services,' *ob utilitates ecclesiasticas*.<sup>121</sup> The journey from Rome to Oxyrhynchus was approximately 19 days long, so these must have been very important services.<sup>122</sup> Nor was Ephesius done traveling; after the journey to Eleutheropolis he set out for North Africa. Assuming Ephesius went to Libya, as was the suggested meaning of Africa above based on evidence from Jerome's *Chronicon*, and taking Lepcis Magna as the premier city in Libya (and the closest city to Eleutheropolis that would not be considered a city of Cyrenaica or Egypt), Ephesius had at least 21 more days of sea travel ahead of him.<sup>123</sup> This is a remarkable amount of travel for one man to undertake in the course of what seems in the text to be only a few months, thus demonstrating the importance the Luciferians placed on personal visitation despite the great costs.

Novatian bishops also traveled, perhaps for similar reasons. Socrates says at one point that Marcian, a presbyter of Constantinople, 'had gone abroad' to Phrygia.<sup>124</sup> While we do not specifically know why Marcian was sent there, Socrates also informs us that Phrygia was a center of Novatian innovation concerning the date of Easter.<sup>125</sup> The Novatians of Constantinople and Bithynia had agreed on the so-called 'Indifferent' Canon, allowing the celebration of Easter at any time, but other Novatian communities were more particular about with whom they would hold communion, differing as they did

---

<sup>120</sup> Ordained: *Lib. prec.* 84, 104. In Eleutheropolis: *Lib. prec.* 104.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>122</sup> Again, according to the estimates provided by ORBIS.

<sup>123</sup> Once more according to the estimates of ORBIS.

<sup>124</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.46.9: Μαρκιανού, ὃς ἐν μὲν τῇ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τάξει ἐτέτακτο καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶ τὸν ἀσκητικὸν ἐπαιδεύετο βίον, ἀπεδήμει δὲ τηνικαῦτα <εἰς Τιβεριάδα τῆς Φρυγίας>.

<sup>125</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 4.28.

on the choice of date for Easter.<sup>126</sup> Later, however, just before Marcian became bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, a Novatian presbyter named Sabbatius caused a schism in Constantinople over the proper date of Easter.<sup>127</sup> It is entirely possible, then, that Marcian had gone to Phrygia in order to help settle the obviously volatile matter of the proper date of Easter. It is also worth noting that going ‘abroad’ from Constantinople to Phrygia was a significantly shorter and more inexpensive trip than the voyages that the Luciferians describe Ephesius undertaking. We also hear of the aforementioned Marcus, Novatian bishop in Scythia, who found himself in Constantinople, though there is little information as to why.<sup>128</sup> The twenty-third canon of the Council of Chalcedon, forbidding clerics and monks from staying in Constantinople and stirring up controversies, identifies a fairly common problem, and it may be bishops like Marcus that eventually prompted such a ruling.<sup>129</sup>

While Donatists appear to have traveled regularly in exile and on their way to and from councils, we have little information that suggests they did much traveling within North Africa to shore up communal cohesion. Instead, Donatist bishops seem to have interrogated travelers to see how other communities were faring, in addition to sending letters.<sup>130</sup>

A unique consequence of the limited geographic extent of the Donatists was that many Christians in other parts of the Mediterranean did not know much about the

---

<sup>126</sup> ‘Indifferent’ Canon: *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 5.21; *ibid.*, 5.22

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.5.

<sup>128</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.46.

<sup>129</sup> Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 3.330-331. Not to suggest that Marcus was actually in Constantinople to start any controversies, of course, but the mere presence of an additional Novatian bishop in town may have easily been perceived this way by increasingly anti-dissident catholic bishops.

<sup>130</sup> *Opt. De schism.* 3.3.



Donatists at all. Epiphanius, in his *Panarion*, lumps the Donatists in with the Novatians as puritanical sects and ascribes to them Arian views.<sup>131</sup> Augustine complains to Emeritus of Caesarea that Emeritus, a Donatist, excludes Christians from all over the world without these other Christians even knowing that they have been cast out: “For it is clear that, to the great part of the Roman world (and I should say nothing more about the barbarian nations, for whom the Apostle also says he was a debtor) with whose Christian faith our communion is joined, the party of Donatus is unknown; and neither do they fully understand either when or by what causes that dissension arose.”<sup>132</sup> Augustine also had to explain the difference between Arians and Donatists to the *comes* Boniface, who had come to Africa in 417 and had no real understanding of what the Donatists believed.<sup>133</sup> Such confusion outside of North Africa betokens a lack of knowledge about the Donatists outside North Africa to a degree inconceivable within the highly charged North African world. Nor did these other Christians seem to care very much. Rufinus of Aquileia, Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, Theodoret of Cyrrhus – none of these major ecclesiastic historians make any mention of the Donatists.

In light of how often we hear of personal travel and visitations in just the *Libellus precum*, both Ephesius’ travels and Hermione’s request to Heraclida, it seems as though this played a more important role for the Luciferians than for the Novatians or especially

---

<sup>131</sup> *Pan.* 59. See Young Richard Kim, “Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Geography of Heresy,” in H.A. Drake, ed., *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), 235-251, at 243-244, on Epiphanius’ eastern focus.

<sup>132</sup> *Ep.* 87.1: *nam certum est magnae parti Romani orbis, ne dicam etiam barbaris gentibus, quibus quoque debitorem se dicebat Apostolus [Cf. Rom 1:14], quorum christianae fidei communio nostra contextitur, ignotam esse partem Donati; nec eos omnino scire vel quando vel quibus causis exorta sit ista dissensio.*

<sup>133</sup> *Aug. Ep.* 185; he calls the epistle *De correctione Donatistorum* in *Retractiones*, ed. P. Knöll, CSEL 36 (Vienna and Leipzig, 1902) 2.40. To be fair, the Donatists did at times have semi-Arian leanings – along with the rest of the Catholics in North Africa. As discussed above, see Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 170.

for the Donatists. This could indicate that the Luciferians attributed a special role to bishops in general or Ephesius in particular. It may also be the case that their communities demanded more personal attention than a letter could provide. Lastly, as we shall see in Chapter 5, the Luciferians in many locations seem to have lacked sufficient numbers of clergy, making the personal appearance of a bishop more significant. In any case, this method of maintaining communal cohesion was, as noted above, costly, and made even more costly by the distances involved for the Luciferians. If their communities relied on letters and traveling bishops to maintain internal cohesion, it would have been difficult and costly for them to do so.

#### *The Consequences of Geography: Councils*

Perhaps even more significant is the complete lack of evidence for any local Luciferian councils.<sup>134</sup> We actually might expect them to mention any such meetings in their petition to Theodosius, since it was such an integral part of Christianity in the late fourth century and since they themselves put such an emphasis on the importance of the councils of Nicaea, Rimini, and Alexandria. The first and foremost Christian way of creating a unified community in Late Antiquity was through the use of councils. Jerome, for example, writes, “There is no bishop in the world except those whom the Council [of Nicaea] ordained.”<sup>135</sup> Obviously Jerome does not mean that the Council of Nicaea itself performed the ordinations – but without the Council of Nicaea, there are no bishops. Furthermore, the existence of the Luciferian community hinged on the decisions of a

---

<sup>134</sup> In antiquity, Greek authors used the word *synodon* universally, whereas Latin authors used *synodum* (which they drew from Greek authors) and *concilium* interchangeably; for the sake of clarity I use ‘council’ to refer to any meeting at which bishops came to decisions concerning doctrine or practice.

<sup>135</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 19: ...et episcopus iam in mundo nullus sit nisi quos synodus illa ordinavit.*

council in Alexandria, one which was apparently quickly followed by councils in Spain, Gaul, Greece, and the province of Asia.<sup>136</sup> How did Christians come to agreements about Christ and God? Voting in councils. How did they define relationships and rules within their communities? The same way: voting in councils.<sup>137</sup> Late antique Christian beliefs and the social structures were intertwined and mutually dependent on councils.

Nor were these councils all large ecumenical ones. Throughout the fourth and fifth centuries, councils were expected to take place at the local level for the purpose of resolving local ecclesiastic disputes. The fifth canon of the Council of Nicaea asserted that a councils held at the level of the ecclesiastical province should be held twice a year to confirm excommunications issued by the provincial bishop.<sup>138</sup> It is unclear whether or not this reflects earlier practices, but it probably represents a formalization of a previously *ad hoc* mechanism for ensuring orthodoxy and discipline. A council of bishops apparently met in Antioch to decide the fate of Paul of Samosata in the late 260s, though it sounds quite disorganized, with no known organizer and bishops meeting at various times and in various places.<sup>139</sup> Another early council was called at Elvira sometime between 300 and 309, perhaps by the bishop Hosius.<sup>140</sup> Another early, small

---

<sup>136</sup> Ath. *Ep. ad. Ruf.* (PG 26:1180); Basil of Caesarea, *Epistula* (= *Saint Basil. The Letters*, 4 vols., ed. and trans. Roy J. Deferrari, LCL 190, 215, 243, 270 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1934]) 204.6.

<sup>137</sup> On this point, see Ramsay MacMullen, *Voting About God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 2.

<sup>138</sup> Canon 5: Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 1.386-387.

<sup>139</sup> Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 7.27.2-28.2: ... οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμένες ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν ὡς ἐπὶ λυμεῶνα τῆς Χριστοῦ ποιμνῆς συνήεσαν, οἱ πάντες ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν σπεύδοντες... πάντων οὖν κατὰ καιροῦς διαφόρως καὶ πολλάκις ἐπὶ ταῦτὸν συνιόντων, λόγοι καὶ ζητήσεις καθ' ἑκάστην ἀνεκινουῦντο σύνοδον.

<sup>140</sup> On the date and authenticity of the earliest canons, but not the later ones, see M. Meigne, "Concile ou collection d'Elvire?" *RHE* 70 (1975): 361-387, who provided the original discussion of the subject. Samuel Laeuchli, *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972), 86-87, gives the latest date of 309. Miguel J. Sánchez, "L'état actuel de la

council occurred at Ancyra in 314, perhaps called by Vitalis of Antioch or Marcellus of Ancyra, and was shortly followed that year or the year after by a council at Caesarea.<sup>141</sup> In fact, many of the signatories to the council held at Ancyra match the signatories to the council held at Caesarea, suggesting that groups of bishops related by geography knew each other and met together on a semi-regular basis. These councils were probably not the only ones of their type, and we might see the workings of such local councils in the description by Optatus of a meeting of bishops held at Cirta right after persecution in the early fourth century had ceased (but explicitly before the restoration of property).<sup>142</sup> Similar meetings may well have inspired Donatist bishops to ask Constantine to hold a meeting of bishops to decide whether Majorinus or Caecilian was the proper bishop of Carthage.<sup>143</sup>

While the addition of imperial influence was new, particularly in calling councils like Arles in 314 and Nicaea in 325 and in the case of Arles even selecting the bishops who would be present, it seems as though by the early 4<sup>th</sup> century there was a nascent form of conciliar decision-making already in place that did not rely on the state for its organization.<sup>144</sup> In any case, the Council of Constantinople in 381 reaffirmed this need for local councils.<sup>145</sup> The Council of Chalcedon also affirmed this in 451, complaining that local councils were not being held and adding that the metropolitan of the

---

recherche sur le concile d'Elvire," *RSR* 82, no. 4 (2008): 517-546, provides a good summary of scholarship since.

<sup>141</sup> For recent scholarship on these councils, see Sara Parvis, "The Canons of Ancyra and Caesarea (314): Lebon's Thesis Revisited," *JTS* 52, no. 1 (2001): 625-636.

<sup>142</sup> Opt. 1.14.

<sup>143</sup> Opt. 1.22.

<sup>144</sup> On Constantine's actions regarding the Council of Arles, see H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 219-220.

<sup>145</sup> Canon 2: Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 2.355.

ecclesiastical province would choose the venue.<sup>146</sup> This repeated assertion of the need for local councils indicates their importance, though it also suggests that not all regions held these smaller councils as regularly as the bishops attending the larger councils would like.

But the Luciferians had none. We might attribute this lack to their paucity of bishops or to the cost of organizing these councils across the Mediterranean. Firstly, as we shall see in Chapter 5, the Luciferians had very few bishops to begin with. Without many bishops, there might be little call for councils of them. But being so geographically disparate meant that no matter how many bishops the Luciferians had, the cost and time of travel to attend such councils would be extravagant. The fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea allows for bishops to miss attending ordinations of bishops within their province if the journey would take too long; a meeting of Luciferians from across the Mediterranean would be exponentially more problematic and costly.<sup>147</sup> Bishops at councils summoned by the emperor benefitted from imperial patronage, particularly in the use of post houses and horses, significantly speeding up their travel times and diminishing their costs.<sup>148</sup> Luciferian bishops would have no such compensation. It was hard enough for the Luciferians to stay in touch with one another by letter. Expecting them to gather *en masse* would be too much.

---

<sup>146</sup> Canon 19: Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 3.404-405. The addition suggests there was some dispute over where exactly the biannual council would take place. Perhaps bishops in distant dioceses resented the additional expenses of travel compared to their metropolitans, who surely often acted as hosts. The fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea (Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 386-387) had already remarked upon the cost of travel bishops incurred when traveling to ordain other bishops.

<sup>147</sup> Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 381. See also the points on the cost and difficulty of travel raised above.

<sup>148</sup> This was done on a case-by-case basis for certain councils until 382, when Theodosius made it a general policy: see Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 237, 260-261, and *CTh* 12.12.9.

This would not be so important if we were not aware of Novatian and Donatist councils, which demonstrate that these were relatively commonplace occurrences for rigorist communities. This does not necessarily mean that these councils functioned to create a coherent communal identity. Concerning the Novatians, Socrates informs us that a local council held at Pazum among the Phrygian Novatians decided on a method of dating Easter different than that which the Novatians in Constantinople and Bithynia had been following.<sup>149</sup> Socrates is keen to point out that this council was held under the auspices of ‘some small number of undistinguished bishops,’ and not the bishops who ‘regulated Novatian worship,’ Agelius of Constantinople and Maximus of Nicaea, as well as the bishops of Nicomedia and Cotyaeum.<sup>150</sup> After a Jewish convert in the clergy of the Novatians at Constantinople, Sabbatius, attempted to propagate this same method of dating, another council was then held at Angarum in Bithynia.<sup>151</sup> Here the bishop of Constantinople and those of Bithynia, having extracted a promise from Sabbatius never to attempt to become a bishop, agreed on the so-called ‘Indifferent Canon,’ allowing any congregation to choose a date for Easter as they pleased. This held for awhile, until Sabbatius broke his oath and had himself made bishop of a Novatian faction in Constantinople which celebrated Easter on the Jewish Passover.<sup>152</sup> This seems counterintuitive at first glance. The Novatians seem to be weaker by virtue of their local councils, since they are apparently breeding grounds for dissent.

---

<sup>149</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.28.17: ‘ποιήσαντες ὀλίγοι τινές καὶ οὐκ εὖσημοὶ τῶν περὶ Φρυγίαν Ναυατιανῶν ἐπίσκοποι’ and 4.28.18: Καθ’ ἣν οὔτε Ἀγέλιος παρὴν ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ναυατιανῶν ἐπίσκοπος, οὐδὲ Μάξιμος ὁ Νικαίας, οὐδὲ ὁ Νικομηδείας, οὐδὲ μὲν ὁ Κοτυαείου· ὑπὸ τούτων γὰρ ἡ Ναυατιανῶν θρησκεία μάλιστα κανονίζεται.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.* 5.21.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.* 7.5.

In the case of the Donatists, the opposite appears to have been true. The Donatists had a major council sometime in the reign of Constantine that some 270 bishops attended.<sup>153</sup> The purpose of this meeting was to decide on a policy for baptisms issued by non-Donatist bishops. The council took 75 days, and in the end, “The debate might well have led to schism, but... This great council, clearly one of the greatest in African Church history, ended harmoniously.”<sup>154</sup> This council served its theoretical function. Bishops debated theological policies until they came to a conclusion that every member could find satisfactory. These councils continued. The Donatists held a council in the 370s that expelled Flavian, the *vicarius* of Africa, from their communion because he was too eager to restrain his fellow Donatists in the name of the emperors.<sup>155</sup> Likewise, around 385, the Donatists under Petilian held a council at which Tyconius was ejected from their communion.<sup>156</sup> No other Donatists followed him. The major Donatist schisms, the Rogatists and the Maximianists, emerged due to distaste for violence and a dispute over ordination, respectively, not because of dissatisfaction with the results of a council.

Perhaps the Donatists were relatively successful because they had more persuasive leaders (and Donatus was considered quite persuasive, though it was he who yielded in the earliest of these major councils). But it is more likely that they had better mechanisms for enforcing the decisions of councils. Looking at the Novatian experiences set alongside these Donatist councils, it seems as though meetings of bishops may have served better to define than to enforce. If the Novatians were less successful or the

---

<sup>153</sup> Aug. *Ep.* 93.43. See also Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 167-168.

<sup>154</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 168.

<sup>155</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 200.

<sup>156</sup> Aug. *C. ep. Parm.* 1.1.1, *De doct. Christ.* 3.30, *Ep.* 93; Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 205; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 392-393.

Donatists more successful in enforcing the decisions of their councils, this is not necessarily the result of the conciliar decisions themselves but of other factors.

Let us not miss the forest for the trees. Whether or not these councils were *effective*, they were still important for the Novatians and Donatists as part of their Christian identity. This was true for them regardless of whether or not the emperors called these councils, as was the case at Rimini and Constantinople, and whether or not they sent a report of the decisions of the council to the emperors. Despite lacking imperial patronage for them, these communities continued to rely on councils to resolve internal issues. The Constantinopolitan Novatian response to an unruly bunch of Phrygian Novatians changing the date of Easter at a local council was not to demand obedience but, *mirabile dictu*, to call another council. Petilian did not evict Tyconius from the Donatist church (though he may have pushed for it), a council of Donatists did. The Luciferians do not seem to have had this option available to them, and without it, they must have seen themselves becoming more and more isolated. The geographic extent of the Luciferians, then, may have diminished their ability to create a coherent and lasting communal identity in part because they were unable to reaffirm their beliefs, solve problems, and maintain group discipline – or imagine that they were doing so – through the common Late Antique Christian mechanism of the church council.

#### *The Consequences of Geography: Luciferians at the Local Level*

A final consequence of the historical circumstances surrounding the emergence of the Luciferians as described in Chapter 1 was that Luciferian communities were relatively small and peripheral at the local level. Furthermore, the Luciferians were apparently



unable or did not desire to proselytize, as is discussed in Chapter 5. This undoubtedly contributed to the smallness of their communities at the local level.

There are two types of places of worship described in the *Libellus precum*. Faustinus and Marcellinus relate that in Spain and in Oxyrhynchus, the Luciferians met in basilicas. They specifically use the word *basilica*, not a more generic term like *ecclesia*. But we should not imagine that these resembled the large and lavishly decorated, imperial-funded churches of the fourth century. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that their places of worship were relatively paltry. In Spain, for instance, Faustinus and Marcellinus describe a basilica in Spain being attacked.<sup>157</sup> But when this basilica was rebuilt, the authors relate that it was in a ‘little field.’<sup>158</sup> Rather than being in a city or town, then, this second basilica stood somewhat apart from a civic center. The basilica in Oxyrhynchus is the only instance where the Luciferians describe a basilica in a city, and while they describe its destruction, they do not say whether it was rebuilt.<sup>159</sup> The two presbyters also mention a monastery (or, rather, monasteries) at Oxyrhynchus.<sup>160</sup> That the Luciferian presence in Oxyrhynchus took the form of a public basilica and monasteries suggests a particularly strong presence there, particularly compared to other sites with Luciferian activity.

---

<sup>157</sup> *Lib. prec.* 75: *Et interea invaderunt quidam basilicam, sed fidem plebis invadere non potuerunt.*

<sup>158</sup> *Lib. prec.* 75: *Denique, alibi in agello eadem plebs basilicam sibi ecclesiae fabricavit...*

<sup>159</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96.

<sup>160</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99: *...quarum monasteria pro merito sanctimoniae earum civitatis ipsa veneratur.* The use of *monasteria* contrasts with the singular *monasterium*, used at *Lib. prec.* 104 to describe the community at Eleutheropolis.

In Rome, in stark contrast, the Luciferians met secretly in a house at night due to pressure from the bishop Damasus:<sup>161</sup>

But since the sacraments of our healing had to be done at any time whatsoever, even in secret due to the state of affairs, the holy presbyter Macarius set up vigils and called the brotherhood together in a certain house so that, even at night, the holy people might affirm their faith by the divine readings.

The tone of this passage alone makes it clear that the Luciferians considered this a less than ideal time and place to gather. They were forced into these circumstances as part of a broader transformation in the Christian world in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, in which imperial legislation and the promotion of public venues of worship, such as basilicas and martyrological sites, became normative and meeting in secret, at night, and/or in households became signs of deviance.<sup>162</sup> Maier argues that “Household space here [in the case of the Luciferians] embodies a theological identity of protest,” pointing to Faustinus’ later complaints about the wealth embodied in these new church structures.<sup>163</sup> But the passage cited above, with phrases like *vel clam* and *vel noctu*, make it clear that Faustinus believes his fellow Luciferians should be worshiping openly and in the day. He was perfectly capable of simply writing *clam* or *noctu*; the inclusion of *vel* in these cases implies that the decision to worship in a house was a result of their circumstances, not a conscious choice. That they could be forced into worshiping secretly at night, while the Novatians still possessed public basilicas in Rome (as we shall see), is a testament to the relative weakness of the Luciferian community at Rome.

---

<sup>161</sup> *Lib. prec.* 79: *Sed quia pro conditione rerum quolibet tempore vel clam salutis nostrae sacramenta facienda sunt, idem sanctus presbyter Macarius dat vigilias, in quadam domo convocans fraternitatem, ut, vel noctu, divinis lectionibus fidem plebs sancta roboraret.*

<sup>162</sup> See Maier, “Heresy, Households, and the Disciplining of Diversity.”

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 226, with reference to *Lib. prec.* 121.

Lastly, when the aforementioned Macarius is killed, the Luciferians in Rome bury him in an ‘ancient monument,’ an action that suggests the Luciferians there did not possess their own catacombs or cemeteries or even an organized, dedicated section of a catacomb or cemetery.<sup>164</sup> Most late antique sources about the violation of burials concern the practice of grave-robbing, but numerous funerary inscriptions limiting who was permitted to be buried in a given tomb demonstrate that the reuse of tombs was both a common practice and carried with it some stigma.<sup>165</sup> This doubtless explains why Faustinus and Marcellinus are quick to point out that the tomb was *vetusto*. But the choice of a monument, even an old one, points to a lack of material resources sufficient to provide for a formal burial. However, the connection between Christian identity and communal burial should not be overemphasized, as Rebillard has recently cautioned.<sup>166</sup>

The Luciferians describe no church, just a monastery of women, at Eleutheropolis, and nothing at all in North Africa.<sup>167</sup> They do recount an instance in Eleutheropolis in the 360s wherein the Arian Turbo set upon a Nicene church hosting Lucifer.<sup>168</sup> But while they provide a parallel description of Turbo menacing their community in the 380s, they do not mention a parallel church. Their failure to mention similar churches for their community in the 380s, as well as their complaint that their opponents still possess ritual vessels and codices that were taken in the 360s, does make the reader question how large and influential their community in Eleutheropolis could have been in the 380s.

---

<sup>164</sup> *Lib. prec.* 82: *Namque cum in quodam vetusto monumento eum frates sepelissent...*

<sup>165</sup> Éric Rebillard, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 58-73.

<sup>166</sup> *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, 35-56.

<sup>167</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104.

<sup>168</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104.

The Novatians, by contrast, were very urban. As noted above, the Novatians had three churches in Constantinople by the middle of the fourth century.<sup>169</sup> These were in the center of the city, not at its edges, and were dedicated church structures, not houses. In fact, in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, the Novatian bishop Chrysanthus was confident enough in his community's strength in Constantinople that he built additional churches and enlarged the ones that were already in the city.<sup>170</sup> One church was even a bit of a tourist attraction for all residents of Constantinople, including Christians of all stripes and pagans, for having miraculously escaped a fire in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>171</sup>

Throughout Anatolia, the Novatians also maintained church structures in cities. We explicitly know from Socrates of churches in Cyzicus, Pazum, Angarum, Ancyra, and generally, 'Anatolia.'<sup>172</sup> References to bishops in other locations, such as Nicaea, probably imply church structures there as well, though Socrates makes no explicit reference to them.

In Rome, Socrates relates that the Novatians had many churches until the bishop Innocent (whose episcopacy ran from 401 to 417) began confiscating them.<sup>173</sup> Thus in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, they appear to have continued their worship in churches undisturbed by the anti-heretical campaigns led by Damasus. Nor was Innocent entirely successful, as Socrates reports that Celestine (422-432) took more churches away. "This Celestine," Socrates writes, "compelled Rusticulus, their bishop, to gather them together secretly in

---

<sup>169</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.38; see also 4.9, in which Socrates describes Valens ordering Novatian churches be shut and then reopened.

<sup>170</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.12

<sup>171</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.39.

<sup>172</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38, 3.11, 4.21, 5.5 (Cyzicus; see also Jul. *Ep.* 46, wherein Julian accuses Eleusius of destroying this Novatian church); 4.28, 6.24 (Pazum); 5.21 (Angarum); 6.22 (Ancyra) 5.19 ('Anatolia').

<sup>173</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.9.

houses.”<sup>174</sup> So the Novatians in Rome suffered the same fate as the Luciferians had – but, significantly, about 40 years later, and after a failed attempt under Innocent to drive them underground. Similarly, in Alexandria, the Novatians did not find their structures and property confiscated until the episcopacy of Cyril, 412-444.<sup>175</sup>

Similarly, Donatists possessed hundreds of public church structures throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> century in North Africa.<sup>176</sup> It would be tiresome to elaborate on each example. Instead, we might take it as a demonstration of the ubiquity of these churches that the first of Optatus’ four major complaints about Donatists is that “they have made unnecessary basilicas,” since the catholic basilicas are the only truly necessary ones.<sup>177</sup> Moreover, a central element of the Macarian persecution in 347-348 was the confiscation of churches, a central element of Julian’s religious policy beginning in 361 was to restore to the Donatists their churches, and imperial legislation passed after the Council of Carthage in 411 demanded the confiscation of Donatist property including churches.<sup>178</sup> Nor was the Council of Carthage in 411 the final word on the subject; Augustine’s continuing complaints about Donatist activities and the repetition of imperial legislation

---

<sup>174</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.11: Καὶ οὗτος ὁ Κελεστίνος τὰς ἐν Ῥώμῃ Νουατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας ἀφείλετο, καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν Ῥουστικούλαν κατ’ οἰκίας ἐν παραβύστῳ συνάγειν ἠνάγκασεν.

<sup>175</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.7.

<sup>176</sup> There is an extensive and ongoing debate among archaeologists as to whether numerous excavated churches with the inscription *Deo laudes* should be identified as Donatist or not; see Éric Rebillard, “Material Culture and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity,” in R. Raja and J. Rüpke, eds. *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), 425-436, at 432-434, for the bibliography on this question. Though certainty is impossible, it is exceedingly likely that at least some of the Numidian basilicas that have been excavated carrying this inscription were Donatist due to their geographic supremacy in the region, a supremacy often admitted to by their opponents: Opt. *De schism.* 2.18; Aug. *Ep.* 129.6, *De un. Eccl.* 19.51. Arguments over the relative ‘urbanism’ of Donatist churches often rely on these identifications; even if the Donatists had proportionally more church structures in rural and village areas than in major urban areas, they still could claim churches in major cities like Carthage, Utica, Cirta, and Hippo.

<sup>177</sup> *De schism.* 3.1: ...*et basilicas fecerunt non necessarias*. The phrase is also used at 1.10 with *ecclesias* substituting for *basilicas*.

<sup>178</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 2.16-17, 3.4, 6.6; *CTh.* 16.5.52.

against Donatists confirms that the Donatists did not simply hand over their basilicas as they were legally obligated to.<sup>179</sup> In fact, even at Hippo itself, the Donatist Macrobius was quick to reopen Donatist churches as soon as the local representative of the imperial government left for Carthage.<sup>180</sup> Far from being shut up in house churches following a period of repression, Donatists continued to worship publicly at least until 429, when the Vandal invasion caused a sea change in Christian disputation in North Africa.

In Rome, however, the Donatists were not so well positioned. The Novatians had at least one basilica; the Luciferians a house; but Optatus mocks the Donatists for having only a cave and the nickname *montenses*, ‘mountain-dwellers’ or just ‘hill-folk.’<sup>181</sup> The term of derision was apparently quite popular, being used also by Jerome and Augustine.<sup>182</sup> Their cave was, at least, a meeting place. There is no account of other Roman Christians under any other bishop persecuting them as they did the Luciferians and Novatians, but we might wonder if their choice of meeting place was not guided by such possibilities.

Compared to the Novatians and Donatists, their churches were small and isolated. Given the significance of universality in late antique Christianity, as discussed above, this surely did not help the Luciferians’ cause. Furthermore, having fewer members meant that the community as a whole had fewer resources to draw from; consequently, they had

---

<sup>179</sup> François Decret, *Early Christianity in North Africa*, trans. Edward L. Smither (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 126-138.

<sup>180</sup> Aug. *Ep.* 139.2.

<sup>181</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 2.4: *Sic speluncam quamdam foris a civitate, cratibus seperunt, ubi ipso tempore conventiculum habere potuissent: unde montenses appellati sunt.* See William Tabbernee, “Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement,” in David Hellholm, et al., eds., *Ablution, Initiation and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 917-945, at 940, on the confusion between Montanists and *montenses* among modern scholars.

<sup>182</sup> Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* 28; Aug. *Ep. c. Pet.* 2.247.

a smaller pool from which to draw clergy, the significance of which will be discussed in Chapter 5, and they were potentially more vulnerable to persecution, as will be discussed in Chapter 6.

### *Conclusion*

From their very origins, the Luciferians were put into a precarious position. Their communities could only exist, in their inception, where rigorist bishops opposed to the Council of Alexandria had their sees or had established contacts. This meant that Luciferian communities existed across the Mediterranean, in every corner of the Roman Empire, but only in small numbers. This distribution makes Faustinus and Marcellinus' claims to represent the 'universal' church ring hollow, as the Luciferians did not in fact represent more than a handful of Christians compared to their adversaries. The Novatians could no better claim to represent the 'universal' church, but they opposed the very idea; the Donatists accepted the notion of a 'universal' church but simply claimed that they were a part of it. The Luciferians, by opposing the bishops who assented to the decisions of the Council of Alexandria and all who supported them, could not take this approach. Their distribution also limited the abilities of the Luciferians to stay in contact with one another and to hold councils, even though communication and councils were integral parts of Christian identity in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. At the local level, too, their communities were small and isolated, and the Luciferians seemed incapable of appreciably growing their sizes.

Does this mean that the communities sown in 362 were inevitably bound to collapse? No. While the distribution of Luciferian communities were a contributing factor

to their decline, the Novatians themselves provide a model of a community spread across the Mediterranean which maintained its cohesion despite not having access to imperial resources. The Luciferians' failure to create communities beyond their initial distribution was probably more important than this initial distribution itself. While the geographic distribution of the Luciferians may have been a contributing factor in their decline, we must continue to look for other factors that prevented them from building the kinds of broader communities the Novatians and Donatists did.



### Chapter 3: Doctrine and Practice

This chapter does not ask whether or not the Luciferians, or the Novatians or Donatists, were heretical, or schismatic, or even catholic and orthodox. Instead, it examines how differences in doctrine and practice, or perceptions of differences in doctrine and practice, as well as changing understandings of heresy and schism in late antiquity themselves, contributed to the construction of communal identities among late antique Christians. Doctrine is one point on which the Luciferians differed significantly from the Novatians and Donatists, as it appears that the Luciferians did not substantially differ from other Nicene Christians on any point of doctrine or practice whereas the Novatians and Donatists did.

The most obvious place to look for different identities among religious groups is in the differing beliefs of those communities, what we may refer to as ‘doctrine,’ and how these communities organized themselves, what activities they took part in, and how they disciplined themselves, what is often referred to collectively as ‘practice.’<sup>1</sup> These two are not immediately separable, of course. Durkheim contends, for example,<sup>2</sup>

Les pratiques traduisent les croyances en mouvements et les croyances ne sont souvent qu'une interprétation des pratiques...On appelle phénomènes religieux les croyances obligatoires ainsi que les pratiques relatives aux objets donnés dans ces croyances.

---

<sup>1</sup> This dichotomy is taken from Émile Durkheim, “De la définition des phénomènes religieux,” *Année sociologique* 2 (1897-1898): 1-28, at 18: “Les croyances ne sont pas, en effet, les seuls phénomènes qu'on doive appeler religieux; il y a, en outre, les pratiques. Le culte est un élément de toute religion, non moins essentiel que la foi,” and *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie* (Paris: PUF, 1912), passim.

<sup>2</sup> “De la définition des phénomènes religieux,” 18.

While there is a distinction between belief and the forms of its expression, the two are so interrelated that it makes sense to examine them together when considering the identity of a religious community.

Approaching a Christian community in late antiquity with the intention of determining whether or not it was a heresy or a schism is inherently flawed. As discussed in the introduction, the very concept of ‘heresy’ has become contested in modern scholarship. But even in antiquity, the process of defining ‘heresy’ and ‘schism’ was still underway when Faustinus and Marcellinus delivered the *Libellus precum* to Theodosius in 383 or 384.

Not all Christian authors presented heresy and schism as concepts still being developed. Basil handily defines heretics as those who differ in matters of ‘faith’ (κατ’ αὐτήν τὴν πίστιν) and schismatics as those who separate themselves for ‘certain ecclesiastic reasons’ (δι’ αἰτίας τινὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς).<sup>3</sup> Likewise, for Vincentius, writing in the first half of the fifth century, it was all so obvious: that which is catholic is “that which was believed everywhere, always, by everyone.”<sup>4</sup> Basil and Vincentius present these terms as relatively unproblematic, straightforward definitions. But trouble immediately arises when we continue to read Basil’s list of the types of Christian communities, as there are also ‘illicit gatherings’ (παρασυναγωγὰς). Basil does not clearly define how these ‘illicit gatherings’ are distinguished from those whom he defines

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121): Ὅθεν, τὰς μὲν αἱρέσεις ὠνόμασαν, τὰ δὲ σχίσματα, τὰς δὲ παρασυναγωγὰς. Αἱρέσεις μὲν, τοὺς παντελῶς ἀπερρηγμένους καὶ κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν πίστιν ἀπηλλοτριωμένους, σχίσματα δὲ, τοὺς δι’ αἰτίας τινὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς καὶ ζητήματα ἰάσιμα πρὸς ἀλλήλους διενεχθέντας, παρασυναγωγὰς δὲ, τὰς συνάξεις τὰς παρὰ τῶν ἀνυποτάκτων πρεσβυτέρων ἢ ἐπισκόπων καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν λαῶν γινομένας.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm.* 2 (*PL* 50:640): *In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*

as schismatics. Nor are Vincentius' definitions any clearer. Anyone could – and did – claim that they represented universality and antiquity and that their opponents did not.<sup>5</sup>

Not all Christian authors in Late Antiquity attempted to create such rigid definitions to begin with. The Luciferians themselves provoked some anxiety over the very definitions of heresy and schism. Augustine, in his *De haeresibus*, writes, “Whether...they are still heretics because they affirm their dissent with destructive vehemence, is another question, and it does not seem to me that it should be dealt with in this place.”<sup>6</sup> Clearly for Augustine the terms were not so easily defined. Asking whether or not the Luciferians or any other Christians were ‘heretical’ or ‘schismatic’ is thus rendered something of a moot point if Christian authors like Augustine were not even certain if one could be ‘schismatic’ without being ‘heretical.’ I shall return to this problem in the Conclusion.

It was quite common in antiquity, when trying to decide which among different Christian communities was ‘orthodox,’ to ask which community had come first. Throughout the *Commonitorium*, for example, Vincentius assumes that all heresies and schisms have deviated from a pre-established system of beliefs and practices. In one such instance, he asks, “What then should a catholic Christian do if some little part of the

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie*, 1.19 on what he calls ‘representation hérésiologique,’ the process by which one community defines others as heretical, and Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” 107: “In Late Antiquity, all Christians who asked themselves the question called themselves orthodox...To describe oneself as a heretic is in essence a logical contradiction. Late antique Christians shared the belief that there was indeed such a thing as a ‘true’ faith, and believed that their version corresponded to it.”

<sup>6</sup> Aug. *De haer.* 81: *sive...sint haeretici, quia dissensionem suam pertinaci animositate firmarunt, alia quaestio est, neque hoc loco mihi videtur esse tractanda.* Augustine unfortunately died before he had time to address the question in a more suitable place.

church should cut itself off from the communion of the universal faith?”<sup>7</sup> But this is not an appropriate way to examine the origins of the Luciferians or any other Christian community either. Christians could easily argue about which community had separated themselves from which and, as we shall see, they often did.

Recent scholarship has instead promoted a model of the development of religious communities that emphasizes a ‘parting of the ways,’ in which a single tradition becomes two new traditions, rather than one diverging from the other, more ‘correct’ community.<sup>8</sup> But even if we prefer a model in which a ‘parting of the ways’ leads to two separate communities of Christians, we are most frequently dealing with a parting based on different doctrinal beliefs and practices. After all, what distinguished the communions of an Arian and a Nicene Christian? The natural answer is a belief or a practice, that is, in the case of Arian and Nicene Christians, the way they understood the relationship between the Father and the Son. The logical question, then, and the subject of the first section of this chapter, is whether or not differences in beliefs or practices led to a separation between the Luciferians and other Nicene Christians or whether or not these differences developed over time, and how these developments (or lack thereof) contrast to the Novatians and Donatists.

#### *The Council of Alexandria: A Parting of Ways?*

Where better to start with an examination of potential doctrinal or practical developments than the council that both communities agreed had led to the division in the

---

<sup>7</sup> *Comm. 3.7: Quid igitur tunc faciet Christianus catholicus, si se aliqua Ecclesiae particula ab universalis fidei communione praeciderit?*

<sup>8</sup> See the Introduction.

first place? The Luciferians and other Nicene Christians diverged first and foremost as a consequence of the decisions taken by the bishops at the Council of Alexandria. In all their writings, the Luciferians complain at length that their opponents hold communion with Arians, by which they mean both Arians proper and those who swore to Arian creeds but then were allowed back into Nicene communion after the council.<sup>9</sup> At first, this dispute does seem like it was over both a doctrinal and a practical issue – it involves both creeds and communion, after all. But on further examination, both sides actually agreed on what the rules of Nicene communion were – they just had different understandings of the events themselves.

For Faustinus and Marcellinus, the bishops who swore to Arian creeds did so because they were either afraid (particularly of losing material possessions), in which case they should have remained constant, or because they wanted to acquire material possessions.<sup>10</sup> When they were let back into Nicene communion, these clergy should have thus been reduced in status to the laity. Faustinus and Marcellinus clearly state this in the heart of their petition: “For who is there that would consider the strength of the divine religion and trust that the peace of liars is pleasing to God, unless (as was decreed by the fathers) they should hand themselves over into the body of laymen, undergoing

---

<sup>9</sup> Canellis, “Arius et les ‘Ariens,’” 492: “Par ‘prévaricateurs,’ Faustin regroupe en fait quatre catégories d’adversaires: les Ariens à proprement parler; ceux qui ont favorisé l’Arianisme avant 360 (en capitulant plus ou moins devant lui ou son protecteur impérial); ceux qui ont ‘failli’ à Rimini et continuent d’occuper leur siège; enfin, ceux qui persistent à ne pas tenir compte des condamnations lancées par les Lucifériens.” The terminology employed by these rigorists will be discussed below.

<sup>10</sup> There are numerous examples, but see, e.g., *Lib. prec.* 49: *...in eorum se dominium delusionemque tradiderunt metu exilii et ut episcopale nomen apud homines retinere uiderentur.*

penance for their deceit?”<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, although the Luciferian in Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* may not accurately represent a member of Faustinus and Marcellinus’ community in all respects, this is the argument that he makes throughout the text.<sup>12</sup>

But this does not conflict with the practices of other Nicene bishops in the 5<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> centuries. By the 4<sup>th</sup> century, clergy did not undergo penance for serious sins committed when they were clergy. They were instead first stripped of clerical rank and reduced in status to the laity because (the reasoning goes) if clergyman sinned, there was no one of sufficient authority to pray on his behalf while he did penance in the same way that a clergyman prayed on behalf of laymen.<sup>13</sup> Of course, if priests were readmitted to communion through a laying-on of hands after a relatively minor infraction, they did not need to be stripped of their rank. The difference – whether one would be stripped of one’s clerical rank or not – lay in the gravity of the sin. So at the Council of Alexandria, the bishops who had not sworn to Arian creeds had to decide whether or not the bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds needed to be removed from the clergy and undergo penance or simply be readmitted with a laying-on of hands.

Apostasy, which included not only turning to paganism but also to heretical forms of Christianity, had always been one of the gravest sins in ancient Christianity. Gregory

---

<sup>11</sup> *Lib. prec. 55: Quis est enim qui considerans vim divinae religionis pacem perfidorum Deo placere confidat, nisi si, ut a patribus decretum est, in laicorum se numerum tradant suae perfidiae dolentes?*

<sup>12</sup> The point is recurring but stated very clearly at *Dial. c. Luc. 3 (SC 473:88): ...aio laicum, ab Arianis venientem recipi debere poenitentem, clericum, vero non debere.*

<sup>13</sup> Maureen Tilley, “Theologies of Penance during the Donatist Controversy,” *SP 35* (2001): 330-337, at 330-331. The refrain was *Sacerdos si peccaverit, quis orabit illo?* from 1 Kgs 2:25. For the argument, see e.g. Opt. *De schism.* 2.20.4; Aug. *C. litt. Pet.* 2.105.241; Leo, *Epistula* (= PL 54.593-1218) 167.2; and Joseph Carola, *Augustine of Hippo: The Role of the Laity in Ecclesial Reconciliation* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2003), 73-77.

of Nyssa's *Epistola Canonica*, for example, established harsher penance for apostasy than for the less grievous sins of murder, adultery, and fornication.<sup>14</sup> His brother, Basil of Caesarea, included apostasy high on a longer list of possible crimes.<sup>15</sup> Like Gregory, the westerners Pacian, and Augustine both treated apostasy as one of the three gravest sins alongside murder and adultery.<sup>16</sup> For Optatus, writing at the height of the Donatist movement in North Africa, the three greatest crimes a Christian could commit were murder, apostasy, and schism.<sup>17</sup> Those who had committed apostasy, generally by sacrificing to pagan deities or swearing to heresy, had committed one of the gravest sins in late antique Christian thought.

So by the standards of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the clerics who had sworn to Arian creeds should have been reduced in status. They were instead admitted back into communion as clergy. Why? It is worth noting at this juncture that the only sources that discuss the rehabilitation of the clergy after the Council of Alexandria are a letter of Athanasius *Ad Rufinianum* in 362 immediately following the Council, Jerome's *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* in the mid-370s, the *Libellus precum* of Faustinus and Marcellinus in 383/4, Rufinus' *Historia ecclesia* of 401, and Sulpicius Severus' *Chronica* of 403.<sup>18</sup> Jerome's is by far the fullest account. He argues that the bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds supposedly did not understand that what they were doing was wrong and therefore had committed no sin during the entirety of the 350s. Concerning the 'Dated Creed,' Jerome

---

<sup>14</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistola Canonica ad Letoium* (= PG 45:221-236) 2-4.

<sup>15</sup> *Ep.* 188.

<sup>16</sup> Pacian, *Paraenesis* (= PL 13.1081-1090) 11; Aug. *Serm.* 352.8 (*PL* 39:1550).

<sup>17</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 1.22.

<sup>18</sup> Ath. *Ad Ruf.* passim; Jer. *Dial. c. Luc.* passim; *Lib. prec.* passim; Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.28-30; Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.45.7.

writes, “The words sounded like piety, and among the honey of such a proclamation, no one reckoned that poison was inserted.”<sup>19</sup> After Valens and Ursacius revealed the Arian nature of the creed signed at Rimini, Jerome states that “the whole world groaned, and marveled that it had become Arian.”<sup>20</sup> Only a few, he emphasizes, still defended the ‘Dated Creed’ once they later learned its true nature.<sup>21</sup> When Julian became emperor,<sup>22</sup>

The bishops gathered together who were ensnared by the traps of Rimini... ‘We thought,’ they said, ‘that the meaning agreed with the words, and we didn’t even suspect that in the church of God, where there is simplicity, where the pure confession is, one thing might be hidden in the heart and another brought out from the lips. Kind judgment about evil men deceived us.’

The *confessores* agreed, arguing that these bishops should be allowed back into Nicene communion “not because those who had been heretics could be bishops, but because it stands that those who were being let back in had not been heretics.”<sup>23</sup> Athanasius’ letter provides evidence that similar councils were held and decided on similarly moderate measures in Greece, Spain, and Gaul.<sup>24</sup>

Implicit in this line of arguing is that if these bishops *had* been conscious heretics, then they should not have been welcomed back into Nicene catholic communion. It was only because they had been deceived by a ruse enacted by the actual authors of heresy (by which Nicene authors mean men like Valens and Ursacius, whom Jerome specifically

---

<sup>19</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 17: Sonabant verba pietatem, et inter tanti mella praeconii, nemo venenum insertum putabat.*

<sup>20</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 19: Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est.*

<sup>21</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 19: Pauci vero ut se natura hominum habet errorem pro consilio defensavere.*

<sup>22</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 19: Putavimus, aiebant, sensum congruere cum verbis; nec in Ecclesia Dei, ubi simplicitas, ubi pura confessio est, aliud in corde clausum esse, aliud in labiis proferri timuimus.*

<sup>23</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 20: ...non quod episcopi possint esse qui haeretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur, haeticos non fuisse.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ep. ad Ruf..* See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158. On Rufinus’ account, see Y.-M. Duval, “La place et l’importance du concile d’Alexandrie ou de 362 dans l’*Histoire de l’Église* de Rufin d’Aquilée (rôle d’Hilaire de Poitiers),” *REAug* 47 (2001): 282-302.



points out were not welcomed back into Nicene communion) that they were allowed to retain their episcopal rank. Jerome was not alone in this reasoning, either. Rufinus states that many of the western bishops were deceived.<sup>25</sup> Sulpicius Severus says that all the west was deceived, although as we shall see, he does contradict himself.<sup>26</sup>

In one sense, then, the emergence of a rigorist community or rigorist communities following the Council of Alexandria was simply the result of their belief that western bishops knew what they were doing and the belief of the rest of the Nicene communion that these bishops were deceived. And it is entirely possible that many westerners were deceived. Dionysius of Milan apparently did not know what the Nicene Creed was when presented with it at the Council of Milan in 355.<sup>27</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, one of the staunchest pro-Nicene individuals of the 350s, and one of the bishops who did suffer exile for his beliefs, claims not to have even known what the Nicene Creed said in 356, mere months before his exile for it.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the creed presented at the Councils of Rimini and Sirmium was a modified version of the ‘Dated Creed,’ composed to be as vague as possible in order to be as acceptable as possible.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps the western bishops did not actually understand the consequences of what they were signing.

But it is entirely possible – in fact, almost certain – that the bishops at the Council of Alexandria were being flexible in readmitting those who had sworn to Arian

---

<sup>25</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.21: ...*plures decepti*...

<sup>26</sup> *Chron.* 2.45.3 (SC 441:330): *Occidentalibus deceptis*...

<sup>27</sup> Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (PL 10:562-563). See in general Jörg Ulrich, “Nicaea and the West,” *VC* 51, no. 1 (1997): 10-24; for the Council of Milan, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 117. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers*, 178-184 expresses skepticism about the incident involving Dionysius of Milan, but see Williams, “The Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers,” 341.

<sup>28</sup> *De syn.* 91 (PL 10:545): *Regeneratus pridem, et in episcopatu aliquantisper manens, fidem Nicaenam numquam nisi exsulaturus audivi: sed mihi homoousii et homoeousii intelligentiam Evangelia et Apostoli intimaverunt.*

<sup>29</sup> Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, 322-323; Meslin, *Les Ariens d’Occident*, 96-97.

creeds as clergy. We should, for starters, be wary of taking Hilary at his word too quickly. His point (that although he did not know what the Nicene Creed stated, but still had understood the distinction between *homoousios* and *homoiousios* because the Gospels and the apostles revealed it to him) is also clearly rhetorical in purpose, implying that Valens, Ursacius, and others were, of course, working against the natural interpretation of the Gospels and apostles. The strictness of his adherence to the Nicene Creed also suggests more than a few months' acquaintance with it, as does his composition of the thoroughly Nicene *De Trinitate* while in exile.

Furthermore, consider what Jerome says about those who oppose the decisions of the Council of Alexandria:<sup>30</sup>

What do they reckon should be done about the ones who made [Arian] confessions? With the old bishops deposed, they should ordain new ones. It was tried. But how many will suffer themselves to be deposed with a good conscience? Especially when all the people, since they loved their priests, gathered together for the near stoning and destruction of those who were removing them.

Jerome still paints those who had sworn to Arian creeds in a good light – they are *bene conscius* – but definitely indicates that some other, unidentified bishops wanted to take action against them for swearing to these creeds. These unknown bishops even tried to have all of the other bishops deposed, which is certainly interesting if there was such confusion over precisely what creedal language was properly Nicene and what was not. The rigorist bishops' first reaction betrays the fact that they believed the bishops who had

---

<sup>30</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 19: quid de confessoribus agendum putaverunt? Depositis, inquit, veteribus episcopis, novos ordinassent. Tentatum est. Sed quotusquisque bene sibi conscius patitur se deponi? Praesertim cum omnes populi, sacerdotes suos diligentes, pene ad lapides et ad interemptionem deponentium eos convolarerint?*

sworn to Arian creeds had indeed sinned and that these creeds were not so ambiguous as others might claim.

A more practical explanation for the results of the Council becomes apparent immediately. The majority of bishops there were lenient because they were compelled to be lenient. We should perhaps not imagine that a crowd of individuals traveled from all over the empire, brandishing rocks and menacing Athanasius, Hilary, Eusebius, and the others if their beloved bishops were taken away. But what Jerome does hint at is that there was a very real demand from the Christian populace at large to retain these bishops in their sees and, in effect, brush over the events of the 350s in favor of unity and harmony.

And so an explanation was needed for this leniency. Modern scholars generally agree that the bishops at the Council of Alexandria consciously decided to rewrite the past in order to present a picture of these bishops being tricked rather than being coerced into signing this Arian creed.<sup>31</sup> The evidence from Sulpicius Severus is particularly damning, as he claims (as noted above) that all the west was deceived, but also relates at length how the bishops at Rimini initially rejected Constantius' formulation when the Arian delegation returned from court until imperial pressure, not vague wording, drove them to accept it.<sup>32</sup> Duval also demonstrates that Jerome had access to the acts of the Council of Rimini and knew what had actually happened when he presented the much

---

<sup>31</sup> See especially Duval, "La place et l'importance du concile d'Alexandrie," 290-291, and Battifol, "Les sources de l'*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*," 108-109.

<sup>32</sup> *Chron.* 2.41-44.

more conciliatory picture described above.<sup>33</sup> In short, there was a conscious effort to exculpate the bishops who had signed the creed presented at Rimini. Hence the rigorists of the time had a legitimate grievance with the clemency of the Council of Alexandria. But all parties involved agreed on the doctrinal grounds; the fact that the leaders of the moderate faction needed to come up with some rationalization for their decision demonstrates as much.

In a purely normative sense, the events of the Council of Alexandria do not seem to indicate a distinction in doctrine or practice between Faustinus and Marcellinus and their contemporaries. They all agreed on what constituted a grave sin and on the proper penalties for bishops who had committed grave sins. While the members of Faustinus and Marcellinus' community (and others) may have been angered by the actual process and results of the Council of Alexandria, they did not believe anything different about the way penance should work. Thus if we are to find a doctrinal difference between the Luciferians and other Nicene Christians, we must look elsewhere.

#### *Other Potential Doctrinal Developments*

Regardless of the machinations going on behind the decisions of the Council of Alexandria, we should look to see if Faustinus and Marcellinus' rigorist community's separation from communion on these grounds led to any doctrinal developments later on. Tilley provides a model for understanding this process adapted from the sociologist Walter Firey.<sup>34</sup> In this model, which she applies to the Novatians and Donatists, two

---

<sup>33</sup> Y.-M. Duval, "La 'manoeuvre frauduleuse' de Rimini: A la recherche du *Liber Adversus Ursacium et Valentum*," in *XVIème centenaire de la mort d'Hilaire, Hilaire et son temps* (Paris, 1969), 51-103, at 81-84. See Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 37.

<sup>34</sup> Tilley, "When Schism Becomes Heresy."

communities both valorize the same goals. In the case of the rigorist bishops at the Council of Alexandria, these would be the goals of (a) maintaining orthodoxy among bishops and (b) showing clemency to those who have made mistakes in order to have enough bishops to satisfy the needs of the community. The initial division occurred when two communities within the broader Nicene community valorized these goals somewhat differently, with rigorist communities emphasizing (a) above (b) and the adherents to the Council of Alexandria emphasizing (b) above (a). It must be emphasized that this is not an either/or system. These two differing attitudes merely reflect two differing emphases within a broader community that generally agreed on the same principles. But as time passed, in Tilley's model, two communities could potentially move "from simply different valorizations of the same ends to valorizations of different ends."<sup>35</sup> In doing so, they needed to justify their eventually apparent differences and they did so doctrinally.

In other words, if the rigorist rejection of the Council of Alexandria itself was not a matter of ecclesiastic doctrine or practice, we should look to see if it nevertheless led to differing developments within Faustinus and Marcellinus' community by a careful examination of their actions and beliefs. The Novatians and the Donatists, according to Tilley, emerged as communities that were reasonably similar to their contemporaries in respect to doctrine and practice but developed differences over time. We might expect the same from these rigorists. Yet as important as this might seem, the Luciferians do not seem to have developed any differences from their orthodox contemporaries in any point of doctrine or practice. They developed no beliefs that are distinguishable from the

---

<sup>35</sup> Tilley, "When Schism Becomes Heresy," 20.

Nicene conception of God, the paramount question of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, and additionally, no other beliefs that were not found in the acceptable range of beliefs held by their Nicene contemporaries.

In fact, even their enemies seem to be at pains to find something wrong with them. Ambrose writes of Satyrus that<sup>36</sup>

He did not reckon that there was faith in schism. For even if [the heirs of Lucifer] held faith in God, he did not reckon that they held faith in the church of God, as though they suffered some of its joints to be divided and its limbs to be torn apart. Since Christ suffered for the church, and since the body of Christ is the church, it does not seem like those who make his suffering empty and drag apart his body show faith in Christ.

This is just a roundabout way of saying that while rigorists in schism still kept faith in God, that is, while they remained orthodox, they separated themselves from communion with the broader church. Thus *it seems* – though he does not state with certainty – that they do not hold faith in Christ. In fact, Ambrose pulls a Nicene rhetorical trick: while these rigorists hold faith in *God*, they do not do so in *Christ*. The implied conclusion of this thought is that, given one cannot hold faith in God and not in Christ, the Luciferians thus do not actually hold faith in God. But Ambrose can point to no doctrinal reason why these rigorists should be anathema. The violent language he employs here rather suggests that he considers them threatening, perhaps in fact because they seem so orthodox. It is easier to dismiss obviously unorthodox beliefs than to convince a listener that those who holds the exact same convictions of the listener *erga Deum* are still to be treated as though they hated Christ.

---

<sup>36</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.47: *non putavit esse fidem in schismate. nam etsi fidem erga Deum tenerent, tamen erga Dei ecclesiam non tenere, cuius patiebantur velut quosdam artus dividi et membra lacerari. etenim cum propter ecclesiam Christus passus sit et Christi corpus ecclesia sit, non videtur ab his exhiberi Christo fides, a quibus evacuatur eius passio corpusque distrahitur.*

Augustine appears to have been in a similar dilemma. As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, he declines to state with certainty as to whether or not schism itself is heresy. This uncertainty, combined with the fact that Augustine included the Luciferians at all in a work called *De haeresibus*, suggests that Augustine wanted these rigorists to be treated as heretics but was unsure how such an attitude might be reasoned out. An earlier passage from Augustine's *De agone Christi* from 396 is instructive as well: "Since the Luciferians have some understanding, and do not rebaptize, we do not condemn them; but since they also wish themselves to be cut from the root, who does not think that they ought to be hated?"<sup>37</sup> Does *detestandum* mean 'treated as a heretic' here? Augustine does not say. By explicitly pointing out that they do have 'some understanding' and that they refuse to baptize those entering this rigorist communion, Augustine definitely implies that their beliefs and practices are completely sound. It is their separation alone that makes them in some undefined way wicked. Like Ambrose, Augustine uses strong language to describe how his reader should feel about the Luciferians, but the reason for doing so is not explicitly a matter of doctrine or practice. By the end of his life, when he composed the *De haeresibus*, he was no closer to answering whether or not that separation itself was a doctrinal matter.

Catholicity was, of course, directly connected with morality in the late antique church. Christians who remained within the catholic community (however defined) were

---

<sup>37</sup> Augustine, *De agone Christiano*, ed. Josef Zycha, CSEL 41 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1900), 30.32: *Quod cum Luciferiani intelligunt, et non rebaptizent, non improbamus; sed quod etiam ipsi praecidi a radice voluerunt, quis non detestandum esse cognoscat?*

those who were moral, while those outside it were immoral.<sup>38</sup> But neither Ambrose nor Augustine feels comfortable saying that for that reason alone these rigorists are in any specific doctrinal or practical way deviant. But what if they were, and Ambrose and Augustine (and perhaps others) were simply unaware of or uncaring towards some actual doctrinal development?

### *Sabellianism?*

There are two possible instances of Luciferian doctrinal differences with their peers worth investigating. The first is a curious passage in which Faustinus states that they have been accused of deviance from the Nicene formula. In the *Confessio fidei*, Faustinus writes that their enemies “cause ill will against us, as though we supported the heresy of Sabellius.”<sup>39</sup> Sabellianism was the belief that the God had one *persona*, not three as elaborated by Nicene theologians.<sup>40</sup> But Faustinus’ theology, as represented by the *De Trinitate*, seems perfectly Nicene. There are three persons, namely the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and they share one same substance.<sup>41</sup> Why were these rigorists accused of Sabellianism, then?

---

<sup>38</sup> A. Louth, “Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century,” in *Doctrinal Diversity: Recent Studies in Early Christianity: A Collection of Scholarly Essays*, vol. 4, ed. Everett Ferguson (London: Garland, 1999), 1-17, at 4-5.

<sup>39</sup> *Conf. fid.* 1: *...nobis invidiam facientes, quod velut haeresim Sabellii tueamur.*

<sup>40</sup> See e.g. Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 7.6, 7.26; Epiph. *Pan.* 62.1 (though see T. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ankyra: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* [Gotha, 1867], 208, who shows that this argument against ‘Sabellius’ is really against Marcellus of Ancyra); J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1978; rev. ed.), 121-123; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, 8.

<sup>41</sup> *De Trin.* Specifically argues for the sameness in distinct persons at 6, 7, 9, 12; the Holy Spirit is discussed at 48-50 in the last passages before Faustinus’ farewell, almost as an afterthought (not unlike in the Nicene Creed); *Conf. fid.* 1-3 also explicitly offers a Nicene formulation.



For Mas, this is a result of shifts in the practice of Greek-to-Latin translation in the middle of the fourth century.<sup>42</sup> Faustinus, like so many others, uses the Latin words *substantia* to refer to the ‘being’ of God and *persona* to refer to three ‘persons’ of God, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. In earlier Christian writings, the Latin word *substantia* was used to translate the Greek word *hypostasis*.<sup>43</sup> Naturally, the formulation of three *hypostases* (‘persons’) in one *ousia* (‘being’), which was becoming prevalent in the east in the 370s under the influence of Basil of Caesarea,<sup>44</sup> would be anathema to a Latin Nicene Christian as supporting the conception of God as having three *substantiae*. Faustinus complains about those who assert a formulation of three *substantiae* in the *Confessio fidei* and he and Marcellinus do the same in the *Libellus precum*.<sup>45</sup> At the same time, the actions of Hilary may have helped transform western attitudes. Hilary, unquestionably orthodox in the eyes of his contemporaries, translated the three-*hypostases* formulation of the Nicene-accepted Council of Antioch (341) in his *De synodis* as *tres substantiae*.<sup>46</sup> His translation was not universally accepted; Lucifer and the deacon Hilarius of Rome both opposed it and leveled serious accusations against Hilary of Poitiers for translating the creed of the Council of Antioch this way.<sup>47</sup> Faustinus

---

<sup>42</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 348-356.

<sup>43</sup> Originally in Tertullian, according to R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1977), 176-194; for the fourth century, see Simonetti, “Appunti per una storia,” 80-81.

<sup>44</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 350; Gregory Nazianzus, *Oratio* (= *Discours 27-31*, ed. and trans. P. Gallay, SC 250 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006; 2nd. ed.]) 31.30; Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomius* (= *Contre Eunome*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. R. Winling [Paris: Les belles lettres, 2008]) 1.34.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. *Lib. prec.* 114: *...ipsi quoque, qui pie inter eos putantur credere, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti tres esse substantias uindicantes uel respicientes...*

<sup>46</sup> *De syn.* 32; Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 348.

<sup>47</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, *Apologetica responsa* (= PL 10.545-548) 4; see Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 183. On this *Apologetica responsa* in general, see Pierre Smulders, “Two Passages of Hilary’s *Apologetica Responsa* Rediscovered,” *Bijdragen* 39 (1978): 234-243.

and Marcellinus were likewise assuredly opposed to an interpretation of the Trinity as being three *hypostases* in one *ousia* because they understood that three *hypostases* in Latin meant three *substantiae*.

Mas suggests that by the 370s, the term *hypostasis* had become at least something to avoid for westerners when they were writing to easterners. Damasus does use the term *substantia* in the same sense as the Greek *hypostasis* when reporting the history of the Council of Nicaea in his letter *Confidimus* to the eastern bishops, and he also uses the term in a report to Paulinus of Antioch entitled *Confessio fidei*.<sup>48</sup> But he twice avoids the term directly, using the transliterated term *ousia* in *Ea gratia*, also to the eastern bishops in general, and avoiding the issue entirely in *Non nobis*.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Ambrose never uses the term *hypostasis* when writing to the Cappadocians.<sup>50</sup> Mas firmly asserts that Damasus' single use of *substantia* as the equivalent of *hypostasis* in the letter *Confidimus* is not an *explicit* reference to a doctrine of three *hypostases* being three *substantiae*, and that these other two instances are attempts at moderation and reconciliation.<sup>51</sup> Still, if Damasus and Basil were avoiding these terms out of a desire for reconciliation and unity together with the east, this does not suggest that their own personal beliefs on the subject

---

<sup>48</sup> *Confid.* (= PL 13:347-349): ...*ut Patrem, Filium, Spiritumque Sanctum unius Deitatis, unius figurae, unius credere oporteret substantiae, contra sententientem alienum a nostro consortio iudicantes; Conf. fid.* (PL 13:558): *Anathematizamus eos qui non tota libertate proclamant cum Patre et Filio unius potestatis esse atque substantiae.*

<sup>49</sup> *Ea grat.* (PL 13:350-352): *quia omnes uno ore unius virtutis, unius maiestatis, unius divinitatis, unius usiae dicimus divinitatem...*; *Non nobis* (PL 13:353-354): ...*sed perfectum in omnibus virtute, honore, maiestate, deitate, cum Patre conveneramur et Filio...*(this letter was subscribed by, among others, Meletius of Antioch, perhaps as a show of some reconciliation: see Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius*); Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 349.

<sup>50</sup> Simonetti, *La crisi Ariana*, 524-525.

<sup>51</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 349.

were changing significantly. Furthermore, western opposition to the term was still well known in 380, according to an oration of Gregory Nazianzus.<sup>52</sup>

Mas also claims that while Jerome shows some discomfort with a doctrine of three hypostases in two letters written to Damasus in 376 or 377, he only ‘distrusts’ but never ‘delegitimizes’ this doctrine.<sup>53</sup> But it is hard to see how Jerome can be taken as doing anything other than waging outright war on the formulation of three hypostases when he writes,<sup>54</sup>

Decide on it, I beg you, and if it pleases you, I will not fear to say ‘three *hypostases*.’ If you order it, a new creed is established beyond the Nicene, and let us orthodox confess along with the Arians with similar words. Every school of secular literature understands by *hypostasis* nothing other than *ousia*. And is there anyone, I ask, who will proclaim ‘three *substantiae*’ with his sacrilegious mouth? That which is truly the nature of God is one and one alone... Whoever in the name of piety says that there are three [natures], that is, that there are three *hypostases*, that is, *ousiae*, is trying to plant three natures. And if that is so, why do we separate ourselves from Arius with walls, since we are joined to him by faithlessness? Let Ursinus be joined to your blessedness, let Auxentius be allied to Ambrose... Let the three *hypostases* be silent, please, and let one be held... But if you rightly reckon that we ought to say ‘three *hypostases*’

---

<sup>52</sup> Or. 21.35.

<sup>53</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 350 (“Jerónimo...demuestra no llegar a entender el alcance de la doctrina de la tres hipóstasis, y desconfía de ella, aunque no la deslegitima abiertamente.”). On the theological content of these letters see Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, 1.50-55.

<sup>54</sup> Ep. 15: *Decernite, obsecro, si placet, et non timebo tres hypostases dicere. Si iubetis, condatur post Nicaenam fides, et similibus verbis, cum Arianis confiteamur orthodoxi Tota saecularium litterarum schola nihil aliud hypostasim, nisi usian novit. Et quisquam, rogo, ore sacrilego tres substantias praedicabit? Una est Dei et sola natura, quae vere est...quisquis tria esse, hoc est, tres esse hypostases, id est, usias, dicit, sub nomine pietatis, tres naturas conatur asserere. Et si ita est, cur ab Ario parietibus separamur, perfidia copulari? Iungatur cum Beatitudine tua Ursinus; cum Ambrosio societur Auxentius. Taceantur tres hypostases, si placet, et una teneantur...Aut si rectum putatis tres hypostases cum suis interpretationibus debere nos dicere, non negamus. Sed mihi credite, venenum sub melle latet.* Note Jerome’s clever rhetoric. If Damasus agrees with the three *hypostases* formula, Ursinus is joined to him and Auxentius to Ambrose – not him to Ursinus and Ambrose to Auxentius. Jerome still blames the Arians no matter what decisions are ultimately reached on the formulation. He goes on in much the same vein: *transfiguravit se angelus Satanae in angelum lucis. Bene interpretantur hypostasim, et cum id quod ipsi exponunt, habere me dicam, haereticus iudicor. Si sic credunt, ut interpretantur, non damno quod retinent. Si sic credo, ut ipsi sentirent se simulant, permittant et mihi meis verbis suum sensum loqui.*

with their interpretations, we won't deny it – but believe me, poison lurks under the honey.

Jerome is clearly disgusted with the idea of *hypostasis* as meaning anything other than *substantia*. Language was no barrier, here; by the 370s, when he traveled to Syria (whence he wrote this letter), Jerome could appreciate lectures delivered in Greek by Apollinaris of Laodicea.<sup>55</sup> Yes, Jerome is asking Damasus how to interpret this doctrine. But this 'request' is clearly just a rhetorical device wherein Jerome pretends to ask for help in understanding in order to highlight how ludicrous he feels this interpretation is. Beneath Jerome's bluntly false show of humility, there is no mistaking how Jerome thought Damasus should react to this doctrine. At best, Jerome tells Damasus that he will obey his wishes, but also indicates that Damasus will thus ally himself with Ursinus, against whom Damasus had battled for the episcopacy and who continued to be a thorn in Damasus' side in the 370s.<sup>56</sup> The two others mentioned – Arius and Auxentius – were, respectively, the supposed founder of the Arian movement and one of that movement's most prominent western bishops in Milan. Jerome might *say* that he is willing to accept this doctrine, but characterizes it as obviously heretical.

Even in the East, the three-*hypostases* formula was unpalatable among many prominent Nicene Christians. The most important of these was Athanasius, who in his early career was fiercely critical of the three-*hypostases* formula.<sup>57</sup> In the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, sent following the Council of Alexandria, Athanasius does say that the

---

<sup>55</sup> *Ep.* 84.3; On Apollinaris and Jerome's education in Greek, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 13-14; Graves, in Jerome, *Commentary on Jeremiah*, trans. Michael Graves, ed. Christopher A. Hall (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), xxv.

<sup>56</sup> See Lippold, "Ursinus und Damasus."

<sup>57</sup> See Joseph T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 37.

Council of Alexandria, which he led, decided that the three *hypostases* was a (not the) valid formulation.<sup>58</sup> He thus seems to have come to accept its orthodoxy – but he never liked it. After the Council of Alexandria, sometime in the mid-360s, Athanasius writes, “*Hypostasis* is *ousia*, and holds no other meaning than ‘that which is.’ ... for *hypostasis* and *ousia* are *existence* (*hyparxia*), for he *is* and he *exists*.”<sup>59</sup> He apparently would admit the three *hypostases* formulation as a matter of political expediency, but was still dissatisfied with it. Others knew of his dissatisfaction as well: Basil of Caesarea, when writing to Athanasius in 371, substituted the term *hyparxis* for *hypostasis* in a conciliatory letter.<sup>60</sup> Athanasius was apparently not convinced by Basil. He instead held communion with Marcellus of Ancyra (whom Basil accused of Sabellianism) and never responded to Basil’s letter.<sup>61</sup> Nor was Athanasius a lone holdout. Epiphanius seems to waffle in the *Ancoratus* of the mid-370s, first describing *ousia* and *hypostasis* as

---

<sup>58</sup> Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (= *Athanasius Werke* II.8, Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen, eds. [Berlin, 2000]). See also Lienhard, *Marcellus of Ancyra*, 200. For Athanasius as the author, see Martin Tetz, “Über nikäische Orthodoxie: Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasios von Alexandrien,” *ZNW* 66 (1975): 194-222, at 207.

<sup>59</sup> Athanasius, *Epistula ad Afros* (= *Athanasius Werke* II.8, Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen, eds. [Berlin, 2000] 4: Ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαϊνόμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν... Ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὑπαρξίς ἐστίν. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὑπάρχει. There are other Athanasian examples that also suggest he saw the terms as identical: see G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1952), 167.

<sup>60</sup> *Ep.* 69.2: Μαρκέλλω δέ, τῷ κατὰ διάμετρον ἐκείνῳ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐπιδειξαμένῳ καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς τοῦ Μονογενοῦς θεότητος ἀσεβήσαντι καὶ κακῶς τὴν τοῦ Λόγου προσηγορίαν ἐκδεξαμένῳ, οὐδεμίαν μέμψιν ἐπενεγκόντες φαίνονται. Lienhard, “Basil of Caesarea,” 160 draws attention to this substitution. At 161, Lienhard also takes Basil’s phrase ὡς μὴ ἀσθενεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ (the church at Antioch) τὴν ὀρθὴν μερίδα περὶ τὰ πρόσωπα σχιζομένην as indicative of Basil’s attempts to placate Athanasius by referring to a dispute over ‘persons,’ but as it seems strange that Basil would use different words for the same thing in the same letter, he seems here to be referring to actual persons (Meletius and Paulinus, among others). See also Joseph T. Lienhard, “Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos,” *VC* 40, no. 4 (1986): 365-389, at 386-388.

<sup>61</sup> Epiphanius, *Pan.* 72.11.3; Lienhard, “Basil of Caesarea,” 162.

representing the same thing (or at least that the Trinity had one *hypostasis*).<sup>62</sup> But he then separates the two terms in his *Panarion* only a few years later, saying only that they are not equal (the exact distinction is left unclear).<sup>63</sup> In sum, despite the best efforts of Hilary and the Cappadocian fathers, the formulation of three *hypostases* in one *ousia* was still problematic in the East as well, judging by the attitudes of two of the most prominent eastern authors of the 360s and 370s.

Clearly for many Christians, West and East, accepting a doctrine of three *hypostases* in the 370s was an unpleasant result of dealing with certain eastern bishops at best and outright heresy at worst. Mas describes Faustinus and Marcellinus' attitude towards the three *hypostases* formulation in the 380s as reflecting an 'archaic' theology; Simonetti assigns partial blame for the decline of the Luciferians on this theological interpretation and the poor state of western theology in general.<sup>64</sup> But this cannot be the case if most westerners, and even prominent easterners like Athanasius and Epiphanius, seem to have agreed with them as late as the 370s. This was an ongoing debate.

Yet despite this Nicene reluctance to accept the three *hypostases* formulation, it does not appear to have been a central issue for the Luciferians. Faustinus really only alludes to the three-*hypostases* formulation once in the *Confessio fidei* and then with

---

<sup>62</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* (= *Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1-33*, ed. Karl Holl, GCS 25 [Leipzig, 1915]) 6: ὅπου γὰρ ὁμοούσιον, μιᾶς ὑποστάσεως ἐστὶ δηλωτικόν, 67.4: τριάς αὕτη ἅγια καλεῖται, τρία ὄντα μία συμφωνία **μία** θεότης τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος **τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως**, 81: ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἐσχηματίζετο, καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑπόστασις ὄν, οὐκ ἄλλοία παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας, **ὑπόστασις ἐξ ὑποστάσεως τῆς αὐτῆς** πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος,

<sup>63</sup> *Pan.* 69.72: ποῖος τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐσίαν εἶπε θεοῦ; οὐκ ἴσασι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία ταυτόν ἐστὶ τῷ λόγῳ. Hanson, *The Christian Search for the Doctrine of God*, 666, writes, "He undoubtedly took the trouble to be well-informed; he understood pretty well the theology of Athanasius...But he was of no great intellect."

<sup>64</sup> E.g. Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 352, 356; Simonetti, "Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano," 81.

Marcellinus only once in the *Libellus precum*.<sup>65</sup> Both instances are seemingly in response to bishops who accused the Luciferians of Sabellianism. It is not that Faustinus and Marcellinus considered it important to bring up a rejection of three *hypostases* as an article of their own faith so much as they felt it important to bring up their support of a one-*substantia* formulation for which they were being criticized. Their objections, after all, are explicitly against three *substantiae*, and the word *hypostasis* never appears. In their reaction to their critics in the *Libellus precum*, the three-*substantia* formulation is only one in a long list of impious theologies. More significantly, there is no discussion of the three *hypostases* formulation whatsoever in Faustinus' work *De Trinitate*, where we most certainly might expect it.

Moreover, it does not seem to have been a central issue for their opponents either. No extant authors themselves criticize Faustinus or any other rigorists emerging from the aftermath of the Council of Alexandria for opposing the three *hypostases* formula, though we have many authors who do criticize the Luciferians on other grounds. We have only Faustinus' testimony that the Luciferians were attacked for Sabellianism.<sup>66</sup> Theodosius apparently took no umbrage at their objections to the three-*hypostases* formula, given that his *Lex augusta* states that Faustinus and Marcellinus' community was catholic. Given the lukewarm attitude of so many authors in the 370s towards the three-*hypostases* formula, it is perhaps no surprise that the rigorist opposition to the three-*hypostases* formula drew no significant ire from western authors in the 380s. In short, the

---

<sup>65</sup> *Conf. fid.* 1, 3; *Lib. prec.* 114: *Denique, cum sint alii eorum Origenistae, alii anthropomorphae, alii autem Apollinaris impii sectam tuentes, triplici cuneo alii aduersum Sanctum Spiritum diuersis studiis solis blasphemantes, sed et ipsi quoque, qui pie inter eos putantur credere, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti tres esse substantias uindicantes uel respicientes...*

<sup>66</sup> Are these related to Jerome's accusers from *Epistle 15*? It is impossible to know.

formulation of the Trinity does not seem to have been a critical aspect of the Luciferian community, either as described from without or from within.

### *Traducianism and Generationism*

A second specific accusation of heresy apart from Sabellianism was raised against ‘Luciferians’ by the author of the *Indiculus de haeresibus*. The *Indiculus* is a heresiology of unknown provenance falsely associated with Jerome in the manuscript record and composed between 393 and 428.<sup>67</sup> In it, the unknown author claims, “The Luciferians, although they hold the catholic truth in all things, were brought to this most foolish error: they say that the soul is generated from transfusion (*ex transfusione*); and they say this same soul is both from the flesh and from the substance of the flesh.”<sup>68</sup> In other words, the ‘Luciferians’ are here accused of believing that the soul was generated at conception from the human body itself in a way that emphasizes both the transferal of the soul from the parents (*trans*) and the blending of the souls of the two parents (*fusio*). The distinction between *de carne* and *de carnis...substantia* seems to be that between the physical form of the flesh and the flesh as a representation of a person’s physical form, judging by Augustine’s definitions: “The flesh is born from the flesh, and a son of the flesh is born from the substance of the flesh.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> For the *Indiculus* in general, see G. Bardy, “L’*Indiculus de Haeresibus* du Pseudo-Jérôme,” *RSR* 19 (1929): 385-405, and Henry Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 203.

<sup>68</sup> *Indiculus* (PL 81:636-646) 26.38: *Luciferiani cum teneant in omnibus catholicam veritatem, in hunc errorem stultissimum prolabantur, ut animam dicant ex transfusione generari; eademque dicunt, et de carne, et de carnis esse substantia.*

<sup>69</sup> Augustine, *Contra Maximinum* (= PL 42.743-814) 2.14.3: *Caro de carne nascitur, filius carnis de substantia carnis nascitur.*



Gennadius apparently read the *Indiculus* and believed that the Luciferians held this belief.<sup>70</sup> The description of this belief, including its attribution to the Luciferians, is copied word-for-word in the sixth-century *Capitula Sancti Augustini*, a work of Roman origin sometimes attributed to Augustine and sometimes to John Maxentius, though neither wrote it.<sup>71</sup>

A very similar belief existed in early Christian thought and is sometimes called traducianism (from *tradux*, ‘vine branch’).<sup>72</sup> This is the belief that an individual’s soul comes from his or her parents and is not created by God for each individual.<sup>73</sup> The earliest clear proponent of this view was Tertullian, who in the *De anima* writes,<sup>74</sup>

How then is a living being conceived? With the substance of both the body and the soul brought about together, or with one of these coming first? No, we say that both are conceived, made, and completed at the same time, just as they are brought out together, and no moment intervenes in their conception by which a ranking might be established.

---

<sup>70</sup> Gennadius, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* (= PL 58:979-1054) 14: *Animas hominum non esse...cum corporibus per coitum seminatatas, sicut Luciferiani, Cyrillus, et aliqui Latinorum praesumptores affirmant, quasi naturae consequentiam servant.*

<sup>71</sup> For this text, see *Capitula Sancti Augustini* (= *Opuscula*, ed. F. Glorie, CCSL 85A [Turnhout: Brepols, 1978]) [XIX] 18a (22a), and the discussion of it by Glorie from 243-246 for the authorship.

<sup>72</sup> On traducianism, see e.g. James Leo Garrett, Jr., *Systematic Theology: Biblical, Historical, and Evangelical*, vol. 1 (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1990; 4th ed.), 509-511.

<sup>73</sup> A related belief is called ‘generationism.’ The distinction between the two is not always clear in ancient texts, but in modern scholarship generationism refers to the creation of the soul from the parents’ souls just as the body comes from their bodies whereas traducianism directly links the creation of the soul to the creation of the body. See Garrett, *ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> Tertullian, *De anima* (= *Opera*, ed. Augustus Reifferscheid and Georg Wissowa, CSEL 20 [Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1890]) 27.1: *Quomodo igitur animal conceptum? Simulne conflata utriusque substantia corporis animaeque an altera earum praecedente? Immo simul ambas et concipi et confici, perfici dicimus, sicut et promi, nec ullum intervenire momentum in conceptu quo locus ordinetur.* See also Ruf. *Apol. Ad Anast.* 6: *Legi quosdam dicentes quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam anima defundatur...Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse...*

The view has a certain logic to it, particularly when considering how the sin of Adam was to be universalized into something resembling original sin.<sup>75</sup> If God creates souls, the argument goes, then why are those souls laden with sins? Propagation of the soul through the souls of the parents provides a straightforward mechanism for understanding this transfer, although Tertullian apparently believed in traducianism on other logical and scriptural bases without believing in something resembling original sin.<sup>76</sup>

Many late antique authors directly associate this belief with Tertullian's theology. Rufinus ascribes it to Tertullian, Lactantius, and others, but refuses to pass judgment on which view of the soul is correct.<sup>77</sup> While lambasting Rufinus for misattributing the belief to Lactantius, Jerome mentions this view as belonging to Tertullian as well, asking whether or not the soul comes<sup>78</sup>

from transference [lit. 'from a vine branch,' *ex traduce*], as Tertullian, Apollinaris, and the majority of westerners assert; that just as the body is born from the body, so too is the soul born from the soul, and exists in a condition similar to that which animates animals.

But like Rufinus, Jerome (despite his claims to the opposite) does not really come down on whether or not he himself believes traducianism to be orthodox or heretical.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> In general, see Pier Franco Beatrice, *The Transmission of Sin*, trans. Adam Kamesar (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 223-227.

<sup>76</sup> Beatrice, *The Transmission of Sin*, 231-233.

<sup>77</sup> Rufinus, *Apologia contra Anastasium* (= *Opera*, ed. M. Simonetti, CCL 20 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1961] 6).

<sup>78</sup> *Ep.* 126.1 (CSEL 56:143): *...an certe ex traduce, ut Tertullianus, Apollinaris et maxima pars occidentalium autumat, ut, quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex anima et simili cum brutis animantibus condicione subsistat.*

<sup>79</sup> Jerome, *Apologia contra Rufinum* (= *Opera*, vol. 3.1, ed. P. Lardet, CCSL 79 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1982]) 2.8-10; *Ep.* 126.1.

Augustine does explicitly label this same theological belief as heretical and ascribes it to Tertullian and the Manichees.<sup>80</sup>

But did the members of the community of Faustinus and Marcellinus hold a view like that of Tertullian? It is difficult to say. The question of the generation of the soul never appears in the works Lucifer himself wrote, the *Confessio fidei* written by Faustinus, the *Libellus precum*, or Faustinus' lengthy theological work *De Trinitate*. Gennadius refers to the *Libellus precum* and the *De Trinitate* but does not seem aware of any other Luciferians texts.<sup>81</sup> Nor does any discussion of the soul occur in Jerome's *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, even though Jerome himself was interested in the question.<sup>82</sup> Mas is content to conclude that it is "completely inadmissible to define the Luciferians as defenders of such a strange doctrine," and he is likely correct that this was not a defining feature of Luciferian theology.<sup>83</sup>

Yet it is interesting to note the choice of words here. The author of the *Indiculus* uses the phrase *ex transfusione*. But no author in the fourth century (or the third, for that matter) wrote about traducianism as being *ex transfusione*. Consider the vocabulary of the sources that mention Tertullian in connection with traducianism. Rufinus writes that he has read authors, among whom Tertullian numbers, who claim that *humani seminis*

---

<sup>80</sup> Augustine, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* (= *Opera*, ed. Michaela Zelzer, CSEL 85.1 [Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1974]) 2.178: *impietatem inquam, qua credis ita esse animarum traducem in Tertulliani olim et Manichaei profanitate damnatam, sicut est etiam corporum tradux.*

<sup>81</sup> *De vir. ill.* 16.

<sup>82</sup> As noted by Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris*, 66. For Jerome's interest, see the aforementioned *Ep.* 126 and *Apol. c. Ruf.* 2.8-10.

<sup>83</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 201: "...todo inadmisibile definir a los luciferianos como los defensores de tan extraña doctrina antropológica."

*traducem...defundatur*.<sup>84</sup> Jerome uses the phrase *animae statu...ex traduce* to describe the view of Tertullian, Apollinaris, and the majority of westerners.<sup>85</sup> Julian of Eclanum apparently claimed that Augustine believes in the *animarum traducem*, which Augustine accepts as a fair definition of Tertullian's belief (though not his own).<sup>86</sup> Only the noun *tradux* appears in these descriptions. Nowhere do these authors refer to the belief as involving *transfusio*. The specificity of this vocabulary would suggest that the author of the *Indiculus* is not making a casual accusation, and that, if the Luciferians did believe in the *transfusio* of souls, they believed in a form of traducianism that was slightly different from what Rufinus, Jerome, and Augustine attribute to Tertullian in some technical way. *Transfusio* suggests a mechanism for the creation of the soul more along the lines of a mixing of the two parents' souls rather than as an offshoot from the two, as two branches being grafted together, though the distinction is admittedly a very unclear one. But if this choice was significant to the author of the *Indiculus*, it was not significant to any other authors who write about the Luciferians, including Faustinus.

Though probably just a slip of the stylus, the *Indiculus*' claim itself is also self-contradictory. The author, again, says that the Luciferians hold to the catholic truth in all things (*teneant in omnibus catholicam veritatem*), not 'in all other things.' This may suggest that even to the author of the *Indiculus* this quasi-traducian belief was not as obviously heretical as many of the other doctrines that he presents in the heresiology.

---

<sup>84</sup> *Apol. c. Anast. 6.*

<sup>85</sup> *Ep. 126.1.*

<sup>86</sup> *Op. imp. c. Jul. 2.178.*

It is also possible that the author of the *Indiculus* had motives for adding, or at least emphasizing, this accusation against the Luciferians in order to call them heretics. This interpretation is suggested by Augustine's interpretation of the *Indiculus*. Augustine read the *Indiculus* when he composed his own book *De haeresibus* and expresses serious doubts about the veracity of this description. First of all, Augustine makes it a point to state that he could not find the name of the author of this text.<sup>87</sup> Augustine is clearly casting aspersions on the trustworthiness of the text. Secondly, after describing what the *Indiculus* says, Augustine writes: "If, however, [the Luciferians] do truly believe this..."<sup>88</sup> This expression of direct doubt on Augustine's part should make us hesitate before eagerly accepting the *Indiculus*' claim as proof of Luciferian doctrinal developments.

But Augustine does say that these beliefs, if the Luciferians held them, would be doctrinally heterodox, which is interesting given the debate over the question in the fifth century. Traducianism was not inherently at odds with orthodox Christian doctrines of the 4<sup>th</sup> century in the way the author of the *Indiculus* implies it is by including the Luciferians in a list of heresies because of this belief. Jerome, though he is likely exaggerating, says in an early 5<sup>th</sup>-century letter that the 'greatest part of westerners' believes in this explanation for the generation of the soul.<sup>89</sup> One could hardly argue that Jerome was suggesting that most western bishops in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century were heretical,

---

<sup>87</sup> *De haer.* 81 (CCSL 46:336): ...cuius nomen in eodem eius opusculo non inveni...

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*: ...sit amen vere ita sentiunt...

<sup>89</sup> As cited immediately above, *Ep.* 126.1 (CSEL 56:143): ...an certe ex traduce, ut Tertullianus, Apollinaris et maxima pars occidentalium autumat, ut, quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex anima et simili cum brutis animantibus condicione subsistat.

and significantly, Jerome himself never came to a conclusion on the subject of the origin of the soul. So why did Augustine so quickly reject this supposedly Luciferian belief?

Early in his career, Augustine had also rejected creationism, that is, the idea that God creates a soul for each individual, on the basis that this belief would nullify any concept of original sin and the consequent necessity of infant baptism.<sup>90</sup> In one letter, Augustine explicitly argues against creationism with this argument:<sup>91</sup>

Thus since we can neither say nor think about God that he creates sinful souls, nor that he punishes the innocent ones, it is also not right for us to deny that those souls which leave their bodies without the sacrament of Christ, even children's souls, are drawn into nothing other than damnation.

He comes very close to making a traducian or generationist argument in the conclusion of this letter, in which he rhetorically asks Jerome to teach him: "I ask you, how is this opinion defended, in which all souls are believed not to have been made from the one of the first man, but individually for each individual, just like the one was for that one man?"<sup>92</sup> Augustine never comes out and says that he believes that all souls are derived from Adam's soul. But he does posit that origin as a natural explanation in contrast to the creationist view at odds with Augustine's other doctrines concerning sin.

Over time, Augustine's reluctance to accept any theory concerning the origin of the soul because of his other beliefs concerning sin led him to eventually conclude that

---

<sup>90</sup> *Ep.* 166.4.8-8.27.

<sup>91</sup> *Ep.* 166.4.10: *Quoniam igitur neque de Deo possumus dicere quod vel cogat animas fieri peccatrices, vel puniat innocentes; neque negare fas nobis est, eas quae sine Christi sacramento de corporibus exierint, etiam parvulorum, non nisi in damnationem trahi.* This follows a series of similar rhetorical questions which Augustine poses to Jerome.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*: *obsecro te, quomodo haec opinio defenditur, qua creduntur animae non ex illa una primi hominis fieri omnes, sed sicut illa una uni, ita singulis singulae?*

the question was intractable.<sup>93</sup> By the time he responded to Julian of Eclanum's accusations in the 420s, Augustine was uncharacteristically unsure of himself and instead of taking a side writes,<sup>94</sup>

Blame my hesitation about the origin of souls, since I do not dare to teach or to swear to what I do not know; offer from such a deep obscurity of this matter whatever pleases you, so long as this opinion remains fixed and unshaken: that the guilt of that one [Adam] is the death of all, and in him, all perish...

While still holding fast to a belief in original sin as derived from Adam, Augustine no longer insisted on a specific mechanism through which this sin was transmitted. This was not a complete about-face, but certainly represents a greater reticence to provide any specific answer on the question.

We can see in a letter of Leo the Great the culmination of this theological shift in Latin Christianity's explanation of the connection between sin and the origin of the soul. Leo proposes a rather creationist model to reject a supposed Priscillianist belief: "...the catholic faith...confesses that every man, in the substance of his body and soul, is formed and animated within the womb by the creator of the universe, with that sin and contagion of mortality remaining, which passed into the progeny from the first parent."<sup>95</sup> While the model still allows for the passing of sin from parent to child, the creation of the soul is in no way connected to one's parents. This was the status of the theological question in the

---

<sup>93</sup> Beatrice, *The Transmission of Sin*, 75, describes him as "more and more incapable of maintaining any of the theories about the origin of the soul, each of which will appear to him as good or problematic to the extent that it can or cannot reinforce the affirmation and the defense of the doctrine of original sin."

<sup>94</sup> *Op. imp. c. Jul.* 4.104: *Argue de origine animarum cunctationem meam, quia non audeo docere vel affirmare quod nescio; profer tu de huius rei tam profunda obscuritate quod placet; dum tamen fixa et inconcussa sit ista sententia, quia illius unius culpa mors omnium est, et in illo omnes perierunt...*Cf. *Ep.* 190.

<sup>95</sup> *Ep.* 15.9: *Quod catholicae fidei repugnans atque contrarium est, quae omnem hominem in corporis animaeque substantia a conditore universitatis formari atque animari intra materna viscera confitetur; manente quidem illo peccati mortalitatisque contagio, quod in prolem a primo parente transcurrit.*

mid-450s in Rome – a far cry from the traducian models that had (at least, according to Jerome) dominated the west in the fourth century and which Augustine himself had initially defended wholeheartedly.

Although Augustine’s thought became less assured as time went on, his earlier writings remained available for opponents like Julian to use against him. A claim in the *Indiculus* that suggests that traducianism is heretical can easily be read as a veiled attack on some of the foundations of Augustine’s earlier theology of the inheritance of sin, or on others who held similar beliefs.

Interestingly enough, Augustine faced a similar attack in the *Praedestinatus*. The first book of this complex, anonymous work consists of a heresiology.<sup>96</sup> The first 88 heresies listed in the *Praedestinatus* are alterations of entries taken straight from Augustine’s *De haeresibus*, which is exceptionally interesting consider the 90<sup>th</sup> and last listed heresy in the *Praedestinatus* is that of the Predestinationists (*Praedestinati*), a barely-veiled criticism of an Augustinian strawman.<sup>97</sup> Even if the author of the *Indiculus* was not targeting Augustine specifically, he was probably writing in a similar vein. Given that no contemporaries of Faustinus and Marcellinus attribute any heretical beliefs concerning traducianism to them, the *Indiculus*’ author probably saw them as an avenue for addressing contemporary debates at the expense of a community that had passed into oblivion.

---

<sup>96</sup> In general, see David Lambert, “Augustine and the *Praedestinatus*: Heresy, Authority, and Reception,” in Wolfram Branes, Alexander Demandt, Helmut Krasser, Hartmut Leppin, Peter Möllendorff, and Karla Pollmann, eds., *Millenium*, vol. 5 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 147-162.

<sup>97</sup> Lambert, “Augustine and the *Praedestinatus*,” 151. The 89<sup>th</sup> heresy is that of the Nestorians, whose beliefs were condemned along with Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, as a consequence of the Council of Ephesus in 431 after Augustine had finished his heresiology.



All of this does not mean that the members of Faustinus and Marcellinus' community held or did not hold traducian beliefs. After all, they do praise Hilary's writings, and Hilary was apparently a traducian. It could be that some members were and some were not. We simply do not have the information to say. If some or all did, it might suggest the author of the *Indiculus* had rigorist literature unavailable to us or even to others like Gennadius of Marseilles who were familiar with other Luciferian texts. The specificity of the vocabulary choice *transfusio* rather than *tradux* may lend credence to this interpretation, as it suggests that the author was specifically referring to a text that used such terminology rather than the apparently much more broadly-used *tradux*.

But in any event, traducianism was no marker of theological distinction in the 4<sup>th</sup> century context of the Luciferians. If this belief played a role in later Christian attempts to differentiate themselves from one another, it does not appear that it played a similar role for the Luciferians in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century. At the earliest, an author writing sometime between 393 and 428 accuses Faustinus and Marcellinus of being heretical for this belief (if they even held it). Given that the debates over traducianism began in earnest later in the 4<sup>th</sup> century than the disappearance of the Luciferians, it makes more sense to situate the composition of the *Indiculus* towards the end of this timeframe. What the accusation of the *Indiculus* does suggest, though, was that this rigorist community was a malleable subject that could be used by later authors in their own debates. By the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, the community itself was gone, but the name applied to it remained readily available for use in other polemics.

### *General Accusations of Heresy*

Other than the unnamed adversaries who accused Faustinus and Marcellinus of Sabellianism or the *Indiculus*' accusation of this particular form of traducianism, only a few extant authors explicitly accuse the Luciferians of being at doctrinal variance with Nicene orthodoxy. Many of these authors do so without providing any specific information as to *why* they consider the Luciferians heretical at all. Instead, they use 'heretic' as a term of abuse. These authors will be discussed in the following chapter. However, there are two cases that offer at least a little more detail as to why they call the Luciferians 'heretical,' and should be addressed here.

Socrates presents an oblique case in his depiction of Lucifer's anger at the decisions of the Council of Alexandria. It is well known that Socrates relied heavily on the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Rufinus, but one subtle change in Socrates' account has major ramifications for understanding his narrative.<sup>98</sup> Both accounts present Lucifer as becoming angry and nearly launching himself in opposition to the council's decrees because Eusebius of Vercelli looked askance at his ordination of Paulinus as the legitimate Nicene bishop of Antioch in the place of Meletius, who had been ordained by an Arian. But Rufinus carefully distinguishes the Council of Alexandria's decision to readmit the bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds from its decisions at large concerning the truth of the Nicene formula, whereas Socrates leaves the readmission of bishops out

---

<sup>98</sup> The accounts in question are in Ruf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.28-30 and Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 3.9. Sozomen follows Socrates here. That Socrates relied on Rufinus for this section of his account is clear. The order of events is almost identical, excepting that Socrates has added numerous quotations from Athanasius' *Apologia de sua fuga*. For a comparable analysis of how Socrates transforms Rufinus, see Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 23 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 199-204 on their respective treatments of the Council of Nicaea.

entirely. Consequently, Lucifer's anger in the account appears to be directed at the Council's reaffirmation of the Nicene Creed as there is no other decision to which he could object.<sup>99</sup> This transformation certainly implies Lucifer is a heretic and his followers are heretical. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by Socrates' use of the word *haeresis* to describe the community itself.<sup>100</sup>

This may in fact reflect less a judgment on the theological beliefs of Lucifer and his followers and more his casual handling of Rufinus. Generally speaking, Socrates tries to uphold Lucifer's ordination of Paulinus of Antioch against Meletius as valid.<sup>101</sup> This would make little sense if Socrates believed that Lucifer was undoubtedly heretical and opposed the Council of Nicaea. Furthermore, the question of Meletius' ordination was over the orthodoxy and therefore validity of the one who ordained him. Many Nicene Christians saw Meletius, ordained by an Arian, as unfit for the episcopacy no matter what his own beliefs were.<sup>102</sup> Given that Socrates sided with Paulinus and not Meletius, Socrates must have seen Lucifer as orthodox. It is more likely, then, that Socrates inattentively omitted Rufinus' details concerning the Council of Alexandria's decision to readmit clergy who had sworn to Arian creeds while leaving in Lucifer's anger at the

---

<sup>99</sup> What Lim, *Public Disputation*, 200, says of the Council of Nicaea might equally well apply to the Council of Alexandria: "Socrates' story also differs radically from Rufinus' in its treatment of details. His narrative is shorter and accords the debate less symbolic weight..."

<sup>100</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.6: ...καὶ γίνεται πάλιν Λουκιφεριανῶν ἑτέρα αἵρεσις.

<sup>101</sup> See Pauline Allen, "The Use of Heretics and Heresies in the Greek Church Historians: Studies in Socrates and Theodoret," in Graeme Clark, ed., *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (Rushcutters Bay: Australian National University Press, 1990), 265-290, at 279.

<sup>102</sup> For the classic treatment of the division between Meletians and Paulinians in Antioch, see F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche: IVe-Ve siècle* (Paris, 1905). For a more modern approach, see Christine Shephardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

Council's decisions. This was not an intentional attempt to denigrate Lucifer by saying that he had objected to the Nicene formula.

Another author also does more than just call the Luciferians heretical as a term of abuse, though not by much. Theodoret calls the Luciferians a heresy and directly offers an explanation as to why. He writes, "Lucifer, coming to Sardinia, added certain other things to the ecclesiastic teachings. And those accepting these things also received from his name the derived name 'Luciferians.'"<sup>103</sup> Fair enough, but Theodoret nowhere explains what it was that Lucifer added to catholic doctrine. It seems more likely that Theodoret was trying to find someone to blame for the ecclesiastic divisions within Antioch caused by Lucifer's ordination of Paulinus; as Allen argues, Theodoret was keenly embarrassed by the divisions at Antioch.<sup>104</sup> As a westerner, Lucifer was an easy target, and besides, he did in fact cause communal divisions among the Antiochenes. Theodoret's addition to this criticism, that Lucifer himself added things to orthodox doctrine, is more interesting as a demonstration of how 'heretic' was the first choice of slur that one could level against a target even without any concrete proof.

In general, then, it does not seem that the Luciferians held any doctrinal or practical differences when compared to their opponents. They had the same beliefs about the relationship between the persons of the Trinity, their beliefs about the soul were at worst within the spectrum of acceptable views in the fourth century and may have reflected the majority's, and they did not rebaptize those entering their communion. Thus,

---

<sup>103</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3: ὁ δὲ Λουκίφερ εἰς τὴν Σαρδῶ παραγενόμενος ἕτερά τινα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς προστέθεικε δόγμασιν. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα καταδεξάμενοι ἐκ τῆς τούτου προσηγορίας καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐδέξαντο· Λουκιφεριανοὶ.

<sup>104</sup> Allen, "The Use of Heretics and Heresies," 279.

doctrinal and/or practical differences could not have functioned to clearly define their communal boundary. It remains to be seen, however, if the Luciferians were alone in their doctrinal and practical conformity or if this was a general trend among rigorists in the fourth century.

### *Novatian Doctrines and Practices*

A comparative examination of how the Novatians and Donatists developed different doctrines and practices compared to their contemporaries may help indicate not why the Luciferian community emerged after the Council of Alexandria but why it eventually declined. If we turn to the beliefs and practices of the Novatians and the Donatists, we do find that both communities developed differences between themselves and their contemporaries. This is in contrast to the Luciferians.

The lack of later Novatian texts makes it difficult to assess the Novatians on their own merits. Yet we can see that it was quite common for Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries to accept the Novatians as orthodox, and those who say or imply that the Novatians are heretical have little in the way of specifics to offer. At the Council of Nicaea itself, Acesius tells Constantine that he saw nothing innovative in the Nicene Creed and the other canons at Nicaea concerning Easter.<sup>105</sup> The willingness to readmit Novatian clergy into catholic communion as clergy suggests that the authors of the canons at Nicaea considered the Novatians orthodox, though their insistence that Novatians follow ‘the catholic doctrines of the church’ (τοις δόγμασι τῆς καθολικῆς

---

<sup>105</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 1.10.

Ἐκκλησίας) suggests that this orthodoxy was at least somewhat in question.<sup>106</sup> An interesting pair of laws following this council further indicates the doctrinal orthodoxy of the Novatians in the eyes of other Nicene Christians. Constantine, in 326, passed a decree that ordered the closure of heretical churches, which he amended later in the same year to exclude Novatians and grant them permission to reclaim their property.<sup>107</sup> Another of his laws was similarly oriented against all heretics except the Novatians.<sup>108</sup> It is noteworthy that these laws do not explain why any of these groups, including the Novatians, are in fact heretical. Although Constantine explicitly refers to them as ‘Novatians,’ the leniency granted them and them alone indicates their unique place in catholic thought.

This treatment of the Novatians as orthodox continued long beyond the Council of Nicaea. In the fifth canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381, they are lumped in with Arians, Sabellians, and others.<sup>109</sup> But the Novatian and catholic bishops Agellus and Nectarius, along with the Novatian bishop’s deacon, worked together the following year to present the case for the *homoousios* formula to Theodosius, under whom the Novatians flourished.<sup>110</sup> We might also see in the persecutions launched by the Arians against the Novatians under Constantius another demonstration of Novatian doctrinal orthodoxy, as there would be no other reason for the Novatians to be attacked in this way. Likewise, if they were not orthodox there would be no reason for them to share their churches with

---

<sup>106</sup> Canon 8: Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, 1.409-414.

<sup>107</sup> *C.Th.* 16.5.1-2.

<sup>108</sup> Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* (= *Eusebius Werke I*, ed. Ivar A. Heikel, GCS 7.1 [Leipzig, 1902]) 3.64-66; *Soz. Hist. eccl.* 2.32.

<sup>109</sup> Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, 2.366-367.

<sup>110</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 5.10.

catholics being persecuted, not for catholics to use their churches, as they were apparently willing to hold their services in Novatian structures.<sup>111</sup>

Why then do authors like Pacian and Ambrose insist on calling the Novatians heretical, if their doctrinal beliefs seem so sound to their contemporaries? The most important reason has to do with their origins, which in this case created an actual division in ecclesiastic practice. The Novatians explicitly stated that they disagreed with their catholic contemporaries on the disciplinary matter of whether or not penance could be offered to someone who had committed a mortal sin. Socrates, reporting the words of the Novatian bishop Acesius to Constantine at the Council of Nicaea, writes,<sup>112</sup>

It is not our practice that those who have after baptism committed a sin which the Holy Scriptures call ‘to death’ be judged worthy of the communion of the holy sacraments; but they should turn to repentance, and take hope for forgiveness not from the priests, but from God who alone is able and has the authority to forgive sins.

In the mid-third century, this was particularly relevant in regards to the *lapsi* whom Novatian argued had apostatized and could not be readmitted to communion; only God had the power to forgive them.<sup>113</sup> Thus the origins of the Novatians, unlike the rigorists of the 360s, involved a difference in actual practice, not in the application of a generally accepted practice.

---

<sup>111</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 2.38. See Gregory, “Novatianism,” 6-7.

<sup>112</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 1.10.3: ...ὡς ἄρα οὐ χρή τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτηκότας ἁμαρτίαν, ἣν “πρὸς θάνατον” καλοῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν θεῶν μυστηρίων ἀξιοῦσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτρέπειν, ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως μὴ παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα. The scriptural foundation claimed to support such a rigorist view is 1 John 5:16: εἰάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, αἰτήσῃ, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωὴν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον· οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ. On this passage, cf. Ambrose, *De paenitentia* (= *Penitence*, ed. and trans. R. Gryson, SC 179 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971]) 1.10.44-47.

<sup>113</sup> On the initial split between Novatians and the Roman church, as noted in Chapter 1, see A. d’Alès, *Novatien, passim*; Friend, *Martyrdom and Persecution*, 285-315; Gregory, “Novatianism,” 2-3; Vogt, *Coetus sanctorum*, 37-56; Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 58-68.

By the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Novatians seem to have held that all mortal sins, not just apostasy, were unforgiveable except by God.<sup>114</sup> Interestingly, Ambrose claimed that while the Novatians in his time thought there were distinctions between sins (i.e. between mortal and venial sins), Novatian himself did not, and thus the 4<sup>th</sup>-century Novatians (he rhetorically concludes) must condemn Novatian himself.<sup>115</sup> But we need not take Ambrose too seriously here. Novatian, at least, seems to have believed that Christian communities could offer penance for sins other than apostasy, as his main theological argument about penance centers around whether or not Christians who had apostatized can have the Holy Spirit in them, with reference to Matthew 10:33: “Whoever shall deny me before men, I too will deny him before my Father in Heaven.”<sup>116</sup> Man, as the logic goes, cannot dictate whom Christ will or will not deny before the Father, and therefore the sin of apostasy is irreconcilable in this life. Thus for the Novatians of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, there was a clear difference with other Christians who held the same doctrinal beliefs as they did: individuals who had committed these mortal sins could not undergo penance as they could in the broader Nicene communion.

Novatians also differed from their peers in that they apparently rebaptized Christians, including Nicene Christians, who entered their communion. Even in the community’s incipient phase, Novatian seems to have recommended this policy, though it seemingly only applied to those initially baptized by *lapsi* or those who held communion with *lapsi* after the beginning of the persecutions in the 250s, since Novatian

---

<sup>114</sup> In addition to Socrates, see Pac. *Ep.* 3.1, responding to a Novatian treatise that argues this point.

<sup>115</sup> Amb. *De paen.* 1.2.5-1.3.11, especially 1.3.10.

<sup>116</sup> Novatian, *De Trinitate*, ed. William Yorke Fausset (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 29.24; Novatian’s view is also found in Cypr. *Ep.* 30.7. Matt 10:33: ὅστις δ’ ἂν ἀρνήσῃται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς.



himself (Cyprian claims) did not have himself rebaptized.<sup>117</sup> He therefore must have seen himself as having received a valid baptism. These rebaptisms continued into the 4<sup>th</sup> century, judging by Ambrose's continued criticism of the practice.<sup>118</sup>

These Novatian views on penance and baptism are distinct from catholic Christian doctrines. Basil of Caesarea, for instance, states that forgiveness will be granted to heretics, fornicators, those who have committing sexual impurities with animals, murderers, sorcerers, adulterers, and idolaters – but only on their deathbeds.<sup>119</sup> While still quite rigorous, this does represent a significant difference. A Novatian who had committed these sins had no hope of returning to Novatian communion at all, and would thus be excluded from their community. This probably meant that Novatian membership was slightly more limited, something which could have negative effects on their community by limiting their pool of resources, isolating them in the face of persecution, or leaving them victims to claims of universality on the part of their opponents.<sup>120</sup> The criticism that Cyprian and Ambrose leveled against Novatian and the Novatians, respectively, for rebaptizing Christians entering their communion demonstrates that this was not, in their minds, an ecclesiastically-sound practice.

But these differing beliefs and their consequently differing practices could also be seen as strengthening the Novatian communal identity. They provided concrete, tangible distinctions between their community and their contemporaries and gave them means by which they could emphasize their superiority to their catholic Nicene peers. Surely it is

---

<sup>117</sup> Cypr. *Ep.* 72.2.

<sup>118</sup> Amb. *De paen.* 1.7.30.

<sup>119</sup> *Ep.* 188.5, 7.

<sup>120</sup> Pac. *Ep.* 1.5-8 discusses the name 'catholic' compared to the names of heretics, and Pacian's main argument is the number of bishops, priests, martyrs, and confessors in his communion group.

significant that the distinction in beliefs concerning the practice of penance is the one single marker by which Acesius defined his community to Constantine. The treatise of Ambrose *De paenitentia* and Pacian's epistles both presuppose their Novatian opponents are proud of their community's rigorist policies. Consider too this exchange between Leontius, the catholic bishop of Ancyra, and the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, Sisinnius, who has come to ask for the restoration of certain Novatian churches:<sup>121</sup>

*Leontius:* You Novatians shouldn't have churches, since you take away repentance and shut out God's love of mankind.

*Sisinnius:* No one repents like I do.

*Leontius:* Why do you repent?

*Sisinnius:* Because I saw you!

While citing this as an example of Sisinnius' wit, Socrates here reveals too that for the Novatians, not only was their rigor a source of criticism from other Christian communities but a source of pride within their own as well. Sisinnius is not virulently defensive, but comfortably jocular, and his comfort in making jokes based in his own rigor suggests that he happily embraced being defined in such a way. Rebaptizing those entering their communion also surely functioned as another marker of distinction and hence superiority just as Christian baptism in general had for centuries served Christians as a marker of their belonging to a specifically Christian, not pagan or Jewish,

---

<sup>121</sup> From Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 6.22.10-12, with the framing verbs removed: Ὁ δὲ θερμῶς ἀπήντησε καὶ φησι πρὸς αὐτόν· “Ὑμεῖς, φησὶν, οἱ Ναυατιανοὶ οὐκ ὀφείλετε ἐκκλησίας ἔχειν, τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιροῦντες καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκλείοντες.” Ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πλείονα τοῦ Λεοντίου κακῶς τοὺς Ναυατιανούς λέγοντος ἔφη ὁ Σισίννιος· “Καὶ μὴν οὐδεὶς οὕτω μετανοεῖ ὡς ἐγώ.” Τοῦ δὲ πάλιν ἐπάγοντος· “<Καὶ> πῶς μετανοεῖς;” {ἔφη ὁ Σισίννιος} “Ὅτι σε εἶδον” ἀπεκρίνατο.

community.<sup>122</sup> For the Novatians, doctrinal and practical differences with other Nicene Christians were important markers of who they were as a community.

#### *Donatist Doctrines and Practices*

The Donatists too seem to have developed differences with their catholic contemporaries in North Africa in disciplinary matters, though not points of theology. There are a few hints that the Donatists had Arian leanings. The fact that Boniface, when made *comes* of Africa, had to have Augustine explain the differences between the Donatists and Arians might suggest that there was some confusion between the two that reflected an actual similarity.<sup>123</sup> But Augustine was quick to distinguish the two, suggesting that even the inveterate opponent of the Donatists saw no such similarities – and in any event, it was the catholic bishop of Carthage, Restitutus, who presided over the Council of Rimini in 359.<sup>124</sup> Although ancient sources tend to focus on Donatist practices more so than beliefs, it certainly seems that at worst they had Arian sympathies not unlike the rest of their North African contemporaries and these sympathies caused no significant disagreements between any North Africans, Donatists or otherwise, and other Christians in the Roman Empire.

Concerning ecclesiastic practice, Donatists differed from their catholic enemies on the practical question of how individuals should move from one communion group to the other, but the beliefs of both represented differing responses to a need for clergy.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> See e.g. Othmar Heggelbacher, *Die christliche Taufe als Rechtsakt nach dem Zeugnis der frühen Christenheit* (Freiburg: University of Freiburg, 1953), 72-90. Baptism of course had many other meanings, as well as pagan and Jewish precedents.

<sup>123</sup> *Ep.* 185.

<sup>124</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 183.

<sup>125</sup> In general, see Tilley, “Theologies of Penance.”

Passing over the instances that occurred in the formative years of the Donatist schism, that is, 305-313, Augustine tells us that Donatists in the 330s allowed catholic bishops and laity to join their communion without rebaptizing them or taking any action whatsoever.<sup>126</sup> But following Julian's edict of toleration in 362, the Donatists required all new members of their community to undergo penance.<sup>127</sup> Sometime later, perhaps in the 380s, Donatists required the rebaptism of all new admissions, even of clergy, as though they had never been Christians to begin with.<sup>128</sup> This policy seems to have continued into the 390s.<sup>129</sup> As clergy who had been reduced in status could typically never be ordained again, this policy allowed these former catholic clergy to become Donatist clergy, as they had never (in the eyes of the Donatists) been baptized or ordained in the first place.

We might see this gradual change as both a practical measure and a reflection of a gradually increasing sense of rigor. The Donatists early in the 4<sup>th</sup> century acknowledged that catholics were not so different from themselves, and therefore did not need to be treated with such harshness. Over time, the Donatists became more and more rigorist and eventually required rebaptism. Yet Augustine's testimony in the late 390s suggests that the policy was very new, despite Optatus' indication that it had been a policy in the 380s. It is more than likely, as Tilley suggests, that there was no single coherent policy that the Donatists observed.<sup>130</sup> But whether the practice of rebaptism began in the 380s or 390s,

---

<sup>126</sup> *Ep.* 93.10.43. Donatus himself apparently opposed this policy, and had in fact rebaptized in the 310s, but was willing to compromise with his own community in the 330s. See also Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 167-168.

<sup>127</sup> *Opt. C. Parm.* 2.24-26.

<sup>128</sup> *Opt. C. Parm.* 3.11.

<sup>129</sup> *Aug. Ep.* 23.2-4, 44.5.10.

<sup>130</sup> Tilley, "Theologies of Penance," 335.

or both but in different parts of North Africa, it clearly represents a turn further towards rigorism compared to Donatist policies in the early and middle of the century.

In any case, other Christians in North Africa developed a different solution. In Rome, most Donatist clergy were reduced to lay status and readmitted to communion without rebaptism; they were then free to seek clerical office within catholic communion.<sup>131</sup> The only exceptions were Donatist clergy who had rebaptized catholics coming into Donatist communion. These had to undergo penance and therefore could not seek clerical office (as this would require a troubling second laying-on of hands after the first laying-on of hands required for penance).<sup>132</sup> This appears to have held true in North Africa as well until the 390s. But a council at Hippo in 393 recommended a novel policy in which Donatist clergy would be readmitted to catholic communion as clergy.<sup>133</sup> A second council at Carthage in 397 supported adopting this policy, despite stated opposition from Anastasius of Rome and Venerius of Milan.<sup>134</sup> Despite this opposition, North African bishops proceeded in another conference at Carthage in 401 to at least allow Donatists who had been baptized as infants to become clergy within catholic communion.<sup>135</sup> Another full council in the same year decided that as a general rule, Donatist clergy should be readmitted as laymen, but local bishops could allow Donatists to enter catholic communion as clergy on a case-by-case basis.<sup>136</sup> It is perhaps unsurprising that, after several attempts to make the admission of Donatist clergy as

---

<sup>131</sup> Sir. *Ep.* 1.14, 5.

<sup>132</sup> Tilley, "Theologies of Penance," 335.

<sup>133</sup> *Decretum Hipponensis Concili* (= PL 11:1185); Aug. *C. ep. Parm* 2.13.28.

<sup>134</sup> Canon 48 (PL 11:1192); Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 251.

<sup>135</sup> The letter announcing the decisions of this council survives in PL 11:1195-97.

<sup>136</sup> The letter announcing this council's decisions can likewise be found in PL 11:1197-99.

catholic clergy a general policy, these case-by-case instances quickly multiplied and the admission of clergy as clergy become the de facto general policy.<sup>137</sup> Thus the catholics of North Africa moved from a fairly lenient policy, requiring no penance except in cases of clergy who had rebaptized, to a very lenient one, allowing clergy to maintain their status.

It is worth noting that both Donatists and catholics changed their disciplinary policies with regards to one another over time. The policies were not set in stone, but were malleable enough to reflect the gradually changing circumstances of each community. While both policies were designed in a way to make the transferal of clergy easier, the Donatists seem to have become more rigorous as time wore on, whereas the catholics seem to have become less so. These different solutions to the same problem, a lack of clergy, clearly reflect two different mindsets, or to return to Tilley's vocabulary, the valorization of two different ends becoming two different valorizations that developed out of the origins of the Donatist and catholic communities in North Africa. This seems to be clear evidence of contrasting disciplinary developments of a type that we do not see occur with the Luciferians.

In the case of the Donatists, then, we can see very clear developments in ecclesiastic practices that stood in contrast to the practices of their contemporaries. While we might hesitate to say that they remained orthodox, their possibly Arian leanings do not seem to have been stressed by their opponents. They were even defended from charges of Arianism by Augustine. The bigger problem, as far as catholic authors were concerned, was their differing practices concerning rebaptism. Like the Novatians,

---

<sup>137</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 252. He cites Aug. *C. litt. Pet.* 3.32.37 as an example of a particularly unsavory Donatist cleric being admitted into catholic clergy.

however, this surely strengthened their own sense of identity. That they treated new members as though they had never been baptized removed some of the major practical consequences of shifting allegiances, particularly the ability to join the Donatist clergy. Yet it also must have created a new bond between members of the Donatist community just as baptism did between members of the Christian community in general.

### *Conclusions*

It is easy, in investigating historical processes, to ignore the fact that for late antique Christians, beliefs mattered. They provided these Christians with a way of understanding the structure of society and of the world as a whole. The Luciferians might have developed a unique doctrinal or practical basis for their community in the wake of the Council of Alexandria. Mas asks, “Can one speak, therefore, of a particularly Luciferian theology?” His response is, “Not properly.”<sup>138</sup> Luciferians appear to be entirely in line with the beliefs of their Nicene catholic contemporaries.

For the community of Faustinus and Marcellinus, then, this does seem to be a very significant difference between the structuring of their communal identity and that of the Novatians and the Donatists. For the Novatians and Donatists, initial disputes over matters of ecclesiastic discipline mutated almost instantaneously into disputes over actual matters of ecclesiastic practice. For Faustinus and Marcellinus’ community, the initial disagreement over the decisions of the Council of Alexandria does not seem to have undergone this same process.

---

<sup>138</sup> *La crisis luciferiana*, 356: “Se puede hablar, por tanto, de una teología luciferiana como tal? Propiamente no.”

Is this difference meaningful in assessing the strengths of these communities? It must be. We should not, of course, take personal convictions as the sole reason a given person belonged to one or another religious community.<sup>139</sup> Simply arguing that an individual believed in the cause of the Luciferians, for example, because he or she believed in it does not tell us where this belief came from. A whole range of other factors existed that contributed to a late antique individual's religious identity – class, upbringing, ethnicity, and so on ad nauseam. But we should likewise not exclude belief entirely. Whatever other factors played into an individual's religious identity, they were themselves perceived and influenced by the individual's beliefs. While we may continue to ask *why* a given individual believed in what he believed, the belief itself also formed a principal motivation for his or her actions and colored every interaction he or she had with the world. In sum, if there was a hard and fast distinction between two Christian communities over a point of doctrine or practice, this provided a fundamental distinction by which they differentiated themselves from each other. Lacking doctrinal or practical uniqueness meant that the Luciferians lacked this central distinguishing characteristic. Gregory writes, “Apparently what held this heterogeneous sect [the Novatians] together

---

<sup>139</sup> See, e.g., Michele Renee Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), xi, on why belief is a necessary but insufficient element in determining one's reasons for religious adherence: “In any case, explanations grounded in Christian ideas suffer by presupposing that people act primarily on the basis of belief. Beliefs matter, but to have broader historical impact they need to interact with wider social and political forces and institutions. A strictly theological or idea-based approach cannot answer why some groups of aristocrats found Christianity intellectually and emotionally compelling while others did not, nor why some groups were more likely to convert earlier than others.”



and prevented its absorption into orthodoxy was a common set of religious principles.”<sup>140</sup>

What are we to make of the Luciferians, then, who did not have such a distinct set?

And yet this is not wholly satisfactory in explaining what made their communal identity uniquely weak. As we will see, although there appears to be no doctrinal reason for a split between the Luciferians and their contemporaries, both insisted on treating each other as doctrinally deviant. The perception of differing beliefs may sometimes have been present even where actual differences of belief do not seem evident. We will first consider these perceptions before turning to other factors that may have played a part in the formation and endurance of these communities.

---

<sup>140</sup> Gregory, “Novatianism,” 8.

## Chapter 4: Naming and Belief

The repeated assertions we find among late antique Christian authors that a given community was heretical, or assertions that a community existed separately from the Christian world at large, could in fact make the community a ‘heresy’ in the eyes of their contemporaries regardless of the beliefs of the community itself. This imposition of names took many forms. I will begin with the names by which other Christians described the Luciferians, the Novatians, and the Donatists. I will then turn to the ways these Luciferians, the Novatians, and the Donatists named others. This firstly took the form of a debate over the terms *catholici* and *christiani* in contrast to terms derived from individuals, in the way that *Luciferiani* derives from Lucifer. Finally, I will examine how all three of these rigorist communities defined themselves in biblical and ecclesiological terms. In sum, we can see that the Luciferians were much less successful than the Novatians and especially the Donatists at refuting their enemies’ descriptions of themselves, at defining their opponents as ‘heretical,’ and at providing a positively-asserted understanding of how their community fit into the social world of the late antique Roman Empire..

The power that names can have over their referents should not be understated. To take just one example of this power in practice, in Late Antiquity, legal *infamia* – a limitation on various legal rights imposed on various ‘immoral’ persons, such as criminal convicts, actors, and gladiators – was routinely applied to heretics.<sup>1</sup> This legal appellation had an intentionally moralizing tone, and authors frequently blurred the line between

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *CTh* 16.1.2.1, and esp. Bond, “Altering Infamy,” 2014: 2 and n4, 10-16.

legal *infamia* and a rhetorical assault on an enemy's moral character.<sup>2</sup> To call someone a heretic was to call someone *infames*, morally deficient. As noted, it also had significant legal consequences; individuals widely used (and abused) the term 'heretic' in court cases to, e.g., seize property from someone else.<sup>3</sup>

In this vein, Christian authors repeatedly leveled accusations of heresy against other Christians in order to attach the immorality of incorrect belief to other Christians. Moreover, Christians believed that those who were heretics were also, as a natural result of their heresy, immoral in any number of other ways; they were supposedly ignorant, lovers of faction, sexual deviants, etc.<sup>4</sup> But these were always subsidiary to the fact that communities were described as 'heretical,' as incorrect in respect to doctrine and practice. These Christians were not necessarily differentiated by any actual theological differentiation, but nonetheless were described first and foremost as though they were. The Luciferians, as far as we can tell, lacked doctrines or practices that differed considerably from other contemporary Nicene Christians.<sup>5</sup> Despite that apparent lack of differentiation, other Nicene Christian authors often still treated the Luciferians as though they were 'heretics' and as though they did have differing doctrines and practices.

Likewise, the ways Faustinus and Marcellinus themselves defined their opponents also suggests that they perceived their differences as concerning doctrines and practices

---

<sup>2</sup> Sarah E. Bond, "Altering Infamy: Status, Violence, and Civic Exclusion in Late Antiquity," *CA* 33, no. 1 (2014): 1-130, at 5.

<sup>3</sup> Caroline Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 255-259.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Y.-M. Duval, "Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'*Adversus Iovinianum* à Rome en 393? ou: du 'portrait-robot' de l'hérétique chez s. Jérôme," *RHE* 75 (1980): 525-557, and Jennifer Wright Knust, *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006). Jerome, in *Adv. Jov.* 2.36, even argued that Christians were pale and poorly dressed whereas heretics were beautiful.

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter 3.

even where this distinction is not readily apparent to the modern scholar. Even a lack of apparent differences in doctrine or practice did not preclude one community from describing another as though they in fact did have these differences.

In contrast to how they were described by, and in turn described, others, Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists all argued that they were *Christiani*, rather than *Luciferiani*, *Novatiani*, or *Donatistae*. All three also provided identities for themselves rooted in biblical metaphors. The Donatists in particular had a very well developed image of their own community as the *collecta* of Israel, and how it differed from the other communities of Christians in North Africa. It is worth examining how the Donatists in particular developed this comprehensive system for understanding their place in the world vis-à-vis the *traditores* of other Christian communities, that is, those who had supposedly handed over scriptures to pagan persecutors and those they ordained. A similar development is not apparent among the Luciferians vis-à-vis the *praevaricatores*, that is, those who had sworn to Arian creeds in the 350s and found their Nicene brethren lenient towards them at the Council of Alexandria in 362.

The fact that doctrine and practice remained the lenses through which these communities viewed one another and themselves indicates that each saw itself as a primarily religious community, not as what we might think of as a community based in nationality, ethnicity, class, or some other defining feature. While these elements might have played a role as well, they remained subsidiary elements in the minds of the actors themselves.

*Naming Names: The Founders of Heresies as Their Namesakes*

Let us begin our examination with the grievances Faustinus and Marcellinus have in the *Libellus precum* against the term ‘Luciferian’ itself:<sup>6</sup>

This is also necessary: we must dispel the malice of the false moniker with which they remark that we are ‘Luciferians.’ Who does not know that the moniker ascribed to sectarians is that of a man, some of whose new doctrines were transmitted to his students on the authority of their teacher?

All of our available sources demonstrate that the two presbyters were correct: the name ‘Luciferian’ derived from that mid-fourth century firebrand, Lucifer of Cagliari.<sup>7</sup> The name *Luciferianus* was of course intentionally malicious. Christians in Late Antiquity claimed that their beliefs had their direct antecedents in Christ and the apostles; innovation was uniformly reviled.<sup>8</sup> As just one of many authors who make similar arguments, Vincentius writes, “And speak truly, what heresy ever bubbled up except under a specific name, at a specific place, in a specific time?”<sup>9</sup> The name ‘Luciferian’ itself implies that the beliefs of the Luciferians were deficient because their community arose under a specific person and therefore at a specific time. By the mid-370s it seems that this name, and by extension, this implication, were attached to the community of rigorists that emerged after the Council of Alexandria (and confusingly in later authors, as noted in Chapter 1, to the most rigorist Nicene faction in Antioch).

---

<sup>6</sup> *Lib. prec.* 86: *Nam et hoc ipsum necessarium est ut falsi cognomenti discutiamus inuidiam qua nos iactant esse “Luciferianos.” Quis nesciat illius cognomentum tribui sectatoribus cuius et noua aliqua doctrina transmissa est ad discipulos ex auctoritate magisterii?*

<sup>7</sup> E.g. *Jer. Dial. c. Luc.* 1; *Ruf. Hist. eccl.* 1.28-30; *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 3.9; Cassiodorus, *Historia ecclesiastica* (= *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita*, ed. Waltar Jacob, CSEL 71 [Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1952]) 6.23.

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts*, 239-240.

<sup>9</sup> *Comm.* 24.62: *Et reuera, quae unquam haeresis nisi sub certo nomine, certo loco, certo tempore ebullivit?* See also, e.g., Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 13.

A related method by which catholic Nicene authors could subtly suggest that Luciferians were heretical, without outright claiming as much, was to include them in anti-heretical works or statements even while expressing doubt about whether or not they were heretical. Ambrose, as noted above, claims that the Luciferians do not hold faith *erga Dei ecclesiam*, which he identifies as the *Christi corpus*, thus suggesting – though not quite outright saying – that the Luciferians do not hold faith in Christ.<sup>10</sup> Jerome names the Nicene adversary of the Luciferians in his dialogue not *Catholicus* but *Orthodoxus*. He thus suggests that there was something *heterodoxus* about the Luciferian in the work (innocuously named Helladius). Augustine, by the very act of including the Luciferians in a work *De haeresibus*, suggests that the Luciferians are heretical even if he states uncertainty on the question within the text itself. Likewise, the author of the obscure *Adversus haereseos* of Pseudo-Hegemonius includes them in his work and compares them to the Donatists without expressly naming them ‘heretical’ or describing why they belonged in the work.<sup>11</sup> Just as the term *Luciferianus* contains an implicit claim that these individuals were heretics, the inclusion of these individuals in works *De haeresibus* implies the same.

The Luciferians found themselves labeled no differently than heretics, despite their lack of doctrinal differences with other Nicene Christians, their knowledge of what

---

<sup>10</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.47: *non putavit esse fidem in schismate. nam etsi fidem erga Deum tenerent, tamen erga Dei ecclesiam non tenere, cuius patiebantur velut quosdam artus dividi et membra lacerari. etenim cum propter ecclesiam Christus passus sit et Christi corpus ecclesia sit, non videtur ab his exhiberi Christo fides, a quibus evacuatur eius passio corpusque distrahitur.*

<sup>11</sup> The small amount of Ps.-Hegemonius still extant is found in *Eusebius Vercellensis, Filastrius Brixianus, Hegemonius (Ps.), Isaac Iudaeus, Archidiaconus Romanus, Fortunatianus Aquileiensis, Chromatius Aquileiensis Opera quae supersunt.; Diversorum hereseon liber.; Adversus haereses.; Opera quae supersunt.; De reconciliandis paenitentibus.; Commentarii in evangelia.; Opera quae supersunt*, V. Bulhart, F. Heylen, A. Hoste, A. Wilmart, B. Bischoff, eds., CCSL 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1957).

mechanisms were at work, and their attempts to repudiate this labeling. Moreover, the name ‘Luciferian’ was also probably quite potent in limiting their appeal as a community to other Nicene Christians. After all, it appears that the Luciferians did not significantly differ doctrinally from their orthodox peers, yet they found themselves labeled by others as though they had. It is likely the average person, when confronted with someone known as a *Luciferianus*, would not investigate the matter too closely. Even if he had, and found that doctrinally they were for all intents and purposes orthodox, there would be little attraction in being a *Luciferianus* without any significant theological differences. The appeal of a community free of the *praevaricatores* had limited appeal anyways, if we consider Jerome’s description of how massive popular pressure caused the retention, not expulsion, of the bishops at the Council of Alexandria, and this appeal would doubtless decline over time as a community filled with these bishops became the normative.<sup>12</sup> The very vehemence of Faustinus and Marcellinus against the name ‘Luciferian’ supports the notion that this was a particularly pernicious problem, not just a hypothetical one.

The Novatians faced a similar pattern. Pacian makes the argument most clearly: “Do you deny that Novatians are called from Novatian? Impose on them whatever name you want...You will respond ‘Christian,’ but when I enquire about the originator of the sect, you will not contest that it is Novatian.”<sup>13</sup> As Lucifer was the supposed founder of the Luciferian community, so too does Pacian treat Novatian as the founder of the Novatian community. As far as we can tell, Novatians objected to the name ‘Novatian’

---

<sup>12</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 19.

<sup>13</sup> *Pac. Ep. 2.3: Negatisne Novatianos a Novatiano vocari? Quodlibet nomen imponas...respondebis Christianum. Inquirente me genus sectae? Novatianum non inficiaberis.*

just as vigorously as Faustinus and Marcellinus objected to the name ‘Luciferian.’ It of course seems likely that the Novatians would, in fact, contest that Novatian had originated any sect, and would instead attribute the founding of a sect to Cornelius, Stephen, and the followers of Cyprian. Pacian also provides an example of a Novatian chafing at the name; he claims that there was no real shame in being labeled a ‘Novatian,’ and offers this description of his unnamed Novatian opponent’s reaction: “At this you are deeply moved, and you sit up as though pricked by a sting, and then you cry out in anger.”<sup>14</sup> Clearly the Novatian in question objected to the name. But this rejection of the term ‘Novatian’ likewise seems to have had no real effect. As with the Luciferians and Lucifer, numerous authors associate the origin of the name with the man.<sup>15</sup> Even Socrates, generally favorable to the Novatians, uses the name unflinchingly. Pacian also adds in that the name ‘Novatian’ should not be considered shameful, but given the Christian tradition of naming heresies after their supposed arch-heretics and his insistence on calling his opponents ‘Novatians’ rather than ‘Christians’ as he supposes they will request, we cannot take him too seriously.<sup>16</sup> Just like the Luciferians, the Novatians apparently understood what mechanisms were at work, but their pleas to not be called Novatians fell on deaf ears.

---

<sup>14</sup> Pac. *Ep.* 2.3: *Illic tu graviter commoveris, et quasi aculeo fixus erigeris; nam sic iratus exclamas...*

<sup>15</sup> Cypr. *Ep.* 72.2; Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 6.43; Epiphanius. *Pan.* 59; Amb. *De paen.* 1.3.10; Philastrius, *Diversarum hereseon liber* 82, which is in Eusebius *Vercellensis, Filastrius Brixienensis, Hegemonius (Ps.), Isaac Iudaeus, Archidiaconus Romanus, Fortunatianus Aquileiensis, Chromatius Aquileiensis Opera quae supersunt.; Diversorum hereseon liber.; Adversus haereses.; Opera quae supersunt.; De reconciliandis paenitentibus.; Commentarii in evangelia.; Opera quae supersunt*, V. Bulhart, F. Heylen, A. Hoste, A. Wilmart, B. Bischoff, eds., CCSL 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1957), 327-329; Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28; ps.-Augustine, *Contra Novatianum* (= PL 35.2303-2313); for this tract, see Adolf Harnack, “Der pseudoaugustinische Traktat *Contra Novatianum*,” in *Abhandlungen Alexander von Oettingen zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag* (Munich,: C.H. Beck’sche, 1898).

<sup>16</sup> Pac. *Ep.* 3.2.



In the case of the Novatians, however, there are exceptions. The eighth canon of the Council of Nicaea, for example, refers to Novatians as “those calling themselves the ‘pure’ (*katharoi*).”<sup>17</sup> Basil of Caesarea simply calls them *katharoi* even though the letter in which he uses this term is not addressed to a Novatian.<sup>18</sup> The term *katharoi* will be discussed below, but is in neither of these cases used pejoratively. The mere fact that these authors use this term, rather than simply calling them Novatians, indicates some willingness to compromise. While individuals like Pacian might insist on the term ‘Novatian,’ it was possible for orthodox Christians to see the Novatians in a more positive light. It is possible that this was changing over time, however, as the seventh canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381 does refer to them as both Novatians and ‘those who call themselves *kathari*.’<sup>19</sup> But still, this is remarkably more charitable towards them than any authors were towards the Luciferians, which suggests that the Novatians were not as summarily dismissed as the Luciferians were.

The term ‘Novatians’ carried with it another complication: it was, in a sense, incorrect. As the man’s name was Novatianus, the name of a Novatian in Latin should have been *Novatianista*, or ‘Novatianist’ (in the same way that *Donatista* was derived from Donatus). But by the fourth century, many authors were unclear as to who their founder even was. For every author that names Novatian as the founder of the movement,

---

<sup>17</sup> Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, 1.409: Περὶ τῶν ὀνομαζόντων μὲν ἑαυτοὺς *Καθαροὺς*; The Novatian terms for themselves will be discussed below.

<sup>18</sup> *Ep.* 188.1.

<sup>19</sup> Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, 2.366-367. Note too that they are not listed among the anathematized heresies of the first canon but are listed alongside the Arians, Macedonians, etc. in the seventh.

there is another that names Novatus.<sup>20</sup> The name ‘Novatus’ might refer to Novatus, a Carthaginian priest who sided with Novatian and participated in his ordination. But it was much more likely just a retrojected corruption of Novatian’s name from *Novatianus* to Novatus, as *Arianus* came from Arius.<sup>21</sup> It is significant, though, that even Socrates in the fifth century mislabels the Novatians as originating with Novatus, and he is (as noted in the Introduction) remarkably well-informed about and sympathetic to the Novatians.<sup>22</sup> If even an author like Socrates was this poorly-informed, it suggests that this name had taken on a life of its own that no amount of Novatian opposition (as reflected in Pacian’s first epistle) would be able to counteract. The term ‘Novatians’ had superseded the man Novatian in the minds of Christians in Late Antiquity. Thus by the fourth century, the label ‘Novatian’ and the concomitant implication of heresy had superseded the historical circumstances surrounding the man Novatian himself.

As *Luciferiani* and *Novatiani* received their names by association with Lucifer and Novatian, the Donatists in antiquity received their name from Donatus, the rigorist bishop of Carthage from 313-355.<sup>23</sup> Augustine not only states this but provides another description of how this type of naming might be used to describe schismatics as heretics:

---

<sup>20</sup> The list of those who mistake the founder of the Novatians as Novatus is quite long, but see, e.g., Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 6.43; Epiph. *Pan.* 59; Phil. *De haer.* 82; etc. The confusion occasionally creeps into modern scholarship, e.g. D. Brendan Nagle, *The Roman World: Sources and Interpretation* (Upper Saddle River: Pearson, 2004), 265; Bill Leadbetter, “Constantine and the Bishop: The Roman Church in the Early Fourth Century,” *JRH* 26, no. 1 (2002): 1-14, at 4-5 (with both names); Kristina Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy: Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 209.

<sup>21</sup> Technically, the term should have been *Novatianisti* (‘Novatianists’ is not unheard-of in modern scholarship) or the even more cumbersome *Novatianiani*. For Novatus, see Cypr. *Ep.* 48. According to Cyprian he had been a laxist in Carthage but upon reaching Rome became a rigorist from his love of sedition, but given the number of crimes Cyprian attributes to him, we need not put much faith in this description.

<sup>22</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 344.

“There were other mountains. Anyone, when he led a ship by them, caused a shipwreck. For leaders of heresies emerged, and were the mountains: Arius was a mountain, Donatus was a mountain, Maximian in some way became like a mountain.”<sup>24</sup> Simply by putting Donatus alongside Arius, Augustine equates the heretical nature of Arians with the supposedly heretical nature of Donatists without actually addressing any doctrinal or practical matters.

The Donatists, interestingly, even received this treatment from former members of their communion who also eschewed the catholic faction. The followers of Rogatus, who separated from the Donatists due to the violence of the circumcellions, apparently called the remainder of the Donatist party *Firmiani*, perhaps because the usurper Firmus had persecuted them in the 370s on behalf of the rest of the Donatist party.<sup>25</sup> Again, this was not inherently a doctrinal or practical distinction (in the religious sense of practice), but the label *Firmiani*, while emerging from historical circumstances, reflects a label generally associated with doctrinal deviance.

In sum, these names – *Luciferiani*, *Novatiani*, *Donatistae* – all allowed catholic authors a shorthand way of identifying members of different communion groups that also suggested they were heretical regardless of what the specific doctrines or practices in question were. This would be particularly problematic for the Luciferians, because while

---

<sup>24</sup> *En. in Ps.* 35.9 (CCL 38:328): *Erant montes alii, per quos unusquisque cum duceret navim, naufragium faceret. Emerserunt enim principes haeresum, et montes erant. Arius mons erat, Donatus mons erat, Maximianus modo quasi mons factus est.* Cf. *En. in Ps.* 125.5: *Venturi enim sunt homines, et dicturi tibi: Magnus ille vir, et magnus ille homo. Qualis fuit ille Donatus! Qualis est Maximianus! Et nescio quis Photinus, qualis fuit! et ille Arius, qualis fuit! Omnes istos montes nominavi, sed naufragosos.*

<sup>25</sup> *Aug. C. ep. Parm.* 1.10.16, 11.17, *C. litt. Pet.* 2.84.184, *Ep.* 87.10. See J.W. Drijvers, “Ammianus on the Revolt of Firmus,” in J.W. Drivers, D. den Hengst, H.C. Teitler, and J. den Boeft, eds., *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff/Brill, 2007), 129-155, at 137-38, and Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 55-56.

all three groups could point to historical circumstances that justified their community in opposition to the catholic community, the Luciferians alone had no other distinguishing traits. Thus by being labeled a separate, and inherently inferior, community, they had little to fall back on to distinguish themselves from their more numerous opponents. What is most interesting, however, is that the method that all Christians used to identify their opponents has a pedigree in doctrinal deviance, even if there is no doctrinal deviance apparent. These markers indicate that in the late antique Christian worldview, different communities intrinsically reflected different beliefs.

*Rigorist Descriptions of Other Christians: Traitors, Pagans, and Jews*

It is all well and good to consider how outsiders labeled these communities, but we turn now to how individuals within these communities labeled other Christians. All three communities were less prone to imposing labels derived from personal names on their enemies, even when they had obvious candidates available. Instead, the preferred terms seem to denigrate their opponents not by their association with individuals but by their actions in times of trial. Nevertheless, the same pattern will hold: these communities describe other Christians in the language of heresy just as other Christians described them in the language of heresy.

Faustinus and Marcellinus seemingly lacked a mechanism by which they might quickly define who their adversaries were. First of all, Faustinus and Marcellinus never seem to consider that turnabout might be fair play. Nowhere do they call their enemies by a name along the model of *Luciferiani*, such as *Athanasiani* or *Hilariani*, which could be for several reasons. First of all, the actual authors of the decisions of the Council of

Alexandria, particularly Athanasius, were essentially heroes to the Luciferians.<sup>26</sup> Were Faustinus and Marcellinus to call these *praevaricatores* by some name like the *Athanasiani*, they would not only have made themselves deeply unpopular with any other Nicene community but also would have cast aspersions on someone they too considered a hero of the anti-Arian movement.

Moreover, consider again what they say about the meanings behind these names: the name comes from the teacher of ‘some new doctrines’ (*nova aliqua doctrina*). Establishing a term like *Athanasiani*, *Hilariani*, *Eusebiani*, or anything related would suggest that the authors of the Council of Alexandria’s decisions had added something to Nicene orthodoxy. But it may have been easier for the larger community to label these individuals as *Luciferiani*, with the concomitant suggestion of doctrinal development, than for the Luciferians to suggest that these *Athanasiani* had added new doctrines, particularly because (a) most Christians saw Athanasius, Hilary, and others as unequivocally Nicene in their beliefs and (b) the Council of Alexandria did reaffirm the Nicene Creed. Lucifer had a bad reputation in the East; Athanasius did not have a bad reputation in the West.

The Luciferians instead refer to their enemies as *Ariani* or *praevaricatores*. *Arianus* was, of course, a pre-existing term.<sup>27</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus generally used this term to represent those whom most catholic Nicene Christians agreed were Arians – men like Ursacius and Valens of Mursa, the architects of the Councils of Rimini and

---

<sup>26</sup> See *Lib. prec.* 88 and L. Saltet, “Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens,” *BLE* 27 (1906): 300-306.

<sup>27</sup> See Canellis, “Arius et les ‘Ariens.’”

Seleucia-in-Isauria.<sup>28</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also use the term in reference to Theodore of Oxyrhynchus, but really only to describe the creed to which he swore – they do not technically describe him as an Arian.<sup>29</sup> As a term used against men like Ursacius and Valens of Mursa, ‘Arian’ would have hardly distinguished the two from any other Nicene Christians, all of whom appear to have loathed these proponents of Arian creeds. It cannot have been an effective tool for creating a distinctive communal identity.

The preferred term that Faustinus and Marcellinus use for their enemies is *praevaricator*. This was applied to what we would call ‘Arians,’ those who had sworn to Arianizing creeds, and those who held communion with either of the above groups – practically anyone who had been anything less than steadfastly Nicene throughout the 350s and beyond.<sup>30</sup> The word is tied to the events that led to the break with catholic Nicene Christians, in that Faustinus and Marcellinus argue that the bishops who had sworn to Arian creeds and then later been readmitted to Nicene communion as clergy had committed an act of *praevaricatio*, treachery or deceit. Hilary also used the term in his *De synodis*, written before the Council of Alexandria, to mean much the same.<sup>31</sup>

For Faustinus and Marcellinus, this seems to represent the single most important way of distinguishing themselves from their fellow Nicene Christians. They were the ones who did not allow *praevaricatores* back into Nicene communion and their enemies are the ones who did. Faustinus and Marcellinus make this distinction throughout the *Libellus precum*; it is their main argument for why they represent the catholic orthodox

---

<sup>28</sup> E.g. at *Lib. prec.* 5, 12, 13, 18, 21, 48.

<sup>29</sup> *Lib. prec.* 101.

<sup>30</sup> *Lib. prec.* 24, 30, 31, et passim.

<sup>31</sup> The full title of Hilary’s *De synodis*, e.g., is *De synodis fidei catholicae contra Arianos et praevaricatores Arianis acquiescentes*. The word *praevarictor* is used at 8.46, 26.77, 26.79.

party and not their persecutors. It is also worth noting, as both an example and as further evidence of the term's importance, that at the very end of his treatise *De Trinitate*, Faustinus adds in a coda right before ending the work:<sup>32</sup>

But, if he is faithful, he will not find an error in this pious confession, which indeed, as it was presented to us by the grace of God, we desire to defend to the death, with the help of him who presented it and without the disgrace of communion with heretics and traitors, because with God as our witness we are afraid to be found the partners of their damnation. If someone thinks that he cannot be made a guilty party from association with heretics and traitors, let him see, trusting in his own conscience, that he defends the intact faith so that he himself never will have stood as a traitor to the faith. But I am compelled to fear more cautiously in the cause of God.

The argument is clear: those who hold communion with *praevaricatores* are possible partners in their damnation and therefore Faustinus will have nothing to do with them either. There follows a set of scriptural references cited in support of this position. Then Faustinus reiterates the general theme before offering a pleasing farewell: "But I made these things known, albeit briefly, for this reason, lest someone believe that we do not hold communion with such men from vain superstition, men whom he sees are condemned by divine sentence."<sup>33</sup> The fact that these outbursts occur in the closing lines of the theological tract demonstrate their significance for Faustinus. Moreover, Faustinus wrote the work *De Trinitate* to combat Arian understandings of the Trinity; the reference

---

<sup>32</sup> *De Trin.* 51: ...non tamen, si fidelis est, piae confessionis errorem, quam quidem in nobis ex Dei gratia praestitam cupimus usque ad mortem, auxilio eius qui praestitit, vindicare sine labe communionis haereticorum atque praevaricatorum, quia et Deo teste metuimus eorum damnationis participes inveniri. Viderit si quis putat se de eorum societate reum non posse fieri, habens conscientiae propriae fiduciam, quia fidem integram vindicat ita, ut numquam ipse eius fidei praevaricator exstiterit; tamen ego in causa Dei cautius timere compellor.

<sup>33</sup> *De Trin.* 51: Sed ego haec ipsa, licet breviter, intimavi, ne nos de vana superstitione credat aliquis nolle communicare cum talibus, quos perspicit per divinam sententiam reprobati. But then Faustinus shifts gears: *Divinitas te incolumem ac beatam in fidei sui nominis etiam in regno coelorum praestet cum tuis omnibus affectibus inveniri.*

to those who swore to Arian creeds in these closing statements reinforces the very real need (in his eyes) for this tract.<sup>34</sup>

Certain elements of this outburst try to mollify its tenor, as when Faustinus presents it as a justification for his own reticence in the face of criticism rather than solely a critique of those who hold communion with *praevaricatores*. He also accepts that it is possible for those who hold communion with *praevaricatores* to be saved, or at least accepts that others might trust in their consciences more than he does. But these ameliorations cannot completely mitigate the tone set by Faustinus' lengthy scriptural citations, the description of this communion as a 'disgrace,' and the phrase 'partners of their damnation.' Throughout the treatise Faustinus has been launching barbs at Arians, which we would expect in a treatise on the relationship between the Father and the Son. But for him to so forcefully turn his attentions to the *praevaricatores* when such attention has been previously uncalled-for, and to say such things to someone who undoubtedly held communion with such clergy, demonstrates just how important an issue this was for Faustinus.

*Praevaricator* was a strong word, to be sure, but not one that had the same heritage as naming one's enemies for their founders. As a tool for creating a strong communal identity, it is difficult to say how effective it was. Faustinus and Marcellinus perhaps derive the term from Isaiah 46:8, which reads *Mementote istud et fundamini; redite praevaricatores ad cor*, since Faustinus and Marcellinus also reference Isaiah in

---

<sup>34</sup> The perceived need for such a tract interestingly finds a parallel in the title page of the anonymous 1721 translation of *De Trinitate* (London: Phoenix, 1721), which describes the work as: "A TREATISE very necessary to be Read at this Time."



one other point of their petition, drawing upon a stock image the punishments in Hell to describe the torments that await *praevaricatores*.<sup>35</sup> They do not, however, directly connect Isaiah 46:8 to the term. This citation is the extent to which they explicitly incorporate the language of Isaiah; it does not form a coherent framework for understanding their place in the world in the sense of the Donatist *collecta*, discussed below.

The term also does not seem to have had any lasting power outside Faustinus and Marcellinus' community and appears in no other writings in reference to the acts of the Council of Alexandria. Jerome, for example, makes not a single use of the word in the mouth of his Luciferian strawman in the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. Augustine's various analyses of the passage from Isaiah 46:8 makes no mention of Luciferians; for Augustine, and other authors in Late Antiquity, this passage was often taken in a self-reflective sense.<sup>36</sup> The repetitive use of *praevaricator* is limited to the Luciferian petition and does not seem to have caused much consternation to their enemies.

Moreover, Faustinus and Marcellinus do from time to time make a distinction between heresy and *praevaricatio*, indicating that in their usage the two were not identical. Now, for the most part, they do seem to equate the two. "Although they did not sign like the traitors," Faustinus and Marcellinus write about a bishop whom (they claim) God punished for holding communion with *praevaricatores*, "they nevertheless joined

---

<sup>35</sup> *Lib. prec. 17: gravius exilium temporale esse crediderunt quam perpetuam poenam secundum Esaiam indormitabilis vermis et ignis inextinguibilis.*

<sup>36</sup> See Simone Deléani, "Un emprunt d'Augustin à l'Écriture: *Redite, praevaricatores, ad cor* (Isaïe 46, 8b)," *REAug* 38 (1992): 29-49, and James J. O'Donnell, *The Confessions of Augustine: Introduction and Text* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 4.12.18

themselves to known traitors through communion.”<sup>37</sup> Signing an Arian creed must be equivalent to heresy, and thus here (and elsewhere) *praevaricator* holds this meaning. But, for instance, the same presbyters write, “It should not be doubted that a few bishops are worthy due to the merit of their confession and inviolable faith, but many are despised due to the merit of their heresy or treachery.”<sup>38</sup> Or later, the people of Oxyrhynchus held communion “with neither heretics nor traitors.”<sup>39</sup> In all of these cases, by bringing up both heretics and traitors, the Luciferians suggest that there is a distinction between the two. Another statement of theirs makes a further distinction about those who are “even now still either heretics, or traitors, or allies of such men.”<sup>40</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus use *aut...aut...aut* here, not *et...et...et* – these men are *either* heretics *or* traitors, not *both* heretics *and* traitors. To some degree, the tenor of these statements implies that the two, heresy and treachery, are one and the same. But the actual phrasing betrays a lingering hesitation to identify them as equivalent. Thus *praevaricator* once more seems to be a less forceful term for differentiating their community from others when compared to a term like *Luciferiani*.

When it came to the Novatians’ methods for defining their opponents, they, like the Luciferians, did not assign a personal name. While Novatian himself, and later his followers, might have defined the opposing faction at Rome as the *Corneliani* or

---

<sup>37</sup> *Lib. prec.* 45: ...*cum non subscripserint ut praevaricatores, tamen per communionem praevaricatoribus sibi cognitis copulati sunt.*

<sup>38</sup> *Lib. prec.* 31: *Sed etsi non est dubitandum paucos episcopos esse pretiosos de merito confessionis et inviolabilis fidei, multos vero nullificare merito haereseos vel praevaricationis...*

<sup>39</sup> *Lib. prec.* 93: ...*ita ut se nullis haereticis nullisque praevaricatoribus per divina commisceant sacramenta.* For further examples, see *Lib. prec.* 24, 94, 103, 104, 119.

<sup>40</sup> *Lib. prec.* 106: ...*etiam nunc usque aut haereticos esse, aut praevaricatores, aut socios talium.*

*Stephaniani*, they never seem to have done so. In this case it is more difficult to see why not, since Novatian had no love for either Cornelius or Stephen.

By contrast with their fellow rigorists, the Donatists had a variety of names available with which they did label their enemies. The Donatists do seem, first of all, to have used names based on individuals involved with the outbreak of religious divisions in North Africa during the Great Persecution. The catholic bishop at the time of the division was a popular one. After the Council of Carthage in 412, Augustine refers to a debate that occurred at the council over the names ‘Caecilianists’ and ‘Donatists.’<sup>41</sup> What’s more, Donatists not only called their opponents Caecilianists, but apparently no Donatist ever named his child *Caecilianus* after 311.<sup>42</sup> More popular, following the Macarian persecutions of 347-348, was the name *Macariani* or the term *pars Macarii*.<sup>43</sup> Augustine mentions this name in passing while writing against Julian of Eclanum: “But you [Pelagians] alone call us Traducians, just as they [Arians] call us Homousians, just as the Donatists call us Macarians, just as the Manichees call us Pharisees, and the rest of the heretics call us by various names.”<sup>44</sup> The offhand nature of the term *Macariani*, coming as it does in this list, implies that this was a general and common term that Augustine encountered regularly. In a letter, Augustine confirms this by saying that the Donatists in

---

<sup>41</sup> Augustine, *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* (= PL 43.613-650) 3.4.5: *ortus est iterum moratorius conflictus de catholico nomine et Donatistarum et Caecilianistarum...*

<sup>42</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 74-75.

<sup>43</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 185; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 344.

<sup>44</sup> Aug. *Op. imp. c. Iul.* 1.75: Athanasianos vel Homousianos Ariani Catholicos vocant, non et alii haeretici. Vos autem non solum a Catholicis, sed etiam ab haereticis, vobis similibus et a vobis dissentientibus, Pelagiani vocamini; quemadmodum non tantum a Catholica, sed ab haeresibus etiam vocantur Ariani. Vos vero soli nos appellatis Traducianos, sicut illi Homousianos, sicut Donatistae Macarianos, sicut Manichaei Pharisaeos, et ceteri haeretici diversis nominibus.

general called his party the *Macariani*.<sup>45</sup> There is a specific example, too: Petilian, as quoted by Augustine, writes that “The party of Macarius cannot be included with us.”<sup>46</sup> In sum, the Donatists, unlike the Luciferians and Novatians, seem to have taken advantage of the power of naming one’s opponents quite early and quite thoroughly. This is especially significant because the general growing concern with heresies was in North Africa relatively muted.<sup>47</sup> The Donatists’ ability to make these names stick, and to draw the attention of enemies like Augustine, indicates that the Donatists were particularly exceptional in their ability to impose names on their enemies.

Yet for the Donatists, the preferred term was related to the origins of the Donatist community just as *praevaricator* was related to the origins of Faustinus and Marcellinus’ community: *traditor*, ‘hander-over’ or ‘traitor,’ a term coming from the handing over of sacred texts during the Great Persecution but later extended in its broader meaning to cover the whole of the Caecilianist party.<sup>48</sup> Over time, this term became associated not just with handing over texts and other objects but with the treachery of Judas himself, making the name *traditor* even more potent.<sup>49</sup> This term inescapably suffuses all Christian literature concerning the Donatists in North Africa. Parmenian’s book to which Optatus’ tract responds was probably even entitled *Adversus ecclesiam traditorum*.<sup>50</sup> It

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ep.* 87.10.

<sup>46</sup> *Aug. C. litt. Pet.* 2.39.92: *Non est pars crudelitas mansuetudinis, nec religio sacrilegii, nec pars Macarii penitus potest esse nostra, quia ritus nostri similitudinem maculat*; Augustine repeats the accusation at 94 and argues with a pun that they are indeed the *pars macarii*, i.e., the blessed or happy party. Cf. *C. litt. Pet.* 2.93.208.

<sup>47</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 310-311.

<sup>48</sup> Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, ix-x. Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 74-82.

<sup>49</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 96-101.

<sup>50</sup> A. Pincherle, “L’Ecclesiologia nella Controversia Donatista,” *Rivista di Ricerche Religiose* 1 (1925): 35-55, who relates that the work probably carried this title, but is uncertain; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 74

was such a powerful term that Optatus spends the bulk of the first book of his *De schismate* attempting to prove that it was the Donatists who were the *traditores*, not his own party (rather than arguing that it did not matter, as would later become the party line).<sup>51</sup>

The Donatists also managed intra-Donatist disputes by imposing hereticizing names on dissidents who had left the Donatist party. Augustine reports that the Donatists not only called one community of Donatists that had splintered off *Maximiniani* but tried to use this name in legal proceedings to demonstrate that these Maximinianists were heretics and therefore should have their basilicas stripped away and returned to the Donatists.<sup>52</sup> Augustine of course exploits this position repeatedly to argue that it is the Donatists whose basilicas should be given to the Catholics. The use of the term *Maximiniani* does indicate, though, that for the Donatists, divisions within their own community were still seen in terms of religious beliefs; whatever Maximian's actual reasons for separating himself from the rest of the Donatist communion group (apparently a succession dispute over the Donatist episcopacy of Carthage), other Donatists used language that suggested that he was creating innovative doctrines or practices.

There are several things worth taking away from this discussion of how Christian communities labeled each other. First of all, it was common Christian practice in Late

---

describes this tract as *De ecclesia traditorum* without hesitation but cites neither Pincherle or any other evidence.

<sup>51</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 162; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 103-106: "Catholics could admit that some of our people *might* have betrayed the scriptures to Roman authorities during the persecution, but even if they did – which the Catholics were not admitting, of course – it would not matter anyway since there was no connection between those earlier people and 'we today, man generations later' in terms of the responsibility that 'we have for our own age.'"

<sup>52</sup> *C. litt. Pet.* 2.83.184; *Aug. Enn. in Ps.* 21.31, 36.19-23, 57.15.

Antiquity to label one's heretical opponents by the name of the supposed arch-heretic. All communities apparently knew this, including those who were being labeled as such, and all of them apparently categorically rejected this labeling. Catholic authors even labeled certain rigorists 'Luciferians' in this way even though they could point to no specific points of doctrine or practice that made Lucifer himself heretical. They applied the label *Luciferiani* in the exact same way and with the exact same intent to marginalize these communities that they showed in applying similar labels to the Novatians and Donatists. While the magnitude of the effects of this is difficult to judge, the stridency with which Faustinus and Marcellinus oppose such terminology suggests that this label was very effective in denigrating them. The Luciferians, without much to distinguish themselves from their opponents, were nevertheless being vilified as though they were heretical and were suffering the consequences of this exclusion.

Lastly, Faustinus and Marcellinus seem unable or unwilling to use similar naming strategies against their opponents. While the Novatian lack of a name-based term for their opponents does suggest that the power of attributing a name to one's opponent along the lines of *Luciferiani* or *Novatiani* was not wholly necessary for creating or maintaining a distinction between two communities, it does seem to have been a powerful tool in the hands of their enemies. The repeated use of the word *praevaricator* throughout the *Libellus precum* does not seem to have been nearly as effective. While it has echoes of the Donatist *traditor*, this was but one Donatist label that was available. And unlike the Donatists, Faustinus and Marcellinus seem to have distinguished at times between

*praevaricatores* and heretics. This weakened the distinctions made between Faustinus and Marcellinus' community and the Christians they opposed.

The result is that while their opponents labeled rigorists as heretical, regardless of doctrinal developments, the Luciferians were not in turn able to convincingly label their opponents as heretical. Given the fierce reactions on the part of Faustinus and Marcellinus, and the effectiveness of this terminology that their opposition suggests, their failure to similarly label their opponents as heretical in some way (whether or not their opponents held any differing doctrinal or practical beliefs or not) must represent a significant failure to separate themselves from their opponents and define themselves as superior.

#### *Defining Communities: Pagans and Jews*

The language of heresy was not the only religiously informed language that Christians used to denigrate their opponents. It was also relatively common for them to treat their opponents as if they were pagans, an insult very objectionable to many Late Antique Christians. Furthermore, both the Novatians and Donatists, though not the Luciferians, insulted their opponents by calling them Jews. Both of these terms once again indicate that even though the communities in question were most certainly not pagans or Jews, late antique Christian communities found ways to vilify each other in the language of religious belief.

Faustinus and Marcellinus suggested that their opponents acted like (or, rather, worse than) pagans did. In one rather exemplary scene, Faustinus and Marcellinus write that the catholic presbyters Luciosus and Hyginus in Spain “at the height of perpetrated

sacrileges, placed the very altar of God, carried from the Lord's [basilica], in a temple beneath the feet of an idol."<sup>53</sup> Regardless of whether or not this account is true, it is telling that for Faustinus and Marcellinus, the height of sacrilege was acting like pagans. They reinforce this with a rhetorical question: "What more grievous thing would a pagan worshiper of idols do, if he had permission to persecute the Church (*ecclesia*)?"<sup>54</sup> They are all but directly calling their opponents pagans for their actions, suggesting that these *praevaricatores* are different only in the way they dress up their crimes.

The structure of the *Libellus precum* also twice suggests the identification between pagan persecutor and catholic persecutor. In describing the exiles of the 350s, Faustinus and Marcellinus relate a lengthy scene set in a courtroom as Osius rages against Gregory of Elvira, and the two also describe the courtroom trial of Ephesius against Damasus.<sup>55</sup> But these court scenes were not invented whole cloth; as Shaw writes, "The normal judicial dream, if we might call it that, became a staple of Christian rhetoric in periods long after the state persecutions were a thing of the past."<sup>56</sup> Regardless of whether or not Gregory or Ephesius were ever actually dragged into court, this literary model was readily available to not only engender sympathy for Gregory and Ephesius (and to link them in the reader's mind), but to use tried-and-true images of pagan

---

<sup>53</sup> *Lib. prec.* 76: *...ad cumulum perpetrati sacrilegii, ipsum altare Dei de dominico sublatum in templo sub pedibus idoli posuerunt.*

<sup>54</sup> *Lib. prec.* 76: *Quid gravius gentilis cultor idolorum faceret, si haberet licentiam Ecclesiam persequendi?* Note that Faustinus and Marcellinus use the term *gentilis* here, rather than *paganus*. They also use *gentilis* at *Lib. prec.* 29, 38, and 83. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, 14-25 argues that the term *paganus* was not used to refer to pagans until the middle of the fourth century, and was at first used as a relatively neutral term for non-Christians. At 16 he emphasizes that *gentilis*, among other terms, had "distinctly hostile connotations" going back at least to the language used by Jewish writers beginning in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E.

<sup>55</sup> *Lib. prec.* 33-39 and 84-85.

<sup>56</sup> Brent Shaw, "Judicial Nightmares and Christian Memory," *J ECS* 11, no. 4 (2003): 533-563, at 546.



persecutors to represent new catholic persecutors. Just as pagans had persecuted, so too did Luciosus, Hyginus, Osius, and Damasus persecute.

Lastly, Jerome provides some evidence that the Luciferians defined their opponents as Jewish. His character Orthodoxus asks his Luciferian opponent, “And why, I ask you, do those excessively religious, or rather, excessively profane, people ass that there are more synagogues than churches?”<sup>57</sup> While Jerome does not have either character elaborate on this slur, it is a glimpse at the world of name-calling that was assuredly part of the vocabulary of abuse available to these communities.

The Novatians had several creative ways of defining their opponents. According to Pacian, at least, they called their adversaries who traced their lineage back to Cyprian by the collective names *Apostaticum*, the *Synedrium*, and the *Capitolinum*.<sup>58</sup> While Pacian calls these mere taunts, they do seem to be Novatian names for their enemies.<sup>59</sup> With these names, they could attribute to their enemies the various ‘crimes’ of apostasy, Judaism, or paganism, respectively. These still lacked the clarity that the name of a heretical antecedent could provide in a single word. Arians were those who followed the teachings of Arius; but what specifically made a member of the *Apostaticum* an apostate, the *Synedrium* a Judaizer, or the *Capitolinum* a pagan, is not entirely clear. Faustinus and Marcellinus’ description of Luciosus and Hyginus’ actions map very well onto the rhetorical suggestion the Novatians make in calling their opponents the *Capitolinum*, but we do not know if the Novatians ever experienced such persecution themselves. It is

---

<sup>57</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 15: Et ubi, quaeso, isti sunt nimium religiosi, immo nimium profani, qui plures synagogas asserunt esse quam ecclesias?*

<sup>58</sup> *Pac. Ep. 2.3.*

<sup>59</sup> *Pac. Ep. 2.3.*

nonetheless significant that the Novatians, just like the Luciferians, do seem to correlate the actions of heretics to the actions of pagans and Jews.

The Donatists, like the Luciferians and the Novatians, also suggested that their opponents acted like pagans. The most obvious way, which will be discussed in Chapter 6, was by the recitation of martyr texts. While these stories were set in times of pagan persecution, they continued to be relevant to Donatist listeners deep into the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, times of catholic, not pagan, persecutions. The reader facing persecution at the hands of catholics might easily identify these pagan persecutors in their stories with their contemporary catholic persecutors.<sup>60</sup> This is not dissimilar from how the Luciferian courtroom dramas reflected the same identification of pagan and catholic persecutors in order to buttress boundaries between their community and other Christians. Like Faustinus and Marcellinus, the Donatists also spread rumors that suggested specific behaviors. Optatus reports a Donatist accusation, for example, that the imperial commissioners Macarius and Paul in 347 brought an image, perhaps of the emperor, and placed it on the Christian altar before participating in Christian services.<sup>61</sup> This is not dissimilar to the story told by Faustinus and Marcellinus, which also emphasized a paganizing desecration of a Christian altar. It seems that not might one Christian community label another as ‘pagan,’ but the specific accusations they used to do so were similar as well.

---

<sup>60</sup> Suggested e.g. by Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, xxii: “...the accounts of martyrdoms were written primarily to inspire Christians who needed to be able to withstand the daily threat of exposure as people different from their neighbors...”

<sup>61</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 3.12.

The Donatists also implied that their opponents acted like Jews, but did so by directly connecting them with the figure of Judas.<sup>62</sup> Shaw writes, “Without doubt, however, the dissident Christians also had access to precisely this same anti-Jewish rhetoric and certainly played it, from their point of view, for all it was worth.”<sup>63</sup> The examples Shaw proffers, in contrast to variegated examples of Augustine correlating Jews and Donatists, are numerous sermons in which Donatist bishops associate the treachery of Judas with the crimes of the *traditores*. For the Donatists, there was a need to not only demonstrate the equivalence of the *traditores* of the Great Persecution and those they called *traditores* later in the century, but between all these *traditores* and the original, archetypal *traditor* as well.<sup>64</sup> Thus, for the Donatists, more so than the Luciferians and Novatians, the various terms used to describe their enemies were clearly interlaced. This suggests that the Donatists had a much more sophisticated view of how they perceived their enemies and, by extension, how they perceived themselves in relation to their enemies.

Although this type of language was popular, it does not seem particularly effective. We do not, at any rate, find other Christian authors spending much time disabusing the Luciferians, Novatians, or Donatists of these notions that their enemies were not Christians. Optatus, for instance, spills much ink arguing with Parmenian over which party represented the actual *traditores* in the Great Persecution, not over which community was pagan and which was Christian. Accusations of pagan activities do not

---

<sup>62</sup> Judas was typically seen as a treacherous Jewish figure in Late Antiquity: see, e.g., Kim Paffenroth, *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 37-41, and Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 98.

<sup>63</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 305.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 305-306.

seem to have been too worrisome for most Christians involved in conflicts with these rigorists.<sup>65</sup> The use of pagan imagery seems to have been a stock accusation more than anything, and does not seem to reflect a real distinction that Faustinus and Marcellinus draw between their community and their enemies.

Moreover, using terms like ‘pagan’ and ‘Jew’ as insults is qualitatively different from accusing one’s enemies of heresy. Accusations of paganism cast persecutors in the mold of Christianity’s old enemies, which could of course be a potent metaphor. We should also not underestimate the continued vibrancy of paganism throughout the fourth century.<sup>66</sup> But these accusations were also ludicrous on their face; Optatus himself may feel compelled to refute the accusation that Macarius acted like a pagan, but no Donatist author seems to go so far as to claim that their opponents were actually all pagans. The use of pagan imagery seems to have been a relatively generic form of abuse more than anything, and does not seem to reflect a real distinction that Faustinus and Marcellinus draw between their community and their enemies.

Heretics and heresy, on the other hand, were insidious in how closely related they were to orthodox beliefs; Jerome, as noted in the previous chapter, writes concerning the three *hypostases* formulation that “poison lurks under the honey.”<sup>67</sup> Heresy could sound sweet to orthodox ears in a way that paganism or Judaism could not. Moreover, a

---

<sup>65</sup> Far more common in Late Antiquity were worries that pagan learning was a burden on the Christian man’s soul (see in general Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992) on the transformation of classical learning to suit Christian needs and e.g. Jerome’s famous dream in which he is accused of being a ‘Ciceronian’ rather than a Christian: Kelly, *Jerome*, 41-4), but there is little hint of this among the Luciferians, Novatians, or Donatists, all of whom counted fairly educated men and women among their ranks.

<sup>66</sup> See e.g. Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 206-214.

<sup>67</sup> *Ep.* 15: ...*venenum sub melle latet.*

Christian preoccupation with heretics and heresies beyond Trinitarian controversies, an interest that had been dormant for some time, had recently re-emerged in the 360s.<sup>68</sup> In the context of this new wave of anxiety, making one's persecutors out to be heretics made them sharply real and dangerously insidious.

But whether these communities defined their enemies as heretics, pagans, or Jews, and whether their enemies in turn defined them as heretics, pagans, or Jews, these identifications in a broader sense still represent a sea change in Late Antique thought. The principle form the identification took in the minds of these authors was that of a religious community. These definitions of communal differences, rooted in religious belief, stand as a unique marker of communal development in Late Antiquity. Ando defines the difference between traditional paganism and Christianity thus: "in contrast to ancient Christians, who had faith, the Romans had knowledge; and...their knowledge was empirical in orientation."<sup>69</sup> His description of Christians finds confirmation in this chapter's examination of the ways Christian communities understood themselves in relation to one another. For Christians, the central element of the construction of one's identity was what one believed in. By extension, moving from the individual's sense of himself to his association with others, religious faith by the fourth century had become one of the fundamental elements with which a community constructed and understood itself as different than other communities. While this does not explain when or how such

---

<sup>68</sup> McClure, "Handbooks against Heresy;" Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 307-311.

<sup>69</sup> Clifford Ando, *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 44 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), ix.

a change had happened, it is a clear demonstration of the degree to which it had become complete among Christians in the second half of the fourth century.

*Defining Communities: Christians and Catholics*

When we turn to the ways in which Christian communities defined themselves, we see the same fourth-century transformation at work. These communities, regardless of whatever additional social and political factors led them to coalesce, perceived themselves first and foremost in religious terms. They emphasized above all belief in Christ as a savior and in Christian scriptures as divine revelation. But these two elements were vague enough that each of these rigorist communities could recast them to suit the needs of their own communities, which reflected both how these communities perceived themselves and the potential weaknesses of each communal identity.

If the members of the community that Faustinus and Marcellinus describe did not call themselves *Luciferiani*, it is fair to ask how they did refer to themselves. Faustinus and Marcellinus quite naturally preferred to define themselves as *Christiani*. They make their reasoning quite clear: “But for us, Christ is teacher. We follow his teachings and thus we are known by the holy designation of his surname. Thus by law, we ought to be called nothing other than ‘Christians,’ since we follow nothing other than what Christ taught through his apostles.”<sup>70</sup> If heretics are known by the name of their originators, the argument goes, so too should Christians be known by the name of their originator. There is never a question of whether or not they should be referred to by a term making

---

<sup>70</sup> *Lib. prec.* 86: *Sed nobis, Christus magister est [Matt 23:10]; illius doctrinam sequimur atque ideo cognomenti illius sacra appellatione censemur, ut non aliud iure dici debeamus quam Christiani, quia nec aliud sequimur quam quod Christus per apostolos docuit.*

reference to the teacher of religious doctrines, only whether or not that teacher should be Christ or a mere man.

Interestingly enough, the vocabulary in use here –*Christianus* versus *Luciferianus* – reflects the vocabulary in use in the fourth century to refer not just to heresies but to schools of philosophy. Faustinus and Marcellinus demand to be called *Christiani* because Christ is their teacher, *magister*, not because he was their *Deus* (though he was of course considered that as well). It was very common to refer to Christ as a philosophical *magister* in text and in art, becoming almost universal in the third century.<sup>71</sup> And competitions between different *magistri* could be fierce. Consider Libanius’ description of the college town of Athens:<sup>72</sup>

I had heard since I was a child, gentlemen, about the Wars of the Students in the middle of Athens, the clubs, the iron, the stones, the wounds – and the indictments after these, the defense speeches, the trials after these refutations – and all the things dared by the youths to elevate their elders’ affairs.

Labeling Christ, rather than a heretic, as one’s teacher was not a trivial matter but one that in schools of philosophy could provoke violence and legal action. Being labeled a student not of *Christus magister* but *Novatianus magister* called into question one’s

---

<sup>71</sup> See in general Paul Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 289-297, Arthur Urbano, *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013), esp. 28 and 152, and, e.g., P. Testini, “Osservazioni sull’iconografia del Cristo in trono tra gli Apostoli,” *RIASA* 11-12 (1963): 230-300, at 236-237, for the use of this image in the catacombs of Domatilla and W. Geerlings, “Zur Frage des Nachwirkens des Manichäismus in der Theologie Augustins,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 93 (1971): 45-60, at 57-58, for the use of this image in Augustine’s writings.

<sup>72</sup> *Or.* 1.19: Ἀκούων ἔγωγε ἐκ παιδός, ὃ ἄνδρες, τοὺς τῶν χορῶν ἐν μέσαις ταῖς Ἀθήναις πολέμους καὶ ρόπαλά τε καὶ σίδηρον καὶ λίθους καὶ τραύματα γραφάς τε ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ἀπολογίας καὶ δίκας ἐπ’ ἐλέγχους πάντα τε τολμώμενα τοῖς νέοις, ὅπως τὰ πράγματα τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν αἴροισιν. For the term χοροί used in this way, see John W.H. Walden, *The Universities of Ancient Greece* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1909), 296.

religious *and* intellectual place in educated society. And just as ‘Christian’ was becoming an intellectual term, so too was *magister* becoming a religious term. Here, we can see that all elements of Roman society were being recast in religious terms.

Secondly, Faustinus and Marcellinus also refer to their own community as the ‘true catholics.’ While for matters of convenience this dissertation refers to the broader Nicene communion of the Roman Empire in late antiquity as the ‘catholic’ party, this was, of course, a title disputed by other Christian communities just as they disputed the imposition of terms like *Luciferianus* instead of *Christianus*. As discussed in Chapter Two, the *Libellus precum* does twice make sarcastic reference to their opponents as *catholici*.<sup>73</sup> They also refer to the emperors regularly as establishing catholic law.<sup>74</sup> But the term is predominately used about themselves. In their opening plea, Faustinus and Marcellinus write, “But it also cannot be doubted that the true catholics are those who – through exiles, through a variety of punishments, through the cruelty of death – upheld without deceit that creed which was composed at Nicaea with apostolic and evangelic reasoning.”<sup>75</sup> The reference to deceit confirms that Faustinus and Marcellinus are not simply referring to those true catholics of the 350s, who opposed Constantius and the Arian party, but those in the present who did not swear to Arian creeds before returning to Nicene orthodox communion. The two state outright near their conclusion that they

---

<sup>73</sup> *Lib. prec.* 66, 75.

<sup>74</sup> *Lib. prec.* 2, 30, 52, 56, 100, 107, 110, 116, 120

<sup>75</sup> *Lib. prec.* 10: *Sed et illud ambigi non potest, hos esse uere catholicos, qui, per exilia, per genera suppliciorum, per atrocitatem mortis, illam fidem sine dolo uindicant quae apud Nicaeam euangelica atque apostolica ratione conscripta est.*



represent “the true catholics and the true community (*ecclesia*) [of God].”<sup>76</sup> Moreover, there are frequent references to the *praevaricatores* persecuting their community ‘under the catholic name’ or while otherwise (according to Faustinus and Marcellinus) pretending to be catholic.<sup>77</sup> This phrasing suggests that while these Christians act under the catholic *name*, true catholics (i.e. the community of Faustinus and Marcellinus’ petition) do not act unjustly. This demonstrates that for many Christians in Late Antiquity there was a pressing need to identify who was a member of the ‘catholic’ community and who was not, and, quite significantly, that *catholicus* did not simply mean ‘universal,’ in terms of being the community with the most members. The Luciferians thought they could claim the title of *ecclesia catholica* despite admitting that their communities were quite small. As mentioned in Chapter 2, this reflects a shift in how the term *catholicus* was interpreted, adding a moral component to the otherwise simplistic definition of ‘universal.’

Nor were Faustinus and Marcellinus the only ones who made such arguments. To begin broadly, Pacian does use *catholicus* in the standard way when constructing this argument about the name *catholicus*: “By chance, say I should enter a populous city today, when I discern Marcionites, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatians, and the rest of this sort who call themselves Christians. By what name should I identify my own

---

<sup>76</sup> *Lib. prec.* 112: *Putamus quod sine offensione Dei haec in ueros catholicos et in ueram eius Ecclesiam perpetrentur...*The same is asserted at 113: *...quia veri catholici a falsis sacerdotibus obteruntur.* It is further implied at 120: *...et patiamini catholicae fidei sectatores ubique cruciari...*

<sup>77</sup> *Lib. prec.* 3, 67, 92, 100, 101, 110, 114,

people, if they should not be known as catholic?”<sup>78</sup> If everyone calls themselves Christian, Pacian claims to need some way of identify his own community. For Pacian, however, this need leads him to make another religious claim: not only is his community a Christian community, it is the ‘universal’ (and, as we shall see, ‘obedient’) party in contrast with these other, naturally less ‘universal’ communities.

The Novatians were once such community that laid claim to the name *Christiani*. As was pointed out earlier, Pacian writes to Sympronian, “Impose on them whatever name you like...you will say Christian.”<sup>79</sup> In this respect, the Novatians appear be rather like Faustinus and Marcellinus, rejecting a term based on the name Novatian because they considered themselves *Christiani*. This represents another example of a Christian community that demanded to be known as Christians rather than some other name-based term.

Yet in this respect the Novatians differed considerably from these other rigorists in that they did not appear to participate in struggles over who was a ‘catholic’ Christian but rather argued about whether or not this was an appropriate term to use in the first place. Pacian’s opponent Sympronian seems to have explicitly eschewed the name *catholicus*. In fact, Pacian opens up a full discussion of the term by stating, “You will say, ‘But under the apostles no one was called catholic.’”<sup>80</sup> The suggestion that the term made Novatians uncomfortable is confirmed by Pacian’s lengthy response to this question. Pacian is compelled to argue that despite not being used by the apostles, the

---

<sup>78</sup> Ep. 1.3: *Ego forte ingressus populosum urbem hodie, cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinarios, Cataphrygas, Novatianos et caeteros eiusmodi comperissem, qui se christianos vocarent; quo cognomine meae plebis agnoscerem, nisi catholica diceretur?*

<sup>79</sup> Ep. 2.3 *Quodlibet nomen imponas...respondebis Christianum.*

<sup>80</sup> Ep. 1.3: *Sed sub apostolis, inquires, nemo Catholicus vocabatur.*

word *catholicus* is perfectly acceptable because its meaning is intrinsically bound with *Christianus*.<sup>81</sup> He actually argues that *catholicus* means “‘everywhere one,’ or, as learned men think, the ‘obedience of all,’ that is, ‘obedience of all the mandates of God.’”<sup>82</sup> These learned men are uncited, but Pacian also bolsters his case through citations of 2 Corinthians and Romans.<sup>83</sup> Neither passage uses the word *catholicus*, but the former does describe obedience “in all things,” *in omnibus*. Then Pacian moves on to claim that whoever is obedient is *Christianus*.<sup>84</sup> Thus whoever is *catholicus* is *Christianus*, and conversely, whoever is not is neither *catholicus* nor as a consequence are they *Christianus*.<sup>85</sup> The quality of Pacian’s reasoning is perhaps a little suspect, but demonstrates that *catholicus* was taking on a moral component in addition to the meaning ‘universal.’ His interpretation also indicates that there was some debate in Spain at the time over the validity of the word *catholicus* used to describe Christians at large. Novatians seem in this case to have argued that *catholicus* was an inappropriate term to use as a Christian – perhaps because they were, notably, not as ‘universal’ as their adversaries.

It is likely, although we lack many Novatian texts, that Sympronian was not alone in this reticence. It must be significant that the ever-sympathetic Socrates uses the term *katholikos* quite stingily. In the first book of his history, for instance, *katholikos* only

---

<sup>81</sup> *Ep.* 1.4.

<sup>82</sup> *Ep.* 1.4: *Et si reddenda postremo Catholici vocabuli ratio est, et exprimenda de Graeca interpretatione Romana: Catholicus, ubi unum, vel, ut doctiores putant, obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatorum scilicet Dei.*

<sup>83</sup> 2 Cor 2:9: *Si in omnibus obedientes estis...* and Rom 5:19: *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius peccatores constituti sunt multi: sic per dicto audientiam unius, iusti constituentur multi.*

<sup>84</sup> *Ep.* 1.4: *Ergo qui Catholicus, idem iusti obediens. Qui obediens, idem est Christianus: ita Catholicus, Christianus est.*

<sup>85</sup> *Ep.* 1.4: *Quare ab haeretico nomine noster populus hac appellatione dividitur, cum Catholicus nuncupatur.*

appears as an adjective when quoted in letters written by others. In other instances where we might expect to see the term, Socrates merely distinguishes between the ‘*ekklēsia*’ and the Novatians, as when he discusses the persecutions of Macedonius in Constantinople under Constantius.<sup>86</sup> Likewise, Macedonians are said to have gone over to ‘the *ekklēsia*’ when persecuted under Nestorius.<sup>87</sup> Even when putting words in the mouths of those we would consider catholics, Socrates refrains from using the term. Consider his account of John Chrysostom’s response to Leontius’ accusation that he had been deposed by a canon at the Synod of the Oak and never rightfully reinstated: “John said that that canon was not of their community (τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας), but of the Arians’.”<sup>88</sup> Why not simply use *katholikēs* or *katholou* here?

In fact, the only time Socrates seems to use the word *katholikos* in his own text (rather than in quotations) occurs in his fifth book, when he is describing the effects of the Novatian Council of Pazum. The Novatian Council at Angarum decided that their selection of a different date for Easter was acceptable, “saying that the disagreement about the festival was no cause worth mentioning for a separation from the church, and that those who gathered at Pazum did nothing prejudicial to their general principles (τῶ

---

<sup>86</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.5: ... καὶ οὐ μόνον γε τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας διακρινομένους συνήλαυνεν, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ Ναυατιανούς, εἰδὼς καὶ αὐτοὺς φρονοῦντας τὸ ὁμοούσιον. The translation in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2*, vol. 2 (Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1890) confusingly translates this as “His persecutions were not confined to those who were recognized as members of the catholic church, but extended to the Novatians also, inasmuch as he knew that they maintained the doctrine of the homoousion” (emphasis added). They offer the same translation, ‘catholic church,’ at 4.26.3, when the text reads only ‘ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.’ Similar misleading translations occur at 5.8.8, 6.18.11, 7.31.5.

<sup>87</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.31.5: τινὲς δὲ αὐτῶν προσεχώρησαν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τῇ πίστει συνθέμενοι.

<sup>88</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.18.11: ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν κανόνα τοῦτον οὐ τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν εἶναι ἔλεγεν.

καθολικῷ κανόνι).”<sup>89</sup> Socrates may be using the adjective *katholikos* here because it is Novatians in question, but as noted above, he does distinguish between the *ekklēsia* and the Novatians. It is more likely that he is simply referring to its potential meaning ‘general’ rather than the particular meaning of ‘catholic’ it clearly had for other authors, even authors whom he cites. In either case it demonstrates a serious reluctance on the part of Socrates to use ‘catholic’ to describe the broader Nicene Christian community.

This conclusion is confirmed by the changes that Sozomen made to Socrates’ text. Sozomen’s history is essentially an expanded, elaborated, and heavily edited version of Socrates’ text.<sup>90</sup> But Sozomen has no compunctions about using the term *katholikos* to describe the broader Nicene communion. In the beginning of Sozomen’s second book, for instance, we find that “Constantine greatly rejoiced, seeing the catholic community (τὴν καθόλου ἐκκλησίαν) in agreement concerning dogma.”<sup>91</sup> Socrates’ account of Constantine’s and Helena’s actions following the Council of Nicaea differ too much to directly compare them. But later in the same chapter of Sozomen’s history, when he is describing the alliance between Arius and Melitius in Egypt, he writes that “Earlier, each carried on differently from the other, but when they saw the majority following the

---

<sup>89</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 5.21.14: ...φήσαντες μὴ ἀξιόλογον εἶναι αἰτίαν πρὸς χωρισμὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν διαφωνίαν τῆς ἑορτῆς, μηδὲ μὴν τοὺς ἐν Πάζῳ συναχθέντας πρόκριμα τῷ καθολικῷ κανόνι γενέσθαι.

<sup>90</sup> See Glenn F. Chestnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977), 204- 205: “The amount of correspondence between the two works is very great. Sozomen apparently made heavy and completely unacknowledged use of a copy of Socrates’ history...On the other hand, Sozomen did go back and independently make use of the sources from which Socrates had derived his information. Sozomen took an independent look at Rufinus’ Church History, drew on parts of Eusebius’ Life of Constantine that Socrates had not used, and also clearly looked at Athanasius’s works himself rather than simply copying the material out of Socrates.” On some of the other differences between the two, see Theresa Urbainczyk, “Observations on the Differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen,” *Historia* 46, no. 3 (1997): 355-373.

<sup>91</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.1: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὑπερφυῶς ἔχαίρε συμφωνοῦσαν ὁρῶν περὶ τὸ δόγμα τὴν καθόλου ἐκκλησίαν.

priests of the catholic community (τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας), they became jealous.”<sup>92</sup> But Socrates had merely written “Melitius, along with those with him, took the part of Arius, plotting with him against the bishop [Alexander].”<sup>93</sup> But nowhere is Alexander referred to as a representative of the catholic community in the way Sozomen describes.

It is likewise clear when we consider other passages where Sozomen has followed Socrates more closely. For instance, Socrates writes, “However, after these things, Eustathius was condemned in a council that was arranged because of him in Gangra in Paphlagonia.”<sup>94</sup> Yet Sozomen: “The nearby bishops convened in Gangra, metropolis of Paphlagonia, and condemned them [those who followed Eustathius] to be estranged from the catholic community (τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας).”<sup>95</sup> These are only a handful examples of a much broader trend. It is clear that not only did Socrates apparently shun the phrase ‘catholic community,’ but Sozomen consciously added the phrase ‘catholic community’ where Socrates did not include it. Given Socrates’ Novatian leanings, Sozomen’s modifications would suggest that the Novatians (and their sympathizers) did find something objectionable about the term *katholikos*.

Why was the term so objectionable to Novatians? It is hard to tell from Pacian’s epistles. His opponent apparently objected to the term *catholicus* on the grounds that it was not the term *Christiani* and seems to have replaced it, it is not found in the New

---

<sup>92</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.21.3: πρότερον δὲ διαφερόμενοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἑκάτεροι, ὡς εἶδον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπόμενον τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας, εἰς φθόνον κατέστησαν.

<sup>93</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.6.39: καὶ ὁ Μελίτιος ἅμα τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ συναλαμβάνετο τῷ Ἀρείῳ, κατὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου συμπατριᾶζων αὐτῷ.

<sup>94</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.43.2: Εὐστάθιος μέντοι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ δι’ αὐτὸν γενομένη ἐν Γάγγραις τῆς Παφλαγονίας συνόδῳ κατεκρίθη, διότι μετὰ τὸ καθαιρεθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Καισάρειαν συνόδῳ πολλὰ παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς τύπους ἔπραττεν.

<sup>95</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 3.14.35: διὰ δὴ ταῦτα τοὺς πλησιοχώρους ἐπισκόπους συνελθεῖν ἐν Γάγγραις τῇ μητροπόλει Παφλαγόνων καὶ ἄλλοτρίους αὐτοὺς ψηφίσασθαι τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας...

Testament, and, judging by Pacian's etymological twisting of *catholicus* to mean 'obedient,' it was used to suggest that those opposed to Pacian's communion group were by definition 'disobedient' towards God.<sup>96</sup> It is perhaps this last that provoked the ire of Sympronian. By taking *catholicus* to mean 'universal in obedience' rather than simply 'universal,' authors like Pacian could marginalize communities like the Novatians. He argues that just because there were Christians who were not part of the *catholica ecclesia* did not mean that the *ecclesia* of Pacian was not *catholica*. Not all who called themselves Christians had to be part of the *catholica ecclesia*, since no *true* (i.e., 'obedient') Christian was separated from the *catholica ecclesia*. It is interesting, in any case, that the Novatians saw this term as of questionable value, arguing not about who were the 'true' catholic Christians but whether or not anyone should claim to be this in the first place.

Our sources only hint at the Donatist attitude towards these terms, but suggest that Donatists approved of both the terms *Christianus* for themselves (expectedly) and the term *catholicus*. When Parmenian (as cited by Augustine) wonders whether there are *boni Christiani* across the sea, the clear implication is that the Donatists are the *boni Christiani* on this side of the shore.<sup>97</sup> *Catholici* was also an acceptable term. The Donatist *Acta Saturnini* (commonly called the *Acts of the Abitinian Martyrs*) begins by stating, "Whoever exults in the faith of the holiest religion and is gloried in Christ, whoever rejoices with the Lord's truth, with sin condemned, so that he might hold the catholic community (*ecclesiam catholicam*), and so that he might separate the holy communion

---

<sup>96</sup> *Ep.* 1.3-4.

<sup>97</sup> Aug. *C. ep. Parm.* 2.2.4: *Nescimus an sint per tot gentes terrarum transmarinarum boni Christiani.*

from the profane, let him read the acts of the martyrs...’’<sup>98</sup> This immediate reference to the ‘catholic’ community in the very first sentence highlights the appropriateness of its use to describe the Donatist community. The Novatians, in other words, were unique in their opposition to the term.

None of these groups were wholly successful in getting themselves called *Christiani*, of course – we still to this day talk of Novatians, Donatists, and Luciferians, though we also think of them as Christians. But it is significant that they all felt compelled to try the same tactic: their stock response to having an individual’s name attached to their community was to instead try to attach Christ’s name to their community. This was a universal behavior, which is made more significant when we turn to the term *catholicus* and more specifically how the attitude of the Novatians towards the term *catholicus* stands in blunt contrast with Faustinus and Marcellinus and the Donatists. While in Late Antiquity it was universal that communities labeled themselves as *Christiani*, it was *not* universal that they label themselves as *catholici*.

And yet, the Luciferians and Donatists meant very different things by *catholici*. For the Donatists, this simply reflected their belief that they were the North African community who should be in communion with the broader Christian community of the Roman Empire. This was not a particularly outlandish claim given the size and density of their community in many parts of North Africa. But for the Luciferians, it reflects a belief that they were the true catholic Christian community of the Roman Empire as a whole. In

---

<sup>98</sup>*Acta martyrum Saturnini presbyteri, Felicis, Dativi, Ampelii, et aliorum* (= PL 8.688-703) 1: *Qui religionis sanctissimae fide exultat et gloriatur in Christo, quique dominica veritate gaudet, errore damnato, et Ecclesiam catholicam teneat, sanctamque communionem a profana discernat, acta martyrum legat...*



other words, the Luciferian claim to the term *catholicus* reflects a much more ambitious – and possibly unreasonable – claim than the Donatist claim. The Novatians may have eschewed the term *catholicus* because it was clear that they were not as universal as their rivals. The Luciferians instead had situated themselves in a debate over who was more ‘universal,’ and that would have been a rather difficult debate to win for a community as small as they appear to have been.

### *Self-Identification Through Biblical Metaphors*

Another significant way by which Faustinus and Marcellinus could imagine their community was through biblical metaphor. For Faustinus and Marcellinus, as for late antique Christians in general, Scripture was the central repository of images that they used to describe themselves. As Tilley writes, “the Bible was used as an authority to legitimate certain beliefs and practices...quotations came to validate a reading of the situation of the readers or listeners themselves.”<sup>99</sup> The *Libellus precum* is saturated with biblical, not classical, quotations and allusions, and these quotations and allusions reflect the circumstances of Faustinus and Marcellinus’ community as the two authors themselves perceived them.

One such metaphor they employ in the heart of the *Libellus precum* is that of Noah and the Flood, allegorizing Noah (and presumably, though not explicitly, his family) as those who refuse communion with the *praevaricatores* and the *praevaricatores* as the unjust men whom God destroyed.<sup>100</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus

---

<sup>99</sup> Maureen Tilley, “Scripture as an Element of Social Control: Two Martyr Stories of Christian North Africa,” *HTR* 83, no. 4 (1990): 383-397, at 384.

<sup>100</sup> *Lib. prec.* 69: *Non sic in diluio iudicatum est ut turba uinceret infidelium, sed et Noe ille iustissimus ideo magis Deo placuit quod, in illo excidio mundi, solus iustus inuentus est.*

employ other violent metaphors as well: the impious bishops are like the residents of Sodom and Gomorrah and the rigorists of the 360s are Elijah combatting the priests of Baal who are killed by Jehu.<sup>101</sup> Following the narration of the mass execution of the priests of Baal, Faustinus and Marcellinus are quick to assure the emperor that their community is not bloodthirsty: “Certainly that happened then, because at that time this very thing was permitted by divine law, when everything was still done according to the body;” but, they continue, it is no longer permitted for Christians to long for the blood of the false priests.<sup>102</sup> Aside from whatever theological interpretations Faustinus and Marcellinus might offer to explain their pacifism, they are also assuredly eager to emphasize to the emperor their own peacefulness and distaste for violent disorder, as any good Roman would be.

These aggressive metaphors even find a home in Faustinus’ ultra-Nicene theological tract *De Trinitate*. While no one at Theodosius’ court by the 380s would have considered Arianism the Goliath against whom a diminutive Nicene David stood firm, this is exactly the metaphor that Faustinus uses in the tract when discussing the Arian assertion that the Son was created *ex nihilo*.<sup>103</sup> He even emphasizes that what damage David could do with one stone, he will be unable to do without several.

There is another strand running through all of these images beyond their violence, of course: that of the one (or the few) against the many. In all of these cases, Faustinus

---

<sup>101</sup> *Lib. prec.* 69-70.

<sup>102</sup> *Lib. prec.* 71: *Factum est quidem tunc, quia et illo tempore id ipsum diuina lege fieri licebat, quando adhuc totum corporaliter agebatur, donec cresceret instructio spiritalis. Sed non, quia quidem nunc non licet bonis et fidelibus falsorum sacerdotum sanguinem cupere, idcirco fideles falsis sacerdotibus addicendi sunt, ita ut grauissimis eorum persecutionibus affligantur.*

<sup>103</sup> *De Trin.* 16.

and Marcellinus paint theirs as a small but righteous community faced with destruction at the hands of a seemingly more powerful force that can only be overcome with help from God. As noted in Chapter Two, the emphasis on their small size was one means of coping with other Christian arguments that their community could not represent the ‘true’ Christian community in the Roman world because it was so small. It is also worth noting the flattery that Faustinus and Marcellinus offer to Theodosius here: if God is the only one who can help the beleaguered Noah, Lot, or Elijah, and Theodosius is the only one who can help the Luciferians, then there is some kind of an equivalence between God and Theodosius which the parallel structure provides.

The image of Noah in particular, adrift, isolated, but safe because of his piety, is a particularly important one because it appears in another document related to the rigorists of the 360s: Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. For Faustinus and Marcellinus, the ark was one of several images used to paint a picture of an isolated but virtuous community. For Jerome, the ark also depicted a community: “Noah’s ark was a prefiguration of the church (*ecclesiae*).”<sup>104</sup> But what the ark prefigured was far different than a small and isolated community. Jerome emphasizes first and foremost the universality of the ark:<sup>105</sup>

Just as in that one there were all kinds of animals, so too in this there are men of all sorts of races and customs. Just as there, there were a leopard and kids, a wolf and lambs, so too here there are both the righteous and

---

<sup>104</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 22: Arca Noe Ecclesiae typus fuit...* The word *typus* is frequently used by Late Antique authors to mean a ‘prefiguration’ in the Old Testament: see, e.g., A. Fitzgerald and J.C. Cavadini, *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1999), 856.

<sup>105</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 22: Ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita et in hac universarum et gentium et morum homines sunt. Ut ibi pardus et haedi, lupus et agni, ita hic et iusti et peccatores, id est, vasa aurea et argentea, cum ligneis et fictilibus commorantur.*

sinner, that is, *vessels of gold and silver lying with those of wood and clay* [2 Tim 2:20].

Although there are many other prefigurations that he brings up, none occupy Jerome so much as emphasizing that the ark contained all sorts of animals and objects just as the church contains all sorts of people. Given that he was arguing for a much more inclusive church than the Luciferians were, this makes sense. Jerome at no point describes the ark as representing an isolated community against an outside threat. The closest Jerome comes to an interpretation of isolation is when he says that “The ark was in danger in the flood, the church (*ecclesia*) is in danger in the world.”<sup>106</sup> But this seems to reflect an early version of the dichotomy between the world and the *ecclesia* that Augustine would fully develop in the *De civitate Dei*. To reiterate: Jerome, in writing a treatise in large part about the fortunes of the Nicene party in the perilous 350s, does *not* compare the inhabitants of the ark to those who stood fast against Constantius. In this respect, he stood in direct contrast to Faustinus and Marcellinus’ interpretation in the *Libellus precum*. The ark does not house a small number of righteous, it houses a wide variety of men, so long as they are baptized. Jerome even explicitly states that there are sinners in the ark.

Given Faustinus and Marcellinus’ use of this metaphor of Noah’s ark, was Jerome responding to a common rigorist interpretation? Perhaps, although if he was, he never explicitly says so. Cyprian had indeed used the metaphor to represent a small, isolated community.<sup>107</sup> But for catholic authors in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, the ark most often

---

<sup>106</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 22: Peraclita est arca in diluvio, periclitatur Ecclesia in mundo.*

<sup>107</sup> *Ep. 74.11.*

represented universality, not isolation.<sup>108</sup> For Ambrose, the ark represented the *ecclesia* in general.<sup>109</sup> Augustine even more specifically describes Noah's ark as the *ecclesia* that welcomes all Christians, both the good and sinners:<sup>110</sup>

Because all sorts of animals are enclosed in the ark, so too does the community (*ecclesia*) contain all races, which that lesson shown to Peter also signifies. Because there are clean and unclean animals there, so too do good and wicked men dwell in the community (*ecclesia*) of the holy mystery. Because there are seven of the clean, and two of the unclean, [understand] not that there are fewer wicked men than good, but that the good preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

The ark was clearly a powerful image for late antique Christians to use in explaining how they could be part of a community that had such impurities, not how they formed a community set apart from the impurity of the rest of the world. Faustinus and Marcellinus did not use this metaphor in the apparently standard way but rather seem to have recast what appears to have been a commonplace among Nicene Christians.

The particularity of the interpretation offered by Faustinus and Marcellinus is highlighted by the fact that late antique Christian (and Jewish) authors also frequently used the ark as a metaphor highlighting the need for repentance, particularly as a prefiguration of Christian baptism, or as a metaphor for the importance of sexual purity.<sup>111</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus provide none of these interpretations. That they did

---

<sup>108</sup> See e.g. Hugo Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche: Die Ekklesiologie der Väter* (Salzburg: Müller, 1964), 504-547.

<sup>109</sup> Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucan*, ed. Karl Schenkl, CSEL 32.4 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1902) 2.92, 3.48.

<sup>110</sup> Augustine, *Contra Faustum* (= *Opera*, ed. Josef Zycha, CSEL 25.1 [Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1891]) 12.15: *Quod cuncta animalium genera in arca clauduntur: sicut omnes gentes, quas etiam Petro demonstratus discus ille significat, Ecclesia continet. Quod et munda et immunda tibi sunt animalia: sicut in Ecclesiae Sacramentis et boni et mali versantur. Quod septena sunt munda, et bina immunda: non quia pauciores sunt mali quam boni; sed quia boni servant unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis.*

<sup>111</sup> Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters Between Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 152-156, 175-179. See e.g. Ambrose, *De officiis*, ed.

not connect the ark to baptism is particularly surprising as it would have been natural for a community so interested in questions over the proper penalties for clerical sins to have developed metaphors that made reference to the practices that depended on the clergy. The lack of a discussion of the ark as a metaphor for sexual purity is also interesting because late antique authors frequently used sexual purity as a metaphor for doctrinal purity, once again a central concern of the Luciferians.<sup>112</sup>

Beyond the fact that Faustinus and Marcellinus use this image as a means of identifying their community, their use also suggests that this community was not as cohesive as the two authors might want us to imagine. As Tilley writes, “one can often identify the specific problems facing the communities that produced the martyr stories by observing how biblical quotations were used to shape beliefs and practices of their readers.”<sup>113</sup> But this should by no means be limited to martyr stories, as discussed in the introduction. By contrasting the two ways in which the Jerome and Faustinus and Marcellinus use this image of Noah’s ark, we can identify two contrasting problems that they were trying to resolve.

Jerome was trying to justify the inclusion of sinners and others into a broad *ecclesia*, as one would expect in a dialogue written against a rigorist community that aimed for a pure community. But such a tendentious and frankly clumsy dialogue was unlikely to convince any rigorists that they were wrong. It is far more likely that Jerome

---

and trans. Ivor J. Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 3.18.108; *De myst.* 3.10 for the image applied to baptism. For sexual purity, see Grypeou and Spurling, *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity*, 160-165, 181-185.

<sup>112</sup> See, e.g., Mathew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 185-186. Chapter 5 discusses the role that ascetics played within communities; one such role was as a figure that embodied Christian ‘purity’ in a way that no one living a daily life in the world could reasonably expect to.

<sup>113</sup> Tilley, “Scripture as an Element of Social Control,” 384.

was writing to reinforce the beliefs of members of his own community. The inference in using this interpretation of the ark is, of course, that some people already within Jerome's community did not want such a variety of sinners within their community. Jerome needed to reinforce for his readers that it was acceptable for sinners to remain within this broad community.

But Faustinus and Marcellinus use this same scriptural example to justify their own isolation and paltry numbers. We have already seen, in Chapter 2, that their communities were generally small and isolated. Their need to reinforce their tenuous position with scriptural citations suggests that some Luciferians, who would have been part of the readership of the petition, found this isolation disheartening. While we do not have explicit evidence of Luciferians returning to the broader Nicene communion for this reason, it is not difficult to infer from this exegesis of the ark that some of those who dissented with the Council of Alexandria in the 360s saw their communities as small, isolated, weak, and vulnerable by the 380s. Their need for reassurance perhaps belies a weakness in their communal identity that came as a direct result of their paltry numbers.

We need not assume that Jerome was responding to Luciferian exegesis about the ark or that the Luciferians were responding to Jerome. It is more likely that both were laying competing claims to the 'correct' understanding of Noah's ark. We have already seen that many Nicene Christians in general, not just Luciferians proper, were dissatisfied with the outcome of the Council of Alexandria in 362. Jerome's and Faustinus and Marcellinus' interpretations seem to suggest that both parties were using different interpretations of the same material in reference to an ongoing debate among all Nicene

Christians on the question of whether or not their community should include sinners. And once more, as with the term *Christianus*, these communities were debating the proper religious interpretation of Noah's ark, not whether or not scripture should be the fundamental basis of their community or not.

It is difficult to see whether or not the Novatians had biblical images along these lines by which they understood their own community owing to the general lack of sources from their point of view. Even Novatian's discussion of why Christians eat food that Jews do not merely uses Noah's ark as proof that God intended all animals to be preserved for human use.<sup>114</sup> Our scattered references in Pacian and Socrates do not offer us any examples, but their absence cannot be taken as conclusive evidence that the Novatians had no biblical metaphors at their disposal. It would be very surprising, in fact, if they did not.

Among the Donatists, there was a powerful merging of the biblical image of the *collecta* of Israel with the Donatist conception of themselves. Tilley writes, "For the first time in Christianity, the term *collecta* was applied to a congregation of Christians, and Israel as a cultic body became a *positive* type of the Church."<sup>115</sup> This self-description was the first instance in which Christians used "Israel" not negatively, as a metaphor for a worldly community, but positively, as a prefiguration of proper Christian behavior in this world. Petilian, for example, compares the Donatists to the Maccabees and to Job, both of

---

<sup>114</sup> Novatian, *De cibis Iudaicis*, ed. Gustav Landgraf and Karl Friedrich Weyman (Leipzig: Teubner, 1898) 2.

<sup>115</sup> Maureen Tilley, "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity: From the Church of the Martyrs to the *Collecta* of the Desert," *J ECS* 5, no. 1 (1997): 21-35, at 27.



whom were willing to suffer greatly in order to remain ritually pure.<sup>116</sup> This could be turned around on their adversaries, too, as Petilian describes them as prefigured by the self-appointed priests who tried to take Moses' authority away while wandering the deserts.<sup>117</sup> They constantly cited scripture in their debates with their enemies that emphasized the ritual purity of the community of Israel.<sup>118</sup>

This image, unlike any provided by the Luciferians, was apparently quite successful in creating a uniquely Donatist identity. The broader Christian party in North Africa never used the term *collecta* to describe themselves, only ever availing themselves of it to describe Donatists (in perjorative terms, of course).<sup>119</sup> In a more general sense, Optatus argues against Donatist interpretations of themselves as the *collecta* of Israel with some frustration at their apparent praise of Jews.<sup>120</sup> Augustine complains at the Council of Carthage in 411 that Donatists call themselves the *collecta* of Israel and compare their catholic opponents to those who fell into idolatry during the wandering in the desert: "With these and examples of this sort, the heretics try to commend their own smallness."<sup>121</sup> But the fact that Augustine cites their example and critiques it suggests that Augustine did consider it a potentially threatening line of argument that needed to be

---

<sup>116</sup> Petilian, *Epistula ad presbyteros et diaconos*, ed. Paul Monceaux (in *Histoire littéraire*, 319-320), 6, 33.

<sup>117</sup> Pet. *Ep. ad presb. et diac.* 34 (Monceaux, 320).

<sup>118</sup> Tilley, "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity," 28-32.

<sup>119</sup> Tilley, "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity," 33-34.

<sup>120</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 4.9. It was not uncommon for catholics to link Donatists to Jews in their polemic: see also e.g. Opt. *De schism.* 7.4.9; Aug. *C. ep. Cresc.* 4.8.10, Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, ed. Karl Urba and Josef Zycha, CSEL 52 (Prague, Leipzig, and Vienna, 1902) 20.41, *Epistula ad catholicos de secta Donatistarum* (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas II*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52 (Vienna and Leipzig, 1909) 19.49; and discussion in Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 273-306. The connection was powerful enough to get Jews and Donatists linked in imperial law: *CTh* 16.5.44: *Donatistarum haereticorum et Iudaeorum nova adque inusitata detexit audacia...*

<sup>121</sup> *De unic. bapt.* 13.33 (CSEL 52:274). ...*His atque huiusmodi exemplis haeretici suam paucitatem commendare...*

addressed. He in fact does not address their specific metaphor, or attempt to recast it; Augustine finds himself limited to criticizing the Donatists for apparently decreeing that even holy men throughout the rest of the world were *not* a part of their community.<sup>122</sup> But if Augustine considered this use of the *collecta* potentially threatening, it also suggests that a major concern for the Donatists was interaction between members of their own community and the catholics. As we shall see, these concerns were not unfounded.

By contrast, the closest the Luciferians get to such a complete image is when Faustinus and Marcellinus suggest that they are the ones who uphold the ‘true faith,’ the *vera fides*.<sup>123</sup> They also twice use the phrase *vera ecclesia*, the ‘true church’ or ‘true community.’<sup>124</sup> But while we can see what this means – the true faith and the true church are the ones without *praevaricatores* – this is not a very compelling image. Every late antique Christian saw themselves as part of the *vera ecclesia* and their opponents as not. Without any further development, these two terms (*vera fides* and *vera ecclesia*) merely reflect their perception of the consequences of their opponents’ *praevaricatio*. They can hardly be said to represent the development of a new and distinct ecclesiology to justify their community’s separate existence the way that the *collecta* functioned for Donatists.

In sum, Christian scripture had become the central source from which ideas about communal identity were drawn. Moreover, these biblical images offered by Faustinus and Marcellinus and the Donatists both point to similar problems that one would expect in a rigorist community: how does one maintain that separation from other Christian

---

<sup>122</sup> *De unic. bapt.* 13.33 (CSEL 52:274): ...*et in sanctis Ecclesiae multitudinem toto orbe diffusam blasphemare non cessant.*

<sup>123</sup> *Lib. prec.* 61, 66, 68 (*vera religio*), 73, 91, 115, 116 (*vera religio*), 123.

<sup>124</sup> *Lib. prec.* 112, 123.

communities and prevent one's own members from crossing over to the other side, as it were? Both appeal to the same, expected solution – a reliance on biblical metaphors – but the Luciferians recast an image already in use by late antique Christians for the exact opposite purpose of its already common interpretation. The Donatists used not a singular image but an entire collection of images all revolving around the identification of their own community with the ritually pure *collecta* of Israel. This image was more potent in that it allowed for a larger variety of references and in that it was much more difficult for catholic authors like Augustine to dismantle. This was not one contested metaphor that could be re-interpreted, it was an entire worldview.

#### *Metaphors of Disease and Contamination*

Faustinus and Marcellinus also at one point refer to the 'uncontaminated faith' and once elsewhere to the 'uncontaminated people.'<sup>125</sup> These words may seem innocuous enough at first, but they betray deep-seated emotions about the society in which they lived. The language of disease and pollution reflects primeval human understandings of order and disorder within the universe, both physically and socially. What Douglas calls "pollution ideas" work at two levels.<sup>126</sup> In the first, disease functions as a means to enforce societal norms and "at this level the laws of nature are dragged in to sanction the moral code...this meteorological disaster is the effect of political disloyalty, that the effect of impiety..."<sup>127</sup> And we can certainly see this connection in Faustinus and Marcellinus' rhetorical question about the problems faced by Theodosius,

---

<sup>125</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77: *...intaminatae fidei...*, 84: *...intaminatae plebi...* Cf. *Lib. prec.* 56.

<sup>126</sup> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London and New York: Routledge, 1964; repr. 2002), 3.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*

undoubtedly referring to the movements of Visigoths within the Roman Empire and the usurper Magnus Maximus in the West: “And why are there so many blows by which the Roman world is shaken and pressed down on?”<sup>128</sup> The obvious answer is that their faith is *intaminata*, their enemies’ is therefore *contaminata*, and it is this contamination that causes the obvious disorder in the world.

Related to this is Douglas’ second level: “some pollutions are used as analogies for expressing a general view of the social order.”<sup>129</sup> One example Douglas makes is quite instructive: “Sometimes...bodily perfection can symbolise an ideal theocracy.”<sup>130</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus clearly see the Roman Empire as some kind of a theocracy: in the beginning of the petition they declare that Theodosius rules ‘by the will of God’ (*Dei nutu*) and near the end declare that Christ ‘chose him for the empire’ (*quem vere ad imperium Deus Christus elegit*).<sup>131</sup> When Faustinus and Marcellinus describe theirs as the ‘uncontaminated faith’ or ‘uncontaminated people,’ they are thus describing something much more than a lack of *praevaricatores* within their community. They are saying that as the only proper Christians they are the proper heart of a Christian Roman society.

We can see a similar motivation at work in the typical Novatian term for themselves: *katharoi* or *cathari*. That this was their own term for themselves is clear. The canons of the Council of Nicaea refer to “those calling themselves the ‘pure’ (*katharoi*),” an identification repeated in the canons of the Council of Constantinople, and Basil of

---

<sup>128</sup> *Lib. prec.* 112: *Et unde sunt tot plagae quibus orbis Romanus quatitur et urgetur?*

<sup>129</sup> *Purity and Danger*, 3.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>131</sup> *Lib. prec.* 2, 123. The refrain throughout the petition as well is that it is Theodosius’ job to enforce laws against heretics *correctly*, not that he should not be involved. Their view of the emperor and the Empire will be discussed at length in Chapter Four.

Caesarea simply calls them *katharoi*.<sup>132</sup> While no extended discussions of the term survive, the very fact that they built their own self-identification around it suggests its centrality. As a central term for defining themselves, in addition to *Christianus*, it clearly meant a great deal to Novatians that they were pure and that therefore their opponents were impure.

The Donatists also used the images of disease and pollution to define themselves against their enemies. The occasional, though not universal, Donatist practice of rebaptism suggests as much. More to the point, Donatus himself referred to the Roman governor/persecutor Gregory as “Gregory, the stain (*macula*) of the Senate.”<sup>133</sup> When Julian’s edict of toleration allowed Donatists to take their basilicas back from catholics, the results demonstrate that this was very much a matter of purity: their eucharists were desecrated, the chrism was thrown out of window and, quite significantly, the buildings and altars themselves were purified with salt and water and given a new coat of white paint (if the altars were not simply sold, as chalices often were).<sup>134</sup> This fear of contamination continued in the afterlife, as Donatist and catholic graveyards were strictly segregated by community.<sup>135</sup> Given that 4<sup>th</sup>-century burial grounds were *not* typically segregated by religious affiliation, this segregation reflects incredibly strong sentiments dividing the two communities.<sup>136</sup> Donatist bakers were even expected to refrain from

---

<sup>132</sup> Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, 409: Περὶ τῶν ὀνομαζόντων μὲν ἑαυτοὺς *Καθαροὺς*; Basil *Ep.* 188.1.

<sup>133</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 3.3: *Gregori, macula senatus...*

<sup>134</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 6.1-7; Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 190; Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 172.

<sup>135</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 4.5, 6.7; Aug. *En. in Ps.* 54.20, *Serm.* 46.7.15.

<sup>136</sup> On communal burial groups, see Rebillard, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, 35-56

baking bread for their catholic neighbors.<sup>137</sup> Even among Donatists this emphasis on purity could lead to schism, as when the primate Primian offered to the Donatist community at Rome, which had separated itself from the Donatist communion at large for an unclear reason, re-entry into the broader Donatist communion: “If Primian tried to broaden the range of persons who could be formally received as members of the church, then he was inviting ‘the impure’ to pollute its body.”<sup>138</sup> These actions all clearly demonstrate a fear of religious miasma spreading into their community.

This language was matched by the expressions of other Nicene Christians. In the third century, following the Decian persecution, Cyprian’s ally Caecilius stated that heretics’ “mouth and words spew cancer,” a point reiterated by another bishop, Munnulus.<sup>139</sup> Optatus himself says of heretics in general that they “corrupt the soundness of the faith with secretly creeping diseases.”<sup>140</sup> Specifically referring to the Donatists, Augustine tells us that they are “swollen with the disease of pride.”<sup>141</sup> These are but a handful of examples of a regular Christian trope used against heretics (as well as against pagans and Jews).<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> Aug. *C. ep. Pet.* 2.83.184. Augustine casts this as an attempt to starve the very small catholic population at Hippo, but the fact that the catholic population at Hippo was not particularly small and that Augustine inserts this right before proffering an example of Crispinus of Calama rebaptizing some 80 individuals.

<sup>138</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 112. Consider too the earlier divisions between Parmenian and Tyconius on much the same grounds: Tilley, “The Ecclesiologies of Parmenian and Tyconius.”

<sup>139</sup> *Sententiae episcoporum LXXXVII* (= PL 3:1052-1078, at 1055): ...*cuius os et verba cancer emittunt...* and *ibid.* (at 1060): *debent venientes ad Ecclesiam matrem nostram vere renasci et baptizari, ut cancer quod habebant et damnationis ira et erroris offectura per sanctum et coeleste Lavacrum sanctificetur.*

<sup>140</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 4.5: ...*[haeretici] qui subtili seductione verborum, morbis obscure serpentibus corrumperent fidei sanitatem...*

<sup>141</sup> *Serm.* 4.33: ...*typho superbiae tumuerunt...*

<sup>142</sup> In general, for antiquity, see Harold W. Attridge, “Pollution, Sin, Atonement, Salvation,” in S.I. Johnston, ed., *Religions of the Ancient World* (London: Belknap, 2004), 71-83. For Late Antiquity, see e.g. *ibid.*, 82-83, and Maijastina Kahlos, *Forbearance and Compulsion: The Rhetoric of Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2009), 36, 61-63, 70-76.

Among the Novatians and Donatists we can see that rigorists employed the language of disease to identify their opponents as ‘contaminated’ and, going back to Douglas, as therefore a part of society that must be removed so that the healthy parts can flourish. The Luciferians do this as well, but not often or with the vehemence of some of these other authors. While the words they use suggest this same deep-rooted fear of contamination, Faustinus and Marcellinus only make two references to their opponents using this language. While this metaphor in the *Libellus precum* also finds itself reflected in numerous other rejections of communion with other Nicene Christians, the actual fear of contamination seems relatively muted compared to the Novatians and Donatists.

### *Conclusions*

Generally speaking, Christian communities in Late Antiquity described each other in the terms of religion no matter what their religious issues with one another were. First of all, an apparent lack of differing doctrines or practices did not mean a lack of a *perceived* difference in these matters. If one wanted to identify and/or denigrate one’s enemy, one called him a heretic and named him after an individual, plainly and simply. This was not just window-dressing, either. Late antique Christians firmly believed that if someone was outside one’s own communion, that someone had to have some kind of doctrinal deviance.<sup>143</sup> It is clear from Augustine’s discomfort at the idea of a schism that was not also a heresy, discussed at the beginning of Chapter 3, that the very notion of separate Christian communities which held the same beliefs caused no small amount of unease in late antique Christian thought. Such a situation was unnatural to the late antique

---

<sup>143</sup> See Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” 107.

conception of social interaction. The fact that the most common terms of abuse other than ‘heretic’ were ‘pagan’ and ‘Jew’ reinforces the notion that in Late Antiquity, religious terminology dominated the lexicon of communal interaction.

We might consider the words of Jones here: “I would contend that under the later Roman Empire most people felt strongly on doctrinal issues and a high proportion had sufficient acquaintance with theology to argue about them with zest if without any deep understanding...As today and in all ages most people’s religious beliefs were determined by a variety of irrational influences.”<sup>144</sup> Jones’ own clearly skeptical religious beliefs aside, it seems likely that many of those who found theological distinctions so compelling in forming communal identities based on them did so with an imperfect understanding of the theology involved.<sup>145</sup> Calling someone a heretic was a far easier way to distinguish oneself from the vile enemy than actually explaining what it was exactly that made him heretical and why it was so important.

Belief was in large part how the social world of the late antique Roman mind was framed. The orthodoxy of the Luciferians did not mean that they appeared orthodox to their Nicene contemporaries, who described them and other rigorists in the exact same way that they described the doctrinally deviant – because, to reiterate, it was matters of doctrine that informed their perception of the world. In the names that Christians called each other and in the way they described one another and themselves, they again and

---

<sup>144</sup> Jones, “Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?” 298.

<sup>145</sup> On Jones’ beliefs, see Alexander Sarantis, “Arnold Hugh Martin Jones (1904-1970),” in David M. Gwynn, ed., *A.H.M. Jones and the Later Roman Empire*, Brill’s Series on the Early Middle Ages 15 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 3-24, at 22.



again reinforce the fact that whatever their actual differences may have been, they were perceived primarily as religious differences.

And yet, on balance, the Luciferians as represented by the *Libellus precum* were not particularly skillful in using these religious terms to distinguish their community. Their enemies quite easily labeled them as *Luciferiani*, but the fact that their enemies were also famous staunch supporters of the Nicene Creed like Athanasius and Hilary meant that they were limited in the degree to which they could apply such names to their enemies. By contrast, the Novatians, for example, were sometimes identified by another term, *kathari*. While still defining their community as some ‘other,’ the term *katharos* was a much less obviously ‘hereticizing’ term than *Novatiani*, and they apparently had some success in getting other Christians to use the term to describe them. Other Luciferian attempts at defining their opponents, most importantly the repeated use of the term *praevaricatores*, do not seem to have had the same power against other Nicene communities the way that the Donatist term *traditor* did. The Luciferians did not apparently force a debate over the issue of *praevaricatio* in the same way that the Donatists forced their enemies into a discussion of who the ‘real’ *traditores* were.

When it came to defining their own community, the Luciferians were also not as successful as their contemporaries. They claimed to be the true ‘catholic’ community, but could not justify their claim the way the Donatists could and chose not to reject the term outright as the Novatians did. The Donatists, furthermore, were able to provide a powerful metaphor for their community: the *collecta* of Israel. Their enemies’ reactions

against such self-definitions demonstrate its power, but we see only hints of a similar development among the Luciferians.

In Chapter 3, we saw how the Luciferians did not develop unique doctrines or practices that set them apart from other catholic Nicene Christians. In this chapter, we have seen how communities consistently defined themselves and others in religiously based terms. It seems as though the origins of the Luciferian community and subsequent lack of differentiation led to a situation wherein the Luciferians could not define their opponents in the same ways that their opponents could define them, could not find any unique ways of defining their opponents, and could not develop a unique sense of their own place within the religious landscape of the Roman world.

## Chapter 5: Asceticism and Ascetics

### *Introduction*

Doctrines and practices were only one way by which communities could distinguish themselves from one another; but as we have seen, even when communities did not hold distinct (or very distinct) doctrines and practices, they still defined themselves and their opponents in religious terms. This chapter is thus concerned with one such religious aspect of a Christian community in Late Antiquity: the role of asceticism and ascetics.<sup>1</sup> Following the legal tolerance and then imperial support granted to Christianity beginning in the early 4th century, the Christian world saw a transformation occur in which “white martyrdom,” ascetic practice, came to replace “red martyrdom,” the actual suffering of violence.<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that these strains of asceticism that flourished in the 4<sup>th</sup>-century had roots going back to the Jewish context of earliest Christianity, the contents of Christian texts written in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Asceticism is a notoriously difficult concept to define; here I use the definition provided by Richard Finn, *Asceticism in the Greco-Roman World: Key Themes in Ancient History* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1: “The loose definition of asceticism which I shall use is that of voluntary abstention from food and drink, sleep, wealth, or sexual activity.”

<sup>2</sup> On the white/red imagery, see Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 168-170. Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Sather Classical Lectures 55 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 68-73. The bibliography on asceticism is vast. See, among many others, Derwas Chitty, *The Desert a City: An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966); Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008; 2nd ed.); Susanna Elm, *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); the collection of essays in Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, eds., *Asceticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); William Harmless, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); A. Louth, “Holiness and Sanctity in the Early Church,” in Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon, eds., *Saints and Sanctity*, Studies in Church History 47 (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011), 1-18; Averil Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity 395-700 AD* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012; 2nd ed.), 76-81; Andrea Sterk, *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

the broader Greco-Roman tradition.<sup>3</sup> By the 4th century, just as violence against Christians was for the most part coming to an end, these tendencies were becoming stronger and stronger throughout the Roman world, and not just among Christians.

The Luciferians, like the Novatians and Donatists, fully agreed with their catholic contemporaries that the ascetic ideals of renunciation and abstention from the various temptations of the world were good. The Luciferians furthermore believed that dedicated ascetic men and women were important members of a Christian community and that groups of dedicated ascetics in monasteries were also important for their community. However, this attitude toward asceticism may have been ultimately detrimental to the Luciferian community. When examining the *Libellus precum*, one can see a large gap between the ideals of the Luciferian community and its apparent membership. While plenty of Luciferian men followed ascetic practices, the only dedicated ascetics found in the Luciferian petition are women, and the same pattern holds concerning their monasteries. This was important for two reasons: (1) ascetic men played a unique role in Christian communities in establishing and maintaining boundaries between communities, and (2) a lack of ascetic men and monasteries may have made the Luciferian community less attractive to potential converts. The Luciferians additionally did not offer anything uniquely appealing in their description of ascetic virtues, much as they did not offer any significantly different theological interpretations, as is clear when examining the ways they describe ascetic women. Furthermore, Luciferian arguments in favor of their community, based in their supposed rejection of wealth, and against other Nicene

---

<sup>3</sup> See the collection of essays entitled *Asceticism and the New Testament*, edited by Vaage and Wimbush.

Christians, whom they describe as universally greedy, were undermined by their hyperbole about their adversaries and the fact that plenty of wealthy individuals were a part of Luciferians communities. These factors may in part explain why the Luciferians were apparently so poor at proselytizing, particularly given that their proselytization was very much based in the ascetic virtues of their leaders. Their failure to actively expand their membership at a time when they leveled increasingly heavy expectations on their clergy to practice asceticism meant that the Luciferians, even by the time they delivered their petition, had a significant shortage of clergy that was unlikely to improve in the future. This lack of clergy, and of converts in general, would be detrimental to any Christian community in Late Antiquity.

It is easy to assume that the Luciferians would naturally be a part of this growing trend toward asceticism. But the late 4<sup>th</sup> century was a dramatically turbulent period regarding ascetic beliefs. As just one example, Hunter uses the Jovinianist controversy to demonstrate that Siricius, Ambrose, and Jerome each found different theological (and even personal) motives for the same conclusion: all clerics should be celibate.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, “Jovinian’s very popularity indicates that the consensus articulated by Siricius [on clerical celibacy] was not a consensus of the whole church.”<sup>5</sup> That the Luciferians adopted a favorable attitude toward ascetic practices represents only one avenue their community could have taken. Asceticism also could have demanded that society be completely up-ended; Krüger argues that the Luciferians could have, but did

---

<sup>4</sup> David G. Hunter, “Rereading the Jovinianist Controversy,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 453-470.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

not, promote such a reorganization of Roman society.<sup>6</sup> But the Luciferians neither rejected asceticism nor reorganized their society based around it; they practiced and described asceticism in much the same ways that their contemporaries did.

There is a need for attention throughout this chapter to the distinction between dedicated ascetics and individuals who practiced asceticism. Ascetic practices were not limited to solitary monks, or even monks in monasteries. Individuals living in towns and cities, and even prominent persons such as bishops, could likewise turn to asceticism to increase their own standing among God and men. In Late Antiquity, there was a growing tendency for a bishop's authority in particular to be linked to his ascetic practices. As Rapp writes, "Many bishops indeed made sincere efforts to justify their appointment and lend greater credibility to their activities by embracing a simple and modest lifestyle. In this way, they sought ascetic authority in order to bolster their pragmatic authority."<sup>7</sup> Rapp also distinguishes between three types of authority among late antique religious figures: pragmatic authority, that is, one's ability to get things done on behalf of others in social or economic terms; spiritual authority, that is, authority given to one from God independent of other individuals; and ascetic authority, that is, the authority derived from public appreciation of one's ascetic practice.<sup>8</sup> The three are interlinked, of course. A

---

<sup>6</sup> *Lucifer und das Schisma der Luciferianer*, 74: "Neben die Forderung der illibata und intaminata fides tritt so die Forderung der conversatio caelestis im streng asketischen Sinne; und wir werden sehen, dass in Ägypten eine luciferianische Gemeinde mit den dort sich ausbildenden Mönkskolonien nicht nur Fühlung unterhält, sondern dass sogar ein Mönch Bischof der Gemeinde wird. Das aber ist nun das Charakteristische: trotzdem ihr Ideal das gleiche war, glaubten die Luciferianer in anderen Formen verwirklichen zu können als die Mönche. Sie dachten nicht daran, die Organisation der katholischen Kirche fallen zu lassen. In Conventikeln und indem sie sich um ihren eigenen Bischof scharten als die wahre Kirche neben der Satanskirche, ohne Gemeinschaft mit ihr und doch in den gleichen Formen bestehend, glaubten sie ihr Ideal verwirklichen zu können."

<sup>7</sup> *Holy Bishops*, 149.

<sup>8</sup> *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 16-18.

bishop's practice of asceticism, for example, might prepare him to receive the spiritual grace that permitted and validated the acts he performed in his office.

Nevertheless, the dedicated ascetic played a unique and important role in late antique society. Particularly fervent practitioners of asceticism could become "holy men," to use Peter Brown's term, men and women living at the edges of society who "had achieved, usually through prolonged ascetic labour, an exceptional degree of closeness to God."<sup>9</sup> These holy men could work miracles and offer up efficacious intercessory prayers on behalf of those whose sins kept them more distant from God. These ascetic men and women were immensely popular figures who played many roles in Late Antiquity; living on the fringes of society, they were both a part of it and apart from it.

Among these roles, the two most important under consideration here are the roles ascetics played in creating and maintaining communal boundaries and the roles they played in attracting potential converts. The often did the former violently, by using the fact that they lived on the edges of society to excuse violent acts that served to highlight the differences between two communities.<sup>10</sup> Less violently, they also provided "an imaginative space" in which Christian communities might see themselves at their purest, knowing that the majority of the members of their communities would see their communal boundaries transgressed regularly in the course of day-to-day life.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Brown, *Authority and the Sacred*, 58.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 133, concerning a certain ascetic named Sergius: "Through Sergius' declaration and violent iteration of the proper communal boundary, awareness of that boundary and whatever it might mean for members of each community was awakened or simply preserved..."

<sup>11</sup> *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 123-124, or 133, once more about Sergius.

Ascetics could also play a direct role in attracting converts; According to Brown, a holy man in Late Antiquity might act as an arbiter or patron (whether vis-à-vis God or a man) but also as “a facilitator for the creation of new religious allegiances.”<sup>12</sup> One spectacular example might do, set at the foot of the pillar of Symeon the Stylite: “The Ismailites [Bedouins] came in bands, 200 in one, 300 in another, at times a thousand, disowning their ancestors’ fraudulence with a shout, shattering the icons that were holy to them before this man’s great light, withdrawing from the orgies of Aphrodite... They obtained the benefit of the sacraments, receiving the laws from that holy tongue [of Symeon].”<sup>13</sup> These images may seem peculiar to us, with hundreds of Arabs flocking to Constantinople in order to smash their altars at Symeon’s feet and become catechumens in the Christian faith instead. But they were not so peculiar to Theodoret and his audience; in fact, Theodoret tells us that he himself witnessed such events; he adds that he was once assailed by these converts when Symeon told them that Theodoret was a man of religious power and they immediately set to snatching pieces of his cloak and beard.<sup>14</sup> Ascetics were potentially very attractive figures.

Yet the Luciferians appear to have lacked such powerful figures living on the fringes of Roman society. While their bishops and other clerics embraced the ascetic life, and there are dedicated ascetic women in their midst, the Luciferians do not report any

---

<sup>12</sup> *Authority and the Sacred*, 60.

<sup>13</sup> Theod. *Hist. rel.* 26.13: Ἰσμαηλίται δὲ κατὰ συμμορίας ἀφικνούμενοι, διακόσιοι κατὰ ταῦτόν καὶ τριακόσιοι, ἔστι δ’ ὅτε καὶ χίλιοι, ἄρνοῦνται μὲν τὴν πατρίαν ἐξαπάτην μετὰ βοῆς, τὰ δὲ ὑπ’ ἐκείνων σεβασθέντα εἰδῶλα πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου ἐκείνου φωστήρος συντρίβοντες καὶ τοῖς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ὀργίοις ἀποταττόμενοι τούτου γὰρ ἀνέκαθεν τοῦ δαίμονος κατεδέξαντο τὴν λατρείαν τῶν θεῶν ἀπολαουσι μυστηρίων, νόμους παρὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης δεχόμενοι γλώττης. See Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984), 1-3. For another example, blending the violence and communal reinforcement, see Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 110, for a monk who forcibly converts the entire pagan population of Gaza.

<sup>14</sup> Theod. *Hist. rel.* 26.14.



such dedicated men as part of their community. Nor did they, as the Donatists did, simply reject the concept of monasticism and thus create a distinction between themselves and other Christian communities. Instead, the Luciferians praised the virtues of asceticism while seemingly unable to embrace it in the form that was to become dominant. It is this lack of distinction between the Luciferians and their catholic adversaries, the inability of the Luciferians to provide for these religious ideals that they were promoting, and the consequences of this failure, that I suggest contributed to the dissolution of their community.

#### *Luciferian Ascetic Men*

Throughout the *Libellus precum*, Faustinus and Marcellinus make note of the ascetic practices of their own community's members. They also frequently connect ascetic practice to one's personal orthodoxy and to one's personal ability to work miracles. None of the ideals the Luciferians promote nor the actions their individuals take were outside the norms for late antique Christian asceticism. It is also important to note that none of these individuals are dedicated ascetics; they are instead all clerics.

The first Luciferian of the 380s whom Faustinus and Marcellinus describe as an ascetic is Macarius of Rome, "a presbyter of remarkable restraint, not comforting his stomach with wine, nor tending to his body by eating meat, but mellowing his harder dishes with oil alone, emptying himself for fasts and prayers."<sup>15</sup> Both elements – extreme

---

<sup>15</sup> *Lib. prec. 78: presbyter mirae continentiae, non vino stomachum relevans, non carnis esculentia corpus curans, sed oleo solo escas asperiores mitigans, ieiuniis et orationibus vacans.*

fasting and constant prayer – were hallmarks of late antique asceticism.<sup>16</sup> Macarius, a presbyter, was by no means an extraordinary ascetic in the later 4<sup>th</sup> century.

Faustinus and Marcellinus also directly tie his ascetic practice to his orthodox faith and claim that these gave him the power to cast out demons: “Clearly, on behalf of the worthiness of his faith and his abstinence, he had the grace of the Holy Spirit in that he could cast out demons from possessed bodies.”<sup>17</sup> It was not unusual for Christian authors to attribute the ability to battle demons to rigorous ascetics, whose ‘zeal and virtue’ made them uniquely suited to the task.<sup>18</sup> Tying together Macarius’ *merito fidei* and *abstinentia* demonstrates that for the Luciferians, the grace of the Holy Spirit – what Rapp calls spiritual authority – was dependent on faith (i.e., orthodoxy) and ascetic practice. If spiritual authority is dependent on both of these qualities, it is incumbent on someone seeking spiritual authority that he both believe correctly *and* be an ascetic.

The Luciferians also connect ascetic practice with the ability to perform miracles. Faustinus and Marcellinus directly connect Lucifer’s lifestyle to his ability to perform miracles: “Since Lucifer believed, taught, and lived according to the Divine Scriptures,

---

<sup>16</sup> The bibliography is vast, but see, e.g., on fasting, Herbert Musurillo, “The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in Greek Patristic Writers,” *Traditio* 12 (1956): 1-64; Veronika E. Grimm, *From Feasting to Fasting: The Evolution of a Sin* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); Teresa M. Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998); and on prayer, Daniel Folger Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 83-125; Sterk, *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church*, 75; Guy S. Stroumsa, “On the Status of Books in Early Christianity,” in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell, eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 57-73.

<sup>17</sup> *Lib. prec.* 78: *Sane, pro merito fidei et abstinentia, habebat gratiam sancti Spiritus in hoc ut de obsessis corporibus eiceret daemona.*

<sup>18</sup> See, in general, David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), esp. 37-47.

he also worked miracles in the name of Christ.”<sup>19</sup> We might also consider as ‘miraculous’ the fact that following Lucifer’s visit to the *praevaricator* Zosimus’ see, Zosimus was thenceforth unable to speak until he resigned his episcopacy.<sup>20</sup> Rapp makes a distinction between the ability to perform miracles and asceticism thus: “His [Theodore of Sykeon’s] ascetic feats made evident his spiritual abilities to work miracles.”<sup>21</sup> But these categories reflected on one another; ascetic feats might make preexisting spiritual abilities evident, but they were also a means of acquiring the grace needed to work these miracles.<sup>22</sup>

Macarius is not the only Luciferian who engaged in ascetic practices. They attribute the origins of their community in Oxyrhynchus to the example of a certain Paul, discussed in Chapter 1, although what his ascetic practices were is decidedly less clear – Faustinus and Marcellinus merely connect him to Antony, implying that he too was an ascetic.<sup>23</sup> Paul is the closest figure to the Luciferians who represents a dedicated ascetic, but we know very little about him:<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> *Lib. prec.* 91: *cum Lucifer secundum Scripturas Divinas et crediderit et docuerit et vixerit et in nomine Christi sit virtutes operatus...*

<sup>20</sup> *Lib. prec.* 63-65. See Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 82: “Typically, a sinner who had suffered a divine punishment for some misdeed – in the form of paralysis, sudden voice loss, or some other ominous occurrence – approached the holy man with the request to be ‘loosed’ by him.” In this case, the order is reversed – Zosimus has been preaching to his congregation despite being ordained by Arians until Lucifer arrived.

<sup>21</sup> *Holy Bishops*, 165; but cf. 161-162, in which she describes Theodore’s abilities as a “gift” from God in recompense for his ascetic acts of extreme physical deprivation. This is an example of how the boundaries between Rapp’s discrete categories of spiritual and ascetic authority (and pragmatic authority) can easily be blurred.

<sup>22</sup> See on this mutual relationship Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 17-18: “The personal practice of asceticism prepares the individual for the receipt of the gifts of the spirit, and thus of spiritual authority, from God... Yet at the same time, asceticism is the gauge of the presence of spiritual authority.”

<sup>23</sup> *Lib. prec.* 93. It is interesting that the Luciferians do not simply claim Antony for themselves, as others (including Arians) did: see, e.g., Greg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, 139-151. On who exactly Paul was, see Chapter 1.

<sup>24</sup> *Lib. prec.* 94: *Ad hanc obseruantiam plerique eorum eruditi sunt exemplo et motu beatissimi Pauli, qui isdem fuit temporibus quibus et famosissimus ille Antonius, non minori uita neque studio neque diuina gratia quam fuit sanctus Antonius.*

Most of them [the Luciferians] learned to observe this [not holding communion with *praevaricatores*] by the example and inspiration of the most blessed Paul, who himself lived in the times in which that most famous Antony did as well. He had no less life, nor zeal, nor divine grace than holy Antony. That city, Oxyrhynchus, also knows this, which most devotedly celebrates the holy memory of Paul to this day.

This Paul does not seem to have been a Luciferian proper. He is said to have lived at the same time as Antony, which would put the general time of his life in the period before the Council of Alexandria in 362 (Antony died in 356).<sup>25</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also say that the whole city celebrates Paul, not just the Luciferian community there. Lastly, even the authors describe Paul as an ‘example and an inspiration’ rather than an explicit member of the community there. Paul is, on the other hand, a demonstration that the Luciferians did not have any particular objection to dedicated ascetic men. It is best to picture Paul as a figure not unlike Cyprian in the Donatist controversy: someone whom all sides of the conflict would attempt to claim as their own.

The two presbyters are much more clear concerning their bishop Heraclida: “He was simple in his lifestyle, devoted to God from the earliest age, who held worldly goods in contempt and lived as a man perfect in faith and doctrine.”<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, they say that Heraclida is like ‘one of that body of saints’ who, quoting Hebrews, “walked around like indigents in sheepskin and goatskin garments, assailed by troubles and pains, of whom

---

<sup>25</sup> Jer. Chron. 356/283<sup>rd</sup> Olympiad.

<sup>26</sup> Lib. prec. 94: ...*qui in vita esset perspicuus, a prima aetate Deo deserviens, contemptis bonis saecularibus et in fide et doctrina perfectus existens*. See too the statements in Lib. prec. 98: *qui Omnia saecularia respuens oblectamenta...aemulans dominica vestigial nudus expeditusque...nihil habens de saeculo quam pro fide tribulationes et dolores...*

the world was not worthy.”<sup>27</sup> In both cases concerning Heraclida the two once more explicitly connect one’s doctrinal orthodoxy with the importance of ascetic practice. The first passage sets up clear parallels linking the two: Heraclida is to be admired because he was simple in his lifestyle (ascetic) and devoted to God (orthodox), because he held worldly goods in contempt (ascetic) and had a perfect faith and doctrine (orthodox). Secondly, Faustinus and Marcellinus directly ground Heraclida’s status as ‘one of that body of saints’ in his adherence to a scriptural passage rooted in ascetic practice. These descriptions naturally have their antecedents in older biblical descriptions of the prophets, John the Baptist, and Jesus.<sup>28</sup> This connection is particularly obvious in that they describe Heraclida’s ascetic practices (and suffering) using the passage from Hebrews but make no reference to the other characteristics of the Old Testament heroes and prophets described in Hebrews 11, that is, their conquests, just administrations, miraculous abilities like quenching fire and raising the dead, ability to withstand torture, and so on. Faustinus and Marcellinus’ deliberate choice of which elements of Hebrews 11 to use reinforces the importance of Heraclida’s ascetic practice just as their citation of Scripture itself reinforces the connection between asceticism and orthodoxy. Thus in the figure of

---

<sup>27</sup> *Lib. prec. 97: Credite, religiosissimi imperatores, beatum Heraclidam unum esse de illo numero sanctorum de quibus refert Scriptura Diuina dicens, [Heb 11:37-38] Circuierunt in melotis et caprinis pellibus indigentes, in tribulationibus et doloribus afflicti, quorum non erat dignus mundus.*

<sup>28</sup> See, e.g., H. Dörries, “Die Bibel im ältesten Mönchtum,” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 11 (1947): 215-222; Susan Ashbrook Harvey, “The Holy and the Poor: Models from Early Syriac Christianity,” in Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg, eds., *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare* (Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994), 43-66, at 54; L. Perrone, “Scripture for a Life of Perfection: The Bible in Late Antique Monasticism: The Case of Palestine,” in Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu, eds., *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 318-417; Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 111.

Heraclida we can quite clearly see the Luciferians establish a direct connection between orthodoxy and asceticism.

Faustinus and Marcellinus give the bishop Ephesius less attention but still praise his ascetic lifestyle. Severus of Eleutheropolis “was led to admire Ephesius not only for the purity of his lifestyle but also by certain divine proofs.”<sup>29</sup> Once again, not only do Faustinus and Marcellinus highlight the lifestyle of Ephesius, but also directly connect it to miracles associated with him, as we have seen above in the cases of Macarius and Lucifer. It is also worth noting at this point that Severus is one of the few converts we *do* hear of, and he is converted not through the Luciferians’ theological or historical arguments but his ascetic lifestyle and the miracles associated with it. Though the Luciferians do not draw the connection to asceticism as clearly in this case, Ephesius is praised for his faith as well: “For the blessed Ephesius is of such faith and holiness that divine grace accompanies whoever goes to him.”<sup>30</sup> In other words, Ephesius was another member of the Luciferian community who is praised for being doctrinally orthodox and having a ‘pure lifestyle.’

The Luciferians were clearly in line with many of the beliefs and practices common among Nicene Christians of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. They constantly link asceticism and orthodoxy, making ascetic practice almost necessary in order to establish one’s personal orthodoxy. But in none of these examples are the ascetic Luciferians dedicated ascetics. Nor is there any mention of a monastery of any kind for male ascetics. They are instead

---

<sup>29</sup> *Lib. prec.* 105: ...ductus in eius admirationem non solum vitae eius puritate sed et quibusdam caelestibus documentis...

<sup>30</sup> *Lib. prec.* 105: ...est enim tantae fidei et sanctimoniae beatus Ephesius ut quocumque perrexerit, eum gratia divina comitetur.

clergy who have adopted certain ascetic practices. But bishops had social obligations that prevented them from fulfilling the roles described above that dedicated ascetics could fulfill within Christian communities.

#### *Novatian and Donatist Ascetic Men*

The Novatians, like the Luciferians, exhibited a tendency towards asceticism. In fact, Novatian himself probably engaged in some form of ascetic practice according to one interpretation of Novatian's conceptualization of 'clinical baptism.'<sup>31</sup> In any case, he was certainly the author of a treatise once attributed to Cyprian, *De bono pudicitiae*, the very title of which suggests Novatian advocated for continence when it came to sexual intercourse.<sup>32</sup> Whether or not Novatian practiced other elements of asceticism or argued for similar practices in other aspects of life, the ground was laid for a strongly ascetic strain among Novatianists in later years.

This strain apparently bore fruit relatively early. Unlike the Luciferians, these rigorists did count dedicated ascetic men among their ranks, not just clergy who also took part in ascetic practices, and from a very early date. Socrates describes a certain ascetic named Eutygian at length who lived in the reign of Constantine.<sup>33</sup> Socrates explicitly describes Eutygian as leading an ascetic, monastic life: "He was living the ascetic life, and healed the bodies and souls of many. And with him was the old man Auxanon, who

---

<sup>31</sup> Holger Hammerich, *Taufe und Askese: Der Taufaufschub in vorkonstantinischer Zeit* (diss. University of Hamburg, 1994), 143-145; see also Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 382.

<sup>32</sup> On the authorship of this treatise, see Bengt Melin, *Studia in Corpus Cyprianeum* (Uppsala, 1946), 6-9, 208-209. Novatian does not advocate for complete celibacy but at 4.1 makes an argument that would become common in the fourth century: virgins held the highest rank among Christians, continent Christians the second-highest, and Christians who had intercourse while married the third-highest.

<sup>33</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.

was very young at the time, was with him, learning about the monastic life from him.”<sup>34</sup>

This kind of dedicated ascetic, devoted to solitary life and instructing others in ascetic practices, is unheard of in the *Libellus precum*.

We should not, however, imagine that Eutychian was the leader of a monastery as we understand it. Organized monasticism is typically thought to have begun in earnest with Pachomius in roughly the year 320, providing Eutychian with a very narrow window in which to become a master of that kind of monastic life.<sup>35</sup> It is instead more likely that Socrates is a victim here of the vagaries of Greek. The phrase he uses, τοῦ μοναχικοῦ βίου, could indeed refer to a monastic way of life in the sense of an organized community of monks dwelling together, but it could also simply refer to a solitary life. His only other use of the phrase is equally vague.<sup>36</sup>

Novatian individuals dedicated to these ascetic practices, much like the individuals whom Faustinus and Marcellinus describe in the *Libellus precum*, were also known as miracle-workers. Socrates says that Eutychian performed miracles, including the healing miracles noted above.<sup>37</sup> He describes one miracle as being particularly impressive because Eutychian was able to free a man from a locked jail cell, the gates

---

<sup>34</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.5: ...ἔνθα ἦν καὶ ὁ Εὐτυχιανὸς τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀσκῶν πολλῶν τε τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐθεράπευεν. Συνῆν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ μακροβιώτατος Αὐξάνων, νέος ὢν πάνυ καὶ τὰ τοῦ μοναχικοῦ βίου ὑπ’ αὐτῷ παιδευόμενος.

<sup>35</sup> See, e.g., Philip Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010; 2nd ed.), 20; Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 115-163; James E. Goehring, “The Origins of Monasticism,” in Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata, eds., *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 235-255.

<sup>36</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.36: Μωϋσῆς τις ὄνομα, Σαρακηνὸς τὸ γένος, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸν μοναχικὸν μετερχόμενος βίον, ἐπ’ εὐλαβείᾳ καὶ πίστει καὶ τεραστίοις περιβόητος ἦν.

<sup>37</sup> And in a general sense, *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.1: ...παραπλήσια ἔργα ποιῶν ἐθαυμάζετο, where ‘similar’ (παραπλήσια) refers to miracles performed by Spyridon of Trimithus (a city on Cyprus); at 1.13.5 he is said to heal both bodies and souls; and at 1.13.6, again more generally: Καὶ γὰρ ἐληλύθει εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ βασιλέως τὰ παρὰ Εὐτυχιανοῦ γινόμενα θαύματα.



opening by the divine grace that attended the ascetic.<sup>38</sup> Eutychian was able to translate this ability to pragmatic matters, as well, as Eutychian was able to successfully request that Constantine pardon the freed prisoner.<sup>39</sup> Thus we can see in the story of Eutychian the combination of ascetic, religious, and pragmatic authority that combined in these late antique holy men: his ascetic practice allows him in a spiritual sense to work miracles and in a pragmatic sense to successfully petition the emperor.<sup>40</sup>

Socrates also regularly praises later Novatian bishops and other leaders for their modesty and restraint and connects this to their orthodoxy. Agelius, bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople under Valens, “lived the apostolic life, for he always went around barefoot, used only one coat, and guarded the word of the Gospel.”<sup>41</sup> This description is not unlike the Luciferian description of Heraclida, quoted above, taken from Hebrews 11, as resembling one of the saints from Scripture who “walked around like indigents in sheepskin and goatskin garments.”<sup>42</sup> As with the Luciferians described above, Socrates directly connects his ascetic practices to his orthodoxy by describing the ‘apostolic life’ as a combination of ascetic practice and orthodox.

---

<sup>38</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.

<sup>39</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.13.

<sup>40</sup> Note that for Socrates, these two are equal in their significance. There is no cynical dismissal of his miracle-working in favor of the more ‘obvious’ benefit he can work at the emperor’s court, but neither does his actual ability to work miracles overshadow his role as a go-between with the emperor. Eutychian and those like him, in their ability to transform ascetic practice into practical action, are 4<sup>th</sup>-century predecessors of what Brown calls “one of those many surprising devices by which men in a vigorous and sophisticated society...set about the delicate business of living” (“The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity,” *JRS* 61 (1971): 80-101, at 82). Brown’s work focuses on the ascetics of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries, but describes a system already in place. Figures like Eutychian help explain how that system emerged.

<sup>41</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.9.3: ...βίον ἀποστολικὸν βιούς· ἀνυπόδητος γὰρ διόλου διῆγεν καὶ ἐνὶ χιτῶνι ἐκέχρητο, τὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φυλάττων ῥητόν.

<sup>42</sup> *Lib. prec.* 97: *Credite, religiosissimi imperatores, beatum Heraclidam unum esse de illo numero sanctorum de quibus refert Scriptura Diuina dicens, [Heb 11:37-38] Circuierunt in melotis et caprinis pellibus indigentes, in tribulationibus et doloribus afflicti, quorum non erat dignus mundus.*

Paul, another bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople whom Socrates describes, was also a renowned ascetic: “He was formerly a teacher of Latin, but later he bid farewell to grammar and turned intent on the ascetic life, establishing a monastery of eager men, and lived in a way not so different from the monks in the desert.”<sup>43</sup> In this case, unlike with Eutychian above, Socrates does use the word μοναστήριον, so we may imagine that here he does in fact mean an organized community of ascetics. Socrates does not here explicitly describe Paul’s orthodoxy in connection with his ascetic practice. But he does describe two miracles performed by Paul, the first immediately following the lengthy description of Paul’s ascetic practices, thus directly connecting his performing a miracle to his ascetic practices in the mind of the reader. In the story, a Jewish man repeatedly undergoes Christian baptism to enrich himself, presumably from gifts offered at the ceremony; when he attempts the trick at Paul’s church, the water in the baptismal font continues to disappear until Paul calls him “either an evildoer or ignorant that he has already been baptized” and a member of the audience recognizes that the man was baptized in the catholic Atticus’ church not long before.<sup>44</sup> While we might wonder if this is Paul’s doing or just God’s, Socrates specifically says, “Such was the portent done by the hands of Paul, the bishop of the Novatians.”<sup>45</sup> Thus in this case, Paul’s asceticism is directly connected with his abilities to work miracles.

---

<sup>43</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.17.2: ...ὅς πρότερον μὲν λόγων Ῥωμαϊκῶν διδάσκαλος ἦν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πολλὰ χαίρειν τῆ γραμματικῆ φράσας ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσκητικὸν ἐπάτη βίον καὶ συστησάμενος ἀνδρῶν σπουδαίων μοναστήριον οὐκ ἀλλοιότερον τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μοναχῶν διετέλει.

<sup>44</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.17. The specific words by which Paul accuses the Jewish man are, “Ἡ κακουργεῖς, ἔφη, ὃ ἄνθρωπε, ἢ ἀγνοῶν ἤδη τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἔτυχες.”

<sup>45</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.17: Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν τὸ τεράστιον ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῶν Ναυατιανῶν Παύλου ἐγένετο.

The same Paul also saved a Novatian church in Constantinople while a fire raged all around it, jumping onto the altar and publicly entrusting the basilica to God; although the surrounding buildings were destroyed, the church was preserved unharmed.<sup>46</sup> Even after two days, the fire did no damage and Paul's reputation – and the reputation of the Novatians in general – was greatly augmented: “On account of the occurrence of the marvel that they saw, almost everyone – not only Christians, but even most of the pagans – agreed to revere that place as truly holy from that point on.”<sup>47</sup> This incident, however, is not as directly connected to Paul's activities as an ascetic as the preceding story was; while Paul performs the miracle, it works because he is “beloved by God” (θεοφιλοῦς). On the other hand, Socrates regularly refers to Paul's asceticism elsewhere, and the fact that Paul stood on the altar “he did not cease to pray” (διέλιπεν εὐχόμενος), which certainly echoes the ascetic practice of constant prayer described above.

Another example where a Novatian's ascetic authority was connected to his religious authority is the case of Sabbatius, a Novatian presbyter who led a group of Novatians who used the Jewish calculation of Passover for Easter. “And first, he retired from the church, using the ascetic life as his cover, saying that he was grieved on account of those whom he suspected were not worthy of sharing in the sacraments.”<sup>48</sup> We might wonder if Socrates describes Sabbatius' withdrawal as ‘cover’ for polemical reasons. Regardless, it is still clear that Sabbatius' ascetic practice here is directly connected to his spiritual authority. It is not enough that he simply separate himself from these supposed

---

<sup>46</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.39.

<sup>47</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.39: Σχεδόν τε πάντες διὰ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῆς συμβῆναι θαῦμα τιμῶσιν ἐξ ἐκείνου τὸν τόπον, καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἅγιον προσκυνοῦσιν, οὐ μόνον Χριστιανοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνιζόντων οἱ πλείονες.

<sup>48</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 5.21: Καὶ πρότερον μὲν προκαλύμματι χρώμενος τῇ ἀσκήσει, τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπανεχώρει, ‘λυπεῖσθαι’ λέγων ‘πρὸς τινὰς· ὑπονοεῖν γὰρ αὐτοὺς μὴ ἀξίους εἶναι τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίας.’

unworthies, he must in some way ‘cleanse’ himself through ascetic practice. It is certainly worth noting that Sabbatius did not just adopt ascetic practices, he withdrew from his duties as a cleric; something about the dedicated lifestyle was more valuable than simply incorporating these practices into his clerical life.

Conversely, Novatian bishops who were not practicing ascetics faced questions as to why they were not. Sisinnius, for instance, was asked why he bathed twice a day and why he wore white clothes.<sup>49</sup> Sisinnius’ witty repartees aside, the fact that he was asked these questions also suggests that there was an element within the population of Constantinople that expected him to act like an ascetic, not a wealthy man. Socrates also reports that “with respect to his way of life, he was not simple; but he lived extravagantly in the greatest moderation.”<sup>50</sup> Even in Sisinnius’ relatively luxurious lifestyle there was room from *askesis*! Sisinnius also jokes about what a burden preaching is, and while this may just be a man complaining about the duties of his chosen occupation, Augustine for example complained at length that pastoral duties distracted him from a more ascetic life.<sup>51</sup>

Thus for the Novatians, while asceticism played a role within the community, it did not have the same centrality it did among the Luciferians. While there was some sense of a connection between orthodoxy and asceticism, it does not seem as pronounced

---

<sup>49</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.22: Καὶ ποτὲ ἐρομένου αὐτὸν τινός, ‘τοῦ χάριν ἐπίσκοπος ὢν δις λούοιτο τῆς ἡμέρας,’ ‘Ἐπειδὴ τρίτον οὐ φθάνει,’ ἀπεκρίνατο. Ἄλλοτε δὲ Ἀρσάκιον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον κατὰ τιμὴν ὄρων, ἠρωτήθη ὑπὸ τινος τῶν περὶ Ἀρσάκιον, ‘διὰ τί ἀνοίκειον ἐπισκόπῳ ἐσθῆτα φοροῖν, καὶ ποῦ γέγραπται λευκὰ τὸν ἱερωμένον ἀμφιέννυσθαι.’ Ὁ δὲ, ‘Σὺ πρότερον,’ ἔφη, ‘εἶπε ποῦ γέγραπται μέλαιναν ἐσθῆτα φορεῖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον.’

<sup>50</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.22: Τὴν δὲ δίαιταν ἦν οὐ λιτός· ἀλλ’ ἐν ἄκρῳ σωφροσύνῃ πολυτελεῖ ταύτῃ ἐκέχρητο.

<sup>51</sup> Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, ed. and trans. Herbert T. Weiskotten (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1919), 19.

(at least in the figure of Sisinnius) as it was in the case of the Luciferians. We hear of one dedicated ascetic, Eutychian, but far more common are Novatian clerics who practiced asceticism. While the Novatians approved of asceticism, they did not demand it, and their members did not necessarily consider it the centerpiece of their community's identity.

The Donatists, too, believed that asceticism was a virtuous practice. Frend even directly connects the asceticism practiced by Donatists and that practiced by the Novatians as reflective of “a common stream of Christian thought both in respect of economic background and belief.”<sup>52</sup> The evidence for Donatist asceticism is not as rich, and mainly comes from their enemies. As many late antique Christians considered asceticism a form of martyrdom in an age without persecution, it makes sense that the Donatist martyr stories, our main surviving Donatist literature, would emphasize the perseverance of Donatist martyrs in the face of physical violence rather than ascetic deprivation. Nonetheless, if the Donatists did count dedicated ascetic men in their ranks, they did not play as central a role in the Donatist imagination as they did for other Christians.

The only real mention of Donatist ascetic tendencies among men (ascetic women are discussed below) in the martyr stories comes in the *Passio Marculi*, in which the bishop Marculus is described as “ending the last day of that four-day period by fasting, clearly so that...the devoted soul of the priest might be made a more acceptable sacrifice to God.”<sup>53</sup> Marculus is also said to have “rejected the world” when he first became a

---

<sup>52</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 334.

<sup>53</sup> *Passio Marculi* (= PL 8.760-766) 7: *Adhuc etiam spiritalem iustitiam sitiens, et promerendo Deo totus inserviens, ultimum quadridui illius diem ieiunio terminavit, scilicet ut illucescente Dominico, in quo erat*

Christian, though what specifically worldly things he was rejecting is left to the reader's imagination.<sup>54</sup> Lastly, according to the catholic Possidius, Donatist churches frequently had dedicated ascetics as part of their congregations, though he calls these *circumcelliones* and identifies them with wandering bands of circumcellions who terrorized the North African countryside in Late Antiquity.<sup>55</sup> Isidore claims that the circumcellions were monks and dressed appropriately.<sup>56</sup> Nothing in these descriptions seems particularly out of line with general ascetic tendencies in Late Antiquity, and nothing directly connects Donatist asceticism with Donatist orthodoxy. Furthermore, it is interesting to note how few mentions of ascetic practice there are in the martyr stories. One might have imagined that Donatist martyr accounts would emphasize asceticism as 'practice' leading up to the actual martyrdom, much as the Luciferian *Libellus precum* focuses on Macarius' ascetic practices before describing his persecution.

The Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists, then, all had in common a definite tendency towards ascetic practice. Furthermore, members of all three communities believed, like many late antique Christians, that ascetic practice put their members in better standing with God. In many cases, this ascetic practice also led God to grant them the ability to perform miracles. None of these beliefs were outside the norms of most late antique Nicene Christians. But compared to the other two communities, the Luciferians

---

*et ipsius passio consummanda, ad offerendum geminum sacrificium acceptior Deo fieret devota anima sacerdotis.*

<sup>54</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 16: ...*in primordiis fidei renuntians mundo...*

<sup>55</sup> *Poss. V. Aug.* 10. On the exceedingly complicated question of the identity of the circumcellions and their relationship to the Donatists, see Chapter 6 and Brent Shaw, "Bad Boys: Circumcellions and Fictive Violence," in H.A. Drake, ed., *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), 179-197, and *Sacred Violence*, 630-674.

<sup>56</sup> Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCSL 113 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989) 2.15: *Quantum genus [monachorum] est circumcellionum, qui habitu monachorum usquequaque vagantur.*

particularly connected ascetic practice with orthodoxy; the one validated the other. While we can see this tendency among catholic Nicene authors, it does not seem as pronounced among the Novatians and Donatists. Yet among the Luciferians, we find no dedicated ascetic men as we do with the Novatians. The Donatists may have had dedicated ascetic men in their ranks, but the evidence is uncertain. A combination of the central importance of asceticism in the Luciferian community and this apparent lack of dedicated ascetics may have left the Luciferians promoting these figures without being able to point to specifically Luciferian ones.

#### *Ascetic Women in the Luciferian, Novatian, and Donatist Communities*

We can clearly see how Luciferian attitudes toward ascetic women reflected general late antique attitudes toward asceticism and women rather than creating anything particularly unique. Faustinus and Marcellinus connect asceticism and orthodoxy, as above, but also used very traditional Roman interpretations of the ascetic figure to counterbalance the very transgressive nature of such figures. And female ascetics were far more potentially transgressive than men. In some respects, ascetic women even shared many characteristics with men; in fact, it was not uncommon for authors to refer to the “manly” qualities of ascetic women.<sup>57</sup> But in other respects, women who practiced asceticism were still often cast in feminine roles by male authors: “A woman’s decision

---

<sup>57</sup> See Karen Jo Torjesen, “Martyrs, Ascetics, and Gnostics: Gender Crossing in Early Christianity,” in Sabrina Ramet, ed., *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 79-91, at 82-87, especially 83: “Because the inferiority of women and their subordination to men was directly linked to their reproductive sexuality, by renouncing the body and sexuality and following the ascetic life, women seemed to transcend their femaleness... women who could sustain the physical rigors of fasting, the sleeplessness of the vigil, and the deprivation of poverty were praised for demonstrating masculine virility.” See also David Brakke, “The Lady Appears: Materializations of ‘Woman’ in Early Monastic Literature,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 387-402.

to become a ‘virgin of God’ is phrased in terms of an engagement and marriage to Christ; members of the clergy progressively adopt a role which can be seen as spiritual fatherhood.”<sup>58</sup> Thus the transgressive female ascetic can be cast as a normative figure; thus asceticism, and with it the rejection of society, need not demand a revolutionary new approach to society. Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Hermione as a very normative figure quite in line with the development of Christian (male) thought on the place of ascetic women that allowed them to incorporate the asceticism they identified with orthodoxy without destabilizing their community – or providing any unique, and attractive, interpretations concerning the ideal organization of a Christian community.

As noted above, there are no accounts of men in Luciferian communities specifically dedicated to the ascetic life. The *Libellus precum* does, however, describe an individual dedicated ascetic woman, Hermione of Eleutheropolis, at great length. Firstly, however, the authors present Hermione not just as an ascetic woman, but an ascetic noblewoman whose asceticism made her more noble. Faustinus and Marcellinus’ first description of Hermione in the *Libellus precum* is as follows: “In Palestine, in Eleutheropolis, there is a sacred virgin of Christ, Hermione. She was certainly born noble

---

<sup>58</sup> Elm, *Virgins of God*, 374. On the image of the ‘bride of Christ,’ see David Hunter, “The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine,” *Church History* 69, no. 2 (2000): 281-303. A common, related scriptural topic was the Song of Songs, which, despite its sexual imagery, was frequently used as a representation of the soul’s bond with the Word of God (who was rarely named Jesus in these discussions, to avoid making the sexual language too connected with the Word as an incarnate human): see Franca F. Consolino, “Veni huc a Libano: La Sponsa del Cantico dei Cantici come modello per le vergini negli scritti esortatori de Ambrogio,” *Athenaeum* 62 (1984): 399-415, and F.B.A. Asiedu, “The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism,” *VC* 55, no. 3 (2001): 301-06.



in her lineage, but was made much more noble by her faith and sanctity.”<sup>59</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus are here taking advantage of a common argument made by ascetics to the late antique aristocracy: nobility granted by birth is good, but ascetic practice is superior and functions as an adornment to the nobility of birth. This new definition of *nobilitas* was likewise not a uniquely Luciferian invention, appearing in the late fourth century in Jerome, Probus, Ausonius, Augustine, and many others.<sup>60</sup> In these cases, as with the Luciferian case, this was one way to make something very ‘un-Roman’ seem very normative; rather than casting aside her traditional role as an aristocrat, Hermione is simply amplifying it. Despite their rhetorical hatred of wealth, and Hermione’s abandonment of her affluence, Faustinus and Marcellinus are explicitly not rejecting the class-based society of Rome.

The next part of their description of Hermione is fairly generic, and connects her virginity with a rejection of worldly things: “She carefully adorns her virginity with contempt for the affairs of this age and for human glory, to which many aspire, even those who glory that they have renounced this age and the desiring of the flesh.”<sup>61</sup> The Luciferians take another jab at those who do desire earthly belongings, in this case glory, a running theme throughout the petition. Otherwise, this description merely informs us that Hermione’s ascetic practice of remaining a virgin carried with it other ascetic practices as well.

---

<sup>59</sup> *Lib. prec.* 102: ...*apud Palestinaum in Eleutheropolim est sacra virgo Christi nomine Hermione generosis quidem edita natalibus, sed fide et sanctimonia multum facta generosior...*

<sup>60</sup> See the discussion in Michele R. Salzman, “Competing Claims to ‘Nobilitas’ in the Western Empire of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries,” *J ECS* 9, no. 3 (2001): 359-385

<sup>61</sup> *Lib. prec.* 102: *ipsam virginitatem condecorans contemptu rerum saecularium et humanae gloriae, ad quam plerique affectant, etiam qui se saeculo et concupiscentiae carnis adnuntiassent gloriantur.*

Her virginal status is connected with her faith in a way not dissimilar with how we have seen this connection drawn for male ascetics: “As much as she guards the chastity of her body with holy rigor, so much does she protect the purity of her soul with her chaste observation of the pious faith.”<sup>62</sup> By the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, Christian councils were compiling rules about dedicated virgins who broke their vows. Rules varied by region; in Spain, for example, if a virgin did not guard the chastity of her body, she might be refused communion, even on her deathbed.<sup>63</sup> In Ancyra, in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, punishment was much more lenient; by the time Basil was writing, in the 370s, he recommended in one letter excommunicating lapsed virgins as if they were adulterers, that is, for 15 years.<sup>64</sup> In other words, this physical virginity was by no means unimportant to late antique men, and it is understandable why Faustinus and Marcellinus stress Hermione’s so heavily to Theodosius. It is also possible that this attitude was appealing to potential female converts; women in a number of late antique accounts deliberately proclaim their asceticism in the face of unappealing arranged marriages.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> *Lib. prec.* 103: *Haec, in quantum castimoniam corporis sacro rigore custodit, in tantum animae puritatem casta piae fidei observatione conservat...*

<sup>63</sup> Canon 13 of the Council of Elvira (= Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, p. 151): *Virgines quae se Deo dicaverunt, si pactum perdiderint virginitatis atque eidem libidini servierint, non intelligentes quid admiserint, placuit nec in finem eis dandam esse communionem.* But, the canon continues somewhat tellingly, if she has only broken her vow to remain a virgin once, and only once, she can be readmitted to communion on her deathbed: *Quod si semel persuasae aut infirmi corporis lapsu vitiatae omni tempore vitae suae hujusmodi foeminae egerint poenitentiam, ut abstineant se a coitu, eo quod lapsae potius videantur, placuit eas in finem communionem accipere debere.* See Elm, *Virgins of God*, 25-29.

<sup>64</sup> *Ep.* 199.18: Οὐκοῦν, ἡ μὲν χήρα, ὡς δούλη διεφθαρμένη, καταδικάζεται, ἡ δὲ παρθένος, τῷ κρίματι τῆς μοιχαλίδος ὑπόκειται. On the accepted length of punishment for adultery, see *Ep.* 217.58. The man who slept with the dedicated virgin suffered the same penalty. But cf. *Ep.* 46, discussed below, in which he threatens and pleads with a lapsed virgin to repent immediately, making no mention of any 15-year period of excommunication.

<sup>65</sup> See, e.g., *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (= Jeremy W. Barrier, ed., *The Acts of Paul and Thecla: A Critical Introduction and Commentary* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009]) 2, and again at 7; Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macrini* (= PG 46.959-1000) 5-6, where Macrina’s fiancé is described in very negative terms before his death; see also Gregory of Nyssa, *De virginitate* (= PG 46.317-416) 2-3 which presents virginity as

Yet however important her physical virginity was, it was not the most important aspect of her ascetic practice. Faustinus and Marcellinus in the same passage directly link her bodily virginity to her spiritual ‘virginity.’ The maintenance of the former is obvious enough, but the maintenance of the latter the Luciferians explain in great detail, connecting Hermione’s attitude towards heresy directly to her physical virginity.<sup>66</sup>

She does not hold communion with heretics, nor with traitors, because she knows that the virginity of her body will not benefit her at all unless she also looks to the integrity of her soul with a holy confession, flees from the disgrace of adulterous communion, and follows the salutary sacraments of the faithful priests.

This is the culmination of their description of Hermione. First of all, there is the definition of spiritual virginity: it consists of three items, namely, one’s confession (i.e., the Nicene formula), one’s communion group, and one’s participation in the sacraments with the correct priests. The latter two are intrinsically tied, of course, meaning that the actual definition could be reduced to (a) Nicene confession and (b) communion with the proper priests. Taken together, this might simply be labeled “orthodoxy.” If Hermione practiced asceticism in the form of chastity, but was not orthodox, then her chastity was meaningless. Ascetic practice was only valid within spiritual orthodoxy.

The belief that one’s physical virginity was meaningless without correct spiritual beliefs was, unsurprisingly, common among other Christian authors as well. Jerome, for

---

liberating for women. See also Ville Vuolanto, *Children and Asceticism in Late Antiquity: Continuity, Family Dynamics, and the Rise of Christianity* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2015), 91-92. Men, too, might be attracted by this, as the prestige of having a female ascetic in the household grew: see, e.g., Jer. *Ep.* 107.3, 130; Aug. *Ep.* 150; Pelagius, *Epistula ad Demetrias* (= PL 30.15-45 and PL 33.1099-1120); Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Martini* (= *Libri qui supersunt*, ed. Karl Halm, CSEL 1 [Vienna, 1866]) 19.

<sup>66</sup> *Lib. prec.* 103: *...non haereticis, non praevaricatoribus communicans, eo quod intellegat virginitatem corporis nihil prodesse nisi et integritatem animae sacra confessione tueatur, labem adulterinae communionis effugiens et sectans salutaria sacramenta fidelium sacerdotum.*

instance, writes to Eustochium, “Besides, the kind of virgins that are said to be among the various heresies and the vilest Manichee ought to be considered prostitutes, not virgins...Antichrist falsely asserts that he is Christ and they cloak the shame of their life with a deceitfully honorable name.”<sup>67</sup> In other words, women who practice asceticism outside the bounds of Jerome’s communion group are, essentially, committing adultery on a grand scale and using their professed asceticism only as cover. Moreover, this interpretation could even be cast in reverse. In the aforementioned letter of Basil, he does not respect the virginity of heretical ascetics at all: “Any women who swear to remain virgins while in heresy, and then later preferred marriage, I do not reckon that they should be condemned. For *Whatever the Law says, it says to those in the Law*. And those who have in no way gone under the yoke of Christ have not recognized the code of the Lord, either.”<sup>68</sup> Thus for Basil, orthodoxy is so integral to chastity that a failure to remain chaste while in a state of unorthodoxy was no failure at all.

Returning to the *Libellus precum*, the passage clearly defines what we might call a ‘hierarchy of virginity’ in which spiritual ‘virginity’ is reckoned above even actual physical virginity. The efficacy of the latter in ‘benefiting’ Hermione is invalidated if she communicates with heretics, but Faustinus and Marcellinus do not claim the converse, that a violation of her physical virginity would call into question her spiritual ‘virginity.’ Physical virginity is valuable and ‘benefits’ Hermione, but ‘spiritual’ virginity is of

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ep.* 22.38: *Ceterum virgines, quales apud diversas hereses et quales apud impurissimum Manicheum esse dicuntur, scorta sunt aestimanda, non virgines... Christum mentitur antichristus et turpitudinem vitae falso nominis honore convestiunt.*

<sup>68</sup> *Ep.* 199.20: Ὅσαι γυναῖκες, ἐν αἱρέσει οὐσαι, παρθενίαν ὁμολόγησαν, εἴτα μετὰ ταῦτα γάμον ἀνθείλοντο, οὐχ ἡγοῦμαι χρῆναι καταδικάζεσθαι ταύτας. Ὅσα γὰρ ὁ νόμος λαλεῖ, τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ. Αἱ δὲ μήπως ὑπελθοῦσαι τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐδὲ τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἐπιγινώσκουσι τοῦ Δεσπότου..

greater concern. We can see hints of this same attitude in another letter of Basil written to a lapsed virgin. In it, he ignores the lengthy excommunication he recommended above, and alternately threatens and pleads with her to return to her ascetic practice as best she can.<sup>69</sup> As Elm writes, “her fall has irreversibly destroyed her physical purity, yet the purity of her soul, the only aspect that matters, may, through true repentance and divine grace, be restored.” So, as the Luciferians imply, there is a definite hierarchy at work in the ways men treated female asceticism. The preservation of physical virginity was very important, yes, but slightly less important than maintaining proper theological beliefs.<sup>70</sup> This nuance is interesting in light of the preceding discussion of male ascetics, in which the Luciferians almost universally castigate the heretical as greedy and praise the orthodox as ascetic. Not only is there little to no emphasis on the sexual chastity of Luciferian ascetic men, there is no room for a Luciferian who might be orthodox and *not* an ascetic.

The importance of ascetic women to the Luciferian community is demonstrated by the fact that Faustinus and Marcellinus directly describe ongoing persecution of them in both Oxyrhynchus and Eleutheropolis. They first relate the actions of Theodore in Oxyrhynchus: “And it would take a long time to report the things which [Theodore] worked against the modesty and intention of the holy virgins.”<sup>71</sup> As for Hermione, according to the two presbyters, Turbo “even tries to persecute the holy virgin, Hermione, too. Anyone who has known that woman has admired her as though she was one of the

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ep.* 46. The classic argument for a hierarchy of states with virginity at the top is Jerome, *Adversus Helvidium* (= PL 23.183-206) and *Ep.* 22.

<sup>70</sup> See too Basil’s eagerness to convince the *kanonikai* of Colonia of the rightness of the *homoousios* formula: *Ep.* 52; Elm, *Virgins of God*, 145-148.

<sup>71</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99: *Et longum est referri quae contra pudorem propositumve sacrarum virginum molitus est...*

women in the Gospel.”<sup>72</sup> Of course, it makes sense to emphasize this detail. Faustinus and Marcellinus can clearly make some rhetorical points in their favor with Theodosius by painting their enemies as persecutors of innocent, virginal women. In the case of Oxyrhynchus, this sexualization of their account of persecution is relatively explicit, as the Luciferians specifically state that Theodore was acting against their *pudor*. The word used to describe Turbo’s behavior at Eleutheropolis, *insequi*, is suitably vague, but does appear in classical poetry as a metaphor for sexual pursuit.<sup>73</sup> But it is also significant that Turbo deliberately persecuted a woman of high social standing who was an ascetic member of this Luciferian community; such a target could be dangerous, which indicates the concern he must have had over her presence.

In sum, the ascetic women described in the *Libellus precum* demonstrate once again that the Luciferians were quite in line with the beliefs of other Nicene contemporaries. In this case, however, we can at least see some examples of dedicated ascetic women. There are even hints of the authors using the ascetic women in their petition to appeal to the sensibilities of those who might be considering the ascetic life for themselves or their family members. But the power of the ascetic was in his or her transgressive nature. Faustinus and Marcellinus, like so many other Christian authors of the time, undermine that transgressive nature by casting it in terms and relationships that signified traditional values.

#### *Novation and Donatist Ascetic Women*

---

<sup>72</sup> *Lib. prec.* 108: *Temptat quoque et sacram virginem Hermionem insequi, illam feminam quam quicumque didicit, ut aliquam de evangelicis feminis admiratus est.*

<sup>73</sup> See, e.g., Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ed. William S. Anderson (Leipzig: Teubner, 1977), 1.504; Martial, *Epigrammata*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990), 5.83.

Among the Donatists, we see a very similar picture; women are praised for their ascetic virtues at the same time as those ascetic tendencies are ‘tamed’ by casting them in traditional Roman terms. Interestingly, while Socrates describes plenty of Novatian women in Constantinople, he makes no reference to any as specifically following any ascetic practices. While I see no reason to doubt that such women were part of the Novatian community, they must remain conjectural.

Our clearest glimpse of the Donatist attitude towards dedicated ascetic women comes from the *Passio sanctarum Maximae, Donatillae, et Secundae*.<sup>74</sup> The first half of the text is quite vague. In the very first line, the three martyrs are referred to as “holy virgins” (*sanctarum virginum*).<sup>75</sup> The same idea is repeated later in the text to describe Maxima and Donatilla, but using the word *castimonialae*.<sup>76</sup> We might also wonder if Maxima and Donatilla are able to see the evil spirit dwelling in the proconsul Anulinus because of their special status.<sup>77</sup> The author of the later addition concerning Secunda is much more explicit:<sup>78</sup>

And when she saw [Maxima and Donatilla] leaving [to go to the city Turbo], looking back to them from the excessively high balcony of her home, she threw herself down from there, having no view in her eyes for her parents’ wealth; she held in contempt all the squalors of this world, so

---

<sup>74</sup> A similar, but briefer, description of a dedicated Donatist virgin can be found in *Acta martyr. Sat. presb. et al.* 17.

<sup>75</sup> *Passiones SS. Maximai, Donatillae et Secundae*, edited by Karl Smedt, Josef de Backer, Francis van Ortroy, and Josef van den Gheyn, eds., *Analecta Bollandiana* 9 [1909]: 110-116), pr.

<sup>76</sup> *Pass. Max. Don. et Sec. 2: virgines speciosae et castimonialae* (‘virgins beautiful and chaste’).

<sup>77</sup> *Pass. Max. Don. et Sec. 2: ...in nobis Spiritus Sanctus est, sed in te vero daemonium se demonstrat*, 3: *Adhuc daemon perseverat in te*.

<sup>78</sup> *Pass. Max. Don. et Sec. 4: Cumque eas proficisci videret, per maenianum domus suae nimis excelsum respiciens, exinde se praecipitavit, nullum habens ante oculos intuitum divitiarum parentum; omnes utique mundi huius, ut dictum est, squalores, contempsit, divitias despexit, unum concupivit quem in aeternum invenire meruit*. On the history of the text and its authors, see Edwards, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, 14. The addition probably dates to the early 5<sup>th</sup> century.

to speak, she scorned wealth, she only desired the one that she deserved to find in eternity.

Once again, there is a direct equivalence between abandoning wealth (asceticism) and finding Christ (orthodoxy). Considering she is joining the two on their way to be tortured for refusing to abandon their Christian faith in the face of pagan persecution in the Great Persecution, before there was a Donatist schism, the emphasis is naturally on Christianity in general rather than Donatism in particular.

The text also includes a mention of sexual purity as well. Secunda tells the other two, “I want to take a spouse who does not corrupt virginity.”<sup>79</sup> Thus we can see in the figure of Secunda the same two tensions identified above. Secunda both rejects her family, thus violating a traditional Roman norm, but portrays Christ as a spiritual husband, thus placing her in an established, acceptable gender role. Once again, rather than overturning traditional society, the Donatist author of this text has found a role in which the ascetic woman can play a traditional woman’s role.

Other evidence for Donatist women voluntarily taking up the ascetic life, or at least a chaste life, come from their opponents and offer little understanding of what the Donatists themselves believed. Optatus accuses Felix of Idicra of violating a dedicated virgin to whom he himself had given the veil that indicated her status.<sup>80</sup> He likewise accuses the Donatists in general of forcing dedicated virgins to remove their old veils and

---

<sup>79</sup> *Pass. Max. Don. et Sec. 4: Sed sponsum ego cupio accipere qui virginitatem non corrumpit.*

<sup>80</sup> *De schism.* 2.19. The veil was common by the 4<sup>th</sup> century: see, e.g., Geoffrey S. Nathan, *The Family in Late Antiquity: The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 131; Elm, *Virgins of God*, 58, where she explains the similarities and differences between this veil and the traditional veil that married women wore in the Greek world.



take new, Donatist veils when they joined the Donatist community.<sup>81</sup> Augustine mentions Donatist virgins in two places without specifically commenting on any peculiarity.<sup>82</sup> In other words, it seems like Donatists treated sacred virgins much the same as other Christians did.

Thus the Luciferians and the Donatists both had female ascetics in their ranks. Both Luciferians and Donatists connected their sexual purity and other ascetic practices (though, notably, mostly their sexual purity) to their orthodoxy. In both cases, furthermore, the Luciferians and Donatists mitigated the potentially socially disruptive elements of ascetic practice by casting ascetic practice in terms of socially normal gender roles. Hermione is described not just as an ascetic, but as an ascetic noblewoman; Secunda is not just a virgin, she is a virgin who desires Christ as the only proper husband. Traditional social roles like “nobleperson” and “spouse” did not need to be cast out in order to incorporate these practices that rejected wealth and sex. Thus any potential adherents to the Luciferians or Donatists who valued women that practiced the ascetic life would have found these communities were not closed to them, but also would have found nothing particularly unique about their attitudes toward female ascetics. In other words, it is not clear at all what would have attracted some such individual attracted to the Luciferians or Donatists rather than other Nicene Christian communities.

#### *Luciferian Claims to Represent True Asceticism*

Furthermore, the Luciferians not only promoted ascetic ideals but also attempted to denigrate their opponents by claiming that they did not. The Luciferians claim that

---

<sup>81</sup> *De schism.* 6.4.

<sup>82</sup> *Epp.* 23.3, 35.4.

Hosius' eventual acceptance of an Arian creed in the 350s was because he was old and wealthy and afraid of losing his fortune in exile.<sup>83</sup> He was brought to this point, the Luciferians say, because Potamius of Lisbon pressured him into doing so after being promised a large state-owned estate by Constantius that he is said to have received afterwards.<sup>84</sup> Even Potamius' death, the Luciferians claim, is exceptionally fitting, occurring on the road right before he reached his newly-won estate: "This is no light torment for a greedy man...when he was hastening to his estate, he was prevented by his deadly punishment from possessing even the comfort of seeing it."<sup>85</sup> As far as Faustinus and Marcellinus are concerned, one of the major reasons for the nearly catastrophic capitulation of the Nicene party in the 350s was a fear of losing possessions and a desire of gaining more. It was only the steadfastness of men like Lucifer who prevented the complete rout of their faction.

This was not just a complaint about the past. The Luciferians also directly connect the examples they provide from the 350s with the present at the conclusion to their petition. They offer two reasons for their opponents' actions in the 380s: "some of them are eager for earthly glory and some for material gain."<sup>86</sup> They hide their true beliefs "so that they lose neither the possessions of the church nor their honors."<sup>87</sup> Moreover, the

---

<sup>83</sup> *Lib. prec.* 32.

<sup>84</sup> *Lib. prec.* 32, 41.

<sup>85</sup> *Lib. prec.* 42: *Non fuit avari hoc tormentum leve...cum ad fundum properat, poenali morte praevenitur ne vel visionis solatio potiretur.*

<sup>86</sup> *Lib. prec.* 117: *Hoc autem ideo faciunt quia quidam eorum gloriae humanae, quidam vero avaritiae student...*

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*: *Et inde est quod sibi invicem sub impia dissumlatione concludunt ut nec possessiones perdant ecclesiae, nec honores.*

Luciferians directly depict themselves in direct contradiction to these by opening their final plea to Theodosius thusly:<sup>88</sup>

Let them have their basilicas, glittering with gold, and adorned with the ostentation of costly marbles or built with the splendor of their columns. Let them also have their possessions, spread far and wide...At least let it be permitted to piously worship and faithfully adore Christ, God, even among those paltry and abject mangers where that same Christ, born in the flesh as an infant, once thought it worthy to lie.

It is obvious that for the Luciferians, their opponents' love of wealth contributed both to the crisis in the 350s and to the continued presence of these same men within the orthodox community in the 380s. These men are falsely orthodox, i.e. are *praevaricatores*, because of their love of material possessions.

By these forceful statements against their enemies, and their emphasis on the ascetic practices of their own members, Faustinus and Marcellinus set up a clear dichotomy between Christians who are content with very little in the way of material possessions (and therefore those whose faith is more pure) and those who sacrifice their Christian faith for gain. There is no room in this system for Christians who worship piously and attend services in 'basilicas glittering with gold.' In other words, it is the converse of how they viewed their own community's members: if asceticism and orthodoxy went hand in hand, so too did greed and heresy.

This message could have been effective if it could have been believed by anyone, Luciferians or otherwise, who seriously considered the state of Christianity and Christians in the 380s. By this point a wide variety of Christians, rich and poor, of all

---

<sup>88</sup> *Lib. prec. 121: Habeant illi basilicas auro coruscantes pretiosorumque marmorum ambitione vestitas vel erectas magnificentia columnarum. Habeant quoque porrectas in longum possessiones...Liceat saltem veritati, vel inter ipsa vilissima et abiecta praeseptia, Christum Deum pie colere ac fideliter adorare, ubi et aliquando natus secundum carnem idem Christus infans iacere dignatus est.*

doctrinal stripes, lived across the Mediterranean.<sup>89</sup> Even among the Luciferians' opponents, Jerome, well educated and with wealthy friends, moved to the Syrian deserts to practice asceticism.<sup>90</sup> In a more general sense, Ammianus Marcellinus acknowledged that there were country bishops who lived in moderation but whose holiness was evident to all.<sup>91</sup> To claim that all of their opponents loved wealth while they shunned it is clearly just a rhetorical reductionism on the part of the Luciferians. It is also interesting to observe that for all their vim and vigor at the end of the petition against their opponents' greed in general, Faustinus and Marcellinus never specifically accuse any of their opponents of the 380s of avarice. While Luciosus, Hyginus, Damasus, Theodore, and Turbo are castigated in harsh terms throughout, Faustinus and Marcellinus provide no specific examples of them acting out of greed and in fact never really accuse these specific individuals of greed to begin with. In attempting to establish a communal identity based on a supposed dichotomy between Christians who loved wealth, and would sacrifice their faith to keep it, and Christians who preferred the 'paltry and abject manglers' of Christ, the Luciferians must be counted as unsuccessful.

### *Wealthy Members of Rigorist Communities*

The Luciferians castigated their opponents for loving wealth while they themselves claimed to be content with the manglers that sufficed for Christ's birth. Their

---

<sup>89</sup> Most, like most Romans, were of course poor; see Peter Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 8-11. At 8 he writes, "Most persons lived miserable lives, at a standard of living that never reached beyond that enjoyed by the population of other pre-industrial empires."

<sup>90</sup> Kelly, *Jerome*, 46-56. Of course, it is worth noting that even in his self-imposed abnegating exile, Jerome makes nonchalant reference to scribes he apparently brought along so that he could make copies of books for his friends and in turn copy their books: *Jer. Ep.* 5.2; Kelly, *Jerome*, 49 (who says that "this detail makes one rub one's eyes"); Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 34-35.

<sup>91</sup> *Res gest.* 27.3.15.

idea that there would be two communities, one ascetic and orthodox, one greedy and heretical, was simplistic at best. This impression is further solidified when we consider the members of the Luciferian community represented in the *Libellus precum*. Luciferian rhetoric might have sounded revolutionary, but their members were often quite traditional Roman elites.

The *Libellus precum* describes the efforts of Hyginus and Luciosus in Spain to intimidate the Luciferians there by imprisoning the decurions of the unnamed city in which the Luciferians under Vincentius had some presence: “They demanded an appearance of the decurions of that city so that they might confine them in jail. One of these, a leader of his country, firmly kept the faith as a man faithful to God and cursed the disgrace of treachery.”<sup>92</sup> Thus the Luciferians in Spain could count at least one town decurion in their ranks. These kinds of connections were vital for Christian communities, which could count on these wealthy locals for material support.<sup>93</sup> It is not necessarily the case that all of the decurions of this town were Luciferians. Faustinus and Marcellinus play up the fact that Luciosus and Hyginus demanded that all of the decurions be summoned and jailed, an act which serves not only to emphasize the depravity of their enemies but also to demonstrate to Theodosius that the Luciferians are good Roman citizens engaged in traditional civic duties. Yet the presbyters only describe one decurion

---

<sup>92</sup> *Lib. prec.* 74: *Denique postulant exhibitionem civitatis illius et ut includantur in carcerem. Ex quibus unus principalis patriae suae, eo quod fidem firmiter ut fidelis in Deo retineret execrans labem praevaricationis...*

<sup>93</sup> See, e.g., Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 44; for specific examples, see, e.g., Douglas Boin, *Ostia in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 178-179; Ville Vuolanto, “Male and Female Euergetism in Late Antiquity: A Study on Italian and Adriatic Church Floor Mosaics,” in Päivi Setälä, ed., *Women, Wealth, and Power in the Roman Empire* (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2002), 245-269.

actually being incarcerated. What happened to the other decurions that were summoned, and why were they not treated similarly? Faustinus and Marcellinus are silent.

Nevertheless, even counting one decurion in their ranks represents a significant level of social respectability and possibly wealth in Spain.

Likewise, in Eleutheropolis, the Luciferians count two local elites in their ranks, the aforementioned Hermione and Severus. How Hermione became a Luciferian is unknown, but her presence in the community again indicates some success among the Luciferians to appeal to local elites. Furthermore, the Luciferians make conscious mention of her status. As noted above, they describe her as noble by birth, but nobler by her ascetic practice. As Salzman writes, “Christian leaders were too deeply entangled in this aristocratic status culture to overturn it. Hence, they adopted this term and claimed it, as a value and a class, for Christianity.”<sup>94</sup> Even as Faustinus and Marcellinus rail against the wealth of their opponents, they have no problems whatsoever addressing the nobility (in this case, Theodosius) using language that would appeal to them and including these wealthy individuals as part of their community.

Severus, the former tribune, possibly provides a good example of the effectiveness of this rhetoric. When describing their new members, Faustinus and Marcellinus write that among them was “the noble house of Severus, a former tribune, who was religious toward the catholic faith.”<sup>95</sup> Whether Severus was a tribune in the civil government or the military, he would have represented the moneyed and politically connected class in Eleutheropolis. The presbyters describe Severus as a new Luciferian,

---

<sup>94</sup> Salzman, “Competing Claims to ‘Nobilitas,’” 375.

<sup>95</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104: ...*inter quos etiam nobilis domus religioisi ad catholicam fidem Severi ex tribunis.*

meaning that their proselytization was in this case effective in courting members of the elite. Given how poor their proselytization was in general (see below), the fact that in this case they were successful is notable as an instance in which this new rhetoric about *nobilitas* might have been very effective indeed. On the other hand, Faustinus and Marcellinus report that “he was led to admire Ephesius not only for the purity of his lifestyle but also by certain divine proofs.”<sup>96</sup> Thus it was the ascetic virtue of Ephesius that provided the main impetus for Severus’ joining the Luciferian community at Eleutheropolis, a point discussed below. Severus also serves as an example of how their rhetoric was just that, not an actual demand for members to give up all their wealth – after all, Severus apparently still had his *domus*.<sup>97</sup>

Lastly, Faustinus himself seems to have some claim to social prominence. His *De Trinitate* is peppered with the ideas of other Christian authors of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, indicating that the author was well read. His writing also bears marks of a traditional rhetorical education; while much of the *Libellus precum* is written in very plain Latin, Faustinus occasionally moves into more rhetorically challenging constructions, and the *De Trinitate* can at times be very convoluted.<sup>98</sup> Moreover, the *De Trinitate* itself was

---

<sup>96</sup> *Lib. prec.* 105: ...ductus in eius admirationem non solum vitae eius puritate sed et quibusdam caelestibus documentis...

<sup>97</sup> The *domus* referred to a large house, as opposed to the *insula* (apartment block) that most citizens lived in; while even the wealthy increasingly did not live in a *domus* in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, by the 4<sup>th</sup>, it had seen a revival. See J.B. Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 210-212. Ward-Perkins even suggests that the Near East was the inspiration for the revival in Italy.

<sup>98</sup> See, e.g., from *De Trin.* 1, the following example, which also includes a standard literary metaphor (a soldier) and a common literary trope (the inability of the author to rise to the challenge, but his courage in doing so anyway): *Confiteor enim quod hac me inhabilis conscientia et inperitia squalidi sermonis suffundit, ut taceam; hac fervor fidei periculum credit esse, si taceam; quomodo enim periculum non videtur, si adversus hostem impium provocati, conscientia eloquendique verecundia quasi terga vertamus, maxime cum in causa fidei non sermonum sublimitas requirenda est, quando ipsa sola testimonia divina sufficiant quae potentius operantur quam quaevis facundi oris eloquentia?* Note too the rising of the action:

written for Flacilla at her request.<sup>99</sup> Thus by the time it was composed (before her death in 386, i.e., roughly the same time as the *Libellus precum*) Faustinus was sufficiently well known in court circles that the empress might specifically request Nicene theological tracts from him. In short, even if Faustinus was not an elite, per se, he still had something of an education and connections with elites. We might consider him to be someone like Jerome or Damasus, not an elite socially or even legally but well read, comfortable in elite circles and certainly not a poor, illiterate peasant.

Novatians also courted elites and counted other well-educated men in their ranks.<sup>100</sup> Under Valens, the Novatian presbyter Marcian served as the grammar teacher for Valens' daughters Anastasia and Carosa, despite the fact that Valens loathed Novatians.<sup>101</sup> Marcian had to have been not only well educated but also well connected at court, not unlike Faustinus. Socrates claims that following Theodosius' defeat of the usurper Maximus in the west, it was the Novatian bishop of Rome, Leontius, who interceded to protect the orator Symmachus.<sup>102</sup> This Leontius must have been prominent enough to count Symmachus, one of the most influential aristocrats in Rome, as a friend, and must also have been prominent enough to influence the emperor himself. Later, Socrates relates that the leading members of the Senate at Constantinople held

---

Faustinus begins with two short, parallel clauses before launching into an eloquent explanation of his own ineloquence; the sentence even places *eloquentia* as the emphatic final word.

<sup>99</sup> *De Trin.* 1.

<sup>100</sup> Susanna Elm describes the Novatians as 'very popular' among the elites: "O Paradoxical Fusion! Gregory of Nazianzus on Baptism and Cosmology (*Orations* 38-40)," in Ra'anan S. Boustian and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 296-316, at 311.

<sup>101</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 4.9.

<sup>102</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 5.14.



Sisinnius in high esteem.<sup>103</sup> While no known senator was a Novatian, Sisinnius' popularity with the Senate is reminiscent of the Luciferians' connection with the decurions in Spain. Sisinnius' successor Chrysanthus, we are told, was the first bishop in Constantinople to give gold to the poor out of his own personal wealth.<sup>104</sup> Rather than merely an outward sign of a good person, or as an 'investment' in future heavenly rewards, charity in Late Antiquity also functioned as another way by which a bishop might make himself popular with the masses, something other elites were beginning to do in ever-increasing numbers by the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>105</sup> Outside of Constantinople, at least one Novatian was likewise from the well-educated classes: the bishop Ablabius not only preached at Nicaea but taught rhetoric as well.<sup>106</sup> Thus it seems that the Novatians, for all their supposed stringency, were also content to go along with the Roman social order.

Donatists also counted elites among their ranks. In a general sense, imperial legislation dictated in 412 established financial penalties for Donatists who refused to submit to their catholic adversaries, with greater financial penalties for those of higher

---

<sup>103</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.22.

<sup>104</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.12.

<sup>105</sup> Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 220 and 223-226 (e.g., at 225: "The importance of Christian charity in carving out a niche for the church within the social order of each city should not be underestimated. As a protector of the poor and disenfranchised, the bishop became the advocate of a large segment of the population."). Earlier bishops, such as John Chrysostom, had only encouraged the rich to give to charity, but had not personally been wealthy enough to participate: see Blake Leyerle, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money," *HTR* 87, no. 1 (1994): 29-47. There are numerous studies on the social aspect of charity in Late Antiquity, most notably Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Waltheim: Brandeis University Press, 2001) and *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 72-90. It is important to note, with reference to Brown, that bishops did not simply co-opt a previous urban model of providing for the poor. While traditional civic euergetism continued in the funding of massive church structures (as well as other traditional building activities and providing games), "members of the rich often came to the church so as to find there a social urban lung... They found that, in the churches, they did not have to give so much at any one time, provided that they gave frequently." Or Leyerle ("John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 37) writes, "In [Chrysostom's] sermons, however, it becomes embarrassingly clear that divine favor is, after all, to be secured by entirely traditional means."

<sup>106</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.12.

social standing.<sup>107</sup> The implication, of course, is that there were sufficient numbers of elite Donatists that such legislation was beneficial. There are specific examples as well of well-educated Donatists as well. Petilian, the leading Donatist representative at the Council of Carthage in 411, had been a lawyer.<sup>108</sup> The title of Augustine's work against him identifies Cresconius as a *grammaticus*. Once more we see Christian leaders who are, while not elites, certainly well-educated and

In sum, while Faustinus and Marcellinus may extensively praise asceticism, the Luciferians did not actively require one to reject all material goods in order to be considered members of their community. Nor were they unique in this behavior. All three communities courted the wealthy and counted educated, and even elite, Romans within their community. They were at a disadvantage compared to catholic communities, to be sure, but this disadvantage did not provoke completely different behaviors. The Luciferians (and the others) did not withdraw from the world to the emptiness of the desert. It is a situation reminiscent of when the famous ascetic Antony was a youth. He rejected his parent's wealth, refused to learn how to read and write, and left for the desert; but when Roman emperors wrote letters to him, he wrote back.<sup>109</sup> These rigorist ascetics remained firmly tied to Roman society no matter how much they might protest it. While this left the door open for individuals like Severus to join the Luciferian community and bring with them their wealth, it also left little unique reason to join the Luciferians rather than their catholic adversaries.

---

<sup>107</sup> *CTh.* 16.5.54.

<sup>108</sup> *Aug. C. ep. Pet.* 3.16.19.

<sup>109</sup> *Ath. V. Ant.* 1, 81.

## *Monasticism*

As noted above, the Luciferians seem to have only counted dedicated ascetic women, not men, in their community. Possible reasons for this will be addressed below. The Luciferians also make no mention of monasteries for men, only for women. The lack of dedicated male ascetics and monasteries for men further indicates that for the Luciferians, ascetic practice was something a male undertook *in addition* to other actions. This stands in stark contrast with the female ascetics of the Luciferian community, to whom Faustinus and Marcellinus attribute several monasteries.

The Luciferians refer to Hermione as belonging to a *monasterium*.<sup>110</sup> The term is unclear. It could refer to organized groups of dedicated (coenobitic) ascetics or it could refer to an individual (anchoritic) ascetic dwelling; Jerome, for example, uses both meanings interchangeably in the same work.<sup>111</sup> But the context seems to make it clear that in this case, an organized group is meant; Hermione is relieved “with her holy monastery,” phrasing that would make little sense if she were alone in a cell. There were other Christian communities with monasteries of women in Eleutheropolis in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, so it is not out of the question that Luciferian women would have gathered into collective dwellings there in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>112</sup> In Oxyrhynchus, the Luciferians seem to use *monasterium* in the plural to give it a collective sense: “And it would take a long

---

<sup>110</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104: *Sed cum venisset [Ephesius] non solum Hermione cum suo sacro monasterio relevatur, sed et quidem fidelissimi servi Dei...*

<sup>111</sup> At, e.g., Jerome, *Vita Malchi* (= *Jerome: Trois vies de moines: Paul, Malchus, Hilarion*, ed. and trans. P. LeClerc, E.M. Morales, and A. de Vogüé, SC 508 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2007) 17.3 (individual dwelling) and 19.1 (large group of coenobitic monks).

<sup>112</sup> See Eduard Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Scythopolis* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1939), 147.3, 13-14; John Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 187, 190. These included Monophysites. It is unclear whether Eleutheropolis was a somehow well-suited site for non-catholic or non-orthodox Christian communities to establish monasteries, or whether these monasteries were simply more common than our sources let on.

time to report the things which [Theodore] worked against the modesty and intention of the holy virgins, whose cells (*monasteria*) that city venerated for the worth of their sanctity.”<sup>113</sup> These women are clearly described as one body; their ‘modesty and intention’ are both singular, as is their ‘sanctity,’ and no differentiation is made between them. So in these two cases we can identify Luciferian women living in coenobitic communities. It is important to note here that the Luciferians thus had no specific objections to coenobitic monasticism as a practice.

Concerning the Novatians, we also hear nothing about the organization of men into monasteries. Gregory suggests that monasticism was the true final blow to Novatians: “Of crucial importance in its collapse must have been the spread of monasticism throughout the empire. This movement allowed orthodoxy to preempt the Novatian disdain for the world.”<sup>114</sup> In other words, the more catholic Nicene Christians acted like Novatians, the less opportunity there was for the Novatians to stand out as unique. And we might consider too the popularity, let alone existence, of bishops like Sisinnius, who did not show particular concern for practicing asceticism. Perhaps it was also the case that by the mid-5<sup>th</sup> century, Novatians were acting more and more like other catholic Nicene Christians. Perhaps this is so; but the Novatians did not, as described above, place such a heavy emphasis on ascetic practice as the Luciferians did. Such an emphasis would make the lack of monasteries for men all the keener.

---

<sup>113</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99: *Et longum est referri quae contra pudorem propositumve sacrarum virginum molitus est, quarum monasteria pro merito sanctimoniae earum civitas ipsa venerator.*

<sup>114</sup> “Novatianism,” 17.

Furthermore, that the Donatists did not include more references to dedicated ascetic men in their writings may reflect a wariness among Donatists about the growing popularity of coenobitic asceticism in Late Antiquity. The Donatists did not practice communal monasticism and their opposition to it as a concept was fierce; Augustine claims that Petilian “has gone on, with his abusive speech, castigating monasteries and monks, arguing even to me myself that this way of life was instituted by me!”<sup>115</sup> Donatists appear to have vigorously opposed monasticism on the grounds that no terms like ‘monasticism’ or organizations that resembled monasteries could be found in scripture.<sup>116</sup> Thus not only did the Donatists not have monasteries, they had specific theological objections to them.

If the Luciferians did not have monasteries, their reason for lacking them cannot be the same theological objection as the Donatists had, because the Luciferians did have monasteries for women. Their apparent lack of monasteries could be a consequence of what information appears in our sources, or another consequence of the small size of their communities at the local level. As we shall see below, the Luciferians had a hard enough time finding the clergy they needed to serve their ecclesiastic needs. It is unlikely that they wanted their clergy to practice asceticism, had a hard time finding qualified ascetic practitioners to become clerics, but also supported large numbers of dedicated ascetics in monasteries. It is also quite possible that without a theology actively opposed to having monasteries, as was the case with the Donatists, a Luciferian lack of dedicated ascetics

---

<sup>115</sup> *C. litt. Pet.* 3.40.48: *Deinceps perrexit ore maledico in vituperationem monasteriorum et monachorum, arguens etiam me, quod hoc genus vitae a me fuerit institutum.*

<sup>116</sup> In general, see Kenneth Noakes, “The Donatist Opposition to Monasticism,” *SP* 39 (2006), 83-88.

and monasteries would make their community less appealing to potential converts, or even those already within the community, who valued such social institutions.

### *Proselytization*

That the Luciferian community was not particularly appealing to outsiders is confirmed by the *Libellus precum*. It is also clear that the Luciferians did not actively proselytize in the way that the Novatians did. The Donatists do not seem to have proselytized much outside of North Africa, but then again, this would not correlate well with their stated desire to be in communion with the broader Nicene communion outside of North Africa. In regards to extending their communities, the Luciferians appear to be quite passive, at most attracting additional locals in cities with preexisting Luciferian communities. Their lack of theological distinction, discussed in Chapter 3, and their emphasis on asceticism while lacking dedicated ascetics and monasteries, as discussed in this chapter, undoubtedly contributed to this lack of appeal. A lack of dedicated ascetics may have also made it more difficult for the Luciferians to attract new converts, as those who did join the Luciferian community seem to have done so out of admiration for certain Luciferians' ascetic practices more so than any arguments over the Council of Alexandria.

Faustinus and Marcellinus offer no information about proselytization in Spain, Trier, or Rome. While other scholars have argued that Ephesius' journey to North Africa was for the purpose of proselytizing, he was clearly invited there by a preexisting

community, as discussed in Chapter 1.<sup>117</sup> Given the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 1, all known Luciferian communities can be traced to individual sees or sites of exile of Nicene rigorists of the 350s, it does not seem like the Luciferians put much effort into expanding beyond these ‘seed’ communities.

When it comes to the East, Faustinus and Marcellinus do provide some details concerning the growth of these communities at the local level. Concerning Heraclida in Oxyrhynchus, the presbyters write,<sup>118</sup>

But such a man as this, with such virtues, began to exercise his pontifical duty in such a way that many men from the furthest places came to the point of view of his faith and doctrine and his most holy conduct. They cursed the unspeakable society of traitors and longed for the sacrosanct company of that man.

The way Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Heraclida’s activities is entirely passive. He acts admirably and thus causes others to approach him and share in his beliefs. In fact, the authors do not even technically describe individuals joining his physical community in Oxyrhynchus, although this may be a purely stylistic element. In any event, the way they depict Heraclida does not include any outreach to other communities.

Likewise, they write that the bishop Turbo heard that that community at Eleutheropolis ‘was growing’ (*crescere*).<sup>119</sup> But Faustinus and Marcellinus do not relate that this community spread outside Eleutheropolis, only that within the city itself the movement was growing. When we examine how the community at Eleutheropolis was

---

<sup>117</sup> For reference: A.-M. La Bonnardière, “Pénitence et réconciliation,” 267-8; Duval, “Saint Jérôme devant le baptême des hérétiques,” 152-8, 168, 176; Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 317; *Lib. prec.* 107: *...invitatus fidelium litteris...*

<sup>118</sup> *Lib. prec.* 95: *Sed hic tantus ac talis ita coepit exercere pontificium ut ad opinionem fidei eius et doctrinae atque ipsius sanctissimae conversationis plerique etiam de longissimis regionibus aduenirent, execrantes nefariam praeuaricatorum societatem eiusque sacrosanctum consortium desiderantes!*

<sup>119</sup> *Lib. prec.* 108.

‘growing,’ we can even see how poor the efforts of the Luciferians were. As recounted in Chapter 1, Faustinus and Marcellinus relate that the former tribune Severus “did not hold communion with heretics and traitors, but had not yet found the holy communion of the catholics.”<sup>120</sup> First of all, Severus thus represents someone who was already withdrawn from communion with other Nicene Christians, not someone who was won over by the Luciferians’ arguments over the Council of Alexandria. Secondly, Severus is described as a former tribune and his house is described as “noble,” thus establishing that he was socially prominent.<sup>121</sup> Hermione was also socially prominent, in that Faustinus and Marcellinus describe her as “born noble in her lineage.”<sup>122</sup> Yet Severus apparently knew nothing about Hermione, given that he had not yet found these ‘catholics.’ Now, Eleutheropolis was by no means a minor city in Late Antiquity; it was in fact one of the most important cities in Palestine.<sup>123</sup> But it also had a very active Christian population. Epiphanius was born there and established a monastery there.<sup>124</sup> According to Epiphanius, there was not only a Nicene church but a Melitian one as well.<sup>125</sup> Moreover, after the Luciferians delivered their petition to Theodosius, the bishop Zebennus (who

---

<sup>120</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104: ...*non communicans haereticis et praevaricationibus, sed nondum qui invenisset catholicorum sacram communionem.*

<sup>121</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104: ...*inter quos etiam nobilis domus religioisi ad catholicam fidem Severi ex tribunis.*

<sup>122</sup> *Lib. prec.* 102: *Hermione generosis quidem edita natalibus, sed fide et sanctimonia multum facta generosior...* For the contrast between noble by birth and noble by ascetic practice, see Chapter 5 and Michele R. Salzman, “Elite Realities and *Mentalités*: The Making of a Western Christian Aristocracy,” *Arethusa* 33, no. 3 (2000): 347-362, and “Competing Claims to *nobilitas*.”

<sup>123</sup> See e.g. Hagit Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Gunter Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 150.

<sup>124</sup> *Jer. Ep.* 51.1-2 (the letter is authored by Epiphanius). For Epiphanius’ early life see e.g. Jon Frederick Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Patristic Monograph Series 13 (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), 25-50.

<sup>125</sup> *Pan.* 68.3.8. This is the Meletius of Egypt, who opposed Peter of Alexandria in the 320s, and whose followers remained a constant thorn in Athanasius’ side, not Meletius of Antioch, who was opposed by Paulinus, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and others.



presumably succeeded Turbo) discovered the relics of both Habbakuk and Micah nearby.<sup>126</sup> The fact that these two elite members of society, living in a clearly active Christian center, both of whom opposed Turbo, did not cross paths is striking. The Luciferians in Eleutheropolis cannot have been reaching out to individuals like him, who were already dissatisfied with the catholic Nicene party in Eleutheropolis, with any particular zeal.

It is very important to note that in both of these cases, individuals are attracted not to the Luciferians by their rejection of the Council of Alexandria but because of the ascetic virtues of their clerics. Heraclida's attraction lay in his 'faith and doctrines' and his 'most holy conduct,' which, as described above, was an ascetic lifestyle resembling the prophets of the Old Testament. Severus examines Ephesius to ensure that Ephesius is doctrinally sound, but "he was led into admiration of Ephesius not only by the purity of his life but also by certain divine proofs."<sup>127</sup> In both of these cases we can see that doctrinal orthodoxy was a necessary, but not a sufficient, cause for conversion; it is not enough for Severus to know that Ephesius is a Nicene Christian, he must also demonstrate the proper (i.e., ascetic) lifestyle with its attendant miracles.

Evidence for Novatian proselytizing, by contrast, goes back to Novatian himself. As noted above, one of Novatian's first actions following his ordination as a bishop of

---

<sup>126</sup> Soz. *Hist. eccl.* 7.29. See Pierre Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient d'Orient, Histoire et géographie. Des origines à la conquête arabe* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985), 41-44 on the discovery of relics and the miracles associated with such discoveries.

<sup>127</sup> *Lib. prec.* 105: ...*ductus in eius admirationem non solum uitae eius puritate sed et quibusdam caelestibus documentis.*

Rome was to send letters to bishops across the Roman Empire.<sup>128</sup> Socrates even explicitly connects the success of those letters in converting Paphlagonians and Phrygians to the ascetic tendencies supposedly inherent in those ethnicities.<sup>129</sup> So in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, at least, one author might see ascetic impulses as a motive for conversion to Novatianism. It is also implicit in the spread of Novatianism from Rome. Since this was initially a local dispute over the episcopacy in the city of Rome, its expansion into a Mediterranean-wide movement necessitates someone who did the spreading. The continued outward spread of Novatians, especially their substantial presence in Constantinople, also demonstrates that they continued to expand long after Novatian himself was dead. Another piece of evidence that demonstrates how actively they proselytized is the presence of a Novatian bishop of the Scythians named Marcus.<sup>130</sup> The presence of this bishop among the ‘Scythians’ indicates that the Novatians had even expanded their community outside the bounds of the Roman Empire. The Roman name of Marcus, unlike the Germanic name Ulfilas of the famous Arian who converted many of the Germanic tribes, implies that this Marcus was originally from within the Roman Empire. Thus his presence implies that the Novatians were active agents in providing or sending clerics to communities at the fringes of the Roman world.

That the Donatists proselytized actively in North Africa is more than merely suggested by their spread across North Africa, their sheer numbers, the number of

---

<sup>128</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28: Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν διακριθεὶς, εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν παρὰ τῶν συμφρονησάντων αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων προχειρισθεὶς, ταῖς πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίαις ἔγραφε... Τοιαύτας ἐπιστολάς οἱ κατ' ἐπαρχίας δεχόμενοι, πρὸς τὰ οἰκεία ἤθη ἐποιούντο τῶν δηλουμένων τὰς κρίσεις.

<sup>129</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.28: Τὰ δὲ Παφλαγόνων καὶ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη πρὸς οὐδέτερον τούτων ἐπιρρεπῶς ἔχει· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἵπποδρομίαι οὐδὲ θέατρα σπουδάζονται νῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς. Διό μοι δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ἐπινενευκέναι τούτους τε καὶ τοὺς οὕτω φρονοῦντας πρὸς τὰ παρὰ Ναβάτου τότε γραφόμενα...

<sup>130</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.46.

instances in which rebaptism became an subject of debate, and the quantity of ink spent arguing over which community represented the true catholic community in North Africa. We have specific textual examples as well. Augustine complains about the Donatists composing secular psalms to win over converts, even as he did the same.<sup>131</sup> The *Praedestinatus*, discussed in Chapter 4, makes a similar claim about the Donatist Parmenian.<sup>132</sup> Augustine also claims that the catholic congregation at Constantina received a letter from the Donatist Petilian that Petilian had tellingly addressed to the presbyters, not the bishop, of that see.<sup>133</sup> These examples of the Donatists reaching out to potential members should not surprise us given the liveliness of Donatism in North Africa in general.

The Donatists do not provide significant evidence of proselytization outside Africa. Although the Donatists might occasionally differ with catholics in the rest of the Empire regarding rebaptism, as was discussed in Chapter 3, both the Donatists and their enemies were very flexible concerning these points; the differences between Donatists and their enemies were not significant enough to bar the Donatists from any and all proselytization. One seemingly obvious example outside North Africa is Rome, where the Donatists sent Victor of Garba to serve as bishop for the small community of Donatists who rejected the Nicene catholic bishop of Rome during the reign of Constantine.<sup>134</sup> The Donatists continued to send bishops from Africa to Rome to replace

---

<sup>131</sup> *Ep.* 55.18.34; *Psalmus contra partem Donati* (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas* I, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1908]).

<sup>132</sup> 1.44: ...*qui per totam Africam libros contra nos conficiens et novos psalmos faciens circumibat*...Note that Parmenian is specifically said to have travelled around for the purpose of spreading these new psalms.

<sup>133</sup> *C. ep. Pet.* 1.1.

<sup>134</sup> *Opt. De schism.* 2.4.

Donatist bishops who had died.<sup>135</sup> These continued efforts indicate a Donatist willingness and ability to support an overseas community. But the salient issue was still local and immediate: the Nicene catholic bishop of Rome had been ordained, the local Donatists claimed, by a *traditor*. Like the Luciferian communities discussed in Chapter 1, this Donatist Roman community appears to have emerged as a result of local rigorists immediately coalescing with rigorists in Africa, not reaching out to communicate with them later. Even the Donatist communities in Spain and Gaul, despite our limited evidence for them, appear to have emerged as a consequence of visits by exiled Donatist bishops, not intentional proselytizing.

Thus once again, we see that the Luciferians appear similar to the Donatists on the surface but in actuality are quite different. The Donatists did not proselytize outside of North Africa, to be sure, but they had good reason: their claims was to represent the catholic community in North Africa. The Luciferians, by way of contrast, claimed to be a universal church, but seem to have made little effort to make this happen. Another contrast is that potential converts to the Donatist community appear to have been targeted with theological tracts (i.e., the letter sent to Constantina's presbyters) or songs. When converts came to the Luciferians, they appear to have done so inspired by the ascetic practices of men like Heraclida and Ephesius rather than by the Luciferians' arguments concerning the Council of Alexandria. But the Luciferians naturally had no monopoly on Nicene ascetics and even lacked dedicated men and monasteries. Thus their ability to

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

attract converts (or keep their own members) through this kind of inspiration would be rather limited.

### *A Dearth of Clergy*

Lastly, there was one significant consequence that these attitudes toward asceticism and this failure to effectively proselytize had for the Luciferians. The Luciferians appear to have an acute dearth of clergy, especially bishops. While the authors of the *Libellus precum* understandably do not discuss this themselves, it seems quite evident to the reader. A combination of small community sizes (as discussed in Chapter 2), a growing assimilation between ascetic practice and doctrinal orthodoxy, and a failure to effectively proselytize may have combined to make it difficult for Luciferian leaders to find qualified men to enter the ranks of the clergy.

The evidence for a dearth of clergy appears at the fringes of the *Libellus precum*. In both Spain and Trier, the Luciferians allude to a bishop in the earlier generation of the 350s and 360s but only to presbyters during the persecutions of the 380s.<sup>136</sup> In fact, in Spain, they mention numerous unnamed clerics but without a bishop to lead them; the basilica they describe is associated with Vincentius, who is only a presbyter. It also seems that Luciferian bishops often had to travel in order to fulfill their communities' needs. Ephesius travels to North Africa, Palestine, and then North Africa, all despite the fact that his see was at Rome. A far cry from Augustine, for example, who spent his episcopacy in North Africa and complained that travel was a distraction from the contemplation of

---

<sup>136</sup> *Lib. prec.* 33 and 73 (Spain) and 77 (Trier).

one's final journey at death.<sup>137</sup> Moreover, Ephesius was only in Palestine because the bishop Heraclida had been summoned thither, indicating that the community in Eleutheropolis expected that a bishop would come visit them even from that far away.<sup>138</sup> These were communities that clearly needed the presence of a bishop, but were unable to find one close at hand.

A small population – and one that was spread out considerably wider than the Novatians and Donatists were – would have trouble finding qualified men to become ordained as bishops. It would be particularly difficult if, over time, the assumed qualifications became more and more strict regarding ascetic practices, as described above. And, as an added difficulty, growing ascetic tendencies could even make men reticent to take office. Dedicated ascetics often feared losing the ability to fully practice asceticism if they were forced to interact with ‘the world,’ sometimes resorting to physical violence against the priest or bishop ordaining them in order to escape the burden.<sup>139</sup> And even if they could find a suitable candidate, the Luciferians, as spread thin as they were, may have found it difficult to gather enough bishops to perform these ordinations.<sup>140</sup> A larger community might have better weathered this tendency toward asceticism, but for one as small as the Luciferians seem to have been, it may have been costly.

---

<sup>137</sup> *Ep. 10.2: Profectiones ergo, quas quietas et faciles habere nequeas, per totam cogitare vitam non est hominis de illa una ultima, quae mors vocatur, cogitantis, de qua vel sola intellegis vere esse cogitandum.*

<sup>138</sup> *Lib. prec.* 104, 107.

<sup>139</sup> See, e.g., Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 142-147; Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 234-235. Gaddis points, for instance, to Call. *V. Hyp.* 11 in which a monk, as was about to ritually lay his hands on him, bit Chrysostom rather than be ordained.

<sup>140</sup> The typical minimum number of bishops required to ordain another was three, though more (seven or twelve, and sometimes more) were preferred. See, e.g., Everett Ferguson, *The Early Church at Work and Worship: Volume 1: Ministry, Ordination, Covenant, and Canon* (Eugene: Cascade, 2013), 53-72; Paul F. Bradshaw, *Rites of Ordination: Their History and Theology* (London: SPCK, 2014), 52.

We hear of no difficulties among the Novatians in finding qualified bishops. Like the Luciferians, the Donatists also had trouble filling sees with qualified bishops, which at times led to the theological ‘refinements’ discussed in Chapter 3.<sup>141</sup> But in contrast to the Luciferians, this paucity of clergy was affecting the Donatists at a much different scale. For the Luciferians we can count less than a dozen sees; for the Donatists, estimates range from anywhere between 500 and 1000 sees, all requiring bishops, presbyters, deacons, and so on.<sup>142</sup> The Donatists did not have the same problem the Luciferians had. It was a problem of having enough bishops, not of having bishops.

Lacking clergy carried with it several consequences. Firstly, bishops played a central role in organizing and maintaining Christian communities at the local level; in one sermon, for example, Augustine describes their role as a shepherd, a teacher, a guard, and even a watchtower for their congregation.<sup>143</sup> Secondly, in an urban context, bishops in late antiquity were becoming more and more involved in running civic communities.<sup>144</sup> Lastly, the Luciferians risked an end to their community not unlike the end of Hilary of Rome’s community in Rome itself, about which Jerome says, “When the man died, the sect died along with the man, since, as a deacon, he could ordain no clergy to follow

---

<sup>141</sup> On the problem in general, see, e.g., Tilley, “Theologies of Penance,” and Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 358.

<sup>142</sup> See W. Eck, “Der Episkopat im spätantiken Afrika: Organisatorische Entwicklung, soziale Herkunft, und öffentliche Funktionen,” *HZ* 236, no. 2 (1983): 265-295, and Serge Lancel, “Évêchés et cités dans les provinces africaines (IIIe-Ve siècles),” in Maurice Lenior and Charles Pietri, eds., *L’Afrique dans l’occident romain. Actes du colloque de Rome (3-5 décembre 1987)* (Rome: l’École française de Rome, 1990), 273-290.

<sup>143</sup> *Serm.* 339; see also, as a very limited sample suggesting the centrality of the bishop in late antique Christian communities, John Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, ed. J. Nairn (Cambridge, 1906), 3; *Constitutiones apostolicae* (= *Les constitutions apostoliques*, 3 vols., ed. M. Metzger, SC 320, 329, and 336 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985-1987) 2.1.1-7.57; Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, passim.

<sup>144</sup> See, e.g., Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 173, 274-289. This process was admittedly in its earliest phases in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century, but ongoing nonetheless.

him.”<sup>145</sup> A shortage of bishops in North Africa, for example, was an ecclesiastical problem, not an immediate threat to the very existence of Donatism. Failing to have a sufficient number of bishops meant that a Christian community like the Luciferians lacked their apparently necessary leaders, had fewer connections with the civic government, and risked the extinction of the community itself.

### *Conclusion*

The Luciferians were very much like other Christians in Late Antiquity in that they praised ascetic practices and those who undertook the ascetic life. Like other Christians in Late Antiquity, the Luciferians also came to see asceticism and orthodoxy as more and more intertwined. They did not, however, allow these ascetic tendencies to overwhelm their communities. Brown quotes Kaplan, who writes of “holy men,” “[they] appeared as representatives of a power superior to that of traditional faiths, but not as purveyors of a dramatically different world view or type of religion.”<sup>146</sup> In many respects, as we have seen, as much as the incorporation of asceticism into a community may have brought in completely revolutionary worldviews, these practices and individuals were also circumscribed and redefined in order to make this worldview conform to Roman society at large. Among the Donatists, as we have seen, there was even active opposition to monasticism on conservative theological grounds. But this did not carry with it an opposition to asceticism itself.

---

<sup>145</sup> *Dial. c. Luc. 21: Et cum iam homo mortuus sit, cum homine pariter interiit et secta, quia post se nullum clericum diaconus potuit ordinare.*

<sup>146</sup> *Authority and the Sacred*, 67.



But the Luciferians faced problems caused by this shift in Roman Christian world. First of all, while dedicated female ascetics and monasteries of them made up a part of their community, there were apparently no dedicated ascetic men or monasteries of them. This lack of ascetics meant that the Luciferians lacked one of the most important figures in Late Antiquity, who was uniquely qualified to police boundaries between communities. Furthermore, in treating asceticism and their ascetics much in the same way that their opponents did, the Luciferians created no real distinctions between their community and their opponents. First of all, as Krüger noted and as we have seen in other aspects of the Luciferian community, they were unable to distinguish themselves from other Christians. Their attempts to do so, by complaining that their opponents were universally greedy, comes off as hyperbole, not the foundation of a true sense of identity. Furthermore, no matter how much the Luciferians might have claimed to represent those who did not care about wealth, they counted plenty of elites in their midst. Their lack of monasteries in no way distinguished them in the same way that, say, the Donatists did, by explicitly denying the value of monasticism and thus creating a divide between themselves and their opponents.

These attitudes towards asceticism and their lack of a unique identity probably further contributed to the dissolution of the Luciferians. The Luciferians were first of all poor proselytizers, not expanding their community beyond the locations where local Luciferian communities initially appeared in any appreciable way. The few converts to the Luciferian community appear to have done so on the basis of the ascetic virtues of certain Luciferians; considering their general similarity with their adversaries when it

came to ascetic practices, and the fact that the Luciferians do not seem to have had any dedicated ascetic men in their ranks, they were not bound to see many converts on such grounds. The nature of these conversions further testifies to the weakness of the central Luciferian argument concerning the Council of Alexandria, as well. And the small size of their communities, as discussed in Chapter 2, combined with the increasing demand among all Christians for a greater degree of ascetic practice among clergy, meant that the apparent dearth of Luciferian clergy in the *Libellus precum* was not going to improve going forward. Beyond a lack of dedicated ascetics, the Luciferians appear to lack in many places even bishops, who were centrally important for local Christian communities in Late Antiquity.

Ascetics were not popular with everyone in Late Antiquity. Ambrose reports that Theodosius himself said to Ambrose, “the monks commit many crimes,” and his *magister militum* Timasius leveled other presumably worse critiques; Libanius called them a “black-robed tribe” that ate and drank to excess before violently setting upon their neighbors; Eunapius said they lived “a pig’s life” and demeaned themselves only to justify their many crimes.<sup>147</sup> But in the case of the Luciferians, they may have been popular enough.

---

<sup>147</sup> Amb. *Ep.* 41.27: *Tunc [Theodosius] ait...monachi multa scelera faciunt. Tunc Timasius magister equitum et peditum coepit adversum monachos esse vehementior*; Lib. *Or.* 30.8: οἱ δὲ μελανειμονοῦντες οὗτοι καὶ πλείω μὲν τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐσθίοντες, πόνον δὲ παρέχοντες τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐκπωμάτων τοῖς δι' ἁσμάτων αὐτοῖς παραπέμπουσι τὸ ποτόν,...; Eun. *V. Soph.* 6.11: Ἐἴτα ἐπεισῆγον τοῖς ἱεροῖς τόποις τοὺς καλουμένους μοναχοὺς, ἀνθρώπους μὲν κατὰ τὸ εἶδος, ὁ δὲ βίος αὐτοῖς συώδης, καὶ ἐς τὸ ἐμφανὲς ἔπασχόν τε καὶ ἐποίουν μυρία κακὰ καὶ ἄφραστα.

## Chapter 6: Violence

This chapter examines the role that violence played in the communal identities of the Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists. ‘Violence’ is a notoriously difficult term to define; in this chapter, it is taken relatively narrowly, that is, it focuses on direct physical acts of religious violence and includes instances of verbal and literary abuse only when they inform the performance of physically violent acts.<sup>1</sup> Late antique religious violence – in all its forms – has been the subject of a recent spate of excellent monographs and collections upon which this chapter relies.<sup>2</sup> What these works all have in common is a fascination with the methods and motivations behind religious violence in Late Antiquity. What this chapter hopes to bring out, building on the previous work of these scholars, are the consequences of the varying expressions of this violence that emerge when one compares the experiences of different Christian communities.

Jerome writes to Heliodorus, “You are mistaken, my brother, you are mistaken if you think that a Christian ever does *not* suffer persecution; and now, you are most under

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a narrow definition compared to the very broad one used by Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 4: “The present study will explore violence in dimensions both large and small, physical and figurative, at levels both individual and systemic. Throughout, it will emphasize the importance of considering emotions and attitudes, reactions as well as actions.”

<sup>2</sup> The opening foray of the past decade was made by Michael Gaddis in *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, a work dedicated to exploring the question of how Christians in Late Antiquity justified their frequently violent behaviors in a system that on its face seems to demand pacifism. A volume edited by H.A. Drake, *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), includes dozens of papers on the theme. Thomas Sizgorich’s *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity* takes these developments into the Islamic world, comparing the roles that ascetics and martyrs played in late antique Christianity with their subsequent afterlives in the seventh- and eighth-century Islamic world. Brent Shaw’s *Sacred Violence* focuses on the North African conflict between Donatists and Catholics, formulating how Christians could reconfigure their pre-existing mental frameworks (e.g. hatred of pagans and Jews) to reflect the emerging divisions between themselves. While seemingly more narrowly focused than these other works, Shaw’s volume is critical for understanding not just developments within the conflict in North Africa but the developments in Christian thought concerning intra-Christian relations throughout the Mediterranean in general.

attack whenever you do not know that you are under attack.”<sup>3</sup> In Jerome’s mind, then, it seems that the fewer the obvious forms of physical violence in the present, the more one ought to think about one’s life in terms of the violent persecution of the past. This transition from the physical violence of persecution to ascetic practice, discussed in Chapter 5, is one of the hallmarks of late antique Christianity. But while the ‘white’ martyrdom of asceticism was beginning to replace the ‘red’ martyrdom of pagan persecution, there was plenty of ‘red’ martyrdom in the fourth and fifth centuries as well. Christians continued to persecute and be persecuted by one another, and venerate those who had been persecuted, no less when this persecution was the result of conflicts between Christians and Christians.

This chapter consists of three sections concerning the ways in which violence could construct communal identity. In the first, I consider violence perpetrated against these communities, and conclude that the Luciferians faced the same kinds of persecution other Christian communities faced. This persecution, namely, persecution that targeted leaders of the community and the objects and places sacred to those communities, was generally ineffective. Secondly, I examine violence perpetrated by these communities. I argue that one difference between the Luciferians and other Christian communities was that they did not commit acts of violence against other Christians, whether out of some particular benevolence or, more likely, because the small size of their communities (as discussed in Chapter 2) made it difficult for them to do so. Lastly, I consider the ways that these communities remembered instances of violence, and particularly how this

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 14.4: *Erras, frater, erras si putas umquam Christianum persecutionem non pati; et nunc cum maxime oppugnaris, sit e oppugnari nescis.*

violence was conceptualized in the veneration of the remains of martyrs and the retelling of martyr stories. The Luciferians acted in much the same way that the Novatians and Donatists did regarding martyrs. But, I argue in the conclusion, the fact that they alone received imperial protection from persecution just before persecution against Novatians and Donatists began to increase dramatically may have diminished their ability to maintain a communal identity that was so deeply rooted in the experience of persecution.

### *Suffering Violence*

Other Christians persecuted the Luciferians in essentially the same manner that they persecuted the Novatians and Donatists. The goal of this persecution seems to have been to destroy the community's identity, forcing individuals to join or rejoin the perpetrating community. To this end, Christian persecutors generally targeted (a) clergy, ascetics, and other prominent members of the community, sometimes by direct physical violence but often by manipulating the Roman court system to punish them or send them into exile, and (b) physical, sacred objects and buildings that served as representations of the community. While we cannot know if the events described in the *Libellus precum* "actually" happened, the types of persecution that the authors recount are no different than the types of persecution we hear of concerning the Novatians and Donatists. There is a consistent pattern in how Christians persecuted one another, and the *Libellus precum* does not provide any evidence that persecutors treated the Luciferians any differently.

The one marked difference between these communities was that the Luciferians faced their persecution in the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, a period of relative peace for the Novatians and Donatists. Those two communities, by contrast, faced persecution in

the early 4<sup>th</sup> century and most significantly in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century. This distinction is important, as we shall see, because persecution of dissident Nicene Christians was generally carried out by Christian clerics in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century, Theodosius being more concerned with the still-powerful Arian communities. By the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, however, emperors were much more willing to use state resources to impose religious conformity even among Nicene Christians.

The methods used by Christians against one another against these rigorist communities were in fact quite similar to the methods employed by earlier pagan Romans against Christians themselves and that Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century used against pagans. The similar treatment of all dissidents also suggests that other Christians perceived all three of these communities as representing a similar threat that called for a similar solution. That these solutions mimicked the forms of persecution all Christians themselves had faced for centuries is not at all surprising given that late antique Christians were, after all, late antique Romans.

Christians did not like to see themselves as violent oppressors, even of pagans.<sup>4</sup> They instead painted pagans as violent and unpredictable in contrast to their sober upholding of the law, whether that law was secular or religious. Moreover, it is not particularly surprising to see a hesitation among late antique Romans of any religious affiliation to use physical force to compel religious adherence. Violence against Roman

---

<sup>4</sup> Michele Renee Salzman, "Rethinking Pagan-Christian Violence," in H.A. Drake, ed., *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), 265-286, at 283: "Our sources share the view that it was the pagans who consistently used violence against people... This explanation for the outbreak of violence against individuals is certainly consistent with Christian perceptions of their role as the upholders of the law in the post-Constantinian empire."

citizens provoked great “anxiety” in the minds of late antique Romans.<sup>5</sup> But despite this “anxiety,” the late antique trend toward using violence to punish even elites, nascent as it was, must have also informed the actions of persecutors who did attack individuals. The social barriers that had safeguarded prominent individuals against such acts for centuries were slowly eroding.<sup>6</sup> And surely the religious background of these conflicts increased their capacity to turn violent; as Shenoute said in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, “there is no crime for those who have Christ.”<sup>7</sup>

### *Suffering Violence: Individuals*

The most obvious way that Christians might attempt to destroy a community’s identity was by violent acts against members of a given group. This method of coercion had a long pedigree going back through the earliest pagan persecutions of Christians (as well as Jews).<sup>8</sup> In the fourth century, Romans continued to use this method to impose religious conformity, whether the agents themselves were state representatives, clerics, ascetics, hired thugs, angry mobs, or simply extremely zealous individuals. However, Christian persecutors did not target members of a community at random. Instead, they

---

<sup>5</sup> Bond, “Altering Infamy,” pp. 16-22.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> As trans. by Michael Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 2.

<sup>8</sup> The literature is vast, but for particularly interesting interpretations, see, e.g., Allen Brent, *Cyprian and Roman Carthage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 198-200; Jan M. Bremmer, “Religious Violence between Greeks, Romans, Christians and Jews,” in Albert C. Geljon and Riemer Roukema, eds., *Violence in Ancient Christianity: Victims and Perpetrators*, VC suppl. 125 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), 8-30; Danny Praet, “Violence against Christians and Violence by Christians in the First Three Centuries,” in Albert C. Geljon and Riemer Roukema, eds., *Violence in Ancient Christianity: Victims and Perpetrators*, VC suppl. 125 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), 31-55; Jeremy M. Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Pieter W. van der Horst, *Philo’s Flaccus: The First Pogrom. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003); Sandra Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 CE and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 17-21.

focused their efforts on the most prominent representatives of a dissident community: clerics, ascetics, and local elites.

When targeting the Luciferians, other Nicene Christians seem to have targeted clergy in particular. For example, the Luciferian presbyter Vincentius did not appear in his church on a day it was to be destroyed by an angry mob and warned his congregation away as well. His reasoning was that their enemies were coming to commit acts of violence against them and he thought it better to sacrifice the building than the people.<sup>9</sup> Vincentius' fears were justified, at least according to the *Libellus precum*: "Those who had come prepared for violence...struck certain clergy devoted to God who they found there with clubs. These men died not much later."<sup>10</sup> This mob, stirred up by the bishops Luciosus and Hyginus, was directly attempting to dissipate a community of Luciferians. Their method for doing so was, as Faustinus and Marcellinus make sure to specify, not by attacking the laity but the clergy.

Faustinus and Marcellinus often describe this violence more vaguely when discussing their own communities but still focus on assaults against leaders. For example, they write that Aurelius, bishop of Rome, was "assaulted several times."<sup>11</sup> Further details are left undisclosed, except the fact that this persecution was not enough to kill him (which does imply that the presbyters are describing a physical form of

---

<sup>9</sup> *Lib. prec. 73: ...et Vincentium quidem non inveniunt, eo quod ipse, praemonitus, etiam populo praedixerat ne illo die procederent quando cum caede veniebant. Hoc enim putavit fieri melius, si irae locum daret.*

<sup>10</sup> *Lib. prec. 74: Sed illi qui ad caedam parati venerant, ne sine causa furor illorum venisse putaretur, certa Christo Deo devote ministeria quae illic inventa sunt ita fustibus eliserunt, ut non multo post expirarent. Ministeria* here, a term also used below in section 76, seems to mean the ministry as a body and the items related to them as ministers.

<sup>11</sup> *Lib. prec. 77: Aurelius episcopus communicans beatissimo Gregorio aliquotiens afflictus est...licet sit saepenumero afflictus, tamen propria accersione requievit.*



persecution). Likewise, the two report that Heraclida of Oxyrhynchus was secretly seized in the middle of the night by some imperial lancers at Theodore of Alexandria's request, and that this happened several times, but they do not describe what else happened to him except that after some divine intervention the soldiers abandoned this policy.<sup>12</sup> The clergy and population of Oxyrhynchus in general were also faced with 'cruel injuries,' though once again, the Luciferians make sure to specifically mention the clergy that were targeted: "But Theodore set upon even that most holy people of [Heraclida's]...and several times he even inflicted horrible injuries on the very servants of God."<sup>13</sup> In general, then, it seems that the Luciferians' opponents specifically (though not exclusively) targeted clergy in their persecution of the Luciferians.

By contrast, Novatians faced physical persecution only rarely. The most noteworthy exception was in the 350s in Constantinople at the hands of the Arians, particularly the bishop Macedonius.<sup>14</sup> Socrates describes persecutions as being against not only other Nicene Christians, but Novatians as well, and then describes in very specific details their forms: Arians seized non-Arian Christians (unless they escaped), tortured them, and compelled them to take Arian communion by forcing their mouths open with blocks of wood.<sup>15</sup> This torture was sometimes extreme enough to cause death, as in the case of one Novatian ascetic, Alexander the Paphlygonian, though not his friend,

---

<sup>12</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96: *Et primum quidem uexat per publicas potestates, ita ut aliquotiens solum intempesta nocte raptum per lancearios de urbe sustulerit. Sed cum eadem potestates non in hoc perseverant in quo temerarie coeperant (quod enim ius habere poterant contra episcopum catholicum? Vnde et merito a coepta persecutione cessarunt, maxime unus ex ipsis etiam diuina plaga admonitus!)*

<sup>13</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99: *Grassatus est Theodorus sed et in ipsam sanctissimam plebem eius...Sed et ipsos servos Dei aliquotiens atrocibus afflixit iniuriis...*

<sup>14</sup> See Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople*, 28-29.

<sup>15</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

the presbyter Auxanon.<sup>16</sup> Socrates mentions similar Arian persecutions at Cyzicus and attempts to persecute Novatians in Mantinium in Paphlagonia.<sup>17</sup> There is not, in this case, as great an emphasis on assaults against the clergy. These assaults instead focused on the Novatian laity as well, just as the Arians seem to have targeted other Nicene Christian laity as well. And the Novatians, both their clergy and general population, do not seem to have suffered persecution of this sort at the hands of Nicene Christians at all, even into the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

Donatist leaders, on the other hand, did face persecution directed toward their clergy at the hands of other Nicene Christians, mainly in the late 340s during the imperial representative Macarius' poorly conceived attempt to impose Christian unity in North Africa. The death of Marculus in 347 is exemplary and will be referred to throughout this chapter. The *Passio Marculi* details how Marculus and nine other Donatist bishops arrived at Vegesela to negotiate with Macarius only to be tied up and beaten.<sup>18</sup> Marculus, while still alive, was taken through various Numidian towns and publicly displayed as an example to other Donatists of what fate they could expect: "Then [Macarius] led [Marculus] with him through certain towns of Numidia as though he were leading a parade [*spectaculum*] of his own cruelty. His ignorant ferocity produced amazement in the pagans, confusion in the enemies of Christ, and incentive in the glorious struggle for

---

<sup>16</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

<sup>17</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

<sup>18</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 4-5.

the faithful servants of God.”<sup>19</sup> Soldiers then took Marculus out just before daybreak and threw him off a mountain, killing him.<sup>20</sup>

Gaddis emphasizes the secretive nature of Marculus’ death.<sup>21</sup> The reason for secrecy is obvious: “A public execution, of course, would have been highly risky: popular sympathy in southern Numidia was very much on the side of the Donatists.”<sup>22</sup> If Macarius had wanted to kill Marculus he had to do it secretly for fear of public violence from Marculus’ many supporters.<sup>23</sup> The particular emphasis on the secrecy of an execution on religious grounds is well founded, since judicial execution for heresy or schism was quite rare in Late Antiquity.<sup>24</sup> Given that Marculus was a cleric, and thus surely better known than almost any given layman, a public execution of him could have had a disproportionate effect on the Donatist masses.

But the acts preceding the murder – the beating of Marculus and the display of his battered body to various townships – were, by contrast, very public acts. These definitely

---

<sup>19</sup> *Pass. Marc. 5: Tunc eum secum per aliquas Numidiae civitates quasi quoddam crudelitas suae spectaculum ducens, nesciens feritas et gentilibus stuporem, et Christi hostibus confusionem, et fidelibus Dei servis incentivium gloriosi certaminis exhibebat.*

<sup>20</sup> *Pass. Marc. 13.* There were arguments even in antiquity as to whether Marculus had intentionally thrown himself off the cliff, committing suicide in order to attain martyrdom. See Alan Dearn, “Voluntary Martyrdom and the Donatist Schism,” *SP* 39 (2006): 27-32, for an overview. Tilley, *The Bible in Christian North Africa*, 71, by contrast, describes the soldiers’ method of executing Marculus as a “parody” of this supposed Donatist practice.

<sup>21</sup> Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 109: “What the *Passion of Marculus* presents to us, clearly, is not a formal execution but rather a discreet judicial murder...By acting in secret, not only do the agents of the state forgo any claims to legitimacy, but they implicitly acknowledge a shameful quality in their action.”

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>23</sup> See T.W. Africa, “Urban Violence in Imperial Rome,” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2, no. 1 (1971): 3-21, for a survey of riots in Rome alone from the age of Augustus through the fourth century. Urban violence was hardly limited to religious factionalism, but it was an increasingly common cause in Late Antiquity.

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 138-148; but see also Virginia Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 209 n. 84.

call to mind old pagan persecutions, which were public acts of intimidation more so than the secret ‘disappearing’ of popular and influential enemies. And the fact that the catholics were intimidating a cleric, not just an ordinary layman, meant that the intimidation carried with it that much more of a threat, though it is impossible to tell if this was in fact a more effective tactic than the violence used against Novatian laity described above. Moreover, the later opponents of the Donatists never denied this brazen act. Optatus not only accepts that Marculus was killed but even seems proud of the fact: “Marculus and Donatus are said to have been killed and to have died [respectively] – as if no one at all ought to be killed in the defense of God!”<sup>25</sup> This was not an outrageous act in Optatus’ eyes but a fitting end to a man who helped divide Christianity in North Africa. Marculus was a public example whose suffering and death were held up as examples of cruelty or obstinacy after his death, depending on which side of the story one was on.

Opponents of the Luciferians also used the courts in attempts to break Luciferian communities apart by targeting Luciferian leaders. Beginning in the reign of Constantine, state authorities frequently resorted to imprisonment or exile as a way of dealing with Christian bishops whose status as quasi-*honestiores* granted them legal privileges against more violent coercion.<sup>26</sup> This form of persecution extended beyond just bishops, however. Faustinus and Marcellinus write, “Bonosus, the presbyter, was locked up for a long time though not convicted and paid the price as an old man for observing the

---

<sup>25</sup> *De schism.* 3.6: ...*quod Marculus et Donatus dicantur occisi et mortui. Quasi omnino in vindictam Dei nullus mereatur occidi.*

<sup>26</sup> See Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 98.

uncontaminated faith.”<sup>27</sup> Labeling Bonosus as a presbyter emphasizes both the unconscionable nature of this disdain for the social hierarchy and also the targeted nature of the attack on this Luciferian community, geared as it was towards the clergy. Once more, Luciferian leaders were targeted, not just individual members of communities.

Other Luciferian clergy *were* brought to trial, and the actions of Damasus in particular demonstrate to what degree Christian leaders could rely on the state to impose their will on other Christian communities. Damasus’ clerics along with some government officials seized Macarius, a Luciferian presbyter in Rome, while he was holding a late-night meeting of Luciferians in a home and brought him before a judge (probably the urban prefect) “as though guilty of a great crime.”<sup>28</sup> Damasus also brought the bishop Ephesius to trial, but in that instance found the urban prefect at the time, Bassus, less cooperative.<sup>29</sup> In both of these cases it is telling that Damasus used the imperial apparatus against a presbyter and a bishop, not the worshipers attending Macarius’ and (presumably) Ephesius’ services.

The opponents of the Luciferians used this tactic against elites other than clergy as well: important local leaders who were part of the laity could also suffer at the hands of government officials backed by Christian leaders. Luciosus and Hyginus chained up a town councilor of a city sympathetic to Vincentius, leading to the death of this local notable.<sup>30</sup> In this way, their opponents Luciosus and Hyginus attacked not only the congregation of the Luciferians, as represented by their clergy, but their financial and

---

<sup>27</sup> *Lib. prec. 77: Sed apud Triveros, Bonosus presbyter inclusus intestatus ac diu poenas senex dedit propter observantiam intaminatae fidei...*

<sup>28</sup> *Lib. prec. 80: ...atque alio die sistunt eum ante iudicem ut magni criminis reum.*

<sup>29</sup> *Lib. prec. 84-85.*

<sup>30</sup> *Lib. prec. 74; the decurions are once again summoned in 75.*

social resources as well. Removing these civic leaders would strip a major source of funding of the Luciferians, as local churches relied on local donors for support.<sup>31</sup> Equally importantly, local notables like these served as political allies in dealings with the imperial government, whose representatives relied on these locals to accomplish their own aims.<sup>32</sup> Lucius and Hyginus were not simply imprisoning Luciferians at random but targeting those Luciferians who had the most influence with the state. By attacking Vincentius and other Luciferian clerics, Lucius and Hyginus were targeting the spiritual heart of the Luciferian community in Spain; by attacking decurions, they were targeting the base of the Luciferian community's civic power.

Christians could also harry Luciferian leaders by forcing them into exile. State authorities generally resorted to exile to punish clergy because, while technically nonviolent, it frequently led to injury or death for the exiled cleric.<sup>33</sup> An unnamed judge exiled the aforementioned Macarius, who refused to hold communion with Damasus, to Ostia where he died of a wound earlier inflicted by Damasus' agents.<sup>34</sup> This appears to have been a particularly favorite tactic of Damasus, as Faustinus and Marcellinus report that he had other members of their Roman community exiled as well.<sup>35</sup> Nor was his use of this tactic limited to the Luciferians, as Damasus also had his rival Ursinus and his

---

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 42, 72, 379.

<sup>32</sup> Brown, *Power and Persuasion*, 21-30: "The administration...needed the authority of well-established local figures to bolster its own authority in the collection of taxes and in the maintenance of law and order;" see also Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy*, 65-66.

<sup>33</sup> See Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 98-100, and Eric Fournier, "Exiled Bishops in the Christian Empire: Victims of Imperial Violence?" in H.A. Drake, ed., *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006), 157-166.

<sup>34</sup> *Lib. prec.* 81: *Sed presbyter, memor diuini iudicii, praesentem iudicem non timens reppulit perfidi communionem atque ideo datur in exilium et, cum est apud Ostiam, atrocitate illius uulneris moritur.*

<sup>35</sup> *Lib. prec.* 83: *Nam idem Damasus accepta auctoritate regali etiam alios catholicos presbyteros nec non et laicos insecutus misit in exilium.* Note again that the Luciferians firstly focus on *catholicos presbyteros* and only then add in *nec non et laicos*. The most significant exiles were the clergy.

courtroom opponent Isaac exiled.<sup>36</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also single Damasus out as a general abuser of the law: “Once Damasus received royal authority, he persecuted other catholic presbyters, and laymen too...arguing through pagan rhetoricians to favorable judges, even though your laws were decreed against heretics, not against catholics.”<sup>37</sup> This seems backed up by Damasus’ actions against them as well as against other enemies of his like Ursinus and Isaac.<sup>38</sup>

The constant repetition of general complaints about abuse of local courts and imperial law in the *Libellus precum* further highlights how pernicious Faustinus and Marcellinus perceived this form of persecution to be. The central importance of the law constitutes their opening argument: “secular law is written so that the powerful or many do not prevail even if the truth is upheld by the insignificant.”<sup>39</sup> The claim that their enemies are abusing the laws is clearly stated numerous times, as in the middle of the petition when they write, “And now the same bishops put forth the laws of catholic emperors against the faithful and the defenders of the catholic faith!”<sup>40</sup> To the emperors, they write that they risk allowing “impiety to have dominion everywhere...under the

---

<sup>36</sup> The classic study of Damasus is Lippold, “Ursinus und Damasus;” see also McLynn, “Damasus of Rome” for a corrective of many of the stronger claims about Damasus’ influence.

<sup>37</sup> *Lib. prec.* 83: *Nam idem Damasus accepta auctoritate regali etiam alios catholicos presbyteros nec non et laicos insecutus...perorans hoc ipsum per gentiles scolasticos faventibus sibi iudicibus, cum utique vestrae constitutiones adversus haereticos decretae sint, non adversus catholicos...*

<sup>38</sup> McLynn (“Damasus of Rome,” esp. 315) has recently argued that Damasus’ seemingly complete reliance on the civil bureaucracy and aristocracy of Rome to impose his will (which these officials and aristocrats only did when it suited their own purposes as well) demonstrates the weakness of his own personal authority. While I agree that Damasus himself may have overstated his own influence, and that earlier scholars like Lippold have ascribed too much power to Damasus alone, we should also not be too quick to dismiss someone who understood that he had to rely on the court system and then effectively manipulated it to suit his own purposes. Even if Damasus did not always get his way, he certainly understood the avenues available to him.

<sup>39</sup> *Lib. prec.* 1: *siquidem ius saeculi ideo scriptum est ne contra uerum aequumue potentia uel multitudo praeualeat, etiamsi ab exiguis uindicetur.*

<sup>40</sup> *Lib. prec.* 56: *Idem et nunc episcopi adversus fideles catholicae fidei defensores catholicorum imperatorum iura proponunt.*

authority of your name.”<sup>41</sup> This applies to the passage about the name ‘Luciferian’ discussed earlier: “We ought to be called nothing other than Christian *by law*.”<sup>42</sup> Other moments also hint at a deep concern with the legal system, as when the two ask how the truly faithful could be criminals or defendants, *rei*, a specifically legal term.<sup>43</sup> The abuse of the law clearly presented a significant threat to the Luciferians. While one would expect a legal petition to focus on the law, of course, it is certainly worth noting the emphasis they place not on physical violence, although these acts are present and described, but on pernicious legal actions against their members.

The Novatians too seem to have been persecuted by imprisonment, at least in the persecution led by the Arian Macedonius the 350s. Socrates relates that Arians under Macedonius jailed some Novatians, including his informant the presbyter Auxanon and Auxanon’s friend, the monk Alexander.<sup>44</sup> There are, however, no examples that Socrates relates in which Novatians were imprisoned by their Nicene peers after this. There was a period of time in which the Arian emperor Valens did exile Novatian bishops, but this appears to have been brief: “Indeed, the emperor did not stop persecuting those who were set on the *homoousios* formula, but drove them out of Constantinople, and along with them, the Novatians, who were of the same mind. He ordered that their churches be

---

<sup>41</sup> *Lib. prec.* 110: *Permittetis, piissimi imperatores, ut sub uestri nominis auctoritate aduersus fideles diu ubique dominetur impietas?*

<sup>42</sup> *Lib. prec.* 86: *...non aliud iure dici debeamus quam Christiani...*

<sup>43</sup> *Lib. prec.* 11, 19. On the term *reus* see Hermann Gottlieb Heumann and Emil Seckel, *Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1971), 517-518.

<sup>44</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38. On Auxanon, see Chapter 2.



closed and prescribed a punishment of exile for their bishop.”<sup>45</sup> In this respect, then, the Novatians are similar to the Luciferians in that persecutors attempted to use imprisonment and exile of clergy as a way of breaking their community apart. However, the two communities are dissimilar in that this appears to have been less of a problem for the Novatians in the later fourth century. For the Luciferians, court actions remained a constant threat against their communities, and it is possible that this pressure contributed to their inability to maintain strong communities or even bishops at the local level (as discussed in Chapter 5), particularly given that it seems to have been civic and clerical leaders who were specifically targeted.

Other Christians also used local courts and exile against Donatists. Many Donatist martyr stories, even those set in the Great Persecution, emphasize the role of local government officials (in addition to imperial ones) in enforcing the law, which suggests that at the time these stories were being copied and recounted in Donatist communities, overzealous local and imperial officials were still a pressing concern.<sup>46</sup> Even Macarius’ first crime in Numidia, according to the *Passio Marculi*, was that he “made public, open charges against the famous Marculus of a cruel barbarity and unheard-of ferocity.”<sup>47</sup> In other words, Macarius’ first crime in Numidia was not of actual physical violence but in making legal accusations. Later in Macarius’ persecution, no less a figure than Donatus

---

<sup>45</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.9.1-2: Ὁ μέντοι βασιλεὺς τοῦ διώκειν τοὺς τοῦ ὁμοουσίου φρονήματος οὐκ ἐπαύετο, ἀλλ’ ἐξήλαυνε μὲν αὐτοὺς τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, σὺν αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ Ναυατιανοὺς ὡς ὁμόφρονας, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν κλεισθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν ἐξορία ζημιοῦν προσέταπεν.

<sup>46</sup> Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, xxx.

<sup>47</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 3: ...in Numidia tamen, et erga Marculum gloriosum, aperta crudelitatis barbarae et inauditae feritatis indicia publicavit.

himself was exiled in 347 or 348 along with other prominent Donatist leaders.<sup>48</sup> Donatus died while still in exile around 355. By the early fifth century, but still before the Council of Carthage in 411, Augustine takes the courts and their punishments as his general recommended policy for dealing with Donatists: “But clearly moderate severity, or rather, clemency, is observed in that they are warned by punishments consisting of exiles and fines to consider what and why they are suffering.”<sup>49</sup> Thus for the Donatists too, just as for the Luciferians and Novatians, the courts provided an excellent venue by which Christians might attempt to weaken or destroy other Christian communities.

Lastly, the Luciferians also make special mention of instances in which persecutions were against their sacred virgins. In Oxyrhynchus, Faustinus and Marcellinus tell us, “it would take a long time to report the things he worked against the modesty and intentions of the holy virgins.”<sup>50</sup> Likewise in Eleutheropolis, Turbo “even tried to persecute the sacred virgin Hermione,” who is once again singled out as a sacred virgin and not just an ordinary member of their community.<sup>51</sup> Ascetics, as discussed in Chapter 5, played a central role in maintaining communal identities: they “controlled, patrolled, and defended the hard edges, the impassable boundaries, of their respective communities.”<sup>52</sup> In attacking the very figures that functioned to define the borders

---

<sup>48</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 181;

<sup>49</sup> *Ep.* 93.3.10: *Sed plane...temperata severitas et magis mansuetudo servatur, ut coercitione exsiliorum et damnorum admoneantur considerare quid et quare patiantur...* On this passage, see, e.g., John von Heyking, *Augustine and Politics as Longing in the World* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 237-238.

<sup>50</sup> *Lib. prec.* 99: *Et longum est referri quae contra pudorem propositumque sacrarum virginum molitus est...*

<sup>51</sup> *Lib. prec.* 108: *Temptat quoque et sacram virginem Hermionem...*

<sup>52</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 108-109.

between their two communities, the enemies of the Luciferians were directly weakening the distinctions between the two communities.

While Socrates does not relate specific instances in which *ascetic* Novatian women were assaulted under Macedonius of Constantinople, he does relate several gender-specific and luridly gruesome methods of Arian torture used against Novatian women who refused to hold communion with the Arians.<sup>53</sup> Other attacks against ascetic men are noted in particular as well. Auxanon reported to Socrates that not only did the Arians under Macedonius attack him, they attacked his friend Alexander, who was his ‘fellow ascetic’ (συνασκοῦντι αὐτῷ).<sup>54</sup> In other words, the persecutors of the Novatians were still attacking their ascetics in particular and thus once more provide an example of persecution targeted at specifically important persons within the community rather than just the laity at large.

As noted in Chapter 5, the Donatists uniquely did not have much of a monastic tradition and in fact seem to have eschewed the term ‘monk.’<sup>55</sup> However, in the *Passiones Maximae, Donatillae, et Secundae*, Maxima and Donatilla are expressly described as *castimoniales* and Secunda has rejected numerous marriage proposals.<sup>56</sup> The descriptions of their martyrdom, then, emphasize their role as sacred virgins within their communities. Although the narrative of this martyr story is set in the Great Persecution,

---

<sup>53</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.9-10: Γυναικῶν γὰρ τῶν μὴ ἀνασχομένων μετασχεῖν τῶν μυστηρίων τοὺς μαζοὺς ἐν κιβωτῷ βαλόντες ἀπέπριον, ἄλλων τε γυναικῶν τὰ αὐτὰ μόρια τοῦτο μὲν σιδήρῳ, τοῦτο δὲ φᾶ εἰς ἄκρον ἐν πυρὶ θερμανθέντα προσφέροντες ἕκαιον. Ξένη τε παρὰ τὰς Ἑλλήνων τιμωρίας αὕτη ὑπὸ τῶν χριστιανίζειν λεγόντων ἐγίνετο.

<sup>54</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.12.

<sup>55</sup> *Aug. En. in. Ps.* 132.3: *Sed tamen dicere consueverunt, Quid sibi vult nomen monachorum?...qui nobis dicunt, Ostendite ubi scriptum sit nomen monachorum...*

<sup>56</sup> *Pass. Max. Don. et Sec.* 2, 4.

the fact that the stories were still relevant and being copied and discussed in the fourth century suggests that Donatists still saw their consecrated virgins as particularly liable to be persecuted by their catholic enemies.

We also hear of at least one later ascetic Donatist woman, and it is in fact in the context of violence:<sup>57</sup>

A certain farmer of our church wished to call back (with his paternal severity) his daughter to catholic communion. She had been a catechumen in our party, but, even though her parents didn't want her to, she had been seduced by their party where she was baptized and took up the monastic way of life. I didn't want her to be received like one choosing the better side [i.e. coming back to the catholic church] except willingly and with free will, since she was of such a corrupted mind. That bumpkin began to compel his own daughter to agree with his side, even by hitting her, but by all means I straightway put a stop to this.

It might be tempting to see this as an example of another ascetic woman bearing the brunt of violence resulting from communal differences. And it is true that the man is striking the woman because of her religious convictions. But this is hardly comparable to the case of Turbo and Hermione because the woman in question is not just an ascetic but a daughter of the man in question. The power of the *paterfamilias* was perhaps waning in Late Antiquity, particularly when women chose to become ascetics, but children in general were still obligated morally and legally to the will of their father.<sup>58</sup> In fact, the very structure of Augustine's narrative seems to emphasize her place as a daughter and

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ep. 35.4: Nam cum ecclesiae quidam colonus filiam suam, quae apud nos fuerat catechumena, et ad illos seducta est invitis parentibus, ut ubi baptizata etiam sanctimonialis formam susciperet, ad communionem catholicam paterna vellet severitate revocare, et ego feminam corruptae mentis nisi volentem, et libero arbitrio meliora diligenter suscipi noluissem. Ille rusticus etiam plagis instare coepit, ut sibi filia consentiret; quod statim omnimodo fieri prohibui.*

<sup>58</sup> See e.g. Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 14-15, 140-141; Kate Cooper, *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 108-114.

minimize her social role as an ascetic. Augustine discusses here the actions and attitudes of a father vis-à-vis his daughter, not a catholic man vis-à-vis an ascetic Donatist woman.

Once again the violence against ascetic women, and ascetics in general, demonstrates that persecution was not targeted against all members of a given community but against its leaders. The intent was clearly to break apart communities from the top down and return their members to catholic communion.

The Luciferians, the Novatians, and the Donatists, all saw attempts to use force to break apart their communities by assaulting their individuals, and in particular their clergy, local notables, and ascetics. This targeted violence demonstrates that the purpose of persecution was to intimidate and coerce members of a community. Moreover, as we shall see, this is mirrored in the targeted destruction of significant objects and structures in these communities.

### *Suffering Violence: Property*

In addition to attacks on individuals, the Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists also suffered material losses. This had been a common tactic in pagan persecutions. The earliest phases in the Great Persecution, for example, saw pagans target Christian structures, books, and ritual objects.<sup>59</sup> This violence was well remembered by Christians throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> century and it is unsurprising that Christians in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries

---

<sup>59</sup> Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* ed. J.L. Creed (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 12; Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 8.2. The secondary literature on the Great Persecution is, of course, vast; but for important recent works, see, e.g., T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982); Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops*; Roger Rees, *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2004); D. Vincent Twomey and Mark Humphries, eds., *The Great Persecution: The Proceedings of the Fifth Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2003* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009); Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, *A Threat to Public Piety: Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).

would use the same tactics.<sup>60</sup> The goal was simple, of course. On a functional level, by destroying a community's ability to function as a religious community, one might, if possible, weaken or destroy the community itself. But these objects served more than just practical purposes; they functioned as symbolic representations of the community itself. Attacking these objects meant attacking these communities.

Christians frequently attacked the church structures of dissident Christians. Faustinus and Marcellinus describe the assault on one of their basilicas in southern Spain that was successful enough to prompt them to construct a new basilica in a new location.<sup>61</sup> The fact that the first response of the Spanish Luciferians was to immediately build another basilica demonstrates how important this structure was to the community. This new basilica was also assaulted, resulting in its doors being broken down.<sup>62</sup> Nor did the Luciferians face such attacks in Spain alone. Clerics of Theodore of Oxyrhynchus 'overturned' the Luciferian basilica in Oxyrhynchus and destroyed its walls and altar with axes.<sup>63</sup> The very inclusion of these moments, and especially the presentation of specific details such as the type of weapon involved at Oxyrhynchus, demonstrates the importance laid by the Luciferians on the actual structures of their buildings. Lastly, near the end of the petition, they connect their concern about the abuse of the legal system (discussed above) with the seizure of churches as well: "Nevertheless, all of these

---

<sup>60</sup> See, e.g., Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 208 on violence against the property (in this case, monuments) of the persecutors themselves. The popular Donatist slur against Catholics, *traditor*, refers to Christians who gave in to this form of persecution and handed over sacred books and objects lest they suffer physical violence against themselves.

<sup>61</sup> *Lib. prec.* 75.

<sup>62</sup> *Lib. prec.* 76: *Simul etiam et presbyteri eius ad locum veniunt, ecclesiae illius ianuas confringunt...*

<sup>63</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96: *tunc egregius iste bis episcopus iam propriis uiribus nititur et mittit turbam clericorum ad ecclesiam beati Heraclidae catholici episcopi eamque evertit destruens undique parietes, ita ut ipsum altare Dei securibus dissiparet...*

(heretics) glory in your laws and lay claim to churches for themselves...<sup>64</sup> The Luciferians were worried that their churches could be seized as well as destroyed. The Luciferians were afraid that catholics would destroy or seize their centers of worship.

While Novatian individuals may have more rarely suffered physical persecution, except under Macedonius, they did frequently see their churches destroyed or closed. Though the forced closure of a church is not the same as its demolition, it still reflects the desire on the part of the persecutors to attack a community by attacking its church structures. As one might expect, Novatian churches were first destroyed or forcibly closed under Macedonius in the 350s. At this time, the Arians demolished numerous Nicene churches in Constantinople and intended to destroy the Novatian church in a certain neighborhood of Constantinople named 'Pelargos' ('Pelican').<sup>65</sup> To the surprise of the Arians, however, the Novatians and others sympathetic to them moved the church tile by tile, stone by stone, timber by timber across the Golden Horn to Sykai. The exact same physical materials were then used to restore the church to its former site at Pelargos under Julian. No example could better demonstrate how important church buildings could be to communities. In this case, the Novatians were literally willing to move their entire church piece by piece to a new location, and then move it back, rather than simply build a new structure. The central importance of the actual physical structure that this episode highlights suggests that for the Luciferians, likewise, the loss of a basilica in southern Spain and the construction of a new one might well have had important practical

---

<sup>64</sup> *Lib. prec.* 114: ...*nihilominus hi omnes de vestris gloriantur edictis et sibi ecclesias vindicant...*

<sup>65</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

ramifications for that particular community's self-identity, though no evidence of that appears in the petition.

The importance of specific structures that this incident highlights further reinforces the importance of the most common way that other Nicene Christians dealt with the Novatians in the 4th and especially the 5th century, that is, by closing their churches rather than destroying them. Valens, in addition to briefly exiling Novatian bishops, also closed their churches.<sup>66</sup> Socrates tells us that John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople from 397-407, traveled around the regions surrounding Constantinople closing Novatian and Quartodeciman churches.<sup>67</sup> Chrysostom appears to have made the closure of dissident churches something of a priority, much more so than the persecution of individuals. Leontius of Ancyra likewise closed Novatian churches and refused to return them at the request of Sisinnius, Novatian bishop of Constantinople in the early years of the 5th century.<sup>68</sup> Sisinnius' request once again demonstrates that the status of church structures was a more central concern for Novatian bishops than, say, persecutions of clergy. Later in the 5th century, the closure of churches became more of a regular phenomenon throughout the Empire: other Nicene Christians closed Novatian churches in

---

<sup>66</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 4.9.1-2: Ὁ μέντοι βασιλεὺς τοῦ διώκειν τοὺς τοῦ ὁμοουσίου φρονήματος οὐκ ἐπαύετο, ἀλλ' ἐξήλαυνε μὲν αὐτοὺς τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, σὺν αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ Ναυατιανοὺς ὡς ὁμόφρονας, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν κλεισθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν ἐξορία ζημοῦν προσέταπεν. Since Socrates mentions only a single bishop, we can infer that he is talking about Novatian churches in particular.

<sup>67</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.11. Quartodecimans dated Easter by the Jewish calendar, whereas other Christians used a variety of computations but always celebrated Easter on a Sunday following the Spring equinox. See Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 5.23-25. Clemens Leonhard, *The Jewish Pesach and the Origins of the Christian Easter* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006) is a recent overview; 303-311 focuses particularly on the Quartodecimans.

<sup>68</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.22.



Alexandria under Cyril and twice in Rome, under Innocent (who is described as the first persecutor of the Novatians) and Celestine.<sup>69</sup>

We should be wary of treating these closures as a general policy undertaken by Nicene Christians or of over-emphasizing its significance in diminishing the Novatian sense of community. In Constantinople, even in the early 5th century, Socrates says that the Novatian bishop Chrysanthus “created and enlarged many churches [*ekklesias*] of the Novatians in Constantinople.”<sup>70</sup> If there were a general policy of closing Novatian churches, the construction of new churches in Constantinople would be difficult to understand. The very existence of a late sixth- or early seventh-century tract *Adversus Novatianos* from Eulogius of Alexandria suggests that the church closures there were not completely effective either, for Eulogius had to have considered Novatians a contemporary concern in Alexandria at the time. And in Rome, the fact that following Innocent’s closure of churches Celestine also had to close Novatian churches certainly implies that these closures were not necessarily effective either. In sum, it is most likely that the Novatians faced only sporadic closures of churches in the 5th century.

Donatists also saw their churches confiscated in the Macarian persecution of the late 340s and lost even more of their churches to confiscation after the Council of Carthage in 411. After Macarius arrived in North Africa and heard the respective cases of the catholic and Donatist parties, Augustine reports, “At that time, after the conclusion of the case in which they [the Donatists] cut themselves off from the catholic [church], it

---

<sup>69</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.7, 7.9, 7.11. On Cyril’s closures, see Christopher Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 298-299, who situates Cyril’s policies within a broader attempt on his part to instill loyalty among his own clergy.

<sup>70</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 7.12.8: ...καὶ σφόδρα τὰς Νουατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνεκρότησέν τε καὶ ἠῤῥησεν.

consequently began to be conducted in such a way that they not hold their basilicas, and they would hold them only by resisting imperial orders...such laws were brought against them [the Donatists] so that they were not permitted to keep those basilicas which were built not for unity but by the separatists and by those established in their own schism.”<sup>71</sup> Thus the imperial representatives acted no differently than their pagan predecessors in making the confiscation of church structures one of the main methods by which they attempted to break apart Christian communities.

Now, Augustine is clearly trying to distance his fellow catholics from this change in policy, as the obtuse and passive phrasing of *egi coepisset* absolves any actor from responsibility for the actions. It should also go without saying that he blames the Donatists for what happened to their own churches. But he further distances other North African Christians from these seizures by emphasizing the role of the state in and pointing out that these seizures were a consequence of imperial laws. This cannot disguise the fact that Augustine is describing the seizure of Donatist churches at the behest of catholics in North Africa. These seizures, like the destruction of Luciferian churches and the closing of Donatist churches, deprived Donatists of meeting places and centers of religious activities.

Following the restoration of Donatist churches under Julian in 362, there was a lull in confiscation. A dramatic change to this relatively peaceful coexistence came

---

<sup>71</sup> *C. ep. Parm. 1.11.18: Sic et tunc cum post terminum causae, in qua se isti a catholica praeciderunt, consequenter agi coepisset ut basilicas non tenerent, et tenerent imperialibus resistendo iussionibus...tales in eos leges proferuntur, ut ne ipsas quidem basilicas quae non errant unitatis, sed a separatistis atque in suo schismate constitutis fuerant fabricatae, retinere sinerentur.* I have retained the awkward ‘it began to be conducted’ to reflect Augustine’s seemingly deliberate attempt to make the seizure of Donatist churches appear to be a natural consequences of their activities rather than a deliberate choice on the part of some agent.

following the Council of Carthage in 411.<sup>72</sup> Augustine once again provides a very pointed example. As Shaw summarizes the scene,<sup>73</sup>

Augustine decided...to confront Emeritus, bishop of the dissident or 'Donatist' Christian community in [Caesarea], and to do this in the basilica that had once been Emeritus' own church. Only a few years earlier, the basilica had been seized by the Catholics under the authority of decrees issued by the emperor that had ordered dissident bishops, like Emeritus, to hand over their places of worship to the state-approved Catholic Church. State coercion had transformed Emeritus' basilica into a Catholic place of worship.

This reflects no simple seizure or closure of a building, or even destruction of it as in the cases of the Luciferians and Novatians, but the re-appropriation of the sacred space of one community for use by another. The transformation of this space would have had two practical effects: firstly, of prohibiting the Donatists from holding services and thus maintaining a community based on shared religious service, and secondly, of naturally increasing the visibility of the catholic community in North Africa which in many towns did not possess a basilica of its own before the Council of Carthage.

But even more importantly, this re-appropriation of a building represents an attempt by catholics to re-appropriate the symbolic homes of the Donatist community. If the structure carried no meaning other than as a place of worship, Emeritus could have his congregation meet elsewhere; Augustine's choice of a place of confrontation clearly demonstrates that he intended this basilica not just as a convenient meeting place but as a demonstration of his authority over the Donatist community in general. The seizure and

---

<sup>72</sup> Shaw calls the relatively peaceful but tense period from 363 to 411 one of 'entrenchment': *Sacred Violence*, 107.

<sup>73</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 11-12.

reuse of Donatist churches reflects one of the fundamental means of persecution employed by Christians against their co-religionists.

Beyond church structures, objects within churches might also be confiscated or destroyed. Faustinus and Marcellinus report their enemies plundering all items relating to the sacraments from their basilica in southern Spain and abusing the altar in particular: “What’s horrible to recount is the height of the sacrileges that were perpetrated: they carried away the altar of God from the Lord’s (place) and placed it in a temple at the feet of an idol!”<sup>74</sup> Likewise, in Oxyrhynchus, the *Libellus precum* reports, “they broke up the very altar of God with axes.”<sup>75</sup> These enemies of the Luciferians did their best to erase the particular objects associated with and representing this separate community, and thus erase the Luciferians as a discrete community. As with the structures themselves, the details reveal both the significance of these items to the Luciferian community and the targeted nature of the persecutions launched by other Nicene Christians. The opponents of the Luciferians were not causing random destruction, but targeting the objects most central to the religious life and identity of the Luciferians.

Other material possessions were vulnerable as well. One bishop, Turbo, threatened (according to Faustinus and Marcellinus) to burn down the private home of a newly converted Luciferian, Severus, who was a former tribune.<sup>76</sup> In this case, it does not seem like it is the function of the house or the role it played for the community that was

---

<sup>74</sup> *Lib. prec.* 76: ...diripientes inde quicquid ad sacra ecclesiae ministeria pertinebant, et postremo, quod horris est dicere, ad cumulum perpetrati sacrilegii, ipsum altare Dei de dominico sublatum in temple sub pedibus idoli posuerunt.

<sup>75</sup> *Lib. prec.* 96: ...ita ut ipsum altare Dei securibus dissiparet...4<sup>th</sup>-century altars were portable and made of wood.

<sup>76</sup> *Lib. prec.* 108: *Sed et Severi domui incendium minitatum veritati, qui tanto magis fidei vindicate quanto et Romano imperio fideliter militavit.*

so important as the fact that their persecutors were menacing a private residence – and, once more, targeting an elite member of the community. The division between public and private property was not particularly clear-cut in Late Antiquity, to be sure.<sup>77</sup> But even Augustine several times argued that Christians were not allowed to break into private residences to destroy pagan shrines,<sup>78</sup> so the willingness of one Christian to threaten another Christian’s home on sectarian grounds suggests how threatening a bishop like Turbo was to the Luciferians.

While we do not hear of persecutors seizing sacred Novatian objects, it seems highly unlikely that their persecutors would torture them and destroy or close their churches while leaving the material goods untouched. The omission of any mention of sacred Novatian objects being destroyed or otherwise abused is possibly a result of source survival, not a significant difference between the persecutions launched against Luciferian and Novatian communities.

A brief examination of the evidence for violence against Donatist sacramental objects may call this conclusion into question. Given the centrality of sacramental objects and scriptures to the origins of the Donatists (even terming their opponents *traditores*, as noted above), it is not surprising to see that in one Donatist account of the Great Persecution, the *Passio Felicis*, the attempts by pagan persecutors to confiscate objects plays a central role.<sup>79</sup> The continuing vitality of such stories implies that the problems

---

<sup>77</sup> See e.g. Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy*, 23-24, and, for a slightly earlier time period, Andrew M. Riggsby, “‘Public’ and ‘Private’ in Roman Culture,” *JRA* 10 (1997): 36-56.

<sup>78</sup> *Serm.* 24, 62.11, 308A; see also Maijastina Kahlos, “Pacifiers and Instigators - Bishops in Interreligious Conflicts in Late Antiquity,” in Andrew Fear, José Fernández Urbiña, and Mar Marcos, eds., *The Role of the Bishop in Late Antiquity: Conflict and Compromise* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 63-82.

<sup>79</sup> *Passio S. Felicis episcopi*, ed. H. Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana* 39 (1921): 110-116, passim.

described within them continued to plague Donatist communities. Another possible example that indicates the destruction of sacramental objects was a pressing concern is in the *Passio Donati et Advocati*, in which the author, probably writing between 317 and 320, warns that under the guise of unification “sacraments are profaned.”<sup>80</sup> However, it is unclear whether these sacraments are profaned because catholics destroy them or because Donatists are forced to hold communion with their adversaries.

On the other hand, it is striking how little attention is paid to the destruction of objects in the *Acta Saturnini*, the *Passiones tres martyrum Africae*, and the later extant martyr stories of the Macarian persecution. In the *Acta Saturnini*, commonly called the *Acts of the Abitinian Martyrs*, Saturninus and a host of other Christians are persecuted for celebrating Mass.<sup>81</sup> The women of the *Passiones* are persecuted for refusing to sacrifice.<sup>82</sup> In the *Passio Maximiani et Isaac*, both Maximian and Isaac are seized by officials without any mention of damage to any property.<sup>83</sup> The same is true of Marculus.<sup>84</sup> Optatus, in fact, claims that during the Macarian persecution, no catholic ever ordered anyone to burn scriptures or destroy basilicas.<sup>85</sup> He instead expresses (at length) seemingly genuine horror that Donatists damaged or destroyed catholic altars.<sup>86</sup> His defense of Macarius’ actions focuses entirely on scriptural justifications for killing

---

<sup>80</sup> *Passio Donati et Advocati* (= PL 8.752-758) 4: ...*profanantur sacramenta*...

<sup>81</sup> *Acta Sat.* 5.

<sup>82</sup> *Pass. tres. mart. Afr.* 2, 4.

<sup>83</sup> *Pass. Max. et Isaac*, 5, 6.

<sup>84</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 4.

<sup>85</sup> *Opt. De schism.* 3.1.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.1.

one's opposition, not for destroying their sacred objects.<sup>87</sup> Optatus even claims, "Even if men's minds are at war, their sacraments are not at war."<sup>88</sup> Theoretically, at least, there should have been no violence perpetrated by catholics against Donatist objects and, it seems, this might well have actually been the case.

Why this apparent lack of violence against Donatist sacramental objects? It is possible that this represents another gap in our sources. It is also possible that Optatus' bluster about Donatist and catholic 'brotherhood' in some ways reflected the real attitudes of the vast majority of his party. It is also possible that, given the importance of the preservation of objects during the Great Persecution in the arguments between Donatist and catholics, other Christians made a conscious effort not to abuse Donatist sacramental objects like altars for fear of inflaming their resistance further or creating additional martyrs. It is in this same vein that Augustine, in a sermon, advocated leniency towards Donatists convicted of attacking catholic clergy – no need to create additional martyrs.<sup>89</sup>

When considering violent persecution against Luciferian, Novatian, and Donatist objects and churches, some interesting comparisons emerge. The Luciferians describe their churches being destroyed or potentially re-appropriated; the Novatians found their churches frequently closed; the Donatists saw their churches re-appropriated. Likewise, when it came to other property, the Luciferians describe their sacred objects being

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 3.7. There are, of course, innumerable examples in the Old Testament that Optatus could have drawn from describing the destruction of false idols.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 3.9: *si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant sacramenta.*

<sup>89</sup> *Serm.* 302.

destroyed; the Novatian picture is still unclear; the Donatists seem to have escaped such violent destruction. The causes for these differing treatments are addressed below.

*Suffering Violence: Further Considerations*

The enemies of the Luciferians used a wide array of tactics in an attempt to eliminate their communities. The two most common methods appear to have been targeted attacks on Luciferian leaders and the targeted destruction of Luciferian churches and property. The violence in the 380s was not perpetrated in a frenzied rush as some of the descriptions in the *Libellus precum* might suggest but rather as a series of targeted attacks on the most potent symbols of the community: leaders, meeting places, and sacred objects.

Following the persecutions under Macedonius, the Novatians seem to have been treated with respect until the turn of the fourth century. With the exception of a very brief spell of persecution under the Arian emperor Valens, the later fourth century was generally peaceful for the Novatians, and most certainly a general peace existed between the Novatians and their Nicene fellows. Following Theodosius I's death, and especially in the reign of Theodosius II, however, they saw their churches closed by other Nicene Christians. But at no point in this later period does Socrates describe any persecutions of their individuals launched by other Nicene Christians. They are not tortured, jailed, or hauled to court. This is not to say that they were not persecuted, only that even at this later time it took a much milder form than it had in the 350s when they suffered alongside their Nicene allies and certainly a milder form than the Luciferians experienced.



The Donatists, likewise, saw a wave of persecutions focusing on their church structures and individuals in the 340s but following that experienced a long period of relative peace. The Donatists' own semi-Arian leanings, as discussed in Chapter Three, may have rendered them relatively innocuous to both sides of that conflict, particularly since their North African opponents were also somewhat semi-Arian.<sup>90</sup> While their catholic enemies in North Africa might not have liked them very much, there are no widespread instances of violent repression until the early fifth century following the Council of Carthage in 411. Even after this, the emphasis seems to be on the seizure of basilicas, not the destruction of property or violence against individuals.

Three interesting conclusions emerge from a comparison of the Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists. Firstly, the Novatians and Donatists seemingly escaped the more violent forms of persecution that the Luciferians did not. A reticence to create additional martyrs might help explain this difference. Novatians and Donatists may have escaped this treatment because, as we shall see, they were numerous enough to inspire a degree of caution in their enemies that the Luciferians, on account of their isolation and small size (as described in Chapter 2), could not.

Likewise, catholics notably did not destroy Novatian and Donatists churches, as they frequently did Luciferian churches, but re-used them, perhaps in another attempt to mollify or sway large populations, something unnecessary for the relatively small Luciferian communities. Luciferians also seem to have suffered a greater destruction of personal property than the Novatians or Donatists did. This difference may also be

---

<sup>90</sup> See Chapter 3 for the unique North African situation in the Arian controversy.

explained by the fact that Luciferian communities were relatively small and isolated. Thus the difference in how catholics treated Luciferians and the Novatians and Donatists in these respects may have come not from reasoned theological interpretations concerning the differences between these communities but practical considerations, such as the vulnerability of these communities and the likelihood of inflaming further resistance to the catholic faction.

Secondly, the Novatians and the Donatists appear to have survived those persecutions handily. The Luciferians seem to have survived, at least long enough to deliver their petition. One cannot help but observe that the Luciferians describe their church in Spain being rebuilt after the first wave of persecution but do not describe any rebuilding following the second wave. Likewise, when describing the destruction of their church in Oxyrhynchus, the authors mention no rebuilding. It is entirely possible that these churches were rebuilt and, after these two communities suffered no further persecution, the Luciferians simply omitted the information. On the other hand, they may not have been rebuilt at all, and the small size of Luciferian communities may thus have made them more vulnerable to these forms of persecution as well.

Lastly, the *Libellus precum* describes persecution at the hands of mobs led by clerics into the 380s, long after violent repression against Novatian and Donatist individuals had ceased and in a period when even seizures of their church buildings appears to have stopped. Perhaps these factors intertwine. As the state took little direct action to suppress Luciferians, Novatians, or Donatists in the 380s, catholic persecution

of these communities would generally take place without active state support.<sup>91</sup> As noted above, violence committed by pagans against Christians only occurred when the pagans thought local authorities would support them; the same could easily have been true for intra-Christian conflicts. Without state support, catholic Christians found the Novatians and Donatists too intimidating to actively persecute. The Luciferians, on the other hand, presented a ripe target.

As active state imposition of unity among Nicene Christians began in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, the Novatians and Donatists once more began to lose their property. The catholic persecutors of the 5<sup>th</sup> century were not obligated to take matters into their own hands, as catholics in the 380s were against the Luciferians. State support of the persecution of dissident Christians created a more difficult environment for the survival of communities like the Novatians and Donatists, who could stand up to other Christian communities far easier than they could oppose the state apparatus. The situation was apparently reversed for smaller communities like the Luciferians. The Luciferians may have had a milder experience when persecutors relied on state agents than they did when matters were in the hands of other Christian clergy. While in the 5<sup>th</sup> century the state may have confiscated churches and sent bishops into exile, instances of mobs burning down churches or individuals being mortally wounded are comparatively rare.

---

<sup>91</sup> Theodosius' legislation in the last decades of the 4<sup>th</sup> century is directed against Arians and other non-Nicene Christians, not Nicene rigorists. See Rougé, "La législation de Théodose." The Luciferians do note that state agents arrested Heraclida at Theodore's request and broke up Macarius' meeting at Damasus' request (and alongside his clerics). But it is also worth noting Heraclida was summarily released because the state found him innocent of wrongdoing, Macarius was exiled only to Ostia, and in court Ephesius defeated Damasus. There is a significant difference between active imperial legislation against Novatians and Donatists and the co-opting of previous legislation to harass a community like the Luciferians.

### *Committing Violence*

When the reverse situation is considered, we see that it was only the Novatians and Donatists who were able to commit acts of violence in defense of their community. Despite the apparent Luciferian readiness to do the same, they do not appear to have been responsible for any direct acts of violence. Their failure to do so is particularly worth noting in light of the fact that they might be expected to resort to violence more often than their catholic persecutors were; as Salzman points out concerning pagan-Christian violence, pagan violence against Christians “is thus also indicative of their relatively disempowered status in the western Roman empire of the late fourth and early fifth centuries. When confronted with attacks on their shrines and idols, pagans had limited legal avenues to redress their situation.”<sup>92</sup> While the Luciferians were not quite as disempowered as pagans were – and even describe a successful victory in court – other Christians (according to the *Libellus precum*) routinely assailed them. Yet they demonstrate a clear inability to actively defend their individuals and property in times of persecution. This failure appears to be another consequence of their relatively small size.

Furthermore, communities can be bound together not only by suffering violence together, but by the act of inflicting violence as well.<sup>93</sup> Committing acts of violence bound communities together because their members shared a heightened emotional experience; this method of binding communities together in antiquity frequently became ritualized into such activities as, for example, sacrifice or gladiatorial combat.<sup>94</sup> Although

---

<sup>92</sup> Salzman, “Rethinking Pagan-Christian Violence,” 283.

<sup>93</sup> Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 12.

<sup>94</sup> On the role of committing violence in communal identity formation in antiquity, see, e.g., B. Goff, “The Violence of Community: Ritual in the *Iphigeneia of Tauris*,” in Mark W. Padilla, ed., *Rites of Passage in*

committing acts of violence bound Novatians and Donatists together, the same process did not occur for the Luciferians.

In stark contrast to the numerous accounts of persecution suffered by the Luciferians that they relate, Faustinus and Marcellinus make no mention of any acts of violence that their community itself perpetrated. On the contrary, the *Libellus precum* represents Vincentius hiding to avoid conflict in southern Spain.<sup>95</sup> Bonosus, Macarius, and Heraclida are all seized apparently without resisting arrest.<sup>96</sup> But we would expect the Luciferians to support this rather pacifistic view of themselves. Faustinus and Marcellinus were, after all, offering a petition to the emperor Theodosius begging for toleration. It would hardly be fitting to recount their various exploits injuring or killing their enemies.

But this image of the Luciferians is seemingly supported by the ways other Christians talk about the Luciferians. None accuse them of committing any direct acts of physical violence. Jerome, for instance, describes the Luciferian opponent in his *Dialogus* as having a “hateful loquacity” and “snarling eloquence,” both terms suggestive of violence, but nowhere actually attributes any violent acts to the rigorists.<sup>97</sup> Ambrose likewise claims that by their very schism they tear the limbs from Christ, but makes no

---

*Ancient Greece* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1999), 109-125, who describes sacrifice as a ritualized murder in which all members of the community are expected to participate; Donald G. Kyle, *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 7, writes, “to reinforce the social order violence must be performed or proclaimed in public, and public violence tends to become ritualized.”

<sup>95</sup> *Lib. prec.* 73.

<sup>96</sup> *Lib. prec.* 77, 80, 96.

<sup>97</sup> *Dial. c. Luc.* 1: ...*odiosa loquacitate...caninam facundiam...*

claim about more literal acts of violence.<sup>98</sup> And we might well expect their enemies to make such claims. Augustine, for instance, makes no mention of Luciferian violence but, as we shall see, is more than happy to recount examples of Donatist violence.<sup>99</sup>

Luciferians violently resisting persecution in this way would have provided other Christian authors with easy ammunition against them. Their failure to mention anything at least suggests that the Luciferians remained relatively peaceful.

It is also important to note that this is not to say the Luciferians did not *wish* to commit acts of violence. They rhetorically ask, for instance, why it is so bad if they ‘spit back’ a false peace, a physical action more meaningful in Roman times than we might expect.<sup>100</sup> The two authors also come close near the end of their petition to demanding blood. Faustinus and Marcellinus recount the story of King Jehu gathering and executing hundreds of priests as an example of what the *praevaricatores* deserved.<sup>101</sup> The two then, as one might expect, quickly backtrack, claiming that they naturally did not want any actual blood to be spilled and justifying their own pacifism by claiming that what happened under Jehu happened in the times of the Old Testament, when things were done

---

<sup>98</sup> *De exc. frat. Satyri* 1.47.

<sup>99</sup> On the Luciferians, see Aug. *De ag. Chr.* 30.32.

<sup>100</sup> *Lib. prec.* 119: ...*huiusmodi pacem respuamus*... See Ludwig Deubner, *Handwörterbuch des Deutschen Aberglaubens* VIII (Berlin and Leipzig, 1937), s.v. “Spucken;” Andrew Louth, “*Fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani*: Conversion, Community, and Christian Identity in Late Antiquity,” in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell, eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 109-119, at 113, emphasizes (among other elements) the reviling of and spitting on the devil in the Eucharist ceremony. See also, e.g., Andrea de Jorio, *Gesture in Naples and Gesture in Classical Antiquity*, trans. Adam Kendon (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 186, a recently-translated 1832 volume comparing the gestures of early 19<sup>th</sup>-century Naples with the gestures seen in classical art and described in classical literary sources: “5. *Mouth in act of spitting and directed to another’s face*. Spitting in someone’s face is the greatest insult one can perform with the mouth. This gesture clearly represents such an unworthy action that it is the most intense form of this kind of insult.”

<sup>101</sup> *Lib. prec.* 70.

‘according to the flesh’ instead of ‘according to the spirit.’<sup>102</sup> Longing for the blood of false priests is described as ‘not permitted,’ *non licet*, though they do not describe it as immoral or unjustified. While these are instances of Luciferian rhetoric, not actions, it is easy to imagine that the impulses that drove them to recount such a bloody story would manifest themselves quite differently if the Luciferians had the ability to more actively defend themselves from other Christian communities.

According to Canellis, a much subtler and more suggestive, but nonetheless intimidating, language is also detectable in the way they construct their petition to the emperor.<sup>103</sup> Quite simply, Faustinus and Marcellinus make the logical argument as follows. The emperors are good; they protect the weak, uphold the laws, and above all, defend the Christian faith and act against heresy.<sup>104</sup> Their failure to protect the Luciferians is due to their ignorance, not their malice: “It is no wonder, however, if you do not know that such cruelties are committed, since you are occupied with affairs of state.”<sup>105</sup> Even bad emperors like Constantius and Valens were deceived, and Faustinus and Marcellinus do not hold them entirely culpable for their actions.<sup>106</sup> But now the emperors do know about these cruelties, since Faustinus and Marcellinus have informed them, and must decide: “Will you, most pious emperors, allow impiety to have dominion

---

<sup>102</sup> *Lib. prec.* 71: *Quae quidem nos non ideo dicimus quasi qui uelimus alicuius sanguinem fundi: absit hoc a uotis nostris!...Sed non, quia quidem nunc non licet bonis et fidelibus falsorum sacerdotum sanguinem cupere, idcirco fideles falsis sacerdotibus addicendi sunt, ita ut grauissimis eorum persecutionibus affligantur.*

<sup>103</sup> For a brief discussion of Faustinus and Marcellinus’ ‘tactique d’intimidation,’ see Canellis, in Faustinus, *Lib. prec.* = *Supplique aux empereurs*, 64-65.

<sup>104</sup> *Lib. prec.* 3, 5, 9, 19, 30, 47, 49, 68, 97, 100, 110, 113, 116, 123, 124.

<sup>105</sup> *Lib. prec.* 49: *non est autem mirum, si haec tam atrocia eorum commissa, occupati rei publicae prouisionibus, ignoratis.*

<sup>106</sup> *Lib. prec.* 12: *...quod imperatorem Constantium per fraudulentam disputationem Arrianae impietatis participem fecerunt; 66: Haec, haec res decepit et Valentem imperatorem...*

everywhere and at length under the authority of your name against the faithful?”<sup>107</sup> So far, the *Libellus precum* offers only praise in support of their requests.

But in the conclusion to the petition, Faustinus and Marcellinus sound an ominous note:<sup>108</sup>

Should we think that these things are done against the true catholics and his [God’s] true church without offending God? Things which, when they were perpetrated a long time ago against the servants of God, were avenged most harshly by divine punishments? And why are there so many blows by which the Roman world is shaken by and pressed down on?

In other words, not only is it the emperor’s responsibility to take care of this problem, but failure to do so to date has resulted in any number of catastrophes that Faustinus and Marcellinus could be referring to (though it seems most likely that they are referred to the Gothic incursions of the late 370s and the usurpation of Magnus Maximus in the West, still ongoing when the petition was brought to Theodosius). The natural conclusion is that failure to help the Luciferians will bring about further disasters for Theodosius and the Roman Empire. While not an explicit threat – and certainly not as suggestive as the citation of the story of King Jehu – it still presents a rather uncompromising choice for Theodosius. He can side with the Luciferians or he can side with heretics and thereby bring down the Roman Empire as well as *divinae animadversiones* upon himself.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Lib. prec.* 110: *Permittetis, piissimi imperatores, ut sub uestri nominis auctoritate aduersus fideles diu ubique dominetur impietas? Expedi enim hoc Romano imperio (quod tamen affectu et fide eius quam Christo Deo exhibetis obseruantiae dicimus), ut qui Christum pie praedicant persecutiones mortisque patiantur, ita ut nusquam liceat Deo pia altaria conlocare aut certe, cum conlocata fuerint, destruantur?* See also *Lib. prec.* 113.

<sup>108</sup> *Lib. prec.* 112: *Putamus quod sine offensione Dei haec in ueros catholicos et in ueram eius Ecclesiam perpetrentur, quae olim aduersus seruos Dei perpetrata grauissime diuinis animaduersionibus uindicata sunt? Et unde sunt tot plagae quibus orbis Romanus quatitur et urguetur?*



Thus in general, there are hints that the Luciferian failure to commit acts of violence in defense of their community was a matter of circumstance, not desire. Their rhetoric, biblical metaphors, and arguments to Theodosius strike a fairly menacing tone. While these are not ‘real’ acts of violence, they suggest that the Luciferians had no strong opposition to such. When we consider the Novatians and Donatists, we can see that other communities did perform acts of violence and this helped maintain their communal identities.

The Novatians do appear rather pacifistic in our sources with one spectacular exception. According to Socrates, the Arian bishop Macedonius wished to eliminate the Novatian presence in Phrygia and, finding his own clergy insufficient in numbers to complete the task, appealed to Constantius.<sup>109</sup> Four companies of soldiers were sent to help his clergy compel the locals around Mantinium, which Socrates notably describes as an especially dense region of Novatian adherence, to swear to an Arian creed. But the residents took up the weapons of the peasantry – scythes, hatchets, and the like – and though many of them were slain, they did massacre almost all of the soldiers. This is a notable example of how the act of committing violence might reinforce a community’s identity. Obviously their sense of community had to be staunch enough to begin with if these poorly armed individuals were willing to take up hatchets against soldiers of the state. But Socrates includes a very significant detail: “I learned these things from a Paphlagonian peasant, who said he was present for the battle, and many other

---

<sup>109</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.

Paphlagonians say these things too.”<sup>110</sup> Clearly this remained a seminal event in the consciousness of these Novatian peasants if not just Socrates’ main source but many others as well recalled the story nearly a hundred years later (though we might cast serious doubts on whether or not Socrates’ source had actually been present at the event, no matter how old he was). While an act of persecution prompted the outbreak of violence, the community clearly remembered the experience as a great instance of violent resistance to persecution rather than the stereotypical example of a stalwart Christian standing steadfast and willing to suffer for the faith in a court.

Another, brief example suggests the Novatian capacity for violence as well. The schismatic Novatian Sabbatius was attempting to celebrate Passover with his followers: “And acting according to custom for the whole night [i.e. holding their vigils], a tumult from some evil spirit fell upon them, as though their bishop Sisinnius were coming to attack them with a great multitude.”<sup>111</sup> The ensuing panic caused the death of about seventy of Sabbatius’ followers, according to Socrates. In this account, Socrates attaches no blame to Sisinnius, as he was not in fact attacking Sabbatius’ group; it was instead some evil spirit stirring up Sabbatius’ followers. But it is still quite suggestive that Sabbatius’ followers considered Sisinnius not only capable of violence but in fact the most likely person to launch an attack against them with a large mob. And these followers of Sabbatius were not catholic enemies of Sisinnius, but Novatians who had attended services with Sisinnius and knew him well. If the members of this Sabbatian

---

<sup>110</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.32: Ταῦτα ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀγροίκου Παφλαγόνος ἔμαθον, ὃς ἔλεγεν παρεῖναι τῇ μάχῃ· λέγουσι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλοι Παφλαγόνων πολλοί.

<sup>111</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 7.5.7: καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἔθους παννυχίδα ποιούντων θόρυβός τις δαιμόνιος ἐνέπεσεν εἰς αὐτούς, ὡς ἄρα Σισίννιος ὁ αὐτῶν ἐπίσκοπος σὺν πολλῶ πληθῆι ἔρχεται κατ’ αὐτῶν.

community could conceive of Sisinnius acting in this way, it most certainly suggests that violence within the Novatian community was quite possible.

It is with the Donatists, however, that we see the true flowering of violent conflict between Christians. There is no need to go through every instance of Donatist violence against their opponents. One example will suffice: the brutality of Donatists against other North African Christians after Julian's general amnesty for all Christian sects in 362. This incident followed over a decade of peace following the Macarian persecution of 347-348. Frend describes the scene, largely based in passages from Optatus' account with elements taken from Augustine as well, as follows:<sup>112</sup>

Donatism swept Numidia and Mauretania like a forest fire. Bishops, priests, and women in vows (*sanctimoniales*) were rudely deposed. Where they were not killed outright, they were ordered 'to become Christians'... The altars at which they had worshipped only a short time before were broke up and burnt, the Communion wine thrown to the dogs or heated into a powerful stimulant and drunk. The Catholic liturgical vessels were thrown out of windows to be smashed, and their fragments sold off at the fairs for what they would fetch.

In this account we can see the Donatists using many of the same tactics as other Christians had used against them and others. There was physical violence against individuals, as many were killed, and the objects related to the sacraments were destroyed or 'decommissioned,' as it were. Optatus in particular emphasizes the Donatist 'scraping' of altars.<sup>113</sup> Nothing in here, grim though it may sound, was particularly innovative or unique to the Donatists.<sup>114</sup> What these actions do suggest, however, is that the Donatist sense of community was sufficiently strong that even after years of living alongside their

---

<sup>112</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 189. See also Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 151-157.

<sup>113</sup> *De schism.* 6.1.

<sup>114</sup> Indeed, Frend (*The Donatist Church*, 188) himself compares Optatus' descriptions to his own observations of inter-communal religious violence in India in 1947.

neighbors in relative peace they were willing to commit savage acts when they had the chance. Lastly, their numbers made this wave of violence possible. Such widespread violence appears to have happened with no government intervention, which suggests that the local government did not care about this widespread slaughter or was unable or unwilling to do anything about it.

Nor was this violence an exceptional event occurring only the once under Julian. A law in the Theodosian Code has extensive provisions for what must happen if anyone “while invading catholic churches brings any kind of harm to priests and their assistants or to the worship or cult itself.”<sup>115</sup> The existence of such a law suggests that at the very least it was a pressing, regular concern to some bishops that Donatists might break into their churches, assault their clergy, and destroy their sacramental objects. Records of such acts exist. Augustine wrote to an imperial official to obtain clemency on behalf of Donatists convicted of killing one presbyter and seriously injuring another, an attack on clergy reminiscent of many already discussed.<sup>116</sup> These are later expressions of the exact methods of violence that the Donatists used in 363 and the exact forms of violence that catholics had used against them as well.

Nor was Donatist violence limited to their catholic opponents. Augustine also reports that the Donatists were happy to seize the churches of the so-called Maximianists who separated themselves from the broader Donatist communion following the election of Primian to the see of Carthage and the subsequent Council of Bagai in 394: “But look!

---

<sup>115</sup> *CTh* 16.2.31: ...*si quisquam...in ecclesias intruans sacerdotibus et ministris vel ipsi cultui locoque aliquid importet iniuriae...*

<sup>116</sup> *Aug. Ep.* 133.1.

Three hundred and ten Donatist bishops condemned the Maximianists in their own council...then it was ordered that those who were condemned by so many bishops should leave their sees. Those who left obligingly didn't suffer much, but those who tried to resist – who doesn't know how they were assaulted?"<sup>117</sup> While Augustine remains coy about what exactly these Maximianists suffered, it is clear that the Donatists were willing to use some form of force to ensure unity within their own communities. Optatus too emphasizes the willingness of Donatists to commit acts of violence against other Donatists to ensure communal conformity.<sup>118</sup>

There has been a clear and conscious attempt in this section to avoid the question of the circumcellions. These bands of apparently wandering vagrants have been the subject of an extraordinary amount of scholarly interest.<sup>119</sup> But the question of their relationship to the Donatist community at large is fraught with source difficulties. As Atkins says, "The prevailing image of the circumcellions still reflects what their rigorous opponents, Optatus and Saint Augustine, wrote about them."<sup>120</sup> Since there are examples of Donatist violence against other Christians, and catholic violence against Donatists, it does not seem like it is necessary to fully explore the question here. In any case, Shaw

---

<sup>117</sup> *C. ep. Parm.* 1.11.18: *Sed ecce damnauerunt in concilio suo Maximianistas trecenti decem episcopi donatistae...Deinde iussum est ut illi qui tanto episcoporum numero damnati sunt, cederunt locis; qui facile cesserunt, non multa passi sunt; qui autem resistere tentauerunt, quemadmodum afflicti sint, quis ignorat?*

<sup>118</sup> *Opt. De schism.* 3.4.

<sup>119</sup> See e.g. J.E. Atkinson, "Out of Order: The Circumcellions and Codex Theodosianus 16.5.52," *Historia* 41 (1992): 488-499, at 491-492, on the historiography of the question up to 1992 and Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 630-674, for the past two decades.

<sup>120</sup> Atkins, "Out of Order," 489.

provides the most nuanced view of the variety of what the circumcellions probably were.<sup>121</sup>

In some cases they were sectarian men of violence who were self-directed, recruited, and motivated; in other circumstances they were not much more than the group of men who happened to be recruited in an *ad hoc* manner to be used as enforcers; in still others, they appear to have been more permanent religious gangs mobilized and activated by a given dissident priest or bishop.

And these gangs were apparently not uniquely Donatist; they were essentially migrant laborers who of their own volition or at the behest of clerical instigators took religious matters into their own hands, meaning both violence against pagans and pagan sites as well as violence against their Christian adversaries.<sup>122</sup> “Once again,” Shaw concludes, “the transfer from anti-pagan to anti-Christian violence was a lateral one that was made easier by the construction of certain heretical Christians as no different than pagans, or Jews.”<sup>123</sup> In this sense, the apparent uniqueness of the circumcellions is more symptomatic of the social and economic circumstances that informed the religious disputes in North Africa than reflective of a particularly unique facet of Donatism. These circumcellions were not the agitated proletariat of North Africa, nor were they religious cohorts in the pay of the Donatists; they were the rural poor, firm in their beliefs, and looking to express those beliefs in a way that might potentially profit them.

In sum, while the Donatists may have suffered dearly at the hands of other Christians in North Africa, they were also ready and willing to use violence themselves to break apart other Christian communities, even those that had formerly belonged to their

---

<sup>121</sup> Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 673.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 673-674.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 674.

communion. Donatist violence even came rapidly following years of peace. While instances of Novatian violence are not as common as Donatist examples, the examples are quite telling: when faced with armed persecution, the Novatians of Paphlagonia were able to fight back, and when faced with schism, the followers of Sabbatius considered Sisinnius the most likely to force them back into Novatian communion. This potential for violence may also explain why relatively isolated Novatian churches in places like Rome and Alexandria were able to be closed by other Christians while the Novatian churches in relatively densely Novatian areas like Constantinople seem not only to have stayed open but flourished. In this sense both differ dramatically from the Luciferians, who seem unable to use force against their enemies rather than unwilling. After all, pagans in Late Antiquity were willing to commit acts of violence in defense of their communities when they felt like the local elites would support them, no matter what the laws said – but they were much more numerous.<sup>124</sup> Given the presence within the Luciferian community of local elites in Spain and Palestine, at the very least, the fact that they were still unable to aggressively defend themselves against persecution and instead sought imperial support is even more telling. The Luciferians may have thus suffered due to the very smallness of their communities. Unable to defend themselves by force, the Luciferians might not only have been more vulnerable to the persecutions of their enemies, but more vulnerable to forces pulling their communities apart without the shared experience of perpetrating violence to keep them together.

### *Remembering Violence*

---

<sup>124</sup> Salzman, “Rethinking Pagan-Christian Violence,” 284.

In addition to suffering violence and inflicting it, remembering violence was a central factor for the maintenance of strong communal identities in Late Antiquity. Luciferians, like other catholic and dissident Christians in Late Antiquity, remembered past violence most often in the form of the veneration of martyr relics and the retelling of martyr stories. Not only was persecution ineffective in destroying communal identities, it in fact seems to have had the complete opposite effect: the communal identities of the Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists were in fact strengthened by their experiences. Christians as early as the first century had used martyrdom as a marker for distinguishing themselves from Jews and pagans.<sup>125</sup> Jews and pagans likewise used their own martyrs to distinguish themselves from Christians and each other.<sup>126</sup> But there was no reason why the same tool for distinguishing Christians from Jews or pagans could not be used to

---

<sup>125</sup> Much has been written about Christian martyrs, naturally, but see, e.g., Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), and G. W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). See also, in a broader sociological sense, Gager, *Kingdom and Community*, 80-87.

<sup>126</sup> Accounts of Jewish martyrs appear as early as the Jewish scriptures, e.g., in the story of Daniel and in the accounts of the Maccabees; sporadic Roman persecution under the Republic and especially the bloody revolts of the 60s and 130s CE were particularly influential on later accounts as well. See especially Shmuel Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). See also the discussions in Friedrich Avemarie and Jan Willem van Henten, eds., *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian Antiquity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 42-87, 132-176. The classic depictions of pagan martyrs come from a set of Alexandrine documents published as *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs (Acta Alexandrinorum)*, ed. H.A. Musurillo (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), which were earlier discussed by their editor in H.A. Musurillo, "The Pagan Acts of the Martyrs," *TS* 10 (1949): 555-564. See also H.A. Musurillo, "A New Fragment of the *Acta Alexandrinorum*," *JRS* 47 (1957): 185-190. Musurillo, for instance, brings up in *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 237, the willingness of Socrates to die as providing a heroic archetype for pagan philosophers to follow. However, Musurillo also points out that these have numerous seemingly fictional elements. These stories differed in numerous respects from traditional Christian martyr narratives; see Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome*, 16. See also A. Ronconi, "Exitus illustrium virorum," *SIFC* 17 (1940): 3-32, on the tradition of 'dying well' among pagan elites in antiquity.



distinguish between Christian and Christian, and it is no surprise that Christians in the fourth century did just that.<sup>127</sup>

Remembering violence was particularly important since this violence generally took place against a backdrop of the mutual tolerance that marked day-to-day life in Late Antiquity. In fact, instances of violence between communities “may often be interpreted not as manifestations of a generalized or popular intolerance but rather as attempts by Christian rigorists to interrupt what was perceived as a dangerous erosion or obfuscation of communal boundaries.”<sup>128</sup> Luciferians, Novatians, and Donatists generally lived peacefully alongside catholic Christians. Faustinus and Marcellinus often betray cordiality towards their enemies. The Luciferians have kind words for Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, and Florentius of Ostia, all of whom held communion with *praevaricatores*.<sup>129</sup> Novatians opened their churches to other Nicene Christians under Arian persecution and worked alongside Nicene Christians to combat Arians at Theodosius’ court.<sup>130</sup> Catholics and Donatists mingled throughout their lives in North Africa, sometimes even marrying each other or attending each other’s services.<sup>131</sup> The hard lines separating these communities were not so hard after all.

---

<sup>127</sup> See e.g. Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 274: “Many Christian communities, for example, seem to have read contemporary events through a narrative of persecution and survival that had become central to Roman Christian modes of self-fashioning. These recalled the periods of pre-Constantinian persecution...”

<sup>128</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 111.

<sup>129</sup> *Lib. prec.* 24: ...*favens praevaricatoribus, ut non dicamus interim, quia favit <et> haereticis, in quos eloquentiae suae viribus [Hilarius] peroraverat*; 82: *Hoc pio suo obsequio, in quantum poterat, Damasi scelus a se [Florentio] facere contendebat alienum*; *Lib. prec.* 88. There are even letters between Athanasius and Lucifer forged by Luciferians: see Saltet, “Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens.”

<sup>130</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 2.38; 5.10

<sup>131</sup> For examples, see, e.g., *Opt. De schism.* 4.2; *Aug. Ep.* 33.5: *Vides quanta et quam miserabili foeditate christianae domus familiaeque turbate sint. Mariti et uxores de suo lecto sibi consentiunt, et de Christi*

Thus even if these communities *could* coexist peacefully, this was certainly not how they perceived and described their interactions. “Tellingly,” writes Sizgorich, “it is the violence that is remembered rather than the much quieter processes of cooperation, exchange, and harmony that this violence disrupted.”<sup>132</sup> Many scholars have emphasized attempts by late antique Christians (and others) to prevent boundaries from being transgressed and have focused on instances of transgression as a way of demonstrating the weakness of these boundaries.<sup>133</sup> It is precisely this atmosphere of general tolerance that permitted such transgressions and thus demanded additional markers in order to distinguish communities. We have already discussed the role that ascetics played in demarcating communal boundaries and serving as ‘pure’ examples of a community’s membership in Chapter 5. But for these three communities, martyrs were much more important individuals in maintaining differences between communities and providing exemplars for good behavior.

These Christian communities constructed the identity of their own communities and the communities of their enemies as being in inimical and violent opposition to one another. Their members focused on instances in which members of their community had been unjustly (in their own eyes) hurt, and often killed, by their enemies. They kept these memories vivid for other members in their community by the veneration of the remains of martyrs and by continuously retelling the stories of martyrdom associated with these

---

*altare dissentiunt...Filii cum parentibus unam domum habent suam, et domum Dei non habent unam....Servi et domini communem Dominum dividunt...Honorant nos vestri, honorant vos nostri. Per coronam nostram nos adiurant vestri, per coronam vestram vos adiurant nostri; Ep. 93.1; De bapt. 2.7.10; Poss. V. Aug. 6-7.*

<sup>132</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 109.

<sup>133</sup> E.g. Boyarin, *Border Lines*, passim; H.O. Maier, “‘Manichee!’ Leo the Great and the Orthodox Panopticon,” *J ECS* 4, no. 4 (1996): 441-460; Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 36-44.

individuals. In death, martyrs were able to serve as the glue that bound communities together.

*Remembering Violence: Martyr Veneration*

One major way that communities built their identities around martyrs was in the veneration of their physical remains. While this veneration may have traced its roots in older hero-worship, it took on a very distinct character in the late antique Christian world.<sup>134</sup> In short, the cult of the martyrs in Late Antiquity was the belief that a martyr had a special connection with God by virtue of his death and could act as an intercessor with God on behalf a worshiper; it was this direct connection between the earthly and the divine that set the cult of the martyrs apart from traditional pagan hero worship.<sup>135</sup>

Shepardson points out that ascetic burial sites came to have a similar power associated with them that martyrial sites had;<sup>136</sup> this perfectly mimics the general late antique transition from ‘red’ to ‘white’ martyrdom discussed in the introduction to this chapter. But as described in earlier in this chapter, ‘red’ martyrdom was still a very real phenomenon for these dissident communities. The Luciferians, no different than the Novatians, Donatists, or other Nicene Christians, considered the proper treatment and veneration of the remains of their martyrs a central element in their community’s conception of itself.

---

<sup>134</sup> In general, see Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014; 2nd ed.), along with the review article by C. Pietri, “Les origines du culte des martyrs (d’après un livre récent),” *RAC* 60 (1984): 293-319, and a volume with studies of the subject edited by James Howard-Johnston and Paul Anthony Hayward, *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>135</sup> See, e.g., Louis Gernet and André Boulanger, *Le génie grec dans la religion* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1970), 264.

<sup>136</sup> *Controlling Contested Places*, 187-190.

In the *Libellus precum*, Faustinus and Marcellinus specifically recount the story not only of a martyr but indicate the significance of his physical remains. In their account, the presbyter Macarius has just died in Ostia after being wounded in a nighttime raid launched by Damasus.<sup>137</sup> They continue:<sup>138</sup>

His [Macarius'] holiness was so great that even the bishop of that place, Florentius by name, who held communion with Damasus, looked up to him with some veneration. For after the brethren had buried Macarius in some ancient monument, that same Florentius did not allow him to lie there where the tomb seemed unworthy. Instead, he relocated him from there and buried him in the basilica of the martyr Asterius, where he is in a spot of the presbyterium next to the grave of Asterius.

Faustinus and Marcellinus call this act a “pious favor.”<sup>139</sup> The account has several noteworthy features. First of all, the Luciferian community originally had chosen for Macarius a burial place within an ancient monument. Burial within a tomb, rather than reuse of the materials of the ancient tomb to build a new one, permitted Faustinus and Marcellinus to present themselves as relatively good Romans, in that they were not violating numerous laws in the fourth century that provided punishments for the common practices of grave-robbing and of despoiling tombs for building materials.<sup>140</sup> This tomb was, however, seen as unworthy not only by the Luciferians themselves but by Damasus’ ally Florentius. Already, then, the Luciferians show some sense that the body of their holy martyr deserved some additional veneration.

---

<sup>137</sup> *Lib. prec.* 82.

<sup>138</sup> *Lib. prec.* 82: *Cuius quidem tanta fuit sanctitas ut eum etiam episcopus loci illius nomine Florentius, communicans Damaso, cum quadam ueneratione suspexerit. Namque cum in quodam uetusto monumento eum fratres sepelissent, non est passus idem Florentius iacere eum illic ubi indigna sepultura videretur, sed transfert eum inde et sepelit in basilica martyris Asterii, ubi in loco presbyterii qui [est] iuxta sepulturam.*

<sup>139</sup> *Lib. prec.* 82: *...pio suo obsequio...*

<sup>140</sup> Rebillard, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, 63-68.

The account provided by the Luciferians of Macarius' reburial also demonstrates how they expected readers, whether Theodosius or members of their own community, to connect the veneration of well-known and beloved pre-Constantinian martyrs to their own community's martyrs. The choice of burial in a basilica was not unusual in Ostia.<sup>141</sup> But according to the *Libellus precum*, Florentius placed Macarius' tomb next to another martyr's tomb, that of Asterius. A reader familiar with the story of Asterius' death as related in the *Gesta martyrum* would see numerous resonances in the account of Macarius' death in the *Libellus precum*.<sup>142</sup> Asterius, for example, was left unburied only to be honorably reburied later by pious Christians, just as Macarius was improperly buried but then reburied by a pious Christian, Florentius. Thus the *Libellus precum* creates an equivalence between the holiness of the two in the reader's mind not only by the fact that Macarius was buried next to Asterius but in how both came to be buried in the same place the same way.

---

<sup>141</sup> Milton Luiz Torres, "Christian Burial Practices at Ostia Antica" (diss. University of Texas at Austin, 2008), 92: "The principal element that we can draw from the architectural context of the basilicas at Ostia and Portus yields two main patterns: first, that they were largely built in connection with the cult of the Christian martyrs from the two cities; second, they are closely associated with existing cemeteries." No basilica in Ostia has been identified as the basilica in question, and none have revealed burials in the location that Faustinus and Marcellinus describe. Torres, *ibid.*, suggests the Basilica di Pianabella is the most likely candidate to be Florentius' but even he does not believe it to be the basilica of the *Libellus precum*; Boin, *Ostia in Late Antiquity*, 168-169, puts the Basilica di Pianabella in the early fifth century, too early to be the basilica of Florentius. See also Rebillard, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, 5. On the connection between the episcopacy and martyrs' burials, see Brown, *The Cult of the Saints*, 8-10; for early examples of burials near the tombs of other famous martyrs, see *ibid.*, 33.

<sup>142</sup> The main account of Asterius' death can be found at *Acta S. Callisti papae martyris Romae* (= PG 10.111-120) 9: *Post dies vero decem et septem venit presbyter eius, nomine Asterius cum clericis noctu, et levavit corpus B. Calixti episcopi et honorifice sepelivit in coemeterio Calepodii, Via Aurelia, pridie Idus Octobris. Post dies autem sex tenuit Alexander Asterium presbyterum: quem praecipit per pontem praecipitari. Cuius sanctum corpus inventum est in Ostia, et a quibusdam Christianis sepultum in eadem civitate sub die XII Kalendarum Novembris.* The *Gesta martyrum* is a late antique collection of apocryphal accounts of the deaths of pre-Constantinian Christians in Rome. Despite questions concerning its date, some of the stories in the *Gesta martyrum* clearly came from the late fourth or early fifth century at the latest. On the *Gesta martyrum*, see Pilsworth, "Dating the *gesta martyrum*," 311, 314, and bibliography.

Furthermore, Macarius' tomb was in the presbyterium, the area at the rear of a basilica containing the altar, bishop's seat, and benches for the clergy. It should be noted that the presbyterium was inaccessible to the common laity: when in the presbyterium, Macarius' body was only accessible to the clergy. It is in fact this very inaccessibility that often gave the body of a martyr its power in the minds of those seeking out the martyr's tomb.<sup>143</sup> Moreover, Macarius himself is described as a presbyter, so this particular final resting place was certainly fitting. Faustinus and Marcellinus also describe themselves as presbyters, so the experience of the presbyter Macarius and his burial site's connection to the center of the shared ecclesiastic duties of Macarius, Faustinus, and Marcellinus might also resonate with these two authors in particular. But most importantly, the burial site creates a link between his death as a clergyman and the center of his duties as a clergyman. Given that the Luciferians put such great emphasis on the proper actions of clergy (rather than focusing on the actions of the laity), their emphasis on his burial as a cleric in the presbyterium, the central location where clerics performed their duties, further solidifies the connection in the reader's mind between the proper actions of a cleric and his willingness to suffer martyrdom.

The Novatians also appear to have great reverence for the physical remains of their martyrs, judging by one of Socrates' brief reports. During the persecution of Macedonius in the 350s, Socrates reports the fate of a prominent Novatian ascetic: "Alexander died in prison from his wounds, and he is now buried on the right-hand side of those sailing into the bay at Byzantion called Keras, near the rivers, where there is also

---

<sup>143</sup> Brown, *The Cult of the Saints*, 87. Brown provides several examples of other martyrs placed in isolated locations.

a church of the Novatians called ‘Alexander.’”<sup>144</sup> Socrates claims to have heard this directly from another Novatian sufferer, Auxanon, which indicates that the importance of the martyr – and, significantly, his burial site – had lasted long after the persecution under Macedonius.<sup>145</sup> The fact that a Novatian church in the 440s was still named after a martyr of the 350s also demonstrates the longevity and continuity with the present that memories of martyrdom had.

This ascetic Alexander was not the only Novatian martyr whose remains were treated this way. Another Novatian named Sabbatius, who (as mentioned above) led a community that separated from the broader community of Novatians over the question of the proper date of Easter, died in exile on Rhodes.<sup>146</sup> But according to Socrates, “Those separating themselves from the Novatians on account of the Jewish Passover transported the body of Sabbatius from Rhodes...and having buried it, prayed at the tomb.”<sup>147</sup> It was obviously important for this group of separatist Novatians to have the physical presence of Sabbatius’ body, not just his memory, so that they could pray alongside his grave.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>144</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.13: Καὶ ἐνεγκεῖν μὲν τὰς βασάνους αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν, Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ ἐν τῇ εἰρκτῇ ὑπὸ τῶν πληγῶν τελευτήσαι· ὃς τέθαιπται νῦν ἐν δεξιᾷ εἰσπλεύσαντι τὸν Βυζάντιον κόλπον, ὃς καλεῖται Κέρας, πλησίον τῶν ποταμῶν, οὗ καὶ ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ τῶν Ναυατιανῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπόνυμος.

<sup>145</sup> Socrates undoubtedly heard this story when he was younger. He wrote in the 440s but Auxanon was alive and a youth at the time of the Council of Nicaea in 325: *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 1.10.

<sup>146</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.25.

<sup>147</sup> *Socr. Hist. eccl.* 7.25.10: ...τοὺς διὰ τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν Πάσχα Ναυατιανῶν χωρισθέντας, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Σαββατίου ἐκ τῆς Ῥόδου μετακομίσαντας (ἐν αὐτῇ γὰρ τῇ νήσῳ περιορισθεὶς ἐτελεύτησεν) καὶ θάψαντας ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ εὐχεσθαι... Socrates does not explain who exiled Sabbatius to Rhodes or on what grounds.

<sup>148</sup> Moreover, Socrates tells us that the Nicene catholic bishop of Constantinople, Atticus, dug up the body at night and moved its grave once he learned of this separatist Novatian practice. Atticus’ removal of the body clearly shows that he understood the importance of this burial for this separatist Novatian community in Constantinople and wanted to break the link they had established between their martyr and their present community. The fact that Atticus did this at night further suggests that this needed to be done secretly, though we cannot know whether he did this because he feared a violent reaction on the part of these particular separatist Novatians or because he feared disinterring a body in view of the public.

Donatists too gave central importance the physical form of the body. For example, the martyr Marculus' body was miraculously spared any damage after it was thrown from a cliff.<sup>149</sup> Then, according to the *Passio Marculi*, a heavenly cloud covered his body 'like a tomb' (*quodammodo sepulturae ipsa interim exhibere videretur*) and the Donatists miraculously recovered the body later with the aid of a divine bolt of lightning.<sup>150</sup> The importance of the physical body is made clear not only by the fact that the Donatists were searching for the corpse of their martyr, but by the fact that it is important to the author of Marculus' passion that his body was in no way damaged. It is also important that the body be buried properly: until the body can be properly buried by the Donatists themselves, it was given a temporary burial by a miraculous, divine cloud rather than be left outside. Even the structure of the *Passio* demonstrates the central importance of proper burial, as the narrative of Marculus' martyrdom ends with his burial by the Donatists. In other words, the conclusion of the entire account of the martyrdom focuses on the preservation and inhumation of the physical body of the martyr.

Marculus' remains continued to be venerated for decades after his death. When subscriptions were being taken at the Council of Carthage in 411 to determine how many bishops represented the Donatists and catholics, for example, the Donatist bishop Dativus of Nova Petra (the site of Marculus' death) cried out, "Dativus, bishop of Nova Petra. I have given my authorization and subscribed. I also have no opposition [i.e. there was no catholic bishop in Nova Petra] because Lord Marculus is there, whose blood God will

---

<sup>149</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 13: *ecce consecratis artubus dura saxa et rupes asperae pepercerunt...*

<sup>150</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 14-15. Cf. *Passio Maximiani. et Isaac* (= PL 8.767-774) 16, in which Donatist bodies thrown into the sea are protected by the sea and then washed ashore in a miraculously-revealed location so that the faithful can bury them properly.



demand in repayment on Judgment Day.”<sup>151</sup> Again, the actual presence of Marculus’ body seems to be just as important for Dativus as the fact that Marculus was martyred there, and Marculus’ presence is the direct explanation for why there is no catholic bishop at Nova Petra. Whether the efficacy of his presence was due to some saintly power or because of the sympathies of the locals, the importance of Marculus, and in particular, his body, was unquestioned by Dativus.

It is clear that the remains of martyrs carried great significance for all three of these communities. The bodies served as physical reminders of persecution not at the hands of pagans, as the bodies of martyrs had in the past, but at the hands of other Christians. The preservation and veneration of these bodies allowed the members of these communities to establish direct links between the past and present and encouraged these members to consider the virtues of these martyrs, both of which were central elements in the recounting of martyr stories, to which we now turn.

#### *Remembering Violence: Martyr Stories*

Another, perhaps more important, way that suffering violence established a communal identity for Christian communities in Late Antiquity was the way they recounted the stories of their martyrs’ suffering. One form of persecution that the Luciferians recalled was the experience of exile, which has already been discussed in terms of the creation of the Luciferian communal identity and its consequent importance in the minds of the Luciferians themselves. But Faustinus and Marcellinus, as well as Novatian and Donatist authors, provide many other stories of violence committed against

---

<sup>151</sup> *Gesta syn. Carth.* 1.187: *Dativus episcopus Novapetrensis... Mandavi et subscripsi. Et adversarium non habeo, quia illic est domnus Marculus, cuius sanguinem Deus exiget in die iudicii.*

their community's members. A consideration of these stories demonstrates that suffering violence did provide these communities with a means of creating boundary lines between themselves and other Nicene Christians.<sup>152</sup>

For the Luciferians, as well as the Novatians and Donatists, the recounting of persecution carried with it two major aspects (just like the account of Macarius' burial). First of all, these *passiones* connected their communities to the past: "The reading of the saint's deeds breached yet again the paper-thin wall between the past and the present,"<sup>153</sup> as Brown puts it, or as Sizgorich states, "narratives allow human subjects not just to imagine the past, but to read the present in accordance with the plot of the narrative in question."<sup>154</sup>

One reason dissident communities in particular needed to connect themselves to the past was to justify their existence in the present.<sup>155</sup> Roman society was very traditional in that innovation was seen as dangerous.<sup>156</sup> The Luciferians (as well as the Novatians and Donatists) needed to connect themselves with the past in order to

---

<sup>152</sup> Denise K. Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 52: "Martyr narratives presuppose and play upon the notion that one's identity is embedded in a multiply inflected social network. Through torture and suffering, but also through resituating identity, these texts produce an idea of Christians that applies to both the individual martyr, the witnesses to the martyrs in the narrative, and the reading/hearing community. The texts help to produce a collective identity."

<sup>153</sup> Brown, *The Cult of the Saints*, 81.

<sup>154</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 69.

<sup>155</sup> Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 13: "Claims to collective memory...operate in part to rationalize innovations in societies where ruptures with the past create cultural anxiety." See also Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2004), 4-5.

<sup>156</sup> Just consider the seemingly absurd purpose of Lactantius' *Institutiones divinae*, ed. Umberto Boella, Collezione Classiche della Filosofia cristiana 5 (Firenze: Sansoni, 1973), meant to prove that Christianity was in fact older than paganism. In Late Antiquity, as in the Roman world in general, the relative antiquity of religious traditions *mattered*. See also Tacitus, *Historiae* (= *Cornelius Tacitus*, vol. 2.1, ed. Kenneth Wellesley [Leipzig: Teubner, 1989]) 5.2-5, in which Tacitus castigates Jewish beliefs and practices (as he understood them) while at the same time accepting their worship as completely legitimate owing to its antiquity.

demonstrate that their community was not innovative. Accounts of martyrs bridged the gaps between the persecutions of the past and the present, allowing communities to demonstrate continuity not just with the ideals of the past but also with the unquestionably properly Christian individuals who lived at the time.

Secondly, martyr stories served as exemplars for good behavior: “members of these communities looked upon the martyrs whose actions were recalled in these stories as exemplars upon whose model one might fashion a genuinely Christian self.”<sup>157</sup> The author of the *Passio Marculi* certainly agrees: “The passions of many martyrs...are always recited to those listening as an incentive for virtue and for praise of the church.”<sup>158</sup> Through recounting stories of persecution, one understands how to act in similar circumstances.

There are numerous examples throughout the *Libellus precum*, but consider just one: Hosius of Cordoba’s conflict with Gregory of Elvira. The shows that the recounting of martyr stories could be used very effectively. While the exiles receive generally one or two sentences apiece, Faustinus and Marcellinus dedicate a significant portion of the entire petition to describe Hosius’ actions in Spain following his ‘fall’ into Arianism.<sup>159</sup> This was clearly a seminal event for the Nicene party, as Hosius was Constantine’s advisor and one of the Nicene faction’s most revered members before his ‘fall.’ To give

---

<sup>157</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 274. See also Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, xxxvi: “By keeping alive the memory of the martyrs, the stories accomplished several purposes...they kept alive traditions on how to survive physical persecution; they kept alive a heritage of resistance...” This is by no means a uniquely fourth-century phenomenon; for a more modern example, consider the words of Frantz Fanon: “The people make use of certain episodes in the life of the community in order to hold themselves ready and to keep alive their revolutionary zeal.” *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 69.

<sup>158</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 1: *multorum martyrium passiones...ad incentivum virtutis et laudis Ecclesiae semper auribus recitantur...*

<sup>159</sup> *Lib. prec.* 32-44.

just one example of how important this was, De Clerq provides no fewer than 14 sources from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> centuries that describe his change of allegiance; all of these accounts except that of the Luciferians emphasize that Hosius was only changed allegiance under extreme duress.<sup>160</sup> Thus it was important for a great many late antique Nicene Christians to not only recount Hosius' fall, but to excuse it as well. The Luciferians alone describe Hosius' return to Spain and his attempts, alongside Potamius of Lisbon, to force other Nicene Christians to swear to Arian creeds. Athanasius, by way of contrast, reports (uniquely) that Hosius even converted back to the Nicene formulation on his deathbed.<sup>161</sup> The memory of Hosius was sharply contested.

Why such an emphasis on Hosius in the *Libellus precum*? After all, the Luciferians could have emphasized the actions of Valens, Ursacius, Germinius, and other well-known Arian bishops who played a very active and well-documented role in opposing the Nicene faction in the 350s. But within the *Libellus precum*, these openly and even proudly Arian bishops receive only a brief mention as authors of the Sirmian Creed.<sup>162</sup> But their story about Hosius provides both a link between later Luciferian experiences and the past and an exemplar for behavior when facing persecutors, both of which serve to distinguish the members of the Luciferian community from their enemies.

First of all, numerous elements from the Hosius account are reflected by Luciferian accounts of later persecutions. For instance, Gregory and Hosius have a showdown in a court in front of a state official just as some thirty years later Ephesus

---

<sup>160</sup> *Ossius of Cordova*, 507-509.

<sup>161</sup> *Hist. Ar.* 45.

<sup>162</sup> *Lib. prec.* 11.

and Damasus will also have a conflict in a court in front of a state official.<sup>163</sup> One persecutor was the archetypical *praevaricator*, a Nicene bishop who became an Arian, and the other was the *praevaricator* bishop of Rome himself. The result is that the reader, just as the Luciferians themselves, links the one with the other, connecting the persecutor of the 350s with the persecutor of the 380s and the persecution of the 350s with the persecution of the 380s.

In both of these cases, the Luciferians even play on typical ideas of the genre of martyr stories. By the early fourth century, the genre was filled with very stereotypical motifs.<sup>164</sup> As Grig points out, one of the stock elements of the genre was that at the end, the (pagan) judge sentences the Christian to die a horrible death.<sup>165</sup> But in both Luciferian cases, those of Hosius and of Damasus, the judge refuses to pass judgment on the upright man while the Christian bishop grows ever more enraged (the rage also being typical of the judge in ordinary stories). Particularly in regards to Bassus, who refused to judge Ephesius guilty of anything, the *Libellus precum* emphasizes that the fault here is not with the state and its officials but with the *praevaricatores* – certainly a fine point to make in a petition to an emperor. The state, they say, has already made the correct decision; Theodosius need only confirm what his representatives have already decided.

---

<sup>163</sup> *Lib. prec.* 35-40 and 84-85. There are many other examples of parallel narratives. At *Lib. prec.* 29, Faustinus and Marcellinus describe swearing an Arian creed as no less a sacrilege than sacrificing at a pagan idol, and at *Lib. prec.* 76, the authors describe Christian clerics taking their altar and placing it at the feet of a pagan idol. *Lib. prec.* 13 complains about Arian abuse of the legal system in much the same way as described above. Their account of persecution at Eleutheropolis (*Lib. prec.* 102-110) is even interrupted by an account of persecution at Eleutheropolis in the 350s with both instances instigated by Turbo, making the connection between the two exceptionally clear.

<sup>164</sup> See e.g. Shaw, “Judicial Nightmares and Christian Memory.”

<sup>165</sup> *Making Martyrs*, 60-61.

Secondly, these connections between the actions of Hosius and later persecutions emphasize proper behavior for the Luciferians. The *Libellus precum* uses Hosius to emphasize that the true enemies of the Luciferians are Nicene persecutors, not Arians or pagans. Hosius is not just an Arian persecutor, but a Nicene bishop ‘gone bad.’ In this way, he is a much more vivid figure for the Luciferian community members who would recount these stories while facing persecutors who were also seemingly ‘good’ Nicene Christians. After all, everyone knows that Arians are bad; but Hosius? His fall exemplifies how any seemingly unimpeachable Christian could in fact become wicked. Given the temptation that must have existed for commingling within these Nicene communities – I have already mentioned how Donatists would attend catholic services – it makes sense to emphasize to Luciferian readers the potential dangers of doing so. Christians like Athanasius were interested in making Hosius, the supposed architect of the Nicene Creed, appear as orthodox as possible; the Luciferians instead make even the most supposedly orthodox of the bishops at Nicaea into a potentially dangerous and treacherous foe.

Even in a general sense, the Luciferians use these stories to reinforce behaviors within their own communities. The most important of these was, not unexpectedly, that their members should be willing to suffer persecution, even death, in defense of their beliefs. This functions as something of a spiritual test for the Luciferians. Fausitnus and Marcellinus make their argument early on in the *Libellus precum*: “Still, if they believed that the judgment of God was going to come, shouldn’t they have been grateful to suffer

all evils rather than be traitors to the revered faith?”<sup>166</sup> This is a very black-and-white system with no room for compromise. The point is reinforced a little further on down in the petition: “This cannot be ambiguous: the true catholics are the those who affirmed the faith without deceit through their exiles, through the varieties of punishments, through the severity of their death.”<sup>167</sup> Again, there are only two options: suffer or be deceitful.

Ambrose provides a similar choice to Theodosius after the synagogue at Callinicum was burnt by a Christian mob and Theodosius ordered the bishop to rebuild it: “He will necessarily be made either a traitor (*praevaricatorem*) or a martyr.”<sup>168</sup> In both cases, the only real choice is between suffering and treachery, faith and faithlessness. In consequence, the Luciferians promote suffering on behalf of their community as faith in God and having refused to suffer as proof of deceitful treachery. There is no room here for someone to believe in God’s judgment and to be unwilling to suffer. It is worth noting that this dichotomy does not necessarily mean that the willingness to suffer martyrdom was sufficient to *prove* that one had faith, merely that it was a necessary demonstration of it.

This emphasis on the willingness to suffer therefore becomes a major marker of Luciferian identity. One can easily see why they would need some method of identification like this. Typical communal markers in Late Antiquity were creeds like the Nicene Creed. But the entire Luciferian community was built against those who *falsely* swore to creeds, making them somewhat questionable for the construction of the

---

<sup>166</sup> *Lib. prec.* 20: *Nonne gratum habere debuerunt, sit amen credebant futurum Dei iudicium, Omnia mala perpeti quam esse venerabilis fidei proditors...?*

<sup>167</sup> *Lib. prec.* 26: *...illud ambigi non potest, hos esse vere catholicos, qui, per exilia, per genera suppliciorum, per atrocitatem mortis, illam fidem sine dolo vindicant...*

<sup>168</sup> *Ep.* 74[40].7: *Necesse erit igitur u taut praevaricatorem aut martyrem faciat.*

Luciferian identity compared to other means. They furthermore held the Nicene Creed as sufficient, at least against the Arians, making additional creeds superfluous and even potentially innovative.<sup>169</sup> Martyrdom was not the only means for the Luciferians to identify who was a true Christian, but it was a significant and easy distinction to make: was someone or was someone not willing to suffer for the faith?

When we turn to the Novatians, we do not have any direct accounts of persecution that are not embedded in Socrates' *Historia ecclesiastica*. Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear from his account that stories of persecution were quite important in the Novatian community. According to Socrates, "Later, [Novatian] was martyred under the emperor Valerian during the persecution which was set against the Christians."<sup>170</sup> This tradition may even have some basis in fact.<sup>171</sup> But at the very least this indicates that the tradition of Novatian's martyrdom was alive and well in fifth-century Constantinople, demonstrating that the Novatians also used martyrs as a bridge between the past and their present.

Socrates also tells his reader several times that he is hearing accounts of Novatian suffering firsthand, demonstrating that they remained relevant at the time he composed his history in the 440s. Concerning the persecution of Novatians and other Nicene

---

<sup>169</sup> *Conf. fid.* 1; *Lib. prec.* 5, 9, 10, 14. Undoubtedly the explosion of intentionally vague creedal statements in the 350s also contributed to later Nicene wariness concerning any statement of faith other than the Nicene Creed.

<sup>170</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 6.28.15: Ἄλλ' οὗτος μὲν ὕστερον ἐπὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως διωγμὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν κινήσαντος ἐμαρτύρησεν.

<sup>171</sup> See Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian*, 35-38, and *Novatian of Rome*, 68. A tomb dedicated to a "Novatian, Most Blessed Martyr" was even discovered in an unnamed catacomb outside Rome near where a Novatian church once stood. Its identity has been disputed, but if it was in fact Novatian's tomb (or even just thought to be his), it would further solidify the importance not just of Novatian but of Novatian as a martyr to the community that came to bear his name. For a discussion of its discovery and the related evidence, see Anita Rocco, "La Tomba del Martire Novaziano," *Vetera Christianorum* 45, no. 2 (2008): 323-341.



Christians under Macedonius, Socrates writes, “I myself heard these things from Auxanon, the presbyter of the Novatian denomination [θηρησκεία], who was very old.”<sup>172</sup> Since Socrates wrote in the 440s, he must have heard these from Auxanon at a time considerably later than the 350s. Nor was Auxanon his only source, as Socrates also tells us that he learned of another instance of persecution (and resistance) in the 350s from another local: “I learned these things from a Paphlagonian peasant, who said he was present for the battle, and many other Paphlagonians say these things too.”<sup>173</sup> These examples demonstrate that examples of Novatian suffering were clearly remembered as important events within their community long after they had occurred. These examples also demonstrate that Novatians were persecuted under the Arians Constantius and Valens just as other Nicene Christians were, thus providing the Novatian community with a history that they shared with other Nicene Christians; they were not innovators. They also undoubtedly served to reinforce normative behavior, that is, resistance in the face of persecution.<sup>174</sup>

Donatists also perceived martyrs as a central facet of their communal identity. As Frend writes, “Martyrdom and devotion to the Word of God as contained in the Bible were the heart of Donatism. These...were the means of uniting clergy and people.”<sup>175</sup> Martyr stories played much the same role for the Donatists as they did for the Luciferians

---

<sup>172</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.11: Ταῦτα δὲ ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ μακροχρονιωτάτου Ἀὔξανοντος ἤκουσα, οὗ καὶ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ βιβλίῳ μνήμην πεποίημαι, ὃς πρεσβύτερος μὲν ἦν τῆς τῶν Ναυατιανῶν θηρησκείας. Cf. *Hist. eccl.* 1.10 in which Socrates writes that Auxanon is also his source of information about Acesius, the Novatian representative at the Council of Nicaea, and the Novatian monk Eutychian.

<sup>173</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 2.38.32: Ταῦτα ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀγροίκου Παφλαγόνου ἔμαθον, ὃς ἔλεγεν παρεῖναι τῇ μάχῃ· λέγουσι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλοι Παφλαγόνων πολλοί. This is also cited above.

<sup>174</sup> Indeed, Socrates’ Paphlagonian source told him not only that they were persecuted but, as discussed above, that they fought back with the farm tools.

<sup>175</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 319.

and Novatians – they established links between the Donatists and the past and provided Donatists with models for behavior.

Donatist martyrs first and foremost could demonstrate that there was a direct connection between their present communities and the undeniably orthodox communities of the past. The Donatists asserted that they were the true heirs of the famous martyr Cyprian: “His place in the history of Donatism may perhaps be compared to that of St. Cyril in the history of Monophysitism. Both men remained ‘orthodox,’ and yet both could be claimed with some justice by the dissenters as the founders of their respective movements.”<sup>176</sup> They circulated their own version of the *Passio sancti Caeciliani Cypriani* that has minor variations compared to the non-Donatist version.<sup>177</sup> When Augustine confronted Emeritus of Caesarea at Emeritus’ basilica, seized after the Council of Carthage in 414, Emeritus would only reply “go on” (*fac*) – an apparently common fifth-century abbreviation of Cyprian’s words to his pagan persecutor: “Do what you are ordered” (*fac quod tibi praeceptum est*).<sup>178</sup> The Donatists were so successful in presenting themselves as the descendants of Cyprian that Augustine was constantly trying to reclaim Cyprian’s memory for his own faction.<sup>179</sup> The Donatists felt a need to claim

---

<sup>176</sup> Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 140.

<sup>177</sup> See Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, 1-2.

<sup>178</sup> For Emeritus, Augustine, *Gesta cum Emerito* (= *Scriptura contra Donatistas* III, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 53 [Vienna and Leipzig, 1910]) 3; for Cyprian, *Acta Proconsularia Sancti Cypriani*, ed. W. Hartel, CSEL 3.3 (Vienna, 1868), 3 (though note that the phrase does not appear in the Donatist version of the martyr story that nevertheless expected readers to be familiar with the version in the *Acta*: Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories*, 1); in general, see Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 11-12.

<sup>179</sup> See e.g. *De bapt.* 2 passim; Darryl J. Pigeon, “Cyprian, Augustine and the Donatist Schism,” *Ashland Theological Journal* 23 (1991): 37-47; W.C. Weinrich, “Cyprian, Donatism, Augustine, and Augustana VIII: Remarks of the Church and the Validity of Sacraments,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (1991): 267-296; Ebbeler, “Augustine, the Donatists, and *Litterae pacificae*,” in David Brakke, Deborah Deliyannis, and Edward Watts, eds., *Shifting Cultural Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2012), 115-128.

Cyprian as their own ancestor just as much as other Christians in North Africa felt a need to disprove that claim and claim Cyprian for their own.

Figures who emerged later in the fourth century could also become significant Donatist martyrs. These martyrs provided not just links to the past, as Cyprian did, but exemplars for good behavior. The most important example is the Donatist bishop Marculus, who has been mentioned several times. Apart from the obvious interest in Marculus that the existence of his *Passio* demonstrates, archaeological evidence also points to the continuing importance of Marculus for Donatists throughout the fourth century.<sup>180</sup> Marculus provides a fine model of a Donatist martyr. While in prison, waiting for martyrdom, the author of his *Passio* tells us, “He was constantly and ceaselessly praying, he was continuously meditating on his devotion, in his speech he had the Gospel and in his thoughts he had his martyrdom.”<sup>181</sup> A good Donatist was devoted to scripture – and ready for martyrdom. But he was not connected to persecutions under pagan emperors but a martyr who had died at the hands of a supposedly Christian official, Macarius. For the Donatist community, this meant that a good martyr like Marculus acted the same against Christian persecutors as Christians had been expected to act against pagan persecutors, and thus the *Passio Marculi* suggests that in emulating his behavior one emulates the heroes of the past. It also associates the undoubtedly evil pagan

---

<sup>180</sup> Pierre Cayrel, “Une basilique donatiste de Numidie,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 51, no. 1 (1934): 114-142, and Pierre Courcelle, “Une seconde campagne de fouilles à Ksar-el-Kelb,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 53, no. 1 (1936): 166-197. Particularly worth noting is an inscription at a basilica dedicated to Marculus that records that Marculus [*Dei*] *inimicis / confusionem / [fe]cit*, very reminiscent of the phrase from the *Pass. Marc.* 5, describing the effects of Macarius’ display of Marculus’ beaten body on parade through various Numidian towns: ...*et Christi hostibus confusionem*... See also Shaw, *Sacred Violence*, 183-185.

<sup>181</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 7: *Erat illi assidua ac iugis oratio, erat continua de devotione meditatio; habebat in sermone Evangelium, in cogitatione martyrium.*

persecutors of the past in the reader's mind with the contemporary catholic persecutors not unlike the way the Luciferians associate their persecutors with the Arian persecutors of the 350s.

The Donatist passion for new martyrs was well known to their opponents, as well. Optatus devotes significant amount of time to rejecting Donatist arguments in favor of treating Marculus and others as martyrs.<sup>182</sup> He even claims that Donatists swore by their martyrs.<sup>183</sup> Augustine names Donatus and Marculus as the two most important Donatist martyrs, even calling them 'prophets.'<sup>184</sup> This love of martyrs was enough to cause consternation; Optatus is even unwilling to state the names of Donatist martyrs, referring to them as "those whom I do not wish to mention, whom you place among the martyrs."<sup>185</sup> Augustine also argues at length that Donatist martyrs ought not be considered martyrs because they are too eager for martyrdom; true martyrs must be patient and, of course, united in communion with the church (i.e. Augustine's church).<sup>186</sup> Optatus and Augustine's rejections of Donatist claims to martyrs suggests not only that the Donatists saw these martyrs as centrally important to their community's identity but that they were successful in using these martyrs to promote their faction. Donatist accounts of their martyrs were dangerous and had to be repudiated.

---

<sup>182</sup> Opt. *De schism.* 3.5-6.

<sup>183</sup> *De schism.* 3.6: ...*per quos tamquam per unicam religionem, vestrae communionis homines iurant.*

<sup>184</sup> *C. ep. Pet.* 2.14.34.

<sup>185</sup> *De schism.* 3.6: ...*quorum nolo, hominum facere mentionem, quos vos inter martyres ponitis.*

<sup>186</sup> *Serm.* 283, 285, 299, 313, 328, *De bapt.* 2.10.15; see Jacques Bels, "La mort volontaire dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin," *RHR* 187, no. 2 (1975): 147-180; Colin Garbarino, "Augustine, Donatists, and Martyrdom," in Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth, eds., *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011), 49-61; Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 62-64.

Persecuted Donatists, however, act significantly differently from Luciferian ones in our extant Donatist martyr stories. For example, the Donatist bishop Marculus was miraculously informed of his impending martyrdom and spent the four days leading up to it deep in prayer.<sup>187</sup> But Faustinus and Marcellinus never report activities like this in the *Libellus precum*. In one case, the *Libellus precum* reports that when Vincentius learned of his martyrdom in advance he fled.<sup>188</sup> But otherwise, the *Libellus precum* emphasizes the willingness to suffer for the faith as the singular critical marker of piety and does not describe activities like prayer.

The recounting of martyr experiences in all three cases served the same purposes. The stories grounded each community in a past that linked their suffering as Christians to general Christian suffering under the pagan and, in the case of the Luciferians and Novatians, Arian emperors. These stories also served as exemplars for good behavior, and unsurprisingly, the most important behavior in question was one's willingness to stand firm in the face of persecution. This moral was particularly important not just during persecutions, as exemplars to emulate in resistance, but in times of peace as well. Recalling the staunch defenders of the faith in the past justified the divisions between communities in the present, which was of particular importance for these communities given the relatively peaceful coexistence they enjoyed and the relatively minor differences in their theologies and practices. In short, rather than destroy these communities, persecutors instead provided them with the tools they needed to understand, justify, and maintain their separate place in the world.

---

<sup>187</sup> *Pass. Marc.* 7.

<sup>188</sup> *Lib. prec.* 73.

## *Conclusions*

The Luciferians seem to have faced a much greater degree of destruction of property compared to the Novatians and Donatists, though this difference remained in degree and not in kind. The Luciferians also appear willing but unable to offer any significant resistance to oppression while the Novatians and Donatists both provide examples of the strength their communities could muster if necessary. One possible explanation for these discrepancies is that the Luciferians lacked the ability to resist persecution. While a catholic might have thought twice about attacking a Novatian or Donatist church for fear of future reprisals, there was much less hesitation when it came to the Luciferians. That the Luciferians faced more aggressive persecution may have been due to the small size of Luciferian communities; larger Christian communities, as well as pagans, could and did fight back much more easily.

But the effectiveness of this violence nevertheless seems minimal. If anything, these experiences probably made the Luciferian sense of community stronger. After all, despite the violence the Luciferians have described, the existence of their communities does not seem to have been seriously threatened by persecution. What Eisenbaum writes of the Book of Hebrews might well stand in for a more general understanding of the role that suffering often played in Christian community formation in antiquity: “Community solidarity in suffering creates communal cohesion and identity over against those who are the source of suffering.”<sup>189</sup> The shared experience of violence serves to reinforce

---

<sup>189</sup> Pamela Eisenbaum, “The Virtue of Suffering, the Necessity of Discipline, and the Pursuit of Perfection in Hebrews,” in Leif Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush, eds., *Asceticism in the New Testament* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 331-353, here at 337.

differences between those who suffer and those who cause the suffering. While inflicting violence might be an attempt to destroy communities, it often serves only to solidify them in this way. This solidification of communal identity is most evident in how the Luciferians and others chose to remember persecution by the veneration of the relics of martyrs and in the stories they told about them.

In the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, active persecution supported by the government began anew against the Novatians and the Donatists. Of the Luciferians, however, we have no word; by the early 5<sup>th</sup> century they appear to be extinct. It is possible that continued persecution at the hands of other Christians had destroyed their community by the time the emperors once again turned their minds toward unity among Nicene Christians. But if persecution in the 380s had been so unsuccessful, it is hard to see what would have changed in the intervening decades.

It may instead be, somewhat paradoxically, a lack of violence that truly contributed to the dissolution of the Luciferian community. Following the publication of the *Lex Augusta* in 383 or 384, legal persecution of the Luciferians ended (and, as they so frequently reminded the emperors, it was under the name of imperial authority that they were being persecuted). It is possible that this law actually did have some effect; as discussed in the Introduction, this document was appended to the *Libellus precum* and circulated with it in a way that suggests the packet was copied and sent to various Luciferian communities. The function of these copies of the law is immediately obvious: these packets would be proof on hand of the orthodoxy and catholicity of any given

Luciferian community. Luciferians could show local authorities an imperial edict in order to stymie future attempts at persecution.

But, as discussed, the communal identity of the Luciferians was founded on suffering and remembering martyrs whose stories made clear the moral necessity for future generations to stand up in the face of persecution at the hands of their fellow Nicene Christians. Given the nature of their community's origins, creeds were insufficient proof of orthodoxy; willingness to suffer for the faith was more important. But if martyrdom, not creeds, served as the 'spiritual test' of who was and who was not a Luciferian, what could one do in the face of toleration? Relief from persecution meant that there would be no new martyrs, no way to adequately demonstrate one's faith. This very important means by which the Luciferians could identify who was in their community and who was not would disappear. While the stories of the persecutions of the 380s would remain relevant for some time, an extended period of peace in which the emperor himself described the Luciferians as catholic and orthodox Christians, no different from most Nicene Christians, would make the borders between Luciferian and not-Luciferian Nicene communities more porous than ever. As noted above, peaceful coexistence tends to blur the imagined lines that separate communities, and as we have already seen in previous chapters, there were not many markers of difference between Luciferians and other Nicene Christians to begin with.



## Conclusion

There are countless Christian communities about which we will never know much. Skimming Augustine's *De haeresibus* demonstrates as much. There are the Caini, who believed that Cain, Judas, and Simon Magus were all exceptionally virtuous; the Passalorhynchitae, who held a finger to their nose and remained utterly silent; the Paterniani, who believed genitals were made by the devil, not God, and thus excessively used them without fear of divine reprisal; and on, and on, and on.<sup>1</sup> But we do not know when or how the Caini community began; we do not know how Passalorhynchitae communities fared at the local level; we do not know what became of the Paterniani. There is a world of Christianities that we will never know about; we might doubt whether some even really existed. Concerning the Luciferians, however, we have an unusual richness in sources that puts us in a much better position to examine a discrete Christian community. These sources allow us to discuss the Luciferians, but also allow us to add greater depth to our understanding of the Novatians and Donatists; we can draw more general statements about Christian communities in Late Antiquity; we can nuance our understanding of the interaction between Christian communities and the state; and we can even discuss the subtle variations in the use of terms like 'heresy' in ancient and modern sources.

Explanations of the dissolution of the Luciferian community have thus far been lacking. Krüger argues that their lack of a monastic tradition and a general similarity to

---

<sup>1</sup> 18, 53, 85, respectively.

catholics led to their dissolution.<sup>2</sup> Simonetti merely states that they were unable to get a foothold without attempting to explain why.<sup>3</sup> Canellis similarly points to their inability to replenish clergy without looking into the causes of that inability.<sup>4</sup> While she does make note of the apparent inability of Luciferians to communicate with one another,<sup>5</sup> she did not connect this with the dissolution of their community as a whole. Mas does address this point, arguing that their dearth of clergy was caused by the high standards they set for their clergy and the distance of time making their disagreement with the Council of Alexandria seem less and less relevant to new generations.

The most thorough explanations – those of Krüger and Mas – are not in themselves incorrect. But a comparative approach allows us to see that they are insufficient explanations for why the Luciferian community dissolved. We can point to other communities like the Novatians and Donatists and discover that they too lacked a monastic tradition; they too in their theology were quite similar (though not identical) to their opponents; they too emerged from conflicts in the past, much further in the past than the Council of Alexandria was to the Luciferians of the late 4<sup>th</sup> century. Instead, it was a confluence of these previously identified factors along with other elements revealed in this comparative study that led to the dissolution of the Luciferian community.

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, the initial personalities that disagreed with the Council of Alexandria established local communities across the Mediterranean in Trier, Baetica, Rome, North Africa, Oxyrhynchus, and Eleutheropolis, rather than in a

---

<sup>2</sup> *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris*, 74-75.

<sup>3</sup> “Appunti per una storia,” 78.

<sup>4</sup> In the introduction to Faustinus, *De Trinitate (Supplique aux empereurs)*, 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

centralized location. This distribution had consequences. The Luciferians, unlike the Novatians and Donatists, were spread very thin across the Mediterranean. They could not reasonably claim to be ‘universal,’ were not always able to effectively communicate with each other, and could not hold councils like most Christians of the 4<sup>th</sup> century could. These points only truly emerge in a comparative study that can show how other communities like the Novatians and Donatists did, e.g., hold councils and find unique ways to cope with the question of universality.

Moreover, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, the Luciferians lacked any notable doctrinal differences compared to their fellow Nicene Christians. It was obvious why one might be, say, a Cainite; there was a notable distinction between their beliefs and those of Nicene Christians. Lacking such an obvious distinction when these distinctions were so important meant the boundaries between the Luciferians and their adversaries remained weak. At most, the Luciferians could argue about the merits of a council held before most of them were probably even born (and in doing so, set themselves in opposition to such revered figures as Athanasius). And as the Council of Alexandria receded further into the historical past, their sole justification for remaining apart from other Nicene Christians did as well. This lack of doctrinal differences with other Nicene Christians was critical because Christians in Late Antiquity conceived of the distinctions between their communities as essentially religious, as is demonstrated by the fact that they and their enemies continued to define one another in religiously based terms.

The Novatians and Donatists did differ from their opponents theologically, but not very significantly. But, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, there were additional religious

markers that communities could and did use to distinguish themselves from others: ascetics and martyrs. These were the figures that policed the imagined boundaries between communities and served as exemplars for their communities. The Luciferians praise asceticism to no end, but this praise looks more like a rhetorical device that they use to insult their enemies. They seem to have lacked dedicated male ascetics, meaning they had one fewer mechanism by which they could keep their community apart from others. And relying as heavily as they did on ascetic virtues to provoke conversions, their lack of dedicated ascetics only further points to difficulties their communities had not only in attracting converts but in providing a sufficient number of clerics, whom they seem to have expected to follow ascetic practices. The Luciferians also had martyrs and did make the willingness to become a martyr a cornerstone of their community's identity. But with Theodosius' law in hand, the Luciferians may well have found peace and tranquility to be their worst enemy. Lacking ascetics and a new source of martyrs meant that the Luciferians lacked the fundamental 4<sup>th</sup>-century figures that separated communities and the fundamental mechanism by which they had come to separate themselves from other Nicene Christians.

A Nicene Christian entering Rome in the 390s would face a bewildering array of Nicene Christians. Aside from the catholics, there were Ursinus' anti-Damasus faction, Novatians, Donatists, Luciferians, and the deacon Hilarius' community (and numerous non-Nicene Christians as well). But the Luciferians offered very little to entice this imaginary traveler. They held no councils, as catholics did; they spoke of the importance of theology while offering nothing theologically distinct compared to Nicene catholics;

they praised asceticism without having dedicated male ascetics as catholics did; they proclaimed the importance of suffering for the faith at a time when they were no longer in danger of suffering. In short, there was little reason to become a Luciferian for those who had not already separated themselves from catholic Nicene communion following the Council of Alexandria. In the last line of his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, Jerome has his Luciferian character Helladius state, “I confess one thing further to you, because I know the ways of my people very well – they can be more easily conquered than persuaded!”<sup>6</sup> In the 370s, perhaps Jerome was right. But by the early years of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, he was wrong; what few Luciferians remained were, in a sense, persuaded by their lack of clear differences from catholic Nicene Christians to return to catholic Nicene communion.

On the other hand, this comparative approach has revealed that individuals would find reasons to join the Novatian or Donatist community. For instance, those who opposed the use of non-scriptural terms like *catholicus* and *monachus* would find a like-minded community among the Novatians and Donatists, respectively. They provided explanations for reasons other Nicene Christians might find them lacking, such as a lack of universality or an opposition to monasticism, and these factors thus do not seem to have significantly depreciated their ability to attract and maintain members. We can also see the importance of geographic dispersion, in that one of the most significant differences between these two communities and the Luciferians was that they had social hearths, centralized locations where their populations were densest, allowing for quick

---

<sup>6</sup> 28: *Unum tamen tibi confiteor, quia mores meorum apprime novi, facilius eos vinci posse, quam persuaderi.*

communications and regular councils. The importance and success of both of these communities in proselytizing compared to the Luciferians is also noteworthy as a reason for their long-lasting success, a process aiding these communities that modern scholars often pass over (but which they do not pass over, for example, when discussing the spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire before Constantine).<sup>7</sup> Compared to the Luciferians, these other rigorist Nicene Christian communities seem remarkably resilient. This resilience relied on establishing and maintaining differences between themselves and their catholic contemporaries.

It is also interesting to note that the Novatians and Donatists, rather than gradually coalescing with other Nicene Christians, actually split into separate communities, as exemplified by the Sabbatian Novatians and the Maximian and Rogatist Donatists. All of these communities coexisted with other Novatians or Donatists and other Nicene Christians. Thus the social landscape in North Africa and Constantinople and Asia Minor became peppered with more, not fewer, Christian communities in the 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> centuries. The tendency was toward more communities, not fewer – it was seemingly quite rare for communities to dissolve entirely! That the Luciferians did so highlights the rarity of this process.

The nature of the dissolution of the Luciferian community is also noteworthy concerning Christian communities in general, as it suggests that Christians in Late Antiquity naturally gravitated towards holding communion with one another unless something kept them apart. There was little desire among late antique Christians to

---

<sup>7</sup> See, as the most prominent example, Martin Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

maintain separate communities that both reflected the same doctrines and practices.<sup>8</sup> We can also see hints of this in Possidius' mention of Donatists who attended Augustine's sermons.<sup>9</sup> To keep two Christian communities distinct from one another, there had to be some way to distinguish them from one another. And in Late Antiquity, the reasons for maintaining such a difference were conceived in religious terms.

Moreover, as the history of the Luciferians makes abundantly clear, the same forces that led to differences between Christian communities were not the same as the forces that kept these communities separated. A disagreement over the Council of Alexandria was enough to provoke a division but not to maintain it. Works like Boyarin's *Border Lines* and Sizgorich's *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity* have traced out the mechanisms by which religious communities in Late Antiquity continually distinguished themselves from each other following such divisions; in the case of the Luciferians, we can instead see how they might fail to do so. To return to Gager's *Social World of Christianity*, noted in the Introduction, we might say that the Council of Alexandria was an excellent moment of 'world-construction' but a poor basis for 'world-maintenance.' Christian communities emerged from transformative moments, but they had to continually transform themselves as the specific moments connected with their emergence receded further and further into the past.

Lastly, their dissolution provides another example validating Jones' suspicions about the supposedly nationalist character of many Christian heresies (or communities in

---

<sup>8</sup> Contrast this with the number of small, independent, non-denominational Protestant churches scattered throughout the modern United States that generally adhere to the same basic tenets of Protestant Christianity but lack any desire to become a single community in the vein of, say, the modern Catholic Church.

<sup>9</sup> Poss. *V. Aug.* 7.

general), as discussed in the Introduction.<sup>10</sup> The Luciferians, in their extent across the Mediterranean, can hardly be seen as a proto-nationalist community; in their castigation of wealth and welcoming of the wealthy, they can hardly be seen as a social movement. Their community arose, as they themselves insist repeatedly and at length, due to a dispute over the actions of a council of bishops; while this is not to say that ethnic and social considerations played no role in communal relations in Late Antiquity, beliefs mattered, and we are unwise to summarily dismiss ancient authors who said as much.

Turning now to the relations between these Christian communities and the state, we can also better appreciate Theodosius I as an emperor when putting the *Lex Augusta* in context. Theodosius is often represented as a staunch opponent of dissent among his Christian subjects. One standard history of the period, for example, describes Theodosius' approach to the Nicene faith "an extreme doctrinal position" and his activities to enforce it against non-Nicene Christians as a "swift assault" prompted by "Christian extremists."<sup>11</sup> Recent scholarship, however, has suggested that Theodosius' laws were not as all-encompassing or stringently anti-heretical as they might appear on the surface. Instead, the emperor consciously crafted somewhat vague laws and relied on officials and bishops to interpret these laws in such a way that they could use them against heretics.<sup>12</sup> Undoubtedly, the numerous complaints lodged by the Luciferians concerning bishops misapplying Theodosius' anti-heretical laws should be understood in

---

<sup>10</sup> "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?"

<sup>11</sup> David S. Potter, *The Roman Empire at Bay* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 560. There are plenty of other examples; see, e.g., Garnsey, "Religious Toleration in Classical Antiquity," 17;

<sup>12</sup> As argued by Neil McLynn, "Moments of Truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I" in Scott McGill, Cristiana Sogno, and Edward Watts, eds., *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 284-450 CE* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 215-240, esp. 238.



this context. Given Theodosius' positive response to the Luciferians, though, we can see that these laws were apparently being used the way Theodosius intended but not against his intended targets (predominately Arians of various stripes).

The fact that Theodosius granted their petition furthermore suggests that Theodosius I's aims were not necessarily unity among his Christian subjects, just unity in their doctrines; the Luciferians, as long as they remained Nicene Christians, were welcome to keep communion apart from other Nicene Christians. This subtle distinction between doctrinal differences and differences in leadership does not truly emerge when one considers the laws of Theodosius I compiled under the auspices of his son Theodosius II into the Theodosian Code on their own. Graumann describes Theodosius II's general religious policy as follows: "determining the precise doctrinal basis for unity was of lesser importance to Theodosius [II] and his government than the actual demonstration of that unity."<sup>13</sup> But the Luciferians demonstrate that for his father, Theodosius I, the opposite was true: unity in doctrine was more important than demonstrations of unity, and while Arians might face legislation aimed at curtailing their activities, Nicene Christians of various stripes like the Luciferians (and Novatians and Donatists) were not just ignored but were consciously protected by the law.

Turning to this distinction between unity in doctrine and unity in communion, the Luciferians provide a cautionary example concerning the use of the terms 'heresy,' 'schism,' 'orthodox,' and 'catholic' in both Late Antiquity and the present. They clearly

---

<sup>13</sup> Thomas Graumann, "Theodosius II and the Politics of the First Council of Ephesus," in *Theodosius II: Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), ed. Christopher Kelly, 123.

were not fully developed terms in the 4th and 5th centuries; non-Luciferian authors vary in describing them as heretical or orthodox, schismatic or catholic. Augustine himself was even prompted by the Luciferians to highlight the insufficiency of these terms in late antique religious discourse: “Whether... they are still heretics because they affirm their dissent with destructive vehemence, is another question, and it does not seem to me that it should be dealt with in this place.”<sup>14</sup> Jerome’s use of ‘Orthodoxus’ as the name of the interlocutor who engages in a debate with a Luciferian is another telling example of how blurry these lines could be, as the name certainly implies the Luciferian is ‘heterodoxus’ but nowhere does Orthodoxus say as much.<sup>15</sup> Le Boulluec’s *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque* rightly challenged scholars who assumed that Christian authors had comprehensively formulated their notion of heresy in the 2nd and 3rd centuries; the multitude of responses to the Luciferians and the anxieties the Luciferians provoked among other Christian authors cautions us against assuming that these notions were fully-formed in the 4th and 5th centuries either.<sup>16</sup> Notions of heresy, schism, orthodoxy, and catholicity were, rather, in a constant state of development.

This lack of clarity does not mean that the terms have no value, whether in how they appear in ancient sources or in how modern scholars use them. But what, exactly, any of these terms meant to, say, an Augustine, a Socrates, or a Theodoret differed and must be treated as such. The average scholar reading Socrates might come across a

---

<sup>14</sup> Aug. *De haer.* 81: *sive...sint haeretici, quia dissensionem suam pertinaci animositate firmarunt, alia quaestio est, neque hoc loco mihi videtur esse tractanda.*

<sup>15</sup> Instead, confusingly, he states (at *Dial. c. Luc.* 19) that Lucifer differed from other Christians “in words, not in things” (*non verbis sed rebus*), a rather vague expression.

<sup>16</sup> Attempts to prescriptively define these terms, as in, e.g., Basil, *Ep.* 188.1, only further highlights that these definitions were still nebulous and in need of definition in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

passage that reads, “and then another heresy, that of the Luciferians, arose,”<sup>17</sup> and never sincerely question whether or not these Luciferians were categorically different than other ‘heresies’ in Socrates’ *Historia ecclesiastica* like the Arians or Photinians. Likewise, a scholar writing about the Luciferians - or any Christian community - should be warned against casually labeling them an orthodox, heretical, schismatic, or catholic community, given the fluid and variable nature of these terms in Late Antiquity. While such labeling may at times be unavoidable (as I have used ‘catholic’ throughout to describe a specific set of Nicene Christians), the Luciferians provide an excellent cautionary example of how modern, prescriptive usage does not reflect the variability found in ancient usage.

Thus the Luciferians and their dissolution can help us better understand not only their own community, important in its own right, but also the Novatians and Donatists, Christian communities in general, relations between these communities and the state, and the very terms used to describe these communities in the past and the present. The preservation of the *Libellus precum* and other related documents gives us a window into processes that would otherwise be hidden to us. This study cannot address all of those processes; it is hoped only that it provides a fitting discussion of the end of one of the few Christian communities whose words we can read. Those final words, Faustinus’ farewell to Empress Flacilla, were as follows:<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 3.9: καὶ γίνεται πάλιν Λουκιφεριανῶν ἑτέρα αἵρεσις.

<sup>18</sup> *De Trin* 51: *Divinitas te incolumem ac beatam in fide sui nominis etiam in regno caelorum praestet cum tuis omnibus affectibus inveniri.*

May the divine take care that you be found unharmed and blessed, in the faith of his name, and in the kingdom of heaven, with all you hold dear.

### Bibliography of Primary Sources

- Acta Pauli et Theclae* = *The Acts of Paul and Thecla: A Critical Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by Jeremy W. Barrier. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Acta Proconsularia Sancti Cypriani*. Edited by W. Hartel. CSEL 3.3. Vienna, 1868.
- Acta S. Callisti papae martyris Romae*. PG 10.111-120.
- The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs (Acta Alexandrinorum)*. Edited by H.A. Musurillo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Aemilianus Palladius. *De re rustica = Opus agriculturae, De Veterinaria, Medicina, De Insitione*. Edited by Robert H. Rogers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1975.
- Ambrose. *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucan*. Edited by Karl Schenkl. CSEL 32.4. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1902.
- *De excessu fratris sui Satyri*. Edited by O. Faller. CSEL 73. Vienna, 1955.
- *Epistulae = Epistulae et acta*. 3 vols. Edited by Otto Faller and Michaela Zelzer. CSEL 82.1-3. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1968-1990.
- *De paenitentia = Penitence*. Edited and translated by R. Gryson. SC 179. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971.
- *Epistulae extra collectionem = Epistularum liber decimus. Epistulae extra collectionem*. Edited by Michael Zelzer. CSEL 82. Vienna, 1982.
- *De officiis*. Edited and translated by Ivor J. Davidson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Ammianus Marcellinus. *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*. Edited by Wolfgang Seyfarth with Liselotte Jacob-Karau and Ilsa Ulmann. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1978.
- Athanasius. *Epistola ad Rufinianum*. PG 26.1179-1181.
- *Apologia contra Arianos = Apologia secunda* = (i) *Athanasius Werke* II.3. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938. (ii) *Athanasius Werke* II.4. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin, 1938. (iii) *Athanasius Werke* II.5. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940.

- . *Historia Arianorum* = (i) *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 7. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940. (ii) *Athanasius Werke II.1*, vol. 8. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940.
- . *Oratio contra Arianos 1.3* = *Athanasius Werke I.2*. Edited by K. Metzler, D. Hansen, and K. Savvidis. Berlin, 1998.
- . *Epistula ad Serapionem* = *Athanasius Werke II.5*. Edited by H.-G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940.
- . *Epistulae festales* = *S. Athanase, lettres festales et pastorales en copte*. Edited and translated by L-Th. Lefort. CSCO 150. Louvain: Peeters, 1955.
- . *Vita Antonii*. Edited by G.J.M. Bartelink. SC 400. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.
- . *Epistula ad Afros* = *Athanasius Werke II.8*. Edited by Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen. Berlin, 2000.
- . *Tomus ad Antiochenos* = *Athanasius Werke II.8*. Edited by Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen. Berlin, 2000.
- Ps.-Athanasius. *Epistulae duae ad Luciferum*. PG 26.1181-1185.
- Augustine. *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*. PL 43.613-650.
- . *Contra Maximinum*. PL 42.743-814.
- . *De unitate ecclesiae* = *Contra Donatistas Vulgo De Unitate Ecclesiae*. PL 43.391-446.
- . *Sermones*. PL 38.
- . *Contra Faustum* = *Opera*. Edited by Josef Zycha. CSEL 25.1. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1891.
- . *De agone Christiano*. Edited by Josef Zycha. CSEL 41. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1900.
- . *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*. Edited by Karl Urba and Josef Zycha. CSEL 52. Prague, Leipzig, and Vienna, 1902.
- . *Contra epistula Parmeniani* = *Scriptura contra Donatistas I*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 51. Vienna and Leipzig, 1908.

- *Psalmus contra partem Donati = Scriptura contra Donatistas I*. Edited by M. Petschenig, CSEL 51. Vienna and Leipzig, 1908.
- *Contra Cresconium = Scriptura contra Donatistas II*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 52. Vienna and Leipzig, 1909.
- *Contra litteras Petilianus = Scriptura contra Donatistas 2*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 54. Vienna, 1909.
- *Epistula ad catholicos de secta Donatistarum = Scriptura contra Donatistas II*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 52. Vienna and Leipzig, 1909.
- *De unico baptismo contra Petilianum = Scriptura contra Donatistas III*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 53. Vienna and Leipzig, 1910.
- Augustine. *Gesta cum Emerito = Scriptura contra Donatistas III*. Edited by M. Petschenig. CSEL 53. Vienna and Leipzig, 1910.
- *Epistulae = S. Aureli Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Epistulae*. Edited by Al. Goldbacher. CSEL 57. Vienna and Leipzig, 1911.
- *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 3 vols. Edited by E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont. CCSL 38-40. Turnhout: Brepols, 1956.
- *De haeresibus = Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars XIII, 2*. Edited by M.P.J. van den Hout. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 46. Turnhout: Brepols, 1969.
- *Confessions = Confessions, vol. I. Introduction and Text*. Edited by James J. O'Donnell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- ps.-Augustine. *Contra Novatianum*. PL 35.2303-2313.
- Basil of Caesarea. *Epistulae = Saint Basil. The Letters* 4 volumes. Edited and translated by Roy J. Deferrari. LCL 190, 215, 243, 270. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1934.
- Capitulare Francofurtense*. PL 97.199-200.
- Capitula Sancti Augustini = Opuscula*. Edited by F. Glorie. CCSL 85A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.
- Cassiodorus. *Institutiones*. Edited by R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

- , *Historia ecclesiastica = Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita*. Edited by Waltar Jacob. CSEL 71. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1952.
- Cicero. *Pro Scauro = Pro Milone. In Pisonem. Pro Scauro. Pro Fonteio. Pro Rabirio Postumo. Pro Marcello. Pro Ligario. Pro Rege Deiotaro*. Edited and translated by N.H. Watts. Loeb Classical Library 252. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Codex Theodosianus = Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*. Edited by Th. Mommsen and Paulus M. Meyer. Berlin, 1905.
- Collectanea Antiariana Parisina*. Edited by A. Feder. CSEL 65. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1916.
- Collectio Avellana = Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio*. Edited by Otto Guenther. 2 parts. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: 1898.
- Constitutiones apostolicae = Les constitutions apostoliques*. 3 volumes. Edited by M. Metzger. SC 320, 329, and 336. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985-1987.
- Cyprian. *Epistulae = Opera omnia*. Edited by Guilelmus Hartel. CSEL 3.2. Vienna, 1871.
- Damasus. *Confessio fidei*. PL 13.358-364.
- , *Confidemus*. PL 13.347-349.
- , *Ea gratia*. PL 13. 350-352.
- , *Non nobis*. PL 13.353-354.
- , *Per filium meum*. PL 13.356-357.
- Decretum Hipponensis Concili*. PL 11:1185.
- Epiphanius. *Ancoratus = Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1-33*. Edited by Karl Holl. GCS 25. Leipzig, 1915.
- , *Panarion haereticorum*. 3 volumes. Edited by K. Holl. Revised by J. Dummer. GCS 25, 31, 37. Berlin,: Akademie Verlag, 1915, 1922, 1933.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Vita Constantini = Eusebius Werke I*. Edited by Ivar A. Heikel. GCS 7.1. Leipzig, 1902.



- , *Die Kirchengeschichte = Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann. 6. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- Eusebius of Vercelli. *Epistulae*. Edited by Vincent Bulhart. CCSL 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.
- Faustinus. *Confessio fidei = Supplique aux empereurs: Libellus precum et lex augusta. Precede de Faustin, Confession de foi*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. SC 504. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 2006.
- , *De Trinitate = Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera*. Edited by Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti. CCSL 69. Turnholt: Brepols, 1967.
- Faustinus and Marcellinus. *Libellus precum = Supplique aux empereurs: Libellus precum et lex augusta. Precede de Faustin, Confession de foi*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. SC 504. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 2006.
- Fortunatus. *Vita Hilarii Pictaviensis*. PL 88.439-454.
- Gennadius. *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*. PL 58:979-1054.
- De viris illustribus = Hieronymus, Liber de viris inlustribus; Gennadius, Liber de viris inlustribus*. Edited by Ernest Cushing Richardson. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1896.
- Gesta synodi Carthaginensis = Actes de la Conférence de Carthage en 411*. 3 volumes. Edited by Serge Lancel Sources chrétiennes 194, 195, 224, 373. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972-1975, 1991.
- Gratian. *De rebaptizoribus = Collectio Avellana*, 1.54-58.
- The Greek New Testament*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. Münster: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993. 4th edition, revised.
- Gregory of Elvira. *De arca Noe = Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera*. Edited by Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti. CCSL 69. Turnholt: Brepols, 1967.
- Gregory Nazianzus. *Orationes = Discours 27-31*. Edited and translated by P. Gallay. SC 250. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006. 2nd. edition.
- Gregory of Nyssa. *Epistola Canonica ad Letoium*. PG 45:221-236.

----- . *De virginitate*. PG 46.317-416.

----- . *Vita Macrini*. PG 46.959-1000.

----- . *Contra Eunomius = Contre Eunome*. Volume 1. Edited and translated by R. Winling. Paris: Les belles lettres, 2008.

Ps.-Hegemonius = *Eusebius Vercellensis, Filastrius Brixienis, Hegemonius (Ps.), Isaac Iudaeus, Archidiaconus Romanus, Fortunatianus Aquileiensis, Chromatius Aquileiensis Opera quae supersunt.; Diversorum hereseon liber.; Adversus haereses.; Opera quae supersunt.; De reconciliandis paenitentibus.; Commentarii in evangelia.; Opera quae supersunt.* Edited by V. Bulhart, F. Heylen, A. Hoste, A. Wilmart, B. Bischoff. CCSL 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.

Hilary of Poitiers. *Apologetica Responsa*. PL 10.545-548.

*Ad Constantium = Fragmenta*. Edited by A. Feder. CSEL 65. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1916.

----- . *Contra Constantium = PL* 10.571-605.

----- . *De Synodis = PL* 10.471-546.

----- . *Tractatus super Psalmos*. Edited by Antonius Zingerle. CSEL 22. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1891.

----- . *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium =* Edited by A. Feder. CSEL 65. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1916.

Hippolytus. *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*. Edited by Paul Wendland. GCS 26. Leipzig, 1916.

*Indiculus*. PL 81.636-646.

Innocent. *Epistulae*. PL 20.463-639.

Isidore. *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. Edited by C.M. Lawson. CCSL 113. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.

Jerome. *Adversus Helvidium*. PL 23.183-206.

- . *De viris illustribus* = *Hieronymus, Liber de viris inlustribus; Gennadius, Liber de viris inlustribus*. Edited by Ernest Cushing Richardson. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1896.
- . *Epistulae* I-LXX. Edited by Isidore Hilberg. CSEL 54. Vienna and Leipzig, 1910.
- . *Epistulae* CXXI-CLIV. Edited by Isidore Hilberg. CSEL 56, no. 1. Vienna, 1918. Reprinted 1996.
- . *Chronicon* = *Eusebius Werke 7: Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. Edited by R. Helm. GCS 47. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.
- . *Apologia contra Rufinum* = *Opera*. Volume 3.1. Edited by P. Lardet. CCSL 79. Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.
- . *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* = *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. Sources chrétiennes 473. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003.
- . *Vita Malchi* = *Jerome: Trois vies de moines: Paul, Malchus, Hilarion*. Edited and translated by P. LeClerc, E.M. Morales, and A. de Vogüé. SC 508. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2007.
- . *Commentary on Jeremiah*. Translated by Michael Graves and edited Christopher A. Hall. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- John Chrysostom. *Homilies in epistulam i ad Timotheum*. PG 62.501-600.
- . *De Sacerdotio*. Edited by J. Nairn. Cambridge, 1906.
- Lactantius. *Institutiones divinae*. Edited by Umberto Boella. Collezione Classiche della Filosofia cristiana 5. Firenze: Sansoni, 1973.
- Leo. *Epistulae*. PL 54.593-1218.
- Libanius. *Orationes* = *Libanii opera*, vol. 10. Edited by R. Foerster. Leipzig: Teubner, 1921.
- Liber Genealogus*. Edited Th. Mommsen. *MGH Scriptores* 9. Hannover, 1892.
- Liber pontificalis* = *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum pars I: Liber Pontificalis*. Edited by Th. Mommsen. Berlin, 1898.

Lucifer of Calaris. *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt*. Edited by G.F. Diercks. CCSL 8. Turnholt: Brepols, 1978.

Martial. *Epigrammata*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990.

Novatian. *De cibis Iudaicis*. Edited by Gustav Landgraf and Karl Friedrich Weyman. Leipzig: Teubner, 1898.

----- *De Trinitate*. Edited by William Yorke Fausset. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Optatus. *De schismate Donatistarum = Libri VII*. Edited by Carolus Ziwsa. CSEL 26. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1893.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Edited by William S. Anderson. Leipzig: Teubner, 1977.

Pacian, *Epistulae*. PL 13.1051-1081.

----- *Paraenesis*. PL 11.1081-1090.

*Passio Donati et Advocati*. PL 8.752-758.

*Passio Marculi*. PL 8.760-766.

*Passio Maximiani et Isaac*. PL 8.767-774.

*Passio S. Felicis episcopi*. Edited by H. Delehaye. *Analecta Bollandiana* 39 (1921): 110-116

*Passiones SS. Maximai, Donatillae et Secundae*. Edited by Karl Smedt, Josef de Backer, Francis van Ortroy, and Josef van den Gheyn. *Analecta Bollandiana* 9 (1909): 110-116.

Pelagius. *Epistula ad Demetrias*. PL 30.15-45 and PL 33.1099-1120.

Petilian, *Epistula ad presbyteros et diaconos*. Edited by Paul Monceaux, in *Histoire littéraire*, 319-320.

Philastrius. *Diversarum hereseon liber = Eusebius Vercellensis, Filastrius Brixienis, Hegemonius (Ps.), Isaac Iudaeus, Archidiaconus Romanus, Fortunatianus Aquileiensis, Chromatius Aquileiensis Opera quae supersunt.; Diversorum hereseon liber.; Adversus haereses.; Opera quae supersunt.; De reconciliandis paenitentibus.; Commentarii in evangelia.; Opera quae supersunt*. Edited by V.

- Bulhart, F. Heylen, A. Hoste, A. Wilmart, B. Bischoff. CCSL 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.
- Philostorgius. *Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Philip R. Amidon. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 23. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Photius. *Bibliotheca, = Bibliothèque, Tome II, Codices 84-185*. Edited and translated by René Henry. Paris: Les belles lettres, 2003. 2nd edition.
- Possidius. *Vita Augustini*. Edited and translated by Herbert T. Weiskotten. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1919.
- Quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos = Collectio Avellana = Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio*. Edited by Otto Guenther. 2 parts. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: 1898.
- Rufinus. *Apologia contra Anastasium = Opera*. Edited by M. Simonetti. CCL 20. Turnhout: Brepols, 1961.
- . *Historiae ecclesiasticae*. Edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann (see above under Eusebius of Caesarea).
- Sententiae episcoporum LXXXVII*. PL 3:1052-1078.
- Siricius. *Epistula ad ecclesiam Mediolanensis*. PL 13.1169-1171.
- . *Epistula ad Episcopos Africae*. PL 13.1155-1162.
- Socrates Scholasticus. *Historia ecclesiastica = Sokrates Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Günther Christian Hansen. GCS NF 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Sozomen. *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres I-II*. Edited by Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah. Translated by André-Jean Festugière. Sources chrétiennes 306. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983.
- . *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres III-IV*. Edited by Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah. Translated by André-Jean Festugière. Sources chrétiennes 418. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996.
- . *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres V-VI*. Edited by Guy Sabbah. Translated by André-Jean Festugière and Bernard Grillet. Sources chrétiennes 495. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2005.

- , *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres VII-IX*. Edited by Guy Sabbah and Laurent Angliviel de la Beaumelle. Translated by André-Jean Festugière and Bernard Grillet. Sources chrétiennes 516. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008.
- Sulpicius Severus. *Chronicon = Libri qui supersunt*. Edited by Karl Hahn. CSEL 1. Vienna, 1866.
- , *Vita Martini = Libri qui supersunt*. Edited by Karl Hahn. CSEL 1. Vienna, 1866.
- Symmachus. *Relationes = Prefect and Emperor: Relationes*. Edited by Reginald Haynes Barrow. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Synesius. *Epistulae*. Edited by A. Garzya. Rome: Typis Officinae Polygraphicae, 1979.
- Tacitus. *Historiae = Cornelius Tacitus*. Volume 2.1. Edited by Kenneth Wellesley. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989.
- Tertullian. *De anima = Opera*. Edited by Augustus Reifferscheid and Georg Wissowa. CSEL 20. Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig, 1890.
- Theodoret. *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte = Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Léon Parmentier. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 19. Leipzig, 1911.
- Theodosius I. *Lex Augusta = Supplique aux empereurs: Libellus precum et lex augusta. Precede de Faustin, Confession de foi*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. SC 504. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 2006.
- Vincent of Lérins. *Commonitorium = The Commonitory of Saint Vincent of Lerins/Adversus profanas omnium novitates haereticorum commonitorium*. Edited and translation by C.A. Heurtly. Sainte Crois du Mont: Tradibooks, 2008.
- Vita Sancti Theodori Syceotae = Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*. Edited by A.-J. Festugière. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1970.
- Zosimus. *Historia nova = Histoire nouvelle*, 3 vols. Edited and translated by François Paschoud. Paris: Les belles lettres, 2000. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

## Bibliography of Secondary Sources

- Africa, T.W. "Urban Violence in Imperial Rome." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2, no. 1 (1971): 3-21.
- Allen, Pauline. "The Use of Heretics and Heresies in the Greek Church Historians: Studies in Socrates and Theodoret." Pages 265-290 in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Graeme Clark. Rushcutters Bay: Australian National University Press, 1990.
- Allen, Pauline, and Bronwen Neil. *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity (410-590 CE): A Survey of the Evidence from Episcopal Letters*. VC supplement 121. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Ando, Clifford. *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 44. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Anonymous, ed. and trans. *Faustinus, On the Trinity*. London: Phoenix, 1721.
- Asiedu, F.B.A. "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism," VC 55, no. 3 (2001): 301-06.
- Atkinson, J.E. "Out of Order: The Circumcellions and Codex Theodosianus 16.5.52." *Historia* 41 (1992): 488-499.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Pollution, Sin, Atonement, Salvation." Pages 71-83 in *Religions of the Ancient World*. Edited by S.I. Johnston. London: Belknap, 2004.
- Avemarie, Friedrich, and Jan Willem van Henten, eds. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Bagnall, Roger S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Bardy, G. "L'Indiculus de Haeresibus du Pseudo-Jérôme." *RSR* 19 (1929): 385-405.
- Barnes, T.D. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile." VC 46, no. 2 (1992): 129-140.

- , "The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers." *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (1992): 256-265.
- , *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Batiffol, P. "Les sources de l'*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* de St Jérôme." Pages 97-113 in *Miscellanea Geronimiana: Scritti varii pubblicati nel XV centenario dalla morte di San Girolamo*. Edited by Vincenzo Vannutelli. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1920.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited and translated by R. Kraft and G. Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Beatrice, Pier Franco. *The Transmission of Sin*. Translated by Adam Kamesar. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Beckwith, Carl L. "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers at the Synod of Béziers (356 C.E.)." *J ECS* 13, no. 1 (2005): 21-38.
- Bels, Jacques. "La mort volontaire dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin." *RHR* 187, no. 2 (1975): 147-180.
- Binns, John. *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Blair-Dixon, Kate. "Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome: The *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*." Pages 59-76 in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900*. Edited by K. Cooper and J. Hillner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Blumell, Lincoln H. *Lettered Christians: Christians, Letters, and Late Antique Oxyrhynchus*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Boin, Douglas. *Ostia in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Bond, Sarah E. "Altering Infamy: Status, Violence, and Civic Exclusion in Late Antiquity." *CA* 33, no. 1 (2014): 1-30
- Bowersock, G.W. *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Bowersock, G.W., Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar, eds. *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Post-Classical World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.



- Boyarin, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- . *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004.
- Bradbury, S. "Libanius' Letters as Evidence for Travel and Epistolary Networks," Pages 73-80 in *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane*. Edited by L. Ellis and F. Kidner. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *Rites of Ordination: Their History and Theology*. London: SPCK, 2014.
- Brakke, David. "The Lady Appears: Materializations of 'Woman' in Early Monastic Literature." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 387-402.
- . *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- . "Self-differentiation among Christian groups: the Gnostics and their opponents." Pages 245-260 in *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1: Origins to Constantine*. Edited by Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Braun, R. *Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1977.
- Bremmer, Jan M. "Religious Violence between Greeks, Romans, Christians and Jews." Pages 8-30 in *Violence in Ancient Christianity: Victims and Perpetrators*. Edited by Albert C. Geljon and Riemer Roukema. *VC* suppl. 125. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Brennecke, C. *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Brent, Allen. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *Cyprian and Roman Carthage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. London: Faber & Faber, 1967.

- "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *JRS* 61 (1971): 80-101.
- *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- *Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman World*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Cambridge, 1993.
- *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*. Waltheim: Brandeis University Press, 2001.
- *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008. 2nd edition.
- *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Buckley, Francis J. *Christ and the Church according to Gregory of Elvira*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964.
- Buell, Denise K. *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- Burns, Paul C. "Hilary of Poitiers' Road to Béziers: Politics of Religion?" *J ECS* 2, no. 3 (1994): 273-289.
- Burrus, Virginia. *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Cameron, Alan. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Sather Classical Lectures 55. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

- , "The Violence of Orthodoxy." Pages 102-114 in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by E. Iricinschi and H. Zellentin. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- , *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity 395-700 AD*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Canellis, Aline. "Arius et les Ariens vus par les Lucifériens dans le Libellus Precum de Faustin et Marcellin." *SP* 36 (2001): 489-501.
- , "Saint Jérôme et les Ariens, Nouveaux éléments en vue de la datation de l'Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi?" Pages 155-194 in *Les Chrétiens face à leur adversaires dans l'Occident latin du 4<sup>ème</sup> siècle*. Edited by Jean Michel Poinssotte. Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen, 2001.
- Caner, Daniel Folger. *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Carola, Joseph. *Augustine of Hippo: The Role of the Laity in Ecclesial Reconciliation*. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2003.
- Casson, Lionel. *Travel in the Ancient World*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1974.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Cavallera, F. *Le schisme d'Antioche: IV<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris, 1905.
- , *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*. 2 vols. Louvain and Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense/Honoré et Édouard Champion, 1922.
- , "Paul de Thèbes et Paul d'Oxyrhynque." *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 7 (1926): 302-305.
- Cayrel, Pierre. "Une basilique donatiste de Numidie." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 51, no. 1 (1934): 114-142.
- Chadwick, Henry. *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Chastagnol, André. *La Préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960.

- Chestnut, Glenn F. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977.
- Chitty, Derwas. *The Desert a City: An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Gillian. *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Consolino, Franca F. "Veni huc a Libano: La Sponsa del Cantico dei Cantici come modello per le vergini negli scritti esortatori de Ambrogio." *Athenaeum* 62 (1984): 399-415.
- Cooper, Kate. *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Corti, Giuseppe. *Lucifero di Cagliari: Una voca nel conflitto tra chiesa e impero alla meta del IV secolo*. Studia patristica Mediolanensia 24. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2004.
- Courcelle, Pierre. "Une seconde champagne de fouilles à Ksar-el-Kelb." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 53, no. 1 (1936): 166-197.
- Curran, John. *Pagan City and Christian Capital*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- D'Alès, A. *Études de theologie historique: Novatien*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924.
- Davidson, Ivor J. *The Birth of the Church: From Jesus to Constantine, A.D. 30-312*. Baker History of the Church, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Davis, Raymond. *The Book of the Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*. Translated Texts for Historians 6. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Deakin, Michael A.B. *Hypatia of Alexandria: Mathematician and Martyr*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus, 2007.
- Dearn, Alan, "Voluntary Martyrdom and the Donatist Schism." *SP* 39 (2006): 27-32.

- Dechow, Jon Frederick. *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. Patristic Monograph Series 13. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- de Clerq, Victor. *Ossius of Cordova: A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954.
- Decret, François. *Early Christianity in North Africa*. Translated by Edward L. Smither. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2009.
- de Jorio, Andrea. *Gesture in Naples and Gesture in Classical Antiquity*. Translated by Adam Kendon. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Deléani, Simone. "Un emprunt d'Augustin à l'Écriture: *Redite, praevaricatores, ad cor* (Isaïe 46, 8b)." *REAug* 38 (1992): 29-49.
- den Boeft, J., J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, and H.C. Teitler, eds. *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- DePalma Digeser, Elizabeth. *A Threat to Public Piety: Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Deubner, Ludwig. *Handwörterbuch des Deutschen Aberglaubens VIII*. Berlin and Leipzig, 1937.
- Diefenbach, Steffen. *Römische Erinnerungsräume: Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Dilke, O.A.W. "Used Forms of Latin Inchoative Verbs." *CQ* 17 (1967): 400-402.
- Dörries, H. "Die Bibel im ältesten Mönchtum." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 11 (1947): 215-222.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London and New York: Routledge, 1964. Reprinted 2002
- Downey, Glanville. "The Perspective of the Early Church Historians." *GRBS* 6 (1965): 57-70.
- Drake, H.A. *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- , ed. *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.

- Drijvers, J.W. "Ammianus on the Revolt of Firmus." Pages 129-155 in *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*. Edited by J.W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H.C. Teitler, and J. den Boeft. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff/Brill, 2007.
- Duchesne, L. *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*. 3 volumes. Paris, 1907-1910.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. "Innocent I on Heretics and Schismatics as Shaping Christian Identity." Pages 266-290 in *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium*. Edited by Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer. *VC* suppl. 132. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Émile Durkheim. "De la définition des phénomènes religieux." *Année sociologique* 2 (1897-1898): 1-28.
- *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie*. Paris: PUF, 1912).
- Duval, Y.M. "Saint Jérôme devant le baptême des hérétiques. D'autres sources de l'Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi." *REAug* 14 (1968): 145-180.
- "La 'manoeuvre frauduleuse' de Rimini: À la recherche du *Liber Adversus Ursacium et Valentum*." Pages 51-103 in *XVIème centenaire de la mort d'Hilaire, Hilaire et son temps*. Paris, 1969.
- Duval, Y.-M. "Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'*Adversus Iovinianum* à Rome en 393? ou: du "portrait-robot" de l'hérétique chez s. Jérôme." *RHE* 75 (1980): 525-557.
- "La place et l'importance du concile d'Alexandrie ou de 362 dans l'*Histoire de l'Église* de Rufin d'Aquilée (rôle d'Hilaire de Poitiers)." *REAug* 47 (2001): 282-302.
- Dyson, Stephen L., and Robert J. Rowland, Jr. *Archaeology and History in Sardinia from the Stone Age to the Middle Ages: Shepherds, Sailors, and Conquerors*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Ebbeler, Jennifer. "Augustine, the Donatists, and *Litterae pacificae*." Pages 115-128 in *Shifting Cultural Frontiers in Late Antiquity*. Edited by David Brakke, Deborah Deliyannis, and Edward Watts. Burlington: Ashgate, 2012.
- *Disciplining Christians: Correction and Community in Augustine's Letters*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Eck, W. "Der Episkopat im spätantiken Afrika: Organisatorische Entwicklung, soziale Herkunft, und öffentliche Funktionen." *HZ* 236, no. 2 (1983): 265-295.
- Edwards, Mark, trans. *Optatus: Against the Donatists*. Translated Texts for Historians 27. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997.
- Ehrman, Bart. *Lost Christianities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela. "The Virtue of Suffering, the Necessity of Discipline, and the Pursuit of Perfection in Hebrews." Pages 331-353 in *Asceticism in the New Testament*. Edited by Leif Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Elm, Susanna. *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- "O Paradoxical Fusion! Gregory of Nazianzus on Baptism and Cosmology (*Orations* 38-40)." Pages 296-316 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by Ra'anan S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Errington, R.M. "Church and State in the Early Years of Theodosius I." *Chiron* 27 (1997): 21-72.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- *The Early Church at Work and Worship: Volume 1: Ministry, Ordination, Covenant, and Canon*. Eugene: Cascade, 2013.
- Field, Lester L. *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis XL*. Studies and Texts 145. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2004.
- Figus, Antonino. *L'enigma di Lucifero di Cagliari: a ricordo del XVI centenario della morte*. Cagliari: Fossataro, 1973.
- Finn, Richard. *Asceticism in the Greco-Roman World: Key Themes in Ancient History*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Fitzgerald, A., and J.C. Cavadini. *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Flora, Jerry Rees. "A Critical Analysis of Walter Bauer's Theory of Early Christian Orthodoxy and Heresy." PhD diss.; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1972.
- Flower, Richard. *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Fournier, Eric. "Exiled Bishops in the Christian Empire: Victims of Imperial Violence?" Pages 157-166 in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*. Edited by H.A. Drake. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- Frakes, Robert M. "The Dynasty of Constantine down to 363." Pages 91-108 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*. Edited by Noel Lenski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Frend, W.H.C. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- , "Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements." Pages 37-56 in *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*. Edited by Derek Baker. Studies in Church History 9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Gaddis, Michael. *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Gager, John. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Gambetti, Sandra. *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 CE and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Garbarino, Colin. "Augustine, Donatists, and Martyrdom." Pages 49-61 in *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*. Edited by Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Garnsey, Peter. "Religious Toleration in Classical Antiquity." Pages 1-27 in *Persecution and Toleration* (Studies in Church History 21). Edited by W. J. Sheils. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Garrett, Jr., James Leo. *Systematic Theology: Biblical, Historical, and Evangelical*. Volume 1. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1990. 4th edition.



- Geerlings, W. "Zur Frage des Nachwirkens des Manichäismus in der Theologie Augustins." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 93 (1971): 45-60.
- Gernet, Louis, and André Boulanger. *Le génie grec dans la religion*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1970.
- Gilliard, Frank D. "Senatorial Bishops in the Fourth Century." *HTR* 77, no. 2 (1984): 153-175.
- Goehring, James E. "The Origins of Monasticism." Pages 235-255 in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Goff, B. "The Violence of Community: Ritual in the *Iphigeneia of Tauris*." Pages 109-125 in *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Mark W. Padilla. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1999.
- Gonis, Nikolaos. "Dionysius, Bishop of Oxyrhynchus, and His Date." *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 36 (2006): 63-65
- Goodman, Martin. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Graumann, Thomas. "Theodosius II and the Politics of the First Council of Ephesus." Pages 109-129 in *Theodosius II: Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Christopher Kelly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Green, M.R. "The Supporters of the Antipope Ursinus." *JTS* 22 (1971): 531-538.
- Gregory, Caspar René. "The Essay *Contra Novatianum*." *AJT* 3, no. 3 (1899): 566-570.
- Gregory, T. E. "Novatianism, A Rigorist Sect in the Christian Roman Empire." *ByzStud* 2 (1975): 1-18.
- Grig, Lucy. *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 2004.
- Grimm, Veronika E. *From Feasting to Fasting: The Evolution of a Sin*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Grypeou, Emmanouela, and Helen Spurling. *The Book of Genesis in Late Antiquity: Encounters Between Jewish and Christian Exegesis*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Haas, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

- Hall, Stuart G. *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Hammerich, Holger. *Taufe und Askese: Der Taufaufschub in vorkonstantinischer Zeit*. Diss. University of Hamburg, 1994.
- Hanson, Craig L. *Pacian of Barcelona and Orosius of Braga: The Iberian Fathers, vol. 3. Fathers of the Church 99*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
- Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Harmless, William. *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Harries, Jill. *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Reception of Walter Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* during the Last Decade." *HTR* 73, no. 1/2 (Jan-Apr., 1980): 289-298.
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. "The Holy and the Poor: Models from Early Syriac Christianity." Pages 43-66 in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*. Edited by Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994.
- Hefele, Charles Joseph. *A History of the Christian Councils From the Original Documents*. 5 volumes. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871-1896.
- Heggelbacher, Othmar. *Die christliche Taufe als Rechtsakt nach dem Zeugnis der frühen Christenheit*. Freiburg: University of Freiburg, 1953.
- Heine, Ronald E. "Cyprian and Novatian." Pages 152-160 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hess, Hamilton. *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Heumann, Hermann Gottlieb, and Emil Seckel. *Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1971.

- Honoré, Tony. *Law in the Crisis of Empire, 379-455 A.D.: The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Howard-Johnston, James, and Paul Anthony Hayward. *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Rise of Normative Christianity*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994.
- Humfress, Caroline. *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Humphries, Mark, "In Nomine Patris: Constantine the Great and Constantius II in Christological Polemic." *Historia* 46, no. 4 (1997): 448-464.
- Hunter, David. "The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine." *CH* 69, no. 2 (2000): 281-303.
- , "Rereading the Jovinianist Controversy." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 453-470.
- Isaac, Benjamin. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Jacobs, Andrew. *Christ Circumcised: A Study in Early Christian History and Difference*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Jones, A.H.M. "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?" *JTS* 10 (1959): 280-298.
- Jones, A.H.M., John Robert Martindale, and John Morris, eds. *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971-1992.
- Kahlos, Maijastina. *Forbearance and Compulsion: The Rhetoric of Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 2009.
- , "Pacifiers and Instigators - Bishops in Interreligious Conflicts in Late Antiquity." Pages 63-82 in *The Role of the Bishop in Late Antiquity: Conflict and Compromise*. Edited by Andrew Fear, José Fernández Urbiña, and Mar Marcos. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1978. Revised edition.
- , *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1975.
- Kim, Young Richard. "Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Geography of Heresy." Pages 235-251 in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*. Edited by H.A. Drake. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- King, Karen L. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Knust, Jennifer Wright. *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Michael J. Kruger. *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010.
- Krüger, Gustav. *Lucifer, Bischof von Calarius und das Schisma der Luciferianer*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf und Härtel, 1886.
- Kuefler, Mathew. *The Manly Eunuch*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Kyle, Donald G. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie. "Pénitence et reconciliation des Pénitents d'après saint Augustin - II," *REAug* 13 (1967): 249-283.
- Laeuchli, Samuel. *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972.
- Lambert, David. "Augustine and the *Praedestinatus*: Heresy, Authority, and Reception." Pages 147-162 in *Millenium*. Volume 5. Edited by Wolfram Branes, Alexander Demandt, Helmut Krasser, Hartmut Leppin, Peter Möllendorff, and Karla Pollman. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Lancel, Serge. "Évêchés et cités dans les provinces africaines (IIIe-Ve siècles)." Pages 273-290 in *L'Afrique dans l'occident romain. Actes du colloque de Rome (3-5 décembre 1987)*. Edited by Maurice Lenior and Charles Pietri. Rome: l'École française de Rome, 1990.

- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe-IIIe siècles*. 2 volumes. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985.
- Leadbetter, Bill. "Constantine and the Bishop: The Roman Church in the Early Fourth Century." *JRH* 26, no. 1 (2002): 1-14.
- Leonhard, Clemens. *The Jewish Pesach and the Origins of the Christian Easter*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Lepelley, C. "Trois documents méconnus sur l'histoire sociale et religieuse de l'Afrique romaine tardive retrouvés parmi les *spuria* de Sulpice Sévère." *AntAfr* 25 (1989): 235-262.
- Le Quien, Michael. *Oriens christianus: in quatuor patriarchatus digestus*. 3 volumes. Paris, 1740.
- Leroy-Molinghen, A. "La mort d'Arius." *Byz.* 38 (1960): 105-111.
- Levick, Barbara. "In the Phrygian Mode: A Region Seen from Without." Pages 41-54 in *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*. Edited by Peter Thonemann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Leyerle, Blake. "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money." *HTR* 87, no. 1 (1994): 29-47.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos." *VC* 40, no. 4 (1986): 365-389.
- , *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
- Lieu, Judith. *Neither Jew Nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity*. Edinburgh and New York: T&T Clark, 2002.
- , *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lim, Richard. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Lippold, Adolf. "Ursinus and Damasus." *Historia* (1965): 105-128.

- Lizzi Testa, Rita. *Senatori, popolo, papi: Il governo di Roma al tempo dei Valentiniani*. Bari: Edipuglia, 2004.
- Louth, A. "Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century." Pages 1-17 in *Doctrinal Diversity: Recent Studies in Early Christianity: A Collection of Scholarly Essays*. Volume 4. Edited by Everett Ferguson. London: Garland, 1999.
- "Holiness and Sanctity in the Early Church." Pages 1-18 in *Saints and Sanctity*. Edited by Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon. Studies in Church History 47. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011.
- "*Fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani*: Conversion, Community, and Christian Identity in Late Antiquity." Pages 109-119 in *Being Christian in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Luiz Torres, Milton. "Christian Burial Practices at Ostia Antica." Diss. University of Texas at Austin, 2008.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984.
- *Voting About God in Early Church Councils*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Maier, H.O. "'Manichee!' Leo the Great and the Orthodox Panopticon." *J ECS* 4, no. 4 (1996): 441-460.
- "Heresy, Households, and the Disciplining of Diversity." Pages 213-233 in *Late Ancient Christianity: A People's History of Christianity*, vol. 2. Edited by V. Burrus. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Maier, Jean-Louis, ed. *Le Dossier du Donatisme*. 2 vols. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur 134-135. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987, 1989.
- Maraval, Pierre. *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient d'Orient, Histoire et géographie. Des origines à la conquête arabe*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985.
- Marique, J. F.-M. "A Spanish Favorite of Theodosius the Great: Cynegius, Praefectus Praetorio" *CF* 17 (1963): 43-65.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity." *Themelios* 2 (1976): 5-14.

- Martin, Annick. *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328-373)*. Rome: École française de Rome, 1996.
- Martin, Brice L. "Some Reflections on the Unity of the New Testament." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 8 (1979): 143-152.
- Mas, Javier Perez. *La crisis luciferiana. Un intento de reconstrucción histórica*. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 110. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008.
- Matthews, J.F. "A Pious Supporter of Theodosius I: Maternus Cynegius and His Family." *JTS* 18 (1967): 438-446.
- , *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364-425*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- McClure, Judith. "Handbooks against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries." *JTS* 30, no. 1 (1979): 186-197.
- McCormick, Michael. *The Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce AD 300-900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- McCue, James. "Orthodoxy and Heresy: Walter Bauer and the Valentinians." *VC* 33.2 (June, 1979): 118-130
- McKitterick, R. "Roman Texts and Roman History." Pages 19-34 in *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and Exchanges of Ideas c. 400-1400*. Edited by C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick, and J. Osborne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- , "Moments of Truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I." Pages 215-240 in *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 284-450 CE*. Edited by Scott McGill, Cristiana Sogno, and Edward Watts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- , "Damasus of Rome: A Fourth-Century Pope in Context." Pages 305-325 in *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike. Repräsentation städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur, und Kunst*. Edited by Therese Fuhrer. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.

- ."Moments of Truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I." Pages 215-239 in *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Cultures, 284-450 CE*. Edited by Scott McGill, Cristiana Sogno, and Edward Watts. Yale Classical Studies 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Maigne, M. "Concile ou collection d'Elvire?" *RHE* 70 (1975): 361-387.
- Melin, Bengt. *Studia in Corpus Cyprianeum*. Uppsala, 1946.
- Meslin, Michel. *Les Ariens d'Occident 335-430*. Patristica Sorbonensia 8. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1968.
- Millar, Fergus. "Repentant Heretics in Fifth-Century Lydia: Identity and Literacy." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23 (2004): 111-130.
- Moffat, J. Review of Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Pages 475-476 in *The Expository Times* 45 (1934).
- Monceaux, Paul. *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe*. Volume 5. Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux, 1920.
- Musurillo, H.A. "The Pagan Acts of the Martyrs." *TS* 10 (1949): 555-564.
- ."The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in Greek Patristic Writers." *Traditio* 12 (1956): 1-64.
- ."A New Fragment of the *Acta Alexandrinorum*." *JRS* 47 (1957): 185-190.
- Nagle, D. Brendan. *The Roman World: Sources and Interpretation*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson, 2004.
- Nathan, Geoffrey S. *The Family in Late Antiquity: The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Nautin, P. "Epiphane." Cols. 15.617-631 in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*. 31 volumes. Edited by R. Aubert and L. Courtois. Paris, 1912-2012.
- Neil, Bronwen. "Leo I on Poverty." Pages 171-208 in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Pauline Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2009.
- Noakes, Kenneth. "The Donatist Opposition to Monasticism." *SP* 39 (2006), 83-88.



- O'Donnell, James J. *The Confessions of Augustine: Introduction and Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Olszaniec, Szymon. *Prosopographical Studies on the Court Elite in the Roman Empire (4<sup>th</sup> Century AD)*. Translated by Jacek Welniak and Małgorzata Stachowska-Welniak. Torun: Nicolaus Copernicus University Press, 2013.
- Paffenroth, Kim. *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Papaconstantinou, A. "Sur les évêques byzantins d'Oxyrhynchos." *ZPE* 111 (1996): 171-174.
- Papandrea, James L. *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of pre-Nicene Orthodoxy*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2012.
- Parvis, Sara. "The Canons of Ancyra and Caesarea (314): Lebon's Thesis Revisited." *JTS* 52, no. 1 (2001): 625-636
- Perrin, Michel-Yves. "The Limits of the Heresiological Ethos in Late Antiquity." Pages 201-227 in *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by D.M. Gwynn and S. Bangert. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Perrone, L. "Scripture for a Life of Perfection: The Bible in Late Antique Monasticism: The Case of Palestine." Pages 318-417 in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006*. Edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Pietri, Charles. *Roma christiana: Recherches sur l'église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*. Rome: École Française, 1976.
- "Les origines du culte des martyrs (d'après un livre récent)." *RAC* 60 (1984): 293-319.
- Pigeon, Darryl J. "Cyprian, Augustine and the Donatist Schism." *Ashland Theological Journal* 23 (1991): 37-47.
- Pincherle, A. "L'Ecclesiologia nella Controversia Donatista." *Rivista di Ricerche Religiose* 1 (1925): 35-55.

- Praet, Danny. "Violence against Christians and Violence by Christians in the First Three Centuries." Pages 31-55 in *Violence in Ancient Christianity: Victims and Perpetrators*. Edited by Albert C. Geljon and Riemer Roukema. *VC* suppl. 125. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Prestige, G.L. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: SPCK, 1952.
- Potter, David S. *The Roman Empire at Bay*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Rahner, Hugo. *Symbole der Kirche: Die Ekklesiologie der Väter*. Salzburg: Müller, 1964.
- Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity; The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rebillard, Éric. *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- "Material Culture and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity," Pages 425-436 in *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*. Edited by R. Raja and J. Rüpke. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- Rees, Roger. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2004.
- Riggsby, Andrew M. "'Public' and 'Private' in Roman Culture." *JRA* 10 (1997): 36-56.
- Rocco, Anita. "La Tomba del Martire Novaziano." *Vetera Christianorum* 45, no. 2 (2008): 323-341.
- Ronconi, A. "*Exitus illustrium virorum*." *SIFC* 17 (1940): 3-32.
- Rougé, Jean. "La législation de Théodose contre les hérétiques. Traduction de C. Th. XVI, 5, 6-24." Pages 635-649 in *Epektasis: Mélanges offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.
- Rouse, Richard and Charles McNelis. "North African Literary Activity: A Cyprian Fragment, the Stichometric Lists, and a Donatist Compendium." *RHT* 30 (2000): 189-238.
- Rousseau, Philip. *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

- Rubio Fernández, Lisardo. *San Paciano: Obras*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1958.
- Sághy, Marianne. “*Scinditur in partes populos*: Pope Damasus and the Martyrs of Rome.” *Early Medieval Europe* 9, no. 3 (2000): 273-287.
- Saltet, L. “Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens.” *BLE* 27 (1906): 300-306.
- Salzman, Michele R. “Elite Realities and *Mentalités*: The Making of a Western Christian Aristocracy.” *Arethusa* 33, no. 3 (2000): 347-362.
- “Competing Claims to ‘Nobilitas’ in the Western Empire of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.” *JECS* 9, no. 3 (2001): 359-385.
- *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- “Travel and Communication in the *Letters* of Symmachus.” Pages 81-94 in *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane*. Edited by L. Ellis and F. Kidner. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.
- “Rethinking Pagan-Christian Violence.” Pages 265-286 in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*. Edited by H.A. Drake. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- Sánchez, Miguel J. “L’état actuel de la recherche sur le concile d’Elvire.” *RSR* 82, no. 4 (2008): 517-546.
- Sarantis, Alexander. “Arnold Hugh Martin Jones (1904-1970).” Pages 3-24 in *A.H.M. Jones and the Later Roman Empire*. Edited by David M. Gwynn. Brill’s Series on the Early Middle Ages 15. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2*. Volume 2. Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1890.
- Schor, Adam. “Performance and Social Strategy in the Letters of Theodoret.” *JLA* 2, no. 2 (2009): 274-299.
- Schott, Jeremy M. *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Schuve, Karl. “The Episcopal Career of Gregory of Elvira.” *JEH* 65, no. 2 (2014): 247-262.

- Schwarz, Eduard. "Die Kanonessammlungen der alten Reichskirche." *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 25, no. 1 (1936): 1-114.
- . *Kyrrillos von Scythopolis*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1939.
- Sessa, Kristina. *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy: Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Shaw, Brent. "Judicial Nightmares and Christian Memory." *JECS* 11, no. 4 (2003): 533-563.
- . "Bad Boys: Circumcellions and Fictive Violence." Pages 179-197 in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*. Edited by H.A. Drake. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- . *Sacred Violence: Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Shaw, Teresa M. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Shephardson, Christine. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.
- Shepkaru, Shmuel. *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Simonetti, Manlio. "Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiana." *Atti del convegno di studi religiosi sardi*. Padua: Cedam (1963), 67-81.
- . *La crisi arriana nel IV secolo*. Rome: Augustinianum (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 11), 1975.
- . "Lucifero di Cagliari nella controversia arriana." *Vetera Christianorum* 35, no. 2 (1998): 279-299.
- Sivan, Hagith. "Ulfila's Own Conversion." *HTR* 89, no. 4 (1996): 373-386.
- . *Palestine in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Sizgorich, Thomas. *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

- Smulders, Pierre. "Two Passages of Hilary's *Apologetica Responsa* Rediscovered." *Bijdragen* 39 (1978): 234-243.
- Sotinel, Claire. "Augustine's Information Circuits." Pages 125-136 in *A Companion to Augustine*. Edited by Mark Vessey. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Stemberger, Gunter. *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- Sterk, Andrea. *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Stroumsa, Guy S. "On the Status of Books in Early Christianity." Pages 57-73 in *Being Christian in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Tabbernee, William. "Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement." Pages 917-945 in *Ablution, Initiation and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Hellholm, et al. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Testini, P. "Osservazioni sull'iconografia del Cristo in trono tra gli Apostoli." *RIASA* 11-12 (1963): 230-300.
- Tetz, Martin. "Über nikäische Orthodoxie: Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasios von Alexandrien." *ZNW* 66 (1975): 194-222.
- Thümmel, W. *Zur Beirtheilung des Donatismus: Eine kirchengeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Halle, 1893.
- Tilley, Maureen. "Scripture as an Element of Social Control: Two Martyr Stories of Christian North Africa." *HTR* 83, no. 4 (1990): 383-397.
- , trans. *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa*. Translated Texts for Historians 24. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.

- , *The Bible in Christian North Africa: The Donatist World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- , "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity: From the Church of the Martyrs to the *Collecta* of the Desert." *J ECS* 5, no. 1 (1997): 21-35
- , "Theologies of Penance during the Donatist Controversy." *SP* 35 (2001): 330-337.
- Torjesen, Karen Jo. "Martyrs, Ascetics, and Gnostics: Gender Crossing in Early Christianity." Pages 79-91 in *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Sabrina Ramet. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.
- Turner, E.G. "Roman Oxyrhynchus." *Journal of Egyptian History* 38 (1952): 78-93.
- , "Oxyrhynchus and Rome." *HSCP* 79 (1975): 1-24.
- Turner, H.E.W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1954.
- Twomey, D. Vincent, and Mark Humphries, eds. *The Great Persecution: The Proceedings of the Fifth Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2003*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009.
- Ulrich, Jörg. "Nicaea and the West." *VC* 51, no. 1 (1997): 10-24.
- Urbainczyk, Theresa. "Observations on the Differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen." *Historia* 46, no. 3 (1997): 355-373.
- , *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Urbano, Arthur. *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013.
- Van Dam, Raymond. *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- van der Horst, Pieter W. *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003.

- van Dommelen, P. "Ambiguous Matters: Colonialism and Local Identities in Punic Sardinia." Pages 121-147 in *The Archaeology of Colonialism*. Edited by C. Lyons and J. Papadopoulos. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2002.
- Vogt, Hermann Josef. *Coetus sanctorum: der Kirchenbegriff des Novatian und die Geschichte seiner Sonderkirche*. Theophaneia 20. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1968.
- von Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz. *Kirche und Kirche, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat*. Munich, 1861.
- von Haehling, Raban. *Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amtsträger des Römischen Reiches seit Constantins I: Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der Theodosianischen Dynastie (324-450 bzw. 455 n. Chr.* Antiquitas 3. Bonn: Habelt, 1978.
- von Heyking, John. *Augustine and Politics as Longing in the World*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.
- von Harnack. *History of Dogma*. 7 volumes. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1901. Translated from 3<sup>rd</sup> German ed., 1894-1898.
- Vuolanto, Ville. "Male and Female Euergetism in Late Antiquity: A Study on Italian and Adriatic Church Floor Mosaics." Pages 245-269 in *Women, Wealth, and Power in the Roman Empire*. Edited by Päivi Setälä. Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2002.
- . *Children and Asceticism in Late Antiquity: Continuity, Family Dynamics, and the Rise of Christianity*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2015.
- Walden, John W.H. *The Universities of Ancient Greece*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- Walraff, Martin. "Socrates Scholasticus on the History of Novatianism." *SP* 29 (1997): 170-177.
- Ward-Perkins, J.B. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Weedman, Mark. *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers*. VC Suppl. 39. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Weinrich, W.C. "Cyprian, Donatism, Augustine, and Augustana VIII: Remarks of the Church and the Validity of Sacraments." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (1991): 267-296.

- Wiles, Maurice. *Archetypical Heresy: Arianism through the Centuries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Williams, D.H. *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- . "Defining Orthodoxy in Hilary of Poitiers' Commentarium in Matthaeum." *J ECS* 9, no. 2 (2001): 151-171.
- Williams, Megan Hale. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- Wimbush, Vincent L., and Richard Valantasis, eds. *Asceticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Woodward, E.L. *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1916.
- Zahariade, Mihail. "Personal Names at Halmyris." *Thraco-Dacica* 4-5 (2012-2015): 159-182
- Zahn, T. *Marcellus von Ankyra: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie*. Gotha, 1867.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.



## Preface to the Appendices

The following four appendices are translations of important documents relating to the Luciferians. The first is the short *Confessio fidei* of Faustinus, written at the request of the emperor Theodosius. The second is his lengthy petition, the *Libellus precum*, written with the presbyter Marcellinus to Theodosius. The third is Theodosius' rescript to his *praefectus oriens*, Cynegius, concerning the *Libellus precum*. The fourth is Faustinus' *De Trinitate*, a treatise written at the empress Flacilla's request in support of the Nicene party against Arian theological doctrines. I have translated all scriptural passages as well, rather than relying on a modern translation, because the authors frequently rely on explications of passages and individual words that are obfuscated by modern translations.

My 2011 M.A. thesis contained the first complete English translations of the *Confessio fidei*, *Libellus precum*, and *Lex Augusta* and only the second translation of these into a modern language. The texts presented here are revisions of those translations. The Latin text used for all three is that provided by Aline Canellis in *Supplique aux empereurs*, though her text is not substantially different from that in *Patrologia Latina* 13 or *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* 35 (where the *Libellus precum* serves as the second and the *Lex Augusta* as the third document of the *Collectio Avellana*). The only substantial area of textual confusion is at *Lib. prec.* 82, and it does not significantly affect the meaning of the passage. I also gratefully drew upon Canellis' excellent translation of these three documents into French in the preparation of this English translation. Her annotation of Faustinus and Marcellinus' biblical references was

invaluable not only in the preparation of the annotation of these translations but in the preparation of the dissertation itself.

The Latin text used for the translation of the *De Trinitate* is that published by Manlio Simonetti in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 69, which contains both Vincent Bulhart's edition of Gregory of Elvira's work and Simonetti's edition of this treatise. I have followed Simonetti's division of the text into 51 sections rather than earlier divisions of the work into 7 'books,' though the latter references have also been provided in parentheses following each section number. As with Canellis' edition of the first three texts, Simonetti's annotations were invaluable, though I have omitted some references to pre-Constantinian Christian works and have corrected a number of misprinted references. Since Faustinus often discusses a given scriptural passage at length, repeating it and phrases from it to emphasize his points, I have only provided a reference for a given scriptural reference the first time it appears in each section. Likewise, patristic sources are only cited when Faustinus begins to make a similar argument in a given section rather than providing line-by-line citations.

My translation is in fact the second English translation of the *De Trinitate*. The first, unknown to Simonetti or any other modern scholar, is a curious rendering from 1721 composed by an anonymous Englishman.<sup>1</sup> In his preface, he tells the reader:<sup>2</sup>

It is extremely sad and melancholy to observe, what amazing Inroads that dire Contagion, first raised and diffused in the Church of *Alexandria* by *Arius* an insolent assuming presbyter, hath of late Years made on this Christian Nation: And what unwearied Pains in the wily Arts of Sophistry

---

<sup>1</sup> Anonymous, *Faustinus the Presbyter, to the Empress Flacilla: of the Trinity, Or, of the Faith against the Arians, To which is Added, a Preface, giving some Account of the Author, and his Faith. A Treatise very necessary to be Read at this Time* (London: Phoenix, 1721).

<sup>2</sup> iii. The roman and italic text have been reversed from the original printing for ease of reading.

and Delusion are taken by false Brethren, of the Same Complexion among our Selves, to render it epidemical.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, Arian beliefs were indeed becoming more and more in vogue among the upper classes in England, to the consternation of Anglican clerics.<sup>3</sup> Why the author of this translation would choose to translate the work of an admittedly schismatic author<sup>4</sup> rather than the unquestionable works of, e.g., Hilary of Poitiers or Athanasius is unclear. So too is the translator's decision to remain anonymous. Further study of the man for whom the tract was published (George Mortlock), the printing house (the Phoenix, located in the printing center of St. Paul's Churchyard), and the ecclesiastic disputes taking place in the 1710s leading up to its publication may bear additional fruit concerning this fascinating early modern English document.

It is hoped that these translations will serve as a convenient touchstone for further reading when a passage is cited in the text. They are also intended for general use by modern scholars, who have only sparingly used these Luciferian texts to date, perhaps owing to the generally obscure locations of these documents within their manuscript traditions and to the lack of easily accessible modern English texts.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Maurice Wiles, *Archetypical Heresy: Arianism through the Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 62-181.

<sup>4</sup> viii: "I am not insensible, that an Objection lies in the Way of my author, and expect, that the *Schismatick* will by thrown in his Teeth by our modern *Arians*, should he chance to be well received here, and on that Account only merit the Favour of their Notice."

**Appendix 1**  
Translation of Faustinus, *Confessio fidei*

pr. The presbyter Faustinus' confession of the true faith, which Emperor Theodosius ordered to be briefly written and sent to him.

1. The creed<sup>1</sup> composed at Nicaea<sup>2</sup> was sufficient against the Arian heresy. But certain men, with a depraved disposition, advance impious expressions while affirming that creed. They cause ill will against us, as though we supported the heresy of Sabellius. Because of this, we show ourselves in a few words - by the confession of the first creed - to be against both Sabellius and against those who, under the name of the catholic faith, defend their impious expressions. They say that there are three substances, when the catholic faith has always said that the substance of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are identical.

2. We believe in the Father, who is not the Son, but has a Son begotten from him without a beginning, not made; and we believe in the Son, who is not the Father, but has a Father from whom he was begotten, not made; and we believe in the Holy Spirit, who is truly the Spirit of God. From this, we also confess that the substance of the Divine Trinity is identical, because just as the Father is in regards to his substance, thus also did he beget the Son; and the Holy Spirit, existing not as something created but as the Spirit of God, is not set apart from the substance of the Father and of the Son, but is itself of the same substance as the Father and Son just as it is of the same divinity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The same word (*fides*) is used to denote the abstract concept of 'faith' as well as specific formulas of faith throughout the Luciferians' writings.

<sup>2</sup> Manuscript B adds *Bithyniae* to distinguish the location of the Council of Nicaea from the Nicaea in Thrace. Thracian Nicaea is where the delegates sent to Constantius from Rimini capitulated.

3. For those who think that we are Apollinarians, let them know that we denounce the heresy of Apollinaris no less than the Arian heresy. However, we are amazed that those who swear that there are three substances - of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit - can be judged to be 'catholics.' But even if they say that they do not believe that the Son of God or the Holy Spirit are created beings, they nevertheless hold opinions contrary to the pious faith when they say that there are three substances. For it follows that those who swear that there are three substances, swear that there are three gods<sup>3</sup> - a statement that catholics have always denounced.

---

<sup>3</sup> Discussed at greater length in *Lib. prec.* 114.

## Appendix 2

### Translation of Faustinus and Marcellinus, *Libellus precum*

1. We beg your clemency, most pious emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius,<sup>1</sup> that you find it worthy to tirelessly read these things in the contemplation of Christ, the Son of God, who gives aid to your empire. Your lofty empire, with the assistance of God, the Father, and Christ, his only-begotten son, ascends even higher when you neither disregard truth among insignificant men nor affirm falsity among the many or powerful. For this is the most just and sound thing in an empire of justice: that people are judged by the merit of the truth, not that the truth is presumed from the power of the persons, since secular law<sup>2</sup> is written so that the powerful or many do not prevail even if the truth is held up by the insignificant.

2. Such cares as these are protected by your tranquility and foresight even in the affairs of the state, so that even among the smallest, the law of truth is paramount against every force and power. Because of this, it is possible for the state, handed down to your rule by the will of God, to flourish. But if this is so, then how, in divine affairs, will the truth of the holy faith be obscured and oppressed by a crowd of impious men and their most dishonest deceits? Especially since you, rulers of the Roman Empire, uphold the pious faith and purity of the Christian religion with so many of your laws, and because you indeed hold Christ, the Son of God, in honor, and decide everything for the benefit of the catholic faith, and compose everything with all your effort against the heretics and

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus establishing the *terminus post quem* for the petition; Gratian was assassinated by agents of Magnus Maximus on August 25, 383.

<sup>2</sup> Or, the 'law of this age'; *ius saeculi* means the laws of this world as opposed to divine law.

faithless by the authority of your empire. You do this not as if you were trying out some novelties of your own opinion, as certain previous rulers<sup>3</sup> attempted to their own ruin and the ruin of others, but so that you might demonstrate that your opinions, and your faith, agree with the holy expressions of the divine scriptures and with the pious confessions.<sup>4</sup>

3. But although this, following the most ferocious persecutions of the previous era,<sup>5</sup> should have helped the holy Church, it has hurt it all the more. This is because those notorious<sup>6</sup> bishops, who prior to this persecuted the church while allying or agreeing with the heretics, now too persecute the Church under the authority of the catholic name. Also, as much as they now do this deceitfully under a false profession of pious faith, so much do they also dangerously lie in wait and so much more does the truth waver grievously, because thus far it is not permitted for it - under you, emperors, who defend the pious faith - to catch its breath.

4. But so that we do not seem to be reporting this out of malice, without proof of the matter, we shall explain our reasoning as best as we are able. However, we are asking, we are asking as suppliants, that you lend your royal ears to us most insignificant ones, while we show you that we are not heretics, but nevertheless are violently assaulted as though we were heretics, while neither those ones who violently assault us nor their allies are now able to say or to prove that we are heretics. But certain men among them cannot deny this about themselves, that in a prior time they either most eagerly upheld heresy by

---

<sup>3</sup> Namely Constantius (*Lib. Prec.* 15ff) and Valens (*Lib. Prec.* 66ff).

<sup>4</sup> I.e., the Nicene Creed.

<sup>5</sup> As above, meaning under Constantius and Valens, though probably indicating Julian as well.

<sup>6</sup> The Latin word here is actually *egregii*. *Egregius* typically has the positive connotation of “outstanding” or “extraordinary” or “surpassing.” It is used here and throughout the *Libellus precum* sarcastically, just as it is used by Jerome throughout his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* by both the Orthodox and the Luciferian speakers.

the unbearable punishment of the faithful or at least gave their hands to it. They did so after condemning the catholic faith to which they previously swore - so long as they were afraid to suffer exile on behalf of Christ, the Son of God, for whom even the faithful laity must submit to any sort of most cruel death. *Because it is given to us*, as the Apostle said, *not only that we believe in him, but that we also suffer for him.*<sup>7</sup> For such death or suffering is the opportunity for blessed immortality.

5. It is no secret to your clemency and your religious observance, devoted to God, how impious or how pestilent the Arian heresy is. A creed was composed at Nicaea against this by our fathers with spiritual vigor, so that in this way both the pious confession of the apostolic faith might be protected and the everlasting condemnation of heresy itself might be protected, so that no one would be able to be deceived later.

6. But Arius, like the *heart of Pharaoh*,<sup>8</sup> not believing that a divine sentence had been given against him at that point, somehow slipped back in with Constantine. He hoped that by his judgment, with the decision of the devout priests annulled, he would be able to be received back into the Church. Finally, that same Constantine ordered that the Bishop Alexander, holy and of blessed memory, hold communion with him. This is not that Alexander who was the bishop of the divine faith in Alexandria. He, both full of wisdom and *burning with the Holy Spirit*,<sup>9</sup> first exposed that same Arius, and expelled him and condemned him eternally. But this is the Alexander who was in this city of Constantinople and was himself an admirable bishop.

---

<sup>7</sup> Philippians 1:29.

<sup>8</sup> Ex 7:13.

<sup>9</sup> Rom 12:11.



7. When Alexander saw that Arius was relying on the king of this age, he cried out from the deepest pain of his heart, standing in the location of the sanctuary to Christ, true and eternal king, and lord of all kings,<sup>10</sup> that he would not suffer that disgrace to enter the church. How fitting, how faithful his speech was is proved from this: the same Arius, before he entered the church, paid an unprecedented and most severe type of penalty up to his shameful death. For although on the day before he thought that he was going to enter the holy church with the help of the emperor as an impious man, although he suffered no weakness, no pain in his body (but, what is more serious, he was incurably sick with a disease of the soul alone), he sought privacy in the human custom.<sup>11</sup> When he sat there, suddenly tortured by the most severe pain,<sup>12</sup> he voided *all his intestines*<sup>13</sup> and his heart itself, which was the *treasure house of impiety*,<sup>14</sup> in his excrement. And thus (amazing to say!), with all his innards emptied out, he was thinned out, or in a moment became softened like the decayed matter of a sallow corpse, with the result that he himself slipped through the narrowness of the opening and of the seat.<sup>15</sup>

8. Worthy is this punishment for the impious, worthy is this shameful death for the pestilent heretic, and for his limbs, most noxious from the odor of the Devil, worthy is this grave! For he who produced unprecedented impieties against the only- born Son of God should also suffer and die in an unprecedented way. He said that “he was not truly

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Rev 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.

<sup>11</sup> A euphemism; Arius, as the following description makes clear, was going to the lavatory.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. 2 Mac 9:5.

<sup>13</sup> Acts 1:18.

<sup>14</sup> Prov 10:2; Mic 6:10.

<sup>15</sup> A. Leroy-Molinghen (“La mort d’Arius,” *Byz.* 38 [1968]: 107) describes this grotesque account of Arius’ death as follows: “C’est le cas notamment de Faustin et Marcellin, auxquels nous accorderions volontiers la palme dans le domaine de l’imagination débridée.”

born from the Father” and that “there was a time when he was not” and that “he was established from nothing,” so that it would not be believed that he was of the same substance and divinity and agelessness and omnipotence of the one who is his Father.

9. We recounted this to your revered clemency for this reason: so that your good sense, attentive to what is true, would give thought to how venerable is the creed composed at Nicaea against Arius (to whom God gave evidence, not only through the authority of the divine scriptures, but also through the most devoted speech of holy Alexander) and how accursed the doctrine of Arius is (which divine judgment condemned by the unprecedented punishment against Arius himself; it did not wait for the day of judgment against him so that the rest might take care to be thoroughly terrified by the example of his punishment).<sup>16</sup>

10. Certainly, due to this example, it should not be doubted that they also believe that his doctrine should be revived or taken up. For how does eternal punishment differentiate between those whose impious doctrine does not differ? Even in your laws, the same jail holds those convicted of the same thing and the same verdict bears on them. But it also cannot be doubted that the true catholics are those who – through exiles, through a variety of punishments, through the cruelty of death – upheld without deceit that creed which was composed at Nicaea with evangelic and apostolic reasoning, and which God quite openly proved good by the punishment of Arius, who was fighting against it.

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. 2 Pet 2:6.

11. Now, if these things, which are affirmed as true in the divine scriptures, are true in your view, give thought, most pious and religious emperors: in what way are they criminals, who consecrated their faith and devotion to Christ, God, under these divine rules and declarations, setting no fear ahead of the *fear of God*?<sup>17</sup>

12. But although Arius was buried in excrement, he nevertheless left behind heirs to his impiety; from that point on, worms that were born from his rotting corpse were not lacking.<sup>18</sup> It would take a long time to relate the sort of things which the Devil, craftsman of error, conducted through them, even if we were able to relate them - for they are infinite and incredible, but not false. But now we will explain what created the present case. The Arians, through their deceitful argumentation, made the emperor Constantius a participant in the Arian heresy. Even those men themselves would have paid the penalty in the present, if it was not necessary, according to the judgment of the Apostle, *that there be heresies so that men might become openly proven good*.<sup>19</sup>

13. And so these worms of Arius which we mentioned had regal power assisting them. At first, indeed, they strove one by one towards the overthrow of the catholic faith and the destruction of the holy religion on behalf of the Arian impiety in this way: they attacked those who resisted with false accusations or they tortured or killed them with either punishments or exile. However, when they went further in their rage and made the fear of themselves universal, they were no longer content to go one by one. Then at last,

---

<sup>17</sup> Ps 13:3 (LXX).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. 2 Mac 9:9; Isa 66:24; Acts 12:23.

<sup>19</sup> 1 Cor 11:19.

they forced bishops to gather from everywhere in one place. And the location given for this synod in the East was Seleucia-in-Isauria, and in the West, the city of Rimini.

14. And indeed, at first the bishops who came there on behalf of the holy faith affirmed that Creed which was composed at Nicaea. They did this in such a way that nothing was taken away from it, since it made the evangelic faith clear with unconquerable words and condemned the impious doctrine of Arius with divine authority. Then, in the end, they cursed a creed presented by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Gaius, of the kind that rejected the catholic faith and absolved Arius, and even introduced his pestilent doctrine. They condemned so impious a faith as much as they condemned the authors of it themselves, judging the crime to be unforgivable if the Church was patient with these men (who were so impious that they violated the venerable faith of the fathers) as well as their impious creed.

15. They also sent ten legates to the emperor Constantius, writing down the things that were done and urging at the same time that he himself also keep inviolate the decrees of the fathers on behalf of the venerable faith against the heretics.

16. Naturally, the heretics also sent legates, whom Constantius then also received most amiably, as though they were his associates, but he rejected those who had come on behalf of the catholic faith against the heretics. Through his associates, sometimes he enticed them with his charm, sometimes he terrified them with threats; and meanwhile he would torment them by the delay alone,<sup>20</sup> for one reason: so that, when they feared the wrath of the king, when they did not deem it worthy to suffer exile for Christ, the Son of

---

<sup>20</sup> In other words, he tormented them (for now) by making them come to court, not by physical violence.

God, when they took comfort in their own sees and in the most pernicious possessions of their churches, they would repudiate that which they had piously affirmed and that they would take up that which they had condemned as impious.

17. In this matter, let it be permitted to painfully lament in the view of you religious emperors for the sake of God. The bishops feared the wrath of the earthly king more than Christ, the true God and eternal King;<sup>21</sup> they believed that transitory exile was more serious than everlasting punishment - according to Isaiah, sleepless worms and inextinguishable flames;<sup>22</sup> they considered their own dwellings and possessions more sweet than the blessed and everlasting dwelling in the kingdom of Christ.

18. But Constantius, not content with the ruin and disgrace of the ten legates, sent to Rimini so that all the bishops there would likewise be turned. And those, in that wicked pattern of their own legates, rejected the pious faith of the fathers that they had affirmed, swearing to that faith of the Arians which they had condemned with sound and free judgment.

19. Let your wisdom take heed of the synod at Rimini, most piously begun but most impiously concluded. Moreover, this same impiety was also committed by the bishops at Seleucia-in-Isauria.<sup>23</sup> Judge, most pious and religious emperors, why those are guilty and why those are worth being assaulted who do not wish to hold communion with such bishops. Those bishops, although at first they upheld the undiminished faith and

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Rev 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Isa 66:24.

<sup>23</sup> Note the lack of details concerning the council at Seleucia compared to that at Rimini. Does this vagueness support the notion that Faustinus and Marcellinus were westerners, perhaps from Rome? Or is their brevity an attempt at cutting down on repetition? They are, after all, well-informed about events in Oxyrhynchus and even spent time in Eleutheropolis (see below, §92-101, 102-110, respectively).

rejected the impious faith, changed their minds later, when they were afraid of exile, when they took comfort in their own things and sees. They condemned at the command of the heretic emperor that apostolic faith which they upheld, and took up that impiety of Arius which they rejected.

20. If they at least believed that the judgment of God was coming, shouldn't they have been glad to suffer all evils rather than be betrayers of the venerable faith, whose virtue had been proven by the speeches of holy Alexander and by the punishment of Arius? This especially, since the example of glorious suffering had preceded them, albeit only of the fewest number of bishops. Those bishops, lest they violate the evangelic and apostolic faith, lest they fall silent before the impious, refused no exile, no punishment, nor any death of a cruel sort.

21. In fact, before the synod at Rimini, Paulinus of Trier, a most steadfast bishop, was given into exile, upholding the pious faith and cursing the company of the Arians.<sup>24</sup>

22. But also the apostolic man Lucifer, bishop of Calaris from Sardinia, since he was well known for his contempt for this age, his fervor for holy scripture, his purity of life, his steadfastness of faith, his divine grace, was sent by the Roman church<sup>25</sup> as a legate to Constantius. And since he upheld the venerable faith, since he exposed and refuted the heretics, he was led into exile with all the cruelty of injuries.<sup>26</sup>

23. It went likewise with Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan, who was at first an associate of King Constantius while he still did not know that he was the patron

---

<sup>24</sup> At the Council of Arles in 353.

<sup>25</sup> Note how the authors refuse to name Liberius, who eventually did cave in to Constantius.

<sup>26</sup> At the Council of Milan in 355.

of heretics; but after it was made known to him, and proven that Constantius supported heretics, he spit back the impious association of the king. He preferred exile, lest he lose the friendship of Christ, God, lest he not keep the company of holy men.<sup>27</sup>

24. But Rhodanius was also sent into exile, and Hilary, who also published writings against heretics and traitors - though in truth he later broke that off, showing favor to the traitors. We are not saying, however, that he also<sup>28</sup> showed favor to heretics, against whom he spoke at length with the powers of his eloquence.<sup>29</sup>

25. Also, Maximus of Naples, in Campania. Since he had a disagreeable stomach and was more delicate in body, at first indeed, in order that he fall, he was assaulted with injuries for a long time. Then, when he was not overcome by the weakness of his flesh due to the steadfastness of his soul and the virtue of his faith, he was led into exile and there rests, a martyr in the peace of the Lord.

26. But Rufinus too, a man of marvelous simplicity but more admirable in protecting the faith, prevented his exile with the shedding of his own blood. In the end, when he persisted on behalf of the undiminished faith, that fierce and horrible Epictetus, bishop of Centumcellae, forced him to run in front of his carriage. And after he ran a long ways, he thus died in the road, spilling out blood with his vital organs ruptured. The Neapolitans in Campania know this, where the remains of his gore assault the demons in possessed bodies, assuredly on account of the grace of the faith for which he too spilled his blood.

---

<sup>27</sup> Like Lucifer, at the Council of Milan in 355.

<sup>28</sup> The text is corrupt but the meaning is clear. Mazochi proposes the *et* which Canellis accepts.

<sup>29</sup> Both Rhodanius and Hilary were exiled at the Council of Beziers in 356.

27. There were also some bishops from Egypt, though few, some of whom were turned to flight, while others were given to exile since they did not wish to hold communion with impious and cruel bishops.

In any case, how salutary, how beautiful, or how glorious would it have been, if all those bishops had protected the faith that they had always rightly upheld, with equal virtue and similar unanimity, not terrified of exiles or punishments, to assuredly grasp the everlasting blessedness to come in the kingdom of Christ, God!

28. And we are silent about how perhaps the united constancy of so many bishops might have checked and subdued that same Constantius,<sup>30</sup> however dreadful he was in his regal power. Perhaps he would have even understood that great is the worth of that faith for which none of the bishops refused exile, proscriptions, torments, and death. But, frightened just a little, such a great number of bishops gave their hands en masse to impiety and their impiety made them callous<sup>31</sup> to the madness. This madness was now made greater by such an easy overthrow of the multitude.

29. No less a sacrilege is this, no less an impiety, than if under a pagan persecution there was a sacrifice to an idol - because to swear to heresy, being terrified, is also to sacrifice to demons, if indeed, as the holy scripture teaches, heresy is the *doctrine of demons*,<sup>32</sup> just like idolatry.

30. Meanwhile, in the view of certain men the multitude is preferred to the truth, because the truth has few followers. And we are assaulted because we follow the

---

<sup>30</sup> Note the play on words between *Constantium* and *constantia*.

<sup>31</sup> Accepting the reading in the manuscripts, *incalluit*, despite the fact that this perfect of *incallesco* is otherwise unattested. Also possible is *incaluit*, the perfect of *incalesco* (to be warm, to be inflamed).

<sup>32</sup> 1 Tim 4:1.



inviolable faith among the few and we shun the many on account of their impious heresies and the sacrilegious signatures of the traitors. Because of this, what is your opinion in this case, O most just emperors and supporters of the catholic faith? Concerning these two parties, to whom do you give your vote? One is the party in which there are many bishops; but where there are many, there the sacred faith of Christ is always violated before it is defended, due to treachery. There, due to the fear of the king,<sup>33</sup> the impiety of Arius is always taken up before it is condemned. But where the fewest are, there the faith of Christ is upheld through exiles, through torture, through the spilling of blood, through death itself - and the impiety of Arius and every heresy are cursed as the highest wickedness.

31. A few bishops may be worthy due to the merit of their confession and inviolable faith, and many may be held in contempt by the merit of their heresy or treachery, since in a case of what is true - especially in a case of religion and of the sacred faith - number ought not be compared to number. Instead, that pure apostolic faith proven by exiles, proven by tortures (even if just the torture of one), ought to be preferred to the infidelities of the many. But even if all of this should not be doubted, it is nevertheless necessary in the present as well to present divine proof of treachery's condemnation for this reason. Arius' impious sect, punished by divine attention, was judged in advance in the case of Arius; and concerning his followers, the same punishment by which Arius is tormented also awaits them. In this same way as well, nothing ought to be thought

---

<sup>33</sup> Here meaning an emperor. The play between the earthly and heavenly kings is apparent throughout the text. The authors also refer to Constantius (but not Theodosius, Valentinian II, or Arcadius) as *rex*.

concerning the traitors of the sacred faith other than what is determined by divine judgment in the contemporary punishments against one or two traitors.

32. Potamius, bishop of the city of Lisbon, certainly was upholding the catholic faith at first. But afterwards, for the reward of a state-owned estate which he had desired to possess, he betrayed the faith. Hosius both exposed this man in the churches of Spain and rejected him as an impious heretic.

But Hosius, summoned to king Constantius by the complaint of Potamius, was terrified by threats. Fearing that he, an old and wealthy man, would suffer exile or proscription, he gave his hands to impiety and, after so many years, betrayed the faith. And he returned to Spain with greater authority, having a terrible order: if any bishop wished in no way at all to hold communion with that same man, who was now made a traitor, he would be sent into exile.

33. But a faithful messenger reported the impious treachery of Hosius to holy Gregory, most steadfast bishop of the city of Elvira. From then on, Gregory too would take no comfort in his unholy communion, being mindful of the sacred faith and of divine judgment. But Hosius, who henceforth was tormented all the more if anyone, upholding the undiminished faith with a firmness that had not lapsed one bit,<sup>34</sup> stood against him now that he himself had lapsed.<sup>35</sup> Through his civic power, he made Gregory, a man with a most vigorous mind, present himself before him, in the hope that this man too might fall by that same terror by which he himself had fallen.

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. WisSol 5:1.

<sup>35</sup> Note the play on words between *lapso* and *inlapsa*

Furthermore, Clementine was the *vicarius*<sup>36</sup> at that time. He, due to Hosius' indictment and the general order of the king, ordered holy Gregory to present himself at Cordoba through his office.

34. Meanwhile, rumor disturbed everyone in their understanding of the matter and the discussion of the people was often as to "Who is this Gregory, who dares to stand up to Hosius?" For many were also still ignorant of Hosius' treachery; they had not yet well ascertained that it was Gregory who was holy! For in the view of those who had known him by chance, he was still an inexperienced bishop. In the view of Christ, however, he was no inexperienced supporter of the faith, due to the worth of his holiness.

35. But look! He came to the *vicarius* and many of his administrators were present, and Hosius was sitting as judge, no, even beyond a judge, relying on royal authority. And holy Gregory, in the imitation of his Lord,<sup>37</sup> was sitting as a criminal, not due to some perverse moral sense, but according to the circumstance of his present judgment<sup>38</sup> - but in respect to other matters, free in his faith. And the individuals were greatly looking ahead toward which party victory would turn.<sup>39</sup> And Hosius indeed leaned on the authority of his era, but Gregory leaned on the authority of the truth; the former indeed leaned on the assurance of the earthly king, but the latter on the assurance

---

<sup>36</sup> The *vicarius* was the Roman official in charge of a diocese, in this case *Diocesis Hispaniarum*, which included several provinces: Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Baetica, Lusitania, Gallaecia, and Mauritania Tingitana.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Mt 27:11-26; Jn 18:28-40.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. WisSol 4:20-5:1.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Ex 17:11-12.

of the eternal King;<sup>40</sup> and Hosius used the writings of the emperor, but Gregory took hold of the writings of the divine voice.

36. And Hosius was checked in all things, in such a way that he was taken care of by his own sayings which he had previously written on behalf of the faith and the truth. Hosius then moved to the *vicarius* Clementine and said, “Understanding is not your responsibility, but taking action. You see that he stands up against the royal commands: thus take that action which is your responsibility, and send him into exile.” But Clementine, although he was not Christian, nevertheless showed reverence for the title of the episcopate in so great a man whom he saw was prevailing reasonably and faithfully. He responded to Hosius, saying, “I do not dare send a bishop into exile, as long as he still continues on in his episcopal title. But first give a judgement casting him out from the honor of the episcopate and then, and only then, will I take that action which you wish to happen against him in accordance with the order of the emperor, as if against a private citizen.

37. But when holy Gregory saw that Hosius wished to pass judgment so that it would appear as if he were cast out, he called the true and powerful Judge, Christ,<sup>41</sup> crying out with the powers of his entire faith: “Christ, God, you who *are going to come to judge the living and the dead*,<sup>42</sup> suffer not today that human judgment be brought out against me, the least of your servants, who offers himself like a criminal standing at a public spectacle on behalf of the faith of your name. But you yourself, I beg, pass

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Rev 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Acts 19:11.

<sup>42</sup> 1 Peter 4:5; 2 Tim 4:1.

judgment in this case today! Find it worthy that you yourself carry out judgment in vengeance! I do not desire this to happen as if I were afraid of exile, since no punishment on behalf of your name is not sweet for me, but so that many might be freed from the error of treachery when they see your present and instantaneous vengeance.

38. And when Gregory appealed to God with his faithful words, more zealous and holy [than Hosius] by far - look! - suddenly, when Hosius attempted to pass judgment, he turned his face, twisting his neck in a like manner as well. He was thrown out from where he was sitting onto the ground and there died, or, as some like it, there he 'became silent.' From there, at any rate, he was carried out as a dead man. Then, as everyone was marveling, even that pagan Clementine was terrified. And though he was the judge, fearing that a judgment with a similar punishment might be passed concerning him as well, he prostrated himself at the feet of such a great man. He begged him to spare one who had sinned against him in ignorance of divine law, and not by his own opinion so much as by the authority of the one commanding.

39. Then there was astonishment among all, and admiration of divine law, because an entirely unprecedented spectacle was seen in this: for he who wished to pass human judgment now endured the more serious divine judgment; and the judge who had come to judge, now growing pale, was afraid of being judged as guilty; and he who had stood like a criminal about to be sent into exile, was being begged by a prostrate judge that he spare him as if he were the judge!

40. For this reason Gregory alone, out of the company of those upholding the undiminished faith, neither turned to flight nor suffered exile, since every person was afraid to judge him further.<sup>43</sup>

41. Do you see the amazing proofs of how treachery is condemned by God? All Spain knows better that we are not making these things up. But also, Potamius' betrayal of the sacred faith was not left unpunished. In fact, when he was hastening on to the estate which he had warranted obtaining from the emperor for his faith's impious signature, he was punished in an unprecedented manner by the tongue through which he had blasphemed. He died in the road, receiving no delight from his estate, not even in seeing it.

42. This is no light torment for a greedy man: he died, who on account of his longing for a state-owned estate violated the sacred faith and, when he was hastening to the farm, came first to his punishing death lest he possess it - even in the comfort of seeing it. In the holy Gospel we read the words of [Christ] reproaching a rich man who was glorifying himself in vain about what he had prepared:<sup>44</sup> *Fool, he said, your soul will be carried away from you this night; the things you have prepared, whose will they be?*<sup>45</sup> If anyone considers that this writing is suitable for Potamius, he would understand that judgment was not lightly passed against him, especially as the punishment passed was of his tongue for which that rich man is also tortured violently in Hell.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Although the details of this story ought to be doubted, Gregory never appears to have suffered exile.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Lk 12:16-19.

<sup>45</sup> Lk 12:20. 43.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Lk 16:19-26.

43. But even Florentius himself, who held communion in some place with Hosius and Potamius while knowing then that they were traitors, was also punished in an unprecedented manner. For when he sat on his throne in the assembly of the people, he was suddenly forced off it and trembled; and having been brought outside, he recovered his strength. And a second time in turn, when after having entered he had sat down, he suffered similarly, not yet understanding that these were punishments for his polluted communion. Nevertheless, afterwards, when he had persisted in entering the church, he was forced off his throne a third time in such a way that it appeared that he was driven back as if he was unworthy for the throne. And, forced onto the ground trembling, he was tortured in such a way that with some severity and great torments his breath was forced out of him. From there he was again lifted, not about to recover as was customary, but about to be buried.<sup>47</sup>

44. The great city of Merida knows to what we are referring, in whose church the people saw this itself with their own eyes. But this also ought to be considered, that Florentius, who had not yet sworn to impiety, suffered these things only because he held communion with the traitors to the faith, while not being ignorant of their treachery.

45. We mentioned this for this reason, so that those men might see what ought to be done by men who - although they did not sign like the traitors did - nevertheless are joined to the traitors through communion with them, since they knew them to be traitors.

---

<sup>47</sup> The text is vague as to whether these events occur on the same day or over a course of several days.

And I think that they should understand why, with the example of Florentius, they should be afraid.<sup>48</sup>

46. But it would take a long time to report the other additional proofs of how treachery is condemned by contemporary punishments. Divine judgment employed these in various places to this end, of course: so that he who is not mindful of divine scriptures for whatever reason would understand by the observation of divine revenge in the present either what he should follow or what he should shun. Without a doubt, God wishes to take vengeance against a few for this reason,<sup>49</sup> so that which is threatened in the divine scripture concerning the coming punishments of the traitors is not thought of as a story, even if he now does not take vengeance against someone in this era.

47. Now let all the bishops traitorous to the faith understand what very serious punishments are reserved for them, when (to the amazement of all) there is vengeance against their own allies in this age as well. For to this end we have set forth contemporary punishments of treachery, so that just as there is vengeance against a few, it is believed there will be vengeance against all of those who are similar - especially since divine scripture also affirms that which is also demonstrated through these contemporary proofs. We have also done this so that this be considered, most pious emperors: in what way are those guilty who do not join in the divine sacraments with men such as these, whose everlasting punishments are described in the holy books and whose exemplary punishments are seen in this era?

---

<sup>48</sup> The authors here switch to the singular (*puto*), which indicates that perhaps Faustinus is the principle author. He is the sole author of the preceding *Confessio fidei* and the *De trinitate* as well. Canellis treats Faustinus as the sole author of the text. Who then is Marcellinus?

<sup>49</sup> In the manuscripts, this just reads *ratione*; earlier editors quickly corrected this to *ratione ne*.



48. But we ask your admirable benevolence that you grant us, in the contemplation of Christ, God, your tireless patience in listening while we explain, albeit briefly, to what extent the impiety has grown.<sup>50</sup> For the accursed Arians, in the Eastern regions and especially in Egypt, were not content with this alone, that the bishops fell into their impious opinion with the undiminished faith condemned, but when they signed for the sake of their desires, the Arians expelled these very men, who at first were ordained by catholic bishops, into the body of the laymen, and afterwards these same heretics ordained them as bishops again, so that not only did they appear to condemn the catholic faith, but even ordination performed by catholic bishops.

49. Turn your attention to this triumph, so to speak, of the heretics against the catholics, and to the wretched, final (so to speak), and most abominable captivity of those bishops.<sup>51</sup> In this, the pious faith and the catholic bishops condemned, they handed themselves over into the dominion and delusion of these due to a fear of exile and so that they might appear to retain the episcopal title in the view of men. In any case, they no longer had that title in the view of God after their signatures. Yet, for this reason the authority of that title is sought, even with every disgrace: so that the possessions of the Church not be taken from them. Would that the Church had never possessed these things, so that living in the apostolic custom it might have inviolably possessed faith undiminished! And now it is called the highest impiety *not* to hold communion with men such as these. And this is said under you emperors who, as your laws pronounce, uphold

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Lib Prec.* 1 and 4.

<sup>51</sup> An allusion to the Old Testament accounts of the Hebrews in Egypt and Babylon, with the understanding that God will free the people (or bishops) in captivity.

the divine sanctity of the venerable Church! It is, however, no wonder, if you do not know that such cruel things are committed, since you are occupied with the cares of the state.

50. The bishops who cursed their impieties and suffered the punishment of exile for the faith or gave themselves to flight, although they were separate in body because of the distances between their regions, nevertheless were arranged in spirit into one body through shared letters. They decided with apostolic force that in no respect was it possible to hold communion with such bishops who betrayed the faith in that way which we related above, unless they requested lay communion, suffering penance for their impieties.

51. But when Constantius, the patron of heretics, died, Julian held the empire alone. By his command, all the catholic bishops were freed from their exiles.<sup>52</sup> The Divine is accustomed to do this, so that even through the adversaries of his Christian religion those who are the worshipers of Christ exert themselves for the faithful so much the more.<sup>53</sup>

52. But not much later, when Julian was killed, Jovian was made emperor. He, upholding the catholic faith, gave his vote to the catholic bishops. But those notorious bishops, even though<sup>54</sup> under Constantius they had condemned with their heretical signatures the undiminished faith that they had upheld, transferred themselves back to the

---

<sup>52</sup> Faustinus refuses to mention here or elsewhere Lucifer's actions in ordaining Paulinus at Antioch during his exile.

<sup>53</sup> That is, since even pagan emperors like Julian have helped the Church, catholic emperors are expected to help the church all the more.

<sup>54</sup> The manuscripts read *quam* instead of *quamquam*; Günther, Simonetti, and Canellis all accept the reading as *quamquam*.

catholic confession of faith when they saw that the emperor was intervening on behalf of the catholic bishops. And where now is the faith and veneration of Christ, when according to the judgment of an earthly emperor, bishops go from being catholics to being heretics and those same bishops turn back from being heretics towards the catholic faith?

53. But perhaps in the end certain exhausted confessors<sup>55</sup> believed that they should join themselves in communion with such men and overturned those agreements on which they previously decided against them with prophetic, evangelic, and apostolic authority. Even if this is so, isn't it possible that they covered up the truth? Isn't it possible that they passed judgment beyond evangelic doctrines? That they upset the apostolic determinations and especially that statement of God, who said, *He who persists up to the end, this man will be saved?*<sup>56</sup>

54. But also, the apostle Paul, who was declared the *chosen vessel*<sup>57</sup> by Christ, God, whose words these are, wrote to the Galatians: *But even if an angel from heaven preaches beyond that which we preach to you, let him be anathema!*<sup>58</sup> Also that same man later in the same letter follows up on this, saying, *For if I build again these things which I destroyed, I establish that I am a traitor.*<sup>59</sup> At any rate, a confessor is made from the Gospels, from the voices of the prophets, from the doctrines of the apostles. Who

---

<sup>55</sup> Such as Hilary of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli.

<sup>56</sup> Mt 10:22.

<sup>57</sup> Acts 9:15.

<sup>58</sup> Gal 1:8.

<sup>59</sup> Gal 2:18.

among the faithful would doubt that this man is not worthy of confession, if he began to build that which destroyed the Gospels, overthrowing the laws of divine scriptures?

55. Are not the divine scriptures assaulted when ecclesiastic peace is joined together with bishops who deny the Son of God? For who is there who, when he considers the strength of the divine religion, trusts that the peace of liars *is pleasing to God*,<sup>60</sup> unless (as was decided by the fathers) they hand themselves over into the body of the laymen, undergoing penance for their deceit?

56. But let them have peace with the unfaithful! In what way do they cause offence, in what way do they trouble the emperors, in what way do they trouble the state, who in the contemplation of divine judgment spit back peace of this sort? This peace which receives the sacrilegious, honors traitors to the faith, shows favor to hypocrites, looks down on the truth, establishes the deniers of Christ, true Son of God, as the lords of the Church, contaminates the people with the disgrace of faithlessness, and overturns the Gospels!

For this we are thought guilty, for this, under the authority of your name, we suffer persecutions from these bishops. At the nod of a previous emperor, these bishops spoke at length in affirming heresy against the catholic faith! Alas! Woe! The same bishops prefer the decrees of the earlier emperor,<sup>61</sup> a heretic, against the faithful and the defenders of the catholic faith! And now the same bishops put forth the laws of catholic emperors against the faithful and the defenders of the catholic faith!

---

<sup>60</sup> Rom 8:8.

<sup>61</sup> Constantius.

57. We say these things with pain in all our innards. We are not weeping because it is not glorious for the faithful to suffer whatever you please for the truth; we are weeping rather because the stupidity in this age is so great that this impiety of theirs, enveloped by so many lies, is not known, and because no one understands how even royal ears always make it a game to disturb Christians and faithful priests. But under the label of ‘peace,’ their impiety is hidden, and the specious name of ‘unity’ is set up to protect the deceivers.

58. But it is good that the Savior himself explained the virtue of his peace, lest anyone be taken in by the simple label of ‘peace’ and join it with any impieties of this era. He says, *I leave behind my peace with you, I give my peace to you; I give it to you not in the way this world gives it.*<sup>62</sup> He distinguishes “his peace” from “the peace of the world.” For if this peace which receives unfaithful bishops into the Church is gratifying to God, then what need is there to suffer agitations in persecutions, to undergo incarceration, to advance in the way of swords, and to endure all types of punishments and death, when indeed after denial, after the sacrileges of deceit on account of this peace which they trust *is pleasing to God*,<sup>63</sup> any of these unfaithful men, freed from care, is received as though he is undiminished with his episcopal honor preserved?

59. According to this assertion, even the martyrs should be judged as worthless! Now, for what benefits did they prefer to bear punishments and death? For if those who in fear of persecution denied the Son of God are not punished, but rather are more effectively honored, the martyrs should not have hoped for the crown of suffering! They

---

<sup>62</sup> Jn 14:27.

<sup>63</sup> Rom 8:8.

are rather more effectively weighing out the punishments for their recklessness! For it is necessary that this follows, for it cannot possibly be that it does not follow, when the opposite things are judged.<sup>64</sup> Is it not obvious to what argument they are compelled by the name of that peace, or that they are compelled to proclaim that if the deniers of Christ, God, are rightfully made greater in honor, then we believe that the martyrs are punished as if for their own recklessness?

60. Begone with it! Begone with it, that Christian conscience would accept this! For we believe in the Son of God, who proclaims, *He who denies me in the presence of men, I also shall deny him in my Father's presence,*<sup>65</sup> and *He who has acknowledged me in the presence of men, I also shall acknowledge him in the presence of my father.*<sup>66</sup>

61. Nevertheless, even in this case, recognize the divine punishment brought forth in the contemporary proofs, lest anyone think that the peace of such bishops ought to be accepted - even if those bishops turn back to the confession of true faith after their impious signatures or unholy communions with heretics, to whom they yielded (though knowing), lest they lose either the possessions of the Church or their honors.

62. The holy man Maximus, a bishop of whom we made mention above, affirmed the upright faith, rejected the company of heretics, and was led into exile. In his place, the traitors ordained a man, Zosimus by name. Indeed, he himself also previously upheld catholic interests. This affair took place in Naples, a city of Campania. Holy Maximus

---

<sup>64</sup> Previous scholars have considered this passage to be corrupted, but Canellis retains the manuscript reading. The sense is very obscure, but seems to mean that if those who avoided martyrdom are praised more, then it should logically follow (according to the Luciferians) that those who suffered martyrdom are denigrated.

<sup>65</sup> Mt 10:33.

<sup>66</sup> Mt 10:32.

knew this and wrote from exile. He passed judgment against him not only by his episcopal authority but also burning with the zeal and virtue of a martyr.<sup>67</sup>

63. But after a few years, blessed Lucifer proceeded towards Rome from his fourth exile. He entered Neapolis, a city of Campania, as we have said. Zosimus tried to approach him, perhaps with that assurance by which he certainly now appeared to have corrected himself from his impiety. But the confessor Lucifer did not wish to receive him, since he was not ignorant of what he had done. Rather, with the fervor of the Holy Spirit, he firmly followed the judgment of the bishop and martyr Maximus and said that in the judgment of the watchful God, Zosimus would not have that episcopate which he claimed as a spiritual adulterer. This man would also know the punishment for his impiety.

64. But not much later, when that same Zosimus wished to carry out the duties of a priest in the gathering of the people, among his priestly words his tongue was stretched out and he was not able to call it back it into the space of his mouth. For this reason, it hung outside his mouth in an unnatural manner, like a panting cow. But as he saw that he had lost the service of his tongue, he went out from the basilica and once outside - a wondrous thing! - his tongue was called back into service. And at first, certainly, it was not understood that the judgment of the martyr and of the confessor<sup>68</sup> was being fulfilled against him. But when he suffered this as many times as he also tried to enter the basilica on various days, he finally recognized from this that his tongue was denied to him in the course of the solemn words of the high priest so that the judgment of the holy priests

---

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Rom 12:11.

<sup>68</sup> Maximus and Lucifer.

(which was rightfully brought forth against him) would be proven. Finally, he left the episcopate, with the result that his tongue, which had left him, was returned to him.<sup>69</sup>

65. We are not reporting ancient matters, which customarily come into doubt for whatever reason: these present proofs still live! For even Zosimus is in body today and does not lack the use of his tongue now, after he preferred to live with the loss of the episcopate,<sup>70</sup> doing penance for his impieties. From those who are similar to them, wasn't it judged in advance that it gives no benefit to those bishops, since they persist in being bishops as if under correct thinking? For it is not correct thinking, but mockery, to change their faith in accordance with the reigns of the emperors.

66. This, this matter deceived the emperor Valens as well, when he saw the constancy of defense among the heretics, but the inconstancy of faith among those notorious catholics. For surely it was proven to him that those who asserted they were catholics had previously signed along with the heretics, cursing that faith which they had at first defended. And the heretics said, "If our faith is wicked, why under Constantius did these men sign on behalf of it? They now say that they are catholics, affirming this faith which - though they defended it at first - they condemned under Constantius, refuted by our arguments." Valens, stirred by these things, did not know the virtue of the true faith. He compared constancy with inconstancy<sup>71</sup> and protected the impiety of the heretics with some justification.

---

<sup>69</sup> Note the twin uses of *cessit* and *cesserat*.

<sup>70</sup> As above with *cesso*, note the parallel use of *amittens* and *amissione*.

<sup>71</sup> The play on words reaches new heights with *Constantio*, *Constantio*, *constantium*, and *inconstantium*.



67. And we remain silent as to how, even under Valens, certain men handed themselves over the heretics again, whom nevertheless we now see named among the catholics. This is the reason that even the common people of the heretics are fortified in their impious faith while the heretics persevere in evil, and those who are considered catholics fall back from good, time and again yielding to the heretics. For by what authority do bishops such as these warn against a heresy to which they cannot deny that they themselves subscribed? And with what trust do they strive to promote the catholic faith to the people, when it so happens that they rejected it with their impious signatures?

68. Do you see? Though, as we believe, you are unaware of this. Even in your own times the pious faith indeed is supported (and would that it were actually truly supported!) - but even if it is truly supported, nevertheless it is supported with a certain injustice, since it is supported through unworthy bishops by the suffering of those priests who defend the pious faith and by the ruin of faithful laymen. But it is considered unholy to cast out so many traitors and to reject a host conscious of its injustice. And where is the justice of the true religion, if it must be yielded to an impious multitude - and this under the most pious and most religious emperors!

69. Thus it was not judged in the flood that the host of unfaithful were victorious. Rather, that most just man, Noah, was more pleasing to God because in that destruction of the world he was the only just man found.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, the impious multitude in Sodom and Gomorrah also faced serious punishments, whereas the most hospitable Lot, on account of his justice, was freed [from these punishments] with only just two of his

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Gen 6-9.

daughters.<sup>73</sup> But the emulator of God, Elijah, who was alone, was also not crushed when four hundred and fifty false priests strove against him. Rather, that whole impious host of priests faced its punishment under the hand of one faithful man while King Ahab watching, a man who was impiously protecting the false priests.<sup>74</sup>

70. But the king of Israel, Jehu, also did not give in to the impious multitude of priests. He gathered all the false priests who had been in the highest place under King Ahab into the house of their impious religion by religious deceit, as if he was about to reward them after the rites of their religion. Finally, he ordered them to be killed in such a way that not one of them would survive.<sup>75</sup> And we read that due to this deed, he was pleasing to God in such a way that *the sons of this same king, to the fourth generation, were seated on the throne of Israel.*<sup>76</sup> There are also many other very similar examples.

71. Assuredly we do not say these things for this reason, as if we are the sort of men who want anyone's blood to be spilled; let that be far from our prayers! For whoever wishes this to occur has deviated from Christian laws. This happened then, certainly, because in that time this itself was permitted to be done by divine law as well. That was when everything was still done according to the body, while spiritual instruction was growing.<sup>77</sup> But because indeed it is not now permitted for the good and faithful to wish for the blood of false priests, the faithful ought not be judged by false priests in such a way that they are assaulted by the most severe persecutions of these men.

---

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Gen 18:16-19:29.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. 1 Kgs 18:16-46.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. 2 Kgs 10:18-28.

<sup>76</sup> 2 Kgs 10:30.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Rom 7:14.

72. What we say would seem false if in various places, some churches of faithful priests were not attacked and others were not destroyed; if due to the appeals of those men, certain holy men were not arrested and confined unjustly for a long time and finally sent into exile; and if some also were indeed not imprisoned, and others, furthermore, wounded by dragging and cutting, did not give up their lives - for no other reason than because they did not wish to hold communion with liars or the allies of liars, in fear of divine judgment.

73. In Spain, what cruelties did the presbyter Vincentius, a priest of the true faith, not suffer because he did not wish to be an ally of the impious treachery of those men? Because he held communion with the most blessed Gregory, that Gregory whose faith and virtue we related above as best as we were able?

Against him, at first, they appealed to the consular of the province of Baetica.<sup>78</sup> Then at last, under the pretense that mediation had been requested, a multitude of the common people was gathered. On the Lord's day they rushed into the church, yet they did not find Vincentius, because he himself was forewarned. He also told the people beforehand that they should not go out on that day when [the others] were coming with violent intent. For he thought this would be better, if he gave the place to their anger.

74. But those who had come prepared for violence, so that their fury would not be thought to have come with no reason, struck certain attendants devoted to Christ, God, whom they found there, with clubs. These men died not much later. But, because the holy people of the presbyter Vincentius cursed them more after these violent acts of theirs

---

<sup>78</sup> Canellis suggests that this may be Caelestinus, who was *Consularis Baeticae* in 357, but the chronology of the document suggests that the consular in question was in office long after 357.

which were done on the Lord's day, the notorious bishops,<sup>79</sup> in order to frighten all the people, started with their leaders. In fact, they demanded an appearance of the decurions of that city so that they might confine them in jail. One of these, a leader of his country, firmly kept the faith as a man faithful to God and cursed the disgrace of treachery. Because of this, he was himself put in chains in their midst and was killed by hunger and cold. That province which had known his upright life the best wept and lamented this.

75. The notorious and 'catholic' bishops Luciosus and Hyginus are the authors of this cruelty!<sup>80</sup>

And meanwhile, certain men attacked the basilica, but they were not able to attack the faith of the people. Finally, the same people built the basilica of a church for themselves in some other little field, to which they came together with holy Vincentius. But Satan, who never suffers Christ to be worshiped openly, fired [the others] up. Again, after a request was delivered, a multitude of decurions and common people was gathered from various cities.

76. Also, at the same time, Satan's presbyters came to the place. They broke apart the doors of that church, plundering anything which pertained to the holy ministry of the church. Finally, something which is horrifying to say, at the height of the sacrileges which were perpetrated, they placed the very altar of God, carried from the Lord's [church], beneath the feet of an idol in a temple!

At any rate, those men did these things, those men who, showing repentance for their impious signature, were admitted to the catholic denomination on account of the

---

<sup>79</sup> The sarcastic epithet *egregii* is used again.

<sup>80</sup> Now the sarcastic *egregii* is matched with a sarcastic *catholici*.

goodness of peace and unity! What more grievous thing would a pagan worshiper of idols do, if he had freedom to persecute the Church?

77. But in Trier, the presbyter Bonosus, locked up for a long time, though not convicted, paid the price as an old man for heeding that uncontaminated faith for which the famous Paulinus, bishop of the same city, gave his life as a martyr in exile.

In the city of Rome as well, what severe persecutions were brought against the faithful! Where even blessed bishop Aurelius, holding communion with the most blessed Gregory, was assaulted several times! But this holy man, though he was assaulted again and again, nevertheless went to his rest by his own summons.

78. But many acts of the impious were committed against the presbyter Macarius. This man was a presbyter of remarkable restraint in the same city, Rome. He did not comfort his stomach with wine, nor tend to his body by eating meat, but mellowed his harsher dishes with oil alone, emptying himself for fasts and prayers. Certainly, due to the merit of his faith and of his abstinence, he had the grace of the Holy Spirit in this he would throw demons out of possessed bodies. For this reason we commemorate his life and worth, so that those who do not suffer such men to live in the Roman Empire be judged as all the more impious.

79. At that time, a severe persecution against us bristled. Damasus, the notorious archbishop, was plaguing us in such a way that it was not permitted for the faithful priests to freely call together the holy gatherings of the people in devotion to Christ, God, during the day. But since the sacraments of our health had to be done at any time whatsoever, even in secret due to the state of affairs, the presbyter Macarius set up vigils, calling

together the brotherhood in a certain house, so that even at night, the holy people might affirm the faith by the divine readings.

80. But the devil, who favors the impious, because the impious also favor the devil, also did not suffer the divine sacraments to be suffered in secret.<sup>81</sup> In fact, the clerics of Damasus laid an ambush. When they knew that the presbyter Macarius was celebrating the holy vigils with the people, they rushed into that house with officials<sup>82</sup> and scattered the people, who were not resisting. They did not deem it worthy then to lead away the presbyter, who was arrested, but dragged him through the rocks, so that a very grave wound was made in his hip, and on another day they made him stand before the judge as though guilty of a great crime.

81. Against him, indeed, the judge - as if under an imperial rescript - strove with threats to make him hold communion with Damasus. But the presbyter, mindful of divine judgment and unafraid of the present judge, rejected the communion of a liar and for that reason was given into exile. When he was at Ostia, he was killed by the severity of that wound.

82. Indeed his holiness was so great that even the bishop of that place, Florentius by name, who held communion with Damasus, looked up to him with a certain veneration. For after the brethren had buried Macarius in some ancient monument, that same Florentius did not allow him to lie there, where the tomb seemed unworthy. Instead, he relocated him from there and buried him in the basilica of the martyr Asterius, where

---

<sup>81</sup> The Luciferians here draw a very close equivalence between Damasus and the Devil without explicitly stating such.

<sup>82</sup> In other words, individuals in the civil service.

he is in a spot of the presbyterium which is next to the grave [of Asterius].<sup>83</sup> By this pious favor of his, he strove to distance himself from Damasus' crime inasmuch as he was able.

83. Let your tranquility give thought: if you wish these things to be done in the Roman Empire against the holy and faithful by those who are traitors, is there no fear that the blood of the faithful might burden the Roman Empire? For that same Damasus, once he received royal authority, persecuted other catholic presbyters and laymen and even sent them into exile. He pled this very matter through pagan rhetoricians, and the judges showed favor to him. Assuredly, though, your laws were decreed against heretics, not against catholics, especially such catholics who did not relinquish the undiminished faith under the heretic emperors, and who indeed have endured many enormities!

84. But Damasus also recently attempted to harshly persecute even the most blessed Ephesius, a bishop burning with the zeal of the holy faith,<sup>84</sup> who was ordained for the uncontaminated Roman people by the most constant bishop, Taorgius, himself a man of unreduced faith as well. He appealed through his protectors to the judge, Bassus,<sup>85</sup> under the malice of a falsely-imposed surname as though he were appealing against "Luciferians."

85. But Bassus, who had long respected the catholic faith, knew that there had been no depravity of heresy in Lucifer, whom naturally he had known well to have suffered exiles for ten years for the catholic faith. In the constancy of his own integrity, he rejected Damasus' accusations. He said that he was not going to make it so that he

---

<sup>83</sup> The Latin here is very corrupt; Günther and Simonetti have *ubi in loco presbyterii quiescit iusta sepultura*, "where in a place of the presbyterium, he lies in a just grave."

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Rom 12:11.

<sup>85</sup> Bassus was *praefectus urbi* from 382-383 (*PLRE* 1.152, s.v. Bassus 11).

would persecute catholic men and men of undiminished faith, he said especially that those laws of the emperors appeared to have been promulgated against heretics and heretics alone, not against those who maintain the holiest faith without the ambition of this age. And then at first Damasus grew red because a judge was found who alone appeared to be interpreting the imperial decrees most piously.

86. For this itself is also necessary, that we dispel the malice of the false surname by which they toss out that we are “Luciferians.” Who does not know that the cognomen ascribed to sectarians is that of the man whose other new doctrines were also transmitted to his students on the authority of the teacher? But for us, Christ is teacher.<sup>86</sup> We follow the teaching of that man and for that reason we are known by the holy designation of that surname, so that by law we ought not be called anything other than Christians, since we follow nothing other than what Christ taught through his apostles.<sup>87</sup> But heresies for that reason are denoted by the designations of men, because they transmit the inventions of men as well. For he who does not follow the teaching of Christ loses the designation of the name of “Christian” for himself.

87. Now they say that Lucifer taught something new which was not handed down from the teaching of Christ, which was not transmitted by the apostles, students of the Savior. And well it is that he wrote books to Constantius, not, as many others did,<sup>88</sup> to capture the glory of his talent, but to collect divine testimonies against the heretics and

---

<sup>86</sup> Mt 23:10.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Acts 11:26; 1 Tim 6:3.

<sup>88</sup> Surely a reference to Hilary.



against that patron of heretics most suitably,<sup>89</sup> inflamed with divine zeal for the love of the Son of God. Let them point out what there is contrary to the scriptures, what new thing he wrote as if he were a heretic.

88. Indeed, even Athanasius received these books as the books of a true defender when he was going through all of them anew. He translated them into Greek writing, lest the Greek tongue not have such a good thing.<sup>90</sup> This is not enough: for truly even in his own letters, that same Athanasius mentioned that those same books were woven together with the doctrines of the prophets and Gospels and apostles and had a pious confession.<sup>91</sup> And however much Lucifer is elevated by the greatest amounts of praise for him, it is nevertheless not equal to the commendation of his worth, even when it is not possible to praise him more. Thus, whatever language is praising him is surmounted by the preeminence of his deeds!

89. But Lucifer, although ignorant of skillful eloquence, nevertheless wrote in the prophetic and evangelic and apostolic custom, which is beyond all human eloquence. He did this because he had the grace of the Holy Spirit from the merit of his upright faith and most sincere conscience. Through this grace he even worked divine miracles not only in Sardinia, but during those four exiles too, up to the point where his enemies said that he was a sorcerer, since they could not deny that apostolic miracles were done through him.

---

<sup>89</sup> Constantius.

<sup>90</sup> No such translations survive, and it is unlikely that Athanasius translated Lucifer's writings. But Lucifer did spend time in exile in Egypt and there were Luciferian communities in Egypt, so it is not out of the question that Greek translations existed, though penned by other authors.

<sup>91</sup> The letters are extant but have long been known to be forgeries: see Saltet, "Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens."

90. Holy Gregory also came to this man<sup>92</sup> and marveled that there was such learning of the divine scriptures in him, and that his life was truly like one placed in the heavens.<sup>93</sup> Now, how great a man was Lucifer, when even Gregory marveled at him? Gregory, who is admired by all not only from that demolition of Hosius but also from the divine miracles that he performed, having the grace of the Holy Spirit in him?

91. What then? Even in this they are impious, because although Lucifer believed and taught and lived according to the divine scriptures and worked miracles in the name of Christ, they impose the name of Lucifer to oppress the defenders of the true faith. They do not understand that they are wretches committing the highest sacrilege when they describe the doctrine of Christ under the designation of a man, just as they are also impious in defending their sacrilegious teachings, published under the authority of the Christian name instead of as the opinion of men! Is it not the highest impiety to affirm their injustices and sacrileges under the name of Christ? Is it not the highest impiety to denote pious doctrine, consecrated under the name of Christ, with human designations? But this fraud, this cruelty against the faithful in Spain and in Trier and in Rome is also done in various regions of Italy.

92. We must now assert what was done in these parts, where notorious bishops, not clad in the truth of the faith but in the designation of the catholic name alone, scattered the faithful and true catholics. They did this not only through judges, nor only through military power, but even occasionally performed cruelties through their own clerics, while judges were ignorant or even pretended not to know. And what end will

---

<sup>92</sup> There is no mention of such a visit in any other extant source.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Phil 3:20.

there be if we relate all the things that individuals of the faithful also suffered or are suffering? Nevertheless, one cruel crime of persecution must be brought forth in order to comprehend what was committed in Egypt at Oxyrhynchus by the attestation of the whole city.

93. A certain part of the holy people is at Oxyrhynchus. Among this holy number, many, however much they directed their zeal or attention intently towards divine matters, so much more anxiously and carefully did they strive to inviolably protect the catholic faith. They did this in such a way that they mixed themselves in their divine sacraments with no heretics and with no traitors. Most of them learned to observe this by the example and inspiration of the most blessed Paul, who himself lived in the times in which that most famous Antony did as well. He had no less life, nor zeal, nor divine grace than holy Antony.<sup>94</sup> That city, Oxyrhynchus, also knows this, which most devotedly celebrates the holy memory of Paul to this day.

94. But this same group of people saw that the bishop of that city, Theodore by name, had fallen into impious treachery in such a way that non only did he condemn the undiminished faith, nor only just impiously gave his signature, but even permitted himself to be made a layman by the impious George and then once again be ordained as a bishop by that very heretic. After this, the group cursed his communion, since it had with itself presbyters and deacons of the unbroken faith, through whom it enjoyed the divine sacraments together with the most blessed Paul, mentioned above.

---

<sup>94</sup> See the discussion of the identity of this Paul in Chapter 1.

But in the end, through the catholic bishops of that time, it even ordained a bishop for itself, holy Heraclida. The more suitable he was to be ordained, the more firmly he needed to be ordained against both heretics and traitors. He was a man plain in life, devoted to God from the earliest age, who held worldly goods in contempt and lived as a man perfect in faith and doctrine. From this he was he was also venerable in the view of all the people there for his apostolic faith, his evangelic doctrine, his heavenly conduct; he was displeasing only to heretics and traitors, while he was even more *pleasing to God*<sup>95</sup> since he displeased such men!

95. But such a man as this, with such virtues, began to exercise his pontifical duty in such a way that many men from the furthest places came to the point of view of his faith and doctrine and his most holy conduct. They cursed the unspeakable society of traitors and longed for the sacrosanct company of that man.

96. But that notorious<sup>96</sup> twice-bishop<sup>97</sup> did not put up with this! And certainly, at first, he caused trouble through his public powers in such a way that several times in the middle of the night he took Heraclida alone, seized by the Lancers, from the city.<sup>98</sup> But these same powers did not continue this action which they recklessly had begun. For what law could they have against a catholic bishop? After this, with merit, they also ceased the persecution they had begun, especially as one of them was even warned by a divine blow! At that time, then, that notorious twice-bishop strove with his own forces and sent a crowd of clerics to the church of blessed Heraclida, the catholic bishop. They

---

<sup>95</sup> Rom 8:8.

<sup>96</sup> Again, the sarcastic *egregius*.

<sup>97</sup> The term *bis episcopus* refers to his two ordinations, once by the catholic faction and again by George of Cappadocia.

<sup>98</sup> *Lancearii* were lightly-armed soldiers who frequently functioned as bodyguards for eminent persons.

overturned the church, completely destroying the walls in such a way that they broke up the very altar of God with axes. The city felt horror and lamentation, because the church was overthrown, and men of various parts confessed its bishop to be of an upright and unbroken faith.

97. Give thought, we ask, most pious emperors and defenders of the upright faith! Do you really proclaim your edicts for the benefit of such impious bishops? So that these men, who are more valuable than the world itself due to the merit of their faith and their holiest lifestyle, might be assaulted? Most religious emperors, believe that blessed Heraclida was one of that body of saints to whom divine scripture refers, saying, *They have walked around as indigents in sheepskin and goatskin garments, assaulted by troubles and pains, of whom the world was not worthy.*<sup>99</sup>

98. For in what way is Heraclida not such a man, who spat back all the delights of this age, and through the very bitterness of his difficult life, strove to proceed along the Lord's footprints, simple and unencumbered, and followed the *salutary road*<sup>100</sup> of virtues, who acted harmoniously for love of the divine faith in such a way as we read that the saints had acted harmoniously, who had nothing from this age other than *troubles and pains*<sup>101</sup> for the faith, thus living, thus moving forward, just like those holy men, too, about whom testimony was placed above? Thus by their merit are both blessed Gregory and the other holy bishops of that sanctity given comfort among so many evils which assault the Church by venerable company as if by divine consolations.

---

<sup>99</sup> Heb 11:37-38.

<sup>100</sup> Ps 49:22 (LXX).

<sup>101</sup> Heb 11:37.

99. However, Theodore did not only move against so venerable a bishop, but also against that most holy people of his, which was set up according to the doctrine and customs of that most sincere and most faithful priest. And it would take a long time to report the things on which he worked against the modesty and intention of the holy virgins, whose monastery that city venerated for the worth of their sanctity. But several times, with cruel injuries, he also assaulted the servants of God themselves - whom he proved even more holier! But what wonder is it if like a wolf he should assault the sheep whose good shepherd he frequently assaults?

100. Look at who, under you pious emperors who come out for the catholic faith, tosses out that he is a catholic, overturns the community of catholics, persecutes catholic priests and servants of Christ, and even impiously assaults His holy virgins! This is the that notorious and 'holiest' bishop who, although he had at first been ordained a bishop by catholic bishops, nevertheless was led later into the body of the laymen by the impious George and was ordained as a bishop by that very George, something which disturbed the faithful. George was sitting and holding communion in the same city with Apollonius, bishop of the Melitians, who agreed with the impieties of George. Likewise, that same Theodore along with that Apollonius persecuted blessed Heraclida, defender of the catholic faith.

101. Look at to whom, as if to a catholic, the basilica of Apollonius is now handed over on the authority of your general edict. This is done, at any rate, because that same Theodore, who received the basilica of Apollonius like a catholic receives that of a heretic, likewise acted as impiously as Apollonius also acted - except that Theodore acted

more cruelly, since he became a layman from a catholic bishop, condemned the pious faith, and subscribed to the Arian impiety, so that he would again be ordained as a bishop by a heretic! Clearly from this he wishes that he would appear to be a catholic, since even now with some persuasion he makes certain presbyters or deacons of Apollonius laymen and ordains them again. He does this so that he might seem to reproduce the back-and-forth nature of that most shameful ordination which he underwent. Does it not go beyond every sacrilege to defend these mockeries under the catholic name in assaulting faithful priests and laymen?

102. But also in Palestine, at Eleutheropolis, there is a holy virgin of Christ, Hermione by name. She was certainly born noble in her lineage, but made much more noble by her faith and sanctity. She carefully adorns her virginity with contempt for the matters of this age and of human glory, to which many aspire, even those who glory that they have renounced this age and the desire of the flesh.

103. This woman, as much as she guarded the chastity of her body with holy rigor, so much did she protect the purity of her soul with the chaste observation of the pious faith. She did not hold communion with heretics, nor with traitors, because she knew that the virginity of her body would not benefit her at all unless she also looked to the integrity of her soul with a holy confession, fled from the disgrace of adulterous communion, and followed the salutary sacraments of the faithful priests.

Finally, she begged in religious letters to blessed Heraclida for him to assist her by his holy visitations.

104. But on behalf of blessed Heraclida, holy Ephesius visited, who at that time had come to the bishop Heraclida from the city of Rome for ecclesiastical services. This is the Ephesius about whom we spoke above, the bishop of the undiminished people at Rome who was ordained by a most constant bishop, Taorgius. But when he came to Eleutheropolis, not only was Hermione comforted, with her holy monastery, but also certain very faithful servants of God. Among these was even the noble house of Severus, a tribune, religious in the catholic faith. He indeed, for a long time, did not hold communion with heretics and traitors, but had not yet found the holy communion of the catholics.

105. However, when he saw holy Ephesius, he determined that Ephesius was catholic after many examinations and handed himself over to Ephesius in holy communion. He judged himself to be blessed because divine mercy had visited his house unexpectedly by the coming of so holy a priest. He was led into admiration of Ephesius not only by the purity of his life but also by certain divine proofs: for blessed Ephesius is of such great faith and sanctity that, wherever he presented himself, divine grace accompanied him. The holy people at Oxyrhynchus, holding communion with blessed Heraclida, also proved this. Bound to him by his pious love due to the merit of his divine grace, they led him as he was setting out with great weeping, as once the Asians had done for the apostle Paul.<sup>102</sup>

106. We do not say these things because we are eager for praise, but so that you might be able to know how holy and faithful souls are assaulted by the harshest

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Acts 20:37-38.



persecutions under the authority of your name. This is done by those who it is generally agreed, though you are unaware, are even now either still heretics, traitors, or allies of such men.

107. For some, the holy truth is burdensome. But what they attempted in Palestine against holy Ephesius was slight. In the end, they ceased, fearing both the boldness of faith and the constancy of the soul in him. They thought (in respect to this man) that it would be more possible for their heresy and impiety to be revealed if they ardently disturbed a bishop of undiminished and constant faith under you catholic emperors. However, when that same blessed Ephesius, invited by letters of the faithful, sailed to Africa, he ordered us in the apostolic custom to watch over the holy brotherhood by our divine and ecclesiastic duties.<sup>103</sup> The holy brotherhood there requested that very thing. That notorious Turbo, bishop of the city of Eleutheropolis, looked down on our insignificance and began to wish to bring against us that which he did not dare to bring about against holy Ephesius. He did not know that the grace of Christ, God, gives protection even to his smallest servants, especially to those toiling for the cause of the upright faith.

108. For after he heard that certain men were joining the undiminished faith and that truth's party was growing through the grace of God, this Turbo threatened us with devastations and disturbances.<sup>104</sup> But his fire was also threatening the truth at Severus' house. Severus, as much as he had faithfully served in the military for the Roman Empire, defended the faith of God all the more. Turbo even tried to pursue the holy virgin

---

<sup>103</sup> Note that Faustinus is a priest. The text here takes on an autobiographical tone.

<sup>104</sup> There is a play on words between *Turbo* and *turbas* ('disturbances').

Hermione, too. She was a woman whom anyone who knew her admired as being like the evangelic women. But he also laid ambushes for any individuals who joined in the company of holy communion with us, as if he were exposing unholiness in accordance with that law of Babylon<sup>105</sup> - because within our dwellings, without the disgrace of heresy and without the communion of deceit, in accordance with the gospels and the apostolic traditions, we celebrate the divine sacraments for the desirous faithful. For at Babylon they also pursued holy Daniel in a similar fury with malicious hatreds because he worshiped God in the observance of divine law.<sup>106</sup>

109. This is the Turbo who was a deacon of Eutychus the heretic, under whom blessed Lucifer suffered exile in the city of Eleutheropolis. He also violently assaulted Lucifer himself, who was boldly defending the faith, with cruelties. Today, there are still those in Palestine who at that time, with those men pursuing them, paid the harshest price because they came together with Lucifer, a bishop of the catholic faith. Let them deny it, if among their other cruelties they did not break open the closed door with axes, if they did not also overturn the divine sacraments, rushing in at Lucifer, the most faithful priest, and wound with an impious blow anyone there who had gathered together! Let them deny it, if they do not possess among themselves to this very day the ritual vessels which they impiously plundered from Lucifer at the time, along with the sacred codices!

110. At that time, in any case, Turbo went around with the heretic Eutychius. After that, saying that he was catholic, he persecutes catholics under the authority of your name! You defend the catholic faith by the consideration of your pious authority. Will

---

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Dan 3.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Dan 6.

you, most pious emperors, allow impiety to have dominion everywhere and at length against the faithful under the authority of your name? This is something which, however, we say with goodwill and faith in the observation which you show to Christ, God: Is it advantageous for the Roman Empire for those who profess Christ piously to suffer persecutions and death in such a way that it is nowhere permitted to set up pious altars to God? Or, of course, when they have been set up, for them to be destroyed?

111. Under the impious Ahab, king of Israel, after the prophets were killed and the altars destroyed, Elijah appealed to God against Israel in the book of Kings, saying: *Lord, they killed your prophets, they destroyed your altars, and I am left alone and they want my life.*<sup>107</sup> Do you also allow this appeal that incites hostility to be made to God in your own times by each of the individual faithful priests?

112. For if they are also silent, will God not know that these very things were done? What? Do we think that these things which, when they were perpetrated long ago against the servants of God and were avenged most harshly with divine attention, are perpetrated against the true catholics and against his true church without offending God? And why are there so many blows by which the Roman world is shaken and pressed down on?<sup>108</sup>

113. There is no need now to recount certain individual blows, which your tranquility recognizes by the agitation and anxiety of your empire. We might even ease this common pain by remaining silent, so that we would not appear to be suffering

---

<sup>107</sup> 1 Kgs 19:10-14.

<sup>108</sup> Referring to, perhaps among other things, a major famine in Antioch in 382, Gratian's assassination in 383, and famines at Antioch and Rome in 384.

alongside you so much as we would appear to be making things worse. But we ask this, most pious emperors: that you deem it worthy to consider the reasons these things come to pass, whether it is because the faithful servants of Christ, fearing divine laws, do not wish to hold communion with the unfaithful, or because true catholics are trampled on by false priests?

114. For how are they not false priests who now ought to be shunned not only due to the treachery explained above but also because many of them even now defend their own heresies under a deceitful profession of the catholic faith to you? For who of the bishops now would fear to proclaim impieties when impiety is honored as often as it is committed, since it is not at all cast out of the priesthood? In fact, while some of them are Origenists, others are anthropomorphites,<sup>109</sup> and others are the impious overseers of the sect of Apollinaris, others blaspheme with a triple wedge against the Holy Spirit in various independent studies,<sup>110</sup> but there are even those too, who think that they believe piously among themselves, affirming or considering that the substances of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three; nevertheless, all of these glory in your laws and lay claim to churches for themselves, although our fathers always condemned these impious sects with apostolic and evangelic authority.

115. Certainly, it is not for this present little work to dispel these sects; but nevertheless, we are saying that which might move your soul, intent on the true faith, to horror.

---

<sup>109</sup> Prior to Canellis, editors corrected this to *anthropomorphistae*, but Canellis retains the manuscript readings of D and E.

<sup>110</sup> Meaning here the Macedonians or *pneumatomachi*, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

116. One heresy, as we judge it, was taken up at Rimini under the heretic king, and now under you pious catholic emperors so many heresies are defended, no less impious than the impiety of Arius!<sup>111</sup> And although they each individually compose books or letters against each other, they nevertheless all join in communion with each other, either by a direct connection or an oblique one. They argue in debates alone, with the empty zeal of philosophers, not even as Christians. The one shuns the other as an impious man due to his devotion to the sacrament, but now, just like in schools, so that it looks like a contest of talent between them, not the holy defense of the true religion, since indeed they do not distinguish the sacraments between them, although they are separated by impious opinions from one another.<sup>112</sup>

117. But they do this because some are zealous for their human glory, and others for material gain; and this is why they secretly collude with each other under an impious disguise, so that they lose neither the possessions of the church nor their honors. And meanwhile, as they cover up their many impieties in mockery of each other, as if bringing forth the tokens of their most kindly mind, they say that they are joined in the company of ecclesiastic communion even with those with opinions contrary to theirs for this reason, lest the benefit of peace perish in the Church.<sup>113</sup> As if truly a peace of this sort, which accepts such great impieties into his Church, would be *pleasing to Christ, God!*<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Note the contrast between the vocabulary used to describe the heretical *rex* and the pious *imperatores* – the old Roman prejudice against kings was alive and well in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>112</sup> The trope of Christianity v. traditional philosophy was a common rhetorical trope used by many Christians.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Jn 14:27 as above.

<sup>114</sup> Rom 8:8.

118. But those who think in this they, let them hear what is written about them: *And they did not know the way of peace; the fear of God is not before their eyes.*<sup>115</sup> But we also read more openly in Jeremiah concerning that impious and sacrilegious peace, as the testimony below explains: *From the smallest of them up to the greatest of all, they perpetrated sacrileges. From the priest up to the pseudo-prophet, they all created falsehoods; and they considered the destruction of my people, determining it the same as nothing, and saying, 'Peace, peace!' And where is there peace?*<sup>116</sup> And it should be noted how cruelly it continues on about those who glory in this vainest peace. For it follows: *They were confounded, since they were found lacking, but maintained their confusion; not even for this reason did they blush, and they did not understand their own disgrace. Therefore, they will fall in their own ruins and grow weak in the time of my visitation.*<sup>117</sup>

119. What evil do we commit, what do we do impiously, if serving the faith for Christ, we spit back peace of this sort, the confusion and disgrace of which are described as of such extent and harshest ends? But these notorious bishops, lovers of peace, stir up war against the faithful priests. For what does the devil want, other than impious men and traitors to glory in the peace of this age? For what does the devil want, other than these who are pious and faithful to be troubled by the persecution of their attackers?

120. We have presented these things to you for this reason, lest by your ignorance the blood of Christians who defend the most pious faith spill at length. For what benefit is there if you are the protectors of the catholic faith and you suffer the followers of the

---

<sup>115</sup> Ps 13:3 (LXX).

<sup>116</sup> Jer 6:13-14.

<sup>117</sup> Jer 6:15.

catholic faith to be tortured everywhere, to be put to flight everywhere, to nowhere proclaim the pious faith freely?

121. Let those men have their basilicas,<sup>118</sup> glittering with gold, and adorned with the ostentation of costly marbles or built with the splendor of columns! Let them also have their possessions, spread far and wide, for which even the undiminished faith is endangered! Why do the cities common to all the Romans give support to their impieties so that they permit no one to live piously in these cities, in which even vain superstition is worshiped without danger by the majority and without hatred for those men? At least let it be permitted to worship Christ, God, piously in truth and to adore him faithfully, even among those most worthless and common managers where that same Christ, born in the flesh as an infant, was also worthy to lie down at one time.<sup>119</sup>

122. That which we seek, we do not seek for this reason, as if we dread being killed for what is true. *God is our witness, who is the true examiner of the heart,*<sup>120</sup> because through the grace of God the highest consolation is possible<sup>121</sup> and there is a sure hope for future blessedness<sup>122</sup> if our throats are cut for this faithful assertion.<sup>123</sup> We do not present these things, then, as if we were the type who would be afraid to suffer, but lest the blood of faithful Christians, having spilled for a long time due to the impieties and cruelties of others, burden the most pious dominion of your state.

---

<sup>118</sup> The entire text up to this point has presented the emperor with little choice but to either throw his full support behind the Luciferians or the *egregii episcopi*; here, the Luciferians present a more practical alternative.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Lk 2:7-13.

<sup>120</sup> WisSol 1:6.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. WisSol 4:7.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. WisSol 3:4.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. 1 Pet. 4:12-19.

123. We believed that God would punish us severely if we stayed silent with you about the things which concern the true faith and the true Church, especially under you,<sup>124</sup> most religious Augustus Theodosius, who with admirable devotion works together with your pious confession of the Christian religion against all heretics, a so religious, so very pious emperor, and one dedicated to Christ, God, with divine and most complete fear,<sup>125</sup> whom truly Christ, God, chose for the Empire. After these things, we are not doubtful in that since you have been made anxious, you will act like the father of the Empire, lest the purity of the professed faith and communion in the Roman world be assaulted. However much you do blessedly in the cause of the holy faith and the professed truth, by so much will you reign gloriously both here and in eternity with the favor of Christ!

124. I, the presbyter Marcellinus, hoping for untroubled calm in your most felicitous empire and for everlasting blessedness in the kingdom of Christ and of God, most pious emperors.

I, Faustinus, who could not be worthy to be called a presbyter of God,<sup>126</sup> hoping both that you rule felicitously here for many years with the help of the most merciful divinity, and that you reach everlasting blessedness in the future kingdom of Christ, the Son of God, with the saints, most glorious emperors.

---

<sup>124</sup> Here the authors switch from the plural *vos*, which has been used throughout the text, to the singular *tu*.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Ps 13:3 (LXX).

<sup>126</sup> Rhetoric. He is elsewhere referred to as a presbyter – for instance, in the preface of the *Confessio fidei*.



### Appendix 3

#### Translation of Theodosius, *Lex Augusta*

The Augustan law responds to these requests:

1. Greetings, Cynegius, most dear to us.

Even if no law ought to be revered in human hearts more than divine law, and even if it is not possible to add anything to it, the encompassing superiority of which, as it has been propitiated as the governor of all of the world and the earth, keeps guard over that which the favor of almighty God wished to be under us,<sup>1</sup>

2. Nevertheless, Faustinus and Marcellinus, priests most filled with the faith, appealed to our clemency. Because of this, we are afraid that if we make no response to the petitioners, we would appear to give approval to those who have added something against our purpose to the divine law that we serve. And thus for this reason, we both rule that we honor the petition which has been presented, but we wish - or order - that in our judgment, nothing be added to the faith.<sup>2</sup> For there was no one ever of so profane a mind who thought that while he ought to follow catholic teachers, he himself should establish for the teachers what should be followed!

3. And the presentation<sup>3</sup> of their requests, which covers nearly the whole range of heretical superstition contrary to the catholic faith, is certainly just and worthy of praise. For the presentation made clear both whence heretical superstition had arisen and what

---

<sup>1</sup> Theodosius' language is markedly more ornate and abstract than the language used in the Luciferian texts.

<sup>2</sup> Clearly a coded warning to the Luciferians as well; although the emperor honors their petition, he clearly is still concerned about the potential for something to be added to the faith.

<sup>3</sup> Canellis corrects the text to read *illatio* instead of *laudatio* to better fit the meaning of the text, anticipating the use of *illatio* in section 6 as well.

instigator had carried it forward.<sup>4</sup> For indeed, since the antiquity of the entire world was changed by certain men's persuasiveness,<sup>5</sup> the innocent, driven into exile for the faith, laid down their lives with the highest praise.

4. But revenge has not been delayed concerning those who prepared an ambush against good morals and heavenly establishments for a little while, struggling not in faith but in faction. They perverted the minds of many by an ingratiating that ought to be detested. For the patience of all-powerful God was moved at this point so that they experienced before their fates the punishment that is owed to criminals after their fates, as an example for all.<sup>6</sup>

5. Indeed, not even once this was done were they able to be turned round and bent to the command of God. They pressed on the catholics with secret designs, they pursued them, they assaulted them. So great is the persistence of error that they would rather sin daily along with other followers of diverse observances than think rightly with catholics.

6. In this, the presentation of the petitioners should be praised. They hold communion with Gregory of Spain and Heraclida of the East, clearly holy and praiseworthy bishops, and wish to live in the catholic faith without anyone's aggression and without trouble. They also wish to be disturbed by no ambushes and assemblies of attackers, and in fact it would be pleasing for them to protect the faith, once it is received, in perpetuity, with all religious conscience.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is unclear if Arius or if Constantius is meant here.

<sup>5</sup> Christian antiquity, of course; in other words, certain men persuaded Christians to change their (supposedly) most ancient beliefs.

<sup>6</sup> Thus referencing numerous stories of divine punishments found in the *Libellus precum*.

7. Thus let whatever is worthy of being eternal be inviolable. Let not any assembly, let not any assault, let not any other's fraud assail them. Let them enjoy their own way of life in whatever place they wish. Let them enjoy divine love in the catholic faith.

Cynegius, dearest and most beloved kinsman,<sup>7</sup>

8. By our serenity's command, we venerate with full support the catholic faith, without which we cannot be saved. Let your loftiness order that command to be observed in such a way that it protects and defends Gregory and Heraclida, priests of the holy law, and the rest of the priests who are similar to these and have given themselves over in equal reverence, from the harms of vile men and heretics. And let all know that this sits in our mind: that we believe that the worshipers of all-powerful God are none other than catholics.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Parens* here does not necessarily refer to a parent, or even a blood relative, but rather reinforces the closeness between Theodosius and Cynegius. It is possible that Cynegius was a Spaniard as well. Simonetti and Günther both take this second personal address to go with the preceding phrase, but it makes more sense to follow Canellis and assume that the address is directed towards what follows, it being Theodosius' summation of his decision and his actual command to Cynegius.

#### Appendix 4

##### Translation of Faustinus, *De Trinitate*

###### 1. Faustinus, to Flacilla Augusta, on the Trinity.

The Roman world took you up as empress, and because there is no longer anything in human matters to which you might aspire, and you are not content with earthly pinnacles, with your holy faith in God you long to master the heavenly matters which the true Son of God promises to those who piously believe in him.<sup>1261</sup> And you work at this like a sage, understanding that all the loftiness of your reign will be of no value to you if you do not struggle to pursue heavenly glory by understanding and defending the true faith. And though it is apparent how graced you are in Christ, our God and Lord who conferred this reign on you, you diligently inquire with anxious questions as to how those chapters, composed by the Arians with their sacrilegious interpretations against the catholics, might be refuted. Possessing true faith, you desire (as much as possible) to understand what you faithfully believe, because if your religious soul understood what it believed, then it might also be fed as if by divine feasts. But also, though you curse the impious expressions of the heretics, you nevertheless desire to be instructed in religious study against them so that you might also spit back reason at the same time, lest your curses appear to be presumed, not proven, as though they depended on the power of your reign.

But even though I regard myself as unequal to this desire of yours – which is so pious, so necessary and becoming – I nevertheless do not dare obstruct you by holding

---

<sup>1261</sup> ...*Sacra in Deum fide caelestia desideras possidere...* Cf. Ovid, *Tr.* 4.10.19: *At mihi iam parvo caelestia sacra placebant...*

back. For on the one hand, I confess that I am filled with poor understanding and have an awkward, rough way of speaking; I should stay silent. On the other hand, the fervor of my faith believes that it would be dangerous if I remain silent. How would it not seem dangerous, if we should act like we are turning our backs when we are called forth against an impious enemy due to our knowledge of and shame in our eloquence?<sup>1262</sup> Especially since in the furthering of the faith, loftiness of speech should not be required. The divine testimonies, which are used with more force than any smooth eloquence, should be enough on their own. But neither should one consider one's knowledge of his own sins, since he is comforted all the more if he does not fear acknowledging God right away. This is like the example of that robber in the Gospels who, on the same day he acknowledged God, earned entry into paradise along with the one whom he had acknowledged.<sup>1263</sup>

Thus obedient to your most religious commands, let us begin to collide with the adversary.<sup>1264</sup> Certainly we do not trust in our own strength. But we have confidence in the patronage of our Savior, against whom the impiety of the heretics wages war in the custom of the pagans and with the fury of the Jews. But I have seen that among the characteristically heretical things that you found worth relating, most are confused. To me, this means that you do not seem to fully know what the Arians assert. For this reason,

---

<sup>1262</sup> Faustinus rhetorically shifts into the first-person plural immediately following his conventionally self-effacing bout of modesty.

<sup>1263</sup> Cf. Luke 23:43.

<sup>1264</sup> The anonymous translation of 1721 begins with this sentence. Are there shades of the famous epitaph for the Spartans at Thermopylae here? Cicero (*Tusc. disp.* 1.101) translates it thus: *Dic, hospes, Spartaee, nos te hic vidisse iacentes / dum sanctis patriae legibus obsequimur*. The vocabulary Faustinus uses is much different – *oboedientes* rather than *obsequimur*, *praeceptis tuis* instead of *patriae legibus* – but the use of *religiosissimis* interestingly parallels Cicero's addition of *sanctis* to the original.

I think it is better if I first make it plain and clear what they believe and how they seize simple souls under the ambiguity of their speech – especially when they make their own impious words sound acceptable under a shared confession. If the impious deception of their sacrilegious sect is revealed first, the faithful refutation from our answers is also made clear at the exact same time.

2 (I, 1). On the impious profession of the Arians.

The impious Arians<sup>1265</sup> indeed assert many things with the very same words as ours, but not with the same sentiments, when they are called to confess the divine faith.<sup>1266</sup> For in the same language as ours, they call out that God is the Father and God is the Son, and that all things from God the Father were made through the Son, and that the Son predates the time of creation. But although they agree with us in these words, they nonetheless break themselves off from the pious sentiments of the catholic community<sup>1267</sup> with their sacrilegious interpretations of these words. Thus they say about the Father that he did not truly beget the Son, and proclaim about the Son, too, that he was not his natural son but was with him by adoption – that is, he was lifted up to the name of the Son and was not truly begotten from God the Father. Although they also confess that the Son was born before time, they nevertheless attribute a beginning to him, saying, “There was a time when he was not.” But they also say that everything was done through him. Thus they assert that he was constituted from nothing that existed, since they suppose that he was not truly begotten from God the Father. And from this, they wish it to be

---

<sup>1265</sup> Faustinus refers to the ‘Arrian impiety’ (*Arriana impietas*) throughout the text, but it is more natural in English to render this ‘impious Arians.’

<sup>1266</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.9, *De Syn.* 15; Hil. *De Trin.* 4.3; Ambr. *De fide* 1.5.34.

<sup>1267</sup> *Ecclesiae catholicae.*

considered settled that Christ indeed is God, but not truly, as they impute to him a beginning; and that Christ indeed is the Son, in such a way that he is understood to have been made, not born.

Indeed, if he was constituted from nothing, and not truly born from the Father, they believe based on this that he is changeable, because in their faith he is neither truly God nor truly the Son. To make these impious sentiments more acceptable among the ignorant or the simpleminded, they also employ the testimonies of divine Scripture (as it seems to them), relating something uttered by the person of Wisdom: *The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his work.*<sup>1268</sup> Moreover, the apostle also affirms that Christ is Wisdom, saying *Christ, the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.*<sup>1269</sup> Thus it stands that Christ, who is Wisdom (as the apostle explains), is a created being; and then, they say, it follows that one who is a created being is not truly God; and then, one who was not begotten by the Father, but created, is not truly the Son; and then, if he was created, there was therefore a time when he was not.

3 (I, 2). These are the weapons of their wickedness that are brought forth. We are provoked to move against them so that the impiety of our opponent's assertion be revealed. We certainly are not, as we said, attempting to do this by our own intelligence, but by the grace of God, which always helps the pious. Now, I ask you, do not grow weary of our rough way of speaking, but stay mindful of the importance of these matters

---

<sup>1268</sup> Prov 8:22. This theme will be fully treated in section 43. In this treatise, Wisdom is generally referred to as the *persona Sapientiae*, one of the guises of the Son, as the next sentence makes clear.

<sup>1269</sup> 1 Cor 1:24.

and give your vote to the truth. Moreover, we are not writing this as a book, but as though we were contending against an adversary present in an actual dispute.<sup>1270</sup>

First, when they say, “There was a time when he was not,” we must counter: “He has always been.” Testimony from the Gospel should be set against them.<sup>1271</sup> John says, *In the beginning was the Word*.<sup>1272</sup> For just as Christ is the Wisdom of God and the Power of God,<sup>1273</sup> so too is he the Word of God. When, therefore, he says, *In the beginning was the Word*, how can the Arians say, “There was a time when he was not”? *In the beginning*, he says, *was the Word*. He did not say, “In the beginning the Word was made.” Surely we must believe that whatever *was* in the beginning has always existed. For if, as the Arians reckon, the Son was something made, undoubtedly the divine scriptures would have related that he was made in the beginning, just like when Moses said *In the beginning, God made heaven and the earth*.<sup>1274</sup> For if the Son of God was also something made, John would have said, “In the beginning, the Word was made.” But the evangelist – or rather, the Holy Spirit through the evangelist – foresaw that impious-minded men would come and say about the Son, “There was a time when he was not,” and began thus: *In the beginning was the Word*. For there is nothing earlier than that which is found before the beginning.

The divine scriptures were revealed so that we could direct our faith in accordance with their meaning, not so that we might insert our own meanings into their

---

<sup>1270</sup> In other words, the style will be colloquial, and not polished for publication. The treatise is not written as a traditional philosophical dialogue.

<sup>1271</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.11; Hil. *De Trin.* 2.13.

<sup>1272</sup> John 1:1.

<sup>1273</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 1:24. This returns to the statements that Faustinus takes as foundations for the entire discussion immediately above in section 2.

<sup>1274</sup> Gen 1:1. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.57.



sacred expressions. Let them see if there are any chapters that they think cause ambiguity by virtue of their obscurity; certainly in this chapter there is no cause for ambiguity. Nor is an interpreter allowed to consider anything other than what has been written, and there is no need now for us to heap our own meanings on top. To fully conceive of the faith that we must observe, it is enough to recite these divine words: *In the beginning*, he says, *was the Word*. Is there any supposed time here, is there any indication of some age, or even some interval of an instant or of some moment, so that you might dare to say, “There was a time when he was not”?

4 (I, 3). *In the beginning*, he says, *was the Word*.<sup>1275</sup> And if you should happen to understand the ‘word’ as the one that functions in speech, there follows, *And the Word was with God*.<sup>1276</sup> He did not say, ‘and the word which God spoke,’ but *and the Word was with God*. At the end, he explained what the word was, saying: *and the Word was God*.<sup>1277</sup> If in the beginning was the Word, and this same Word was with God, and God was the Word, then the plan of their impiety is confounded.<sup>1278</sup> For this chapter proves that Christ is the Son of God, that he always existed, that he was always inseparable from the Father, and that he was always God. For just as he is without a beginning, when it says *In the beginning was*, so too is his inseparability from the Father without a beginning declared when it says *was with God*. But even when this Word is defined as God, there is no ambiguity when we believe that God is without a beginning. For what it says first, *In the beginning*, must be ascribed to all the parts – that is, it says, *In the beginning was the*

---

<sup>1275</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 2.14; Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.11.

<sup>1276</sup> John 1:1.

<sup>1277</sup> John 1:1.

<sup>1278</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.9-11.

*Word*; and when there follows, *And the Word was with God and the Word was God*, without a doubt *In the beginning* must still be understood. Finally, it concludes thus: *This was in the beginning with God*.<sup>1279</sup> How then was there a time when he, who always is, was not? How is he, who is always with the Father, from nothing that exists? How is he, who is always God, and likewise through whom everything was created, a created being? For there follows, *All things were made through him*.<sup>1280</sup> How then was he, through whom all things were made, made from nothing that existed? For if he himself was also made, how were all things made through him? After all, when he was being made, he who did not exist could not have been his own originator. And for this reason, we must believe that he, through whom all things were made, was not made, because it is meaningless and absurd to say that he was made through himself when he did not exist.

5 (I, 4). Similarly, Paul also teaches that Christ always existed, and that he is God and equal to the Father. For he is truly God only when he is equal to the Father. He would not be called equal if he were not truly considered God, since it would be unjust to God if one who is not the true God were called equal to him.<sup>1281</sup> And so Paul puts in his epistle, *Think in yourselves that which you think in Jesus Christ, who, though he was constituted in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as a boon, but diminished himself by taking the form of a servant*.<sup>1282</sup> If Christ is truly a man because he takes the form of a servant, then truly he is God as well, since he is held to be in the form of God. And Paul would only call him equal to God if he had wanted *in the form of God* to be understood as

---

<sup>1279</sup> John 1:2.

<sup>1280</sup> John 1:3. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 2.18; Ambr. *De fide* 1.14.88.

<sup>1281</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.45, 12.6.

<sup>1282</sup> Phil 2:5-7. *Servus* can mean 'servant' or 'slave.' Here I have retained the more common English translation of 'servant,' although at §20 the word is used more in the sense of 'slave.'

*to be the true God.* Whoever is the true God is certainly always God, and one cannot say about one who is always God that “there was a time when he was not.”

But the apostle Paul also says that all things were made through him.<sup>1283</sup> He writes, *Since all things are created in him, whether in heaven or on earth, invisible and visible things, whether thrones or dominions or sovereigns or powers – all things are created through him and in him, and he is prior to all.*<sup>1284</sup> Therefore he, through whom and in whom all things are done, always exists. But the psalmist also sings, *In Wisdom you have made all things.*<sup>1285</sup> But he did not say that that very Wisdom was made, because the apostle also denies that it was made when he says, *And he is prior to all.* For if he wanted us to believe that he who was not made was made, he would have put it thus: “And he was made prior to all.” But when he says, *And he is prior to all,* he gives a beginning to ‘all,’ and the Son is instead the preceding maker of all. Truly he is without a beginning, since he is not spoken of as made but exists prior to all. Moreover, the apostle says, *There is one God, the Father, by whom all things exist, and for whom we exist. And there is one Lord, our Jesus Christ, through whom all things exist and through whom we exist.*<sup>1286</sup> And when he says that all things exist through Christ, he quite clearly separates the maker from the made,. One cannot perceive the nature of something made in the one who made all things.

---

<sup>1283</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 2.19; Ath. *Decr. Nic. syn.* 17.

<sup>1284</sup> Col 1:16-17.

<sup>1285</sup> Ps 103:24 (LXX). Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.19, 2.51; Amb. *De Fide* 1.14.88.

<sup>1286</sup> 1 Cor 8:6. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.16.

6 (I, 5). But let us see if Moses also teaches the same thing that the apostles relate, that is, that all things were made by God through the Son.<sup>1287</sup> Among other things, when he refers to the creation of the world, he says, *And God said: Let there be a firmament in the middle of the water, and let it be the divider between water and water, and so it was made. And God made the firmament, and God made a division through the middle of the water.*<sup>1288</sup> When he says, *And God spoke: Let there be a firmament*, the person of the Father should be understood in the speaking; but when he says, *And God made*, the person of the Son should be understood in the making.

If you do not think we should understand it this way, the apostolic assertion that *There is one God, the Father, by whom all things exist, and for whom we exist. And there is one Lord, our Jesus Christ, through whom all things exist and through whom we exist* is put to the test.<sup>1289</sup> Unless you believe that the entire creation of the world was made through the Son, and indeed all things, whether invisible or visible, how do you faithfully accept the expression of the apostle when he says, *one Lord, our Jesus Christ, through whom all things exist?* And also what we brought up above: *Since...all things are created...in him,*<sup>1290</sup> and also this: *In wisdom you have made all things?*<sup>1291</sup> But John also followed this with *All things were made through him.*<sup>1292</sup> So how is it ‘all things’ if you deny that this was said about the Son of God: *And God made the firmament, and God made a division through the middle of the water?* Thus even Moses represents the Son as

---

<sup>1287</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.16.

<sup>1288</sup> Gen 1:6-7.

<sup>1289</sup> 1 Cor 8:6, referring to §5.

<sup>1290</sup> Col 1:16, referring to §5.

<sup>1291</sup> Ps 103:24 (LXX).

<sup>1292</sup> John 1:3.

the maker, not the made. If he had known by the Holy Spirit's revelation that the Son was made, Moses would have also recounted earlier that the Son was made among the other things that he described as being made.

7 (I, 6). Further below he continues more explicitly, when the first person to live in the world that was formed was going to be made: *And God said, Let us make man in our appearance and likeness.*<sup>1293</sup> Now, one person would not say, *Let us make man in our appearance and likeness*, but neither would a divided deity. For the plural nature of the words, that is, *Let us make* and *our*, signify the persons of the Father and the Son. Moreover, because he says *appearance* in the singular, he clearly indicates a single deity, and the single power of both persons. If Christ is a created being, why is he brought up as a partner of God in his work? For on this subject it says, *Let us make*. If he is not the true Son, how is his appearance one with the Father? An adopted son does not have the appearance of the one adopting him; certainly he can have his generosity, but he cannot have the natural characteristics of his appearance.

Naturally, I know that there are differences in appearances which are long and unnecessary to follow through on now. But I insist upon what matters in this case: in this passage, where the appearance of the Father and the Son is asserted to be one, there is no difference in appearance. For he did not say, "Let us make in our appearances" but *in our appearance*. And you, heretic, whoever you are, in case with your dull mind you should happen to assume that one person might say, *Let us make*, so that it doubtlessly reflects the mindset of one thinking to himself and does not indicate several persons, there

---

<sup>1293</sup> Gen 1:26. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.17-18.

follows: *And God made man, he made him in the appearance of God.*<sup>1294</sup> These things are openly brought to light; if anyone does not see, he is blind. *God*, he says, *made man, he made him in the appearance of God.* Isn't it exceedingly clear at this point, then, that the Holy Spirit was discussing the revelations of the Gospels through Moses by saying God and God, but not two gods, because the appearance of the Father and the Son is the same?

And O, how providently they are all put forth! God and God, the holy scripture pronounces, so that it might shut out Sabellius, who defends the unity of the person of the Father and the Son. But just in case on the pretext of the persons Arius might once more introduce two gods by the words which indicate a plural number of persons, Moses puts in a singular appearance. You will find this to be so, considering the testimony that says, *Let us make man in our appearance and likeness.* What do you make of that, impious Arians? If Christ is a created being, how is the appearance of the created and the creator the same? A different nature does not allow a singular form to be shared.

8 (I, 7). There are many expressions in the books of Moses that could refute the impious regarding the Son, and indeed, regarding the Father.<sup>1295</sup> Don't the Arians also direct against the Father with a profane spirit that which they work against the Son, when they deprive the Father of that which truly belongs to a Father and take away from the Son that which truly belongs to a Son? For how is he truly the Father, if according to them he did not truly beget? How is Christ truly his Son, if they deny he was truly begotten from the Father?

---

<sup>1294</sup> Gen 1:27. Faustinus does not address the natural interpretation of the first-person plural as a 'royal we.'

<sup>1295</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 2.23.

But as I said, there are many verses in the books of Moses that might refute this impiety of theirs, yet we are not following up on them. We are not inclined to write a book, just to sketch out certain highlights onto a sheet in a hurry so that in some way we might appear to be obedient to your command. Thus we must pass over certain verses, especially because regarding divine verses, it is not the number of witnesses but their authority that is required, and their authority is sufficient even if only one verse is brought out. For the moment, let it suffice to have brought Moses into agreement with the Gospels and the apostles from this one chapter. God and God, Moses proclaims, just as his testimony from Genesis says above. And so too did John relate that *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*<sup>1296</sup> Neither one said two gods, though he might say God and God; both related that the appearance of the Father and the Son was one. And likewise the catholic faith knew to say ‘one’ in its confession,<sup>1297</sup> but not so that by this confession the Son of the one God might be denied to be God; just as the Father is God, so too is the Son God. For if the Father is not God in the same way that the Son is also God, how do they have a single appearance, in accordance with Moses? Or how, in accordance with Paul, does Christ in the form of God exist as an equal to God?

9 (I, 8). But when John asserts that God as the Word was in the beginning with God, not that it was apart from God, he also seems to me to indicate the same inseparability of the Word of God from God that that their appearance and form

---

<sup>1296</sup> John 1:1. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.18.

<sup>1297</sup> I.e., the Nicene Creed.

indicates.<sup>1298</sup> The inseparability of the Father and Son is demonstrated through their single appearance and same form; why then, when John relates the inseparability of God and God (through saying *and the Word was with God and This was in the beginning with God*),<sup>1299</sup> should we not believe that he is indicating that the Father and Son have a single appearance and the same form?

Of course, the meaning would appear ambiguous here if the same evangelist did not follow up on this more clearly a little further on: *And we saw his glory, glory that belonged to the only-begotten of the Father.*<sup>1300</sup> And just like their single appearance and same form, so too is the Son's glory none other than the Father's glory. Meanwhile, you who say that Christ is the Son by adoption, how do you understand his *glory that belonged to the only-begotten of the Father?*<sup>1301</sup> If you profess that there are many sons of God by adoption, and if Christ was also adopted, how is he the only-begotten of the Father, since he cannot be only-begotten given that other sons also exist through adoption? But if he is truly the only-begotten of the Father in that he alone was truly begotten from that Father, how can you assert that he was adopted? One who is adopted among many adopted sons cannot have the particular quality of being the only-begotten of a father. But even if they are adopted, it nevertheless does not say about any of them, *And we saw his glory, glory that belonged to the only-begotten of the Father.* About Christ alone it says, *And we saw his glory, glory that belonged to the only-begotten of the Father.* Therefore he was not adopted, since what is said about him cannot be said about

---

<sup>1298</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 3.5, *Decr. Nic. syn.* 17; Hil. *De Trin.* 8.48.

<sup>1299</sup> John 1:1-2.

<sup>1300</sup> John 1:14. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 9.39.

<sup>1301</sup> Cf. Ath. *Sent. Dion.* 23.



adopted sons. And his appearance is deservedly one with the Father, because he alone is only-begotten of the Father.<sup>1302</sup> Why is it surprising, then, if the appearance of the Father is indicated by the appearance of the Son? This is also why the Savior himself said, *He who has seen me has seen my Father as well.*<sup>1303</sup> I do not take this like Sabellius does, as though he were saying that he himself was the Father who begat him, but instead as though he were saying that he truly was the Son, who was born. But when he says, *He who has seen me has seen my Father as well,* he also demonstrates that there is one deity, since no difference is found in the substance of the Father and the Son, just as he demonstrates that the person of the Father is not that of the Son.

10 (I, 9). Again, on this point I would also say: If the Son is something created, how does he who sees the Son see the Father as well? Certainly no one sees a father by seeing something created. While a creator may be apparent when considering something created, a father is only apparent when considering a son.<sup>1304</sup> Therefore if Christ is something created and not truly the Son, and if a father cannot become apparent by considering something created, how can he say, *He who has seen me has seen my Father as well,*<sup>1305</sup> unless it is because the Son was truly born from God the Father? And for this reason, when you see the Son, it is necessary that you also see the Father. For without the Son there is no Father, just as there is no Son without the Father. Thus he also puts

---

<sup>1302</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.49.

<sup>1303</sup> John 14:9.

<sup>1304</sup> *Nemo enim in visione creaturae patrem videt: de inspectione enim creaturae creator videri potest; pater autem non videtur nisi de inspectione filii.* In other words, when one sees something created, the existence of a creator is implied; when one sees a son, the existence of a father is implied.

<sup>1305</sup> John 14:9.

below, *I am in the Father and the Father in me*,<sup>1306</sup> certainly not in some mixed-up confusion, but because it follows that wherever a father is, a son is understood to be there too; and wherever a son is, you also understand that a father exists there too.<sup>1307</sup>

And there is another meaning of that remark, *He who saw me, saw my Father as well*. It does not mean that he who had seen Jesus in body with his own body's eyes had seen the Father. Otherwise, the Lord's rebuke to Philip, *I have been with you for so long, and you do not know me, Philip?*, is absurd.<sup>1308</sup> For it was not Philip alone who saw Jesus according to his body, but all the Jews who turned against him. But nevertheless you should not believe that they also saw the Father in the same way that they saw Jesus, according to his body. Why, then, is it, *He who has seen me has seen my Father as well?* Look to the acumen of your heart and see, in accordance with the consideration of the spiritual faith, that Christ, the Son of God, is not something created but a creator; regard him to truly be God, eternal without beginning; and in accordance with this (that he is God) regard him invisible, inestimable, incorruptible, immutable, and in all things of such a quality as that of his Father who begat him as well. And seeing the Son thus, there is no doubt that you have also seen the Father.

11 (I, 10). Also accept this meaning when he says, *I am in the Father and the Father in me*.<sup>1309</sup> For the Father, since he is perfect, begat a perfect Son; and since he is

---

<sup>1306</sup> John 14:10.

<sup>1307</sup> Or with reference to the specific Father and Son under discussion, i.e., "...but because it follows that wherever the Father is, the Son is understood to be there too; and wherever the Son is, you also understand that the Father exists there too." Faustinus will return to the theme of the necessary existence of a father given a son, and a son given a father, in §49. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.16, 19, 33; Hil. *De syn.* 64, *De Trin.* 7.31, 10.6.

<sup>1308</sup> John 14:9. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.36.

<sup>1309</sup> John 14:10. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.38.

the invisible, incomprehensible, inestimable God, and the true light, his Son too was born with the qualities of the one who begat him. And for this reason he says, *I am in the Father and the Father in me*. For when all the things that are of the Father's power and deity are held in the Son, the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father. And for this reason he first said, *If you knew me, you would know my Father as well*.<sup>1310</sup> And here it is shown that the substance of the Father and the Son is the same, because the two are understood the same way. But understanding a created being is not the same as understanding a creator, because their substance is not also the same.<sup>1311</sup> Yet the Father and Son are understood the same way. Thus the Son is not a created being, but a creator, just as the Father is also a creator. And he is God, just as the Father is also God.

But we do not say through these arguments that there are two gods. Here is where, impious heretic, you grow inflamed with a diabolic fury when you hear God and God, as though you were inflamed against the foolishness of that confession; but we nevertheless do not say two gods. For puffed up by secular literature, you grow incurably sick concerning this question, and you reckon that you ought to treat us as though we were saying two gods when we acknowledge God and God. You unhappy one, who would profess himself in some way to be Christian, do not gather together against Christ, Lord, the arguments of ingenious Aristotle's contentions on every created being. And you should not come against the pious confession of the indescribable sacred mystery

---

<sup>1310</sup> John 14:7.

<sup>1311</sup> *Et hic ostenditur quod eadem sic Patris et Filii substantia eo quod sit una utriusque cognitio. Sed creaturae et creator non est una cognitio, quia non et una substantia est.* More literally, "And here it is shown that the substance of the Father and the Son is the same, because there is a single understanding of both, but there is not a single understanding of a something created and a creator, because there is not a single substance."

concerning God like a malicious prosecutor with your sentencing, as one who deceives by using his education in earthly reasoning.

It is preferable that you look into the divine books, and concerning the divine faith use divine sayings. Surely you have read: *And in your light we shall see the light.*<sup>1312</sup> What is the difference here between the light and the light? For [David] would have also established a difference between the light and the light, if there had been one, lest anyone believe that there was no difference. But if there is no difference, there are therefore not two lights but one light, since the light of the Son is recognized in the light of the Father. This is the light about which Daniel speaks, saying, *And the light is with him.*<sup>1313</sup> For this is not said about another created being, but about the splendor of that very God who exists as eternal light. If the Father is the eternal light, without a doubt the Son is also the eternal light. Truly, if one denies that the Son is the eternal light of God, how is the light of the Son, which is not eternal, seen in the eternal light of the Father? But among the praises of God this expression of the saints is not false: *And in your light we shall see the light.* Thus the light of the Son is also eternal, because it does not stand apart from the eternal light of the Father. For this reason, although the light is the Son and the Father is the light, there is nevertheless a single light of the Father and Son, because in the Father and Son there is no difference, there is no separation of light – nor a separation of appearance, as according to Moses, nor a separation of form, as according to the apostle Paul.

---

<sup>1312</sup> Ps 36:9 (LXX). Cf. Greg. Elv. *De fide* 5; Ambr. *De fide* 1.7.49; Hil. *De Trin.* 7.29.

<sup>1313</sup> Dan 2:22.

12 (I, 11). Moreover, the sacred mystery of their inseparable unity in accordance with this – that is, that both the Father and the Son are one God, equally and indivisibly, and not in parts – and of their plurality in accordance with this – that there is one Father and one Son – is even clear in this chapter that we read in the Gospel, when the Savior himself says, *I and the Father are one*.<sup>1314</sup> For *are* signifies the plurality of persons, because here is the Father and here is the Son; but *one* indicates that the substance and deity are one and the same in the Father and Son, so that truly the Father and Son are one God, when both, that is, the Father and the Son, are one according to their deity, not one according to their persons. *I and the Father are one*: with this one expression Sabellius is shut out and Arius is confounded. For Sabellius describes the Father, who is also the Son in some way, just as if the one had two names, and he interprets *one* for this reason as something said so that the singularity of one person should be believed. But contrarily Arius, looking back to this passage that said *are* and understanding a plurality in this assertion, has introduced an impious plurality of gods, believing in one eternal God, and another who began to be a god, one omnipotent and another who is not omnipotent.

But O, the blindness in both! They have before their eyes that which they might piously see, and they impiously exert themselves in arguing with offensive recklessness. They should at least accommodate their own understandings to one other, and perceive the truth of pious faith. Sabellius, in admiration of the miracles which Christ worked, believed that Christ truly was God, who always was and had mastery over all things, and not someone who began at some time. Let Arius believe this, and not blaspheme against

---

<sup>1314</sup> John 10:30. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.5, 8.36; Ambr. *De fide* 1.1.9 (drawing on Tert. *Adv. Prax.* 22; Nov. *De Trin.* 27).

Christ, whom he confesses is the Son. Likewise, Arius denies that Christ is the Father; let Sabellius also deny this, and piously proclaim that Christ truly is God, not existing as the Father but as the Son. Here I would simply say: Sabellius would conquer Arius, because Christ is truly God, and Arius would conquer Sabellius, because Christ is also the true Son of God under the confession of the true God.<sup>1315</sup> And with me, the catholic, they have both conquered – that is to say, they both conquer the error of impiety along with me when they both understand along with me the truth of the sacred faith, which understands both a plurality of persons and the unity of the deity in this proclamation of the Lord, who says *I and the Father are one*.

But when they seek to subvert matters, the Arian sectarians interpret this divine proclamation and this pious understanding of the divine proclamation in another way, and they say, “They are indeed one, but not in substance, nor in deity, nor in power, but in will; that is, because they have one and the same will, he for that reason says *I and the Father are one*.”<sup>1316</sup> Tell us, O impious heretics, whether he who is the self-existent Word of God and who conveyed this expression did not know how to speak, was ignorant of how to explain your other meaning with the proper and suitable expressions, and was incapable of saying, “I and the Father will one thing,” if he wished at this point for a unity of will, and not of substance and deity, to be understood.

13 (I, 12). But now, empress, I ask that you recall those chapters you deemed worthy to relate that are characteristic of the heretics. These heretics say: *The Father who*

---

<sup>1315</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 1.26, 7.4.

<sup>1316</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.5, 9.70.

sent me commanded me as to what I should say and what I should speak,<sup>1317</sup> and I descended from heaven not that I might do my will, but the will of the my Father who sent me.<sup>1318</sup> This is the artifice of the heretics, so that they might deny in one place what they affirm in another, so that when they see themselves vigorously held in check by the answers to their presented questions, they might always escape with serpentine slipperiness. O heretics, certainly you say that the Father commanded his Son as to what he should say, what he should speak.<sup>1319</sup> How are *you* correcting his words (or rather, now, his Father's words, given that the Son both says and speaks what he says and speaks according to the command that his Father gave him) as if he does not know how to speak? Do you not understand that when you struggle to exercise your madness against the deity of the Son with your profane spirit, you also burst forth raging against the Father? The Son cries, *I and the Father are one*,<sup>1320</sup> and you, like grammarians, as if supplying a deficiency in the Lord's proclamation with the perversion of a falsely substituted word, correct him and say, "This thing that says 'are' should be understood as 'will,' so that it says, of course, 'I and the Father will one thing.'" But the Son also cries back against you, saying what he said to the Jewish participants in your impiety, *Why do you not understand what I am saying?*<sup>1321</sup> Let the parables and allegories and enigmas have their proper place; in this place, it is most clearly and plainly written, *I and the Father are one*.

---

<sup>1317</sup> John 12:49.

<sup>1318</sup> John 6:38. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.5, 9.70.

<sup>1319</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.7.

<sup>1320</sup> John 10:30.

<sup>1321</sup> John 8:43.

And how they are one he declares elsewhere, when he says, *Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me.*<sup>1322</sup> And lest he appear to be making use of something that was not about himself, he first said, in order to demonstrate the truth of what he said, *You do not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words which I speak to you I do not speak by my own self, but my Father, remaining in me, speaks, and the works which I do, he does.*<sup>1323</sup> But in another place, he also says, *Just as my Father taught me, I say these things, and he who sent me is with me; he did not leave me alone, because I always do the things which are pleasing to him.*<sup>1324</sup> He says, *The Father, remaining in me, speaks, or, Just as my Father taught me, I say these things,* not because the Son was ignorant as to what he should have said (for what is there about which the wisdom of God is ignorant?) but so that he might also soften the stubbornness of your uncouth faith toward a pious understanding of the divine unity by the authority of the Father. Moreover, the works of the Son are likewise the works of the Father; for this reason, when the Son is acting, the Father acts, remaining in the Son. Thus the things that the Son says, the Father says, and says nothing other than what the Son says, remaining in him, because the Son also does not say anything other than what the Father says, remaining in him.<sup>1325</sup> Therefore the speech of the Father and the Son is the same, just as their work is also the same. For this reason, he says, *Otherwise, believe on account of the works themselves,*<sup>1326</sup> works that he surely did similarly to the Father, so that later, at least

---

<sup>1322</sup> John 10:38.

<sup>1323</sup> John 14:10.

<sup>1324</sup> John 8:28-29.

<sup>1325</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.40-41.

<sup>1326</sup> John 14:12.



on the authority of his works, it might be believed that the Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son.

14 (I, 13). Now the way that this should be understood – when he says, *I am in the Father and the Father in me*<sup>1327</sup> – was already explained above.<sup>1328</sup> But I will also now briefly discuss it.<sup>1329</sup> In accordance with the lack of difference in substance, one should hear, *I am in the Father and the Father in me*. But he also says, *I and the Father are one*.<sup>1330</sup> Regarding the lack of difference in their substance, the Father and the Son are one. Do not, impious heretic, also insolently add in that there is unity in their will (which you elsewhere impiously deny by saying, ‘It is written: *I descended from heaven not that I might do my will, but the will of my Father who sent me*’<sup>1331</sup>) so that you might take away the lack of difference in substance of the Father and Son. You who would so impiously deny that there is unity in the will of the Father and Son, being ignorant regarding that statement as to the sacred mystery of what he said, how should I believe that you sincerely confess that the will of the Father and Son is indicated as one and the same when the Lord proclaimed *I and the Father are one*?<sup>1332</sup>

If you truly believe that the Father and Son are one in their will, I do not see how you can deny that they are also one in their substance, divinity, and power. For why would there not be one substance, one divinity and power, for whom there is one will? For if their will is equal, their divinity is also equal. If their divinity is not equal, their will

---

<sup>1327</sup> John 14:10.

<sup>1328</sup> See §10, 11, 13.

<sup>1329</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.10.

<sup>1330</sup> John 10:30.

<sup>1331</sup> John 6:38.

<sup>1332</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 9.70.

is not equal either. For the will of God and the will of whomever else – but not God – cannot be made equal, because there is one force of will for one who is God and another force of will for one who is not God. The will of God is naturally good, it is perfect, it is immutable, it always exists as the same will, exists without beginning, and persists without end. Truly the will of one who is not God, because it has a beginning just like one who is not God, can sway and be changed just like one who is not God. Because of this, the will of one who is not God is also not truly good, because it is not good by nature, nor is this will truly perfect, as it can be changed and diminished in such a way that what it wants today, it does not want tonight, or what he does not want today, it does want tonight.

15 (I, 14). I might speak more clearly with an example. That angel who is now the devil had a good will before he became the devil, but when he was made the devil, he parted with his good will by the exercise of his own judgment – because, of course, he exists as something made, and is not God by nature. And we should think this way about every created being in regards to its reason: for even if some of them did not turn away and do not turn away from their good will, they nevertheless have in their nature the capacity to turn away, because they are created beings and not God. For this – that they do not turn away – they maintain from the constant observation of what they have learned, not from the truth of their immutable nature. But God, just as he alone is without beginning, good and perfect and unchanging, has also without beginning a good and perfect and unchanging will. He has this good and perfect and unchanging will not from instruction or by profiting from what he has observed, but from the truth of his immutable

nature, by which God is also good and perfect and unchanging. It shall be seen whether perhaps there is some heresy that spits back at this sense; but you in particular, Arian, agree on this point, you who say that the very Son of God, whom you confess is the Lord of every created being, is changeable and mutable, because you proclaim that he was made by God from nothing, but was not truly born from God.

But if this is your understanding, that every created being is changeable and mutable, and if moreover you say that Christ is a created being, then according to you he himself, existing as changeable and mutable due to his condition of being a created being, also does not have an unchanging and immutable will. And how would you explain that the Father and Son are one in their will when, according to you, the wills of the Father and of the Son are different and contrary? Naturally, since one [will] is immutable and unchanging but another is mutable and changeable, you are checked and uncovered, you fraudulent heretic, in how you attempt to encircle and capture simple souls. For you are constrained and confined by the testimony of the Lord's pronouncement, when he says, *I and the Father are one.*<sup>1333</sup> However you fly away from this statement, which demonstrates in clear words the unity of the divinity between the Father and the Son, you are overcome by necessity, not by sound judgment, to this: briefly, with just lip service on the verse in question and, so to speak, on the surface meaning of the words alone, you insert a unity of their will by which you expressly and vigorously and thoroughly exclude the unity of their divinity. For you take away the meaning of 'with a unity of substance,' which is easily believed from the very simplicity of the words, and interpret the meaning

---

<sup>1333</sup> John 10:30.

of ‘with a unity of will.’ Because the reason for going beyond what he said is not easily understood by all, you say this so that you might deceive the simple listener for awhile, when you do this so that he does not understand the unity of their divinity.

For the catholic faith also most sincerely and most truly believes in the unity of the will in the Father and Son, not just paying lip service but with its whole heart, which well knows both the unity of their substance and of their divinity. For just as the Son is of an immutable and unchangeable substance with the Father, so too is the Son of an immutable and unchangeable will with the Father.<sup>1334</sup> And for this reason there is one will of the Father and of the Son, just as there is also one power and one appearance.

I would rather say that the Son himself is the will of the Father. For just as there is one appearance of the Father and the Son according to Moses, the son himself is furthermore also recorded as the *appearance of the invisible God* by the apostle.<sup>1335</sup> And thus it is pious to define the Son as the will of the Father when there is one will of the Father and of the Son.<sup>1336</sup> Just as the appearance of God is invisible, think of his power in a similar fashion.<sup>1337</sup> For the catholic faith says that there is one power of the Father and of the Son, and furthermore, the apostle writes that Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Thus it is piously said that the Son is the will of the Father, just as this same one is also the wisdom of God.

And nevertheless, if this still disturbs your sense of understanding, consider what we are saying. Certainly Christ is the wisdom of God – and what is the will of God but

---

<sup>1334</sup> Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 3.66.

<sup>1335</sup> Col 1:15.

<sup>1336</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 1:24.

<sup>1337</sup> Faustinus here draws a direct correlation between God’s will (*voluntas*) and power (*virtus*), that is, what he wishes to accomplish and his ability to accomplish.

the wisdom of God?<sup>1338</sup> For there is no will in God in one respect and wisdom in another.<sup>1339</sup> Certainly among men there can be a will, but this itself is not also wisdom, since the will of a man comes to potential wisdom for himself through learning and preparation and progress. But the will of God does not come to potential wisdom through learning and preparation and progress, but itself, lacking nothing, is naturally substantive wisdom. Thus Christ both exists as the wisdom of God and also is the will of God, since in God there is no will in one respect and wisdom in another.

16 (II, 1). That the Son was not made from nothing but is the true Son from the true Father himself, and was begotten without beginning.

David, striking the forehead of Goliath with one blow of a stone, laid out the hostile strength of his huge body.<sup>1340</sup> But it is not within our power to be victorious by using a single stone, as I judge it, for two reasons: because we do not have such powers as David had and because those men show that their foreheads are too hardened by the impieties of their shamelessness. For this reason, though perhaps we have already fired off many stones (and without missing), we must still attack again in the grace of God, and their shameless foreheads, which are without the sign of the Lord, must be crushed by the numerous stones of the witnesses. Even if they pour out gore, pierced by many wounds, without them caring, their shame might still nevertheless grow red by the spreading blood if they are also overcome by those things of theirs which you had written about.

---

<sup>1338</sup> Here Faustinus switches to a direct correlation of God's will (*voluntas*) and wisdom (*sapientia*), that is, what he wishes to accomplish and what is wise to accomplish.

<sup>1339</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.38.

<sup>1340</sup> Cf. 1 Sam 17:50.

You say that these are the words of the heretics: ‘From nothing,’ he says, ‘God made the Son for himself.’<sup>1341</sup> If he made him from nothing, he is a created being and not the Son. And how is it that you call him the Son, whom you assert is a created being, when you say that he was made from nothing? You cannot thus call him the Son and a created being, for a son exists from birth but a created being from its fabrication. Why do you bring up things contrary to yourself? Pick one of the two: call him either the Son, truly as the Son, or a created being, truly as a created being. If you thus call him the Son so that you might truly call him the Son, you have denied that he is a created being. And how can you say that he was made from nothing, whom you assert is truly the Son? But if you say that he is truly a created being, why do you name him the Son, since you deny in him the truth of his name?

17 (II, 2). But let us strike the shamelessness of his forehead with the living stones of the divine voice. You say that he is a created being; I say that he is the Son. Who between us makes his pronouncement from the truth of his profession? I reckon that you would gladly have it that he himself judge, by whom you (with us opposing) say that Christ was made from nothing.<sup>1342</sup> Thus let us hear what he himself pronounces from heaven: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*<sup>1343</sup> Did he ever say, ‘This is whom I made from nothing’? And see how he first said this when Jesus came up as a man to baptism, and, I reckon, with no other reason than because it had been possible that he would not be believed to be the Son of God, who appeared corporally and who himself

---

<sup>1341</sup> Faustinus switches from the plural “heretics” to the singular “he says,” probably reflecting his belief that whoever penned these Arian tracts for Flacilla represented the beliefs of all Arians.

<sup>1342</sup> I.e. the Father will be the judge.

<sup>1343</sup> Matt 3:17. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.23; Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.23; Ambr. *De fide* 1.13.83.

also came among the rest of the men like a sinful man to baptism, though he did not have his own sins. Thus, when Jesus consummates the sacrament of baptism in the adopted form of a man, lest he not truly be believed to be the Son of God, the Father cries from heaven, *This is my beloved Son*. Certainly John had also understood that he [the Son] was his own Lord when he also says of him when he was coming to baptism, *I ought to be baptized by you, and you come to me?*<sup>1344</sup> But lest by chance the testimony of John not appear so great among certain people, with the result that he subdue faith in the flesh and the humility in Christ, and all the things everywhere that are done through his flesh, he himself – than whom no one is greater – he himself – than whom no one is a better advocate – gives testimony from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*. For in as much as the faith was clear concerning the flesh of the Savior, the faith also ought to have been clear concerning the divinity of the Savior, for then too he is also truly God, if he is also truly the Son. Certainly no one is unsure about his flesh, or I should rather say, the man, since no one could be unsure. But in order that what was in the man and born with the man, since it could not be seen by its nature, would not be uncertain, it is demonstrated by the voice and as though by the finger of the Father saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*.

And meanwhile, faith in Christ is conveyed in both substances, that is, in him as God and in him as a man, with equal authority. For the Son himself indicated in himself faith in his human self through his conception and birth from the Virgin, through the crying of his infancy, through his cradle and swaddling clothes, through the very breasts

---

<sup>1344</sup> Matt 3:14.

of his mother, through the very nourishment of his mother's milk, through his bodily growth with age, through himself when he came to be baptized. You see, meanwhile, how he expressed in himself the truth of his human self up to his baptism. As much as he did this more accurately, so much more difficulty there was in him being able to be believed to have become God in a man.<sup>1345</sup> And lest by chance you reckon that he was compelled to this and was not made the Son of God as well as the son of a man by his own accord, listen to the apostle speaking about him: *who, though he was constituted in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as a boon, but diminished himself by taking the form of a servant.*<sup>1346</sup> Thus if he diminished himself, taking the form of a servant, he was not compelled, but of his own accord was made the son of a man, existing in the shape of God, equal to God. And so you have the Son, expressing in himself faith in his human self.

18 (II, 3). Likewise, let us see the faith in the divinity in him expressed. Although it was expressed sufficiently above concerning faith in his divine self, there are still other, much richer, instances as well, in which faith in the divinity in Christ might be apparent. I nevertheless remain silent about those things for now, for it is enough for me if the Father alone demonstrates faith in the divinity in Christ, saying *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*<sup>1347</sup> What do you say, heretic? Without a doubt you believe Christ, in that he made himself the son of a man. How do you rate the Father? Is he not truthful when he testifies that Christ is his own Son? If you do not believe the Father, when he

---

<sup>1345</sup> I.e. the more closely he resembled a man, the more difficult it was to believe he was God.

<sup>1346</sup> Phil 2:6-7.

<sup>1347</sup> Matt 3:17.



testifies that Christ is his own Son, Christ – whom you believe concerning faith in his human self – is now of a greater authority for you, and the Father – whom you do not believe concerning his testimony about the Son – is less suitable. And how can you affirm the Father as God is the greater, whose voice you value as little as possible? Or how can you assert that Christ as God is the lesser, whom you believe in proportion with how much you do not believe in the one whom you profess is greater? You remove this great honor of yours from the Father, so that you do not believe in what he professes concerning his own Son.

Moreover, he professes again and in another place that this is his own Son, when along with the apostles Peter and James and John the Lord ascended the mount and his face shone like the sun.<sup>1348</sup> Again, the divine testimony strikes the shamelessness of your forehead: *And lo, he says, a bright cloud cast a shadow over them, and lo a voice, speaking from the cloud: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him.*<sup>1349</sup> Certainly Moses and Elijah, both of whom you cannot deny were made sons of God through adoption, were seen speaking together with him; so how does the divine voice testify about Christ alone, saying *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him?*<sup>1350</sup> For if Christ was also a son through adoption, when he was standing among the two adopted sons, he assuredly would have said, ‘And this is my Son,’ so that Christ would not be believed to be his only son. But when he says, *This is my beloved Son*, he separates him from the adopted sons, so that the particular quality of

---

<sup>1348</sup> Cf. Matt 17:2.

<sup>1349</sup> Matt 17:5.

<sup>1350</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.24; Ambr. *De fide* 1.13.81.

Christ's true birth as his only Son would be believed. But it is not enough to just profess that Christ is his Son, for he adds what is owed to the true Son, saying, *Listen to him*. He demonstrates in the Son the great, no, an even equal authority to his own, when the Son must thus be listened to, as the Father also must be listened to.

*Listen* – he says – *to him*. Thus whatever Christ now says, he must be listened to. And let us see if he ever says that he is the Son of God, if ever he professes to have God as his Father.<sup>1351</sup> His statement is: *Everything planted that my Father did not plant will be destroyed.*<sup>1352</sup> And again: *You have made the house of my Father a house of business.*<sup>1353</sup> Also, elsewhere: *And do you believe in the Son?*<sup>1354</sup> He would never presume to say *my father* and *of my Father* and *Do you believe in the Son of God?* unless there was an assuredness in his nature which affirms the designation of truth in the case of his Father because of his knowledge of his own birth. For what would he say arrogantly, given that he humbled himself and was made obedient up to his death (and a death by crucifixion)?<sup>1355</sup>

19 (II, 4). There are many other testimonies, but we are not writing a book now, where we would follow everything up. For the sake of brevity, we are summing up the highlights with a few testimonies, so that that voice which denies that Christ is the true Son of God be overwhelmed. Certainly, Christ says that he was also the son of a man,

---

<sup>1351</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.25.

<sup>1352</sup> Matt 15:13.

<sup>1353</sup> John 2:16.

<sup>1354</sup> John 9:35 reads 'Do you believe in the Son of Man,' but Faustinus renders it 'the Son of God' in the following sentence, as it appeared in the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate.

<sup>1355</sup> Cf. Phil 2:7.

when he says: *And you will see the Son of Man*,<sup>1356</sup> and *Who do they say is the Son of Man?*<sup>1357</sup> For this is the sacred mystery of faith in Christ, that while you believe that he is the Son of God, you also believe that he was also made the son of a man. For the Son of God naturally possesses; but this, which was made the son of a man, is how he stands out as beneficent for us. And for this reason, he who does not believe that Christ is the Son of God is impious, but furthermore, he who scoffs at confessing that Christ was made the son of a man is without grace. Yet you, heretic, you believe that Christ was made the son of a man, and when he says about himself that he is the Savior, you do not deny it. But truly when the Father said *This is my Son*<sup>1358</sup> and when the Son said *My Father*,<sup>1359</sup> you harden like the heart of Pharaoh and do not believe.<sup>1360</sup> It goes beyond your shamelessness that, as though filled with bile, not examining what is true, you say that the Father and Son have lied.

He says: “I do not deny the Son, but I deny the true Son. For this reason, Peter was also thus worthy the voice of blessedness, since he did not believe that Christ was the true Son, though he confessed that he was the Son of the living God. In fact, the sacred mystery of the confessed faith was great in Peter’s conscience, so that he said with his lips, *You are Christ, the Son of the living God*,<sup>1361</sup> but held in his heart that he was not the true Son of the living God.”

---

<sup>1356</sup> Mark 14:62.

<sup>1357</sup> Matt 16:13. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.25.

<sup>1358</sup> Matt 3:17.

<sup>1359</sup> Matt 17:5. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.26.

<sup>1360</sup> Cf. Exod 7:13; *Lib. prec.* 6.

<sup>1361</sup> Matt 16:16. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.36; Ambr. *De fide* 2.15.129.

I, I am a man: I hear the words, I understand the words, I cannot hear this silent interpretation of his heart. He said that Christ is the Son of the living God: unless he were to add in ‘adopted,’ I understand nothing at all other than what he said. It will be seen if Christ, as Lord and God, looks to the heart. But to me, who hears with the ears alone, the confession of his heart (on account of which, additionally, Peter was questioned) ought to also have become clear through his voice, for Peter was not asked for himself alone, but for all of us, so that when he made a good confession concerning Christ, we might also learn similarly to come to blessedness with the same confession.

And meanwhile, let us see if Peter worthily followed his duty of proclaiming blessedness, believing in his heart that Christ was not the true Son but adopted – let us see whether this revelation is worthy of the Father, and not rather of flesh and blood. Certainly very many men are the sons of God by adoption, and not only Jeremiah, who while still in his mother’s womb was sanctified;<sup>1362</sup> nor John the Baptist alone, who exulted in the Spirit as an infant within his mother;<sup>1363</sup> but not Elijah alone, who has not suffered death even up to the present;<sup>1364</sup> or whosoever you please from the number of the prophets, from whom one, as was related in the Gospel, was reckoned as Christ.<sup>1365</sup> Yet prostitutes and tax collectors, with a great deal of correcting, came to this adopted name. And lest someone reckon that I am blaspheming, let him listen to the Gospel, which says, *The prostitutes and tax collectors go before you into the Kingdom of*

---

<sup>1362</sup> Cf. Jer 1:5; Ath. C. Ar. 3.33.

<sup>1363</sup> Cf. Luke 1:44.

<sup>1364</sup> Cf. 2 Kgs 2:11; Sir 48:13-15.

<sup>1365</sup> Cf. Matt 16:14.

Heaven,<sup>1366</sup> where they are none other than adopted sons. Thus since the grace of adoption is not denied on account of blasphemies or disgraces, if they correct them, did the Father reveal this to Peter as the great sacred mystery: that though Christ is indeed the Son of the living God, it is instead rather by adoption and not by birth, and only by name, yet not also with the truth of the name? Clearly he who believes this is not blessed, but the most wretched of all men, having not only the understanding of the flesh and blood, but even of the spirit of the devil as well! But I ask, Empress, that you understand how many things might be said on this point, which I, as a consequence of hastening, am passing over. I believe that given the occasion, as one of the wisest women, you might understand more than we are saying, in accordance with the sentiment of Solomon: *Give the wise man an opportunity and he will become wiser.*<sup>1367</sup>

20 (II, 5). This is your doctrine, Arians, this is your singular interpretation, this is the secret sacred mystery of your faith: ‘By adoption,’ he says, ‘Christ is the Son, and not the true Son.’ Let us ask John as well. It is possible that this man also had learned the truth, whether because he was present when Peter’s confession was praised, or from the Savior’s special love by which he was closest to him, so that he even reclined on his breast.<sup>1368</sup> Let us see what, clinging to his breast, he drew out: *No one has ever seen God, except the only-begotten Son, who is in his Father’s bosom.*<sup>1369</sup> No created being sees God, in accordance with what is God,<sup>1370</sup> and for this reason he says, *No one has ever seen God.* But he follows this and says, *except the only-begotten Son.* Thus the only-

---

<sup>1366</sup> Matt 21:31.

<sup>1367</sup> Prov 9:9.

<sup>1368</sup> John 13:23.

<sup>1369</sup> John 1:18. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.39.

<sup>1370</sup> Cf. §10.

begotten Son is not a created being, as he sees God, whom no created being has seen. And lest by chance you believe that he is one of the adopted sons, he has cut off the opportunity for your impious understanding when he said that he was not only the Son, but also the only-begotten Son. This title does not have partners. And although other sons may be spoken of, they are nevertheless sons by adoption, not by nature. But Christ alone is the only-begotten Son, since he alone is the true Son, not by adoption but by nature, not by pronouncement alone but by origin as well.<sup>1371</sup> He alone – I say – is the true Son, who is also in his Father’s bosom. The adopted sons are in Abraham’s bosom, but he who is the true Son, and is the only-begotten Son, is in his Father’s bosom.<sup>1372</sup>

Moreover, also understand in this that the Son cannot be separated from the Father’s substance, since he is said to be in his Father’s bosom. We likewise read, *For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, so that all who believe in him might not perish but might have eternal life.*<sup>1373</sup> I do not see how the love of God is conveyed to the world, if it is not his true and only-begotten Son whom he gave for the redemption of the world. The world, without doubt, is a created thing; if Christ is also a created being, what is he [the Father] conferring to the world, giving something created for something created?<sup>1374</sup> Everything created is distinguished by its servile condition. If Christ is a created being, he is a servant: and how can he redeem anything to liberty, when by no right can a servant confer liberty?<sup>1375</sup> And moreover, Abraham, that he might

---

<sup>1371</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.40.

<sup>1372</sup> Cf. Luke 16:22.

<sup>1373</sup> John 3:16.

<sup>1374</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.67.

<sup>1375</sup> But cf. §5, in which Faustinus discusses Christ ‘taking the form of a servant,’ *forma serui accipiens*. *Servus* and *servilis* are here used more in the sense of ‘slave.’

convey the love which he had for God, offered up his own, true, only-begotten, and most-beloved son as a burnt offering, when God had ordered that this very thing be done to prove to everyone his love for him.<sup>1376</sup> And you say, impious one, since God wished to convey his own love to the world and did not have a true son whom he might give, he instead appealed to necessity like a eunuch, so that, since he did not have by nature a truly begotten son from himself, he instead gave something made from nothing?

21 (II, 6). Speak, impious one: in offering his own and only-begotten son, did Abraham convey his love with greater virtue than God, who did not give his own or truly only-begotten son? This above all is what God wishes to convey, and he conveys it in a lesser manner than a man conveys it? And that very God, whom you proclaim is greater, is less than a man in conveying his love: for he conveyed less love, if he did not give his true and only-begotten son for his love of the world. And Abraham, who offered up his own and only-begotten, conveyed more. But let this impiety begone, that God who is inestimable in all things just be lesser in conveying his love. For he gave his true and only-begotten Son in love of the world. For Paul, the chosen vessel,<sup>1377</sup> follows through on this, saying, *He who did not spare his own Son, but handed him over for all of us.*<sup>1378</sup> When he says *his own Son*, he demonstrates the particular quality of truth in the name. And moreover, look to the wording he makes use of, saying, *He who did not spare his own Son*. You have read in another place God speaking to Abraham, when he wished to kill his son for his love of God: *Do not put your hand to the boy, do not do anything to*

---

<sup>1376</sup> Cf. Gen 22.

<sup>1377</sup> Cf Acts 9:15.

<sup>1378</sup> Rom 8:32. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.44-45.

*him: for now I know, since you fear your God and did not spare your own beloved son for me.*<sup>1379</sup> And Paul says, *He who did not spare his own Son, but handed him over for all of us.* The apostle, from the voice of God, says how he conveyed his love. He made improper use of the divine words if he was not also speaking here about the true Son.

And furthermore, who among the faithful does not know that the representation of the truth to come had its precedent in Abraham the father and Isaac his son?<sup>1380</sup> The apostle also showed the sacred mystery of the preceding figure in God the Father and Christ his only-begotten Son, signaling the truth with the very words by which the figure was first signaled, saying, *He who did not spare his own Son, but handed him over for all of us.*<sup>1381</sup> Thus if the figure was in Abraham, when he was offering his son, but the truth was in God the Father, when he handed over *his* Son, what do you say, scholar of impiety? What greater force ought to be considered, the figure or the truth? Without a doubt, the truth. For the figure is more fulfilled when the true son is offered, and the truth is lesser when, as according to you, the true son is not handed over. But clearly the truth is greater and the figure is lesser. If you wish this to be proven, believe in the true only-begotten Son of God, and you will understand to how much greater a degree than Abraham God acted, giving his only-begotten Son for his love of the world,<sup>1382</sup> according to the Gospel, or when, according to Paul, *he did not spare his own Son but handed him over for all of us.* For Abraham, though he offered his own son, nevertheless offered him

---

<sup>1379</sup> Gen 22:12.

<sup>1380</sup> The following represents a typical late antique Christian exegesis concerning the Old Testament, in which elements from the Old Testament are called 'figures' or 'types' and are said to have 'prefigured' the 'truth' of the New Testament.

<sup>1381</sup> In other words, the phrase 'you did not spare your own son' (*non pepercisti filio tuo*) from the account of Abraham and Isaac in Genesis prefigured the same phrasing in Romans (*suo Filio non pepercit*).

<sup>1382</sup> Cf. John 3:16.



for his love of God, to whom, whatever you might offer, you would not come equal to what is worthy. And he offered a son, whom he got after he could not have one in the natural way of things, yet against the natural way of things, through God, he did obtain. Thus he offered to God that which God had given to him against natural hope, and offered his son.

22 (II, 7). It will make my case if I call Abraham lesser, and without that condition that was presented,<sup>1383</sup> because he is going to die at some time due to the law of mortality. Against these considerations is what God offered: he offered his only-begotten Son, whom he did not obtain later through the grace of anyone, but whom he always had, born from him, without a beginning, from his particular nature, of a quality that the Father himself is as well, who begot him invisible, inestimable, eternal, without suffering, and immortal and omnipotent, just as the Father himself is as well, and finally, equal in all things, in accordance with that which is God, to him who begot him. You see what sort of Son the Father gave. Look, now God is inestimably found superior in his Son.

And now consider that he offered such an only-begotten Son as this for his love of the world. Ponder too, now, what this world is: assuredly it is a created thing. Likewise too, ponder what God is: assuredly he is the creator. And now, now compare what Abraham loved and what God loved: certainly, Abraham loved God. But calculate how much God offered to Abraham, and you will find that Abraham returned his debt of love to God by much less than he owed, though he returned as much as he could return. Yet God loves the world not for the thanks given to him by it. You see how much more

---

<sup>1383</sup> I.e. that he is greater, *maiores*.

commendable the love of God is, which is not offered for a debt, than that of Abraham, which is offered for a debt.

But see still the supremacy of the love with which God loves the world, not only the world committed (with no just merit) to him who formed it, but also the sinner and the impious one opposed to him. Thus God loved the world that was answerable for its sinners and impious ones, not because he loved the sins and impieties of the world, but he loved the world so that this very world might be freed from its sins and impieties. And listen to the apostle on these matters, who marvelously conveys his love of God when he writes to the Romans: *For why did Christ, while we were still weak, die on behalf of the impious at the proper time? Surely, it is rare that anyone die for the just. But for a good man perhaps someone would dare to die. Nevertheless God conveys his love to us: since if Christ died for us while we were still sinners, with much greater justification now in his blood we will be safe from [God's] wrath through him.*<sup>1384</sup>

23 (II, 8). Certainly I understand that this testimony wishes to be discussed; but for now we are briefly unfolding what makes our case. The apostle, having explained that the world means the inhabitants of the world, shows that Christ died on behalf of the impious and the sinners, in order that he convey his own love for us who are in the world. And Christ dies, he says, on behalf of the impious and the sinners, since indeed it is rare that anyone die for the just, though perhaps for a good man someone would dare to die.<sup>1385</sup> Do you now understand how indescribably God's love excels, when it is the

---

<sup>1384</sup> Rom 5:6-9. The word for 'love' in this passage is *caritatem*, 'dearness, love' as opposed to the word for 'love' that Faustinus has been using, *dilectio*, 'love.'

<sup>1385</sup> Cf. Rom 5:6-7. The syntax, which differs slightly from Paul, has been retained in the translation.

expression of truth, and lesser than it is the love of Abraham, where the figure was signaled? I do not say this as if Abraham did not love very much; no, rather, he loved God as much as he could as well, as much as no man (from those born of women) could surpass.<sup>1386</sup> But although he loved God very much, and loved with his whole heart and all the powers of his soul, he nevertheless is overcome by the indescribable supremacy of boundless divine love. For who could explain the love that God offered to the world, giving his only-begotten Son in such a way that a man was born who was God, and he had, in the flesh, a human condition from the beginning of his birth, a man who was born without a beginning from the Father. And that one, forever existing equal to God in the form of God, having taken the form of a servant, became lesser not only than the Father, but even lesser than the angels, and what's more, even lesser than men.<sup>1387</sup> I do not know whether or not he was even much lower as well, comparable to a worm.<sup>1388</sup> And finally, in accordance with the nature of the human soul that he had taken up, he suffered sorrow up to death<sup>1389</sup> – he who is every joy, not only of Abraham, who *longing to see his day, saw and rejoiced*,<sup>1390</sup> but of all the saints as well.<sup>1391</sup>

Thus he offered to the world his only-begotten Son, so that he who is the true life, hanging on the wood in the flesh, might suffer death by crucifixion, his eternal and inviolable divinity meanwhile hidden – the divinity which for him is one with the Father. See his love, that the Lord of majesty be crucified on earth for the welfare of the world,

---

<sup>1386</sup> Cf. Matt 11:11.

<sup>1387</sup> Cf. Phil 2:6-7; Heb 2:7.

<sup>1388</sup> Cf. Ps 21:6 (LXX).

<sup>1389</sup> Cf. Matt 26:38.

<sup>1390</sup> John 8:56.

<sup>1391</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 11.15; Ambr. *De fide* 2.8.16.

the Lord who offers eternal life in heaven to those believing in him as the Son of God. O most blessed are you, patriarch Abraham, whose greatest love for God is not submersed except by the inundation of divine love! And I do not know whether God does not offer this much to the impious world out of respect for your love and faith, for God had promised to you and your offspring that *you be heir to the world through the justice of your faith*,<sup>1392</sup> just as the apostle Paul teaches.

24 (II, 9). But I would be thoroughly delayed if I wished to follow through more fully in this place. Let me turn back to you, heretic, reminding you that you are considering how God, loving the world, gave his only-begotten Son, or – as the apostle says – how *He did not spare his own Son, but handed him over for all of us*.<sup>1393</sup> If you understood the sacred mystery of that indescribable love, you would never put together impious questions against the Son of God, questions that a man of pious mind understands are resolved by the things we said above. But still, let us see the remaining part of the testimony put forth, so that the impudence of your forehead might be more forcibly crushed. For after he had said *For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son*, he follows up on it and says, *so that all who believe in him might not perish but might have eternal life*.<sup>1394</sup> Again, I would say: if the only-begotten Son is a created being, how can one who believes in him not perish, but have eternal life, since it is an offense to divinity to believe in a created being? Look back to the apostle Paul, consider what disgraces, what obscenities he refers to concerning these men who, as he says, *have*

---

<sup>1392</sup> Rom 4:13.

<sup>1393</sup> Rom 8:32. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.45.

<sup>1394</sup> John 3:16. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.40.

*entirely transformed the truth of God into falsehood, and worshiped and served a created being rather than the creator.*<sup>1395</sup> You, if you believe thus and you worship thus and serve the only-begotten Son of God in such a way that you say that he is a created being, those evils await you, wretch, by which those who *have entirely transformed the truth of God into falsehood and worshiped and served a created being rather than the creator* are punished.

By adoption, [the Arian] says, Christ is the Son of God and not the true Son. All the Gospels are gathered together, and it is nowhere written that Christ is the Son by adoption and not the true Son. And John, that John reclining on the breast of the Lord, presented his reasons for a written Gospel well, and said, *Indeed, Jesus also made many other signs before his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these things are written, so that you believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God, and so that in believing, you might have eternal life in his name.*<sup>1396</sup> Is there still a need to more openly explain this? He says, *And Jesus made many other signs*, and although they are not all written down, since they could not have all been written down due to the infinite abundance of materials, these very things nevertheless were written down for this reason, so that we believe *that Jesus is Christ the Son of God*. And so that he might summon the faith of the individuals, he also pointed out the reward, saying, *so that in believing, you might have eternal life in his name*. If he were truly the Son of God by adoption and not by nature, if by proclamation alone and not also by what is understood in the proclamation, John would have explained this in no other place than in the end of his writing, lest his faith,

---

<sup>1395</sup> Rom 1:25. Cf. Greg. Elv. *De fide* 2; Ambr. *De fide* 1.16.10.

<sup>1396</sup> John 20:30-31. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.41.

abandoned to ambiguity, might do away with eternal life through an uncertainty in his confidence. But the evangelist, who was appointed so that having the grace of the Holy Spirit he especially might more clearly make known these things that pertain to the rewards of eternal life, ended his Gospel not in ambiguity but most plainly expressed that his Gospel was written for this reason: *so that you believe*, he says, *that Jesus is Christ the Son of God, and so that in believing, you might have eternal life in his name*. Is there still suspicion that the Son of God is a created being, when whoever believes that the Son of God is Christ might possess eternal life, and in no other way than in his name? He is assuredly not a created being but the creator, and the Son not by adoption but the true Son of God: for indeed, no one can obtain even a temporal life in the name of a created being, except if someone is said to offer it by not taking it away.

25 (II, 10). From nothing – he says – God made for himself the Son. I am passing by many witnesses; let John speak, as he stands out in Christ, the Lord’s love.<sup>1397</sup> Writing a letter, he says: *All who love the Father love him who was born from him*.<sup>1398</sup> Does he say: He loves him whom God made from nothing? But he would not have named him the Father at all unless he had known that the Son was born from him. And now make it so that it must be understood just as you, heretic, interpret it: that certainly he made him from nothing, whom John says was born from the Father. I ask, according to you, whether Christ alone was made from nothing. Was not the world itself, that I might remain silent about other things, also made from nothing? Thus the world also ought to

---

<sup>1397</sup> Cf. John 19:26, 21:20.

<sup>1398</sup> 1 John 1:5. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.42.

be loved by us, if the Father ought to be loved. But the same John cries out, *Do not love the world.*<sup>1399</sup> Is John so fickle that he proclaims things contradictory to himself?

Let this impiety begone, that John, who spoke in the Holy Spirit, is said to say things repugnant to himself. He understands the difference between ‘made’ and ‘born’ right away in the very beginning of his Gospel, just as was set forth above when this [point] was drawn out from that chapter.<sup>1400</sup> And for that same reason he understands him not as something made, whom he says was born from the Father, because he would not uniquely write this if he wished us to understand that this which was born from the Father was something made, knowing that many things are made from nothing. But in writing it uniquely, he wrote it concerning the true Son alone, saying that he was born from the Father, because he alone truly was born from the Father but all the rest were made as though by a crafter.

Do not do violence to the divine sayings. Why do you insert something that he does not say? Why do you teach what he did not teach? If you are a Christian, and if for you John is a true teacher, believe what he taught. From the Father, he says, he was born. If you should believe this, you love the Father, and by loving the Father, you love the Son, who was born from him. But if you should not believe that he was born from the Father, you neither love the Father nor him who was born from him. Furthermore, you do not love in this way: when you deny against the Father that there exists that which is the Father’s, that is, to generate, and you deny against the Son that there exists that which is the Son’s, that is, to be born. And hear now what sort of name the blessed John puts on

---

<sup>1399</sup> 1 John 2:15.

<sup>1400</sup> §3-4.

you, saying, *This man is antichrist, who denies the Father and the Son.*<sup>1401</sup> Indeed, you falsely put the surname of Christian onto yourself, but you are termed antichrist by the truth-telling John as your sect deserves.<sup>1402</sup> I am lying if you do not understand a ‘creator’ in the word ‘Father,’ if you do not assert a ‘created being’ in the name ‘Son.’ John calls them ‘Father’ and ‘Son,’ and you in these names interpret ‘creator’ and ‘created being.’ Thus you are deservedly termed antichrist, you who deny the Father and Son under your impious interpretation.

26 (II, 11). But listen still, o whoever you are, you who are insolent and obstinate against the Son and you who pride yourself concerning the person of the Father, and understand: you cannot have the Father if you do not also acknowledge the Son. The same John follows: *He who denies the Son also does not have the Father: he who acknowledges the Son has both the Son and the Father.*<sup>1403</sup> You see where John places these names, so that nothing is understood other than that which is in the nature of the names. And moreover, if the forehead of your shamelessness can still sustain the blows of the stones, and if the obstinacy of your stubbornness is such that when you hear ‘Father and Son’ you do not, nevertheless, believe in the Father truly nor in the Son truly, look: the same John who was beloved by God,<sup>1404</sup> returning recompense for the Lord’s love, severely strikes with a stronger stone here not so much the brow, but that very serpentine head of yours, when he writes at the end of his letter, *We know that the Son of God has come*, and was incarnated for us, and suffered, and rising from the dead he received us,

---

<sup>1401</sup> 1 John 2:22. Cf. Ambr. *De fide* 2.15.135.

<sup>1402</sup> Cf. John 19:35. Faustinus here uses the word *secta* rather than *haeresis*.

<sup>1403</sup> 1 John 2:23. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.42.

<sup>1404</sup> Cf. John 19:25, 21:20.



*and he gave to us good understanding, so that we might know that he is true and that we might be in that true Son of his, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life and our resurrection in him.*<sup>1405</sup>

It cannot be explained how many stones and rocks of sayings against you he has gathered under this one testimony. *We know*, he says, *that the Son of God has come*. You have one confession concerning the Son, and a little later after the holy mysteries of the incarnation and his passion and the resurrection, which he surely worked in himself for us, he follows up, saying, *and he gave to us good understanding*. Without a doubt, since the giver himself is good, he gives good understanding. We do not understand impiously, if we were to say that this good understanding is the Holy Spirit, who is also called the Spirit of understanding,<sup>1406</sup> in whom we know the truth itself. Without the Holy Spirit, the truth cannot be understood, for you have the testimony in the Gospel when the Lord also promises the Holy Spirit, and says about him that *He shall bring forth testimony of me*.<sup>1407</sup> Surely in the apostles or in any of those praising him, he was giving understanding to them as the Spirit of understanding to know the truth. Whence even the apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, *But we do not receive the spirit of this world, but the Spirit who is from God, so that we understand what things are given to us*

---

<sup>1405</sup> 1 John 5:20. The uncanonical interpolation from the *Vetus Latina* reads: *Scimus quia Filius Dei venit, et incarnatus est propter nos et passus est et resurgens de mortuis adumpsit nos...* Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.42, which has a similar phrase: *Quia scimus quod Filius Dei venit, et incarnatus est propter nos, et passus est, et resurrexit a mortuis assumpsit nos...*

<sup>1406</sup> Cf. Is 11:2.

<sup>1407</sup> John 15:26.

by God.<sup>1408</sup> Thus he gave good understanding, that is, the Holy Spirit, so that we might know the truth itself.<sup>1409</sup>

27 (II, 12). Still, if you do not understand from the many sayings brought up above, direct your mind to how all the suggestions of your impious interpretation are excluded by what follows: *So that we might be*, he says, *in that true Son of his, Jesus Christ.*<sup>1410</sup> And still he solidifies the pious faith more fully, saying *This is the true God.*<sup>1411</sup> And he was not yet silent, but heaps and piles up more, so that your impious notion, trusting in sophistic arguments, is overwhelmed. For subsequently he says, *and eternal life and our resurrection in him.*<sup>1412</sup> Where now are those impious sophistries of yours, which you learned from the teaching of your bishop Aristotle,<sup>1413</sup> saying, ‘He is the Son, but he is not the true Son; he is God, but he is not the true God’? Look, in one testimony the true name of the Son is expressed in so many ways, rather since he is also the true God. For how is he not the true God who is the true Son?

Indeed, since not only is the true God proven from the name of the true Son, but even through this: he is eternal life. For eternal life has neither a beginning nor an end. Thus the true God is Christ, having neither a beginning nor an end, existing himself as eternal life, which is without beginning and end. But even when he is our resurrection the

---

<sup>1408</sup> 1 Cor 2:12.

<sup>1409</sup> Cf. 1 John 5:20.

<sup>1410</sup> 1 John 5:20. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.43.

<sup>1411</sup> 1 John 5:20.

<sup>1412</sup> 1 John 5:20. Faustinus cleverly breaks this passage into several parts so that he might in turn heap and pile it up as a nice piece of sophistry.

<sup>1413</sup> I.e., the Arians rely on classical philosophy. Faustinus was surely well educated but in none of his writings makes direct reference to any classical authors.

power of true divinity in him is recognized, since he excludes death through the virtue<sup>1414</sup> of his resurrection by the example of his own human self which he assumed, in which he was also worthy of being born from a virgin, in which we too now have been resurrected. And each of us is going to have a special particular resurrection according to the merit of our true faith and life, whether to comfort or to the burning. See, wretch, lest you still do not believe that he is the true Son, and lest you begin to have a resurrection to perpetual punishment in Hell, in the outer shadows where there is the weeping of eyes and the gnashing of teeth<sup>1415</sup> – if, moreover, something still more foul does not await those who are impious against the Son.

28 (II, 13). This is enough, in my opinion, though it was proven by very few testimonies that he is the true Son of God, born from the Father, not made from nothing. But thus far, I ask, offer up your tireless patience so that we may prove this very thing from just one attestation of the Old Testament. You, heretic, say that the Son was made from nothing, though you read this nowhere. You deny that which is written, that he was born from the Father.<sup>1416</sup> Tell me whose words these are: *From the womb I have begotten you before the morning star.*<sup>1417</sup> If you are unsure, look back to the beginning of his psalm, and read what is written: *The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I place your enemies as a footstool for your feet.*<sup>1418</sup> The Savior himself used this testimony when he wished that he be believed to be the Lord, speaking to those who reckoned that he was born only as a man, from the seed of David, and not also as God, as

---

<sup>1414</sup> The Latin term *virtus* here has added connotations of ‘power’ or ‘miracle.’

<sup>1415</sup> Matt 8:12.

<sup>1416</sup> Cf 1 John 5:1.

<sup>1417</sup> Ps 109:3 (LXX). Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 6.16; Ambr. *De fide* 1.14.89.

<sup>1418</sup> Ps 109:1 (LXX).

the Son of God.<sup>1419</sup> But Paul the apostle, too, believing in this very thing that the Holy Spirit said through David long ago and that the Savior later set forth, says in his letter: *To whom, however, of the angels did he ever say, Sit at my right hand?*,<sup>1420</sup> explaining that none of the angels is of such a quality as the Son is. For all the angels were made, but the Son alone was born, to whom he also says, *Sit at my right hand*, since he alone is also the *only-begotten Son, who is in his Father's bosom*. However, an exposition of the whole psalm is not necessary right now, but only that one which was to be proven, that the Lord, the Father, says to my Lord, the Son, *Sit at my right hand*, so that none other than the Father is believed to have said this too which is said in the following: *From the womb I have begotten you before the morning star*.<sup>1421</sup> Is it still not proven by this most truthful testimony that the impious statement of those who say that God made the Son from nothing is buried? For how do you get 'from nothing' when the Father himself cries, *From the womb I have begotten you before the morning star?* And see to it that you do not reckon that we think that God exists as a composition of limbs or parts. Let this impiety begone. For God, whatever that is, is simple. He is all the same in his substance, not part and part, not limb and limb, but as we said, something simple (I know not what), which is whole and perfect and inestimable, but also inexplicable. Thus although he does not exist with limbs or parts, nevertheless the divine scripture, when it wishes to convey to us the true understanding of God as the fabricator, speaks with these things that we know, saying the heavens (or whatever is something created) are the works of his

---

<sup>1419</sup> Cf. Matt 22:41-46.

<sup>1420</sup> Heb 1:13.

<sup>1421</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 12.8-12; Ambr. *De fide* 4.8.88.

hands,<sup>1422</sup> since among men it is truly and rightly understood that work, or fabrication, is that which is effected by hands; finally, when something is seen to be artfully fabricated, it refers to the hands of the maker. And similarly, again, among us, when we wish to designate the nature of a son, we make mention of a womb, for no one who is a true son is not born from a womb. And God, thus wishing to demonstrate that the Son was born from him, said that he was begotten from a womb, lest you, heretic, should falsely allege that he was born from nothing. But just as when God is said to have made something with his hands, this should be understood as worthy for God, so too also when he has begotten from a womb should we hold the opinion that it is nothing else than worthy for God. But that certainly must be confessed, that he is truly a crafter in what is signified by the work of his hands, and he is truly the Father in what is signified by the begetting of the womb, even if he himself has no limbs.

29 (II, 14). But since you are accustomed to say, o Arian, ‘In God ‘to make’ is the same thing as ‘to beget,’ I should also take this opportunity to refute this perversity of yours on the present occasion.<sup>1423</sup> Certainly the works of hands are many, but there is only one only-begotten Son of the womb; thus ‘to make’ is not the same thing as ‘to beget.’ And all things indeed are made through the Word and in his wisdom,<sup>1424</sup> but the Word, or Wisdom, were not made by anything but were born from God; whence ‘to make’ is not the same thing as ‘to beget.’ For unless there were a distinction between making and begetting, nothing would prohibit him from saying ‘My hands begat you’ and

---

<sup>1422</sup> Cf. Ps 101:25 (LXX).

<sup>1423</sup> Cf. Ar. *Ad Eus.* 5; Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.58.

<sup>1424</sup> Cf. John 1:3, Ps 103:24 (LXX).

‘The heavens are the works of my womb.’ But just as the wording carries a great distinction, so too do the matters that the wording defines. *From the womb* – he says – *I have begotten you before the morning star.*<sup>1425</sup> Moreover, the Father says this to the Son, not because the Son did not know it, but in order that we might learn for ourselves the proper place of the Father in respect to the Son, or of the Son in respect to the Father. For this same reason it is thus written, just as the only-begotten Son himself, existing as Wisdom, says, *But before all the hills, he begat me.*<sup>1426</sup> Whence even in this very place he is said to have been begotten before the morning star. The phrase ‘morning star’ signifies every more luminous created thing, wherever it is, whence when he is said to be begotten from the womb before the morning star, this exact thing is taught, that he was truly born from the Father, and not made, because while he says *before the morning star* he signifies ‘before every created being,’ according to which it was written, *And he is prior to all.*<sup>1427</sup>

30 (III, 1). That the Son of God is omnipotent and immutable, and that there is one omnipotence of the Father and the Son, just as there is one deity; and on the sacred mystery of the incarnation of the Son, or rather of the lifting of man by him.

Let us strike yet another blasphemy of theirs, in which, as you write, they say that the Son is not omnipotent.<sup>1428</sup> And I will do this briefly, lest by going on too long I make reading a chore. They say that in some way he is not omnipotent, through whom, as they themselves also admit, all things were made. Let them provide one work of the Father that the Son did not do as well, so that they might prove that the Son is not omnipotent.

---

<sup>1425</sup> Ps 109:3 (LXX).

<sup>1426</sup> Prov 8:25.

<sup>1427</sup> Col 1:17. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 11.8.

<sup>1428</sup> Cf. Ambr. *De fide* 1.5.19.

But since there is no such work that does not exist as the Father's and the Son's, without a doubt the Son is also omnipotent, making whatever the omnipotent Father makes. It is enough if we also prove this very thing with divine testimonies.<sup>1429</sup> In the Prophet Zachariah, we read, *O, o, flee from the north, the Lord says, since I shall collect you from the four winds of heaven; in Zion you will be made safe again, you who live in the daughter of Babylon, since the omnipotent Lord says these things: after the honor, he sent me above the nations which despoiled you, since he who touches you is just like one who touches the pupil of his own eye; since lo, I bear my hand over them, and they will be spoils, who despoiled you, and you will know that the omnipotent Lord sent me.*<sup>1430</sup> If you should turn to this chapter, you would find that the omnipotent Son was sent by the omnipotent Father, so that he might come to the help of those placed in captivity. For consider how the prophet says, *The omnipotent Lord says these things*; and let us hear (with the prophet's report) that he says the Lord is omnipotent: *After the honor*, he says, *he sent me above the nations*. Without a doubt it is the Son whom he says was sent after the honor above the nations, whom the prophet says is the omnipotent Lord. This one, then, the Son, existing as the omnipotent Lord, says in his last testimony, *and you will know that the omnipotent Lord sent me*. Thus the omnipotent Son, as was said above, was

---

<sup>1429</sup> Cf. Ambr. *De fide* 2.4.35-36.

<sup>1430</sup> Zech 2:6-9 (LXX). The Septuagint passage differs quite significantly from the modern text of Zechariah. In the Vulgate, this runs *o o fugite de terra aquilonis dicit Dominus quoniam in quattuor ventos caeli dispersi vos dicit Dominus, o Sion fuge quae habitas apud filiam Babylonis, quia haec dicit Dominus exercituum post gloriam misit me ad gentes quae spoliaverunt vos qui enim tetigerit vos tangit pupillam oculi eius quia ecce ego levo manum meam super eos et erunt praedae his qui serviebant sibi et cognoscetis quia Dominus exercituum misit me* which the NRSV renders, "Up, up! Flee from the land of the north, says the Lord; for I have spread you abroad like the four winds of heaven, says the Lord. Up! Escape to Zion, you that live with daughter Babylon. For thus said the Lord of hosts (after his glory sent me) regarding the nations that plundered you: Truly, one who touches you touches the apple of my eye. See now, I am going to raise my hand against them, and they shall become plunder for their own slaves. Then you will know that the Lord of hosts has sent me."

sent by the omnipotent Father. But the apostle John also says these things in Revelation: *Amen, faithful witness, the beginning of the creation of God, who is and who was and who is to come, Lord God omnipotent.*<sup>1431</sup> But Solomon too, among other things he says concerning Wisdom, which is surely Christ the Son of God, says, *For it [sc. sapientia] is the splendor of eternal light, and the untarnished mirror of the majesty of God, and the image of his goodness: and although it is alone, it does all things.*<sup>1432</sup> How is it not omnipotent, since it can do all things? For even earlier, concerning the same Wisdom, he had said: *Having every power.*<sup>1433</sup> Therefore, it is omnipotent, having every power. But now Solomon himself says: *and remaining in itself, it restores all things.*<sup>1434</sup>

31 (III, 2). Recognize its omnipotence, when it restores all things; recognize too, meanwhile, that it is immutable, since it remains in itself, restoring all things. That is, although it restores all things, it itself nevertheless persists immutable, since it belongs only to the omnipotent God. But that the Son is truly immutable, and the crafter of all things, is also commended in these verses of Psalms: *In the beginning you established the earth, Lord, and the heavens are the works of your hands. They will perish, but you will remain, and all will grow old like clothing, and you will change them like a garment and they will be changed; but you yourself are, and your years shall not come to an end.*<sup>1435</sup>

---

<sup>1431</sup> Rev 3:14. Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 3.4.

<sup>1432</sup> Wis 7:26-27. There is a significant manuscript variant here that adds *dominus omnipotens nomen est ei item ipse est qui redimit illos dominus omnipotens nomen est illi item in machabaeorum nondum enim omnipotentis et Omnia possidentis dei iudicium*, that is, “The Lord omnipotent is the name for him who himself redeemed them. The omnipotent Lord is the name for him again in Maccabees: *for you have not yet escaped judgment of omnipotent God, who possesses all things.*” 2 Macc. 7.35 reads in the NRSV: “You have not yet escaped the judgment of the almighty, all-seeing God.”

<sup>1433</sup> Wis 7:23.

<sup>1434</sup> Wis 7:27. Cf. Greg. Elv. *De fide* 2.

<sup>1435</sup> Ps 102 (101): 26-28. Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 1.36.



Paul interpreted this as written about the Son of God, writing to the Hebrews.<sup>1436</sup> Thus you recognize in these verses that the Son is omnipotent, immutable, and the crafter of all things, just as he is also the fashioner of all things, which Solomon says: *For Wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me.*<sup>1437</sup> But lest you deduce that there are two omnipotences, you must beware: for although the Father is omnipotent and the Son is omnipotent, there is nevertheless only one omnipotence, just as also there is only one God, since the omnipotence of the Father and of the Son is the same, just as their deity is the same, as I expressed above (given my abilities and that my time was constrained).<sup>1438</sup> But now it will also be explained below from the testimony of the prophet Isaiah: *Egypt is exhausted, and the merchandise of the Ethiopians and the tall men of Saba will come over to you, and they will be your servants and follow after you bound by chains, and they will adore you and will pray to you, since God is in you, and there is no God besides you. For you are God, and we did not know, God, savior of Israel. All who oppose him will blush and be confounded, and they will go into confusion.*<sup>1439</sup> Pay attention to what is said about the Son: *and they will be your servants and follow after you bound by chains, and they will adore you and will pray to you.* Thus here also is the Son shown to be the true God, since he is adored. For adoration belongs to God, since indeed the apostle also teaches elsewhere that it is written about the Son of God: *And let all the angels of God adore him,*<sup>1440</sup> clearly because he is God and the Lord. But in the present testimony of Isaiah, just as he himself is God, thus too is God in him. For he says, *Since God is in you,*

---

<sup>1436</sup> Cf. Heb 1:10-12.

<sup>1437</sup> Wis 7:21. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.38; Ambr. *De fide* 1.3.20.

<sup>1438</sup> §7, 9, and esp. 12.

<sup>1439</sup> Is 45:14-16 (LXX). Cf. Greg. Elv. *De fide* 7.

<sup>1440</sup> Heb 1:6.

*and there is no God besides you.* And when he says that God is in God, he follows it up and says, *For you are God, and we did not know, God, savior of Israel.* Thus since God is in God, and since there is no God beyond him in whom God is, and since he is God, the savior of Israel, the unity of the divinity in the Father and the Son is demonstrated, and so too the unity of their omnipotence, and whatever at all there is of divine substance. In this alone does the Son differ from the Father, that the one is the Father and the other is the Son; that is, because the one begat and the one was born.<sup>1441</sup> However, nor because he was born does he have anything less than what is in God the Father, existing *as the image of the invisible God,*<sup>1442</sup> and *the splendor of his glory and the character of his substance.*<sup>1443</sup> They who do not believe this about the Son of God will suffer the sentence of Isaiah, who says: *All who oppose him will blush and be confounded, and they will go into confusion.* But Jeremiah too describes the deity of the Son, saying, *This is our God, and none shall be considered other than him. He has found every path of knowledge and gave it to his servant Jacob and to his beloved Israel. After these things he was seen on earth and conversed with men.*<sup>1444</sup> Certainly it was not God the Father, but the Son, made into a man, who was seen on earth and who conversed with men, working the nature of man into himself without sin for our salvation, about whom we also read, *And the Word was made flesh and also lived among us; and we saw his glory, the glory just as of the only-begotten of the Father.*<sup>1445</sup>

---

<sup>1441</sup> Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 3.11.

<sup>1442</sup> Col 1:15.

<sup>1443</sup> Heb 1:3.

<sup>1444</sup> Bar 3:36-38. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 4.42; Greg. Elv. *De fide* 7; Ambr. *De fide* 1.3.28.

<sup>1445</sup> John 1:14.

32 (III, 3). If the Word was thus made flesh and lived among us, with us and born from a virgin as God, how now, heretic, does it profit you to ignore the weaknesses of the flesh that he assumed, if you describe the passions of the human soul (which he had taken along with the flesh) as useful stirrings within us, since it stands that he, according to that which is God and the Son of God, is in all things incapable of passion just like the Father?<sup>1446</sup> For on this account, we also set out those things that pertain to his deity, so that now, if any lowness or weakness is attributed to Christ, one does not believe in a violation of his deity but rather the nature of man that he took up, and the accomplishment of the instruction that he handed over is proven. For it is meaningless to have wished that he were born a man (though from a virgin, nevertheless a man), but not to point out the weak nature of man in him. It is meaningless that he should give commands by which men should live, and he himself now, since he was once worthy to be a man, should go about without observing these commands. If he, made a man, did not wish to take on the weakness of man, who would believe that he had been made a man from the motherly source of our own origin (though without the embrace of a man)? And especially since today there is no shortage of people who deny that he bore our bodily nature, even after he took on the weaknesses of the flesh, even if he, made a man, had not observed the instruction that he had come to teach, he would not have given a good example of teaching. For what student would attempt to be observant of what the teacher himself (made as a man) is not observant of, since today whoever is observant is supported by his [Christ's] example so that he is observant? You see that he also ought to

---

<sup>1446</sup> Cf. Ambr. *De inc. dom. sacr.* 5.39.

suffer weaknesses, so that it might be proven that he was born a man, and made a man to serve whatever he had taught, so that he might invite others, or rather, however, I should say, so that he might assist others. For now our flesh has learned to be supported in his flesh. For if he had not wished to suffer the weaknesses of man, why was he born into humanity from a virgin? And if he did not wish to observe his commands, since he is the Lord, why did he also take up the form of a servant, which is obedient and subject to commands? And yet, this is the sacred mystery of man taken up by God: that which was not observed by Adam through disobedience was observed by the man Christ through obedience. The apostle Paul, among other things that he divinely discusses, asserts this very thing: *For just as many sinners are made through the disobedience of one man, so too are many made just through the heedfulness of one.*<sup>1447</sup> For just as many sinners are made through the contempt of a man, so too are many saved through the sacred mystery of the heedfulness of Christ, which he performed for the salutary teaching of man not through weakness but through the goodness of his deity.

33 (III, 4). Let us also look now to the sacred mystery of his passion. All Adam had sinned; all Adam had been expelled from paradise; he who had come to save all ought to have taken all of what was expelled.<sup>1448</sup> However, he did not appear to have taken into himself all of what was expelled, except that he had taken himself up in the substance of his flesh and of his soul. For all man is this in his nature. But if he took on those weaknesses of his flesh and soul, though without the offense of the sins, so that he might be reckoned truly to have taken up no other substance than that of the flesh and

---

<sup>1447</sup> Rom 5:19.

<sup>1448</sup> Cf. Ps.-Ath. *C. Apoll.* 1.17; Or. *Dial. Her.* 6; Hil. *De Trin.* 10.20; Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 10.7, 30.5.

soul, then this can be proven: since he frees the humanity in himself from weaknesses and passions, we too might believe that those who follow in accordance with his footsteps are freed.<sup>1449</sup> But let the apostle, teacher of the gentiles, be the defender of this interpretation, writing vigorously and mystically: *For just as all die in Adam, so too are all revived in Christ.*<sup>1450</sup> But Isaiah described the nature of man taken up in him better: *Lord, who has believed our message? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? We have announced in his presence that he is like a boy, like a root in the dry earth. And there is neither beauty for him nor a charming appearance, and we saw him, and he had neither beauty nor elegance. But his look is without charm, lacking more so than the rest of men. A man pressed by affliction, and fully knowing weakness, since his face was turned away. He was unappreciated and was not esteemed. He carries our sins and grieves for us, and we judged him to be in pain and in affliction and in misfortune. But he was wounded on account of our iniquities and was weakened on account of our sins. The instruction of our peace was on him; by his affliction we are healed. We all stray like sheep; man strayed from his path, and the Lord handed him over for his sins. And that one, on account of what was wickedly asserted, did not open his mouth. Just like a sheep he was led to the slaughter, and just like a lamb before one who shears it he did not open his mouth. In his humiliation, judgment was taken away. Who will narrate his generation, since his life is withdrawn from the world? He was led to death by the iniquities of my people, and I will*

---

<sup>1449</sup> In other words, Christ took the liability to sin but did not sin, serving as an example for the rest of mankind that while they are liable to sin, they need not do so.

<sup>1450</sup> 1 Cor 15:22.

*give the wicked for his grave and the rich for his death; since he did not commit an iniquity, neither did he speak some deceit with his mouth.*<sup>1451</sup>

34 (III, 5). This testimony is enough to prove that he carried in himself all the nature of man, nevertheless without his own sin, though he bore our sins. But lest he be believed to be only a man, he interjected and said: *Who will narrate his generation?*<sup>1452</sup> – that [generation], certainly, which is without beginning, in which he was generated from God the Father. And for this reason he says about it, *Who will narrate his generation?*, not as though saying something out of ignorance but as saying something inexplicable. For all who are catholic understand that he was born from God the Father, but indescribably so. And for this reason he says, *Who will narrate his generation?* Moreover, the Gospel refers to this generation, by which he was born from a virgin in the flesh, in describing his life as well.<sup>1453</sup> But the beginning of his divine generation, as we have said, cannot be discovered, just as his divinity cannot, which for him is one with the Father's. And for this reason he says, *Who will narrate his generation?* If, therefore, we accept this in the sacred mystery of faith, so that we believe that Christ is God and a man (God, indeed, in that he was born from God without a beginning, but a man, in that he was born from a virgin into our times), let us not misrepresent his divinity, since he performs things which pertain to men for our remedies, having taken in himself the nature of man. Thus his humanity must not be denied, since he exercises the natural power of his own divinity having taken the form of a servant in himself. Thus if he prays

---

<sup>1451</sup> Is 53:1-9 (LXX).

<sup>1452</sup> Is 53:8 (LXX). Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 2.9.

<sup>1453</sup> Cf. Luke 2.

to the Father and says that that he does nothing apart from him but what he sees the Father doing<sup>1454</sup> (as I will say nothing else for now), certainly, like a teacher, he imposes a limit on human pride, so that man might learn to instead defer to God, since the true Son also deferred. He did this even though he did not have his own reason for subjection, and also gave us a way of praying<sup>1455</sup> so that we do not ask that our will be done but the *will of the Father who is in heaven*.<sup>1456</sup> And therefore, so that he might fulfill what he taught,<sup>1457</sup> he says, *I have not come to do my will, but his will, who sent me*.<sup>1458</sup> But that he was made lesser, that he grows, that he develops, that he hungers, that he thirsts, that he works, that he cries, that he suffers, that he is sad, finally, that he dies<sup>1459</sup> – this should refer back to the nature of man that he took up, which he worked for the sacred mystery of our salvation in the understanding which was related above in the testimony of Isaiah. In this sacred mystery of faith, not only are those chapters resolved, about which you deemed worthy to ask me, but also all the questions which the impious heretics put together against the divinity of the Son.

35 (IV, 1). On that which the Son says: *The Father is greater than me*.<sup>1460</sup>

Accept now that these questions are resolved too, which you put forth from the other party as being stronger. The heretics say – you say – to depreciate the eternal and

---

<sup>1454</sup> Cf. Mark 1:35; Luke 22:41-42; John 5:19, 17:1.

<sup>1455</sup> Cf. Matt 6:9.

<sup>1456</sup> Matt 7:21; John 6:38.

<sup>1457</sup> Cf. Matt 23:3.

<sup>1458</sup> John 6:38.

<sup>1459</sup> For this list of attributes, cf. Luke 2:52, Matt 4:2, John 19:28, Luke 22:43, Luke 19:41, John 11:35, John 11:33, Matt 26:38, Matt 27:50.

<sup>1460</sup> John 14:28.

perfect deity of the Son in all ways: *The Father is greater than me.*<sup>1461</sup> But it must be asked: when did the Son say this? Was it not when that which was written was fulfilled in him: *You have made him a little lesser than the angels, you have crowned him with glory and honor?*<sup>1462</sup> Let the apostle Paul, who knew the third heaven, explain how he was made lesser: *Less than Paul – he says – we see Jesus made lesser than the angels on account of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor so that he might taste death by the grace of God for all.*<sup>1463</sup> For all, he says, not for himself. What wonder is it if he who tasted death for all was also made lesser for all? Though he tasted death for all, not for himself, because that one, made a man, who tasted death for all those placed in the condition of sin, was held liable by no sin of his own. And look how the most wise Paul concludes concerning him, because he was made lesser on account of the suffering of death and because he tasted death for all by the grace of God, following this with: *For it was fitting that he, on account of whom are all things and through whom are all things, with many sons being brought to glory, made perfect the leader of their salvation through his sufferings.*<sup>1464</sup> You see how beautiful or how comely the sacred mystery of our salvation is, in that it is revealed how the Son became lesser. How then do you cast this as a reproach to obfuscate his divinity, when it results in his glory?<sup>1465</sup> *The Father is greater than me;*<sup>1466</sup> then he says this after *The Word was made flesh and also lived among us.*<sup>1467</sup>

---

<sup>1461</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.6; Ambr. *De fide* 2.8.59.

<sup>1462</sup> Ps 8:5. Cf. Ambr. *De fide* 2.8.63.

<sup>1463</sup> Heb 2:9.

<sup>1464</sup> Heb 2:10.

<sup>1465</sup> There is a play on words throughout between *decor*, *decorus*, meaning ‘comely,’ and *decus*, *decorum*, meaning ‘glory.’

<sup>1466</sup> John 14:28.

<sup>1467</sup> John 1:14.



36 (IV, 2). And look, lest you think him changeable, as if he ceased to be the Word when he became flesh. But God, while always remaining the Word, was also made flesh as well. For even though he said *And the Word was made flesh*,<sup>1468</sup> he wished to speak more precisely lest anyone not believe that the flesh in him was true – since indeed it is not hard to find those who even after such precise wording say that he had an imaginary flesh. Moreover, so that it be clear that the Word was made flesh not by a changing of his divine substance but by the taking up of human flesh, turn to what follows: *And he lived among us*.<sup>1469</sup> The Word which lived among us in the flesh that it took up, then, was not interrupted by a change, for its habitation proves the constancy of the Word. For this reason I have introduced this, lest anyone believe that the Son of God is changeable when he reads, *And the Word was made flesh*. Thus the Son says *The Father is greater than me*<sup>1470</sup> after the Word was made flesh and undertook the duty of ministering: *For he comes not to be ministered but to minister*.<sup>1471</sup> *The Father is greater than me*. What do you say, o truth? How can you say that the Father is greater than you? Certainly the appearance of the Father is also the same for you, according to Moses,<sup>1472</sup> and the form is the same, according to the apostle Paul,<sup>1473</sup> who also taught me that you are *the splendor of glory and the imprinting of his substance*.<sup>1474</sup> But you yourself even taught this, saying *He who saw me, saw the Father*,<sup>1475</sup> and *I am in the Father and the*

---

<sup>1468</sup> John 1:14.

<sup>1469</sup> John 1:14. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 9.66, 10.26; Ambr. *De fide* 2.8.65, *De inc. dom. sacr.* 6.55.

<sup>1470</sup> John 14:28.

<sup>1471</sup> Matt 20:28.

<sup>1472</sup> Cf. Gen 1:26.

<sup>1473</sup> Cf. Phil 2:6.

<sup>1474</sup> Heb 1:3.

<sup>1475</sup> John 14:9.

*Father in me*<sup>1476</sup> and *I and the Father are one.*<sup>1477</sup> But also, whatever the Father does, you also do similarly; for your words are, *For whatever that one does, the Son also does these things similarly,*<sup>1478</sup> and *Just as the Father raises the dead and makes them live, so too does the Son make those live whom he wishes,*<sup>1479</sup> and *Let them honor the Son just as they honor the Father.*<sup>1480</sup> Thus since the appearance is the same for you, and the form the same and the substance the same, the unity of nature the same, the power the same, the freedom of will the same, the honor the same, so too is everything which is the Father's completely yours, because also everything which is yours is the Father's.<sup>1481</sup> How then do you say *The Father is greater than me*, since in all things that are of your deity, you are of such a kind and such a sort as the Father? Let the apostle Paul speak, in whom Christ spoke, according to that which he says: *Would you seek to test Christ who speaks in me?*<sup>1482</sup> What does the apostle say? *He who, though he was constituted in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as a boon.*<sup>1483</sup> Thus according to this, because he is in the form of God and because he is equal to God, the Father is not greater. And how the Father is greater the following demonstrates: *but diminished himself by taking the form of a servant.*<sup>1484</sup>

---

<sup>1476</sup> John 14:10.

<sup>1477</sup> John 10:30. Cf. Or. *Hom. Gen.* 1.13; Hil. *De Trin.* 7.16, 9.23, *C. Const.* 17; Ambr. *De fide* 2.8.69.

<sup>1478</sup> John 5:19.

<sup>1479</sup> John 5:21.

<sup>1480</sup> John 5:23.

<sup>1481</sup> These points have been made piecemeal throughout the *De Trinitate*; here they are finally summarized to provide evidence against what surely must have been one of the most popular passages for Arians to cite and one of the most difficult passages for Nicene Christians to explain.

<sup>1482</sup> 2 Cor 13:3.

<sup>1483</sup> Phil 2:6. This passage is more fully discussed immediately below in §37.

<sup>1484</sup> Phil 2:7. This passage is also more fully discussed immediately below in §37.

37 (IV, 3). Pay attention, lest you gather from this that there is also an interruption of his divinity here when you hear that he has diminished himself. For turn your mind to that which follows: *taking the form of a servant*.<sup>1485</sup> Thus it is shown that he who is said to have taken the form of a servant remained in his own state. But however much the divine state should remain and be constant, nevertheless he diminished himself, of course, through concealing his divinity, *taking the form of a servant, made in the likeness of men, and in his appearance having come like a man. He lowered himself, obedient up to death, even death on the cross*.<sup>1486</sup> Now so it is that if he says *The Father is greater than me*<sup>1487</sup> he does not contest the equality of their divinity but indicates the holiness of the low status that he took, in which he lowered himself, taking the form of a servant. Now so it is that if he says, *The Father who sent me commanded me as to what I should say and what I should speak*,<sup>1488</sup> and *I descended from heaven not that I might do my will, but the will of the my Father who sent me*,<sup>1489</sup> he shows that he lowered himself, taking the form of a servant, made in the likeness of men and in his appearance having come like a man. He lowered himself, obedient up to death. And moreover, what lessening of his divinity is there in this, if he does not speak arrogantly about himself so as to cut off the arrogance in men? I am a liar if the apostle Paul does not place this very testimony so that that he might provoke individuals to humility by the example of the Savior. Thus you will find this, if you attentively read that same letter which he writes to the Philippians. But even if the heretics do not wish that *The Father is greater than me* to be said about

---

<sup>1485</sup> Phil 2:7. Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.45, 9.14, 11.48.

<sup>1486</sup> Phil 2:7-8.

<sup>1487</sup> John 14:28.

<sup>1488</sup> John 12:49.

<sup>1489</sup> John 6:38.

the holy mystery of God lowering himself by accepting a servile form, let us also say that the Father is greater by the sacred mystery of his generation alone. For some catholics follow this pious interpretation, saying that the Father and the Son are of the same substance, and for this reason in respect to substance the one is not greater than the other.<sup>1490</sup> For just as God is the Father, so also is God the Son. For he begat nothing less from himself than he himself is; for existing as perfect, he begat what is perfect, and existing as complete he begat what is complete. Thus even if as God, the Son is equal to God, nevertheless as the Son, he is said to be less than the Father – that is, because the Son is from the Father, but the Father began the Son, and for this reason he did not say, God is greater than me, but instead, *The Father is greater than me*.

38 (V, 1). That which is read in the Acts of the Apostles: *Thus certainly all the house of Israel knows that God made him Lord and Christ, whom you have crucified*.<sup>1491</sup>

Among the remains of the matters of the heretics, you have even offered this, acting like someone from the opposing faction, so that the Son of God be clearly believed to be something made. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, with blessed Peter speaking: *Thus certainly all the house of Israel knows that God made him Lord and Christ, whom you have crucified*.<sup>1492</sup> But the resolution of this question is also obvious in accordance with the explanation above, in which we said that the Son of God was also made the son of man. Even if it is not possible that he suffer, since the Son of God exists as the Word and the Wisdom of God and because in accordance with this he is at all times incapable

---

<sup>1490</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.58; Hil. *De Trin.* 9.56.

<sup>1491</sup> Acts 2:36.

<sup>1492</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.58; Ambr. *De fide* 1.15.95. The Arian points – which Faustinus leaves unstated – are that the passage says “God *made* him Lord and Christ” and that by suffering, Christ showed that he was different than the Father, who cannot suffer.

of suffering, just as his Father is as well,<sup>1493</sup> nevertheless, in that he was made a man, born from the Virgin Mary, he is capable of suffering. Of course, he also underwent death, and death on the cross, remaining in himself always since God is inviolable, even when he is turned into a man and crucified. Thus God made this Jesus, who is in the flesh, Lord and Christ. For in that he is the only-begotten Son of God, who is the Word and the Wisdom of God, he is nothing created and he does not await promotion, clearly existing as the perfect God in all things, just as also his Father does. This Jesus, then, in the flesh, was made Christ, when that servile form which he took up from the sin of Adam was first freed. For Adam fell away from the Lord into servitude from committing a sin: *For everyone who commits a sin is a servant.*<sup>1494</sup> But the Savior recalled a much stronger, no, a much more incorruptible kingdom in adopting humanity, when he wiped away that very sin in it which had been the cause of abject servitude for Adam. But truly he was once more made the Lord when the people believing in him put themselves under his rule. For called forth by the urgings of the sacred scripture, which says *Serve the Lord in fear,*<sup>1495</sup> everyone who now knows the saving rule in Christ says: *Isn't my soul subject to God?*<sup>1496</sup> For to become his servant is the highest honor, like a certain nobility, towering over the world. For this reason, even the apostle writes on his own glory: *Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ.*<sup>1497</sup> You see how the Lord was made, when even that one, who had been his persecutor, confesses that he is his Lord as his highest glory.

---

<sup>1493</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.11-12; Ambr. *De fide* 1.15.95.

<sup>1494</sup> John 8:34.

<sup>1495</sup> Ps 2:11.

<sup>1496</sup> Ps 61:2 (LXX).

<sup>1497</sup> Rom 1:1.

39 (V, 2). But Jesus was made in the flesh not only as the Lord but also as Christ. Furthermore, the holy mysteries of the king and of the priest depend on the name of Christ. We read in the Old Testament that priests and kings among the Israelites were marked by being anointed with oil, and for this reason they were called *Christs*, for *Christ* is in Greek what is translated in Latin as *anointed* or *smeared*.<sup>1498</sup> But our Savior was truly made Christ in the flesh, existing as the true king and the true priest. The same one was both, lest anything in the Savior be considered lesser. And so, hear that he was made king when he says, *But I am set as king by him over his holy mountain, Zion*.<sup>1499</sup> Hear that he is also a priest from the testimony of the Father, who says, *You are a priest for eternity in the order of Melchizedek*.<sup>1500</sup> Aaron was made the first priest by law by the application of ointment, and he did not say “in the order of Aaron,” lest it be believed that it was possible that the priesthood of even the Savior was held by succession. For that priesthood which was Aaron’s was sustained by succession; but the priesthood of the Savior is not transferred by succession to another, because that priest remains perpetually in accordance with what was written: *You are a priest for eternity in the order of Melchizedek*. Thus the Savior is both king and priest in the flesh, but anointed not physically but spiritually. For those kings and priests among the Israelites, anointed physically by an anointing of oil, were kings and priests. No one was both, but each one of them was either a king or a priest. For perfection in all things and completeness belongs to Christ alone, who also came to fulfill the law. But although no individuals of

---

<sup>1498</sup> Cf. Ex 30:30, Lev 8:12, 1 Sam 10:1, 2 Sam 12:7. The words in question are the Greek *χριστός* and Latin *unctus* and *linitus*, respectively. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.46; Cyr. *Jer. Cat. Myst.* 10.

<sup>1499</sup> Ps 2:6. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.9.

<sup>1500</sup> Ps 110:4 (LXX).

them were both, they nevertheless were called christs, physically anointed with kingly or priestly oil. But the Savior, who is truly Christ, was anointed by the Holy Spirit, so that what was written about him might be fulfilled: *Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness, beyond your fellows.*<sup>1501</sup> For in this he was anointed more than those sharing his name, when he was anointed with the oil of gladness, by which nothing other than the Holy Spirit is meant.

40 (V, 3). We understand that this is true from the Savior himself. For when he had received and opened the book of Isaiah and had read, *The Spirit of the Lord is over me, because he has anointed me,*<sup>1502</sup> he said that the prophecy was then fulfilled in the ears of those listening. But Peter, leader of the apostles, also taught that the ointment, whence Christ is shown to be the Savior, is the Holy Spirit, [and] that this is also the power of God, when in the Acts of the Apostles he spoke to a most faithful and compassionate man who was then a centurion. For among other things, he says, *...beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John proclaimed, Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit and his power, went around doing miracles and great works, and freeing all who were possessed by the devil.*<sup>1503</sup> You see that even Peter said that this Jesus in the flesh was anointed by the Holy Spirit and his power. Thus even this Jesus in the flesh was truly made Christ, who was made king and priest for eternity by the anointing of the Holy Spirit. But I have pursued these things so that it be clearly apparent not that Jesus, Son of God, was crucified or made Lord and Christ as the Word

---

<sup>1501</sup> Ps 44:8 (LXX). Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.47; Cyr. *Jer. Cat. Myst.* 3.

<sup>1502</sup> Is 61:1; Jesus reads the passage aloud at Lk 4:16-20.

<sup>1503</sup> Acts 10:37-38. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.12.

and the Wisdom of God, but rather in the form which he took from Mary, though we say that in the suffering of the humanity he took up, the only-begotten Son of God suffered. Not because that only-begotten Son, by which he is the Word and the Wisdom of God, truly suffered, but because whatever injury and suffering was brought against his assumed humanity for some reason refers entirely to that only-begotten God who is incapable of suffering. For this reason even the apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, *For if they had understood – namely ‘the rulers of this age’ – they never would have crucified the Lord of majesty.*<sup>1504</sup> If these things are obvious, it is clear why it is written, *Thus certainly all the house of Israel knows that God made him – ‘Jesus,’ namely – Lord and Christ, whom you have crucified,*<sup>1505</sup> whom even Peter named a man above, saying, *Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man proven by God among you by these powers and portents and signs.*<sup>1506</sup> Of course, Paul also calls this Jesus Christ a man, writing to Timothy, *There is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ.*<sup>1507</sup> He [Christ] also said in the Gospel, *Now, then, you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth.*<sup>1508</sup>

41 (V, 4). Nor do we speak on behalf of the impious Photinus, who wishes for the man to be bare, without the incarnation of God the Word. But we do declaim against the antichrist Arius, who wishes that the only-begotten Son, who is the Word and the Wisdom of God, be crucified as God and not as a man, and that as such he was made

---

<sup>1504</sup> 1 Cor 2:8.

<sup>1505</sup> Acts 2:36.

<sup>1506</sup> Acts 2:22.

<sup>1507</sup> 1 Tim 2:5. Cf. Ambr. *De fide* 3.2.8.

<sup>1508</sup> John 8:40.



Lord and Christ.<sup>1509</sup> But even if they fight with the hardest obstinacy, saying that it is written about God the Word that God made him both Lord and Christ, we also, with the confidence of truth, are not thus afraid lest by chance that someone believe through what is written that the Word of God is a created being. For imagine the Word of God was made Lord and Christ; how does this injure his substance, by which he is always the Word of God? For consider that he did not say that the substance of the Word of God was made, but that this very Word itself, which is always the Son of God, was made Lord and Christ. For ‘this which did not exist at all, was made’ and ‘this which did exist, was in some respect made’ are not the same thing.<sup>1510</sup> For even God sometimes became helper and protector; nevertheless, it must not be believed that he, even though this is God, was made because he was made helper and protector. For even Moses, after he sensed the divine aid and protection from God who both helped and protected him against Pharaoh, said, *He is made my helper and protector for salvation.*<sup>1511</sup> And you will find many similar testimonies that I, lest I go on much more here, am passing over. If, then, when God is a helper and protector, it should not be believed because this is God that God is made, but rather this, that he is worthy to be helper and protector. How then is it that we should reckon that the substance of the Word of God is made, when they say the Word of God was made Lord and Christ? Because we read *And the Word was made flesh,*<sup>1512</sup> must we really believe that the Word was also made? But it is most obviously expressed not so

---

<sup>1509</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 7.7; Ambr. *De fide* 1.1.6.

<sup>1510</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.45.

<sup>1511</sup> Ex 18:4.

<sup>1512</sup> John 1:14.

much that the Word which *was in the beginning with God*<sup>1513</sup> was made, but rather that the very Word, which always existed, was afterwards made flesh, so that the creation be not so much in the Word as in that which was made flesh. Thus too then when the Word of God is said to have been made Lord and Christ, it must be understood not so much that the substance of the Word of God was made, but that this very Word, which was always God, was made Lord and Christ.

42 (V, 5). Moreover, he is made the Lord of those who deliver themselves to him with a resolution of serving him. And give me indulgence, most blessed Matthew, if I say that Christ, God, was not yet Lord to you while you still served in the customs house.<sup>1514</sup> But he was first made Lord to all the apostles at the time when, with all of their things left behind, they preferred to serve him. He was made Lord of all the gentiles at the time when, with the empty superstition of idols left behind, those same gentiles handed themselves over to his kingdom. For to whatever degree anyone is a servant of sin or Mammon, to such a degree is he incapable of being a servant of God.<sup>1515</sup> Therefore, whenever he should renounce sin and Mammon, making justice and spitting on the desire to possess, then Jesus is made his Lord. By this same reasoning, he is understood to be made Christ as well – if indeed, as was said above, the kings and priests shall be deemed christs by the term. Thus the Savior was made the king of those who are no longer held bound by the kingdom of death, in whose mortal body son has ceased to reign, after they have learned in the divine teachings with the apostles instructing: *Thus do not let sin*

---

<sup>1513</sup> John 1:3.

<sup>1514</sup> Cf. Mt 9:9, Mk 2:14.

<sup>1515</sup> Cf. John 8:34, Mt 6:24.

*reign in your mortal body.*<sup>1516</sup> But even when he performs the office of the priest on our behalf, he is truly made Christ. He always stands particularly as a defender and advocate on our behalf, as an intercessor with the Father, too, as the only most pure priest, so that, with disgrace of our fault atoned for, we might be saved by his divine propitiation. In these matters, therefore, that Jesus was made both Christ and Lord, it is not so much that anything was brought in to his divine substance as it is that he was provided for us, to whom the power of his kingdom and priesthood and lordship was brought like a saving gift. For it does not seem absurd if you also understand this similarly, when he says, *But I am set as king by him over his holy mountain, Zion.*<sup>1517</sup> For even if he is said to have been set as king, nevertheless when there is added *over his holy mountain, Zion*, it shows that he is not speaking about that kingdom of his that he also had before he was set as king *over his holy mountain, Zion*. For he is king before all the ages of ages, holding in his power every created being that he formed. From this he is also proven omnipotent, because he is able to preserve all things that are made.

43 (VI, 1). On that which Solomon says: *The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works.*<sup>1518</sup>

Let us now touch upon that question that you added among the others in the end. *The Lord* – he says – *created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*. The heretic says: You see that Wisdom is a created thing, which certainly, as the apostle Paul explains, is Christ.<sup>1519</sup> Thus Christ – he says – who is Wisdom, is not the true Son, but

---

<sup>1516</sup> Rom 6:12.

<sup>1517</sup> Ps 2:6. Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 2.52.

<sup>1518</sup> Prov 8:22.

<sup>1519</sup> Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 2.1; Hil. *De Trin.* 12.35.

exists as a created being and was made the Son by adoption. This is the poison of the Arians. But o, how blind the impiety is in this to see that which is pious! Now already, because (as is written) *they hate the Wisdom and do not accept the Word of God*,<sup>1520</sup> they see nothing in Wisdom of the most genuine beauty – just as there is no truthful vision to bleary eyes, since indeed their sight reports things other than what is in the truth of the matters. But this is also like one who is corrupted by the bitterness of his own gall, pouring forth its own flavor, so that if he tastes sweet honey, he denigrates the pungent sweetness of the honey, not recognizing the evil of his own bitterness.<sup>1521</sup> But, o wretched heretic, what can you see of the true light when you are blind or walking in the paths of shadows, devising all the things that belong to impiety? Let that spiritual man cry out with the proven sweetness of the divine feast, who invites you to *Taste and see how sweet the Lord is*.<sup>1522</sup> But for you, if you taste, nothing sweet is perceived in the Lord, because, as is written, *there is a poisonous snake on your lips, because your mouth is filled with cursing and bitterness*.<sup>1523</sup>

Finally, Solomon himself also declared endless things about the Wisdom of God, and has described it so divinely that nothing else might be believed about it other than that which is believed about the nature of God. In all these matters, the heretic, blind to this, believes that he alone sees this, by which he proves that it is a created being. But it is written – he says – *The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*. But

---

<sup>1520</sup> Cf. Bar 3, particularly 3:10-13 and 3:20.

<sup>1521</sup> There is a play on words here, as *amaritudo* and *amarus* generally mean ‘bitterness’ and ‘bitter,’ often associated with gall, or ‘sourness’ and ‘sour,’ but can also more generally reflect ‘pungency’ and ‘pungent.’ Thus Faustinus describes the *amaritudino*, or ‘bitterness,’ of the bile, and the *amaram dulcedinem* of the honey, its ‘bitter sweetness’ or, as translated, its ‘pungent sweetness.’

<sup>1522</sup> Ps 33:9 (LXX).

<sup>1523</sup> Ps 13:3 (LXX).

we will not go on long, nor will we bring out things from the other books of Solomon on behalf of the eternal Wisdom of God. It is enough for now if from this same place, from which he brought out this testimony, the opposite party is overcome.

44 (VI, 2). You say, heretic, that it is written, *The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*.<sup>1524</sup> But consider that this very Wisdom nevertheless says, *But before all the hills, he begat me*. How then can this Wisdom, in this exact same place, say that it is both a created being and begotten? And first things first – let us see what is first, whether it is that which was begotten or that which was created. But although it first said *The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*, nevertheless, lest you reckon that it is something created, it runs back to what was first, saying next, *But before all the hills, he begat me*.<sup>1525</sup> Look, lest you reckon that the begetting was later, since it established that it was created earlier. For even if in the order of the verses it first put that it was created, but then that it was begotten, the meaning nevertheless indicates this: that it was first begotten, rather than created. Thus the meaning of Wisdom speaking is this:

*The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*, but lest anyone reckon me to be a created being because of this, or to have begun first at the time when he created me as the beginning of his ways for his works, I will follow up and say, *But before all the hills, he begat me*, so that you will know that I was begotten first rather than created.

---

<sup>1524</sup> Prov 8:22.

<sup>1525</sup> Prov 8:25. Cf. Ath. C. Ar. 2.2, 2.44, 2.60.

For when it says, *But before all the hills, he begat me*, he makes that which was created that which was later, so that that which was begotten precedes and is earlier. If, then, it was thus created in such a way that it was begotten first, the meaning of impiety is shut out – a meaning that had said that Wisdom was created so that it be believed that Wisdom first existed at the moment when it relates that it was created by the Lord as the beginning of his ways for his works. Look, the meaning also makes it obvious that before it was created, it existed as Wisdom, since surely that which was begotten is first rather than that which was created.

45 (VI, 3). But this catholic meaning shall be trusted more if these words, as much as is possible for us, are also discussed, by which Wisdom refers to itself as either only-begotten or created. *The Lord* – it says – *created me as the beginning of his ways for his works*.<sup>1526</sup> Consider how when he said *The Lord created me* he was not silent, lest he truly be reckoned a created being, but follows up, explaining why he was created and for what reason he was created. For it says *He created me as the beginning of his ways* and when there follows *for his works*, it is clear that it also shows the reasons why it was created as the beginning of the ways of the Lord. Not then was Wisdom created so that it would exist, as if it were something that did not exist, but although it was always existent, it was then created in its dispensation as the beginning of the ways of the Lord, and was created for the works of the Lord.<sup>1527</sup> Thus Wisdom was created as the beginning of the ways of the Lord, and was created for the works of the Lord, but Wisdom was not created because it did not exist before this. But truly when it says that it was begotten before all

---

<sup>1526</sup> Prov 8:22.

<sup>1527</sup> Cf. Orig.(?) *In Prov.* 8.22; Hil. *De Trin.* 12.45; Greg. Elv. *De fide* 2; Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.45.

the hills, it does not say that it was begotten on account of some matter. Instead, existing as the eternal progeny of the Father, it says that it was created for certain reasons – that is, as the beginning of the ways of the Lord and for the works of the Lord. Thus even from this it is clear that Wisdom is not a created being, which was created for something, that is, for the works of the Lord, since it itself was begotten, not for works, but existing from the Father as his eternal progeny, as we said.

46 (VI, 4). But this should also be considered: it is one thing to say that Wisdom is created and another to say that it is a created being. For however much one reads that Wisdom is created, one nevertheless nowhere reads that it is a created being. For not everything that is created should also then be called a created being, though every created being is created – just as not everything that is made should then be asserted to be something manufactured, though everything manufactured was made. If this seems obscure, I will clear things up with an example. We read someone being grateful and saying to God, *But I will sing your virtue and I will exalt your mercy in the morning, because you are made my guardian and my refuge in the day of my distress.*<sup>1528</sup> Look – God is made a guardian and a refuge, but God is not something manufactured. And this is what I said: not everything that is made should then be called something manufactured. For God, who always exists, not existing as something manufactured, was made a guardian and refuge for a man in a day of distress, so that which was made a guardian and refuge for a man in a day of distress might seem to have referred to that which was made. But not because he was made a guardian and refuge for a man should God also be

---

<sup>1528</sup> Ps 58:17 (LXX).

believed to be something manufactured, as his divine substance is eternal. Likewise too his Wisdom, if it is called ‘created,’ is nevertheless not a created being, as it always exists. But although it always exists, it is created for something so that it might be beneficial, not so that it might be called a created being, like something made which did not exist. For the Wisdom of God was inseparable from God, and this same one, existing as the eternal progeny of God, was created as the beginning of the ways of the Lord.

47 (VI, 5). But I will unfold this still more plainly. Certainly the Wisdom of God is that which is also written about as being the Word of God, as was shown in the preceding passages.<sup>1529</sup> And, because it is written about the Word of God *And the Word was made flesh*,<sup>1530</sup> should we really now assert that the Word is also something manufactured, as though it first began to exist at the time when it was made flesh? Ah, good – because it was most plainly demonstrated that all things are made through the Word, and in most recent times this very Word was made flesh. The Word of God is not, therefore, a manufactured thing, though it is said to be made flesh; thus too the Wisdom, although it is said to be created as the beginning of the ways of the Lord and for his works, is nevertheless not a created being. Instead, it stands that it existed before every created being, since indeed all things are made in Wisdom.<sup>1531</sup> I add this, too, that not everything that is said to be created should be understood as though it were made in regards to its substance. Finally, a certain man, seeing that his heart was stained with a certain uncleanness, poured out a prayer to the Lord, saying, *Create a clean heart within*

---

<sup>1529</sup> §2. Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.62; Ambr. *De fide* 3.5.35.

<sup>1530</sup> John 1:14.

<sup>1531</sup> Cf. Ps 103:24 (LXX).



*me, God.*<sup>1532</sup> Surely he was not praying that the substance of a heart be made within him, but that this very heart existing within him, which was unclean to him, be created clean. Thus not everything which is said to be created should then be immediately understood as also created with regards to its substance, seeing as he was praying that the very heart which existed be made clean by the Lord. Thus too when Wisdom is said to be created, it is not so much its substance that was made, as though it did not exist, but that very Wisdom, existing, as was more wisely said, was created as the beginning of the ways of the Lord for his works. Thus understand that Wisdom was created for the mystery either of the things that were to be created or of the direction of humanity, as when the Wisdom of God deems worthy of taking this up it is said to be created. But it says that it is truly begotten, lest you recognize any less divinity in it than he who begat it has. For it is exceedingly impious to believe that God was at any time without his own Wisdom.<sup>1533</sup> For this reason, and because Wisdom was truly begotten by God, existing in regards to substance as the same thing that the progenitor is, Wisdom itself is, moreover, Christ.<sup>1534</sup> Thus Christ, who is Wisdom, is not the Son by adoption, but the true Son, existing as the progeny of God, and not something manufactured.

48 (VII, 1). On the Holy Spirit.

I judge that all the questions that you had written about the Father and Son are resolved, to the extent that the grace of God has helped me. But your religious prudence will judge whether this is true for you – although I should confess that I have touched on

---

<sup>1532</sup> Ps 50:12 (LXX). Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 2.46.

<sup>1533</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.19; Greg. Elv. *De fide* 2; Ambr. *De fide* 1.13.79.

<sup>1534</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 1:24.

the highlights of these rather than followed through the entirety, due to the constraint of time, the hastiness of my circumstances, and that dry eloquence of my paltry speech.<sup>1535</sup> I had begun to write something not like a book, as I said before, but rather like you had called for an abstract of a certain summary concerning the faith, lest you think that if I were silent when called forth by your extraordinary benevolence that I was faithless in this. But now, something must be confessed about the Holy Spirit (even if briefly) for fear that if we have not said anything particular about this, we will likewise be believed to be blasphemers, just like those who also say that it is a created being. We nevertheless marvel at their insanity, that they think impiously about that which they confess is the Holy Spirit.<sup>1536</sup> For if it is the Holy Spirit, how is it a created being? For it is not holy in the same way as the rest who come to the term ‘holy’ by faith, a way of life that is pleasing to God and the sanctification of that very Holy Spirit. Rather, it itself is naturally always holy in such a way that it might sanctify others, not so that it might receive sanctity from without as though it was something which did not have it previously. In this way it possesses the name ‘holy’ as the Father and Son possess it. But it possesses it not itself existing as either the Father or the Son but rather as the Spirit of God. Thus, moreover, it is called the Spirit of God, not the ‘angel of God’ nor the ‘man of God,’ as their nature is inestimably distinguished from the divine substance.<sup>1537</sup> But such is the Spirit of God that it shares the same substance as the Father and the Son, because there is also one holiness of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. This same Holy Spirit is so

---

<sup>1535</sup> *Angustus* as a descriptive term for Faustinus’ speech can mean ‘paltry, low, base,’ as translated here, but also suggests once more that Faustinus is constrained by time and space, as the more usual meaning of the term is ‘narrow, tight, constrained.’

<sup>1536</sup> Cf. Ambr. *De spir. S.* 1.5.63.

<sup>1537</sup> Cf. Ambr. *De spir. S.* 3.4.28.

truly and naturally holy that this is naturally and truly the term for it. For consider the words of the Savior, who says, *Thus go now, teach all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.*<sup>1538</sup> For just as the term for the Father is true, and the term for the Son true, so too is the term for the Holy Spirit true. And we will try to understand how the term for the Father is called true by turning our attention to how he is called the true God.

49 (VII, 2). Many are called gods but are not truly gods. And I remain silent for now on Satan and demons and those similar to these, who are called gods with an impious use of the name. Even certain men are called gods in accordance with this testimony: *I have said: You are gods and all sons of the highest.*<sup>1539</sup> But how they are truly gods the subsequent passages make clear, which consider them in such a way: *But you shall die like men, and you will fall like one of the rulers.*<sup>1540</sup> If, then, wherever any holy men you please are called gods, this [name] piously comes forth for those living with justice from the grace of God, especially when the Holy Spirit lives within them. Some fall away from this term, if they do not continue to walk in the paths of the Lord. Thus no one among the created beings is the true God, because no one is naturally God. God alone, however, is naturally the true God, existing as this very thing without beginning and end. In this, now, we understand the perception of the true God and the true term of ‘the Father.’ For among men, then, anyone is called a ‘father’ from the time when he begets a son.<sup>1541</sup> But although he begat a son from himself, he is nevertheless not

---

<sup>1538</sup> Mt 28:19. Cf. Ps-Ath. *De Trin.* 10.

<sup>1539</sup> Ps 81:6 (LXX). Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.9; Hil. *De Trin.* 6.18, 7.10; Greg. Elv. *De fide* 2.

<sup>1540</sup> Ps 81:7 (LXX).

<sup>1541</sup> Cf. Ath. *C. Ar.* 1.21-22, *Ad Ser.* 4.6.

properly the 'true Father' to whom this term applies, the very term given by God. Certainly he is called a father for as long as his son also lives. For just as he adopts the term 'father' from the birth of his son, thus too he gives up the term 'father' on the death of his son. But God alone is properly the true Father, who is the Father without beginning and end. For he did not begin to be a father at some time, but is always the Father, always having the Son begotten from himself, just as he is also always the true God, continuing without beginning and end. Therefore, just as God alone retains the term 'true God,' so too does he alone enjoy the term 'true Father,' as he alone is called the Father without beginning and end.

So too should we understand the true term 'Son of God.' For among men, anyone is a 'son' who began to be a son, and he gives up this term on the death of his father. Moreover, he frequently crosses from the term 'son' to the term 'father,' when he begets a son. The proper and true term for the 'Son' is thus not in a created being, because he both began to be a son and cannot keep this name, either when his father dies or when he himself crosses over to using the term 'father' even before he obtains it on condition of his father's death. The Son of God alone is the true Son, existing as such without beginning, without end, always having the Father, and is never termed a 'father' by begetting as he was begotten. For this reason, the proper and true term 'son' is in the Son of God alone, just as he is naturally the true God. If, then, we have understood how proper and true the term 'Father' is, and how proper and true the term 'Son' is, it follows that we thus understand how proper and true the term 'Holy Spirit' is, since clearly this thing is naturally the Holy Spirit, without beginning, without end. For the term 'Holy

Spirit' would never be joined with the equal authority of its name to the true terms of 'Father' and 'Son' unless the term 'Holy Spirit' were also proven proper and true.

50 (VII, 3). If, then, this is the proper and true and natural term for it, without beginning and end, the Holy Spirit is not, therefore, a created being, as it bears such a proper and true term 'Holy Spirit' as no created being could. But also, when the Lord ordered that the nations be baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, it is most plain that the Holy Spirit is not a created being, either due to its association which is in unity with the Father and the Son, or because the Lord would never order that anyone be baptized in the name of a created being. For he restricts much of his divine power if confessing a created being is also set as equal to confessing the divine name. And he did well to put down a single 'name,' saying, *In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit*,<sup>1542</sup> so that the single ruling authority of the indivisible and perfect Trinity might be believed.<sup>1543</sup> For how can one believe that the Holy Spirit is separate from the ruling authority when we read what is written about it in the fiftieth Psalm, *And strengthen me with your ruling Spirit?*<sup>1544</sup> Thus in this too it is shown that there is one ruling authority of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, seeing as in every situation the Holy Spirit is found as a companion to the Father and the Son. Meanwhile, take even one testimony: *The heavens are made firm by the Word of the*

---

<sup>1542</sup> Mt 28:19. In other words, the passage does *not* read, 'In the *names* of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.'

<sup>1543</sup> This marks the first time that the word *Trinitas* appears in the *De Trinitate*.

<sup>1544</sup> Ps 50:14 (LXX); the Septuagint reads *potenti*, not *principali*, for 'ruling.'

*Lord, and all their strength by the breath [Spirit] of his mouth.*<sup>1545</sup> In this it is also shown that the Holy Spirit is not a created being, seeing as even it is proven a crafter along with the Father and Son. I will openly call the Holy Spirit both God and Lord, having learned from the ecclesiastic men of the past, who themselves, instructed first by apostolic men in the testimonies of divine scripture, also handed down this instruction to posterity. I would also follow up on each individual testimony, except the divinity of the Holy Spirit is clear before the faithful soul from those things which were briefly made known above – especially because it was not so much a dispute about the Holy Spirit that was set before me as it was a pious confession about his divine name that was called for. Nevertheless, I will supply this as a short way of proving its divinity, because even in this, in which it is shown that it is not a created being, the Holy Spirit is proven to be God. For all that is, is either divinity or a created being. But the Holy Spirit, existing as such, without beginning or end, is not a created being; thus the Holy Spirit is a thing of divinity, and as such the incorruptible and unchangeable and eternal Spirit of God. Thus there is one divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, just as there is one holiness of the same perfect and inseparable Trinity.<sup>1546</sup>

51 (VII, 4). But we should make an end here. For however much anyone who considers the sacred scriptures wishes to speak about the faith, so much does he also fall short of what he is talking about. But I do not waver in this, however: if anyone eloquent by chance reads these things, he will find fault with this inelegant discourse. But, if he is

---

<sup>1545</sup> Ps 32:6 (LXX). In Latin, *spiritus* can mean spirit or breath. There is an understood correlation here between *verbum* and *spiritus*, i.e., the “Word of the Lord” and the “‘Spirit’ of his mouth.” Cf. Ath. *Ad Ser.* 1.31, 3.5; Ambr. *De spir. S.* 2.5.35.

<sup>1546</sup> Cf. Hil. *De Trin.* 8.26; Ambr. *De spir. S.* 3.16.109.

faithful, he will not find an error of faith. Indeed, as it stands out for us by the grace of God, we desire to defend [the faith] to the death – with the help of whoever offers and without the disgrace of communion with heretics and traitors, because with God as our witness we are afraid to be found the partners of their damnation.<sup>1547</sup> Let he who thinks that he cannot be made a guilty party from association with them see to himself, trusting in his own conscience that he is defending the intact faith in such a way that he himself never stands as a traitor to the faith. But I am compelled to fear more cautiously in the cause of God, seeing as we read a warning about them: *Shun a heretical man after one corruption, knowing indeed that a man of such character is ruined, and sins and is condemned by himself.*<sup>1548</sup> But we also read about the punishment of traitors, when Isaiah says, *And all flesh will come into my sight to worship me in Jerusalem, says the Lord God. And the saints will go forth, and they will see the limbs of men who have betrayed me. Their worm shall not die and their fire shall not go out, and they will be in view for all flesh.*<sup>1549</sup> But even the apostle says, *Do not bear your yoke with the unbelievers,*<sup>1550</sup> because elsewhere too the same apostle after a description of evils says, *Not only – he says – those who do these things, but also those who agree with the ones doing them.*<sup>1551</sup> And there are many other divine testimonies, in which fellowship with the aforementioned men is forbidden. But I made these things known, albeit briefly, lest someone believe that we do not hold communion with such men from vain superstition,

---

<sup>1547</sup> Here, at the very end of the treatise, Faustinus veers into the territory covered by the *Libellus precum*.

<sup>1548</sup> Tit 3:10-11.

<sup>1549</sup> Is 66:23-24. Isaiah traditionally reads *in satietatem visionis*, ‘abhorrent in appearance’ or ‘loathsome’ to all flesh.

<sup>1550</sup> 2 Cor 6:14.

<sup>1551</sup> Rom 1:32.

men whom he sees are condemned by divine sentence. May the divine take care that you be found unharmed and blessed, in the faith of his name, and in the kingdom of heaven, with all you hold dear.