

## **UC Riverside**

### **UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

#### **Title**

Non aliud iure dici debeamus quam Christiani: Heresy and Orthodoxy, Catholicity and Schism in the Late Fourth Century

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/66b056tx>

#### **Author**

Whiting, Colin Mathew

#### **Publication Date**

2011

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
RIVERSIDE

*Non aliud iure dici debeamus quam Christiani:*  
Heresy and Orthodoxy, Catholicity and Schism  
in the Late Fourth Century

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

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Colin M. Whiting

June 2011

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Michele R. Salzman, Chairperson

Dr. Randolph Head

Dr. Sherri Johnson

Copyright by  
Colin M. Whiting  
2011

The Thesis of Colin M. Whiting is approved:

---

---

---

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

*Amicis meis*

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
i. The Problem	2
ii. Historiography	5
iii. Outline of Thesis	15
I. Historical Background.....	17
i. The ‘Arian Crisis’	17
ii. The Libellus Precum and the Luciferians	25
II. Moderate Views.....	30
i. Schismatic?	30
ii. Catholic?	35
III. Accusations of Heresy.....	40
i. Unsubstantiated Accusations	40
ii. Baptism and Rebaptism	45
IV. The Luciferian Petition.....	55
i. Penance	55
ii. Ordination	62
iii. Communion	68
iv. A Friendly Disagreement?	75
v. Asceticism	78
vi. Violence	91

V. Conclusion.....	109
i. Satire and Identity	111
ii. A Luciferian Social Network	114
Bibliography of Primary Works.....	125
Bibliography of Secondary Works.....	129
Appendix I: Translation of the <i>Confessio Fidei</i> .....	138
Notes	140
Appendix II: Translation of the <i>Libellus Precum</i> .....	141
Notes	196
Appendix III: Translation of the <i>Lex Augusta</i> .....	203
Notes	206

## Commonly-Used Abbreviations

- ANF* *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325.* Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1886-1897. Reprint: Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- CCSL* *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina.* Turnholt: Brepols, 1954 to date.
- CSEL* *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Prague-Vienna-Leipzig: 1886 to date.
- GCS* *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.* Leipzig and Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1897 to date.
- LCL* *Loeb Classical Library.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1911 to date.
- PG* *Patrologiae cursus completes, series Graeca.* Edited by J.P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1866.
- PL* *Patrologiae cursus completes, series Latina.* Edited by J.P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- SC* *Sources chrétiennes.* Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1942 to date.

*Introduction.*

*Non solum te vicisse existimes, vicimus utrique, uterque nostrum palmam refert: tu mei, ego erroris. Utinamque mihi sic semper disputare, contingat, ut ad meliora proficiens, deseram quod male tenebam. Unum tamen tibi confiteor, quia mores meorum apprime novi, facilius eos vinci posse, quam persuaderi.*<sup>1</sup>

You should not think that you alone are victorious; we are both victorious. Both of us carry back the palm [of victory] – you over me, and I over my error. May it always happen for me to argue in this way, that in advancing to better things, I abandon that which I was holding in error. However, I admit one thing to you, because I know the customs of my own best: they are more easily conquered than persuaded.

With these words, the ‘Luciferian’ in Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* surrenders to his transparently-named opponent, Orthodoxus. The dialogue, probably composed sometime in the late 370s, is one of Jerome’s earliest works.<sup>2</sup> It concerns a Christian group which Jerome and other authors refer to as the “Luciferians,” after Lucifer of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* 28 (SC 473, ed. Canellis:200-201). The best edition of the text is *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe* (SC 473, ed. and trans. Aline Canellis; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003). The dialogue is referred to variously as the *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* and the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. I have chosen to use the latter, as it better represents Jerome’s purpose in writing the work. I have provided all translations throughout, except where noted.

<sup>2</sup> For the longstanding discussion of its date, see Aline Canellis, ed., *Débat entre un luciférien et un orthodoxe*, 28-34 and *Ibid.*, “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 s* (ed. Jean Michel Poinssotte; Rouen: Publications de l’Université de Rouen, 2001): 155-194, especially 156 and n5. The classic argument for a slightly later date, in the early 380s during Jerome’s stay at Rome, is Paul Batiffol, “Les sources de l’*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* de St Jérôme,” in *Miscellanea Geronimiana* (Rome: Vatican Press, 1920), 97-113. Previously posited dates are the mid-370s, 378/9 while Jerome was near Antioch, in 382 while in Constantinople, in 382-386 while in Rome, or in 387/8 while in Bethlehem. Rome is a compelling choice, because there was a large Luciferian community in the city, but there were Luciferians throughout the Mediterranean as well. Bethlehem is also a tempting choice, because the Luciferians in their writings do not seem aware of the dialogue’s existence. However, on the basis of his other writings, as well as certain stylistic elements, Cavallera, Kelly, and Canellis all agree on a date in the 370s: F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre* (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 Canellis, “Saint Jérôme et les Ariens,” 193-194; Kelly’s argument about its relative placement in Jerome’s notice about his other works in his *De viris illustribus* is particularly convincing. Canellis argues for a date perhaps even before 376 on a comparison with the attitude towards Arianism presented in the dialogue and in Jerome’s *Chronicon*.

Cagliari. The very name “Orthodoxus” implies that for Jerome, at least, there is something ‘unorthodox’ about his unnamed Luciferian opponent. But who were these Luciferians? Were they catholic, schismatic, or heretical? Is that even the right question to ask?

*i. The Problem.*

Stark and Bainbridge, in *A Theory of Religion*, define a sect as “a deviant religious organization with traditional beliefs and practices,” created by a schism, which is defined as “the division of the social structure of an organization into two or more independent parts.”<sup>3</sup> This definition is in contrast to that of a cult, which Stark and Bainbridge define as “a deviant religious organization with novel beliefs and practices.”<sup>4</sup> Thus a sect, formed by a schism, retains the same beliefs and practices as its source, but with a new and separate social structure. While the model’s imperfections shall be discussed, it serves as an example of the meanings modern scholars (and others) attribute to these terms.

Modern scholars generally describe the Luciferians as schismatic, conflating the terms (as defined by Stark and Bainbridge) ‘sect’ (meaning the organization) and ‘schism’ (meaning the formation of said organization). The title of Gustav Krüger’s *Lucifer: Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* says as much.<sup>5</sup> Manlio Simonetti’s classic *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* likewise refers to them as “lo scisma

---

<sup>3</sup> Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *A Theory of Religion* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987): 124; 128.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>5</sup> Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf und Härtel, 1886).

luciferiano.”<sup>6</sup> R.P.C. Hanson’s English work on the same subject, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, uses the term “sect” to describe the Luciferians.<sup>7</sup> Recent scholarship has continued to describe the Luciferians as ‘schismatic.’ Giuseppe Corti calls them the “scisma luciferiano” just as Simonetti does.<sup>8</sup> Aline Canellis, in her critical editions of Jerome’s *Dialogus* and a Luciferian treatise, the *Libellus Precum*, refuses to pass judgment, merely pointing out what other ancient authors said on the subject.<sup>9</sup> Javier Pérez Mas, in a very recent work, refers to them as a ‘cisma.’<sup>10</sup>

Despite the apparent readiness in modern scholarship to call the Luciferian faction a ‘schism,’ this is a remarkable simplification of how the surviving sources treat the Luciferians. Aside from Canellis, these scholars are ascribing modern terms to the Luciferians were without clearly taking into account the wide variety of opinions present in the fourth through the sixth centuries. This is not to suggest that the Luciferians were not a schism (although the conceptual wall drawn between the Luciferians and other Christians by the word ‘sect’ or ‘schism’ is far more porous than the theoretical model Stark and Bainbridge propose), or that they held certain heterodox theological beliefs. But these terms reflect a modern scholar’s analysis of the Luciferians. Authors contemporary with the Luciferians, and those writing within the first centuries following

---

<sup>6</sup> Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), 443-445. Simonetti also presents a critical edition of several Luciferian writings in *CCSL* 69, 1967.

<sup>7</sup> R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 1988), 516.

<sup>8</sup> Giuseppe Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari: una voce nel conflitto tra chiesa e impero alla metà del IV secolo* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2004), 166-174.

<sup>9</sup> *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), 29-40.

<sup>10</sup> Javier Pérez Mas, *La crisis luciferiana: Un intento de reconstrucción histórica* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 110; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008).

the group's apparent dissolution, present a much more variegated picture than modern scholarship suggests.

That one group could provoke so many different reactions among ancient authors should indicate that either the Luciferians themselves were an exceptional group or that these terms – schismatic, sectarian, heretical, catholic, orthodox – were used differently in the ancient world than in the modern day. Previous scholarship, despite defining the Luciferians as a sect and thus (in Stark and Bainbridge's model) as maintaining their previous traditions and beliefs, has attempted to find factors pointing towards the former. The Luciferians dissipate “wie so manche andere rigoristische,”<sup>11</sup> show “più rigido estremismo,”<sup>12</sup> are “ultra-nicéens,”<sup>13</sup> and although there are no “especiales diferencias respecto al común que se tiene entre los nicenos de la época,” they nevertheless exhibit a certain “radicalidad.”<sup>14</sup> The implication, of course, is that the other Nicene-orthodox Christians of the late 4<sup>th</sup> century were not rigorous, showed less rigidity in their beliefs, were less devoted to the Nicene Creed, and were less radical. But as I will show, despite the objections of other 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christian authors and of the Luciferians themselves, their actions and beliefs were not very different at all from many other orthodox Christians in late antiquity. Other Nicene Christians could be just as rigid in their beliefs as the Luciferians, and the Luciferians could be just as flexible as their contemporaries. Not only their respective theologies, but their very ways of engaging with their realities, were essentially identical. In my view, the Luciferians were entirely normative as 4<sup>th</sup>-

---

<sup>11</sup> Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris*, 96.

<sup>12</sup> Simonetti, “Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano,” in *Atti del Convegno di Studi religiosi sardi* (Padua: 1963), 79.

<sup>13</sup> Canellis, ed., *Supplique aux empereurs*, 11.

<sup>14</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 340-341.

century Nicene orthodox Christians, a fact that modern scholarship has obscured due to their attempts to differentiate the Luciferians and their contemporaries on theological extremism rather than social grounds.

*ii. Historiography.*

The terms themselves – schism, heresy, catholicity, and orthodoxy – that modern scholars use are the problem. In his series of lectures published as *Schism in the Early Church*, S.L. Greenslade points out the difficulty inherent in the terms ‘schism’ and ‘heresy’ in early Christianity, noting that “there was no consistent usage which determined when a difference of opinion constituted a heresy rather than a schism.”<sup>15</sup> He also points out that divisions existed within the “Church” that did not constitute schisms or heresies, including what he refers to as instances of ‘mediate communion,’ meaning that certain Christian groups held communion with a common third party but not each other.<sup>16</sup> But Greenslade has little to say on how these groups form or define themselves against one another; it is enough for him that these varying types of communities exist. His descriptions also generally take the side of the ‘Church,’ treating the various schisms and heresies as groups deviating from an institution; for instance, he claims that a “rigorism of Puritan spirit which, for all its admirable qualities, has induced men throughout Christian history to hive off from their parent body in order to form, as they hoped and believed, congregations of saints.”<sup>17</sup> Firstly, there was no Church, no uniform,

---

<sup>15</sup> S.L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953), 29.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

institutionalized body in the early centuries of Christianity. Secondly, to describe a schism as ‘hiving off’ from the whole suggests that the schismatics are somehow inherently ‘incorrect’ or ‘deviant’ and that the process of defining one group as ‘schismatic’ had no effect on the group of Christians it supposedly ‘deviated’ from.

It is tempting to rely on the model recently developed by Daniel Boyarin and Karen King to explain how these varying Christian groups came to exist in opposition to one another. Both have much to say about the formations of religious identity, and are particularly apt as a critique of Stark and Bainbridge’s model in which one religious group ‘deviates’ from another. In her work *What is Gnosticism?*, Karen King explores boundary-making in the context of Christian theological disputes in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. While discussing the role of early Christian polemicists in the 20<sup>th</sup>-century creation of ‘gnosticism,’ King describes one of their primary significances for studying ancient Christianity: “The construction of heresy was only one part of the larger rhetorical enterprise of establishing the boundaries of normative Christianity, which also had to distinguish itself from other forms of belief and practice, notably Judaism and paganism.”<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, she continues, “The polemicists’ rhetoric is further complicated by their claim that heresy was not in fact an *internal* issue but a problem of contamination from *outside*... Their rhetoric contains both implicit and explicit calls to secure the borders and shore up internal order, to “restore” (or rather to create) purity by exclusion.”<sup>19</sup> Put simply, heresy and orthodoxy only emerge in light of one another. There was not some standard ‘Church’ away from which heresies deviated just as there

---

<sup>18</sup> Karen King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 21.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 33 (emphasis is King’s).

was no uniform ‘Judaism’ away from which Christianity deviated. Any ‘heretics,’ of course, considered themselves perfectly orthodox; as Averil Cameron writes, “In Late Antiquity all Christians who asked themselves the question called themselves orthodox, no matter what their position.”<sup>20</sup> This very insistence on orthodoxy is in fact what leads one group to define another as ‘heretical’ and vice-versa. Any Christians, by defining themselves as orthodox and other Christians as unorthodox, created a new boundary line between two groups of Christians where no boundary line previously existed.

One problem with this methodology is that it heavily emphasizes questions of belief over questions of authority. While perfectly suitable for distinguishing between groups that argue over theology, the model has little to say about schism and catholicity, that is, about the organizational and bureaucratic development of churches when no theological rifts are apparent. To further complicate matters, an emphasis on beliefs alone has little to say about the interaction between schism and heresy and the ways in which polemicists frequently collapse the two into one and the same category, as Greenslade noted above. Although the models employed by Boyarin and King are useful in describing the ramifications created by differences in belief, they do not thoroughly address questions of authority within a theologically homogenous group.

One way to examine the interaction between schism and heresy is Maureen Tilley’s model developed in regards to the Novatians and Donatists, groups often called both schismatic and heretical in antiquity but generally regarded by modern scholars as classic examples of schism. The question at the heart of Tilley’s recent work on the

---

<sup>20</sup> Averil Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (ed. Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 107.

Donatists is, “How indeed does schism become heresy?”<sup>21</sup> She concedes to Augustine and others that schisms, given enough time, becomes heresies. Then drawing upon the sociological work of Walter Firey, she argues that given the fact that they were two different communities, they faced different social needs or differing levels of the same needs – so, for instance, competing interests in maintaining a pure community and a unified community.<sup>22</sup> In economic terms, these competing interests should be considered as two differently-drawn lines on a graph of diminishing returns. The differing responses to these differing needs drove the two groups (schismatics and catholics) further and further apart. In the end, “As the graphed profiles of the two African communities mutated over time, they moved from simply different valorizations of the same ends to valorizations of different ends. Thus they moved from schism to heresy.”<sup>23</sup>

Such an approach has much merit, as clearly demonstrated by Tilley’s two representative examples, but several objections should be raised. First, her assumption along with Augustine that a sufficient amount of time drives the wedge between two groups even deeper is problematic; surely the wedge could also be removed, and the rift healed. The ‘time’ itself is vague, as well. The Luciferians persisted in the Roman world for roughly four decades, but no doctrinal deviance appears to have emerged. That is a very long time to spend merely differently valorizing the same ends without this progressing to the valorization of different ends. Perhaps most importantly, while Tilley is more concerned with actual doctrinal deviance rather than the rhetorical accusations of

---

<sup>21</sup> Maureen Tilley, “2006 NAPS Presidential Address. When Schism Becomes Heresy in Late Antiquity: Developing Doctrinal Deviance in the Wounded Body of Christ,” *J ECS* 15, no. 1 (2007): 2.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-13.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

such, she does not address the real possibility that rhetoric might drive difference, that accusations of heresy hurled between the two communities might cause one to be considered ‘heretics’ by the other despite no differences in theology apparent to an outsider. Furthermore, the ramifications of these rhetorical accusations may originate after one community has long since ceased to exist, or at the very least persist after one community’s dissolution.

The potential for rhetoric to define reality in late antiquity was very real. Maijastina Kahlos’ recent work, particularly *Debate and Dialogue*, has done much to illustrate this trend in Christian communities. She argues, “There was a strong tendency in late antique Christian writings to analyze, arrange and verbalize the surrounding world in terms of polar opposites... Binary oppositions are more than a rhetorical tool; they are a way of conceiving the world.”<sup>24</sup> Rhetorical devices, particularly the casting of arguments into black-and-white simplicity, can color the very way in which one perceives the world. Although Kahlos’ arguments concern the differentiation between Christians and pagans, there is no reason why the model is not applicable to the Christian way of thinking about Jews, schismatics, or heretics.

But Kahlos is (pardonably) guilty of the same polarity she describes in late antique Christianity. For instance, she discusses *incerti*, that is, those people who embraced certain elements of paganism and certain elements of Christianity while Christian leaders built supposedly impermeable walls between the two. These *incerti* were neither pagan nor Christian, but both. One example she brings up is Synesius, a

---

<sup>24</sup> Maijastina Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue: Christian and Pagan Cultures c. 360-430* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 11.

bishop of Ptolemais in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, who, “unlike many Christian leaders...showed a considerable lack of concern for details of Christian doctrine.”<sup>25</sup> But his nuanced requests for personal concessions to his philosophy before being ordained demonstrate a very thorough engagement with the details of orthodox Christian doctrine. Furthermore, his ordination itself raises a problem. Kahlos argues that “Christian leaders took a negative stand to *incerti* and labelled them as opportunists who had chosen Christian creed for reasons of social convenience or for winning promotion in their careers.”<sup>26</sup> While there is no denying that many Christians felt this way, what is one to make of Theophilus of Alexandria, bishop of one of the most important sees in the Roman world, who was willing to grant these concessions in matters of theological doctrine in order to convince an *incertus* to be ordained as bishop? Likewise, Kahlos brings up examples of ‘good’ pagans in Christian texts, arguing that “The exceptions of good pagans may reinforce the general rule of corrupt and miserable pagans, explaining away inconsistencies that do not fit the stereotype. Flexible prejudices that did not label all pagans as depraved made it possible for pagans or *incerti* to draw themselves closer to Christianity.”<sup>27</sup> The same mechanism appears in Luciferian texts, but it is possible that some ‘good’ pagans were just that. Although Christian authors may have made the rhetorical division between pagans and themselves stark, there is no reason to believe that some Christians could not actually admire or like pagan individuals. This is something Kahlos admits, providing examples over the next page from Ambrose, Jerome, and

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 90.

Augustine of genuine admiration of certain pagans and likewise of intellectual pagan visitors to the sermons of famous speakers like Ambrose and Augustine.<sup>28</sup> But Kahlos never explains what these transgressions mean for her binary model. It seems as though this rhetoric, powerful as it is in creating a total world view, could never quite create an impermeable wall. It is not just the *incerti* who refuse to be bound by these sharpening distinctions between paganism and Christianity, but some committed Christians and pagans as well.

The rhetoric specific to Christian debate, rather than Christian-pagan debate, is relevant as well. In a recent essay, Averil Cameron describes the inherent ‘violence of orthodoxy.’<sup>29</sup> She begins with a summary of how the concept of ‘heresy’ itself is now under fire, replaced by a discursive model in which the definitions of both orthodoxy and heresy only emerge in contrast to one another. Furthermore, she argues that the concept of orthodoxy “implies not only intolerance but also violence.”<sup>30</sup> This ‘violence’ encompasses more than just the basic meaning of physical combat. It also refers to textual battles, verbal arguments, and even the falsehoods and mental simplifications which the concept of ‘orthodoxy’ requires.<sup>31</sup> While ‘heresy’ and ‘orthodoxy’ derive from

---

<sup>28</sup> One should add here Jerome’s dream, recorded at *Ep.* 22.30 (*CSEL* 54, ed. Hilberg:189-191), in which he swears off classical literature, only to find its appeal undeniable later. Rufinus later sharply criticizes him for this apparent about-face in his *Apologia* 2.5-12 (*CCSL* 20, ed. Simonetti:86-93), but the criticism is generally leveled at Jerome’s ‘perjury,’ not at Jerome’s love of classical literature itself (except in the case of Porphyry).

<sup>29</sup> Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” 102-114.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

<sup>31</sup> For an excellent study on the nature of late antique ‘violence’ apart from the physical aspects of it, see Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995). There has been much discussion about religious (physical) violence in late antiquity recently, but see especially Michael Gaddis, *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), the collection of essays in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perception and Practice* (ed. H. A. Drake; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), and Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and*

one another, it is the concept of ‘orthodoxy’ itself that drives Christians towards violence. The importance of violence in defining communal identities is only now beginning to be fully appreciated. Thomas Sizgorich, for instance, investigates “why militant forms of piety and the figures associated with militant and aggressive modes of religiosity became such crucial resources for communal self-fashioning among early Christian and early Muslim communities... Even as they celebrated pious militants who often violently imposed boundaries between their own communities and the other communities of their world, many late ancient individuals seem to have been quite content to lead lives in which they themselves mixed regularly and intimately with members of other communities.”<sup>32</sup> Although his work is more concerned with physical acts of violence, there is no need for such a limitation. The conceptual violence which Cameron describes in addition to physical violence can be shown to inspire the same ‘aggressive modes of religiosity’ and hypocritical boundary-crossing.

Cameron’s work, however, addresses questions of orthodoxy and heresy, that is to say, belief; but similar questions of catholicity and schism, that is to say, authority, have gone yet unasked. As noted earlier, Cameron states, “In Late Antiquity all Christians who asked themselves the question called themselves orthodox, no matter what their position; indeed the aspiration to universalism was not given up even when the reality of division seems to us to have been undeniable.”<sup>33</sup> This drive towards universalism had a definite

---

*Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

<sup>32</sup> Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 4.

<sup>33</sup> Cameron, “The Violence of Orthodoxy,” 107.

moral component.<sup>34</sup> But the drive towards universalism and the drive towards orthodoxy represent two different aspects of late antique Christianity. Universalism represents a question of authority. While a drive towards universalism may imply a need to compel others to one's own definition of orthodoxy, one could imagine two groups of equal orthodoxy existing in separately organized communities.

Although such a division may be possible, an examination of the Luciferians demonstrates that Christian groups in Late Antiquity revert to the concepts of 'heresy' and 'orthodoxy' when contesting authority. Authors create fictional theological distinctions during a controversy in which very little theology is involved – *both* sides' arguments are characterized by misrepresentation. Kahlos' binary oppositions come to light here, as there is no room for a third 'class' of Christians, i.e. the orthodox in doctrine but schismatic in organization. Instead, Christian authors sort all Christians into 'heretics' and 'orthodox.'

In addition to 'heresy' and 'orthodoxy' emerging from previously shared ground, as in King's model, or schisms becoming heresies, in the way that Tilley describes, the Luciferians show that this rhetorical oversimplification, done in order to maintain a binary worldview, can also cause the formation of alleged 'heresies' where none previously existed. Transgressors of these boundaries, however, can demonstrate that this rhetorical construction was not always respected by the individuals in question. As this study of the Luciferians and their opponents will demonstrate, late antique Christianity

---

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, Andrew Louth, "Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century," in *Doctrinal Diversity: Varieties of Early Christianity* (ed. Everett Ferguson; New York and London: Garland, 1999): 5.

did not have a fully-formed conceptual system for distinguishing between disputes over authority and disputes over theology, as the former leads quickly and directly to the latter with little regard for how similar these two communities of Christians were in their doctrine.

Previous scholarship has been concerned with the Luciferians as a specific historical group, and thus has emphasized the role of Lucifer in the group's formation, its spread, and its dissolution.<sup>35</sup> Others, particularly Aline Canellis in several works, have been concerned with the various rhetorical methods used by the Luciferians. This work has been valuable in explaining their techniques, but lacks any analysis of what appears to an outsider as rhetorical exaggerations presented by both the Luciferians and their opponents during the controversy. Canellis, for instance, comments on how the Luciferians present a black-and-white view of the world, but devotes only a handful of pages to this worldview, does not comparatively address other late antique Christians' arguments against the Luciferians, and does not fully situate the Luciferians within the context of their controversy and the broader intellectual world in which they lived.<sup>36</sup> While she demonstrates that the Luciferians do present '*un monde en noir et blanc*,' she does not address how this may have been a very Christian way, not Luciferian way, of conceptualizing the world in the 4<sup>th</sup> century – which Kahlos would certainly suggest. The Luciferians must be viewed not *qua* Luciferians but as Christians living in the late 4<sup>th</sup>-century Roman Empire. Set in context, the Luciferians and their opponents reveal how

---

<sup>35</sup> Especially Javier Perez Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, the subtitle of which (“Un intento de reconstrucción histórica”) makes this very clear.

<sup>36</sup> Canellis, *Supplique aux empereurs*, 53-57.

Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century answered questions of catholicity, schism, orthodoxy, and heresy.

*iii. Outline of Thesis.*

In the first chapter, I will discuss the historical background of the Luciferians. I will also include a brief examination of the main source concerning the Luciferians, a petition entitled the *Libellus Precum*. This petition was written in the 380s by two Luciferian priests, Faustinus and Marcellinus. In the next chapter, I will examine the ‘moderate’ views of some authors who describe the Luciferians as a schism to demonstrate that even these ‘moderate’ views demonstrate a harsh and polarizing rhetoric. This polarization makes it easier to understand how, as I will show in my third chapter, many Christian authors from the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries describe the Luciferians as heretical, even attacking them on certain points of doctrine, when there appear to be no differences between these authors and their Luciferian targets on any theological matters. In the fourth chapter, I will show that this rhetorical exaggeration was not limited to the opponents of the Luciferians alone, but that the Luciferians too created fictions about their opponents’ doctrinal beliefs and practices to solidify their own identity. Lastly, I will tie these elements together in order to demonstrate how schism might engender violence, both rhetorical and physical, and how these disputes over discipline so easily spilled into disputes over doctrine, even when no doctrinal difference is apparent – a circumstance which may have led to the faction’s dissolution less than a century after its establishment. Another element of Roman society, satire, will be used comparatively to

clarify the causes and effects of rhetorical exaggerations such as those found within the Luciferian petition and their opponents' attacks – a comparison for which I believe there is no precedent. To help explain this group's rise and fall, which I believe is also integrally connected to the lack of theological distinction between this group and many other Christians, I will draw upon network analysis techniques developed by other authors to explain the personal side of ancient controversies. In my appendices, I have provided translations of the Luciferian *Confession fidei* and *Libellus precum*, for which there is no published English translation, along with a new translation of the *Lex Augusta* written in reply to the petition.

## *Chapter I. Historical Background*

### *i. The 'Arian Crisis.'*

To understand the Luciferians it is necessary to return to the Council of Nicaea, convened in 325, and the influence it had on the development of schisms and heresies throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>37</sup> The creed established at the Council of Nicaea in 325 declared that the Father and the Son of the Christian religion were 'ὁμοούσιος,' that is, 'of the same substance.'<sup>38</sup> The bishops present took this position in opposition to a variety of Christian beliefs about the precise nature between the Father and Son which later authors lumped together under the term "Arian" beliefs. They derived this name from Arius, an Alexandrian presbyter who argued that the Father existed prior to and was superior to the Son.<sup>39</sup> Despite the condemnation of 'Arianism,' heterogeneous beliefs continued to flourish throughout the Empire. Furthermore, after the death of the council's presiding Emperor Constantine I in 337, Nicene Christians were faced with rulers far less enthusiastic about the term 'ὁμοούσιος.'

Constantine's son Constantius II took sole control of the Empire in 353.

Constantius' ecclesiastic policies, according to later Nicene authors, did not favor the

---

<sup>37</sup> For a general summary of the events following the Council of Nicaea and a detailed discussion of the theological questions at stake, see Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

<sup>38</sup> For the 5<sup>th</sup>-century ecclesiastical accounts of the Council of Nicaea, see Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.7-14 (*GCS NF* 1, ed. Hansen:13-53), especially 1.8, Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.16-25 (*SC* 306, ed. Grillet and Sabbah:1.190-219), especially 1.22, and Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.6-11 (*GCS* 19, ed. Parmentier:27-48), especially 1.11 (*Ibid.*, 46-48).

<sup>39</sup> For the 5<sup>th</sup>-century ecclesiastical accounts of the beginnings of 'Arianism,' see Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 1.5 (*GCS NF* 1:5-6), Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 1.15 (*SC* 306:1.182-190), and Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 1.1 (*GCS* 19:4-6). The secondary literature is vast, but particularly important are Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, and Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*.

ὁμοούσιος formula.<sup>40</sup> In addition to Athanasius of Alexandria, Hilary of Poitiers and Lucifer of Cagliari would later demonize Constantius for pro-Arian sentiments late in his reign, starting in the 350s, and continuing after his death in 361.<sup>41</sup> The Council of Arles in 353/4 quickly deposed Paulinus of Trier, a strong supporter of the ‘ὁμοούσιος’ formula.<sup>42</sup> Constantius was in Arles at the time and probably oversaw the proceedings personally.<sup>43</sup> In 355, Constantius II used a council at Milan in order to condemn Athanasius of Alexandria.<sup>44</sup> Bishops generally linked Athanasius with the Nicene formula and opposition to Athanasius with the Arians.<sup>45</sup> A few Eastern bishops opposed to Athanasius attended, but western bishops – who were generally supportive of Athanasius – turned out in force.<sup>46</sup> Due to Constantius’ threats and intimidation (as the supporters of the ‘ὁμοούσιος’ claimed, at any rate), the council condemned Athanasius. According to Hilary, this was all an Arian plot: when Eusebius of Vercelli presented Dionysius of Milan with a copy of the Nicene Creed to sign, a prominent Arian, Valens of Mursa, slapped away Dionysius’ stylus and famously shouted “Certainly not that!”

---

<sup>40</sup> Athanasius’ portrayal of Constantius is the classic example: see T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 121-135.

<sup>41</sup> T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 106.

<sup>42</sup> Hilary, *Ad Constantium* 1.8 (*PL* 10:562-563).

<sup>43</sup> Hans Christof Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 133-46.

<sup>44</sup> Liberius of Rome, a supporter of Athanasius, initially convened the council. Constantius, however, made it suit his own purposes. A variety of primary sources describe the council, including Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (*PL* 10:562-563); Athanasius, *Historia Arrianorum* 31-34 (*PG* 25:728-733); Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.20 (*GCS NF* 6.2:986-987); Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 2.36 (*GCS NF* 1:151-152); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 4.8-11 (*SC* 418, ed. Grillet and Sabbah:2.214-238); Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 2.12 (*GCS* 19:122-123); Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicon* 2.39-40 (*SC* 441, ed. de Senneville-Grave:312-318). See also Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine*, 116-18.

<sup>45</sup> 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’Athanasie, que les connotations doctrinales devinrent l’argument majeur de la polémique, 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>46</sup> Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 4.9 (*SC* 418:2.218) puts their number at around 300.

before it could be read.<sup>47</sup> Only three of the bishops present opposed the condemnation of Athanasius: Dionysius of Milan,<sup>48</sup> Eusebius of Vercelli, and the bishop of Rome's legate, Lucifer of Cagliari.<sup>49</sup> The council immediately deposed all three, who went into exile. Lucifer spent much of his exile writing vitriolic treatises directed towards Constantius.<sup>50</sup> A year later, the Council of Béziers deposed and exiled Hilary of Poitiers, a strong supporter of the Nicene Creed.<sup>51</sup> It also deposed and exiled Rhodanius, who had reluctantly accepted the decisions of the Council of Milan.<sup>52</sup> When the bishop of Rome, Liberius, later refused to sign the condemnation, he too was deposed and exiled by Constantius.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (PL 10:562-563).

<sup>48</sup> According to Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2.39 (SC 441:314), Dionysius had actually agreed to condemn Athanasius, but only if doctrinal matters were also discussed. This was no longer an option after Valens of Mursa's actions.

<sup>49</sup> The classic work on Lucifer and the Luciferians remains Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer*. For the best critical editions of Lucifer's writings, see *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt* (CCSL 8, ed. Diercks; Turnholt: Brepols, 1978).

<sup>50</sup> "...the violent and often hysterical diatribes of Lucifer contain distressingly little of real historical value": Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine*, 6. Hanson, 508 (and n4): "We have already had occasion to form no very high opinion of the subtlety of thought or elegance of language of Lucifer of Calaris...Almost everybody who writes about Lucifer finds him an intolerable bore and bigot..." See also Krüger, *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer*, 25. Hilary followed suit shortly thereafter with his *Contra Constantium* (PL 10: 571-605; not to be confused with his *Ad Constantium*), a work Mark Humphries calls "venomous invective" in his discussion of anti-Constantian polemic: "In Nomine Patris: Constantine the Great and Constantius II in Christological Polemic," *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 46, no. 4 (1997): 448.

<sup>51</sup> The precise reasons for Hilary's exile are the subject of much debate. For a major overview of the arguments, see T.D. Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile," *VC* 46, no. 2 (1992). For later additions, see Paul C. Burns, "Hilary of Poitiers' Road to Béziers: Politics of Religion?," *JECS* 2, no. 3 (1994) and Carl L. Beckwith, "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers at the Synod of Béziers (356 C.E.)," *JECS* 13, no. 1 (2005).

<sup>52</sup> Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2.39.4 (SC 441:314) and Hil., *Contra Constantium* 11 (PL 10:580). See also Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile," 134-35.

<sup>53</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 15.7.6-10 (ed. Seyfarth:1.56); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 4.11-12 (SC 418:2.232-242). He returned three years later, and his death led to conflicts between two factions led by Ursinus, who had supported Liberius, and Damasus, who had supported Liberius' replacement, Felix. Damasus emerged victorious but Ursinus remained a thorn in his side for some years. See Ath., *Contra Arianos* 89.3 (PG 25:408-409) and *Hist. Ar.* 41.2 (PG 25:741); Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 2.17.1 (GCS 19:136). There is a brief and partisan account of Liberius and Felix on the side of Ursinus in the *Collectio Avellana* 1.1-15 (CSEL 35:1-4), immediately preceding the *Libellus Precum* of the Luciferians. For bibliography and

Thus by 357, the major Nicene supporters in the West had all been exiled. Constantius then convened another council, this time at Sirmium.<sup>54</sup> This council published a creed (which Hilary calls *blasphemia*) that intentionally left out any mention of the term οὐσία at all.<sup>55</sup> It was at this Second Council of Sirmium that Ossius of Cordoba, a staunch Nicene and Constantine's close adviser, finally gave in to the Arian party.<sup>56</sup> Finally, in 359, Constantius called two councils, one at Rimini in the West and one at Seleucia in the East.<sup>57</sup> A variation on the so-called 'Dated Creed' was proposed and, after pressure and a minor revision from Constantius, the councils accepted the Dated Creed. "The whole world," as Jerome so famously put it, "groaned and was shocked that it was Arian."<sup>58</sup>

In 361, Constantius died, leaving the throne in the hands of Julian. One of Julian's first acts as emperor was to rescind the orders of exile against all Christian bishops and allow each person to practice his or her religion – including Nicene Christianity as well

---

a discussion of the proper dating, see T.D. Barnes, "The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers," *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (1992).

<sup>54</sup> Socr., *Hist.* 2.30-31 (*GCS NF* 1:141-147). See also Hil., *De Synodis* 10-11 (*PL* 10:476) and Ath., *De Synodis* 28 (*PG* 26:740-744).

<sup>55</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 2.30 (*GCS NF* 1:141-147) and Hil., *De Syn.* 10 (*PL* 10:476). See also Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, 276-281.

<sup>56</sup> For an extended discussion of the primary sources surrounding Ossius' "fall" and his death, 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.

<sup>57</sup> Hil., *Contr. Const.* 12-16 (*PL* 10:590-594); Ath., *De Syn.* 10-12 (*PG* 26:696-704); Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 2.37-40 (*GCS NF* 1:152-176); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 4.17-22 (*SC* 418:2.268-312); Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 2.16-22 (*GCS* 19:131-150); Jer., *Dial. contr. Luc.* 17-18 (*SC* 473:148-156); Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2.41-45 (*SC* 441:318-332).

<sup>58</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 19 (*SC* 473:158-159): *Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est*. The 'Dated Creed' received the nickname because its introduction claimed that the day of its publication marked the publication of the catholic faith. Nicene Creed supporters quickly jumped on this miscue and the name has stuck. It is more properly called the Fourth Sirmian Creed or the Fourth Creed of Sirmium. See Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, 282-285.

as any and all so-called heretical forms of Christianity – as he or she pleased.<sup>59</sup> Lucifer of Cagliari, among others who had been exiled to the east, was welcome to return to his see. However, Athanasius and Eusebius of Vercelli first called an ecclesiastical council at Alexandria.

They called the Council of Alexandria in 362 to both reaffirm the Nicene Creed and to decide how to treat the bishops who had sworn to the creeds promoted at Rimini and Seleucia.<sup>60</sup> The choice was simple: should these clergymen be forced to undergo penance and thus accept their status as members of the laity, or should they merely be readmitted after a laying-on of hands? The council took the moderate approach and did not strip the bishops of their rank, 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>61</sup> Similar decisions were made in Greece, Spain, and Gaul.<sup>62</sup>

Lucifer of Cagliari did not attend the council. He sent two delegates in his stead while he traveled to Antioch, by whose decisions he swore he would abide.<sup>63</sup> Meanwhile at Antioch, while the Council of Alexandria was in session, Lucifer had ordained

---

<sup>59</sup> Amm. Marc., *Res Gest.* 22.5.3-4 (ed. Seyfarth:1.252-253). Ammianus claims that Julian’s order was meant to cause more dissension in the Church. This policy is variously described by Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.27 (*GCS NF* 6.2:990); Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.4 (*GCS NF* 1:196); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 5.5 (*SC* 495, ed. Sabbah: 3.112); and Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 3.2 (*GCS* 19:177).

<sup>60</sup> The Council of Alexandria is described variously by Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.28-29 (*GCS NF* 6.2:990-992); Jer., *Dial. contr. Luc.* 20 (*SC* 473:162-170); Socr., *Hist.* 3.7 (*GCS NF* 1:197-199); Soz., *Hist.* 5.12 (*SC* 495:148-152); and Theod., *Hist.* 3.5 (*GCS* 19:180-181).

<sup>61</sup> Interestingly, the rehabilitation of the clergy is only discussed by Jerome and Rufinus, who remain the earliest sources on this council. On these competing accounts, 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," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 47, no. 2 (2001). Jer., *Dial. contr. Luc.* 20 (*SC* 473:168): *...non quo episcopi possint esse qui heretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur haereticos non fuisse.*

<sup>62</sup> Ath., *Epistola ad Rufinum* (*PG* 26.1180-1) and Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine*, 158.

<sup>63</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.5 (*GCS NF* 1:196-197), writes that Lucifer and Eusebius agreed that Lucifer should go to Antioch. Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 3.4.6 (*GCS* 19:180) states that Eusebius begged Lucifer to go to Alexandria but Lucifer went to Antioch instead.

Paulinus as bishop while the other (Nicene) Bishop of Antioch, Meletius, was still en route from exile.<sup>64</sup> One local group of firm Nicene Christians followed Paulinus, because Meletius had been ordained by an Arian whereas Paulinus had been ordained by Lucifer, a man of unquestioned orthodoxy.<sup>65</sup> Eusebius of Vercelli was distraught over the split in the Nicene community at Antioch. However, due to his personal respect for Lucifer, he took no action.<sup>66</sup>

Later authors associated Lucifer one way or another with the group that bore his name. The ancient sources themselves reveal a great deal of uncertainty. Rufinus, for instance, writes:

*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...sumpsit exordium.*<sup>67</sup>

Thus he returned to Sardinia, and I am not confident in asserting whether because he did not have the time to change his opinion since he was prevented by a quick death (for things begun thoughtlessly are often corrected with time), or because he remained firm in this opinion. Meanwhile, the Luciferian schism...took its beginning from that man.

Rufinus does not explicitly state that Lucifer himself started a schism, although that is certainly implied. Similarly, Ambrose states that Lucifer left 'heirs' (*heredes*) but does

---

<sup>64</sup> The ordination is described by Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.30 (*GCS NF* 6.2:992); Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.9 (*GCS NF* 1: 203-204) and 5.5 (*Ibid.*, 276-277); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 5.12-13 (*SC* 495:148-156) and 7.3 (*SC* 516, ed. Sabbah and de la Beaumelle:78-80); and Theod., *Hist. eccl.*, 3.5.1 (*GCS* 19:180). Jerome mentions it in passing at *Dial. contr. Luc.* 20 (*SC* 473:170). According to Socrates, the Arian Bishop of Antioch, Euzoïus, still controlled most of the actual church buildings in Antioch (except one which he permitted Paulinus to use). When Meletius returned, the control of the main church in Antioch was still in question, but Meletius quickly seized control. On the incident, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 155-158.

<sup>65</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 5.5 (*GCS NF* 1: 276-277). Athanasius refused to his death to hold communion with Meletius: Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158.

<sup>66</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.9 9 (*GCS NF* 1: 203-204); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 5.12 (*SC* 495:148-152); Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3 (*GCS* 19:181).

<sup>67</sup> Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.30 (*GCS NF* 6.2:992).

not explicitly ascribe responsibility for the group's foundation to Lucifer.<sup>68</sup> Augustine likewise begins his entry in *De haeresibus* with "The Luciferians, rising from Lucifer of Cagliari..." (*Luciferianos a Lucifero Caralitano episcopo exortos...*).<sup>69</sup> Augustine uses this same phrasing (using *orti*) elsewhere to make a pun on the Lucifer as the morning star.<sup>70</sup> Although "rising from" would imply foundation, it is once more not explicit. Jerome, on the other hand, is. He states that "Taking a few sheep aside, he abandoned the rest of the flock" (*segregatis paucis ovibus, reliquum gregem deseruit*).<sup>71</sup> Jerome does not add anything further about Lucifer returning to the flock, even though such a fact would have made his case against the Luciferians all the stronger. Isidore, a much later author, takes a phrase of Augustine's (*cum Lucifero qui mane oriebatur cadere meruerunt*) and changes it to make Lucifer's responsibility more clear (*cum ipso Lucifero auctore suo qui mane oriebatur cadere meruerunt*).<sup>72</sup> Thus Isidore understood Augustine's phrase as explicitly indicating that Lucifer founded the sect. The Western authors thus seem inclined to blame Lucifer, some absolutely, some simply by implying that he was to blame for the sect's origin.

Eastern authors also remain vague but hint at Lucifer's responsibility. Sozomen's vague vocabulary choice indicates that Lucifer was either the "cause" or "supposed cause" (πρόφασις) of the schism before returning to communion with other Nicene Christians.<sup>73</sup> Theodoret only states that the Luciferians were those who accepted

---

<sup>68</sup> Ambrose, *De excessu fratris sui Satyri* 47 (PL 16:1362-1363).

<sup>69</sup> Augustine, *De haeresibus* 81 (CCSL 46, ed. van den Hout:336-337).

<sup>70</sup> Aug., *De agone christiano* 30.32 (CSEL 41, ed. Zycha:134).

<sup>71</sup> Jer., *Dial. contr. Luc.* 20 (SC 473:170).

<sup>72</sup> Aug., *De ag. chr.* 30.32 (CSEL 41:134); Isidore, *Etymologiarum* 8.5.55 (PL 82:303).

<sup>73</sup> Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 5.13.4 (SC 495:152-156). The Greek word can have either meaning.

Lucifer's teachings (οἱ δὲ ταῦτα καταδεξάμενοι), not necessarily that Lucifer himself organized a separate communal group.<sup>74</sup> Again, as with Rufinus, Lucifer's responsibility as the originator of the group is strongly implied. Socrates states that Luciferianism 'arose;' the bishop himself (reluctantly) later accepted the decisions of the Council of Alexandria.<sup>75</sup> The order of these events suggests that Lucifer had something to do with the group before returning to Nicene communion, though Socrates does not explicitly say so. Cassiodorus follows Socrates but the order of events is reversed. Instead of Lucifer returning to communion with other Nicene Christians *after* the group is formed, in Cassiodorus' account, the group forms after Lucifer returned to Nicene communion.<sup>76</sup> Thus although the other authors remain vague, Cassiodorus gives Lucifer the closest thing to pardon.

Thus there is no absolute consensus among Christian authors as to whether Lucifer himself founded the group. Modern scholarship is equally divided. Some, like Krüger and Canellis, argue or at least suggest that Lucifer founded this group.<sup>77</sup> Simonetti (in earlier works), Diercks, and Figus, on the other hand, doubt that Lucifer was anything more than a figurehead around whose name later groups rallied.<sup>78</sup> Mas, in a recent study,

---

<sup>74</sup> Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3 (GCS 19:181).

<sup>75</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.6 (GCS NF 1:204): ...καὶ γίνεται πάλιν Λουκιφεριανῶν ἑτέρα αἵρεσις. At 5.5.7 (Ibid., 227) Socrates again describes the Luciferians as the active party in separating themselves from the Church, not Lucifer himself.

<sup>76</sup> Cassiodorus, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* 6.19 (PL 69:1041); 6.23 (Ibid., 1046; the chapter heading is misprinted by Migne as XXXIII): ...ipse [Lucifer] quidem Ecclesiae tenens fidem, in Sardiniam ad proprium remeavit thronum. Hi vero qui prius cum eo contristati fuerant, hactenus ab Ecclesia segregantur.

<sup>77</sup> Krüger, 55-56; Canellis, *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe*, 22-24; see also Mas 8-11.

<sup>78</sup> Simonetti, "Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiana," 76, and "Lucifero di Cagliari nella controversia arriana," 24; Diercks, *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt xxxii-xxxiii*; Antonino Figus, *L'enigma di Lucifero di Cagliari: a ricordo del XVI centenario della morte* (Cagliari: Fossataro, 1973) 132-151.

refuses to pass judgment at all, thus reflecting the ambiguity of the sources.<sup>79</sup> Another recent publication on Lucifer by Corti also takes this position.<sup>80</sup>

*ii. The Libellus Precum and the Luciferians*

Lucifer died in 370 or 371.<sup>81</sup> By the 380s, whether or not he had founded this movement, there were so-called Luciferian communities scattered throughout the Roman world.<sup>82</sup> Communities apparently existed in southern Spain, Trier, Rome, North Africa, Oxyrhynchus in Upper Egypt, and Eleutheropolis in Palestine.<sup>83</sup> These communities typically arose in the sees of bishops who had remained staunchly pro-Nicene under Constantius or in locations these same bishops had visited.<sup>84</sup> The Luciferians provide something nearly unique in the field of ancient heresy and schism: writings created by the group in question, not by their opponents. For this reason, the group provides an excellent view not only into how the predominant Nicene orthodox faction in these debates characterized their ‘heretical’ or ‘schismatic’ opponents but the style in which the ‘heretical’ or ‘schismatic’ factions present their own views of themselves.

---

<sup>79</sup> Mas 12-13.

<sup>80</sup> Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari*, 166-174.

<sup>81</sup> Jer., *Chronicon* 287.7 (PL 27:695).

<sup>82</sup> The Luciferians, predictably, reject the term *Luciferianus*: *Lib. Prec.* 84-86 (SC 504, ed. Canellis:188-190).

<sup>83</sup> Spain: *Lib. Prec.* 32-44; 73-76 (SC 504:138-151; 176-181); Trier: *Ibid.* 77 (SC 504:180-1); Rome: *Ibid.* 77-85 (SC 504:180-191); North Africa, *Ibid.* 107 (SC 504:216-217); Oxyrhynchus, *Ibid.* 92-101 (SC 504:196-211); Eleutheropolis: *Ibid.* 102-110 (SC 504:211-221).

<sup>84</sup> For a full analysis of this network of bishops and their actions under Constantius, and how this appears to have directly led to the formation of so-called ‘Luciferian’ communities, see Chapter 5.

This unique source is the *Libellus Precum*, a petition written by Faustinus and Marcellinus, two presbyters accused of being ‘Luciferians.’<sup>85</sup> The main request throughout the work is for the Emperor to compel their opponents to stop harassing them and that their group be acknowledged as ‘Christian,’ even if their opponents were still called ‘Christian’ as well.<sup>86</sup> This was particularly important at this point in time, because Theodosius promulgated a series of laws from 380-384 that severely punished heretics.<sup>87</sup> Thus the emperor’s response to their request had not only spiritual, but tangible ramifications.

The text survives in several ways.<sup>88</sup> The *Confessio Fidei* of Faustinus, preceding the *Libellus Precum* in Canellis’ edition, has an independent manuscript tradition going

---

<sup>85</sup> The best edition of the *Libellus Precum*, referred to as the *Lib. Prec.*, along with the preceding *Confessio Fidei* and the *Lex Augusta* which follows it, is *Supplique aux empereurs*, ed. Canellis. The *Conf. Fid.* and *Lib. Prec.* are also presented by Simonetti in *Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera.* (CCSL 69, ed. Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti; Turnholt: Brepols, 1967). The classic edition of the *Lib. Prec.* and the *Lex Aug.* was part of the *Epistolae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum Inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque DLIII datae Avellana Quae Dicitur Collectio* (CSEL 35, 2 parts, ed. Otto Günther; Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1895). Canellis generally follows Günther’s textual choices. Marcellinus calls himself a presbyter at *Lib. Prec.* 124 (SC 504:234). Just after him, Faustinus says he is not worthy of being called a presbyter: *ego Faustinus qui non possum dignus vocari presbyter Dei...* (Ibid.). This is a rhetorical trope. He calls himself a presbyter in preface of the *Conf. Fid.* that precedes the *Lib. Prec.*: *Faustini presbyteri confessio verae fidei quam breviter scribi et sibi transmitti iussit Theodosius imperator* (SC 504:102). Faustinus is also responsible for the *De trinitate*, written to Augusta Flaccilla, which is presented in Simonetti’s edition (CCSL 69: 293-353). For the argument that the Luciferians were also supporters of the antipope Ursinus, Damasus’ rival, see M.R. Green, “The Supporters of the Antipope Ursinus,” *JThS* 22, no. 2 (1971): 531-538. Neil B. McLynn agrees with Green’s conclusions at *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994): 56, but is the only scholar to do so; Kate Blair-Dixon, “Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome: The *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*,” in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (ed. Kate Cooper and Julia Hillner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 72-73, for instance, mentions Green’s writings but offers no support, and Canellis is entirely silent on the theory throughout her works.

<sup>86</sup> Firmly stated at *Lib. Prec.* 121 (SC 504:230-233).

<sup>87</sup> For the set of Theodosian laws concerning heretics, including examples of potential punishment, see the brief discussion and translations in Jean Rougé, “La législation de Théodose contre les hérétiques,” in *Épektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972).

<sup>88</sup> For transmission, see Günther, ed., *Collectio Avellana* (CSEL 35), i-xciii, Canellis, *Supplique aux empereurs*, 97-99, and Bulhart and Simonetti, *Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera*, 292-94.

back to five sources dating back to the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries. The *Libellus Precum* by itself is transmitted by 7 manuscripts (or partial manuscripts). The earliest pieces are contained on the verso side of twelve leaves dating to the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century. The *Libellus Precum* is mostly known as an attachment, along with the *Lex Augusta* in response, to the beginning of the *Collectio Avellana*. The *Collectio* is a group of texts collated in the 6<sup>th</sup> century which relate to the pontificate.<sup>89</sup> The earliest manuscripts of the *Collectio* go back to the 11<sup>th</sup> century. The *De trinitate* of Faustinus has an entirely separate tradition going back to the 9<sup>th</sup> century.

The *Libellus Precum* dates to late 383 or more likely 384 on the basis of the addressees: Valentinian [II], Theodosius, and Arcadius.<sup>90</sup> The address to the three emperors comes within the text, which makes their place in the text more certain than if the petition had had a heading added onto it later. Gratian was assassinated in August of 383 and is not addressed, thus making it clear that the presbyters must have sent the work to the emperors after Gratian's death. The text treats Damasus, bishop of Rome, as a living person. Since Damasus died in December of 384, the text must have been sent to the emperors sometime in the 16-month span from August of 383 to December of 384.

Formally, the text is initially addressed to all three emperors. However, only Theodosius is named at the end of the work, and the authors revert to using the singular *tu* form of address.<sup>91</sup> If the work were truly meant for all three emperors, this would be no small slight against Valentinian II and Arcadius; it seems likely then that the petition was

---

<sup>89</sup> Perhaps as a critique of papal dependence on imperial power: see Kate Blair-Dixon, "Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome: The *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*," 59-76.

<sup>90</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 1 (SC 504:106).

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.* 120: ...*sitis*... (SC 504:230) but then *Ibid.* 123 (SC 504:234): *Maxime sub te, religiosissime Auguste Theodosi...*

intended to be delivered to Theodosius alone. This suggestion is borne out by other evidence. Theodosius, not Valentinian II or Arcadius, specifically requested the *Confessio Fidei* preceding the *Libellus*.<sup>92</sup> Faustinus' other major work, the *De trinitate*, is addressed to Theodosius' wife, Flacilla. He implies that she personally requested the treatise.<sup>93</sup> Both of these items give evidence that the imperial household in the east was particularly interested in Faustinus, to the point that they acted as his patron.

Furthermore, the text is vehemently anti-Arian, as shall become clear. Valentinian II was only 13 years old in 384; his influential mother, Justina, was still considered Arian in 385/6.<sup>94</sup> Surely Faustinus and Marcellinus would not have directed such vitriol towards the beliefs held by Justina if they were seriously attempting to request the help of Valentinian II. Lastly, the *Lex Augusta* responds to the petition of the *Libellus* to Cynegius, *praefectus oriens*. Since Theodosius had sole reign in the East, while Valentinian II and Arcadius shared their rule in the West (and unofficially were still under the dominion of Magnus Maximus), Theodosius is responsible for the law, not the other two emperors who are named (in accordance with custom) at the beginning of the law. It is clear, then, that Faustinus and Marcellinus intended for the petition to be delivered solely to Emperor Theodosius in the east sometime between August 383 and December 384. The inclusion of the names of the other emperors is merely a formality

---

<sup>92</sup> *Conf. fid.* Preface (SC 504:102).

<sup>93</sup> *De trin.* 1 (CCSL 69:295): ...*sublimitatibus non contenta terrenis, sacra in Deum fide caelestia desideras possidere...sollicita interrogatione perquiris quomodo capita illa [sc. ab Arrianis scripta] solvantur...*

<sup>94</sup> On Justina, see Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 5.13 (GCS 19:303-304) and Aug., *Conf.* 9.7.15-16 (ed. O'Donnell, 109-110). Augustine describes Ambrose's discovery of the bodies of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius as a way to stop the Arian Justina: *ad coercendam rabiem femineam sed regiam*. On the incident, and Justina, see McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 209-19. For the argument that the homoian form of Arian thinking experienced a revival in the west during the 380s, see D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 185-210.

that does not continue throughout the text. Thus the text must be viewed as a product designed to appeal to Theodosius, not Valentinian II or Arcadius.

## *Chapter II. Moderate Views.*

Many Christian authors contemporary with the Luciferians and in the centuries that followed often described them as schismatic, generally meaning that the Luciferians refused to hold communion with most Christian communities, but otherwise held orthodox theological beliefs. In describing this ‘schism,’ however, some of these authors come to take a rather violent tone which suggests that the divide between catholicity and schism itself engendered a certain degree of vitriol. This hostility is an important marker of the strength of the rhetorical divide between the Luciferians and other Christians. Contrarily, at least one author – no less than the emperor Theodosius – calls the Luciferians ‘catholic,’ which represents a different type of falsehood that could be perpetrated when questions of schism and catholicity arose.

### *i. Schismatic?*

Ambrose, the earliest source who writes about the Luciferians, says that his brother, Satyrus, “did not think that there was faith in schism, for although [the Luciferians] held faith towards God, they nevertheless did not hold faith towards the community [*ecclesiam*] of God...”<sup>95</sup> Ambrose (through his praise of Satyrus) still

---

<sup>95</sup> *De exc. frat. sui Satyr.* 47 (PL 16:1363): ...*non putavit tamen fidem esse in schismate. Nam etsi fidem erga Deum tenerent, tamen erga Dei Ecclesiam non tenebant...* The date of the text is uncertain, but McLynn reasonably posits 378: *Ambrose of Milan*, 69. Satyrus had traveled to North Africa, but was shipwrecked apparently near a Luciferian community. Ambrose’s inclusion of the Luciferians in a eulogy delivered in Milan, where no known Luciferian community existed, suggests the extent of knowledge of the group may have extended beyond communities where Luciferians were present. I have chosen throughout to translate *Ecclesia*, when it does not refer to a specific building, as “community,” to avoid the suggestion that there was an organization akin to the modern Catholic Church in existence in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, but the reader should pay mind that this meaning indicates a conceptual community rather than a discrete group of individuals.

considers the Luciferians as schismatic, not heretical, although the clear implication is that a very fine line divides the two. Even at this early point in the Luciferians' development, their refusal to participate in the broader communion among Christian communities is roughly equated with not following God. Ambrose does not go so far as to explicitly call the Luciferians heretics, but he is very close.

Rufinus, not much later, explicitly uses the word schism.<sup>96</sup> He does not explain why he uses that term in lieu of 'heresy,' which in and of itself is significant. This suggests that Rufinus feels no need to castigate the Luciferians for separating themselves from the Church like Ambrose does.

Augustine is much more ambiguous than Ambrose or Rufinus. In his *De agone Christi*, he argues, "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>97</sup> Augustine remains vague in this work of 396. He does not define what constitutes the 'root' from which the Luciferians wish to separate themselves. More importantly, does "*detestandum*" further imply "ought to be treated as heretics"? This near equation of schism and heresy as egregious sin makes some sense given the emphasis laid on unity by 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christians.<sup>98</sup> But Augustine's vagueness also matches the uncertainty fourth-century authors had concerning what these

---

<sup>96</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.30 (GCS NF 6.2:992): *Ex ipso interim Luciferianorum schisma...sumsit exordium.*

<sup>97</sup> *De ag. Chr.* 30.32 (CSEL 41:134): *Quod cum Luciferiani intelligunt, et non rebaptizent, non improbamus; sed quod etiam ipsi praecidi a radice voluerunt, quis non detestandum esse cognoscat?*

<sup>98</sup> Andrew Louth, "Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century," in *Doctrinal Diversity: Varieties of Early Christianity* (ed. Everett Ferguson; New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999): 4, "The Church's own rhetoric of unity was considerable...Everything came from unity and was destined for unity. Division was seen as fragmentation, multiplicity as attenuation," and 5: "Morality was defined in terms of unity; singleness – i.e., celibacy – became an ideal that reached beyond the confusing multiplicity of the present..."

terms actually *meant*. By the end of his career, in 428 or 429, Augustine was no clearer. He begins his entry in *De haeresibus* by quoting a puzzling description of a strange Luciferian theology (which survives in a pre-Augustinian form) that does not appear to have anything to do with the group.<sup>99</sup> Then he writes, “But if they did not believe this, or do not believe this, whether for that same reason they nevertheless are heretics (because they strengthen their discord with a destructive ferocity) is another question, and it does not seem fit to me to drag it out in this place.”<sup>100</sup> The question Augustine poses is simple: are they heretics on account of ‘strengthening discord’? Unfortunately, it did not seem fit for him to drag it out in any other place, for the question was still unanswered at Augustine’s death. The ambiguity is present not only in Augustine’s writing but in the very question he raises.

It is clear from the text itself that to argue that schisms were automatically heresies would be unconventional, since Augustine is reluctant to make the argument outright. Furthermore, this new definition contradicts other definitions. Basil of Caesarea, for instance, clearly defines schism and heresy as separate categories. In his so-called ‘Canonical Epistle,’ written around 374, he defines heretics as those having separated from the church in matters of faith, schismatics those who separate for ecclesiastic reasons (i.e. disputes over episcopal elections) and with whom reconciliation is possible,

---

<sup>99</sup> The strange, pre-Augustinian text is the *Indiculus*, which modern scholars assign to a “Pseudo-Jerome.” It will be discussed later.

<sup>100</sup> *De haer.* 81 (CCSL 46:337): *an etiam si id non sentirent, sive non sentirent, ideo tamen sint haeretici, quia dissensionem suam pertinaci animositate firmarunt, alia quaestio est, neque hoc loco mihi videtur esse tractanda.*

and further mentions illicit gatherings led by “disorderly” bishops or laymen.<sup>101</sup> On the other hand, Augustine apparently felt willing to suggest that definitions such as these could change, which in turn suggests that these definitions were flexible. His reluctance to redefine ‘heresy’ to encapsulate groups which separate themselves from catholic communion indicates some adherence to earlier traditions. What Augustine’s treatment of the Luciferians does suggest, in any event, is a potential trend towards identifying ‘schism’ and ‘heresy’ as one and the same in the intervening time between Basil’s writings and the later period of Augustine’s life, a timespan into which the Luciferians fall.

Three authors later in the fifth century describe the Luciferians as schismatic. In the late 430s, an unknown author penned the work now called the *Praedestinatus*. This work is largely based on Augustine’s *De haeresibus*, though clearly opposed to him in many respects.<sup>102</sup> In the *Praedestinatus*’ entry on the Luciferians, the author writes “they are gloried since they have not deviated from the faith, but we argue that they who do not wish to have love for the Church of God have committed no small wickedness.”<sup>103</sup>

Although schism is a ‘*crimen*,’ the author is careful to point out that they have not left the

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ep.* 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121): Ὅθεν, τὰς μὲν αἰρέσεις ὠνόμασαν, τὰ δὲ σχίσματα, τὰς δὲ παρασυναγωγὰς. Αἰρέσεις 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>102</sup> See J. McClure, “Handbooks against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries,” *JThS* 30 (1970): 193 and David Lambert, “Augustine and the *Praedestinatus*: Heresy, Authority, and Reception,” in *Millenium: Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* (vol. 5; ed. Wolfram Brandes, Alexander Demandt, Hartmut Leppin, Helmut Krasser, and Peter von Möllendorff; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008): 147.

<sup>103</sup> *Praedestinatus* 81 (CCSL 25B, ed. Gori:47): *Gloriantur quidem a fide non deviasse; sed non parvum crimen arguimus eos incurrere qui cum Dei Ecclesia noluerint habere charitatem.* The work is often attributed to Arnobius the Younger.

faith itself. Like Ambrose, while reticent to call them heretics outright, the *Praedestinatus* also looks askance at them merely for being schismatic.

Another 5<sup>th</sup> century author eagerly takes up Augustine's recommendation. This obscure document of the early 5<sup>th</sup> century, variously attributed to Prosper or Quodvultdeus, lists the Luciferians under a group of "heresies" and calls them "leprosy" like the Donatists.<sup>104</sup> Their only fault, however, appears to be that they separated themselves from the Church. No other sin is attributed to them other than "deserting the Catholic unity."<sup>105</sup> Apparently for this author, schism *was* identical with heresy.

But this was only one interpretation. Gennadius of Marseilles, in his late 5<sup>th</sup>-century continuation of Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, includes Faustinus and writes that his work "to Valentinian and Arcadius" (curiously omitting the actual recipient, Theodosius) shows that he belonged to the Luciferian *schism*.<sup>106</sup> He also praises Faustinus' other writings, and his description of the origins of the Luciferian group is remarkably sober. Gennadius was working off of Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, however, and in Jerome's work there is a very flattering description of Lucifer.<sup>107</sup> If Gennadius saw Jerome's positive appraisal of Lucifer himself, it is not outlandish to suggest that Gennadius would likewise be inclined to approve of the Luciferians.

Although there is no firm consensus among these authors as to how heinous a crime schism itself was, there does seem to be a definite pattern of heaping scorn upon

---

<sup>104</sup> *De promissionibus et praedicationibus Dei* 2.6.10 (CCSL 60, ed. Braun:81): ...*lepra in corpora...*

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*: ...*unitatem catholicam relinquentes...*

<sup>106</sup> Gennadius, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* 16 (PL 58:1069): *Scriptit et librum, quem Valentiniano et Arcadio Imperatoribus, pro defensione suorum, cum Marcellino quodam presbytero obtulit. Ex quo ostenditur Luciferiano schismati consensisse...*

<sup>107</sup> Jer., *De viris illustribus* 95 (PL 23:697).

schismatics in fourth and fifth century authors. At least one author suggests that schism and heresy are equivalent, and another explicitly says so. The tendency to castigate schismatics may not emerge in all of these authors, particularly Gennadius, but it seems clear in a general sense, based on their responses to the Luciferians, that schism was not something which Church authors wanted to tolerate.

*ii. Catholic?*

It should here be noted that authors had more options available than just ‘schism’ or ‘heresy’ in order to describe the Luciferians. The Luciferians of course thought of themselves as catholic and orthodox. More importantly, and strangely, is Theodosius’ response to their petition. In 380, Theodosius passed legislation defining what was considered heretical:

*Imppp. Gratianus, Valentinianus et Theodosius aaa. edictum ad populum urbis Constantinopolitanae. Cunctos populos, quos clementiae nostrae regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum petrum apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque ad nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret et Petrum Alexandriae episcopum virum apostolicae sanctitatis, hoc est, ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam patris et filii et spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub parili maiestate et sub pia trinitate credamus. 1. Hanc legem sequentes christianorum catholicorum nomen iubemus amplecti, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque iudicantes haeretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere nec conciliabula eorum ecclesiarum nomen accipere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus nostri, quem ex caelesti arbitrio sumpserimus, ultione plectendos.*<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> *Codex Theodosianus* 16.1.2.pr-1 (ed. Mommsen and Meyer:833), dated 27 February 380. At the time, Theodosius ruled in the East (including Constantinople) and Gratian ruled in the West alongside his younger half-brother Valentinian II, who was only nine years old at the time. Theodosius passed similar legislation in 381 following the Council of Constantinople which ordered catholics to be in communion with Nectarius of Constantinople, Timothy of Alexandria, and several other eastern bishops: *C. Th.* 16.1.3 (ed. Mommsen and Meyer:834). Hanson is surely right in arguing that the exclusion of Damasus reflects the Eastern focus of the law rather than a slight against the bishop of Rome: *The Search for the Christian*

The Emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, an edict to the people of the city of Constantinople. We wish for all those over whom the measure of our clemency rules to practice such a religion as that which the divine apostle, Peter, handed down to the Romans, which from that introduction has made its way to the present, and which it is clear that the Pontiff, Damasus, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity, follow; that is, as is according to apostolic teaching and evangelic doctrine, we believe in one deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in equal majesty and pious trinity. We order those following this law to embrace the name of “catholic Christians,” but judging the rest to be demented and insane, [we order them] to bear the infamy of heretical dogma, and that their meeting places not be given the name ‘churches;’ these men ought to be punished first by divine vengeance, and in addition to that, by revenge of our own undertaking, which we take upon ourselves from heavenly judgment.

Since the edict is directed towards the people of Constantinople, it is clear that this law derives from Theodosius and not the other two emperors. The definition of orthodoxy seems simple enough. In addition to a simple statement of faith – the “equal majesty and pious trinity” of the three – Theodosius defines ‘catholic Christians’ as those who practice religion in the same way as Peter of Alexandria and Damasus of Rome (*in tali...religione...*); heretics are those who do not. At first glance, the law does not define ‘catholic Christians’ as those who hold communion with Damasus and Peter. The requirement is that the religious beliefs are the same. But Theodosius certainly implies that communion should be shared requirement, since both Damasus and Peter surely would have emphasized the need to be in communion with them. In any event, it is interesting that Theodosius uses the term *catholici* to define those with proper beliefs, not

---

*Doctrine of God*, 821. The legislation and its exaggerated significance are discussed further by E.D. Hunt, “Imperial Law or Councils of the Church? Theodosius I and the Imposition of Doctrinal Uniformity,” in *Discipline and Diversity* (ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory; *Studies in Church History*, vol. 43; Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2007), 57-68.

*orthodox*; he reveals here the same assimilation of the two terms that the Luciferians will demonstrate below.

Furthermore, although this law defines what heresy was, it also indicates that Theodosius considered himself the proper arbiter for determining what heresy was and was not. Thus the proper judge of what constitutes ‘heresy’ is both Theodosius and some measure such as a requirement that all ‘catholic’ Christians follow a certain creed and share the beliefs of Peter and Damasus. This ambiguity is reflected in the rescript that Theodosius wrote in response to the Luciferian petition. In the rescript, despite the fact that the Luciferians openly admit to ordaining their own bishop of Rome (thus also that they are clearly not in communion with Damasus, whom they openly despise), Theodosius states that they are catholic.<sup>109</sup> This clearly demonstrates the fluidity of terms like ‘heretical’ and ‘schismatic.’ If the Luciferians were ‘catholic,’ they should have no need for another bishop of Rome. And although the law may not explicitly claim that one must be in communion with Damasus and Peter, it is hard to believe that Damasus – to whose beliefs ‘catholics’ must adhere, according to the law – would find a second bishop of Rome acceptable. Matters of episcopal authority and belief are difficult to separate at this time, but having two bishops in one city would naturally be viewed as unacceptable. But if the law implies (at the very least) that ‘catholics’ must be in communion with Damasus, and the Luciferians are not, Theodosius is issuing a law seemingly in violation of his own definition! It is likely that Theodosius was attempting to minimize differences

---

<sup>109</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 84 (*SC* 504:188-189) and *Lex Aug.* 8: *non aliud nisi catholicos esse credamus*. This had tangible benefits: as catholic Christians, not only were they exempt from persecution (e.g., *C. Th.* 16.5.11; ed. Mommsen and Meyer:859), but they were also eligible to receive churches confiscated from those deemed heretics (*C. Th.* 16.1.3; 834).

between various Christian factions in order to create ecclesiastic harmony, a perpetual goal of his.<sup>110</sup> In any event, there are no other surviving authors that simply refer to the Luciferians as catholic.<sup>111</sup>

It should also be noted that the Luciferians agree that Theodosius has the authority to make decisions of this nature. The existence of the petition itself implies that the petition's recipient has the authority to decide this matter. Furthermore, within the text itself, the Luciferians write, "You, leaders of the Roman Empire, strengthen the pious faith and purity of the Christian religion with all your laws...with all your force, you write against the heretics and the liars with the authority of your empire."<sup>112</sup> Clearly, the Luciferians supported Theodosius' intervention in religious matters. Their contemporaries surely would have agreed; emperors had played an active role in Christian disputes since the reign of Aurelian.<sup>113</sup> The concept of a separation between church and state did not exist.<sup>114</sup> There is no fundamental question of authority – can the emperor make this decision? – but rather a more superficial question of application.

---

<sup>110</sup> McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 106, argues that Theodosius made his decision in ignorance. There is no reason, of course, why it could not rather be a desire for ecclesiastical peace with or without knowledge of the specific details involved. On Theodosius' ecclesiastical policy, see, for instance, Hunt, "Imperial Law or Councils of the Church?" 57-68. The imperial throne still guarded its role as arbiter: "Par la suite, on ne parla plus de l'édit: il n'avait pas servi à grand'chose. L'Empereur réglait concètement les problèmes, jouant tour à tour de la conciliation ou de la fermeté," Charles Pietri, "Damase et Théodose: Communion orthodoxe et géographie politique," in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (ed. Jean Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser; Paris: Beauchesne, 1972): 629.

<sup>111</sup> It is significant, on the other hand, that the Luciferians are not mentioned in the canons of the Council of Constantinople, held only a few years before the Luciferians submitted their petition and at a time when the Luciferians appear to have been active.

<sup>112</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 2 (SC 504:108-109): ...vos, principes Romani Imperii, piam Christianae religionis fidem puritatemque tot vestris constitutionibus vindicetis...omni nisu contra haereticos et perfidos imperii vestri auctoritate conscribitis...

<sup>113</sup> Paul of Samosata's expulsion from the see of Antioch is related by Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 7.30.18-19 (GCS NF 6.2:714).

<sup>114</sup> See, for instance, A.H. Armstrong, "The Way and the Ways: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in the Fourth Century A.D.," *VC* 38, no. 1 (1984): 2-4; 12-13.

While the Luciferians may argue that the laws are being misapplied, they do agree that the state should be responsible for enforcing these laws. Christian subjects and emperors all agreed that the emperor should have at least some authority over matters of doctrine and discipline, even if that authority was exercised haphazardly and inconsistently. One should not, however, imagine that the Luciferians would blindly accept the emperor's decision. The Luciferians would have almost certainly taken a decision against them as the sign of a wicked emperor, not of any mistake on their own part. Although the long-term impact of the emperor's rescript on inter-Christian relations is impossible to judge, the Luciferians considered it important enough to circulate their petition with it attached at the end.<sup>115</sup> The mere act of making a request of the emperor not only suggests that the emperor had the authority to decide on a case like this, but that the Luciferians thought that the tangible benefits of having a rescript in their favor made it worth the time and effort to present the petition to court. This also indicates that they had the power or influence to do so, which is suggested also by Flacilla's request for Faustinus' *De trinitate*.

---

<sup>115</sup> As noted above, in the manuscript tradition the petition was prefaced by the *Confessio fidei* and the *Lex Augusta* was attached to the end.

### *Chapter III. Accusations of Heresy.*

The violent streak, so apparent in some descriptions of the Luciferian schism, becomes even more apparent when one considers the fictions that emerge in order to paint the Luciferians as heretics. To demonstrate that the real issue at stake here is one of authority, not theology, the various theological points made by the opponents of the Luciferians and the Luciferians themselves must be dealt with. Several opponents of the Luciferians make claims about the heterodoxy of the Luciferians that is not borne out by the evidence as they present it. These theological arguments, instead, are developed in order to delineate two groups that are remarkably similar. In the process of doing such, they simplify and exaggerate – in other words, commit acts of textual/verbal violence. These arguments, when given any support, tended to revolve around the need (or lack thereof) for rebaptizing heretics.

#### *i. Unsubstantiated Accusations*

The strangest accusation leveled against the Luciferians appears in the so-called *Indiculus*.<sup>116</sup> The unknown author (sometimes referred to as Pseudo-Jerome) writes, “The Luciferians, although they held the Catholic truth in all things, were brought to this most foolish error: they say that the soul is generated from transfusion; and they say this same

---

<sup>116</sup> For discussion of the *Indiculus* and its origins, see G. Bardy, “L’*Indiculus de Haeresibus* du Pseudo-Jérôme,” *Recherches de science religieuse* 19 (1929): 385-405 and Henry Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 203.

thing about the flesh, and that substance is from flesh.”<sup>117</sup> This appears to have nothing whatsoever to do with the Luciferian texts that have come down to the present, nor does any ancient witness come close to repeating the same argument about the Luciferians. Augustine brings it up in his *De haeresibus* and seems suspicious. First of all, he makes sure to point out that he could not even find the name of the author of the work.<sup>118</sup> By including this fact he cannot be doing anything but attempting to cast doubt on the unknown author. Secondly, after describing what the *Indiculus* says, Augustine expresses direct doubt (“...if, however, they truly do believe thus...”) about whether or not they actually believe this.<sup>119</sup> A work known as the *Capitula Sancti Augustini*, though not by Augustine nor John Maxentius (to whom it is sometimes attributed), also mentions this description of Luciferian thought.<sup>120</sup> And so, for this particular attack on Luciferian orthodoxy, there is only one witness, and another ancient author casts aspersions on it only a few decades after its composition. It is unlikely that this is anything more than an invention.

Another, very short text which treats the Luciferians as a heresy dates from the late fourth or early fifth century and is now called the *Adversus haereses*, attributed to a

---

<sup>117</sup> *Indiculus* 26.38 (PL 81:642): *Luciferiani cum teneant in omnibus catholicam veritatem, in hunc errorem stultissimum prolabantur, ut animam dicant ex transfusione generari; eandemque dicunt, et de carne, et de carnis esse substantia.*

<sup>118</sup> *De haer.* 81 (CCSL 46:336): *...cuius nomen in eodem eius opusculo non inveni...*

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*: *...sit amen vere ita sentiunt...*

<sup>120</sup> *Capitula Sancti Augustini* [XIX] 18a (22a) (CCSL 85A, ed. Glorie:262). For a discussion of the text's unusual history, see Glorie's discussion in *Ibid.*, 243-246.

‘pseudo-Hegemonius.’<sup>121</sup> The Luciferians appear in a list of heresies, and are explicitly compared to Donatists, but the word ‘heresy’ never appears in the text itself.<sup>122</sup>

The major Church historians of the 5<sup>th</sup> century call the Luciferians a heresy outright. Socrates and Sozomen both use the term “heresy” explicitly.<sup>123</sup> One of Sozomen’s sources is Socrates, so his adoption of Socrates’ term for the Luciferians is not necessarily surprising, although Sozomen did independently look at Rufinus’ work as well.<sup>124</sup> A closer examination of Socrates, in any event, demonstrates the type of subtle modifications authors could make to project their worldview into the reader’s mind. Socrates’ primary source for the events in the West during this time period is Rufinus.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> The entire text itself runs less than three pages as presented by Hoste in *CCSL* 9:327-329.

<sup>122</sup> *CCSL* 9:329.

<sup>123</sup> And in Sozomen’s case, this despite his assertion at 3.15.9 (SC 418:146) that he will leave doctrinal judgments to others: Οὐ γὰρ τάδε συγγράφειν προυθέμην οὔτε ἱστορία πρέπον, ἢ ἔργον μόνα τὰ ὄντα ἀφηγεῖσθαι μηδὲν οἰκεῖον ἐπεισαγούση. Ὅσοι μὲν δὴ τότε ὄν παρειλήφαμεν τῇ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ κεκρημένοι ἐπὶ παιδεύσει καὶ λόγοις ἐνδοξότατοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τοῖς εἰρημένοις τετέχθων.

<sup>124</sup> Socr.: *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.6 (*GCS NF* 1:204): καὶ γίνεται πάλιν Λουκιφεριανῶν ἕτερα αἵρησις. Soz.: *Hist. eccl.* 5.13.4 (SC 495:154): Ὁ [Λουκίφερ] δὴ πρόφασις ἐγένετο τῆς αἵρησεως τῶν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καλουμένων Λουκιφεριανῶν. The evidence for Sozomen’s dependence on Socrates (rather than the other way around) relies on one parallel passage, Socrates’ *Hist. eccl.* 1.10 (*GCS NF* 1:40-41) and Sozomen’s *Hist. eccl.* 1.22 (SC 306:210-212). Socrates provides an anecdote about the Council of Nicaea which he claims appears in no other works and which he personally heard from an old Novatian, Auxanon; Sozomen provides the same story but offers no source for it, merely writing that ‘it is said.’ 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.” Frances Young agrees: “Much of [Sozomen’s] work runs closely parallel to that of Socrates, and it is clear that he used Socrates’ history at least as a guide-book and directory to sources, without acknowledging his debt,” in *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 32. See also Theresa Urbainczyk, “Observations on the Differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen,” *Historia* 46, no. 3 (1997): 355-357 and notes.

<sup>125</sup> On Socrates’ indebtedness to and dissatisfaction with Rufinus, see Socrates’ own *Hist. eccl.* 2.1 (*GCS NF* 1:92-93). That he relied on Rufinus for this section seems clear enough with the texts side-by-side, as the order of events is almost identical except for a lengthy insertion by Socrates of quotations from Athanasius’ *Apologia de fuga sua*. For a similar account of how Socrates was prone to changing details in Rufinus, see Richard Lim’s analysis in *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*

Rufinus describes the Council of Alexandria's purpose as to reaffirm the Nicene Creed and to allow the bishops who swore the Dated Creed at Rimini and Seleucia back into the Church; Lucifer, according to Rufinus, became angry at the latter decision.<sup>126</sup> In Socrates, on the other hand, the Council of Alexandria merely reaffirms the Nicene Creed; there is no mention of the readmission of the bishops who swore the Dated Creed to the clergy. Thus, when Lucifer gets angry in Socrates' account, it appears as though his ire comes from the decision of the Council of Alexandria to reaffirm the Nicene Creed, thus explaining why he and his followers would so easily be burdened with the label of 'heresy.' Socrates, on the other hand, generally attempts to uphold Paulinus' ordination by Lucifer as wholly valid.<sup>127</sup> This clashes with another of Socrates' characteristics; Allen gives examples of how "as usual Socrates stresses the disturbance that episcopal contentions cause."<sup>128</sup> Socrates, then, needs a way to support Paulinus while still emphasizing the need for peaceful episcopal successions. Socrates (and those who follow him) can blame Lucifer for the disturbance while still supporting Paulinus and the bishops who succeeded him.

---

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995): 199-204 on their respective treatments of the Council of Nicaea; in particular, Lim's description of Socrates' attitudes on p. 200 are accurate in this case as well: "Socrates' story also differs radically from Rufinus' in its treatment of details. His narrative is shorter and accords the debate less symbolic weight..."

<sup>126</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 1.28-30 (*GCS NF* 6.2:990-993).

<sup>127</sup> Pauline Allen, "The Use of Heretics and Heresies in the Greek Church Historians: Studies in Socrates and Theodoret," in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (ed. Graeme Clark; Rushcutter's Bay, Australia: Australian National University Press, 1990), 279. Socrates was also quite friendly towards the rigorist Novatians (if not a Novatian himself), which may in part explain his friendliness towards Paulinus, a representative of other Nicene rigorism: Chestnut, *The First Christian Histories*, 184-186.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 278.

Theodoret writes that Lucifer added to the Church’s teachings and his followers accepted these additions.<sup>129</sup> Theodoret never does explain exactly *what* Lucifer added, however. The general scholarly consensus seems to be that Lucifer and the Luciferians were actually quite orthodox. Mas, for instance, explains that “No nos interesa hacer una presentación detallada y minuciosa de su planteamiento teológico, porque no encontramos en él especiales diferencias respecto al común que se tiene entre los nicenos de la época.”<sup>130</sup> Theodoret, despite making a stronger claim than Socrates or Sozomen, offers no evidence or examples to back it up. Theodoret’s writings, according to Allen, “betray retrospective embarrassment among the Antiochenes at the divided front presented against the Arian party.”<sup>131</sup> Calling Lucifer and the Luciferians heretics helps Theodoret explain how this ‘embarrassment’ could have come about due to heresy instead of due to members of the Church. This is another example of an author apparently creating an argument to make Lucifer and the Luciferians fall under the rubric of ‘heresy’ without cause.

By the 6<sup>th</sup>-century, Cassiodorus used the phrase “heresy of the Luciferians” without feeling any need to explain why he used that particular term.<sup>132</sup> Since Cassiodorus is following Socrates throughout the passages in question, however, it

---

<sup>129</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3 (GCS 19:181): ὁ δὲ Λουκίφερ εἰς τὴν Σαρδῶ παραγενόμενος ἕτερά τινα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς προσέθηκε δόγμασιν. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα καταδεξάμενοι ἐκ τῆς τούτου προσηγορίας καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐδέξαντο· Λουκιφεριανοὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πλείστον ὀνομάζοντο χρόνον. ἀπέσβη δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα καὶ παρεδόθη τῇ λήθῃ.

<sup>130</sup> Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 341.

<sup>131</sup> Pauline Allen, “The Use of Heretics and Heresies,” 279.

<sup>132</sup> *Hist. eccl. trip.* 6.23 (PL 69:1046; misprinted in Migne as XXXIII): ...*et denuo altera Luciferianorum haeresis est exorta.*

should come as no surprise that he merely follows Socrates' definition of the Luciferians as heretics as well.<sup>133</sup>

## *ii. Baptism and Rebaptism*

Jerome is the earliest author to suggest that the Luciferians are in some way unorthodox. Unlike the author of the *Indiculus*, he does not hesitate to put his name on the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. His first polemical work, it also contains a number of glaring contradictions. First of all, as noted above, the name of the opponent of the Luciferians in the dialogue is 'Orthodoxus,' which suggests that *Luciferianus* in some way means *unorthodoxus*. Jerome's main argument is also over theological grounds: the fact that the Luciferians hold ordinations performed by *praevaricatores* ('traitors') as invalid, but accept baptisms performed by the same seems to him to be a gross violation of logic. One of Jerome's arguments throughout the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* is that they *should* be rebaptizing, at least, if they want to be consistent.<sup>134</sup> Augustine seems to agree, writing, "As for the Luciferians, since they understand, and they do not rebaptize, we do not condemn them."<sup>135</sup> This statement implies that the Luciferians might very well have had good reason for rebaptizing. Jerome then brings up another man, Hilarius of

---

<sup>133</sup> Migne 69.1046 and Canellis, ed., *Supplique aux empereurs*, 37; Cassiodorus himself announces his intention in the preface to the first book: *Hac igitur historia ecclesiastica, quae cunctis Christianis valde necessaria comprobatur, a tribus Graecis auctoribus mirabiliter constat esse conscripta; uno scilicet Theodoro, venerabili episcopo et duobus desertissimis viris, Sozomeno et Socrate...* (PL 69:879-880)

<sup>134</sup> For instance, *Dial. contr. Luc.* 11 (SC 473:126): *Si in fide sua baptizato baptizans nocere non potuit, et in fide sua sacerdotem constitutum constituens non inquinavit.*

<sup>135</sup> *De ag. Chr.* 30.32 (CSEL 41:134): *Quod cum Luciferiani intelligunt, et non rebaptizent, non improbamus...*

Rome, who does rebaptize.<sup>136</sup> Hilarius is held up as a model heretic, whereas the Luciferians appear rather as only inconsistent in their doctrine. This is undoubtedly a rhetorical device, but one which Jerome expected would depict the Luciferians as illogical, if not heretical.

The propriety of baptisms performed by heretics was a perpetual question for Christian authors. The ambiguity may best be summed up by a passage from Ambrose. In his *De mysteriis*, Ambrose brings up ministers while discussing baptism in particular:

*Quid vidisti? Aquas utique, sed non solas; levitas illic ministrantes, summum sacerdotem interrogantem et consecrantem. Primo omnium docuit te Apostolus non ea contemplanda nobis quae videntur, sed quae non videntur, quoniam quae videntur, temporalia sunt; quae autem non videntur, aeterna. Nam et alibi habes: Quia invisibilia Dei a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt comprehenduntur : sempiterna quoque virtus eius ac divinitas operibus aestimatur. Unde et ipse Dominus ait : Si mihi non creditis, vel operibus credite. Crede ergo divinitatis illic adesse praesentiam. Operationem credis, non credis praesentiam? Unde sequeretur operatio, nisi praecederet ante praesentia?*<sup>137</sup>

What do you see? Water, yes, but not alone; you see that there are clerics [deacons] there, ministering, and the high priest [the bishop] questioning and consecrating. First, the Apostle [Paul] has taught you that “that which is seen” ought not to be considered by you, “but that which is not seen, since that which is seen is temporal; that which is not seen, however, is eternal” [2 Cor. 5.18]. For you also have, “Because the things of God, invisible since the creation of the world, are understood through the things which are made; His eternal virtue and divinity” are also judged by His works [Rom. 1.20]. Thus the Lord Himself also says, “If you do not believe in me, at least believe in the works” [John 10.38]. Therefore, believe that the presence of the divinity is there. Do you believe in the work, but don’t believe that the presence is there? Where does the work follow, if the presence does not lead earlier?

---

<sup>136</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 21 (SC 473:172): The Luciferian asks, *Restat unum, quod quaeso te ut edisseras, quid adversum Hilarium dicendum sit, qui ne baptizatos quidem recipiat ab Arianis.*

<sup>137</sup> Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 3.8 (PL 16:408).

The passage is remarkable for including the clergy at the beginning and then proceeding to ignore them for the next nineteen chapters of the *De mysteriis*. Ambrose similarly denies the importance of the water itself and anything visible. The only critical part of the entire process of baptism is the presence of God. Everything else in the scene is window dressing. J.N.D. Kelly describes this late antique attitude in general terms: “in the fourth and fifth centuries...the sacraments were outward and visible signs marking the presence of an invisible, but none the less genuine, grace.”<sup>138</sup> The sentiment is echoed elsewhere.<sup>139</sup> Ambrose is not finished. Later in the work, he claims that “the baptism of liars does not heal, it does not clean, but it pollutes. A Jew washes pitchers and cups...[Mark 7.4].”<sup>140</sup> Thus baptism itself, although just a sign of divine work, must still be performed in the right circumstances. The baptism performed by Jews is *not* effective.

The question at hand, however, is about a variety of Christian groups, not Jewish baptism. What about baptisms performed by Christian ministers who have sinned? Ambrose writes, “Nor should you consider the merits of the individuals, but rather the duties of the priests. And if you do look at his merits, you should consider him as Elijah...”<sup>141</sup> Even when a priest is not perfectly pure, it is not a barrier to proper administration of sacraments. Ambrose expects the addressee to overlook the individual in question and replace him mentally with the proper abstraction, namely the office or the

---

<sup>138</sup> J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, Revised (1978) ed. (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1960), 422.

<sup>139</sup> See, for instance, Optatus, *De schisma Donatistarum* 5.4-7 (CSEL 26, ed. Ziwsa:129-137) and Aug., *Tractatus in Iohannem* 26.11 (CCSL 36, ed. Willems:264-265).

<sup>140</sup> Amb., *De myst.* 4.23 (PL 16:412-413): *Non sanat baptismus perfidorum, non mundat, sed polluit. Judaeus urceos baptizat et calices...*

<sup>141</sup> Amb., *De myst.* 5.27 (PL 16:414): *Non merita personarum consideres, sed officia sacerdotum. Et si merita spectes, sicut Eliam consideres...*

type, freeing the one being baptized to consider more important matters (such as the answers to his catechism, which Ambrose reminds him to think on in the very next paragraph). Even when a priest is not perfectly pure, he does not obstruct the proper administration of sacraments. There is a certain undefined line, however, which can be crossed; Jews, as noted above, do not perform proper baptisms. A less-than-meritorious minister does. Ambrose leaves the precise point at which an individual becomes *too* unfit to administer the sacraments vague. This lack of clarity goes some distance towards explaining why Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century might variably define baptisms performed by Luciferians as valid or invalid, and thus in part define the performers as valid or invalid; after all, if a Christian author considered the baptisms performed by a Luciferian to be invalid, then he would be judging the faith of the Luciferians invalid in some way as well. Where the line was drawn depended on whom and when one asked.

This vagueness is also apparent in other debates over baptisms performed by heretics. Whether the baptism performed by heretics was considered a ‘true’ baptism or whether those who had been baptized by heretics needed to be baptized again by an orthodox minister was a major issue for Christians throughout the first centuries after Christ. Tertullian of Carthage, roughly a century and a half before the Luciferian faction emerged, argues that heretical baptism was completely invalid.<sup>142</sup> Another Carthaginian, Cyprian, also believed that heretics need to be rebaptized (or, more appropriately, need to be baptized properly for the first and only time).<sup>143</sup> Stephen of Rome, after the Decian

---

<sup>142</sup> Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 19.5 (CCSL 2, Dekkers:1320): *Cui enim dubium est haereticum institutione deceptum cognito postmodum casu et paenitentia expiato et ueniam consequi et in ecclesiam redigi?*

<sup>143</sup> *Epistolae* 69-73 (CSEL 3.2, ed. Hartel:749-799); especially see 72.2 (CSEL 3.2:775-778) for Cyprian’s view of Stephen, who upheld heretical baptism as valid: *Hic cum omnium baptismo communicans*

persecutions, argues against Cyprian, claiming that heretical baptisms are entirely valid.<sup>144</sup> These different attitudes resulted from different social factors in Africa and Rome, particularly the growing power of so-called ‘confessors’ in Africa.<sup>145</sup> Although this 3<sup>rd</sup>-century debate appears to be an example from the distant past, it resurfaces during the Luciferian debate in Jerome’s *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. Two of Jerome’s major sources in the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* were Tertullian and Cyprian.<sup>146</sup>

This inconclusive 3<sup>rd</sup>-century dispute continued into the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>147</sup> In the West, for instance, Augustine is hesitant about treating heretical baptism as baptism. He argues (while discussing the Luciferians, in fact) that baptisms performed by schismatics and heretics had the proper form (*species*) but no effectiveness (*virtus*).<sup>148</sup> The ritual did not need to be repeated, but was still invalid until the individual returned to communion with the broader Christian community. By way of contrast, Augustine claimed that his longtime enemies, the Donatists, held that no heretical baptisms were valid at all.<sup>149</sup> The

---

*universorum delicta in sinum suum coacervata congressit*. In *Ep. 73.2 (CSEL 3.2:779)*, Cyprian mentions how Novatian, the schismatic bishop at Rome, also rebaptized those he accepted into his church, thus implying that in the West rebaptism was not uncommon at all. Kelly calls this viewpoint “conservative”: Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 209.

<sup>144</sup> Cyprian, *Ep. 73.1-2 (CSEL 3.2:778-780)* et passim.

<sup>145</sup> See J. Patout Burns, “On Rebaptism: Social Organization in the Third Century Church,” *J ECS* 1, no. 4 (1993): 367-403.

<sup>146</sup> Tertullian: 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. Cyprian: Y.M. Duval, “Saint Jérôme devant le baptême des hérétiques. D’autres sources de l’Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi,” *Revue des études augustinienne* 14 (1968): 145-180.

<sup>147</sup> For a broad overview of baptism in the West in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, see Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church* 634-686.

<sup>148</sup> Aug., *De ag. Chr.* 30.32 (*CSEL* 41:134). See also *Ep. 173.3 (LCL, ed. Baxter:286-288)* and 185.23 (*CSEL* 57.4, ed. Goldbacher:21-22).

<sup>149</sup> According to Augustine and Optatus, at least: Aug., *Ep. 129.5 (PL 33:492)* and Opt., *De schism. Don.* 5.4-7 (*CSEL* 26:126-137). Augustine’s and Optatus’ views of the Donatists are incredibly partisan. Their ‘Donatists’ should be treated as straw men, not Donatists. Still, these straw men argue for a set of beliefs which Augustine’s audience would have considered possible to hold.

4<sup>th</sup>-century *Apostolic Constitutions* also hold that a baptism performed by heretics was not a baptism but “pollution” instead; heretic priests are not true priests and therefore cannot offer true rites.<sup>150</sup> In contrast, Jerome, in the *Dialogus*, argues that Arians (and other heretics by extension) baptize validly.<sup>151</sup> Thus there was no uniform consensus in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century, although the evidence of Ambrose (as discussed above) and Jerome suggests that the baptism of heretics and schismatics was seen as valid in most of the West, while Africa – where the rigorists Tertullian and Cyprian had written in the past – remained more reticent in regards to heretical baptism, whether performed by ‘orthodox’ bishops on those later entering Donatist churches or vice-versa.

In the East, there was an even wider range of opinions.<sup>152</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, writing early in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, says that a laying-on of hands, not rebaptism, is the older (and therefore, it is implied, superior) custom.<sup>153</sup> Athanasius, the leading figure of the Nicene faction in the mid-fourth century, flatly states that the baptisms performed by Arians and other heretics are completely invalid.<sup>154</sup> Basil of Caesarea presents a fascinating picture of Christian attitudes towards rebaptism. In his so-called “Canonical Epistle,” he writes that those who were baptized into “the Father, the Son, and Montanus or Priscilla... were not baptized.”<sup>155</sup> Thus for him, the most important aspect in this group’s baptism was the liturgical formula which they used. Later in the same paragraph,

---

<sup>150</sup> *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.15.2 (ed. Funk:337): μόλυσμα.

<sup>151</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 11 (SC 473: 126).

<sup>152</sup> Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 455-633.

<sup>153</sup> Eus., *Hist. eccl.* 7.2 (GCS NF 6.2:638).

<sup>154</sup> Ath., *Contr. Ar.* 2.41-2 (PG 89:249-252).

<sup>155</sup> *Epistola* 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121): Τίνα οὖν λόγον ἔχει τὸ τούτων βάπτισμα ἐγκριθῆναι τῶν βαπτιζόντων εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Μοντανὸν καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν; Οὐ γὰρ ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ μὴ εἰς τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν βαπτισθέντες.

he makes the bishop presiding over the baptisms the focus of discussion. While discussing the Novatians (whom he calls Cathari), Basil states,

Οἱ δὲ, ἀπορραγέντες, λαϊκοὶ γινόμενοι, οὔτε τοῦ βαπτίζειν, οὔτε τοῦ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον τὴν ἐξουσίαν, οὔτε ἠδύνατο χάριν Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἑτέροις παρέχειν, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπτώκασι· διὸ ὡς παρὰ λαϊκῶν βαπτιζομένους τοὺς, παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσαν, ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι τῷ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀνακαθαίρεσθαι. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὅλως ἔδοξέ τισι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, δεχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα, ἔστω δεκτόν.<sup>156</sup>

Some, having broken off [from communion with other churches], becoming laymen, had neither the power of baptizing nor of ordaining, nor were they able to pass the grace of the Holy Spirit (from which they fell away) onto others; they ordered those coming into the Christian community to be cleansed in the true baptism of the Christian community, because being baptized by those men was like being baptized by laymen. But since it seemed altogether best to some of those in Asia to accept the baptism of these (for the sake of managing so many), let it be accepted.

The Council of Nicaea treats the Novatians as schismatics, not heretics.<sup>157</sup> Basil here argues that schismatic baptism is invalid – except that since accepting it makes it easier to run churches, it should be considered valid! In the very same paragraph he also admits to holding communion with two Encratite bishops and their communities despite stating in plain language that this should not be done.

Lucifer himself provoked the best example of how some Christian leaders refused to accept ordinations performed by heretics. While the Council of Alexandria discussed the readmission of clergy who had sworn the Dated Creed at Rimini, Lucifer ordained the upright Nicene Paulinus as bishop of Antioch in place of Meletius. Meletius, despite having been exiled for supposedly Nicene beliefs, had initially been appointed to the see

---

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Canon 8. Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, 1:409-14.

of Antioch by the Acacian faction (which supported the  $\text{o}\mu\text{o}\text{i}\text{o}\varsigma$  formulation).<sup>158</sup> Even after the Council of Alexandria, when Meletius returned to his seat at Antioch, a number of westerners along with Athanasius insisted on holding communion with Paulinus, *not* Meletius, implying that Meletius' ordination was in some way defective.<sup>159</sup> It could only be defective in this case due to who had performed it. Thus many westerners held beliefs like the Luciferians, namely that a bishop ordained by a heretic was no bishop at all.

These examples all indicate that any theoretical position on sacramental theology could and often did give way to the practical side of running a church hierarchy in the West and in the East.<sup>160</sup> While a group's theological position *might* force a minister to rebaptize them, it *might* not. Each case brought with it its own peculiar circumstances. There was no clear test for determining "how heretical" someone was, at least not in regards to baptism. For Jerome then to argue that the Luciferians are inconsistent is only to say that they are normal. Christian authors in general were inconsistent. Oddly enough, Jerome *also* writes that the difference between Lucifer and other Christians was one of words, not actual things.<sup>161</sup> This appears to extend to the Luciferians themselves, as he

---

<sup>158</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.29-33 (GCS 25, ed. Holl:305-308); Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 2.44 (GCS NF 1:181-182); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 4.28.6-7 (SC 418:346-348); Theod., *Hist. eccl.* 2.27.13-15 (GCS 19:161); R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for a Christian Doctrine of God* 382 briefly describes the situation and provides a bibliography, omitting the classic work by F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche. iv-v siècle* (Paris: Picard, 1905). Meletius was forced into exile several times by the Arianizing emperor Valens and his associates, who thought of him as, to use Hanson's phrase, "that Benedict Arnold of the Homoian party." *The Search for a Christian Doctrine of God*, 792-793.

<sup>159</sup> Including Damasus, bishop of Rome, Ambrose, and Jerome himself! See Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 796-805 and Ambrose, *Epistulae extra collectionem* 6 [11].4 (CSEL 82, ed. Zelzer:188).

<sup>160</sup> Although the Luciferian in Jerome's *Dialogus* is obviously a strawman extraordinaire, it is interesting that he at one point argues that the Luciferians receive laity without rebaptizing for very practical, not theological, reasons; *Dial. contr. Luc.* 4 (SC 473:94): *Recipimus laicos, quoniam nemo convertetur, si se scierit rebaptizandum.*

<sup>161</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 20 (SC 473:170): *...verbis eum a nobis dissentire, non rebus.* The vagueness of 'things' suits the vagueness of *rebus* well.

nowhere in the treatise calls them heretical. In fact, he even says, “We agree in faith” and describes them as “followers of the Nicene faith.”<sup>162</sup> For all his attacks on their consistency, Jerome seems to be suggesting that “Orthodoxus” opponent is in fact quite *orthodoxus* himself. His attack based on their failure to rebaptize comes off more and more as a rhetorical trope meant to paint the Luciferians as heretics rather than schismatics, as he himself does not seem to accept that this creates a true rift between the Luciferians and the Church.

Furthermore, the Luciferians did not even consider baptism an issue worth discussing in their petition. In fact, neither the topic nor even the word itself occurs in the text of their petition a single time. Baptism is discussed in Faustinus’ *De trinitate*, but only in a debate with an imaginary Arian wherein Faustinus uses the words spoken from heaven in Matthew 3.17 (“This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased”) during Jesus’ baptism by John as evidence that Jesus was the Son, not a created being.<sup>163</sup> Clearly the Luciferians did not define their community by their baptism practices, whether they rebaptized or not. The lack of attention to this practice is particularly interesting in light of the focus which western authors put on the Luciferian opposition to rebaptism, and once more suggests that Jerome’s argument is rhetorical and not reflective of any real difference between his own theology and that of the Luciferians.

Arguments against the Luciferians which suggest that they were more than merely schismatic appear to be merely rhetorical methods of maligning the Luciferians as

---

<sup>162</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 14 (SC 473:136): *Consentimus in fide, consentimus in haereticis recipiendis...*; 20: *...certe Nicaenae fidei sectatores...*

<sup>163</sup> *De trin.* 17-18 (CCSL 69:311-314). The debate opens with *Tu dicis eum esse creaturam; ego dico eum esse filium* at 17.2. Mt. 3.17 is quoted eight times in the two chapters.

heretics. They do not function as accurate descriptions of Luciferian theology. It is not difficult to see why these arguments arose. Schism by its very nature was intolerable to other universalizing Christian groups, and Christians relied on the naturally violent nature of orthodoxy to punish transgressors. Thus the concepts of catholicity and schism began to be expressed in terms of orthodoxy and heresy, even if such a heresy was nowhere to be found. The fluid nature of Christian beliefs in the 4<sup>th</sup> century allowed authors to draw lines and define heretics where lines had not been drawn before. As there was no test for defining ‘heresy’ as opposed to simple disagreement, authors were free to define ‘heresy’ however they saw fit – and frequently did so. The response to the Luciferians clearly demonstrates how the driving need for uniformity in doctrine *and* in regards to the unity of communion led to fictions designed to combat an otherwise seemingly orthodox group.

*Chapter IV. The Luciferian Petition.*

Other Christian authors alone are not guilty of such arguments *ex nihilo*. The Luciferians themselves, throughout their petition, demonstrate a flair for creating differences out of whole cloth or exaggerating differences held between them and *some* Christian authors to draw stark boundary lines between themselves and *all* other Christians. These differences, as is sometimes clear even within the petition itself, simply did not exist. The Luciferians rarely if ever do full justice to the complexity of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, whether in regards to the vicissitudes of various Christian factions or to the bewildering array of beliefs held by Christian individuals of that time. These arguments are almost entirely built around questions of orthodoxy even when it appears by all standards that their theological beliefs and those of their contemporaries were quite similar; this is a demonstration that even among members of the minority, the concepts of schism and catholicity still devolve into arguments over orthodoxy.

*i. Penance.*

The Luciferians and their opponents do not discuss the administration of penance, which was closely related to baptism.<sup>164</sup> Whether or not the administration of penance relies on the bishop himself or the office of the bishop is apparently just as unimportant for Faustinus and Marcellinus to discuss in the Luciferian petition as rebaptism, and a similar reasoning most likely applies. The Luciferians are instead more than happy to discuss what penance bishops should have suffered, rather than administered. Several

---

<sup>164</sup> See Everett Ferguson, "Laying On of Hands: Its Significance in Ordination," *JThS* 26, no. 1 (1975): 9 for a brief discussion and bibliography.

times throughout the text, the Luciferians argue that *praevaricatores* who fell into Arianism ought to be readmitted into communion as laymen only.<sup>165</sup> The Luciferian in Jerome's *Dialogus*, though admittedly a mere prop for Jerome to strike at, argues the same point vehemently.<sup>166</sup> Thus it appears that the most important factor for the Luciferians (in this particular historical circumstance) was not who administered penance but who received it.

By the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Christians had found it necessary to formulate rules guiding the readmittance of sinners, both of the laity and the clergy, into communion.<sup>167</sup> For serious crimes, laymen had to undergo a lengthy period of formal penance, at least in theory.<sup>168</sup> This penance "included prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, as well as lamentations and wearing ashes and sackcloth."<sup>169</sup> Clergymen of any rank did not undergo formal, public penance, but were stripped of their rank; churches would only receive them into communion as laymen.<sup>170</sup> The theological idea behind this was the necessity of a bishop to pray for a penitent's readmittance, but the nonexistence of any higher church authority

---

<sup>165</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 50 (SC 504:156): ...*nisi si laicam postulaverint communionem*; 55 (SC 504:160): ...*nisi si, ut a patribus decretum est, in laicorum se numerum tradant*...

<sup>166</sup> Throughout, e.g. *Dial. contr. Luc.* 3 (SC 473:88): The Luciferian says, ...*aio laicum, ab Arianis venientem recipi debere poenitentem, clericum, vero non debere*.

<sup>167</sup> For what follows, see Maureen Tilley, "Theologies of Penance during the Donatist Controversy," *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001): 330-331.

<sup>168</sup> See, for instance, Cypr., *Ep.* 64.1.1 (CSEL 3.2:717).

<sup>169</sup> Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 93. There was, of course, a sliding scale of penance required based on the severity of the crime.

<sup>170</sup> Tilley, "Theologies of Penance," 330. This difference is mentioned in an early 5<sup>th</sup>-century work by Augustine, *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum Donatistam*, 3.27.30 (PL 43.510-511). The precedent apparently began with Trophimus, who returned his congregation in 250 to catholic communion during the Novatian controversy but was made a layman: Cypr., *Ep.* 55 (CSEL 3.2:631-632). See other examples, along with the critical exceptions to the 'rule,' in Tilley, "Theologies of Penance," 332-35. For examples of church canons that specify this, see for instance Canons 51 and 76 of the Synod of Elvira, held in 305 or 306 (Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, 1:159; 169) and Canon 2 of the Synod of Toledo, held in 400 (Ibid., 2:419).

to pray for a clergyman.<sup>171</sup> However, clergymen admitted after only a laying-on of hands could retain (but did not by necessity retain) their ecclesiastic ranks.<sup>172</sup> This was clearly an important issue after Constantius' death, as bishops called the Council of Alexandria and other councils in large part to determine which of these options the orthodox bishops would exercise on those who "fell."

This was a difficult issue because Christian authors had long considered apostasy one of the most serious crimes that one could commit. The third-century Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*, for example, states that bishops who have departed from the faith are not to be ministers again because they have "lied."<sup>173</sup> Frequently, it is listed along with adultery and murder as one of the three worst sins.<sup>174</sup> See, as one 4th-century example, Gregory of Nyssa's *Epistola Canonica ad Letoium* 2-4, which establishes the harshest penalties for apostasy, then murderers and adulterers (which of the two is more serious depends on the good behavior of the penitent), then fornicators.<sup>175</sup> Pacian, a Spanish bishop of the fourth century, gives the same group of three, as does Augustine a little later.<sup>176</sup> In the East, Gregory of Nyssa uses the same three.<sup>177</sup> Basil of Caesarea exemplifies another tradition, wherein those three sins are subsumed into a larger list of

---

<sup>171</sup> The common refrain was *Sacerdos si peccaverit, quis orabit illo?*: Tilley, "Theologies of Penance," 331. The possibility of a bishop praying for a priest is not discussed.

<sup>172</sup> Rémi Crespin, *Ministère et sainteté: Pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donatiste dans la vie et la doctrine de Saint Augustin* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1965), 51.

<sup>173</sup> *Didascalia Apostolorum* 11 (ANF 8, trans. Pratten:668). Chapter 13 (Ibid., 669) states that a minister divided in his mind should not be a minister either.

<sup>174</sup> The earliest example is Tertullian, but it follows his conversion to a Montanist form of Christianity: see Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 94.

<sup>175</sup> PG 45:224-229.

<sup>176</sup> Pacian, *Paraenesis* 11 (PL 13:1088); Aug., *Sermones* 352.8 (PL 39:1550).

<sup>177</sup> *Ep. Can. ad Let.* (PG 45:225;288;229).

serious crimes.<sup>178</sup> Fourth-century authors such as Optatus equated heresy and even schism with apostasy.<sup>179</sup> Thus the remaining Christian leaders, had these bishops truly ‘fallen’ into heresy, ought to have compelled them to undergo penance and give up their rank in their ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Even these practices were flexible, however. At the Council of Nicaea, far earlier than the Luciferian schism emerged but still very important to the Luciferians and their opponents, Novatians (referred to as the *Καθαροί*) were allowed to return to communion with the bishops assembled. Their bishops retained full episcopal rank, unless there was already an orthodox bishop in the diocese, in which case the Novatian would be made a priest (or given episcopal rank if the local bishop permitted him).<sup>180</sup> Although the Council considered them schismatic, not heretical,<sup>181</sup> the canon orders the Novatians to follow all of the ‘catholic doctrines’ (*τοῖς δόγμασι τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*), which indicates that the authors of the Nicene canons felt the Novatians had the potential to teach theologically disputed doctrines. Nevertheless, the laying-on of hands was the only penance which the bishops at Nicaea demanded from the Novatians, and this did not strip their clergy of their rank. A nearly identical canon, also concerning the Novatians, was promulgated at the Synod of Rome in 386, only a couple of years after the Luciferians presented their petition to Theodosius.<sup>182</sup> Thus, even though orthodox bishops frequently

---

<sup>178</sup> *Ep.* 188 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121).

<sup>179</sup> J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 412.

<sup>180</sup> Canon 8. For text of the canon and discussion, see Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, 1:409-14.

<sup>181</sup> Furthermore, by the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century, Basil of Caesarea specifically identifies them as schismatics, not heretics: *Ep.* 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121). The Novatians are another example of a group which 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christian authors found difficult to define as heretics, schismatics, or catholic.

<sup>182</sup> For the Synod and the eighth canon in particular, see Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, 2:387.

forced heretic and schismatic bishops to renounce their clerical rank, there was by no means a universal consensus on the subject.<sup>183</sup> Just as Christians in the fourth century disagreed over the efficacy of heretical baptism, they disagreed with each other over what measures should be taken against heretical bishops returning to orthodox communion. For the Luciferians then to argue that the bishops who signed the “Dated Creed” had to renounce their ecclesiastic rank represents one branch of Christian opinion, but by no means represents some universally agreed-upon attitude towards ordination. It is the need for a way to differentiate themselves from other Christians that forces the Luciferians to polarize this muddy mess into a clear black-and-white distinction.

In any event, the debate quickly focused on the questionable circumstances of the councils, not whether or not formerly heretical bishops had to be removed from the clergy. According to Jerome, the Councils found that these ‘traitor’ bishops were merely deceived, not weak.<sup>184</sup> Rufinus and Sulpicius Severus give the same reason.<sup>185</sup> Modern scholars have treated this as an act of clemency and pragmatism, and it is beyond doubt

---

<sup>183</sup> Writing about the African Church’s choices in readmitting Donatist bishops, Crespin remarks that “Cette diversité de solutions concernant un problème limité nous semble significative de la richesse accumulée par la tradition canonique africaine”: Crespin, *Ministère et sainteté*, 52. Undoubtedly, the same could be said of the tradition at Alexandria some decades earlier. This diversity allowed the bishops to justify their decisions with precedents, no matter what those decisions were. By the 380s, the Luciferians (and their opponents) could draw on various council canons, some contradicting each other, from all across the Empire.

<sup>184</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 17 (SC 473:150) concerning the “Dated Creed”: *Sonabant verba pietatem, et inter tanti mella praeconii, nemo venenum insertum putabat.* 19 (Ibid., 158), concerning some of the bishops at Rimini: *Pauci vero –ut se natura hominum habet – errorem pro consilio defensavere.* 19 (Ibid., 160), after Julian’s tolerance edict: *Concurrerant episcopi, qui Ariminensibus dolis irretiti, sine conscientia haeretici ferebantur...* Most importantly, 20 (Ibid., 168), concerning the Council of Alexandria: *non quod episcopi possint esse qui haeretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur, haeticos non fuisse.*

<sup>185</sup> Ruf.: *Hist.* 1.21 (GCS NF 6.2:987): *plures decepti*; Sulp. Sev.: *Chron.* 2.45.3 (SC 441:330): *Occidentalibus deceptis...*

that this is true in part.<sup>186</sup> The bishops who ‘fell’ at Rimini may not have even fully understood the theological implications of their actions. Hilary of Poitiers, one of the staunchest Nicene Christians in the period, claimed that he did not even know what the Nicene Creed said until just prior to his exile in 356, only a few short years before the councils at Rimini and Seleucia.<sup>187</sup> At Rimini, Dionysius of Milan apparently did not know what the Nicene Creed was when presented with it.<sup>188</sup> If Hilary, one of the leading Nicene Christian figures in the West, did not know what the Nicene Creed stated, then the chances that all of his other fellow bishops did are slim.

The creed which Constantius pushed at Rimini was the “Dated Creed” of the Council at Sirmium, held in 359 just before the councils at Rimini and Seleucia, but included minor changes.<sup>189</sup> This Sirmian creed (not to be confused with the earlier “blasphemy” of the Second Council of Sirmium) was designed to be flexible and have none of the vocabulary (specifically, ὁμοούσιος) which some found particularly questionable.<sup>190</sup> By pushing this vague creed on bishops who did not have the theological acumen to understand its implications, the ‘Arian’ party may in fact have been able to deceive a vast majority, or find a compromise with these Western bishops that later Nicene authors found unacceptable. In this case, then, the knowledge which these bishops had of their own actions played an integral role in whether or not Orthodox theologians

---

<sup>186</sup> See Batiffol, “Les sources de l’*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*,” 108-109 and 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,” 290-291.

<sup>187</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>188</sup> Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (*PL* 10, 562-563). For further discussion of the West’s ignorance of the Nicene Creed, see Jörg Ulrich, “Nicaea and the West,” *VC* vol. 51, no. 1 (1997): 10-24.

<sup>189</sup> Meslin, *Les Ariens d’Occident*, 282-285.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, 96-97.

thought they should readmit the bishops. The implication is that if these ‘fallen’ bishops fully understood the theological implications of their actions at the Council of Rimini in 359, they should not be readmitted to catholic communion as clergy.

Whether or not the bishops at Rimini understood what they were signing, the Luciferians did not doubt that they knew that they had become heretics. As just one example, Faustinus and Marcellinus use *praevaricator* as a substantive adjective for these bishops over 30 times throughout the *Libellus*. They use it to describe a variety of individuals ranging from Arians to bishops who may well have been deceived.<sup>191</sup> The word choice is critical. The Luciferian authors never describe the bishops at Rimini as “fools” or “simpletons” but always as “traitors.” The implication of the word is active and knowing cooperation. Thus since they *knowingly* had become heretics, Faustinus and Marcellinus argue, they ought to lose their rank and the orthodox clergy ought to force them back into the ranks of the laity. This was a critical component in their self-identity. The two authors create a simple dichotomy, referring to their opponents as those who “were afraid to suffer exile for Christ, Son of God,” *not* “those who were tricked.”<sup>192</sup> These *praevaricatores* (broad as the term is) stand as a uniform mass against which the Luciferians can define themselves as the stronger and more ‘Christian’ faction. There is no room for ignorant bishops in this schema. The fact that this is a simplification is made all the more clear by the Luciferians’ argument to Theodosius that fraud and deceit is

---

<sup>191</sup> “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 imperial); 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”: Aline Canellis, “Arius et les ‘Ariens’ vus par les Lucifériens dans le *Libellus Precum*,” *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 492.

<sup>192</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 4 (SC 504:112): ...*metuunt pro Christo Filio Dei exilium perpeti...*

hiding the true faith from him.<sup>193</sup> After all, it would be improper to accuse the petitioned emperor of heresy, so the Luciferians must find some excuse for his hitherto lack of awareness concerning what they say ‘truly’ happened.

For the Luciferians, as for both Jerome and Rufinus, the knowledge or ignorance of the bishops involved was paramount. Both imply that knowledge of their apostasy would convict them and strip them of their rank of bishop; they merely disagree on whether or not the bishops at Rimini had knowledge. The argument was not over the theological propriety of the actions taken by the bishops at the Council of Alexandria, merely the analysis of events and the understanding that the council had as to what had happened at Rimini.<sup>194</sup> Although apparently an important way by which the Luciferians defined themselves, this treatment of the bishops at Rimini and Seleucia shows no theological distinction from other orthodox Christians.

## *ii. Ordination.*

Although the Luciferians do not in their pamphlet explicitly discuss the propriety of heretic baptisms and administration of penance, they do discuss the ordination and communion of heretics. Although Eno writes that “the purity of ecclesial lineage” was not important to the Luciferians,<sup>195</sup> the Luciferians would ordain bishops for their own

---

<sup>193</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 2 (SC 504:108): ...*sanctae fidei veritas impiorum caterva et fraudulentissimis eorum circumventionibus obfuscatut et premitur?*

<sup>194</sup> The current emperors are presumed ignorant of the truth of what happened at Rimini and of Luciferian suffering: *Lib. Prec.* 106 (SC 504:214): ...*ignorantibus vobis...*

<sup>195</sup> Robert Eno, "Holiness and Separation in the Early Centuries," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 539.

communities. These communities are described as “uncontaminated” or “uncorrupted.”<sup>196</sup> The clear implication is that Christian communities require a bishop who is free from the taint of heresy, and that in the eyes of the Luciferians, heretic bishops were insufficient for the needs of a ‘true’ Christian community. For the Luciferians, this ecclesial lineage was important.

This ‘contamination’ was also carried down through the ordinations of the ‘contaminated’ bishops. The Luciferians, among others, condemn bishops ordained by the ‘Arians.’ Near the start of the Luciferian schism, certain Christians in Antioch had opposed Melitius solely because he had been ordained by Arians, despite his support of the Nicene Creed.<sup>197</sup> The Luciferians followed suit with one of Melitius’ appointees, Apollonius. Faustinus and Marcellinus refer to Apollonius as the “bishop of the Melitians” and then call him a heretic.<sup>198</sup> Thus according to the Luciferians, heretical ordination created heretical bishops.

Reordination was also anathema to the Luciferians. Obviously, based on their beliefs concerning the proper penance for bishops discussed above, no reordination was open to bishops who had sworn to the Dated Creed. Furthermore, the Luciferians held previously orthodox bishops reordained into Arian churches in exceptionally low regard. For example, they refer to Theodore as “that remarkable twice-bishop” (*ille egregius bis*

---

<sup>196</sup> Bishops included Ephesius in Rome, ordained by Taorgius in opposition to Damasus: *Lib. Prec.* 84 (SC 504:188) and Heraclides at Oxyrhynchus; the Luciferians write, ...*haec ipsa pars plebs...episcopum sibi per tunc temporis episcopos catholicos ordinavit sanctum Heraclidam* in opposition to Theodore (a pawn of George of Cappadocia): *Lib. Prec.* 94 (SC 504:200). For the “uncontaminated” faith, see *Lib. Prec.* 77 (SC 504:180): *intaminatae* (Trier) and *Lib. Prec.* 84 (SC 504:188): *intaminatae* (Rome).

<sup>197</sup> Ath., *Hist. Ar.* 4.1 (PG 25:741) and T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantine*, 149.

<sup>198</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 100 (SC 504:208): ...*cum Apollonio Melitianorum episcopo...* and 101 (SC 504:208): ...*haeretici Apollonii...*

*episcopus*).<sup>199</sup> Theodore is also criticized for being ordained by orthodox bishops and then later being ordained again by George of Cappadocia in particular, who was the Bishop of Alexandria in lieu of Athanasius at the time.<sup>200</sup> Naturally, the Luciferians object both to the bishops who knowingly reordain men and the bishops themselves who were reordained. Thus the recipients of the new ordinations incur some blame or fault for this action. They should neither be reordained as clergy nor admitted as clergy after a mere laying-on of hands.<sup>201</sup>

As was the case with the bishops at Rimini, the Luciferians assume the bishops being ordained fully appreciated the heresy of those who were ordaining them *and* the very concept that being ordained by a heretic made one a heretic. Jerome criticizes them heavily for this last point, arguing that the error of the consecrator does not affect the consecration.<sup>202</sup> This point relies on Jerome's argument about the equivalence of baptism for laity and ordination for clergy. Jerome argues that since the Luciferians accept baptisms performed by heretics, they must accept ordinations performed by heretics as well. He appears to have found a contradiction in Luciferian thought and hammers away at the point.

Jerome provides the counter-argument to his own point in the course of his text.

Early on, he clearly states that baptism can be performed by laymen in urgent

---

<sup>199</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 96 (SC 504:96). *Egregius* throughout the text is a sarcastic epithet, as it is in Jerome's *Dialogus Contra Luciferianos*. See Canellis, "Arius et les 'Ariens' vus par les Lucifériens dans le *Libellus Precum*," 500. Once again, the Luciferians unwittingly demonstrate how in tune they were with the Christian trends of their time; in the 360s, *egregius* was still being used unironically. See *Débat entre un luciférien et un orthodoxe*, ed. Aline Canellis, 57.

<sup>200</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 94 (SC 504:200-202).

<sup>201</sup> A sentiment pervasive throughout the text and explicitly stated at *Lib. Prec.* 112 (SC 504:222): *...in veram eius [Dei] ecclesiam...*

<sup>202</sup> *Dial. contr. Luc.* 11 (SC 473:124-128).

circumstances.<sup>203</sup> Jerome later mocks Hilarius of Rome, saying that his sect died “because as a deacon he was unable to ordain anyone as a cleric after him. Now, there is no community [*ecclesia*] which has no priests.”<sup>204</sup> Thus according to Jerome in one and the same text, bishops are absolutely required for ordination but not always for baptism.<sup>205</sup> Ordination then particularly relies on the episcopate, but baptism does not.<sup>206</sup> Thus, the Luciferian position is not as unusually contradictory as Jerome presents it. Although they may differ from Jerome in respect to the importance of the bishop’s orthodoxy, they do not disagree on the relative importance of the bishop himself in ordination as opposed to baptism. As a bishop is necessary for ordination, but not baptism, the Luciferians could, even within the measure of Jerome’s rhetorical set piece, accept the baptisms performed by heretics (just as Jerome accepts certain baptisms performed by laymen) but not the ordinations performed by heretics (just as Jerome refuses to accept that Hilarius would have any authority to ordain anyone).

Some Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century did insist on the validity of ordinations performed by heretics. Melitius of Antioch’s supporters, for instance, seemingly

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 9 (*SC* 473:118-122).

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., 21 (*SC* 473:172): *...et cum iam homo mortuus sit, cum homine pariter interiit et secta, quia post se nullum clericum diaconus potuit ordinare. Ecclesia autem non est, quae non habet sacerdotes.*

<sup>205</sup> It should be noted, however, that Jerome is well-aware of his rhetorical posturing, telling his Luciferian opponent “I am not, in the present, either attacking or defending the Arians...” Ibid., 11 (*SC* 473:124-126): *Ego enim non tam in praesenti Arianos vel improbo vel defendo...*

<sup>206</sup> To further complicate matters, the precise 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christians were still in the process of defining the proper actions and the meanings of the actions in ordination rituals. See Everett Ferguson, “Jewish and Christian Ordination,” *Harvard Theological Review* 56, no. 1 (1963): 13-19, Ibid., “Origen and the Election of Bishops,” *Church History* 43, no. 1 (1974): 26-33, especially 30-31, and Ibid., “Selection and Installation to Office in Roman, Greek, Jewish and Christian Antiquity,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 30 (1974): 283. Jerome, in *Ep.* 146.1 (*CSEL* 55.1, ed. Hilberg:310), gives an account of how presbyters in Alexandria (prior to Heraclas and Dionysius) would choose a bishop for their community, explicitly comparing this to the selection of an archdeacon by local deacons and the selection of emperors by the army (!).

comprised the majority of the church at Antioch.<sup>207</sup> By supporting him, these commoners (not theologians) supported a bishop who had been ordained by heretics. Some theologians agreed. Even though Chrysostom is not specifically talking about heretics, in his 14<sup>th</sup> homily on Acts he states, “The hand lies on the man, but God works everything, and it is His hand which clasps the head of the man being touched.”<sup>208</sup> If it is God’s hand, and not the bishop’s hand, which actually touches the man during his ordination, whose physical hands are touching the cleric-to-be seems irrelevant.

Augustine is slightly more reticent. As with baptism, he argues that ordination performed by heretics does not need to be repeated, but is defective until the ordained priest enters into communion with the correct community.<sup>209</sup> Others are even stricter, such as the supporters of Paulinus of Antioch in opposition to Meletius. This would have included the laity of Antioch, which chose to follow Paulinus after he was ordained by Lucifer in opposition to Meletius, Athanasius of Alexandria, and prominent westerners including Jerome and Damasus, the bishop of Rome.<sup>210</sup> If they accepted ordinations performed by Arians, surely a man like Meletius, who was ordained by an Arian but proceeded to publicly affirm Nicene beliefs, would have made for a power ally and a rhetorical coup.<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> Socr. *Hist. eccl.* 5.5.4 (GCS NF 1:277) says ἐκβιάζεται ὁ λαός, implying that the ‘people’ supported Meletius and his successors.

<sup>208</sup> *Homiliae XIV in Acta Apostolorum* (PG 60.116): Ἡ χεὶρ ἐπίκειται τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ δὲ πᾶν ὁ Θεὸς ἐργάζεται καὶ ἡ αὐτοῦ χεὶρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπτομένη τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου.

<sup>209</sup> Aug., *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* 2.13.28 (PL 43:70-71).

<sup>210</sup> As noted above in the discussion on communion; see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God, 796-805* and Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 158.

<sup>211</sup> Meletius’ ordination: Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 5.5 (GCS NF 1: 276-277).

Basil of Caesarea argues that since heretics have separated themselves from the orthodox Christian community, they have become laymen; since they have become laymen, they have no ability to ordain or baptize.<sup>212</sup> Basil then curiously reverses course, saying in the very same chapter that he has allowed two bishops from Encratite communities, Izois and Saturninus, to retain their episcopal rank on returning to communion with him. Those ‘attached’ to them are also allowed to rejoin his church, their baptisms remaining valid. His justification for this leniency is that those bishops shared communion with his church, and by accepting their leaders he must accept their laity; no justification is given for why he accepted the bishops.<sup>213</sup> It is striking just how flexible Christian practices were; Basil’s words agree with the Luciferians, but his actions do not, and he seems to feel no need to explain the difference. In one section of one letter, Basil has demonstrated that the sharply-defined rules as the Luciferians cast them could easily be bent, if not broken.

The variety of beliefs about ordination demonstrated by Christian authors once more shows that supposedly clear lines between heresy, schism, orthodoxy, and catholicity were in fact blurred and always dependant on circumstance. Even individual authors like Jerome might argue with the Luciferians that bishops associated with Arianism could be readmitted into the clergy but then turn around and hold communion

---

<sup>212</sup> *Ep.* 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121). Basil then specifically says that schismatic (Novatian, in this case, and explicitly not Encratite) baptisms will be accepted for practical reasons; conspicuously absent is any such statement regarding their ordinations.

<sup>213</sup> Basil was, however, concerned with his personal control over ascetic groups in Anatolia: Charles Frazee, "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea," *The Catholic Historical Review* 66, no. 1 (1980): 16-33. Since these Encratites represented a group of ascetics near his episcopacy, Basil found a way of exerting more control over their activities by extending a welcoming hand to their bishops. This is, however, a practical explanation, not a theological justification.

with Paulinus instead of Meletius.<sup>214</sup> While the Luciferians use their policy on the suitability of bishops ordained by heretics to define their community against other Christian authors (who in their eyes all-too-gladly accepted ordinations performed by *praevaricatores*), there were plenty of Christians outside of the Luciferian communion who felt the exact same way. Thus while this division works as a rhetorical piece, it does not distinguish the Luciferians from other orthodox Christians. Once more, the Luciferians feel the need to exaggerate the difference between themselves and their enemies, simplifying a very complex situation in order not only to depict themselves as orthodox, but to depict their enemies as heterodox.

*iii. Communion.*

The Luciferians also argue that these heretical bishops (or bishops ordained by heretics; both are called opponents of the “true faith”) lack the spiritual authority to perform other ecclesiastical duties. The Luciferians oppose holding communion with the bishops who they thought had ‘fallen’ at Rimini and their latter day allies. As with their position on the ordinations performed by ‘heretics,’ communion was thought to spread the religious impurity brought about by their submission at Rimini or worse; the general feeling might be described as “a morbid fear of spiritual contamination or guilt by association.”<sup>215</sup> The Luciferians describe how they refuse communion with the

---

<sup>214</sup> Jer., *Chron.* 286.1e (*PL* 27:503-504).

<sup>215</sup> Eno, "Holiness and Separation in the Early Centuries," 538.

*praevaricatores* (generally meaning all non-Luciferians) numerous times.<sup>216</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus, to take the Oxyrhynchus community as a specific example, write that “they so cautiously and carefully strive to protect the catholic faith inviolably that they mix themselves with no heretics or traitors in the divine sacraments.”<sup>217</sup> Instead, the Luciferians would ordain their own bishops in a given community, as noted above.

The implication of ordaining a bishop in opposition to an already seated orthodox bishop is that the sacraments – including the eucharist – administered by the orthodox bishop were not valid due to the ‘contaminated’ nature of the bishop himself. This same ‘contamination’ could be spread even to good bishops who held communion with heretics. According to Faustinus and Marcellinus, Florentius of Merida (not to be confused with Florentius of Ostia) held communion with Ossius and Potamius; for this crime, a divine power twisted his neck every time he entered his church until he was finally killed.<sup>218</sup> Even an upright bishop is held at fault if he holds communion with *praevaricatores*.

This communion-spreading-disease metaphor was not limited to the Luciferians, however. The fourth-century *Constitutiones apostolorum*, for example, explicitly state

---

<sup>216</sup> See, for instance, *Lib. Prec.* 18 (SC 504:126); 27 (SC 504:132-134); 49 (SC 504:154); and so on. 49 is perhaps the clearest example of the Luciferian position: *Et nunc his talibus non communicare summa impietas dicitur...*

<sup>217</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 93 (SC 504:198-200): *...tanto sollicitius diligentiusque fidem catholicam inviolabiliter servare contendunt, ita ut se nullis haereticis nullisque praevaricatoribus per divina commisceant sacramenta.*

<sup>218</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 43-45 (SC 504:148-150). The importance of spatial location as a function of religious identity is highlighted by Shepardson, who describes John Chrysostom in the 380s as a preacher “explicitly linking religious identity with attendance at particular physical places”: “Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom’s *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy,” *JECS* 15, no. 4 (2007): 484. While Shepardson’s work focuses on the attempts to physically control certain church buildings by Chrysostom, it is a very small conceptual leap to then imagine God defending proper Christian sites against improper Christians.

that sharing communion with heretics was worse than with Jews or pagans.<sup>219</sup> The disease metaphor appears in that passage as well, and the anonymous author discusses it at length.<sup>220</sup> One text written in opposition to the Luciferians (among others), the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus*, calls them a leprosy.<sup>221</sup> These metaphors were not only used for intra-Christian conflicts. John Chrysostom, attempting to prevent members of his Antiochene congregation from attending synagogues, describes one who does so as a man who, “fleeing a hospital, even if he appears to be healthy, will swiftly fall into sickness.”<sup>222</sup> The Luciferians are vitriolic about church discipline, but this vitriol is not particularly distinctive in an age in which it was thought that “accommodation or compromise imperiled one’s place within the one true community of God upon the earth, and indeed the very survival of that community.”<sup>223</sup> Like other Christians of the fourth century, they are adapting language used for distinguishing Christians from other religious adherents to distinguish certain Christians from other Christians.

---

<sup>219</sup> Worse than Jews and pagans: 6.18.3 (ed. Funk:343); disease metaphor: 6.18.10 (ed. Funk:345). The sixth book was based on the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, a 3<sup>rd</sup>-century work, but compiled in the 4<sup>th</sup> century: see David Fiensy, “Redaction History and the Apostolic Constitutions,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (New Series) 72, no. 4 (1982): 293, especially the bibliographic references in n1.

<sup>220</sup> 6.18.10 (ed. Funk:345): καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς, διερχόμενοι τὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ἐκκλησίας, τοὺς μὲν ἐν πολλῇ νοουθεσίᾳ καὶ λόγῳ ἱατικῶ ὑγιάσαντες ἐπανηγάγομεν μέλλοντας ὅσον οὐδέπω θνήσκειν ἀπάτη, τοὺς δὲ ἀνιάτως ἔχοντας ἐξεβάλομεν τῆς ποιίμνης, ἵνα μὴ φωραλέας νόσου μεταδῶσιν καὶ τοῖς ὑγαίνουσιν ἀρνίοις, ἀλλὰ καθαρὰ καὶ ἄχραντα, ὑγιῆ καὶ ἄσπιλα διαμείνη κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ.

<sup>221</sup> 2.6.10 (CCSL 60:81): ...*lepra in corpora*...

<sup>222</sup> *Adversus Iudaeos* 3.2.4 (PG 48:864): ὁ μέντοι τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἑαυτὸν ἀπορρήξας καὶ τῆς τῶν πατέρων διδασκαλίας ὑπεξαγαγὼν καὶ τὸ ἱατρεῖον φυγῶν κἂν ὑγιαίνειν δοκῆ ταχέως εἰς ἀρρωστίαν πεσεῖται. The Luciferian emphasis on communal purity may be compared to another Christian group especially prominent in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the Donatists; according to Tilley, “one of the distinctions which separates Catholics from Donatists is the Donatists’ *positive* conception of themselves as the holy assembly of Israel in the midst of her unclean enemies.” Maureen Tilley, “Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity: From the Church of the Martyrs to the *Collecta* of the Desert,” *J ECS* 5, no. 1 (1997): 23. But the Luciferians nowhere call themselves the *collecta* of Israel. Furthermore, the usage of clean/unclean or healthy/sick metaphors among other Christians should indicate that such language, or even such a world view, was not unique to the Donatists or even to minority groups of Christians.

<sup>223</sup> Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 79.

As far as the laity is concerned, the Luciferian willingness to accept bishops back into communion as laymen and their apparent willingness to accept heretical baptism indicates that the purity of the lay community – their status as “uncontaminated people” – was dependent on their current choice of communicants, not necessarily their past choices.<sup>224</sup> This attitude was different than the Donatists of the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, who (according to their opponents, at any rate) insisted on the purity of both their clergy and laity.<sup>225</sup> Augustine, for instance, claimed that the Donatists insisted on the purity of their laity, arguing that this was impossible and thus the Donatists were arrogant.<sup>226</sup> The implication is that their beliefs concerning proper communion practices, being impossible, were untenable and should be replaced by beliefs that made more sense, i.e. Augustine’s own. Basil of Caesarea, as discussed above, accepted communion with two Encratite bishops’ congregations *because* he accepted them as bishops.<sup>227</sup> If he had not accepted the bishops, the implication is that he would not have held communion with their laity either (unless they underwent a laying-on of hands, presumably). Many Christian authors at the time, however, argued that a church should receive laymen of questionable purity into its communion.<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 84 (SC 504:188-189): *...intaminatae plebe Romanae...*

<sup>225</sup> According to Opt., 2.1 (CSEL 26:32-36) and 7.2 (Ibid., 168-170), for what that is worth. See also Maureen Tilley, "Dilatory Donatists or Procrastinating Catholics: The Trial at the Conference of Carthage," *Church History* 60, no. 1 (1991): 14-16. At page 16, she writes, "The Donatists saw the holiness of the Church and its members as inextricably linked."

<sup>226</sup> E.g. Aug., *Psalmus contra partem Donati* 22 (PL 43:25): *Homines multum superbi, qui se dicunt iustos esse*. The actual Donatist position was considerably more sensible; see Robert Eno, "Some Nuances in the Ecclesiology of the Donatists," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 18 (1972): 46-50.

<sup>227</sup> Ep. 188.1 (ed. Courtonne, 2.121).

<sup>228</sup> For instance, Opt., *De schism. Don.* 2.1 (CSEL 26:32-36) and 7.2 (CSEL 26:168-170), Aug., Ep. 129.1 (PL 33:490-491) against the Donatists. But also, apart from the Donatist question, Hil., *Commentarium in Evangelium Matthaei* 33.8 (PL 9:1075-1076): *quia tum in eo* [sc. *linto*]; c.f. Acts 10.11-12], *ut in*

Faustinus and Marcellinus also insist that a Luciferian ascetic, Hermione, is “not a heretic...not holding communion with traitors, because she understood that the virginity of her body would do no good unless she also tended to the integrity of her soul by the holy confession [of faith],” a description directly connected to her status and actions as a holy virgin.<sup>229</sup> The Luciferian authors draw a clear connection between one’s ascetic practice and ecclesiastical practice. Her ascetic practices, which develop her personal ascetic authority, are intricately linked (according to the Luciferians) with her choice of communicants. Holding communion with ‘heretics,’ for the Luciferians, invalidates one’s personally-developed ascetic authority.<sup>230</sup> The choice of communicating bishops was critical. The Luciferians describe Hermione in order to demonstrate that their views on communion applied to laymen as well as bishops.

This was not unique to the Luciferians. The Luciferian stance harkens back to the famous phrase taken from John Cassian’s opponents in the debate concerning the proper interaction between ascetics and the world, who said “Monks should flee bishops.”<sup>231</sup>

---

*confusione Ecclesiae, mundorum atque immundorum animalium fuerit congesta diversitas and Tract. sup. Ps. 1.9 (CSEL 22:25): in ecclesia quidem manentes, sed ecclesiae disciplinam non tenentes.*

<sup>229</sup> *Lib. Prec. 103 (SC 504:210-211): non haereticis...non praevaricatoribus communicans, eo quod intellegat virginitatem corporis nihil prodesse nisi et integritatem animae sacra confessione tueatur.*

<sup>230</sup> The Luciferians are forgiving of those who did not know they were communicating with heretics. For instance, Dionysius of Milan continued to hold communion with Constantius, but the Luciferians excuse him because he stopped when he realized that Constantius was an enemy of the Church (at least, according to them): *Ibid. 23 (SC 504:130).*

<sup>231</sup> *Institutiones 11.18 (CSEL 17, ed. Petschenig:203): Quapropter haec est antiquitas Patrum permanens nunc usque sententia, quam proferre sine mea confusione non potero, qui nec germanan vitare potui, nec episcopi evadere manus, omnimodis monachum fugere debere mulieres et episcopos. Neuter enim sinit eum, quem semel suae familiaritati devinxerit, vel quieti cellulae ulterius operam dare, vel divinae theoriae per sanctarum rerum intuitum purissimus oculis inhaerere.* Rapp argues that this is frequently taken out of context to indicate that there was a conflict between the monastic and ecclesiastic establishments of the Church, while Cassian demonstrates that the truth is more complicated. While this is true for some, like Cassian, there were many others who believed the matter to be more black-and-white than Rapp’s “mutating tapestry.” Although Cassian is a later author, these attitudes were prevalent in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century as well; see the discussion of the desert fathers Affy and Mathois below.

Just as these unnamed opponents of Cassian argued that monks ought to flee bishops for fear that these bishops would contaminate their ascetic virtue in some way, the Luciferians argue that monks (or in this case, a female ascetic) ought to flee the *wrong* bishops while seeking out the right.<sup>232</sup> So while the Luciferians support Rapp's argument that the interaction between bishops and monastics was more than just "interaction" or "non-interaction," at a more fundamental level, they are in agreement with Cassian's unnamed opponents. Generally speaking, both believe that the people with whom any given ascetic interacts affects the ascetic's worth as an ascetic. It is not enough to deny oneself the pleasures of the world. One must deny association with the unrighteous as well. The Luciferians argue that Hermione must hold communion with the right bishops. Most Christians, however, would agree – the question was really about who the right bishops were.

Calling the Luciferian refusal to hold communion with the *praevaricator*-bishops a "morbid fear of contamination," however, is misleading.<sup>233</sup> The Luciferians undermine their own rhetorical divisions. After all, Florentius of Ostia was in communion with Damasus while the latter persecuted the Luciferian presbyter Macarius. Florentius, despite siding with Damasus, reburies Macarius in the church of the martyr Asterius

---

<sup>232</sup> It should be noted, in order to demonstrate how variable these beliefs still were in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, that bishops did not always care to associate with monks, either. Siricius, bishop of Rome from 384 to 399 (following Damasus), "was no friend of the newly emerging model of the monk-bishop. In his view, the practice of celibacy or other forms of ascetic renunciation was no substitute for working one's way through the ranks of the clerical hierarchy... Siricius was decidedly unimpressed with monks as candidates for the clergy...": David Hunter, "Rereading the Jovinianist Controversy: Asceticism and Clerical Authority in Late Ancient Christianity," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 456. I have chosen to avoid the use of the word "nun" to avoid the connotations which it calls to mind in the present.

<sup>233</sup> Eno, "Holiness and Separation in the Early Centuries," 538.

instead of the unmarked tomb he had initially been buried in.<sup>234</sup> The Luciferians write, “By his own pious indulgence, inasmuch as he had been able, he was struggling to make the crime of Damasus something apart from himself.”<sup>235</sup> Florentius is one Christian for whom the Luciferians have sympathy *in the petition itself*, due to the kind behavior Florentius shows to Macarius by reburying him near a prominent martyr’s shrine.<sup>236</sup> Although the Luciferians do not explicitly state that they would receive this Florentius into communion with their group, he is still spoken of in very flattering terms. It would thus be incorrect to call this a “morbid fear,” given their naturally positive disposition towards Florentius of Ostia. Furthermore, Athanasius, as noted above, accepted communion with these *praevaricatores* after the Council of Alexandria. Would the Luciferians have refused communion with him? It seems highly unlikely given the high praise they have for him in the petition. Thus even sharp rhetorical divisions can give way in certain circumstances. The sharp rhetorical lines drawn by terms like *intaminata* are on one level rhetorical tropes which the Luciferians employ in order to exaggerate the differences between themselves and their enemies. But it is important to note that they do not reflect the reality of 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christian thought and practice, as I have already shown.

---

<sup>234</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 81-82 (SC 504:184-186). On the importance of proper burial for late antique Christians, especially on its importance for those still living, see Éric Rebillard, “Église et sépulture dans l’antiquité tardive (Occident latin, 3e-6e siècles),” *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 54, no. 5 (1999): 1027-1046.

<sup>235</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 82 (SC 504:184-186): *Hoc pio suo obsequio, in quantum poterat, Damasi scelus a se facere contendebat alienum.*

<sup>236</sup> Whether in the original petition the Luciferians say that Macarius was buried *in loco presbyterii qui est iuxta sepulturam* (Canellis) or *in loco presbyterii quiescit iuxta sepultura* (Guenther, Simonetti), the same appreciation for his reburial alongside Asterius is clearly meant. See Aline Canellis, ed., *Supplique aux empereurs*, 186-87.

*iv. A Friendly Disagreement?*

Furthermore, the Luciferians are far from consistent in their application of this outrage. Lucifer, for instance, returned to communion with the orthodox community and accepted the decisions taken at the Council of Alexandria.<sup>237</sup> The Luciferians have only the highest praise for him, however, even saying that he “had the grace of the Holy Spirit due to the merit of his upright faith and most sincere conscience.”<sup>238</sup> Despite his return to what they considered a tainted communion, the Luciferians have no problem praising Lucifer.

Their treatment of Athanasius provides another example of the Luciferian willingness to praise their enemies. The Luciferians write that he sent certain letters which praise Lucifer and his writings against Constantius, going so far as to translate some of Lucifer’s writings into Greek.<sup>239</sup> Some of these letters are extant; while they are forgeries, as Saltet demonstrated long ago, there is no reason to suspect that other Christians reading them, such as Faustinus and Marcellinus, knew this, nor is it likely that Theodosius, once informed by the Luciferians in the petition, would immediately suspect that the letters mentioned were forgeries.<sup>240</sup> Athanasius and Lucifer both despised

---

<sup>237</sup> According to most ecclesiastical historians, at any rate: Socr. 3.9.8 (*GCS NF* 1:204); Soz. 5.13 (*SC* 495:152-156); Cass., *Hist. eccl. trip.* 6.19 (*PL* 69:1041). Rufinus (1.30; *GCS NF* 6.2:992) disagrees. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 95; *PL* 23:697) does not say one way or the other, but writes about him in glowing terms. The other historians do not say one way or the other.

<sup>238</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 89 (*SC* 194): *habuit gratiam sancti Spiritus ex merito rectae fidei et sincerissimae conscientiae.*

<sup>239</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 88 (*SC* 504, 192-195).

<sup>240</sup> Louis Saltet, “Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens,” *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 8 (1906): 300-326. The Luciferians were not unique in this respect either; there exists a Donatist forgery claiming to be a letter of Jerome’s, for instance: D. Donatien De Bruyne, “Une lettre apocryphe de Jérôme fabriquée par un Donatiste,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 30 (1931): 70-76. For another example of late antique Christian forgery, see Mark Vessey, “The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study,” *J ECS* 4, no. 4 (1996): 495-513.

Constantius and made no secret of it, thus making the connection a logical one. The Luciferians' (supposed) connection to Athanasius supports their claim to orthodoxy and to being the legitimate heirs of the Christian past. This gives the group a historical and theological identity which they claim for themselves and implicitly *not* for other Christians, despite Athanasius' continued popularity among Christian communities throughout the Roman world. While the treatment of an individual as a canonical source may at first appear strange – perhaps even 'adding to dogma' – this too was becoming usual Christian practice in the fourth century. As Mark Vessey writes, "...the process of refining a Christian doctrine of God having precipitated an extensive body of writing by men retrospectively acclaimed as "catholic" writers, their texts...now offered themselves as a basis for further elaborations *de fide*."<sup>241</sup> Athanasius himself was frequently the subject of this use; in 382, for instance, "Bishop Damasus' secretary would turn to the works of writers like Athanasius of Alexandria whose impeccably Nicene credentials served as a guarantee of their orthodoxy on supra-Nicene topics."<sup>242</sup> Jerome – for he is the secretary in question – used Athanasius to bolster his own theological position writing under Damasus just as the Luciferians did less than two years later in their petition to Theodosius. Thus the use of 'canonical' patristic authors like Athanasius is not a unique way of defining their community either; the Luciferians merely used different writings of Athanasius to do so.<sup>243</sup> The Luciferians thus rely on Athanasius' orthodoxy as a prop for their own orthodoxy and historical background. However, the Council of Alexandria was

---

<sup>241</sup>Ibid.: 499.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.

<sup>243</sup> It must again be stressed that these letters, though forgeries, served the same social function for the Luciferians as Athanasius' treatises did for Jerome.

held in Athanasius' see and he concurred with all of its decisions.<sup>244</sup> Would this not make him a *praevaricator*? The arguments of the Luciferians seem to run hollow at this point, because they clearly refuse to hold communion with any of these *praevaricatores* – except when it helps them make their point, as with Lucifer and Athanasius.

They likewise praise an associate of Damasus, Florentius, bishop of Ostia.<sup>245</sup> Florentius is quite clearly meant to be contrasted with Damasus, as they write, “He was trying to separate himself from the wickedness of Damasus.”<sup>246</sup> The good behavior of the *praevaricator* Florentius amplifies the perception of the bad behavior of the *praevaricator* Damasus. Concerning the binary pagan/Christian dichotomy created by ancient Christians, Kahlos writes, “The exceptions of good pagans may reinforce the general rule of corrupt and miserable pagans, explaining away inconveniences that do not fit the stereotype.”<sup>247</sup> Certainly this is true of the black-and-white world in which the Luciferians write, as well, even though the Luciferians are primarily interested in binary dichotomies between various Christian groups and individuals.

Furthermore, Kahlos argues, “Flexible prejudices that did not label all pagans as depraved made it possible for pagans or *incerti* to draw themselves closer to Christianity.”<sup>248</sup> This unfairly downplays the reverse effect, however. Christians did not merely draw pagans and *incerti* towards some mythical ideal ‘Christianity’ with these concessions, at times they moved further towards a positive view of these pagans and

---

<sup>244</sup> Expressly stated by Socr., *Hist eccl.* 3.7.1 (*GCS NF* 1:197), Soz., *Hist.* 5.12 (*SC* 495:148-152), and Cass., *Hist. eccl. trip.* 6.19 (*PL* 69:1041).

<sup>245</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 82 (*SC* 504:182-185).

<sup>246</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 82 (*SC* 504:186): ...*Damasi scelus a se facere contendeat alienum.*

<sup>247</sup> Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue* 90.

<sup>248</sup> Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue*, 90.

*incerti* as well. Likewise, just as these supposed Luciferian allowances towards virtuous Catholics may have been designed to make themselves appear more moderate to Catholics, they perhaps also have the unintended side effect of actually weakening the black-and-white worldview so essential in building a separate community. Kahlos herself accepts that “Binary oppositions are more than a rhetorical tool; they are a way of conceiving the world.”<sup>249</sup> But she does not follow this to its logical conclusion: when those binary oppositions are weakened, so is that worldview. This attempt at creating a theological distinction based on the propriety of holding communion with supposed *praevaricatores* does not even stand the test of the Luciferians’ own writings, and once again the oversimplification which the Luciferians force into their text can be shown as a purely rhetorical set piece rather than a clear-cut distinction between themselves and other Christians on issues of doctrine or practice. It is an attempt, not entirely successful, at drawing a solid line between two communities where no line truly existed. The fact that this emerges even in a petition, which one would expect to be among the most rhetorically-driven genres, suggests all the more that the Luciferians are not as rigorous or extremist as they appear at first glance.

*v. Asceticism.*

Another way by which the Luciferians attempt to create a division between themselves and their opponents is through their support of asceticism. Once again, these divisions are rhetorical; the Luciferians do not appear to be any more or less involved in

---

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

ascetic practice than numerous other Christian communities. This was a time when asceticism, particularly in the West, was still developing.<sup>250</sup> Thus the Luciferians were at the fringe of new developments in Christian thought reflected in the writings of some of their contemporaries as well.<sup>251</sup> While they shared in these developments, they still remained within the normal bounds of Christian practice in the fourth century.

The Luciferians describe a number of their bishops as ascetics. The two authors describe Macarius, the Roman presbyter, as a man “of marvelous restraint, not relieving his stomach with wine, not caring for his body with the consumption of meat, but easing the more serious hunger pangs with oil alone.”<sup>252</sup> Likewise, in the East, they describe the Luciferian bishop Heraclidas as “serving God from the earliest age, with secular goods held in contempt.”<sup>253</sup> Clearly it was important to the two authors if their fellow clergymen appear to be upstanding ascetics. For the Luciferians, active asceticism meant the denial of pleasure, not the performance of certain acts like repeated chanting.

These Luciferian authors not only admire the cultivation of asceticism in their own leaders; they also use their leaders’ asceticism to attack their opponents and thus define themselves as ‘ascetic’ while at the same time defining their opponents as ‘not ascetic.’ At the very end of the petition, they tell Theodosius in no uncertain terms what they are requesting in relation to their opponents:

---

<sup>250</sup> On these early years in the West, see Philip Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 79-91.

<sup>251</sup> Most notably, Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome: Ibid, 79-139.

<sup>252</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 78 (SC 504:180-183): ...*mirae continentiae, non vino stomachum relevans, non carnis esculentia corpus curans, sed oleo solo escas asperiores mitigans...*

<sup>253</sup> Ibid. 94 (SC 504:202-203): ...*a prima aetate deo deserviens contemptis bonis saecularibus...*

*Habeant illi basilicas auro coruscantes pretiosorumque marmorum ambitione vestitas vel erectas magnificentia columnarum! Habeant quoque porrectas in longum possessiones, ob quas et fides integra periclitata est!...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.*<sup>254</sup>

Let them have their basilicas, glittering with gold, and adorned with a show of marble or built with the splendor of columns! Let them also have their possessions, spread far and wide, on account of which even the uncorrupted faith is endangered! ...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 mangers where that same Christ, born in the flesh as an infant, was also once worthy to lie down.

The Luciferians use the growing wealth of some Christian communities to sarcastically snipe at their opponents. The passage claims that their desire for possessions endangers the faith of other Christians. This is reinforced by the example of Potamius of Lisbon, who according to the Luciferians betrayed the faith in exchange for state land.<sup>255</sup> The Luciferians, however, claim they are above such petty concerns. By using the image of Christ in poverty to conclude their point, the Luciferians (since they are happy to share in that poverty) associate themselves with Christ while implicitly defining other supposed Christians as ‘unlike Christ.’ But many bishops preferred to go into exile rather than preserve their possessions, and the occasional persecution of Nicene Christians under Valens is well-attested despite its complete absence from the Luciferian account.<sup>256</sup> All

---

<sup>254</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 121 (SC 504:230-232).

<sup>255</sup> *praemio fundi fiscalis: Lib. Prec.* 32 (SC 504:138-140). Some writings of this Potamius, who was mentioned above, do survive. A summation of Potamius’ life, an analysis of his style, and commentaries on his writings are provided by Marco Conti, *The Life and Works of Potamius of Lisbon* (Instrumenta Patristica 33; Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

<sup>256</sup> These deliberate Luciferian omissions are briefly noted by Canellis in *Supplique aux empereurs*, 50. On Valens’ policy towards Nicene Christians in the East, see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 791-793.

these bishops, however much they supported the Nicene Creed, are lumped in along with the greedy *praevaricatores*. To prefer the ‘true’ faith to possessing episcopal sees is not necessarily a specifically ascetic position. However, the combination of this passage with the strength of the phrase ‘*vilissima et abiecta praesepia*’ does not leave much of a middle-ground. The choice is stark: either luxurious cathedrals or low mangers. So, although they do not emphasize the ascetic virtues of all of their bishops, the conclusion of the passage cited above firmly implies that even these bishops who are not praised for their ascetic virtues would still have preferred these ‘most common mangers’ to their sees.

Faustinus and Marcellinus describe Hermione, a Luciferian ascetic of Eleutheropolis in Palestine, as a “sacred virgin...decorating her virginity with contempt towards worldly matters and human pride, to which most people work at, even those who boast that they have renounced the world and the desire of the flesh.”<sup>257</sup> What differentiates Hermione from other ascetics of the day (i.e. those associated with the Luciferians’ opponents) is her contempt for boasting, emphasized by the repetition of *gloriae...gloriantur*. Once again, the Luciferians describe her virtues as closely tied to the renunciation of worldly things, particularly sex, the *res saecularia*, and boasting. By using Hermione’s avoidance of boasting, however, the Luciferians admit that there are other ascetics who are *not* Luciferian but who are quite able to renounce worldly goods. Once again, the Luciferians undermine their attempts to differentiate themselves from

---

<sup>257</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 102 (SC 504:210-211): *sacra virgo...ipsam virginitatem condecorans contemptu rerum saecularium et humanae gloriae, ad quam plerique affectant, etiam qui se saeculo et concupiscentiae carnis abrenuntiasse gloriantur.*

other Christians. Asceticism functions as an important rhetorical device for differentiating the Luciferian community from its opponents, but much as they would wish it otherwise, they were not alone in supporting the efforts of ascetics. The reality of Christian attitudes towards asceticism was much more complex than the simplified view the Luciferians present.

Numerous orthodox bishops followed ascetic practices.<sup>258</sup> As just one example, while unknowingly sharing the Luciferian disdain for bishops living luxurious lives, the pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus is impressed by the simple lifestyle of many provincial bishops.<sup>259</sup> The proper role asceticism played in Christian communities, and the expectation that bishops follow some of these practices, was one of the major debates of the fourth century. Although Rapp points out that the distance between ascetic and spiritual authority should not be exaggerated in an institutional sense (i.e. churches versus monasteries, bishops versus monks), authors in the fourth century still debated the propriety and proper degree of ascetic practices for a bishop. The relationship between the monastic lifestyle and the episcopacy was, as Rapp describes it, “a tapestry of mutating shades of gray.”<sup>260</sup>

Some Christian clergymen did not support clerical asceticism with the same fervor. Many of John Chrysostom’s clerics were reluctant to join his ascetic program, discussed below.<sup>261</sup> Others simply could not be ascetic due to the demands of their position. The constant influx of wealth into individual churches, and the expectation that

---

<sup>258</sup> On asceticism in an episcopal context, see Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 100-152.

<sup>259</sup> *Res Gest.* 27.3.15 (ed. Seyfarth:2.37).

<sup>260</sup> Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 138.

<sup>261</sup> Socr., *Hist eccl.* 6.4.2 (*GCS NF* 1:315); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 8.9.5 (*SC* 516:276); J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 127.

a bishop manage that wealth, invariably tied the bishop to the world in a way sometimes considered incompatible with asceticism.<sup>262</sup> One saying of the desert fathers seems to accept this and pardon the bishop – thus implying that some pardon might be necessary for giving up these practices. Affy, a bishop of Oxyrhynchus, apologizes to God for being unable to continue his ascetic lifestyle after his ordination. God actually responds, telling him that he does not need to maintain such a lifestyle in the city.<sup>263</sup> Although the tone is forgiving, the implication is still clear. For the author of this passage at least, the ascetic practices which open up a conduit to the divine are naturally at odds with the worldly nature of the bishop. In another saying of the desert fathers, the unnamed bishop of Gebalon ordains Mathois and then promptly apologizes for the act. Mathois reluctantly accepts, along with another brother, but when the two have died they have not offered communion even once.<sup>264</sup> Mathois and his brother were reluctant to accept the call to the episcopacy, and once there, passively resisted any contamination it might have brought them. Also in Egypt, Theophilus compelled the so-called ‘Tall Brothers’ to be ordained; they chafed at this because it left them unable to practice asceticism to the degree to which they were accustomed.<sup>265</sup> Others went further. When Chrysostom tried to ordain

---

<sup>262</sup> On the role of the bishop in connection to the growing wealth of the Church, see Rapp, 208-234.

<sup>263</sup> *Apophthegmata Patrum: Humilitas* 13 (PL 73:596): *Narraverunt de episcopo civitatis, quae vocatur Oxyrhinchus, nomine Affy, quia cum esset monachus, nimis dure tractaverit vitam suam; et cum factus fuisset episcopus, voluit ipsa duritia uti in civitate quam in eremo habuerat, et non praevaluit. Idcirco prosiravit se in conspectus Domini, dicens: Putasne, Domine, propter episcopatum discessit a me gratia tua? Et revelatum est ei: Quia non; sed quia tunc solitudo erat, et cum non esset homo, Deus tuus susceptor erat tuus; nunc autem hic in saeculo es, ubi auxiliantur tibi .*

<sup>264</sup> *Apoph. Patr.: Hum.* 27 (PL 73:959).

<sup>265</sup> *Socr., Hist. eccl.* 6.7.18 (GCS NF 1:323)

some of the local ascetics of Constantinople, one resisted actively – by biting John’s hand and fleeing!<sup>266</sup>

Some, however, were perfectly fine unifying the ascetic call of monasticism and the more ‘mundane’ role of the episcopacy. In the East, the life of John Chrysostom perfectly exemplifies the ascetic bishops as well as the sometimes contradictory attitudes Christians had towards bishops who did maintain an ascetic life. One of his earliest actions upon assuming the episcopacy of Constantinople was to enforce stricter rules for the clergy below him.<sup>267</sup> Even if, as Kelly argues, John emphasized personal virtue (including a variety of ascetic practices) in the clergy both due to his personal beliefs and “...to bring them more effectively under his personal control,”<sup>268</sup> he still must have thought that this specific approach would be efficacious. However, his clergy by all accounts grew quite irritated with him and refused to support him in later struggles. It is clear that his strong opinions on asceticism in the clergy were not universally well-received. There is a clear division between John’s ascetic emphasis and the resistance to it, and both sides represents viewpoints within the late antique clergy across the empire. Even John’s own ascetic actions, most famously refusing to provide visiting bishops with banquets or even dine with them, did not enhance his authority as an ascetic. Rather, they condemned him in the eyes of other bishops for avarice and inhospitality.<sup>269</sup> There was a

---

<sup>266</sup> Callinicos, *Vita Hypatii* 11.4 (SC 177, ed. Bartelink:110).

<sup>267</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 6.3.13-6.4.1 (GCS NF 1:315); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 8.3.1-2 (SC 516:242-244); Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 115-127.

<sup>268</sup> Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 120.

<sup>269</sup> Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 6.4.7 (GCS NF 1:316); Soz., *Hist. eccl.* 8.9.6 (SC 516:276); Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 118-119.

certain line between ‘ascetic’ and ‘too ascetic’ which Chrysostom had toed and occasionally crossed.

The Luciferian location of that ‘line’ was much closer to Chrysostom’s conception of it than that of his enemies. Bishops *must* be content with mere mangers. Although they do not say that bishops *must* be ascetic in all respects, it is clear from the glowing terms which they use concerning their ascetics that the Luciferians thought asceticism was the mark of a truly virtuous bishop. While the Luciferians were fairly rigorous in respect to the ascetic authority of their bishops, such an attitude was not wholly alien to contemporary Christians. While there is no indication that the Luciferians saw any tension between these roles, as did the desert fathers Affa, Mathois, and Mathois’ brother, there is no indication that other Christian authors would have considered these Luciferian beliefs as inappropriate either. The proper place of asceticism in Christianity was an ongoing debate in which the Luciferians participated, but they did not hold such radical beliefs as to push them beyond the boundary of acceptable Christian behavior. They most certainly did not represent the only or even the dominant ascetic branch among 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christians, despite the contrast they draw between their own asceticism and their enemies’ supposed love of ‘possessions spread far and wide.’<sup>270</sup> Once again, the necessity for differentiation encourages the use of specious arguments.

Hermione also exemplifies the Luciferian alignment with two major changes in Christian thought of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. First of all, heresy is clearly sexualized. When Turbo persecutes the Luciferians of Eleutheropolis, Faustinus and Marcellinus write that she

---

<sup>270</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 121 (SC 504:230-233): ...*porrectas in longum possessiones...*

refused to hold communion with him, “running away from the fault of adulterous communion and following the saving sacraments of the faithful priests.”<sup>271</sup> Faustinus and Marcellinus also say that Lucifer would not hold communion with Zosimus of Naples because Zosimus held his episcopal seat “as a spiritual adulterer.”<sup>272</sup> Thus in addition the common trope of “disease” spreading in their communities, as noted above, the Luciferians also portray heresy as spiritual “adultery.” Prominent Christian authors used the same metaphor. Ambrose makes the connection between heresy and adultery just as explicit in a letter to Marcellina, describing his refusal to hand over a basilica for the Milanese Arians to use: “What do you [Valentinian II] have to do with an adulteress? For she [the Arian community] who is not joined to Christ in a legitimate marriage is an adulteress.”<sup>273</sup> Arians, according to Ambrose, were just the same as adulteresses. In both Ambrose and in the Luciferians, heresy is presented as sexual violation, reflecting the intense 4<sup>th</sup>-century focus on the human body as a microcosm of the larger spiritual world.

In a way, this is also similar to Ambrose’s insistence that Mary was perpetually virginal. As Peter Brown describes Ambrose’s position in the debate, “an unbreakable ‘invisible frontier’ lay between a virgin’s body and the polluting ‘admixture’ of the outside world.”<sup>274</sup> These sharp boundaries between the virgin and the world could be broken by physical sex, with the resulting spiritual contamination, but more importantly

---

<sup>271</sup> Ibid. 103 (SC 504:210-211): *...labem adulterinae communionis effugiens et sectans salutaria sacramenta fidelium sacerdotum.*

<sup>272</sup> Ibid. 63 (SC 504:166-167): *ut adulter...spiritalis.*

<sup>273</sup> Ep. 20.19 (PL 16:1042): *Quid tibi cum adultera? Adultera est enim, quae non est legitimo Christi coniugio copulata.* The letter was penned in 385, only a year or two after the Luciferians penned their petition.

<sup>274</sup> Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 354.

for Ambrose (and for the Luciferians) these *exact same* boundaries could be broken by incorrect belief as well. Sex, especially adultery, and heresy are spiritually the same thing, not metaphors for one another. Communicating with heretics was equivalent to engaging in sexual intercourse with one who was not one's spouse; these two separate actions have become united in order for these 4<sup>th</sup>-century authors to communicate the spiritual risk in terms understandable to their audiences as both Christians and as Romans.

4<sup>th</sup> century authors, both East and West, present sacred virgins as "brides" of Christ, whom they portray as the bridegroom-to-be for these virgins.<sup>275</sup> This was no different than many of their contemporaries. Basil of Caesarea, for instance, argues that virgins who had given up their role as devoted persons and taken husbands ought to be punished in the same manner as adulterers.<sup>276</sup> Although this does indicate that many Christians maintained the difference between a spiritual marriage to Christ and a worldly marriage, it also demonstrates that some leaders were pushing for a closer unity of these two concepts. In Basil's case (with whom the Luciferians agreed on a number of spiritual

---

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., 274-275. For specific examples in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, 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. Ambrose also connects the *Song of Songs* to baptismal rights, using the love imagery to suggest a bond between the human soul and the Word (who is rarely explicitly named Jesus, due to the obvious sexual connotations of the *Song of Songs*). See *De myst.* 7.34-35 (*PL* 16:399-400), Franca F. Consolino, "Veni huc a Libano: La Sponsa del Cantico dei Cantici come modello per le vergini negli scritti esortatori di 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. See also the following footnote for an Eastern example.

<sup>276</sup> *Ep.* 199.18 (*PG* 32:717-720): [717] Ὅταν γὰρ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖν θέλουσιν, ἔχουσαι κρίμα, ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν. [720] Εἰ τοίνυν χήρα κρίματι ὑπόκειται βαρυτάτω, ὡς τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀθετήσασα πίστιν, τί χρὴ λογιζέσθαι ἡμᾶς περὶ τῆς παρθένου, ἥτις νύμφη ἐστὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ σκευὸς ἱερὸν ἀνατεθὲν τῷ Δεσπότῃ; ...πολλῶ δὲ δήπου χαλεπώτερον [sc. than a widow remarrying] τὴν νύμφην μοιχαλίδα γενέσθαι, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον ἔνωσιν ἀτιμάσασαν, ἡδοναῖς ἀκολάστοις ἑαυτὴν ἐπιδοῦναι. Οὐκοῦν ἢ μὲν χήρα, ὡς δούλη διεφθαρμένη, καταδικάζεται· ἢ δὲ παρθένος τῶ κρίματι τῆς μοιχαλίδος ὑπόκειται.

points as noted above), and undoubtedly for many others, the marriage was perceived as ‘real’ in some sense.

For Hermione to hold communion with the Luciferians’ opponents would not only be a violation of Christian spiritual norms – already indicated by the use of “disease-bearing” or “polluting” in connection to their communion – but it would defy the social norms of traditional Roman society as well, which forbade women from committing adultery. In this more mundane sense, the use of “adulterous” performs two functions. It provokes not only a spiritual but also a traditional-moral reaction. Thus the Luciferians present themselves not only as model Christians but as model Romans, a theme which recurs several times throughout the text and is perfectly understandable given the recipient of the petition.

Lastly, Faustinus and Marcellinus write that Hermione was “certainly noble in birth, but by her faith and holiness made all the more noble.”<sup>277</sup> The idea that Christianity was the marker of a higher nobility than just office-holding was just emerging in this period, and the Luciferians are among the first to use this trope.<sup>278</sup> Oftentimes, the authors promoting this view considered ascetic practice as an even higher achievement. Jerome, Pelagius, and other westerners frequently state that ascetic Christian nobles are superior to mere Christian nobles.<sup>279</sup> Although the Luciferians do not explicitly say that Hermione was *generosior* on account of her asceticism (they only explicitly mention her *fide* and *sanctimonia*), she is the only Luciferian they describe in this way and her

---

<sup>277</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 102 (SC 504:210): ...*Hermione, fide et sanctimonia multum facta generosior*...

<sup>278</sup> On Christianity and its relationship to traditional “nobilitas” in Late Antiquity, see 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>279</sup> *Ibid.*, 365-367.

asceticism is what sets her apart from the other members of the group.<sup>280</sup> Since her asceticism is her defining characteristic, it is not a stretch to suggest that her asceticism is what made her particularly ‘noble’ as well. Although she is unique in this respect, the Luciferians bring her up for two clear reasons. First, she adds a certain cachet to the group, since the Luciferians can now show that they are both supporting ascetics in line with the new expectations of 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christians; that their ranks include spiritually *and* traditionally significant individuals. Secondly, her opponent – in this case, a bishop named Turbo – is painted as a persecutor of the holy, an enemy of righteousness and of traditionally important aristocrats.<sup>281</sup> This rhetorical attack occurs earlier in the text as well, when the orthodox bishops Luciosus and Hyginus, while persecuting Vincentius in Baetica, compel a town’s councilors to appear in court and even imprison them, killing one.<sup>282</sup> Hermione allows the Luciferians to present a man like Turbo who attacks both the ascetic ‘stars’ of 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christianity and the traditional aristocracy of Roman society. This Turbo stands as an archetypical opponent for the Luciferians, practically frothing at

---

<sup>280</sup> Which did include at least one other man of rank: Severus, described as *ex tribunis* at *Lib. Prec.* 104 (*SC* 504:212). According to Elizabeth A. Clark, female ‘holy women’ typically achieved their status within a Christian community through the material wealth and social standing they brought to a community rather than their ascetic actions, and they are frequently portrayed as teachers: “Holy Women, Holy Words: Early Christian Women, Social History, and the ‘Linguistic Turn’,” *J ECS* 6, no.3 (1998): 413-430. Hermione, then, seems to be something of an exception, but not a major one.

<sup>281</sup> Along with the sarcastic *egregius*.

<sup>282</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 74 (*SC* 504:176-178): *denique postulant exhibitionem decurionum civitatis illius et ut includantur in carcerem, ex quibus unus principalis patriae suae...inter eos et ipse catenatus fame frigore necatus est...* Local decurions had special legal privileges that ordinary citizens did not, and in fact “The privileges of decurions in the cities were comparable with those of senators at Rome,” according to Peter Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970): 244, though admittedly Garnsey is working in an earlier time period.

the mouth for a chance to persecute the righteous, but there is no need to view him as anything more than a stock villain.<sup>283</sup>

The Luciferians are no different than other Christians in presenting heresy as spiritual adultery or in presenting Hermione as more noble by faith than by birth. In fact, it suggests a deep closeness with trends in 4<sup>th</sup>-century Christian thought. This very closeness in the rhetorical tropes between the Luciferians and the Catholics demonstrates exactly how close they truly are in respect to their beliefs and attitudes about asceticism, despite the Luciferians' attempt to distinguish themselves from other Christians using those very beliefs and attitudes.

The Luciferians rhetorically used their ascetic practices to distinguish themselves from other allegedly less-ascetic Christians by portraying themselves as more Christ-like in their simplicity contrasted with the growing wealth of certain churches. Their presentation is rhetorically one-sided, however, as one would expect. Many Christians had adopted ascetic practices. Furthermore, the actual Luciferian practice as regards ascetic authority is in no way unique compared to many other Christians of the fourth century, and it is no surprise that no author questions their orthodoxy on grounds of their ascetic beliefs or practices. The debates over the ascetic practices of bishops and of women encompassed a wide variety of 'correct' positions, ranging from the very ascetically-minded attempts by men like Chrysostom and Jerome to numerous less

---

<sup>283</sup> Local bishops in the 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> centuries had little power over local officials; Hermanowicz writes, "Bishops were able to maintain control over some local residents, especially those of lower class status who received financial support from the church, but success along a broader social spectrum was largely dependent on the will of the local administrations to enforce the laws. Municipal senates were often beyond the reach of bishops' control..." Erika T. Hermanowicz, "Catholic Bishops and Appeals to the Imperial Court: A Legal Study of the Calama Riots in 408," *JECS* 12, no. 4 (2004): 492.

rigorous approaches like those of Chrysostom's opponents. Struggles over where Christians would define proper boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable behavior in regards to asceticism were still being fought, and the Luciferian position was squarely within one quite popular camp that emphasized the importance of ascetic practice. The lines they draw between themselves and their opponents using these tools only suggest once more how very similar the two groups actually were, despite the language suggesting otherwise throughout the petition.

*vi. Violence.*

In the 4<sup>th</sup> century, as asceticism developed, it grew to replace “red” martyrdom – the bloody type which Christians suffered for centuries – as the “white” martyrdom of self-denial.<sup>284</sup> Gordon Jeanes even writes that in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem (313-386 CE), “the age of the martyrs was past, the imagery and language of martyrdom was, as it were, ‘up for grabs.’”<sup>285</sup> Although the so-called age of martyrs had passed, actual violence between pagans, Jews, and Christians, and especially between Christians and Christians, continued throughout and beyond the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Sometimes this violence led to the deaths of martyrs; sometimes authors rhetorically transformed martyrdom itself to include less-than-fatal suffering. Violence between different groups of Christians was especially common in the period between 325 and 381, during which time Nicene bishops in particular frequently experienced state persecution during the so-called ‘Arian’

---

<sup>284</sup> Michael Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 168-70 and Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 68-73.

<sup>285</sup> Gordon Jeanes, "Baptism Portrayed as Martyrdom in the Early Church," *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993): 159.

crisis.<sup>286</sup> The Luciferians writing the petition, however, did not only suffer physical violence at imperial hands during the reign of Constantius. They also claim to have suffered violence from orthodox bishops.

Suffering violence can cause individuals to come together and form ‘imagined communities’ primarily as a reaction to communal suffering.<sup>287</sup> These communities might differ in a number of other respects; the Luciferians, for example, lived in all parts of the empire, had members from all strata of society, and so on. Communal suffering, however, bound them together. The general purpose of the petition, in fact, is to seek an imperial order against these acts from Theodosius.<sup>288</sup> In the Luciferians’ descriptions of violent interaction between the Luciferians and their opponents, there can be seen two kinds of violence that ‘schism’ presupposes: both the actual, physical violence which the Luciferians suffered at the hands of their enemies, and the conceptual violence the Luciferians themselves commit in the simplification of thought into black-and-white categories of “us versus them.”

The Luciferians claim to have suffered at the hands of both the ‘Arians’ and the orthodox Christians of the 380s. Their examples make up the bulk of the text, spanning a wide variety of geographical locations. Some form of violence under the Arians is apparent in the Luciferian descriptions of the Council of Rimini (where bishops were

---

<sup>286</sup> Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 77.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, 96-97, using theories developed in Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1996).

<sup>288</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 4 (SC 504:110-112). The emphasis on violence rather than theological minutiae is interesting but explainable. As Gaddis writes, “This shift of focus away from the religious made it easier to contemplate opposition to such groups, and to argue for their repression by force,” *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 219.

threatened by Constantius);<sup>289</sup> the exiles of Lucifer, Eusebius, and others;<sup>290</sup> Gregory of Elvira in Spain (who was put on trial);<sup>291</sup> and Maximus in Naples (who was killed).<sup>292</sup> Persecutions under the Nicene faction begin in the West with the bishops Vincentius of Baetica (whose church was destroyed);<sup>293</sup> Bonosus of Trier (who was killed);<sup>294</sup> and Macarius, a presbyter of Rome (who was put on trial).<sup>295</sup> The Luciferians then move East, writing about the bishop Heraclidas of Oxyrhynchus (whose church was destroyed)<sup>296</sup> and Hermione, the sacred virgin, in Eleutheropolis (who was harassed in an unspecified manner).<sup>297</sup>

Although the true extent of the persecution of Luciferians is impossible to tell, it seems likely that there is at least some truth to these stories. It would take quite an imagination for the Luciferians to create them all wholesale, and Christian-Christian violence was very common in the time period. Of course, it would show remarkable restraint not found in other aspects of the petition if the Luciferians did not exaggerate at all either. To whatever extent these persecutions did occur, they demonstrate how the categorizations of heresy and schism, orthodoxy and catholicity, engender violence in the

---

<sup>289</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 14-20 (SC 504:124-128).

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.* 21-28 (SC 504:128-134).

<sup>291</sup> *Ibid.* 32-44 (SC 504:138-150). Several works by Gregory of Elvira do survive. He is in need of a new, full-length study, as the most recent of these was Francis J. Buckley, *Christ and the Church according to Gregory of Elvira* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964). Particularly interesting would be an examination of Gregory's *De fidei orthodoxa contra Arianos* in conjunction with Faustinus' *De trinitate*.

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.* 62-65 (SC 504:166-168).

<sup>293</sup> *Ibid.* 73-76 (SC 504:176-178).

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.* 77 (SC 504:180).

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.* 78-82 (SC 504:180-186).

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.* 94-101 (SC 504:200-210).

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.* 102-110 (SC 504:210-220); the language is vague: *Tentat quoque et sacram virginem Hermionem insequi*. Lewis and Short provide meanings ranging from "pursue" (s.v. I.B) and "strive after" (s.v. II.B.1), to "pursue in a hostile manner with words" (s.v. II.B.4), "censure" (*Ibid.*), and "reproach" (*Ibid.*), all of which are very general and could imply a variety of meanings.

enforcement of those boundaries. The Luciferians demonstrate no innovation in how these martyrdoms are described or what role they function in the formation of a Luciferian community, but the impact of this history of violence in creating a separate community should not be understated either.

Beyond the physical violence described in the text, though, the Luciferians still manage to radically simplify reality in order to argue their point. First and foremost, history itself is radically simplified to a before-and-after affair; first the Arians persecuted, then the orthodox Christians persecuted. Secondly, individual opponents are drawn as caricatures, not as real individuals. Lastly, the Luciferians present martyrdom itself as a test which only they are willing to take.

The Luciferians initially use their experience of martyrdom under Constantius to establish themselves within the context of Christian history. Frequently, they associate themselves with unquestionably orthodox bishops who suffered under Constantius. For example, they have an obvious dislike for Hilary of Poitiers, who argued that Christians should allow the bishops who signed the creed at Rimini back into the episcopate.<sup>298</sup> Nevertheless, they still mention that under Constantius he was sent into exile along with Lucifer, Paulinus and the others.<sup>299</sup> Since they have such apparent disdain for him, the inclusion of Hilary alone appears jarring at first. However, the Luciferians use this to indicate that they too shared in the persecution of the Nicene faction that occurred under Constantius. This connection is important because the Luciferians identify themselves as the ‘true’ Nicene Christians. If they are the ‘true’ Nicenes, then they must have shared the

---

<sup>298</sup> Ibid. 24 (SC 504:130) and Ruf., *Hist. Eccl.* 1.30 (GCS NF 6.2:992).

<sup>299</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 24 (SC 504:130).

experience of suffering under Constantius, because other Nicene Christians later used this same experience to create a shared identity for those who had suffered for the ‘true’ faith.<sup>300</sup> As Castelli observes, “Claims to collective memory...operate in part to rationalize innovations in societies where ruptures with the past create cultural anxiety.”<sup>301</sup> Thus the Luciferians rationalize their innovation, i.e. their separation from other Christian groups, by emphasizing the shared past of their own members and of the petition’s intended reader. By describing their opponents in the same breath as their heroes, the Luciferian authors indicate that before the Council of Alexandria, there was no difference between the Luciferians and their enemies. Thus the Luciferians can lay claim to the entirety of the Christian tradition leading up to the Council of Alexandria, a tradition which they and their opponents naturally consider an integral part of being true Christians.<sup>302</sup>

After these persecutions, however, history diverges. After Canellis summarizes the events presented in the petition, she emphasizes other rhetorical tricks which Faustinus and Marcellinus use and the geographical sweep of the text, but she does not make note of the parallel structure between the first and second half of the text and the rhetorical effect of this construction.<sup>303</sup> Orthodox Christians are now presented as the new

---

<sup>300</sup> For instance, the bishops who withstood persecution and later met at the Council of Alexandria are referred to by Rufinus as *pauci numero, sed fide integri*: *Hist. eccl.* 1.28.1 (*GCS NF* 6.2:990).

<sup>301</sup> Elizabeth Castelli’s interpretation of Maurice Halbwachs’s view: *Martyrdom and Memory*, 13. See also Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2004), 4-5, for the social necessity of retelling martyr stories to connect Christianity’s past to the reteller’s present, and Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 51-56.

<sup>302</sup> This depiction was also necessary to earn Theodosius’ support: “Requests for patronage, ancient or modern, are almost always plays for sympathy. And sympathy usually begins from a sense of common ground.” Adam Schor, “Performance and Social Strategy in the Letters of Theodoret,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2, no. 2 (2009): 278.

<sup>303</sup> Canellis, ed., *Supplique aux empereurs*, 43-53.

*praevaricatores*, betraying the faith for temporal gains. One way in which the parallels between the *praevaricatores* and these orthodox Christians are made clear is the form of the text itself. All of the examples relating to the Arians and *praevaricatores* appear in the first half of the text; all of the examples relating to more contemporary Christian persecutions appear in the second half of the text. The reader, already inclined to despise the Arians, finds the first half easily believable. However, the Luciferians then present a group of Nicene Christians acting the same way. The reader is given no choice; if the Arians were wicked for acting in a certain way, and Nicene Christians are doing the same things, then these Nicene Christians must surely be wicked as well.

There are also similarities between the Luciferian treatments of the two groups which heighten the identification of these Nicene Christians as the new *praevaricatores*. The stories of Gregory and Macarius, for example, both relate a courtroom drama wherein the judge sides with the Luciferian. Gregory was persecuted under Ossius; Macarius was persecuted under Damasus.<sup>304</sup> This type of parallel structure emphasizes the similarity between *praevaricatores* like Ossius and the orthodox Christians who persecute the Luciferians. This locates the Luciferians directly within another Christian tradition. As Brent Shaw writes, “The more normal judicial dream, if we might call it that, became a staple of Christian rhetoric in periods long after the state persecutions

---

<sup>304</sup> Gregory: *Lib. Prec.* 32-44 (*SC* 504:138-150); Macarius: *Ibid.* 78-82 (*SC* 504:180-186). The story of Damasus has at least the ring of truth to it. He and his successor, Siricius, are both well-known for their attempts to maintain direct control over churches throughout Rome and their activities against schismatic and heretical factions, frequently making use of imperial power in an effort to promote uniformity in doctrine and discipline throughout the city. See 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), 1.407-447 and Harry O. Maier, “The Topography of Heresy and Dissent in Late-Fourth-Century Rome,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44, no. 2 (1995): 232-249.

were a thing of the distant past.”<sup>305</sup> The literary trope of a Christian being hauled into court for his faith lived far past the 4<sup>th</sup> century, even when the persecution of Christians for the sake of being Christian had ceased. Whether or not the Luciferians were actually brought before judges in this manner, which may well have happened, is irrelevant, because it was a common method of early Christian storytelling and one with which a Christian reader would be able to identify. The sympathies would naturally lie on the side of the Luciferian in both instances.

In another instance of parallel structure, the Luciferians write early in their petition that the *praevaricatores* committed no less an impiety than sacrificing to an idol during a pagan persecution.<sup>306</sup> In the second half of the text, when two other bishops persecute Vincentius in Spain, the Luciferians claim that they threw the altar from Vincentius’ church at the feet of an idol – and what more serious a thing, they ask, would even a pagan do?<sup>307</sup> The implication is clear – just as the earlier *praevaricatores* were no better than pagans, so too are their current persecutors no better than pagans. Although the persecutors have gone from the Arians to the orthodox, the implication of the structure of the text is that there is little difference between them.<sup>308</sup>

The general storyline is the same in all of the Luciferian examples. The *praevaricatores* and their allies always persecute; the Luciferians always suffer patiently without fighting back. However, unlike before, these martyr stories are told to differentiate themselves not from the Arians of the age of Constantius but from the

---

<sup>305</sup> Brent D. Shaw, “Judicial Nightmares and Christian Memory,” *J ECS* 11, no. 4 (2003): 546.

<sup>306</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 29 (*SC* 504:134-136).

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.* 76 (*SC* 504:178-180).

<sup>308</sup> Particularly given the emphasis laid on spiritual contamination, above.

Christian bishops of the mid-380s. The Luciferians, by creating their history in this way, indirectly emphasize the importance that martyrs have had in their communal history and by these retellings, they emphasize the martyrs' importance in their self-identification as a community.<sup>309</sup> Telling history via martyr stories is nothing new or unique to the Luciferians. For instance, the first true ecclesiastic historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, structures his whole history with martyrs occupying the central place; the apex of the work is the final victory of Constantine which (supposedly) ends all persecution.<sup>310</sup> This use of martyrdom by Christians to define eras of religious history would continue throughout Late Antiquity.<sup>311</sup> Just as the triumphal narrative in Eusebius did not reflect the end of struggles within Christian communities and challenges from without, this simple binary division into two eras of persecution by the Luciferians does no more justice to the complex political and social upheavals taking place all across the Roman world throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> century in regards to the 'Arian crisis' than accounts of the crisis itself by men like Athanasius.

The petition also includes a lengthy story about Gregory of Elvira and Ossius of Cordoba, Constantine's adviser at the Council of Nicaea who later 'fell' into Arianism.<sup>312</sup> Ossius' decision to accept the Sirmian creed was clearly a shocking blow to many Christians, as de Clercq collects no less than fourteen 4<sup>th</sup>-, 5<sup>th</sup>-, and 6<sup>th</sup>-century sources

---

<sup>309</sup> Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*, 4.

<sup>310</sup> Friedhelm Winkelmann, "Historiography in the Age of Constantine," in *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, ed. Gabriele Marasco, Leiden: Brill (2003), 27-28.

<sup>311</sup> In large part due to Eusebius' later influence: see *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>312</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 32-44 (SC 504:138-150).

that mention or discuss his decision to sign the creed.<sup>313</sup> In the Luciferian account alone, however, Ossius then returns to Spain and tries to force other bishops, including Gregory, to sign the Arian creed. He is not presented as a simple-minded dupe or a tired old man, but a consciously rabid persecutor. In every other source, Ossius merely gives in to heresy. Athanasius even reports a deathbed recantation.<sup>314</sup> Only according to the Luciferians, however, does he both give in to heresy *and* persecute other Christians. The Luciferians can thus point to Ossius as an example of the character of the *praevaricatores* in general. The enemies of the Luciferians are wicked, not weak. The fact that Ossius and Theodosius, the petition's recipient, were both Spanish undoubtedly would add something of a personal touch to Theodosius' reception of this recounting.

By presenting their own bishop, Gregory, as a victim of this arch-*praevaricator*, the Luciferians accomplish two things. First, as with Hilary, the Luciferians connect themselves to the Nicene tradition of suffering under Constantius. The importance of Ossius' lapse among all Nicene authors only heightens the sense of unity among those who persisted in the struggle against Arianism, because the potential for a lapse was present among even the most revered of Nicene supporters. Thus in regards to the importance of Ossius' lapse, the Luciferians identify themselves the same way as their opponents.

Secondly, however, communal identity arises not only from the experience of suffering, but also from the identity of the persecutor; hatred against the other is just as

---

<sup>313</sup> Mostly from the 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, including the Luciferian petition. 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), 507-09.

<sup>314</sup> *Hist. Ar.* 45 (PG 25:749).

important developing a sense of community.<sup>315</sup> In this case, the Luciferians (but not their contemporaries) emphasized the persecutor as a former Catholic. Although the Luciferians mention Ursacius, Valens, and other staunchly ‘Arian’ bishops,<sup>316</sup> they do not focus on their actions in the same way that other Christian authors do. Instead, they focus on the former Nicene-turned-traitor Ossius. The emphasis laid on Ossius indicates the enemies the Luciferians emphasize: not Arians per se, but *praevaricatores*. In this respect, at least, they differ from their adversaries. The reason is clear; the Luciferians, facing persecution from the Christians of their day, are more pressingly interested in Nicene Christians who became Arian persecutors during the ‘Arian crisis’ than the original Arians themselves, who are no longer the threat to the Luciferians they once were.<sup>317</sup> This allows the Luciferians to define their community using past figures like Ossius, whom Christian authors generally agreed was a *praevaricator*, to represent contemporary persecutors as well.

These descriptions are not always believable. Concerning the Luciferian account of Ossius’ actions, de Clerq writes, “A mere reading of the flagrant absurdities and impossibilities contained in this amazing pamphlet should convince anyone of its manifestly calumnious nature and historical worthlessness.”<sup>318</sup> The Luciferian petition is, by any standard, patently absurd in many of its details to the modern reader. The fact that their history alone casts Ossius in such an evil light does little to recommend it to the

---

<sup>315</sup> Michael Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 96.

<sup>316</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 14 (SC 504:124). They are merely named as the authors of the Sirmian Creed (Hilary’s *blasphemia*).

<sup>317</sup> Like most antique Christians, the Luciferians refer to the Arians as a bloc rather than address the mottled patchwork of beliefs concerning the relationship of the Father and Son which existed in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>318</sup> de Clerq, *Ossius of Cordova*, 528.

reader as a true account of what happened, and thus more likely represents yet another falsehood created in a schismatic crisis. Why create such elaborate fiction?<sup>319</sup> One reason is to place their own bishop, Gregory, on a level far above Ossius. The Luciferians set up these archetypal examples as extremely one-sided versions of real people. They do this so that their own bishops – Gregory, for instance – stand in incontrovertibly positive contrast to the cartoonishly evil *praevaricatores*. This also is in no way unique. Kahlos describes how when Christians created the Christian/pagan rhetorical divide, they merely substituted one hierarchical dichotomy with another.<sup>320</sup> Non-Christians were labeled with a variety of derogatory terms. Similarly, the Luciferians lump together all their opponents and create another dichotomy, with the Luciferians themselves in the place of honor and the *praevaricatores* dehumanized into mere caricatures. These caricatures do not do justice to the complicated social pressures at play here; one need only contrast the Luciferians' hostile appraisal of Ossius to Athanasius' desperate attempts to reconcile him after death to realize that both are creating elaborate fictions to justify their own positions.

The Luciferians use these martyr stories to promote their theological take on the meaning of martyrdom itself. This is reflected in the very way they describe the bishops

---

<sup>319</sup> Despite the fact that not one other source agrees with them, the Luciferians call their claims *documenta* and then make an ever bolder claim: *scit melius omnis Hispania, quod ista non fingimus*. An easy claim, since at the time the Luciferians presented their petition, the usurper Magnus Maximus still controlled the Western Empire. The petition, however, was presented to Theodosius, who at the time was ruling thousands of miles away in Constantinople. This claim may also have carried a personal impact for Theodosius, since Theodosius himself was from Hispania. Theodosius would have been approximately ten years old when Ossius signed the second Sirmian Confession and died two years later. The Luciferians also seemed to have a certain panache for fabrication; at least two letters supposedly written by Athanasius to Lucifer but penned by Luciferians survive and are even referenced at *Lib. Prec.* 88 (*SC* 504:192): see Louis Saltet, "Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens aux IVE et Ve siècles," 300-326.

<sup>320</sup> Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue* 29.

who ‘fell’ at Rimini. Close to the beginning of the work, when discussing the

*praevaricatores*, Faustinus and Marcellinus write:

*Nonne gratum habere debuerunt, si tamen credebant futurum Dei iudicium, omnia mala perpeti quam esse venerabilis fidei proditores, cuius virtus sancti quoque Alexandri orationibus et Arrii supplicio fuerat adprobata?*<sup>321</sup>

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 of the revered faith, the holy virtue of which had been proven by the speeches of Alexander [of Constantinople] and by Arius' punishment?

There are really two parts to this passage. First of all, the Luciferians establish the role of violence in their theology as part of an either/or decision. The only two choices are to either suffer or be a traitor to the faith, and the *praevaricatores* chose to be traitors.

Secondly, there is the argument that if these *praevaricatores* had true faith, they would have suffered.

The Luciferians argue that there is no possibility other than suffering violence or being a traitor. This is nothing out of the ordinary for Christians of the 4<sup>th</sup>-century. Ambrose, a contemporary of the Luciferians, even uses the same terminology. In 388, after the local bishop incited the people of Callinicum to burn down a local synagogue, Theodosius ordered the bishop to rebuild it. Ambrose defended the bishop, saying that forcing him to do this “will necessarily also make him either a traitor (*praevaricatore*) or a martyr.”<sup>322</sup> Ambrose repeats the same argument vis-à-vis the local governor.<sup>323</sup> Like the Luciferians, Ambrose here gives no indication that the coercive power of the emperor

---

<sup>321</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 20 (SC 504:128-129).

<sup>322</sup> *Ep.* 74 [40].7 (CSEL 82:59): *Necesse erit igitur, ut aut praevaricatore aut martyrem faciat...*

<sup>323</sup> *Ep.* 74 [40].9 (CSEL 82:60): *Habebis, imperator, comitem praevaricatore...*

in any way exculpated the bishop. Ambrose, like the Luciferians, is writing to Theodosius himself. Ambrose is also, like the Luciferians, trying to coerce the emperor into siding with him. Since the bishop involved had already been excused from this duty and the *comes* was unlikely to disobey the emperor on religious grounds, Ambrose's emphasis on this traitor/martyr dichotomy indicates it held a particular rhetorical significance for Ambrose. Indeed, Ambrose's rhetorical dichotomy no longer applied to the facts of the matter.<sup>324</sup> Thus the Luciferians are presenting a choice – traitor or martyr – that would have been perfectly reasonable for Christians of their day. They may differ on when Christians should have been willing to suffer, but this does not represent any theological difference with other orthodox Christians, as the Luciferian statement above might suggest.

More importantly, the Luciferians present martyrdom as a test. The conditional statement quoted above could be shortened to, “If they had faith [during the Council of Rimini], they would have suffered.” Martyrdom thus becomes a test of sorts, because the natural conclusion to that conditional is, “Since they did not suffer, they have no faith.” Thus anyone unwilling to be martyred becomes, in the eyes of the Luciferians, without true faith. There is some evidence that this was not an uncommon position. The mere fact that Athanasius had to write an *Apologia de fuga sua* indicates that, even if the attacks against him were mere rhetorical devices which he dreamt up, he assumed his readers would expect that Christians should in general suffer as martyrs rather than flee.<sup>325</sup>

---

<sup>324</sup> Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 300-01.

<sup>325</sup> The *Apologia de fuga sua* is presented as *Apologie a l'empereur Constance / Apologie pour sa fuite* (SC 56, ed. and trans. Jan-M. Szymusiak; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1958).

Similarly, the Luciferians are creating yet another fictional dichotomy: that they were the ones who suffered, and the *praevaricatores* did not. The Luciferians nowhere mention those who suffered under Valens, as noted above. When the Luciferians state, “This cannot be uncertain: that those who are truly catholics are those who affirmed the faith which was sworn at Nicaea...without treachery, through their exiles, through various punishments, through the fierceness of death,”<sup>326</sup> they are ignoring many who did just that. This too was a common tactic for all Christians in Late Antiquity, as well as pagans and Jews.<sup>327</sup> Once again, the Luciferians define themselves as a unique community through the methods and beliefs which they share with their contemporaries.

The rhetorical dichotomy between persecutor and persecuted is a key element of their self-identification. The Luciferians recount these martyr stories “to structure a world view, to endorse specific characters, and to deliver the messages the author proclaimed,” in keeping with the behavior of other Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>328</sup> Lucy Grig writes that late antique martyr stories were generally binary, since “the intention of the text is to allow for no impartial observers.”<sup>329</sup> This worldview is present throughout these Luciferian stories: the Luciferians always suffer yet never commit violent acts

---

<sup>326</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 10 (SC 504:120): *Sed et illud ambigi non potest, hos esse vere catholicos, qui, per exilia, per genera suppliciorum, per atrocitatem mortis, illam fidem sine dolo vindicant quae apud Nicaeam...conscripta est.* They reveal here the same assimilation of *catholici*, the term which they use, and *orthodoxi* that Theodosius demonstrated above.

<sup>327</sup> Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 273: “...it is through narrative that the specific attributes to be sought during processes of boundary maintenance are articulated; what marks one as a real member of the community in question, and so which qualities or behavioral traits should be insisted upon by those who patrol communal boundaries, are frequently exemplified in certain narratives privileged by that community.”

<sup>328</sup> Maureen Tilley, “Scripture as an Element of Social Control: Two Martyr Stories of Christian North Africa,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 83, no. 4 (1990): 384.

<sup>329</sup> Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*, 5.

themselves,<sup>330</sup> the Arians and *praevaricatores* are always the persecutors, and the reader is naturally expected to side with the suffering Luciferians. Kahlos argues that Christians, by presenting a simplified view of pagans, simplified themselves as well.<sup>331</sup> Likewise, the Luciferians, by presenting a simplified view of their enemies, simplify themselves. By presenting the *praevaricatores* and their orthodox opponents as almost universally violent and themselves as universally peaceful, the Luciferians inevitably present the *praevaricatores* and the orthodox enemies of the Luciferians as violent by virtue of being *praevaricatores* and orthodox enemies of the Luciferians, while presenting themselves as righteous by virtue of having previously held up against persecution.

This binary distinction between persecutors and persecuted is naturally not limited to the Luciferians. Lucy Grig's comment, that martyr stories were inherently binary, was written about stories written by other Christian authors. Once more, in defining themselves in opposition to their enemies, the Luciferians are not being innovative. The very tools with which Christians interacted with pagans have become, by the 380s, the tools with which Christians deal with one another during heretical and schismatic crises.

---

<sup>330</sup> Which is not *entirely* beyond belief. In his dialogue *Against the Luciferians*, Jerome writes that his Luciferian opponent argued with hateful loquacity (*odiosa loquacitate contendens*; SC 473:82). However, he never once mentions actual acts of violence perpetrated by the Luciferians, even though that would score easy rhetorical points in a very rhetorical piece. Furthermore, violence in retribution against persecutors diminished the value of martyrdom, while "Vengeance would always fall upon persecutors sooner or later...but it should properly be seen to come from God, in an unambiguously miraculous manner, and not from human hands." Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 178. According to Faustinus and Marcellinus, the Luciferians' enemies are indeed punished by God; see below. This binary depiction also supports their case to the emperor. By describing their enemies as committing acts of violence to enforce social boundaries, they also implicitly comment on their enemies' lack of respect for the state's prerogative: "Such disruptive violence, when carried out by anyone other than the authorized agents of the state, was in in and of itself a usurpation...critics could present [violent monks] not just as undisciplined toughs but as a serious challenge to the very authority and legitimacy of the imperial government," Ibid., 217. This can also be seen in the Luciferians' description of how Luciosus and Hyginus treated the town councilors in Spain, as noted above.

<sup>331</sup> Kahlos, *Debate and Dialogue* 15.

These tools are in no way designed to accurately reproduce a picture of society with any accuracy; they are designed to argue, convince, and coerce.

The Luciferians' enemies do not go unpunished, of course. The petition includes a number of scenes in which heretics and persecutors suffer torments or death. These always come at the hand of God, and always strike the Luciferians' enemies. The lengthiest description is given to Arius' death, a gruesome tale in which Arius' life is ended by a disease that causes him to void his intestines (a common story), his body thus becoming so thin that he falls through the seat and drowns in the feces (less common).<sup>332</sup> Leroy-Molinghen, writing about various accounts of Arius' death, says that some groups stretched the truth. "C'est le cas notamment de Faustin et Marcellin," she writes, "auxquels nous accorderions volontiers la palme dans le domaine de l'imagination débridée."<sup>333</sup> She points out, though, that the story itself is just one of many variations on the same theme. Beginning at the latest with a letter of Athanasius, written around 358, the story of Arius' death became an *exemplum* of divine vengeance to authors of all provenances.<sup>334</sup> While the Luciferian version may be the most entertaining (and least believable), the common nature of the story is the best indicator that the Luciferians are here in no way unique among their contemporaries. Their account of Arius' does not signify a real difference, merely the lengths to which they had to go in order to differentiate themselves. As with the caricatures of their persecutors, the story works only to present a contemptible figure – there is no space for theological hair-splitting here,

---

<sup>332</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 6-12 (SC 504:114-122).

<sup>333</sup> A. Leroy-Molinghen, "La mort d'Arius," *Byz.* 38 (1968): 107.

<sup>334</sup> *Ep. ad Serapionem de morte Aarii* (PG 25:685-690). For a collection and discussion of these various stories, see Leroy-Molinghen, "La mort d'Arius," 105-111. Athanasius mentions the death in a slightly earlier letter (50) but with no details.

only a simplified, fictional world in which the righteous are righteous and the heretics are punished hideously. This was an important part of Christian discourse in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. For all the importance that the law had, and however persuasive the Luciferians could be towards the emperor just by rhetoric, Christians in the 4<sup>th</sup> century put more stock in divine signs, both miraculously healing or damning, than they did in argument.<sup>335</sup>

The Luciferians do not shy away from violent language. The petitioners openly quote Jeremiah 6.13-14, “For from the least to the greatest of them, everyone is greedy for unjust gain; and from prophet to priest, everyone deals falsely. They have treated the wound of my people carelessly, saying ‘Peace, peace,’ when there is no peace,” and then add in their own commentary, “And it should be noted how vicious things proceed from those who glory in this emptiest of peaces.”<sup>336</sup> Soon afterwards, the Luciferians rhetorically ask Theodosius, “What evil do we commit, what do we do impiously, if serving the faith in Christ, we spit on peace of this sort...?”<sup>337</sup> Spitting on peace certainly implies that physical violence remains an option for the Luciferians, even if they do not seem to have engaged in it (whether due to some desire for peace or, more likely, an inability to effectively fight their enemies, one cannot say).<sup>338</sup> This, too, is very much like their contemporaries. Jerome, for example, uses Jeremiah 6:14 in a very similar sense.<sup>339</sup>

---

<sup>335</sup> Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, 47-73.

<sup>336</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 118 (SC 504:228): *Sed apertius quoque et apud Hieremiam legimus de ea pace impia et iniqua, sicut exequatur subiectum testimonium: A pusillo eorum usque ad magnum cuncti perpetraverunt iniqua. A sacerdote usque ad pseudopropheta universi operati sunt falsa, et meditabantur obritioni populi mei pro nihilo constituentes et dicentes ‘Pax, pax!’ Et ubi est pax? Et intendum est quam atrocita de illis prosequatur qui hac vanissima pace gloriantur.*

<sup>337</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 119 (SC 504:230): *Quid mali committimus, quid impie facimus, si servantes fidem Christo, huiusmodi pacem respuamus...?*

<sup>338</sup> On the importance of scripture in legitimizing and extolling certain beliefs and practices, see Maureen Tilley, “Scripture as an Element of Social Control.”

<sup>339</sup> *Adversus Jovinianum* 2.37 (PL 23:350).

Time and time again, the Luciferians demonstrate no difference in practice with their opponents.

One need only refer to the story of Florentius of Ostia, or their love of Athanasius, discussed above, to demonstrate the hollowness of this rhetoric. The implication of asking, “Where is the peace?” is that there is none. It is clear, however, that the true answer is “between Luciferians and Christians like Athanasius and Florentius.” Their rhetorical division of the world into ‘those who accept this false peace’ and ‘those who do not’ suffers from their own willingness to transgress the boundaries they establish. That alone should demonstrate that this divide between ‘catholic’ and ‘schism’ engenders a great deal of fiction on the part of the supposedly ‘schismatic’ side as well.

Just as other Christians writing about the Luciferians frequently invent or twist arguments to demonstrate that the Luciferians are heretical, the Luciferians frequently find ways to demonstrate their own superiority in regards to other Christians in manners that simply do not reflect reality. Rather than merely state that, following the Council of Alexandria in 362, they had differing opinions on how the returning clergy should be treated, the Luciferians appear compelled to create arguments based on their ecclesiastical policies, their asceticism, and their suffering in order to demonstrate both that they are different from other Christians and that they are better. This sort of fictive violence is matched by the true suffering (to whatever extent) that the Luciferians actually faced during the 380s.

*Chapter V. Conclusion.*

The Luciferian attacks on their enemies' theological positions, and their enemies' attacks on them, are by no means unique. As just one brief example, consider Ursinus, Damasus' competitor for the episcopate in Rome. According to Ammianus, the two were fighting over 'their interests' as well as the wealth that the episcopate of Rome ensured.<sup>340</sup> But Ammianus' vagueness obscures the theological interests of the two parties, regardless of whether or not they desired the wealth the office might bring. According to the very tendentious *Gesta Liberii* (the first document in the *Collectio Avellana*), when the bishop Liberius was exiled by Constantius, Damasus (as a deacon) had supported his imperially-appointed replacement, Felix.<sup>341</sup> This became an issue following Liberius' death, as Ursinus' supporters believed that Ursinus should become bishop of Rome, not Damasus, for that reason.<sup>342</sup> Damasus, victorious, contrived to have Ursinus exiled.<sup>343</sup> It was during his exile to Milan that he – according to a letter of Ambrose, written some six years later – allied with the Arians in Milan, including the

---

<sup>340</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, 27.3.12-14 (ed. Seyfarth:2.36-37): [12] *Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam episcopalem sedem ardentis, scissis studiis asperrime conflictabantur ad usque mortis vulnerumque discrimina adiumentis utriusque progressis, quae nec corrigere sufficiens Viventius nec mollire, coactus vi magna secessit in suburbanum.* [13] *Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte, quae ei favebat, instante. Constatque in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadavera peremptorum, efferatamque diu plebem aegre postea delenitam.* [14] *Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans urbanarum, huius rei cupidus ob impetrandum, quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum iurgari debere, cum id adepti, futuri sint ita securi ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes circumspecte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas adeo ut eorum convivium regales superent mensas.*

<sup>341</sup> *Coll. Av.* 1.2 (CSEL 35:1).

<sup>342</sup> *Ibid.* 1.5 (CSEL 35:2).

<sup>343</sup> *Ibid.* 1.6 (CSEL 35:2-3). His exile, return, and exile is described by some other imperial letters in the *Collectio Avellana*, notably *Ibid.* 5 (CSEL 35:48), *Ibid.* 7 (CSEL 35:49-50), *Ibid.* 11 (CSEL 35:52-53), and *Ibid.* 12 (CSEL 35:53-54).

homoian Emperor Valens.<sup>344</sup> As McLynn points out, however, this makes no sense. Such a staunch supporter of the Nicene cause, to the degree that Damasus' communion with Felix had somehow made Damasus ineligible for the Roman see, would hardly join the Arian party so easily. McLynn's careful textual analysis of Ambrose's description in fact reveals that "Ursinus had *not* publicly attended any Arian assemblies... This is nothing but a smear, intended to compromise Ursinus' case for clemency by associating him with the heretics condemned by the council of Aquileia and (at least implicitly) by the emperor himself."<sup>345</sup> McLynn is right to believe that an intransigent Nicene like Ursinus could so easily find such allies.

The information which survives about Ursinus is scant, but it appears to suggest a similar case of a schismatic figure being accused of a contrived 'heresy.' The Luciferians have left behind a lengthy petition, and numerous Christian authors in antiquity discuss their faction. The pattern recurs. Other Christian authors accuse the Luciferians of doctrinal irregularity, but none can point to any specific doctrine which the Luciferians are unique in holding; likewise, the Luciferians discuss at great length the various doctrinal errors of their enemies, but none of these accusations appear to be legitimate differences of belief. The question remains, then, as to why these differences which appear to be solely related to church authority – or schism – so quickly turn into debates over invented theological differences – 'heresy.'

---

<sup>344</sup> *Ep. extr. coll.* 5 [11].2-3 [CSEL 82:183-184].

<sup>345</sup> McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, 57-60. The fact that Ursinus was accused of Arianism, while the Luciferians were apparently accused of Sabellianism (*Conf. Fid.* 1; SC 504:102), suggests that the two were not of the same party – especially as Ambrose does briefly discuss the Luciferians, as noted above, and nowhere suggests that they have any Arian beliefs.

*i. Satire and Identity*

A comparison may be made to one of Rome's older literary traditions: satire. In his landmark study of satire, anthropologist Robert C. Elliott writes that one social function of satire is to be "employed in straightforward and warlike defense of his tribe against threat from without," in other words, to establish and maintain boundaries between two social groups.<sup>346</sup> Cathy Keane connects this to the Roman context, arguing that, "Rather than simply punishing offenders, the attacks serve to construct the social boundaries that separate assailant from victim...[s]atiric mockery and blame are aimed at making and reinforcing difference, rather than simply reflecting historical reality."<sup>347</sup> Like these satirists, the Luciferians and their opponents are more interested in reinforcing the differences between the two communities than depicting the historical reality, and this need to exaggerate leads both to the creation of fictions about one another.

Returning to Elliott, he also describes the satirist's defense of his own social position as "a public servant fighting the good fight against vice and folly where he meets it; he is honest, brave, protected by the rectitude of his motives; he attacks only the wicked..."<sup>348</sup> Such words could equally apply to the Luciferians, who in these pages have constantly depicted themselves as struggling to maintain the 'true' faith in view of the strength of the wicked; but such is also true of their opponents, who view the Luciferians (along with any other schism or heresy) as a threat to their social world. When the satirist claims that he is "the preserver of tradition, the true tradition, from which there has been

---

<sup>346</sup> Robert C. Elliott, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 259.

<sup>347</sup> Catharine Keane, *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 43.

<sup>348</sup> Robert C. Elliott, *The Power of Satire*, 265.

grievous falling away,”<sup>349</sup> one needs only quote the Luciferians when they clamor, “This cannot be uncertain: that those who are truly catholics are those who affirmed the faith which was sworn at Nicaea...without treachery, through their exiles, through various punishments, through the fierceness of death,” to demonstrate how the mental states of the satirist and the petitioner are, in this case, quite similar.<sup>350</sup>

Does this satirical need to distance the ‘other’ apply to late antique religion? After all, it is one thing to argue that Juvenal is worried that the differences between Romans and foreigners are becoming less and less important, and another to argue that sectarian Christians quickly turn to accusations of heresy in order to differentiate the one community from another. The need to exaggerate differences, and sometimes even to create them, in order to define communal boundaries is, however, not at all limited to satire. Returning to the work of Daniel Boyarin, one can see how

...it was the threat of Gentile Christianity to the borders of Jewish peoplehood in Asia Minor, represented by the new second-century Christian claim to be *Verus Israel*...that may have given rise to nonliturgically formalized or even popular curses on Gentile Christians and to the reviling of Christ in the synagogues. That development may very well have taken place first in the areas in which Jews and Gentile Christians were in intense and tense contact...<sup>351</sup>

This development in the history of Judaism – that of curses directed specifically towards Christians, and thus defining ‘Christians’ as a separate community – occurred primarily in communities wherein Jews and Gentile Christians were contesting the borders between the two groups in both a literal, physical sense and in a theological sense. It was their

---

<sup>349</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>350</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 10 (SC 504:120): *Sed et illud ambigi non potest, hos esse vere catholicos, qui, per exilia, per genera suppliciorum, per atrocitatem mortis, illam fidem sine dolo vindicant quae apud Nicaeam...conscripta est.*

<sup>351</sup> Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 71.

very closeness, in space and in thought, that provoked these strong responses. Likewise, schismatic Christians appear to have been ‘too close’ to orthodox Christians for them to coexist for very long. Instead, differences over authority alone quickly led each faction to recategorize the other not as schismatic but as heretical, and thus create a wider distinction between the two than existed previously.

Furthermore, this development in Jewish curses made use of the same terminology previously employed by Jews against ‘heretics’ (*minim*), and that same terminology was previously utilized against ‘sectarians.’<sup>352</sup> In other words, by the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Jewish curses against sectarians, heretics, and even members of a different religion all utilized the same terminology. Thus Jews were beginning to conceptually understand ‘sectarian’ Jews as ‘heretics,’ and both ‘sectarian’ and ‘heretical’ Jews as those belonging to another religion entirely – and in this way worked towards defining Christianity and Judaism as separate entities entirely. Within Christian communities of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, it is possible to see this same need to distinguish ‘true’ Christianity from opposing factions with greater and greater clarity. Just as ‘orthodox’ Jews began to consider ‘sectarian’ Jews as ‘heretical,’ ‘orthodox’ Christians were clearly beginning to consider ‘schismatic’ Christians as ‘heretical’ – collapsing the two categories into one another, even at the expense of actual beliefs and actions of any one group of Christians. Just as “Chrysostom set about an elaborate refiguring of contemporary Jews as something other than real Jews, and contemporary Judaism as something other than real Judaism,”<sup>353</sup> the Luciferians and their enemies both set about refiguring their Christian opponents as

---

<sup>352</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>353</sup> Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity*, 29.

something other than real Christians, and their opponents' beliefs and practices as something other than real Christianity. Late antique Christians were compelled to enforce notions of 'catholicity,' but they did so in the terminology of orthodoxy and heresy.

## *ii. A Luciferian Social Network*

One question remains: if these factors all created an ever-widening gap between Luciferians and other Christians, why did no Luciferian heresy – or even religion – survive? By around the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, they appear only as a dead group.<sup>354</sup> To understand this, we must understand how the group maintained its identity beyond these theological and rhetorical distinctions (or lack thereof), and in particular the social network created by its founding members. It is clearly demonstrable that 'Luciferians' emerged in locations directly linked to Lucifer of Cagliari and his network of allies in the Nicene struggle against Constantius.

Elizabeth Clark's works on the Origenist controversy cover a dispute among Christians in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century over the orthodoxy of Origen's writings. The dispute over Origen, in particular his *De principiis*, thus arose only a handful of years after the Luciferians penned their petition. The two factions were led by Jerome and his one-time friend, Rufinus. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Jerome's friends, patrons, and past allies took up

---

<sup>354</sup> Rufinus, writing in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century, reports that only a few were active in his time: *Hist. eccl.* 28 (*PL* 21: 501): ...*schisma quod licet per paucos adhuc volvitur*... Socrates describes the Luciferians as active: *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.6 (*GCS NF* 1:204); Theodoret claims that they are no longer active: *Hist. eccl.* 3.2.4 (*GCS* 19:181). Perhaps Theodoret was in a better position to know of extant groups, as no known Luciferian groups existed in Constantinople, where Socrates lived, but Theodoret, being a Syrian in Cyrrhus, would have been much closer and more concerned with affairs in Antioch, where a group had apparently emerged following Lucifer's visit.

his theological position and Rufinus' took up his.<sup>355</sup> Social networks were incredibly important in the formation of these divided communities – perhaps even more important than the theological questions. Clark concludes a slightly earlier study on the same subject with a rhetorical question: if Jerome and Rufinus had not become estranged over Origen, would something else have come to the surface and “given them outlets for their social, economic and intellectual rivalry?”<sup>356</sup> In this case, these networks were able to polarize two groups against one another despite their almost universal agreement on the proper beliefs and practices of the Church. Clark points out that modern social network analysis is based on “direct observation, interviews, and questionnaires.”<sup>357</sup> Although this is impossible to do when studying individuals long-dead, the amount of information which survives concerning some of these individuals ensures that the historian may use these methods confidently.

The origin and development of the Luciferian schism may also be examined as a network of allies and enemies. Although information is scantier than the data available for the Origenist controversy, there is enough to adequately demonstrate that Luciferian groups developed in the same places in which stringently Nicene bishops opposed Constantius' attempts at creating doctrinal unity. This connection between the Nicene faction in the West during the reign of Constantius and the location of Luciferian communities has gone unnoticed by scholars.

---

<sup>355</sup> Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

<sup>356</sup> Elizabeth Clark, “Elite Networks and Heresy Accusations: Towards a Social Description of the Origenist Controversy,” *Semeia* 56 (1991): 97.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

The Luciferians in the 380s describe communities of Luciferians all across the Mediterranean. Communities existed in Elvira (modern Granada), Trier, Rome, Naples, North Africa, Oxyrhynchus, and Eleutheropolis in Palestine.<sup>358</sup> Although Canellis points out the rhetorical use which Faustinus makes of the geographical spread of the Luciferian communities, she does not connect this to the origins of the group.<sup>359</sup> Evidence exists connecting Lucifer and his allies to almost all these communities except North Africa. First of all, there is no evidence that Gregory of Elvira knew Lucifer, although Faustinus claims that Gregory visited Lucifer in Sardinia.<sup>360</sup> Gregory did, however, receive a letter from Eusebius of Vercelli.<sup>361</sup> The Council of Milan in 355 exiled both Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercelli, who were present, and who together suffered exile later.<sup>362</sup> Furthermore, the petition presents Gregory as the primary Nicene opponent of Ossius of Cordoba, who accepted the ‘blasphemy’ of Sirmium in 357 and died in 359. Although the connection is not strong, Gregory was clearly a part of the stringent-Nicene faction in the West, of which Lucifer was one of the most prominent members. It should come as no surprise, then, that the Luciferians claim that Vincentius, a presbyter in Spain, was persecuted because he would only hold communion with Gregory.<sup>363</sup> Similarly, Paulinus of Trier was exiled in 353 for his support of the Nicene formula.<sup>364</sup> Hilary of Poitiers,

---

<sup>358</sup> Spain: *Lib. Prec.* 32-44; 73-76 (*SC* 504:138-151; 176-181); Trier: *Ibid.* 77 (*SC* 504:180-1); Rome: *Ibid.* 77-85 (*SC* 504:180-191); there is no way to know if a community in Naples existed in the 380s, but there was certainly an ally of Lucifer’s there in the 360s: *Ibid.* 25 (*SC* 504:132-132); North Africa, *Ibid.* 107 (*SC* 504:216-217); Oxyrhynchus, *Ibid.* 92-101 (*SC* 504:196-211); Eleutheropolis: *Ibid.* 102-110 (*SC* 504:211-221).

<sup>359</sup> Canellis, *Supplique aux empereurs*, 52.

<sup>360</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 90 (*SC* 504:194).

<sup>361</sup> *PL* 10:713-714.

<sup>362</sup> They left exile from Oxyrhynchus together: Socr., *Hist. eccl.* 3.5.1 (*GCS NF* 1:196).

<sup>363</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 73 (*SC* 504:176).

<sup>364</sup> Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (*PL* 10:562-563).

who collaborated with Lucifer as noted above, was familiar and friendly with Paulinus.<sup>365</sup> It is not unreasonable to suggest that Paulinus was familiar with the circle of Nicenes formed by Lucifer, Eusebius, Hilary, and others at the time. Hilary had, for instance, penned a letter to Liberius, who had sent Lucifer as his delegate to Constantius.<sup>366</sup> Liberius wrote to Lucifer, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Dionysius of Milan.<sup>367</sup> Jerome, in a defence of his occasional use of Origen's writings, points out that Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli both did the same; this might have been nothing more than an odd coincidence if he had not also explicitly named them as co-confessors while not referring to Victorinus of Pettau's martyrdom, and even separating the latter from the former two in the text.<sup>368</sup> Many of the Nicene champions of the 350s were connected to one another, and in many of these same places, such as Spain, Rome, and Trier, Luciferians later arose.

There is much more direct evidence for many of the communities. Lucifer himself visited Rome, according to the petition.<sup>369</sup> He also visited Naples on his way to Rome, once more, according to the petition.<sup>370</sup> One of his exiles was spent in the Thebaid along with Eusebius, and they surely would have passed by the important city of Oxyrhynchus on their way to and from the southern region if their exile was not in Oxyrhynchus

---

<sup>365</sup> Hil., *Adversus Valentem et Ursinum* pref. 3.6. (CSEL 65, ed. Feder:102), and see Carl Beckwith, "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers," 26.

<sup>366</sup> Hilary's letter: *PL* 10:714-716. Lucifer, Hilary, and Pancratius were Liberius' delegation to Constantius: Hil., *Ad Const.* 1.8 (*PL* 10:562-563); Jer., *De vir. ill.* 95 (*PL* 23:697). A letter sent by Liberius to Constantius and carried by Lucifer is also extant (*PL* 10:681-686).

<sup>367</sup> *PL* 10:686-695.

<sup>368</sup> *Ep.* 61.3-4 (CSEL 54:577). Victorinus was martyred under Diocletian: Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 74 (*PL* 23:719-722).

<sup>369</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 63 (SC 504:166).

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.* 26 (SC 504:132).

itself.<sup>371</sup> Another of his exiles was spent in Eleutheropolis.<sup>372</sup> It is certainly suggestive, though not conclusive, that the Luciferians mention no communities in Poitiers or Vercelli, where Hilary and Eusebius returned *after* agreeing to the conditions of the Council of Alexandria.<sup>373</sup> There are too many coincidences; of all the places where there were Luciferian communities described, only North Africa has no instantly recognizable connection to Lucifer, Eusebius of Vercelli, Hilary of Poitiers, or another member of their circle.<sup>374</sup> These communities must have arisen at least in part as a result of personal connections to Lucifer or his associates. Although the evidence here is thinner than the evidence supplied by Elizabeth Clark for her well-documented controversy, it goes beyond being merely suggestive.

These visits of Lucifer and others helped develop and maintain a sense of a unity among the clergy who opposed the policy of leniency taken at the Council of Alexandria. Personal visits create new links in social networks as well as reinforce old ones. For instance, during the Origenist controversy, aristocrats frequently took trips to the monasteries of Rufinus and Jerome.<sup>375</sup> These visitors then returned to their homes and acted as surrogates for their allies in these struggles. The contacts Lucifer made during

---

<sup>371</sup> Ruf., *Hist. eccl.* 1.27 (PL 22:498): ...*in partibus vicinis Aegypti*...; Socr., *Hist.* 3.5.1 (GCS NF 1:196): Ἄμφω οὖν τῶν ἄνω Θηβῶν τῆς ἐξορίας ἐπανιόντες... On the size and importance of Oxyrhynchus, Hermopolis, Antinoopolis, and Arsinoe, see E.G. Turner, "Roman Oxyrhynchus," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* vol. 38 (1952): 78-86; Turner, "Oxyrhynchus and Rome," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* vol. 79 (1975): 20-24; Roger S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 45-54.

<sup>372</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 109 (SC 504:220).

<sup>373</sup> Nor, interestingly, in Sardinia, where Lucifer returned – also having agreed to the Council's decision, according to Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.6 (GCS NF 1:204). See the discussion in Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 264-267. He concludes that there was no Luciferian group on Sardinia.

<sup>374</sup> Although it is interesting that Jer., *Chron.* 288.6a (PL 27:505-506) lists an otherwise-unknown Philo of Libya along with Lucifer and Gregory of Elvira as a bishop who never 'fell' into Arianism.

<sup>375</sup> Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 24-33.

his exile and his return via Italy undoubtedly created partisan supporters (like Vincentius, perhaps) who led their communities alongside his. Letter-writing also maintained these ties during the Origenist controversy.<sup>376</sup> Letter-writing was particularly important in the Roman world.<sup>377</sup> Again, the letters exchanged between Eusebius of Vercelli and Gregory of Elvira undoubtedly helped create some sense of allegiance between those who had opposed the creed sworn at Rimini from the start.<sup>378</sup>

The group continued to maintain social bonds between various communities. Ephesius, a bishop of Rome (though not according to his Catholic counterpart, Damasus) is summoned to Eleutheropolis by letter and then a letter takes him from them to North Africa as well.<sup>379</sup> This demonstrates two aspects of Luciferian networking: they continued to write letters to one another and their leadership was willing to make personal visits to communities that were in need. Just as these visits and letters helped create the sense of a unified, separate group, they also helped maintain it.

Lastly, these communities would have needed some kind of funding. They appear to have had some success in courting members of the upper class, which would have provided them with just that. As mentioned above, two known members of the Luciferian faction had some standing: Severus, the former tribune, and Hermione, “noble by birth.”<sup>380</sup> The decurions of a town in Spain appear to have had at least some sympathy

---

<sup>376</sup> Ibid.

<sup>377</sup> See, for instance, Scott Bradbury, “Libanius’ Letters as Evidence for Travel and Epistolary Networks among Greek Elites in the Fourth Century,” in *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity* (ed. Linda Ellis and Frank L. Kidner; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004): 73-94.

<sup>378</sup> The Luciferians even mention the importance of letter-writing as a tool of keeping the confessors of the 350s in contact with one another: *Lib. Prec.* 50 (SC 504:156).

<sup>379</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 103 (SC 504:212) and 107 (SC 504:216).

<sup>380</sup> Severus: *Lib. Prec.* 104 (SC 504:212); Hermione: Ibid. 102 (SC 504:210).

with Vincentius, a Luciferian, whether or not they were Luciferians themselves.<sup>381</sup> These kinds of connections would have been able to provide for the financial needs of local Luciferian communities.

All of these causes for the creation of Luciferian communities also point towards potential causes for the group's dissolution. First of all, they clearly were lacking in capable and qualified leaders. Vincentius, as noted above, needed to travel among various communities which did not have bishops of their own. This is unsurprising given their above-noted stance on communion with most other Christians, which, while theologically no different than what those Christians might have done, placed great social pressures on laity and leadership alike.<sup>382</sup> Without ever-present leadership, these communities may have found it even more difficult to bear up under the pressure put on them by other Christians around them. As for why leaders were not recruited from within Luciferian communities, one can only speculate, but a group that had taken its formation from such apparently charismatic figures may have found it difficult to find suitably charismatic replacements. Furthermore, the Luciferians writing the petition clearly know far less about Trier than they do about communities in the Mediterranean basin.<sup>383</sup> This indicates another problem with a thinly-dispersed group: communication. In the ancient world, communication was expensive and dangerous enough over sea, but communication overland – even by river, to Trier – was even more difficult.<sup>384</sup> The amount of time

---

<sup>381</sup> Ibid. 74 (SC 504:176-178).

<sup>382</sup> A point made by Javier Perez Mas, *La crisis luciferiana*, 340.

<sup>383</sup> Aline Canellis, ed., *Débat entre un luciférien et un orthodoxe*, 50.

<sup>384</sup> On sea travel, see Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994): 149-162; for land travel, *ibid.*, 163-196; for sending letters in the ancient world, *ibid.*, 219-225; 220 is particularly instructive: "...there never were enough carriers to meet the needs, and delays were

needed to respond to crises in distant places could be disastrous, particularly for groups with weak leadership and relatively few members. The Luciferians did not possess the ability to quickly respond to crises as a group, and from the actions of Ephesius and the constant descriptions of violent oppression it is apparent that they faced many such crises. Without sufficient leadership and the ability to communicate with one another, Luciferian communities may have found it difficult to exist as separate from other local Nicene communities.

The foundation of the group, so heavily based on individuals connected to Lucifer, also may have created a problem of a different sort. By the 380s, twenty years after the Council of Alexandria, most of those individuals were dead. Paulinus of Trier and Rhodanus of Toulouse died in 358;<sup>385</sup> Hilary of Poitiers in 368;<sup>386</sup> Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercelli in 371;<sup>387</sup> Gregory of Elvira's evidence suggests he lived into the 390s.<sup>388</sup> As the generations passed, and as new challenges emerged, the distant decision to readmit some bishops who had (perhaps) knowingly sworn to an Arian creed under threat of force would have seemed less and less immediate and thus less and less compelling.<sup>389</sup> Indeed, the Origenist controversy had a similar conclusion. After the

---

inevitable... The vast majority of letter writers, of course, had neither couriers nor the pouch available to them. Their only recourse was to find some traveller who happened to be heading in the right direction."

<sup>385</sup> Jer., *Chron.* 284.21b (*PL* 27:502).

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, 287.3b (*PL* 27:506).

<sup>387</sup> Lucifer: *Ibid.*, 288.6a (*PL* 27:505-506); Eusebius: *Ibid.*, 288.5a (*PL* 27:506).

<sup>388</sup> At *De vir. ill.* 105 (*PL* 23:741-742), composed in 392 or 393 (Kelly, *Jerome*, 174), Jerome writes that Gregory "is said" to still be alive. On this point, see also Mas 340. According to Mas 13, Gregory of Elvira may not have even been a 'Luciferian.' The Luciferians themselves apparently believed he was, and thus – knowingly or unknowingly – he became a factor in forming a Luciferian identity.

<sup>389</sup> It is suggestive as well that the ecclesiastical historian Socrates tells Theodore in the proem to the sixth book that the first five books dealt with matters of the past, but that in continuing on he will deal with matters 'displeasing' to many on account of their own opinions concerning the individuals he is going to

conflict between Jerome and Rufinus, some Origenist ideas remained popular in both the West and the East; some in one or the other; some not at all; but Christian leaders only formally condemned Origen in the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, by which time his influence in the West had slowly passed.<sup>390</sup> Jerome's and Rufinus' circles did not continue opposing one another over the issue across generations. The monumental campaigns of Rufinus and Jerome had some impact close to their deaths, but Christians treated Origen as neither heretical nor completely orthodox for over a century after Jerome's death. The Luciferians' social network, while effective in producing a unique group, may have been unable to last very much longer than its original members. The firm opposition of its founding members to the Council of Alexandria waned in the decades after their deaths, and with it, the group.

Lastly, the same aristocrats who may have been providing for the material needs of Luciferian communities appear to have been specifically targeted by the enemies of the Luciferians. Turbo specifically harasses Hermione and Severus.<sup>391</sup> According to the petition, the decurions who appear sympathetic to Vincentius in Spain were imprisoned, one even dying in the process.<sup>392</sup> Although the Luciferians present these as examples of bravery and courage under persecution, it is possible that they are not mentioning similar individuals who did succumb to this persecution and whose funds therefore were no longer available to these Luciferian communities. And although there is no evidence that the Luciferians were being honest in their accusation that Luciosus and Hyginus actually

---

describe (*GCS NF* 1:310). Socrates felt that matters of the past were less likely to provoke an emotional reaction; the Luciferians may represent an example of this occurring.

<sup>390</sup> Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 248-250.

<sup>391</sup> *Lib. Prec.* 108 (*SC* 504:216-218).

<sup>392</sup> *Ibid.* 104 (*SC* 504:212).

killed a decurion in Spain, if they did, this would represent another (extreme) method of cutting off funding for Luciferian communities. There is no way of knowing if Theodosius' rescript had any effect on this persecution, or even if its recipient, the Prefect of the East, Cynegius, forwarded it to regional governors. Furthermore, since Theodosius was only in power in the East at this time, the western communities would still be vulnerable.

The Luciferians took their origin and continued success in large part from the social networks established between various communities. A combination of letter-writing and personal visits ensured that members of the group considered themselves members of the group. Their ability to attract aristocratic sponsors probably played some role in the ability for independent communities to survive. In this respect, they were no different from other Christian communities. Controversies over men like Origen demonstrate how factions can fully develop within a community. Just as it would be inappropriate to label Rufinus or Jerome 'schismatic' or 'heretical' despite their separation from one another's communion, this social separation of the Luciferians again points out the inadequacy of these terms for defining religious group formation in the fourth century. A simple term like 'schism' does not signify the relative importance of these social relationships. Later, the social pressure that other Christians undoubtedly pressed upon the Luciferians and the deaths of its founding members seem to have contributed substantially to the dissolution of the group.

Last of all, their very theological closeness to other Christians may have accelerated this process of decline. Juvenal may complain bitterly about foreigners

moving into Rome, but he himself boasts that in *his* childhood he ate Sabine olives – in other words, what ‘foreign’ meant was open to change.<sup>393</sup> Although the Luciferians may have rhetorically distanced themselves from other Christians, their lack of any meaningful difference in their theological thought or practice with that of other Christians, as well as their continual compliments towards men like Lucifer, Athanasius, and Florentius of Ostia, suggests that this rhetorically-defined difference was in practice negotiable as well. Thus this rhetoric may have been an inadequate means of separating the Luciferians from other orthodox Christian communities. With little to distinguish themselves from other Christians except a difficult social situation, many Luciferians may well have decided that such a personal sacrifice over the Council of Alexandria was no longer worth it, particularly given the passing of the generation which led these groups following the Council. On examination of the differences between themselves and other Nicene Christians, these later Luciferians, not connected by their initial social circles, may have rejoined communion with the other Nicene Christians in their communities. Although rhetorical exaggeration seems to be necessary in any kind of identity formation, it does not appear to be sufficient. We often discuss the formation of schisms and heresies, but here we may catch a glimpse of the termination of one, and (perhaps) its re-absorption back into the broader Nicene communion of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>393</sup> Juvenal, *Sat.* 3.84-5 (*LCL*, ed. Braund:57): *usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum / hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina?*

*Bibliography of Primary Works*

- Ammianus Marcellinus. *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*. Edited by Wolfgang Seyfarth with Liselotte Jacob-Karau and Ilsa Ulmann. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1978.
- Ambrose. *Epistularum liber decimus. Epistulae extra collectionem*. Edited by Michael Zelzer. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 82. Vienna, 1982.
- Arnobius the Younger. *Praedestinatus*. Edited by F. Gori. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 25B. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Athanasius. *Apologie a l'empereur Constance / Apologie pour sa fuite*. Edited and translated by Jan-M. Szymusiak. Sources chrétiennes 56. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1958.
- Augustine. *De agone Christi*. Edited by Joseph Zycha. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 41.5.3. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1900.
- . *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Epistulae*. Edited by Al. Goldbacher. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 57. Vienna and Leipzig, 1911.
- . *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*. Edited by D. Radbodus Willems. Corpus Christianorum Latinorum 36. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
- . *Select Letters*. Edited and translated by James Houston Baxter. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- . *Aurelii Augustini Opera. Pars XIII, 2*. Edited by M.P.J. van den Hout. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 46. Turnhout: Brepols, 1969.
- . *Confessions. I. Introduction and Text*. Edited by James J. O'Donnell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Basil of Caesarea. *Lettres*. Edited and translated by Yves Courtonne. Two vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1961.
- Callinicos. *Vie d'Hypatios*. Edited and translated by G.J.M. Bartelink. Sources chrétiennes 177. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971.
- Codex Theodosianus = Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*. Vol. 1, part 2. Edited by Th. Mommsen and Paul M. Meyer. Berlin: 1905.

- Constitutiones apostolorum*. Edited by Franz Xavier Funk. Vol. 1. Paderborn: 1905.
- Cyprian of Carthage. *Epistulae*. Edited by Guilelmus Hartel. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 3, part 2. Vienna: 1871.
- Didascalia Apostolorum = The Teaching of the Apostles*. Pages 667-672 in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 8. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Translated by B.P. Pratten. Originally published 1885. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Epiphanius. *Anchoratus. Panarion 1-33*. Edited by Karl Holl. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 25. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1915.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Die Kirchengeschichte = Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge 6. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- Faustinus and Marcellinus. *Supplique aux empereurs: Libellus precum et Lex Augusta. Précédé de Faustin, Confession de foi*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. Sources chrétiennes 504. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- Gregory of Elvira and Faustinus. *Gregorii Iliberritani Episcopi Quae Supersunt. Accedit Faustini Opera*. Edited by Vincent Bulhart and M. Simonetti. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 69. Turnholt: Brepols, 1967.
- Günther, Otto, ed. *Epistolae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum Inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque DLIII datae Avellana Quae Dicitur Collectio*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 35. 2 vols. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1895.
- Pseudo-Hegemonius. *Adversus haereses*. Edited by A. Hoste. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1962.
- Hilary of Poitiers. *Tractatus super Psalmos*. Edited by Antonius Zingerle. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 22. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1891.
- *Fragmenta*. Edited by A. Feder. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 65. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1916.
- Jerome. *Epistulae I-LXX*. Edited by Isidore Hilberg. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 54. Vienna and Leipzig, 1910.
- *Epistulae CXXI-CLIV*. Edited by Isidore Hilberg. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 56, no. 1. Vienna, 1918. Reprinted 1996.

- , *Débat entre un Luciférien et un Orthodoxe*. Edited and translated by Aline Canellis. Sources chrétiennes 473. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003.
- John Cassian. *Institutiones*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 17. Edited by Michael Petschenig. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1888.
- Juvenal. *Satires. Book One*. Edited by Susanna Morton Braund. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Pseudo-John Maxentius. *Capitula Sancti Augustini*. Edited by Fr. Glorie. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 85A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.
- Lucifer of Calaris. *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae Supersunt*. Edited by G.F. Diercks. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 8. Turnholt: Brepols, 1978.
- Optatus. *Libri VII = De schisma Donatistarum*. Edited by Carolus Ziwsa. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 26. Prague-Vienna-Leipzig, 1893.
- Patrologiae cursus completes, series Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886.
- Patrologiae cursis completes, series Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Pseudo-Quodvultdeus. *De promissionibus et praedicationibus Dei*. Edited by R. Braun. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 60. Turnholt: Brepols, 1976.
- Rufinus. *Tyrannii Rufini Opera*. Edited by M. Simonetti. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 20. Turnholt: Brepols, 1961.
- , *Historiae ecclesiasticae*. Edited by Winkelmann (see above under Eusebius of Caesarea).
- Socrates Scholasticus. *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte = Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Günther Christian Hansen. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge 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. *Chronique*. Edited and translated by Ghislaine de Senneville-Grave. Sources chrétiennes 441. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999.

Tertullian. *De pudicitia*. Edited by E. Dekkers. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

Theodoret. *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte = Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Léon Parmentier. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 19. Leipzig, 1911.

*Bibliography of Secondary Works*

- Allen, Pauline. Pages 265-289 in "The Use of Heretics and Heresies in the Greek Church Historians: Studies in Socrates and Theodoret," in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Ed. by Graeme Clark. Rushcutter's Bay, Australia: Australian National University Press, 1990.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1996.
- Armstrong, A.H. "The Way and the Ways: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in the Fourth Century A.D." *Vigiliae Christianae* 38, no. 1 (1984): 1-17.
- Asiedu, F.B.A. "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, no. 3 (2001): 301-06.
- 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." *Recherches de science religieuse* 19 (1929): 385-405.
- Barnes, T.D. "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile." *Vigiliae Christianae* 46, no. 2 (1992): 129-140.
- , "The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers." *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (1992): 256-265.
- , *Athanasius and Constantine*. Cambridge: 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.
- Beckwith, Carl L. "The Condemnation and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers at the Synod of Béziers (356 C.E.)." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 13, no. 1 (2005): 21-38.
- 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 Kate Cooper and Julia Hillner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Bradbury, Scott. "Libanius' Letters as Evidence for Travel and Epistolary Networks among Greek Elites in the Fourth Century." Pages 73-94 in *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Linda Ellis and Frank L. Kidner. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Brennecke, Hans Christof. *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Buckley, Francis J. *Christ and the Church according to Gregory of Elvira*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964.
- Burns, J. Patout. "On Rebaptism: Social Organization in the Third Century Church." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1, no. 4 (1993): 367-403.
- Burns, Paul C. "Hilary of Poitiers' Road to Béziers: Politics of Religion?" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, no. 3 (1994): 273-289.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Canellis, Aline. "Arius et les Ariens vus par les Lucifériens dans le *Libellus Precum* de Faustin et Marcellin." *Studia Patristica* 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 4ème s.* Edited by Jean Michel Poinssotte. Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen, 2001.
- Casson, Lionel. *Travel in the Ancient World*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Cavallera, F. *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*. 2 vols. Louvain and Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense/Honoré et Édouard Champion, 1922.

- Chadwick, Henry. *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Chestnut, Glenn F. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. "Elite Networks and Heresy Accusations: Towards a Social Description of the Origenist Controversy." *Semeia* 56 (1991): 81-117.
- , *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- , "Holy Women, Holy Words: Early Christian Women, Social History, and the 'Linguistic Turn.'" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6, no.3 (1998): 413-430.
- 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.
- Conti, Marco. *The Life and Works of Potamius of Lisbon*. Instrumenta Patristica 33. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- 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.
- Crespin, Rémi. *Ministère et sainteté: Pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donatiste dans la vie et la doctrine de Saint Augustin*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1965.
- De Bruyne, D. Donatien. "Une letter apocryphe de Jérôme fabriquée par un Donatiste." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 30 (1931): 70-76.
- 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.
- Duval, Y.M. "Saint Jérôme devant le baptême des hérétiques. D'autres sources de l'Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi." *Revue des études augustiniennes* 14 (1968): 145-180.
- , "La place et l'importance du concile d'Alexandrie ou de 362 dans l'Histoire de l'Église de Rufin d'Aquilée." *Revue des études augustiniennes* 47, no. 2 (2001): 283-302.

- Elliott, Robert C. *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Elm, Susanna. *'Virgins of God': The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Eno, Robert. "Some Nuances in the Ecclesiology of the Donatists." *Revue des études augustiniennes* 18 (1972): 45-50.
- "Holiness and Separation in the Early Centuries." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 523-542.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Jewish and Christian Ordination." *Harvard Theological Review* 56, no. 1 (1963): 13-19.
- "Origen and the Election of Bishops." *Church History* 43, no. 1 (1974): 26-33.
- "Selection and Installation to Office in Roman, Greek, Jewish and Christian Antiquity." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 30 (1974): 273-284.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Laying On of Hands: Its Significance in Ordination." *Journal of Theological Studies* 26, no. 1 (1975): 1-12.
- *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- Fiensy, David. "Redaction History and the Apostolic Constitutions." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (New Series) 72, no. 4 (1982): 293-302.
- Figus, Antonino. *L'enigma di Lucifero di Cagliari: a ricordo del XVI centenario della morte*. Cagliari: Fossataro, 1973.
- Frazer, Charles. "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea." *The Catholic Historical Review* 66, no. 1 (1980): 16-33.
- Gaddis, Michael. *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Garnsey, Peter. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Green, M.R. "The Supporters of the Antipope Ursinus." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 22, no. 2 (1971): 531-538.

- Greenslade, S.L. *Schism in the Early Church*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953.
- Grig, Lucy. *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 2004.
- Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Hefele, Charles Joseph. *A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents*. Translated by William R. Clark. 2d ed. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1883.
- Hermanowicz, Erika T. "Catholic Bishops and Appeals to the Imperial Court: A Legal Study of the Calama Riots in 408." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12, no. 4 (2004): 481-521.
- Humphries, Mark. "In Nomine Patris: Constantine the Great and Constantius II in Christological Polemic." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 46, no. 4 (1997): 448-464.
- Hunt, E.D. "Imperial Law or Councils of the Church? Theodosius I and the Imposition of Doctrinal Uniformity." Pages 57-68 in *Discipline and Diversity*. Edited by Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory. Vol. 43 of *Studies in Church History*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.
- Hunter, David. "The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine." *Church History* 69, no. 2 (2000): 281-303.
- "Rereading the Jovinianist Controversy: Asceticism and Clerical Authority in Late Ancient Christianity." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003): 453-470.
- Jeanes, Gordon. "Baptism Portrayed as Martyrdom in the Early Church." *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993): 158-176.
- Kahlos, Maijastina. *Debate and Dialogue: Christian and Pagan Cultures c. 360-430*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Keane, Catharine. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1975.

- , *Early Christian Doctrines*. Rev. ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1978.
- , *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom - Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Krüger, Gustav. *Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf und Härtel, 1886.
- Lambert, David. "Augustine and the *Praedestinatus*: Heresy, Authority, and Reception." Pages 147-162 in *Millenium: Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* Volume 5. Edited by Wolfram Brandes, Alexander Demandt, Hartmut Leppin, Helmut Krasser, and Peter von Möllendorff. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Leroy-Molinghen, A. "La mort d'Arius." *Byzantion* 38 (1968): 105-111.
- Louth, Andrew. "Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century." Pages 1-17 in *Doctrinal Diversity: Varieties of Early Christianity*. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York and London: Garland, 1999.
- Lim, Richard. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Keane, Cathy. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- King, Karen. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Louth, Andrew. "Unity and Diversity in the Church of the Fourth Century." Pages 1-18 in *Doctrinal Diversity: Varieties of Early Christianity*. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Voting about God in Early Church Councils*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Maier, Harry O. "The Topography of Heresy and Dissent in Late-Fourth-Century Rome." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44, no. 2 (1995): 232-249.
- Mas, Javier Perez. *La crisis luciferiana. Un intento de reconstrucción histórica*. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 110. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008.
- McClure, J. "Handbooks against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries." *Journal Theological Studies* 30 (1970): 186-197.

- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Meslin, Michel. *Les Ariens d'Occident 335-430*. *Patristica Sorbonensia* 8. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1968.
- Pietri, Charles. "Damase et Théodose: Communion orthodoxe et géographie politique." Pages 627-634 in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Edited by Jean Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.
- *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.
- Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Rebillard, Éric. "Église et sépulture dans l'antiquité tardive (Occident latin, 3e-6e siècles)." *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 54, no. 5 (1999): 1027-1046.
- 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.
- Rousseau, Philip. *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Saltet, Louis. "Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens aux IVe et Ve siècles." *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 8 (1906): 300-326.
- Salzman, Michele R. "Competing Claims to 'Nobilitas' in the Western Empire of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9, no. 3 (2001): 359-385.
- Schor, Adam. "Performance and Social Strategy in the Letters of Theodoret." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2, no. 2 (2009): 274-299.
- Shaw, Brent D. "Judicial Nightmares and Christian Memory." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11, no. 4 (2003): 533-563.

- Shepardson, Christine. "Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15, no. 4 (2007): 483-516.
- 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.
- Sizgorich, Thomas. *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Stark, Rodney and William Sims Bainbridge. *A Theory of Religion*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Tilley, Maureen. "Scripture as an Element of Social Control: Two Martyr Stories of Christian North Africa." *The Harvard Theological Review* 83, no. 4 (1990): 383-397.
- , "Dilatory Donatists or Procrastinating Catholics: The Trial at the Conference of Carthage." *Church History* 60, no. 1 (1991): 7-19.
- , "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity: From the Church of the Martyrs to the *Collecta* of the Desert." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1997): 21-35.
- , "Theologies of Penance during the Donatist Controversy." *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001): 330-337.
- , "2006 NAPS Presidential Address: When Schism Becomes Heresy in Late Antiquity: Developing Doctrinal Deviance in the Wounded Body of Christ." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15, no. 1 (2007): 1-21.
- Turner, E.G. "Roman Oxyrhynchus." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 38 (1952): 78-93.
- , "Oxyrhynchus and Rome." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79 (1975): 1-24.
- Ulrich, Jörg. "Nicaea and the West." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 1 (1997): 10-24.

- Urbainczyk, Theresa. "Observations on the Differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 46, no. 3 (1997): 355-373.
- Vessey, Mark. "The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4, no. 4 (1996): 495-513.
- Williams, D.H. *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Winkelmann, Friedhelm. "Historiography in the Age of Constantine." Pages 3-41 in *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* Edited by Gabriele Marasco. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Young, Frances. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*. London: SCM Press, 1983.

*Appendix I:*  
*Translation of the Confessio Fidei*

Faustinus, *Confessio Fidei*

**Faustini presbyteri confessio verae  
fidei quam breuiter scribi et sibi  
trasmitti iussit Theodosius imperator.**

1. Sufficiebat fides conscripta apud Nicaeam aduersus haeresim Arrianam; sed quia prauo ingenio quidam, sub illius fidei confessione, impia verba commendant, nobis inuidiam facientes quod uelut haeresim Sabellii tueamur, paucis, et contra Sabellium primae fidei confessione signamus, et contra hos qui, sub nomine catholicae fidei, impia verba defendunt, dicentes tres esse substantias, cum semper catholica fides unam substantiam Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti confessa sit.

2. Nos patrem credimus, qui non sit Filius, sed habeat Filium de se sine initio genitum, non factum; et Filium credimus, qui non sit Pater, sed habeat Patrem, de quo sit genitus, non factus; et Spiritum Sanctum credimus, qui sit uere Spiritus Dei. Vnde et diuinae Trinitatis unam substantiam confitemur; quia qualis est Pater secundum substantiam, talem genuit et Filium; et Spiritus Sanctus, non creatura existens sed Spiritus Dei, non est alienus a substantia Patris et Filii, sed est et ipse eiusdem

Faustinus, Confession of Faith

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 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

substantiae cum Patre et Filio sicut eiusdem deitatis.

3. Nam qui nos putant esse Apollinaristas, sciant quod non minus Apollinaris haeresim execramur quam Arrianam. Miramur autem illos catholicos probari posse qui Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti tres substantias confitentur. Sed, etsi dicunt non se credere Filium Dei aut Spiritum Sanctum creaturam, tamen contra piam fidem sentiunt cum dicunt tres esse substantias. Consequens est enim ut tres deos confiteantur, qui tres substantias confitentur. Quam vocem catholici semper execrati sunt.

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.

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 creatures, they nevertheless hold opinions against 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 which catholics have always denounced.

1. The same word (*fides*) is used to denote the abstract concept of ‘faith’ as well as specific formulas of faith throughout the Luciferians’ petition.
2. Manuscript *B* adds *Bithyniae* to distinguish the Council of Nicaea from the Nicaea in Thrace. Thracian Nicaea is where the delegates sent to Constantius from Rimini capitulated.
3. Further elaborated at *Lib. Prec.* 114.

*Appendix II:*  
*Translation of the Libellus Precum*

**FAVSTINVS (ET MARCELLINVS),  
LIBELLVS PRECVM**

1. Deprecamur mansuetudinem uestram, piissimi imperatores, Valentiniane, Theodosi et Arcadi, ut haec in contemplatione Christi Filii Dei qui vestrum iuuat imperium, infatigabiliter legere dignemini. Sublime regnum vestrum tunc ad sublimiora, Dei Patris omnipotentis et Christi unigeniti Filii eius opitulatione conscendit, cum nec in exiguis hominibus despicitis ueritatem, nec in multis uel potentibus mendacium roboratis. Hoc enim iustissimum est et saluberrimum apud regnum iustitiae, ut personae probentur ex merito ueritatis, non ueritas praesumatur ex potentia personarum; siquidem ius saeculi ideo scriptum est ne contra uerum aequumue potentia uel multitudo praeualeat, etiamsi ab exiguis uindicetur.

2. Quod si haec tanta cura etiam in rebus rei publicae a uestra tranquillitati et prouisione seruanda est, ut contra omnem uim potentiamue etiam in minimis ius veri obtineat, quo possit tradita uestro imperio Dei nutu florere res publica, quomodo, in negotiis diuinis, sanctae fidei ueritas impiorum caterua et fraudulentissimis eorum circumuentionibus obfuscatur et premitur?

Maxime cum uos, principes Romani imperii, piam Christianae religionis fidem puritatemque tot uestris

Faustinus (and Marcellinus),  
Petition of Requests

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, if secular law<sup>2</sup> is written for this reason, so that the powerful or many do not prevail against the truth or justice, even if it is held up by the insignificant.

2. Such cares as these are protected by your tranquillity 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

constitutionibus uindicetis: totum quidem quia, ueneratores Christi Filii Dei, pro fide catholica decernitis et omnino contra haereticos et perfidos imperii uestri auctoritate conscribitis, non quasi aliqua propriae sententiae noua temptantes, sicut quidam anteriores principes in suam aliorumque perniciem conati sunt, sed ut ostendatis uestras sententias, uestramque fidem, cum sacris Scripturarum Diuinarum sententiis et piis confessionibus conuenire.

3. Sed hoc cum magis post atrocissimas prioris temporis persecutiones iuuare sanctam deberet ecclesiam, magis affligit, cum idem ipsi egregii episcopi, qui eam ante hoc sub adsertione uel adsensu haereseos persecuti sunt, nunc quoque sub auctoritate catholici nominis persequuntur et quanto nunc sub ementita pia fidei professione hoc fraudulentius agunt, tanto et perniciosius grassantur et dolentius aestuat ueritas, quod ei adhuc non licet nec sub uobis imperatoribus, qui piam fidem defenditis, respirare.

4. Sed ne hoc ad inuidiam sine rei probatione referre uideamur, causam ut possumus explicamus. Quaesumus autem, supplices quaesumus, ut regias aures uestras nobis exiguiis commodetis, dum ostendimus non nos esse haereticos, et tamen quasi haereticos uehementer affligi, cum nec ipsi, qui nos uehementer affligunt, uel

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 total effort against the heretics and 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.

3. But although this, following the most ferocious persecutions of the previous era,<sup>4</sup> should have helped the holy Church, it has hurt it all the more. This is because those notorious<sup>5</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 more deceitfully under a false profession of pious faith, so much more dangerously do they also lie in wait and so much more grievously does the truth waver, because thus far it is not permitted for it to catch its breath under you, emperors, who defend the pious faith.

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

socii eorum, possint nunc dicere uel probare, quod simus haeretici; sed ne quidem de se negare, quod superiori tempore haeresim aut acerrime uindicauerint cum intolerabili supplicio fidelium aut certe ei manus dederint, damnata catholica fide, quam prius adserebant, dum metuunt pro Christo Filio Dei exilium perpeti, pro quo etiam laico fideli quaeuis mors atrocissima subeunda est, “*quia nobis donatum est,*” ut ait Apostolus, “*pro Christo, non tantum ut in eum credamus sed etiam pro illi patiamur;*” talis enim mors uel passio beatae immortalitatis occasio est.

5. Non latet mansuetudinem et deuotam Deo religionem uestram, quam impia quamue pestifera sit haeresis Arriana, contra quam a patribus nostris apud Nicaeam spiritali uigore conscriptum est, ita ut et apostolicae fidei pia confessio seruaretur atque ipsius haereseos perpetua damnatio seruaretur, ne quis falli posset in posteris.

6. Sed Arrius, ut *cor Pharaonis*, non credens diuinam in se tunc datam fuisse sententiam, nescio qua ratione subripuit apud Constantinum, sperans quod ipsius suffragio spiritalium sacerdotum sententia rescissa, recipi posset in Ecclesiam. Denique idem Constantinus iusserat ut ei sanctus ac beatae memoriae episcopus Alexander communicaret, non ille Alexander, qui fuit diuinae fidei

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 the unbearable punishment of the faithful or at least gave their hands to it. They did so with the catholic faith to which they previously swore condemned - 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>6</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>7</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

episcopus in Alexandria (qui et plenus sapientia et *spiritu* sancto *feruens* eundem Arrium primus et detexit et expulit et in perpetuum damnauit), sed iste Alexander, qui in hac Constantinopolitana urbe fuit et ipse admirabilis episcopus.

7. Qui, cum uideret quod Arrius saeculi istius rege niteretur, exclamauit ex imo pectoris dolore stans in loco sacrarii ad Christum uerum et sempiternum regem et dominum omnium regum, ne illam labem in Ecclesia pateretur intrare. Cuius oratio quam constans fuerit, quam fidelis, hinc probatum est quod idem Arrius, antequam intraret ecclesiam, dedit poenas nouas et grauissimas usque ad turpem interitum. Nam, cum pridie quam se putauit sanctam ecclesiam imperatoris auxilio homo impius intraturum, cum nihil languoris, nihil doloris in corpore pateretur sed, quod grauius est, solo animi morbo insanabiliter aegrotaret, humana consuetudine secessum petit atque illic cum sedit, grauissimo repente dolore cruciatus *omnia sua uiscera* et ipsum cor, quod erat *thesaurum impietatis*, effudit in stercora atque ita (mirabile dictu!) internis omnibus euacuatis attenuatus est uel ad momentum sicut luridati corporis tabe resolutus est, ut per angustias foraminis et sedilis totus ipse laberetur.

8. Digna haec poena impio, digna haec mors turpis pestifero haeretico atque de

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>8</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.

7. When Alexander saw that Arius was relying on the king of this age,<sup>9</sup> 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. When he sat there, suddenly tortured by the most severe pain,<sup>11</sup> he voided *all his intestines*<sup>12</sup> and his heart itself, which was the *treasure-house of impiety*,<sup>13</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 decay of a sallow corpse, with the result that he himself slipped through the narrowness of the opening and of the seat.

8. Worthy is this punishment for the impious, worthy is this shameful death

spiritu diaboli foetidissimis membris digna haec sepultura! Nouo enim exemplo et cruciari debuit et perire, qui nouas aduersus unigenitum Filium Dei commentatus fuerat impietates, dicens eum “non uere de Patre natum” et quia “erat quando non erat,” et quia “ex nihilo substitutus est,” ne eiusdem substantiae et diuinitatis et sempiternitatis et omnipotentiae cuius et Pater est, crederetur.

9. Hoc retulimus Augustae mansuetudini uestrae ut uero intenta uestra prudentia animaduertat, quam uenerabilis fides sit conscripta apud Nicaeam aduersus Arrium, cui et Deus, non solum per auctoritatem scripturarum diuinarum, sed etiam per sacratissimam orationem sancti quoque Alexandri testimonium dedit; et quam execrabilis est impia doctrina Arrii, quam in ipso Arrio nouo genere supplicii sententia diuina damnauit non expectans in illo diem iudicii, ut exemplo poenae eius ceteri perterriti praecauerent.

10. Quo utique exemplo nec illud dubitandum est, etiam doctrinam renouandam vel suscipiendam esse crediderunt. Quomodo enim eos perpetua poena disiungit, quos impia doctrina non separat? Pares reos etiam uestris legibus unus carcer includit atque una ferit sententia. 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,

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 be tortured and die in an unprecedented way. He said that “he was not truly 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 the Creed is, 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>14</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

quam Deus apertissime probavit  
supplicio Arrii impugnantis eam.

11. Quod si haec apud uos uera sunt,  
quae apud scripturas diuinas uera  
roborantur, aduertite, piissimi et  
religiosissimi imperatores, in quo rei  
sint, qui sub his diuinis regulis et  
professionibus fidem suam ac  
deuotionem Christo Deo consecrauerunt  
nullum timorem *diuino timori*  
praeponentes.

12. Sed licet Arrius sit sepultus in  
stercoribus, reliquit tamen suae  
impietatis heredes; denique non  
defuerunt uermes, qui de eius putrido  
cadauere nascerentur. Per quos quae  
gesserit diabolus artifex erroris, longum  
est exsequi, etiamsi exsequi possemus;  
infinita sunt enim et incredibilia, non  
tamen falsa. Illud uero nunc, quod ad  
praesentem causam facit, exponimus,  
quod imperatorem Constantium per  
fraudentam disputationem Arrianam  
impietatis participem fecerunt. Dedissent  
et isti in praesenti poenas, si non  
*oporteret*, secundum Apostoli  
sententiam, *et haereses esse ut probati*  
*manifesti fierent*.

13. Habentes ergo hi, quos diximus,  
uermes Arrii adsistentem sibi regiam  
potestatem primum quidem per singulos  
in euersionem catholicae fidei et in

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.

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: why are  
these put on trial, 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>15</sup>

12. But although Arius was buried in  
dung, he nevertheless left behind heirs to  
his impiety; from that point on, worms  
which were born from his rotting corpse  
were not lacking.<sup>16</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 that which 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>17</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

excidium sacrae religionis pro Arriana impietate contendunt, ita ut resistentes aut calumniis adpeterent uel poenis uel exilio cruciarent et necarent. Vbi tamen amplius per suam rabiem grassati sunt et fecerunt sui ubique terrorem, non iam contenti ire per singulos: postremo cogunt undique in unum episcopos conuenire. Et datur locus ad synodum Orientalibus quid Seleucia Isauriae, Occidentalibus uero ciuitas Ariminensis.

14. Atque illic primum quidem episcopi pro sancta fide uenientes confirmant illam expositionem, quae apud Nicaeam conscripta est, ita ut nihil inde minueretur, eo quod euangelicam fidem uerbis inexpugnabilibus explicaret et Arrii impiam doctrinam diuina auctoritate damnaret. Tunc demum oblatam ab Ursacio, Valente, Germinio, et Gaio huiusmodi fidei conscriptionem, quae et fidem catholicam reprobaret et Arrium absolueret, immo et introduceret pestiferam eius doctrinam, execrantur et damnant tam impiam fidem eorum quam etiam ipsos, inexpiabile scelus esse iudicantes, qui patrum fidem uenerabilem uiolent, si hos tam impios atque impiam eorum conscriptionem pateretur Ecclesia.

15. Mittunt quoque decem legatos ad imperatorem Constantium scribentes quae gesta sunt et hortantes simul ut ipse quoque decreta patrum pro fide

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, 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 evan-gelic faith clear with unconquerable words and condemned the impious doctrine of Arius with diuine authority. Then, in the end, they cursed a creed presented by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Gaius, of the kind which 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 inexpiable 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 which were done and urging at the same time that he himself also keep

venerabili contra haereticos inuiolata seruaret.

16. Mittunt sane et haeretici legatos: quos tunc familiarissime et ut suos suscepit Constantius; eos uero legatos qui pro fide catholica contra haereticos uenerant, reprobant et per suos nunc gratia inuitat, nunc minis perterret; et interim sola dilatione discruciat, ut in ultimum, cum iram regis metuunt, cum non dignantur pro Christo Filio Dei exilium perpeti, cum propriis sedibus et ecclesiarum perniciosissimis possessionibus oblectantur, rescindant quod pie uindicauerant, et suscipiant quod ut impium damnauerant.

17. Liceat in hoc apud uos religiosos imperatores in causa Dei dolentius ingemiscere: episcopi plus iram regis terreni timuerunt quam Christum uerum Deum et sempiternum regem; grauius exilium temporale esse crediderunt quam perpetuam poenam secundum Esaiam indormitabilis uermis et ignis inextinguibilis; suauiora habuerunt propria domicilia et possessiones quam in regno Christi beatam et perpetuam habitationem!

18. Sed Constantius, non contentus ruina et labe decem legatorum, mittit

unviolated 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>18</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 God, when they took comfort in their own sees and in the most destructive 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 more sorrowfully 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>19</sup> they believed that transitory exile was more serious than the everlasting punishment which is, according to Isaiah, worms that never sleep and inextinguishable flames;<sup>20</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

Ariminum, ut omnes illic episcopi similiter uerterentur. Qui et ipsi, malo illo exemplo legatorum suorum, piam fidem patrum quam uindicauerant reprobant subscribentes in illa fide Arrianorum quam integro et libero iudicio damnauerant.

19. Aduertit sapientia uestra Ariminensem synodum piissime coeptam sed impiissime terminatam. Eadem autem et apud Seleuciam Isauriae ab episcopis impietas commissa est.

Iudicate, piissime et religiosissimi imperatores, in quo rei sunt et in quo merentur affligi, qui nolunt cum talibus episcopis conuenire, qui, cum primum fidem integram uindicarent et impiam fidem reprobarent, postea, cum metuunt exilium, cum rebus suis et sedibus oblectantur, uertunt sententias, damnantes, ad nutum haeretici imperatoris illam apostolicam quam uindicauerant fidem et suscipientes illam Arrii quam reprobauerant impietatem.

20. Nonne gratum habere debuerent, si tamen credebant futurum Dei iudicium, omnia mala perpeti quam esse uenerabilis fidei proditores, cuius uirtus sancti quoque Alexandri orationibus et Arrii supplicio fuerat adprobata?

Maxime cum et gloriosae passionis praecessisset exemplum licet paucissimorum episcoporum, qui, ne euangelicam apostolicamque fidem uiolarent, ne impiis adquiescerent, non

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 which 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>21</sup>

Judge, most pious and religious emperors, why these are put on trial and why they 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 rejected the impious faith, changed their minds later, when they were afraid of exile, when they took pleasure in their own things and sees. They condemned at the nod 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 both the speeches of holy Alexander and 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 evagelic and apostolic faith, lest

exilium, non supplicium nec aliquam atrocitatis mortem recusauerunt.

21. Denique, ante synodum Ariminensem, Paulinus de Triueris constantissimus episcopus datur in exilium piam fidem uindicans et execrans consortium Arrianorum.

22. Sed et apostolicus uir Lucifer de Sardinia Caralitanae ciuitatis episcopus ob hoc, quod bene esset agnitus per contemptum saeculi, per studium sacrarum litterarum, per uitae puritatem, per constantiam fidei, per gratiam diuinam, a Romana ecclesia missus est legatus ad Constantium et, ob hoc quod fidem uenerabilem uindicauit, quod detexit et conuicit haereticos, ductus est in exilium cum omni atrocitate iniuriarum.

23. Similiter Eusebius a Vercellis nec non et Dionysius Mediolanensium, Constantio regi primum familiaris, cum adhuc ignoraret eum fautorem esse haereticorum; postea tamen quam ei cognitum est et probatum quod haereticos uindicaret, respuit regis impiam familiaritatem, malens exilium, ne Christi Dei amicitiam perderet, ne sanctorum consortium non haberet.

24. Sed et Rodanius mittitur in exilium nec non et Hilarius, qui etiam scripta contra haereticos et praeuaricatores edidit, licet postea uero interruperit fauens praeuaricatoribus, ut non dicamus interim, quia fuit <et> haereticis, in

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>22</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>23</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>24</sup>

23. It went likewise with Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan, who was at first an associate of Emperor Constantius while he still did not know that he was the patron of heretics;<sup>25</sup> 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>26</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 showed

quos eloquentiae suae uiribus  
perorauerat.

25. Maximus quoque de Neapoli  
Campaniae, eo quod esset inhabili  
stomacho et corpore delicatior, primum  
quidem, ut cederet, diu afflictus iniuriis;  
deinde, ubi ob constantiam animi  
fideique uirtutem carnis infirmitate non  
uincitur, ductus est in exilium atque illic  
martyr in Domini pace requieuit.

26. Sed et Rufininus, mirae quidem  
simplicitatis sed admirabilior in tuenda  
fide, effusione sui sanguinis praeuenit  
exilium. Denique, cum pro fidei  
integritate persistit, hunc Epictetus atrox  
ille et dirus de Centumcellis episcopus  
ante raedam suam currere coegit et, cum  
diu currit, sic in via ruptis vitalibus  
sanguinem fundens expirauit. Sciunt hoc  
Neapolitani in Campania, ubi reliquiae  
cruoris eius in obsessis corporibus  
daemonia affligunt, pro gratia utique  
fidei illius pro qua et sanguinem fudit.

27. Fuerunt et alii episcopi de Aegypto,  
licet paeculi, quorum alii in fugam uersi  
sunt, alii uero in exilium dati eo quod  
nollent cum episcopis impiis et  
crudelibus conuenire.

Quam utique salubre fuerat, quam  
pulchrum quamue gloriosum, si omnes  
illi episcopi pari uirtute et simili  
conspiratione fidem, quam recte semper

favor to heretics,<sup>27</sup> against whom he  
spoke at length with the powers of his  
eloquence.<sup>28</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 Rufininus 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 traveling carriage. And after he ran  
a long time, 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.

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 guarded the faith  
which they had always rightly upheld,

uindicauerant, in finem usque seruassent,  
non exilia neque supplicia  
pertimescentes, ad capiendam utique  
futuram in Dei Christi regno perpetuam  
beatitudinem!

28. Et tacemus quod fortassis ipsum  
illum Constantium, quamuis regni  
potestate terribilem, tantorum tamen  
episcoporum unita constantia confutasset  
et frangeret, fortassis etiam et intellegere  
fecisset magnum pretium esse istius  
fidei, pro qua nullus episcoporum  
exilium, proscriptiones, tormenta  
mortemque recusaret. Sed, paululum  
territus, tantus episcoporum numerus  
cateruatim dederunt manus impietati et  
ad maiorem iam uesaniam incalluit  
impietas tam facile strage multitudinis.

29. Non hoc minus sacrilegium est, non  
haec minor impietas, quam si sub  
persecutore gentili idolo sacrificatum est,  
quia et in haeresi perterritum subscribere  
daemoniis sacrificare est, siquidem  
docentibus Scripturis Diuinis doctrina  
*daemoniorum est haeresis*, sicut et  
idolatria.

30. Interea, quia apud quosdam  
multitudo praeponitur ueritati eo quod  
pauculos habeat sectatores, et ob hoc  
affligimur quod in paucis sequimur  
inuiolabilem fidem et multos uitamus  
propter impias haereses et sacrilegas  
praeuaricatorum subscriptiones, quid  
censetis in hac causa, o iustissimi  
imperatores et catholicae fidei uindices?  
De his duabus partibus cui calculum  
datis? Vna est pars, in qua multi sunt  
episcopi; sed ubi multi sunt, illic per

with equal virtue and similar consensus,  
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>29</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>30</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>31</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 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

praeuaricationem sacra Christi fides uiolata est semper ante defensa, illic metu regis Arrii suscepta impietas est semper ante damnata. Vbi uero paucissimi sunt, illic per exilia, per cruciatus, per effusionem sanguinis, per ipsam mortem fides Christi uindicatur et Arrii impietas atque omnis haeresis ut summum malum execrabiles sunt.

31. Sed etsi non est dubitandum paucos episcopos esse pretiosos de merito confessionis et inuiolabilis fidei, multos uero nullificare merito haereseos uel praeuaricationis, quia in causa ueri, maxime in causa religionis et sacrae fidei, non numerus numero comparandus est sed pura illa apostolica fides probata exiliis, probata cruciatibus licet unius, multorum infidelitatibus praeponenda est, tamen necessarium est damnatae praeuaricationis diuinum quoque praesens proferre documentum, ut sicut in Arrio impia secta eius diuina animaduersione punita praeiudicat et de sectatoribus eius, quod eadem illos poena maneat qua torquetur et Arrius, ita et de praeuaricatoribus sacrae fidei nihil aliud sentiendum sit quam quod in uno uel duobus praeuaricatoribus poenis praesentibus diuino iudicio determinatum est.

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 emperor,<sup>32</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 provide divine proof of treachery's condemnation for this reason. Arrius' 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 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, Odyssiponae ciuitatis episcopus, primum quidem fidem catholicam uindicans, postea uero, praemio fundi fiscalis quem habere concupiuerat, fidem praeuaricatus est. Hunc Osius de Corduba apud ecclesias Hispaniarum et detexit et reppulit ut impium haeticum.

Sed et ipse Osius Potami querela accersitus ad Constantium regem minisque perterritus et metuens ne senex et diues exilium proscriptionemue pateretur, dat manus impietati et post tot annos praeuaricatur in fidem. Et regreditur ad Hispanias maiore cum auctoritate, habens regis terribilem iussionem, ut si quis eidem episcopus iam facto praeuaricatori minime uelit communicare, in exilium mitteretur.

33. Sed ad sanctum Gregorium, Eliberitanae ciuitatis constantissimum episcopum, fidelis nuntius detulit impiam Osii praeuaricationem; unde et non adquiescit, memor sacrae fidei ac diuini iudicii, in eius nefariam communionem. Sed Osius, qui hinc plus torqueretur si quis ipso iam lapso staret integram fidem uindicans in lapsa firmitate uestigii, exhiberi facit per publicam potestatem strenuissimae mentis Gregorium, sperans quod eodem terrore quo ipse cesserat hunc quoque posse cedere.

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. Osius both exposed this man in the churches of Spain and rejected him as an impious heretic.

But Osius, 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 Osius 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 Osius, who henceforth was tormented all the more if anyone, upholding the undiminished faith with a firmness that had not lapsed one bit,<sup>33</sup> stood against him now that he himself had lapsed.<sup>34</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.

Erat autem tunc temporis Clementinus uicarius. Qui, ex conuentione Osii et generali praecepto regis, sanctum Gregorium per officium Cordubam iussit exhiberi.

34. Interea, fama in cognitionem rei cunctos inquietat et frequens sermo populorum est: “Quinam est ille Gregorius, qui audet Osio resistere?” Plurimi enim et Osii praeuaricationem adhuc ignorabant; quinam esset sanctus Gregorius nondum bene compertum habebant! Erat enim etiam apud eos, qui illum forte nouerant, rudis adhuc episcopus, licet apud Christum non rudis uindex fidei pro merito sanctitatis.

35. Sed ecce uentum est ad uicarium et multi ex administratoribus intersunt et Osius sedet iudex, immo et supra iudicem, fretus regali imperio. Et sanctus Gregorius, exemplo Domini sui, ut reus adsistit, non de praua conscientia sed pro conditione praesentis iudicii, ceterum fide liber, et est magna expectatio singulorum ad quam partem uictoria declinet. Et Osius quidem auctoritate nititur suae aetatis, Gregorius uero auctoritate nititur ueritatis; ille quidem fiducia regis terreni, iste autem fiducia regis sempiterni. Et Osius scripto imperatoris utitur, sed Gregorius scripto diuinae uocis obtinet.

Furthermore, Clementine was the *vicarius*<sup>35</sup> at that time. He, due to Osius’ 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 Ossius?” For many were also still ignorant of Ossius’ 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 Ossius was sitting as judge, no, even beyond a judge, relying on royal authority. And holy Gregory, in the imitation of his Lord,<sup>36</sup> was sitting as a criminal, not due to some perverse moral sense, but according to the circumstance of his present judgment<sup>37</sup> - but in respect to other matters, free in his faith. And the individuals were greatly looking forward towards which party victory would turn.<sup>38</sup> And Ossius 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 of the eternal King;<sup>39</sup> and Ossius used the writings of the emperor, but Gregory took hold of the writings of the divine voice.<sup>40</sup>

36. Et cum per omnia Osius confutatur, ita ut suis uocibus, quas pro fide et ueritate prius scripserat, uindicaretur, commotus ad Clementinum uicarium: “Non,” inquit, “cognitio tibi mandata est, sed exsecutio. Vides ut resistit praeceptis regalibus: exsequere ergo quod mandatum est, mittens eum in exilium.” Sed Clementinus, licet non esset Christianus, tamen exhibens reuerentiam nomini episcopatus in eo maxime homine quem uidebat rationabiliter et fideliter obtinere, respondit Osio: “Non audeo,” inquiens, “episcopum in exilium mittere, quamdiu adhuc in episcopale nomine perseuerat. Sed da, tu, prior sententiam eum de episcopatus honore deiciens et tunc demum exequar in eum quasi in priuatum quod ex praecepto imperatoris fieri desideras.”

37. Vt autem uidit sanctus Gregorius quod Osius uellet dare sententiam ut quasi deiectus uideretur, appellat ad uerum et potentem iudicum Christum totis fidei suae uiribus exclamans: “Christe Deus, qui *uenturus es iudicare uiuos et mortuos*, ne patiaris hodie humanam proferri sententiam aduersus me minimum seruum tuum, qui pro fide tui nominis ut reus adsistens spectaculum praebeo. Sed tu ipse, quaeso, in causa tua hodie iudica! Ipse sententiam proferre dignaberis per ultionem! Non hoc ego quasi metuens exilium fieri cupio, cum mihi pro tuo nomine nullum supplicium non suaue sit, sed ut multi praeuaricationis errore

36. And Ossius 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. Ossius then moved towards the *vicarius* Clementine and he 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 Ossius, 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 Osius wished to pass judgment so that it would appear as if he were cast out, he called to 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 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,

liberentur cum praesentem et  
momentaneam uiderint ultionem.”

38. Et cum multo inuidiosius et sanctius  
Deum uerbis fidelibus interpellat, ecce  
repente Osius, cum sententiam conatus  
exprimere, os uertit, distorquens pariter  
et ceruicem de sessu in terram eliditur  
atque illic expirat uel, ut quidam uolunt,  
obmutuit; inde tamen effertur ut  
mortuus.

Tunc admirantibus cunctis etiam  
Clementinus ille gentilis expauit et, licet  
esset iudex, timens ne de se quoque  
simili supplicio iudicaretur, prostrauit se  
ad pedes tanti viri, obsecrans eum ut sibi  
parceret qui in eum diuinae legis  
ignoratione peccasset, et non tam proprio  
arbitrio quam mandantis imperio.

39. Erat tunc stupor in omnibus ac  
diuinae uirtutis admiratio, quod in illo  
spectaculum totum nouum uisum est:  
nam qui proferre uoluit humanam  
sententiam, mox diuinam perpessus est  
grauiorem, et iudex, qui iudicare uenerat,  
iam pallens ut reus timebat iudicare, et  
qui quasi reus in exilium mittendus  
adstiterat, a iudice prostrato rogabatur ut  
parceret quasi iudex!

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 more holy [than Osius] by far -  
look! - suddenly, when Osius 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. Inde est quod solus Gregorius ex numero uindicantium integram fidem, nec in fugam uersus, nec passus exilium, cum unusquisque timuit de illo ulterius iudicare.

41. Videtisne damnatae a Deo praeuaricationis mira documenta? Scit melius omnis Hispania, quod ista non fingimus.

Sed et Potamio non fuit inulta sacrae fidei praeuaricatio. Denique, cum ad fundum properat quem pro impia fidei subscriptione ab imperatore meruerat impetrare, dans nouas poenas linguae per quam blasphemauerat, in uia moritur, nullus fructus fundi uel uisione percipiens.

42. Non fuit auari hoc tormentum leue: moritur, qui propter concupiscentiam fundi fiscalis fidem sacram uiolauerat et, cum ad fundum properat, poenali morte praeuenitur ne uel uisionis solatio potiretur. In sacro Euangelio legimus uerba improperantis ad diuitem qui sibi de conditis uanissime gloriabatur: “*Stulte,*” inquit, “*hac nocte anima tua abs te augetur; quae praeparasti, cuius erunt?*” Si quis hoc scriptum et de Potamio conuenire consideret, intellet in eum non leuiter iudicatum, maxime passum linguae supplicium in qua et diues ille apud inferos uehementius cruciatur.

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 earned 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 not a 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>

43. Sed et Florentius, qui Osio et Potamio iam praeuaricatoribus sciens in loco quodam communicauit, dedit et ipse noua supplicia. Nam cum in conuentu plebis sedet in throno suo, repente eliditur et palpitat atque foras sublatus uires resumpsit. Et iterum et alia uice cum ingressus sedisset, similiter patitur, nec adhuc intellegens poenas suae maculatae communionis. Nihilominus postea cum intrare perseuerasset, ita tertia uice de throno excutitur, ut quasi indignus throno repelli uideretur, atque elisus in terram ita palpitans torquebatur, ut cum quadam duritia et magnis cruciatibus eidem spiritus extorqueretur, et inde iam tollitur non ex more resumendus sed sepeliendus.

44. Scit hoc quod referimus magna ciuitas Emerita, cuius in ecclesia plebs hoc ipsum suis uidit obtutibus. Sed et hoc considerandum est, quia Florentius haec passus est, qui nondum subscripserat impietati, sed tantum quod communicauit praeuaricatoribus fidei, non ignorans eorum praeuaricatiunem.

45. Hoc ideo intulimus ut videant illi quid sibi agendum sit, qui, cum non subscripserint ut praeuaricatores, tamen per communionem praeuaricatoribus sibi cognitis copulati sunt. Et puto quod

43. But even Florentius himself, who held communion in some place with Ossius 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 to be taken back as was customary, but 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

intellegant quid, exemplo Florentii, timere debeant.

46. Sed longum est referre alia quoque documenta poenis praesentibus damnatae praeuaricationis, quae diuinum iudicium uariis in locis exercuit, ad hoc scilicet ut qui Scripturas Diuinas quadam ratione non respicit, uel praesenti ultionis diuinae animaduersione intellegat quid sibi sectandum sit quidue uitandum. Vindicare uoluit Deus uel in paucos sine dubio et illa ratione ne, quae per Scripturam Diuinam de praeuaricatorum futuris suppliciis minitatur, uelut fabula putaretur si nunc in hoc saeculo in neminem uindicaret.

47. Intellegant nunc omnes episcopi praeuaricatores fidei quam grauissimis suppliciis reseruati sunt, quando in suos socios in hoc quoque saeculo ad stuporem omnium uindicatum est.

Ad hoc enim etiam praesentes poenas praeuaricationis exposuimus ut, quod in paucos uindicatum est, credatur et in omnes eorum similes uindicari, maxime cum et Scriptura Diuina hoc ipsum adseueret quod et per praesentia documenta monstratum est, et hoc consideretur, piissimi imperatores, in quo rei sunt, qui cum talibus diuina sacramenta non copulant, quorum et perpetua supplicia sacris leguntur in

through communion with them, since they knew them to be traitors. 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 present 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 for what very serious punishments they are reserved, 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

libris et suppliciorum exempla uidentur in saeculo.

48. Sed quasumus miram beniuolentiam uestram, ut adhuc nobis pro contemplatione Christi Dei infatigabilem audiendi patientiam commodetis, dum adhuc, summatim licet, exponimus in quantum creuit impietas.

Execrabiles enim Arriani, in partibus Orientis et maxime in Aegypto, non fuerunt hoc solo contenti ut episcopi damnata fide integra in eorum impiam sententiam declinarent, sed hos ipsos, qui primum fuerant per catholicos episcopos ordinati, ubi pro eorum desideriis subscripserunt, in laicorum numerum exigebant et postea iterum eos idem haeretici episcopos ordinabant, ut non solum fidem catholicam damnare uiderentur, sed etiam ordinationem factam per catholicos episcopos.

49. Intendite in hoc aduersus catholicos quasi quemdam triumphum haeticorum et miseram et quasi ultimam et foedissimam captiuitatem in his episcopis, qua, damnata pia fide et catholicis episcopis, in eorum se dominium delusionemque tradiderunt metu exilii et ut episcopale nomen apud homines retinere uiderentur, quod utique iam apud Deum post subscriptiones impias non habebant. Sed ideo nominis istius etiam cum omni dedecore quaerebatur auctoritas, ne illis

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?

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

possessiones Ecclesiae tollerentur, quas utinam numquam possedisset Ecclesia ut, apostolico more uiuens, fidem integram inuiolabiliter possideret.

Et nunc his talibus non communicare summa impietas dicitur et hoc sub uobis imperatoribus qui, ut uestrae constitutiones eloquunter, uenerabilis Ecclesiae diuinam sanctimoniam uindicatis (non est autem mirum, si haec tam atrocia eorum commissa, occupati rei publicae prouisionibus, ignoratis).

50. Has eorum impietates execrantes episcopi, qui pro fide poenas exilii perpetiebantur uel qui se in fugam dederunt, licet essent corpore discreti per interualla regionum, tamen spiritu in unum positi per mutuas litteras apostolico uigore decernunt nullo genere talibus episcopis posse communicari, qui fidem illo modo, quo supra retulimus, prodiderunt, nisi si laicam postulauerint communionem, dolentes suis impietatibus.

51. Sed mortue Constantio patrono haereticorum, Iulianus solus tenuit imperium, ex cuius praecepto omnes episcopi catholici de exiliis relaxantur. Solet hoc facere Diuinitas, ut etiam per aduersarios Christianae religioni suae consulat, ut tanto magis, qui cultores sunt Christi, pro fidelibus elaborent.

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 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 through the distances of 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. Sed non multo post, Iuliano intercepto, Iouianus efficitur imperator, qui uindicans fidem catholicam dedit calculum episcopis catholicis. Sed illi egregii episcopi, quamquam sub Constantio integram quam uindicauerant fidem haeretica subscriptione damnauerant, uidentes quod imperator pro catholicis episcopis interuenit, iterum se ad confessionem fidei catholicam transtulerunt.

Et ubi iam fides et ueneratio Christi est quando, pro terreni imperatoris arbitrio, episcopi nunc ex catholicis fiunt haeretici et idem ipsi ex haeticis ad fidem catholicam reuertuntur?

53. Sed etsi quidam confessores fatigati in ultimo talium se communioni iungendos esse crediderunt, euertentes illa statuta quae prius aduersus eos prophetica et euangelica atque apostolica auctoritate decreuerant, numquid hoc potest diuinam obruere ueritatem? Numquid hoc potest euangelicis praeiudicare doctrinis? Numquid apostolicas labefactare sententias et illam praesertim Dei uocem dicentis, “*Qui perseuerauerit usque in finem, hic saluus erit*”?

54. Sed et apostoli Pauli, *uasis electionis*, a Christo Domino pronuntiati, cuius ad Galatas scribentis haec uerba sunt: “*Sed etsi nos aut angelus de caelo euangelizauerit praeterquam*

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 which they had upheld, transferred themselves back to the 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 rattled 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, writing to the Galatians: *But even if an angel from heaven preaches beyond that which we*

*euangelizauimus uobis, anathema sit!”*

Vnde et idem ipse inferius in eadem epistola prosequitur dicens, “*Si enim, quae destruxi, haec iterum aedifico, praeuaricatorum me constituo.*”

Confessor utique factus est de Euangelii, de uocibus prophetarum, de doctrinis apostolorum: quis fidelium dubitet hunc confessionis meritum non habere, si Scripturarum Diuinarum iura subuertens incipiat *aedificare* quae *destruunt* Euangelia?

55. An non Scripturae Diuinae impugnantur, quando cum episcopis Filii Dei negatoribus pax ecclesiastica copulatur? Quis est enim qui considerans uim diuinae religionis pacem perfidorum *Deo placere* confidat, nisi si, ut a patribus decretum est, in laicorum se numerum tradant suae perfidiae dolentes?

56. Sed esto habeant pacem cum infidelibus! In quo tamen offendunt, in quo laedunt imperatores, in quo rem publicam uexant, qui, diuini contemplatione iudicii, huiusmodi pacem respuunt quae sacrilegos recipit, praeuaricatores fidei honorat, fauet hypocritis, despicit ueritatem, Christi Dei ueri Filii negatores tamquam dominos Ecclesiae constituit, populum perfidiae labe contaminat, euertit Euangelia?

*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 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!

Hinc rei sumus, hinc, sub nominis uestri auctoritate, patimur persecutiones ab his episcopis qui, pro nutu prioris imperatoris, haeresim uindicantes contra fidem catholicam perorabant. Heu gemitus! Idem episcopi aduersus fideles et catholicae fidei defensores haeretici prius imperatoris decreta praeferebant! Idem et nunc episcopi aduersus fideles et catholicae fidei defensores catholicorum imperatorum iura proponunt!

57. Haec cum dolore omnium uiscerum loquimur deflentes, non quod non sit fidelibus gloriosum sub quolibet pro vero perpeti, sed quia tantus est stupor in saeculo, ut haec illorum tantis inuoluta perfidiis non agnoscatur impietas, ut nemo intellegat quomodo etiam reges aures semper inludunt in uexationem Christianorum et fidelium sacerdotum. Sed, sub uocabulo pacis, impietas tegitur et speciosum nomem unitatis opponitur ad patrocinium perfidorum.

58. Sed bene quod ipse Saluator uirtutem suae pacis exposuit, ne quis simplici pacis uocabulo caperetur et eam quibuscumque saeculi impietatibus copularet, dicens: "*Pacem meam relinquo uobis, pacem meam do uobis; non sicut hic mundus dat, ego do uobis.*" "Pacem suam" a "mundi pace" discreuit. Nam si haec pax Deo grata est quae in Ecclesiam recepit episcopos infideles, quid ergo opus est in persecutionibus aestus perpeti, carcerem sustinere, ire obuiam gladiis atque omnia genera suppliciorum mortisque tolerare, quando

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!

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

quidem post negationem, post perfidiae sacrilegia propter pacem hanc quam *Deo placere* confidunt, securus unusquisque infidelium tamquam inlibatus saluo episcopi honore suscipitur?

59. Vani iam secundum hanc adsertionem et martyres iudicandi sunt! Ad quos enim fructus poenas mortemque ferre maluerunt? Si enim qui metu persecutionis negauerunt Filium Dei non habent poenam, immo potius honorantur, nec martyres coronam passionis sperare debuerunt! Immo potius pendunt supplicia suae temeritatis! Hoc enim necesse est consequatur. Non enim fieri potest ut non, ubi contraria iudicentur. Nonne manifestum est ad quam uocem coartantur uocabulo pacis istius uel quod pronuntiare cogantur, ut si negatores Filii Dei recte in honore corroborantur, credamus martyres tamquam pro sua temeritate puniri?

60. Sed absit! Absit ut hoc admittat conscientia Christiana! Credimus enim Filio Dei pronuntianti: “*Qui me negauerit coram hominibus, et ego negabo eum coram Patre meo,*” et “*Qui me confessus fuerit coram hominibus, et ego confitebor eum coram Patre meo.*”

61. Verumtamen, et in hac causa diuinum iudicium cognoscite prolatum

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 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

praesentibus documentis, ne quis putaret acceptandam pacem talium episcoporum, etiamsi ad uerae fidei confessionem reuerterentur post subscriptiones impias uel nefarias haereticorum communiones, quibus scientes subcubuerunt, ne aut possessiones Ecclesiae perderent aut honores.

62. Sanctus uir Maximus episcopus, cuius supra meminimus, fidem uindicans rectam consortiumque reprobans haereticorum, ductus est in exilium. In loco eius praeuaricatores ordinant nomine Zosimum, qui et ipse prius quidem catholica uindicabat. Res ista in Neapoli ciuitate Campaniae acta est. Cognoscit hoc sanctus Maximus et, de exilio scribens, dat in eum sententiam non solum episcopali auctoritate sed etiam aemulatione ac uirtute martyrii feruens in gloriam diuinam.

63. Sed post aliquot annos beatus Lucifer, de quarto exilio Romam pergens, ingressus est Neapolim, Campaniae, ut diximus, ciuitatem; ad quem Zosimus uenire temptauit illa forte fiducia qua scilicet iam de impietate correxisse uidebatur. Sed hunc confessor Lucifer suscipere noluit non ignorans quae gesserat, immo et Sancti Spiritus feruore episcopi et martyris Maximi sententiam robustius exequitur dicens quod episcopatum ipsum quem sibi ut adulter uindicat spiritalis, animaduertentis Dei iudicio non habebit, hic quoque sentiet poenam suae impietatis.

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 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. Sed non post multum temporis idem Zosimus cum in coetu plebis uult exsequi sacerdotis officia, inter ipsa uerba sacerdotalia eius lingua protenditur nec ualet eam reuocare intra oris capacitatem, eo quod contra modum naturae extra os penderet ut boui anhelio. Sed ut uidit se linguae officium perdidisse egreditur basilica et, res mira!, foris iterum in officium lingua reuocata est. Et primum quidem non intelligitur compleri in eum sententiam martyris et confessoris; sed, cum hoc totiens patitur quotiens et basilicam diuersis diebus temptauit intrare, ipse postremo recognouit ob hoc sibi linguam inter pontificii sollempnia uerba denegari ut sanctorum episcoporum in eum rite prolata sententia probaretur. Denique cessit episcopatum ut ei lingua quae cesserat redderetur.

65. Non res antiquas referimus, quae solent quadam ratione in dubium uenire: uiuunt adhuc praesentia ista documenta! Nam et Zosimus hodieque in corpore est, usum iam linguae non amittens, posteaquam maluit cum amissione episcopatus uiuere dolens suis impietatibus. Nonne etiam de similibus praeiudicatum est nihil illis prodesse, quod quasi sub correctione episcopi esse perseuerant? Non enim correctio est ista, sed inlusio prout sunt imperatorum tempora fidem uertere.

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 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 (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> regretting 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. Haec, haec res decepit et Valentem imperatorem, cum in haereticis uidet constantiam defensionis, in istis autem egregiis catholicis inconstantiam fidei. Nam utique probatur illi quod hi qui se catholicos adserebant subscripsissent prius cum haereticis, damnantes quam primum defenderant fidem. Et dicebant haeretici: “Si nostra fides mala est, quare sub Constantio pro ipsa subscriptum est ab his, qui nunc se catholicos dicunt hanc fidem uindicantes, quam cum primum defenderent conuicti rationibus sub Constantio damnauerunt?” His rebus Valens motus, ignorans uirtutem uerae fidei et constantiam cum inconstantia conferens, impietatem haereticorum cum quadam iustitia uindicabat.

67. Et tacemus quod, etiam sub Valente, iterum se quidam haereticis tradiderunt, quos nunc nihilominus uidemus inter catholicos nominari. Inde est unde etiam plebes haereticorum ad fidem impiam roboratae sunt, dum haeretici in malo perseuerant et, qui putantur catholici, de bono recedunt aliquotiens subcumbentes haereticis. Qua enim auctoritate hi tales episcopi contra haeresum praedicant cui se subscripsisse negare non possunt? Et qua fiducia catholicam fidem plebi suadere nitantur, cum constet quod eam impiis subscriptionibus reprobauerint?

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.

67. And we remain silent as to how, even under Valens, certain men handed themselves over to 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. Videtisne etiam uestris temporibus, sed, ut credimus, ignorantibus uobis, fidem quidem piam, atque utinam uel uere, sed etsi uere cum quadam tamen iniustitia uindicari, cum per indignos episcopos uindicatur in afflictionem piam fidem defendentium sacerdotum et in perniciem fidelium laicorum? Sed nefas putatur tot praeuaticatores deicere et conscientem ad iniustitiam turbam reprobare. Et ubi est iustitia uerae religionis, si addicenda est impiae multitudini et hoc sub piissimis et religiosissimis imperatoribus?

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. Nihilominus et in Sodoma et Gomorra graues poenas dedit impia multitudo, unde hospitalissimus Loth ob iustitiam liberatus est cum duabus tantummodo filiabus. Sed nec Dei aemulator Helias, qui fuit singularis, obtritrus est, cum aduersus illum quadringenti quinquaginta falsi sacerdotes niterentur, sed omnis turba illa impia sacerdotum luit poenas sub unius fidelis manu et hoc spectante rege Achab, qui falsos sacerdotes impie uindicabat.

70. Sed nec Iehu rex Israhel detulit impiae multitudini sacerdotum; denique omnes falsos sacerdotes, qui sub rege Achab fuerant in culmine, cum religiosa

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 for this reason: 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 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 Achab 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

fraude in domum religionis impiae conuocasset quasi eos post ritus religionis remuneraturus, iussit occidi, ita ut nemo de his superesset. Et legimus quia ob hoc factum ita placuit Domino ut “*filii eiusdem regis quarta progenie sederent in throno Israel.*” Sunt et alia multa simillima exempla.

71. Quae quidem nos non ideo dicimus quasi qui uelimus alicuius sanguinem fundi: absit hoc a uotis nostris! Hoc enim qui nunc fieri cupit, exorbitat a legibus Christianis. 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.

72. Falsum videatur quod dicimus, si non, uariis in locis, ecclesiae fidelium sacerdotum alibi inuasae et alibi destructae sunt, si non interpellationibus illorum, sancti quique comprehensi et diu ad iniurias inclusi et postremo missi sunt in exilium, si non etiam et ceteri quidam in carcere, alii autem tractu et caede mulcati animas reddiderunt, ob nullam aliam causam quam quia, metu

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.

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

diuini iudicii, nolebant communicare cum perfidis uel sociis perfidorum.

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?

Contra quem, primum, interpellauerunt Baeticae prouinciae consularem tunc demum sub specie intercessionis postulatae ex aliis locis plebeia colligitur multitudo et irruunt die dominica in ecclesia et Vincentium quidem non inueniunt, eo quod ipse, praemonitus, etiam populo praedixerat ne illo die procederent quando cum caede ueniebant. Hoc enim putauit fieri melius, si irae locum daret.

74. Sed illi, qui ad caedem parati uenerant, ne sine causa furor illorum uenisse putaretur, certa Christo Deo deuota ministeria quae illic inuenta sunt ita fustibus eliserunt, ut non multo post expirarent. Sed, quia plebs sancta Vincentii presbyteri magis eos execrabantur post illas eorum caedes quae in dominico factae sunt, egregii episcopi, ut plebs uniuersa terreretur, ab ipsis principalibus incipiunt. Denique postulant exhibitionem decurionum ciuitatis illius et ut includantur in carcerem. Ex quibus unus principalis

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 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

patriae suae, eo quod fidem firmiter ut fidelis in Deo retineret execrans labem praeuaricationis, inter eos et ipse catenatus fame frigore necatus est, cum fletu et gemitu illius prouinciae quae honestam uitam eius optime nouerat.

75. Egregii et catholici episcopi Luciosus et Hyginus huius crudelitatis auctores sunt!

Et interea inuaserunt quidem basilicam, sed fidem plebis inuadere non potuerunt. Denique, alibi in agello eadem plebs basilicam sibi ecclesiae fabricauit, ad quam cum sancto Vincentio conueniret. Sed Satanas, qui nusquam patitur Christum pie coli, inflammat eos et iterum deposita postulatione ex diuersis urbibus decurionum ac plebeia multitudo colligitur.

76. Simul etiam et presbyteri eius ad locum ueniunt, ecclesiae illius ianuas confringunt diripientes inde quicquid ad sacra ecclesiae ministeria pertinebat, et postremo, quod horroris est dicere, ad cumulum perpetrati sacrilegii, ipsum altare Dei de dominico sublatum in templo sub pedibus idoli posuerunt!

Haec utique illi faciunt qui, paenitentes de impia subscriptione, suscepti sunt ad catholicam disciplinam propter bonum pacis et unitatis! Quid grauius gentilis

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,<sup>81</sup> 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

cultor idolorum faceret, si haberet  
licentiam Ecclesiam persequendi?

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.

In ipsa quoque urbe Roma quam graues  
persecutiones fidelibus inlatae sunt! Vbi  
et beatus Aurelius episcopus  
communicans beatissimo Gregorio,  
aliquotiens afflicus est; sed hic uir  
sanctus, licet sit saepenumero afflicus,  
tamen propria accersione requieuit.

78. In Macarium uero presbyterum multa  
impiorum commissa sunt. Hic erat in  
eadem urbe Roma presbyter mirae  
continentiae, non uino stomachum  
releuans, non carnis esculentia corpus  
curans, sed oleo solo escas asperiores  
mitigans, ieiuniis et orationibus uacans.  
Sane, pro merito fidei et abstinentia,  
habebat gratiam sancti Spiritus in hoc ut  
de obsessis corporibus eiceret daemonia.  
Ideo uitam eius meritumque  
memorauimus ut tanto magis impii  
iudicentur hi qui tales uiuere non sinunt  
in Romano imperio.

79. Eodem tempore grauis aduersum  
nostros persecutio inhorruerat, infestante

the 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 softened 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 same time, a severe  
persecution against us bristled. Damasus,

Damaso egregio archiepiscopo, ita ut fidelibus sacerdotibus per diem sacros plebis coetus ad deseruendum Christo Deo conuocare libere non liceret. Sed quia pro conditione rerum quolibet tempore uel clam salutis nostrae sacramenta facienda sunt, idem sanctus presbyter Macarius dat uigilias, in quadam domo conuocans fraternitatem, ut, uel noctu, diuinis lectionibus fidem plebs sancta roboraret.

80. Sed diabolus, qui fauet impiis, quia et impii fauent diabolo, nec in occulto patitur diuina sacramenta celebrari. Denique tendunt insidias clerici Damasi et, ubi cognouerunt quod sacras uigilias celebrat cum plebe presbyter Macarius, irruunt cum officialibus in illam domum et plebem dissipant non resistentem ipsumque presbyterum comprehensum non iam ducere dignantur sed per silices trahunt, ita ut in coxa eius perniciosum uulnus fieret, atque alio die sistunt eum ante iudicem ut magni criminis reum.

81. Cui quidem iudex, ueluti sub imperiali rescripto et minis extorquere contendit ut cum Damaso conueniat. 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.

the notorious archbishop,<sup>82</sup> 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 celebrated in secret.<sup>83</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>84</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. 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. Hoc pio suo obsequio, in quantum poterat, Damasi scelus a se facere contendebat alienum.

83. Aduertat tranquillitas uestra: si haec fieri uultis in Romano imperio aduersus sanctos et fideles ab his qui praeuaricatores sunt, nonne metus est ne sanguis fidelium Romanum grauet imperium?

Nam idem Damasus accepta auctoritate regali etiam alios catholicos presbyteros nec non et laicos insecutus misit in exilium, perorans hoc ipsum per gentiles scolasticos, fauentibus sibi iudicibus, cum utique uestrae constitutiones aduersus haereticos decretae sint, non aduersus catholicos, et tales catholicos, qui fidem integram nec sub haereticis imperatoribus reliquerunt, et quidem grauia multa perpessi!

84. Sed et nuper temptauit grauiter persequi beatissimum Ephesium episcopum sanctae fidei aemulatione feruentem, ordinatum intaminatae plebi Romanae a constantissimo episcopo Taorgio et ipso inlibatae fidei uiro, sub

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 he is in the place of the presbyterium which is next to the grave [of Asterius].<sup>85</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 Ephesus, a bishop burning with the zeal of the holy faith,<sup>86</sup> who was ordained for the uncontaminated Roman people by the most constant bishop,

inuidia falsi impositi cognomenti per suos defensores interpellans iudicem Bassum quasi aduersum “Luciferianos.”

85. Sed Bassus, olim catholicam fidem uenerans, sciebat in Lucifero nullam haereseos fuisse prauitatem, quippe quem et bene nouerat pro fide catholica decem annos exilia fuisse perpessum et pro constantia suae integritatis reppulit accusationes Damasi negans se facturum ut homines catholicos et integrae fidei uiros insequeretur, dicens maxime quod ipsae constitutiones imperatorum contra haereticos solummodo promulgatae uideantur, non contra hos qui sanctissimam fidem sine saeculi ambitione conseruant. Et tunc primum erubuit Damasus quod inuentus est iudex qui solus imperialia scripta piissime interpretans tueretur.

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? Sed nobis, *Christus magister est*; 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. Haereses autem ideo hominum appellationibus denotatae sunt, quia et

Taorgius, himself a man of unreduced faith as well. He appealed through his protectors to the judge, Bassus,<sup>87</sup> under the malice of a falsely-imposed surname as if 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 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 blushed 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>88</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

hominum commenta tradiderunt. Perdit enim in se Christiani nominis appellationem, qui Christi non sequitur disciplinam.

87. Dicant nunc quid Lucifer nouum docuerit quod non ex Christi magisterio traditum est, quod non ab apostolis discipulis Saluatoris transmissum est in posteros. Et bene quod libros scripsit ad Constantium, non, ut plerique, gloriam captans ingenii sed diuina testimonia aptissime congerens contra haereticos et contra ipsum patronum haereticorum, ad diuinam aemulationem pro Filii Dei amore succensus. Denotent, quid illic contrarium Scripturis, quid nouum quasi haereticus scripsit.

88. Quos quidem libros, cum per omnia ex integro ageret, suspexit et Athanasius ut ueri uindicis, atque in Graecum stilum transtulit, ne tantum boni Graeca lingua non haberet. Parum est: quin etiam propriis litteris idem Athanasius eosdem libros praedicat ut prophetarum et Euangeliorum atque apostolorum doctrinis et pia confessione contextos. Et quamuis plurimis in eum laudibus erigatur, tamen non aequat ad meriti eius praeconium, et quidem cum amplius laudare non posset. Ita, rerum eius supereminetia quaeuis laudans lingua superatur!

through his apostles.<sup>89</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>90</sup> to capture the glory of his talent, but to most carefully collect divine testimonies against the heretics and against that patron of heretics,<sup>91</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>92</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>93</sup> And although 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. Sed Lucifer, ignarus licet artificiosae eloquentiae tamen ut prophético et euangelico atque apostolico more scriberet, quod super omnem humanam eloquentiam est, habuit gratiam sancti Spiritus ex merito rectae fidei et sincerissimae conscientiae. Per quem etiam diuinas uirtutes operatus est, non solum in Sardinia, sed in ipsis quoque quator exiliis usque adeo ut eum aduersarii magum dicerent, cum apostolicas uirtutes per eum fieri negare non possent.

90. Venit ad hunc et sanctus Gregorius et admiratus est in illo tantam doctrinam Scripturarum Diuinarum et ipsam uitam eius uere quasi in caelis constitutam. Iam quantus uir Lucifer fuerit, cum illum admiretur et Gregorius, qui apud cunctos admirabilis est non solum ex conlisione illa Osii sed etiam ex diuinis uirtutibus quas habens in se gratiam Sancti Spiritus exsequitur?

91. Quid ergo? Et in hoc impii sunt, [quod] cum Lucifer secundum Scripturas Diuinas et crediderit et docuerit et uixerit et in nomine Christi sit uirtutes operatus, ad opprimendos uerae fidei uindices Luciferi nomen imponant nescientes miseri summum se committere sacrilegium, cum doctrinam Christi sub hominis appellatione designant, sicut et in hoc impii sunt, quando sacrilegas institutiones pro arbitrio hominum editas sub Christiani nominis auctoritate defendunt! An non summa impietas est iniquitates suas et sacrilegia sub Christi nomine uindicare? An non summa

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,<sup>94</sup> 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.

90. Holy Gregory also came to this man<sup>95</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>96</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 Ossius but also from the divine miracles which 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

impietas est piam doctrinam sub Christi nomine consecratam humanis appellationibus denotare? Sed haec fraus, haec atrocitas aduersus fideles in Hispania et apud Triueros et Romae agitur et in diuersis Italiae regionibus.

92. Adserendum nunc necessario est quod in his partibus gestum est, ubi egregii episcopi, non fidei ueritate sed sola catholici nominis appellatione uestiti, non solum per iudices neque tantummodo per manum militarem fideles et ueros catholicos dissipant, sed etiam interdum per suos clericos, ignorantibus iudicibus uel etiam dissimulantibus, atrociam exercent. Et qui finis erit, si cuncta referamus, quae singuli quoque fidelium passi sunt atque patiuntur? Vnum tamen atrox persecutionis facinus ad compendium referendum est quod in Aegypto apud Oxyrhynchum commissum est sub totius testimonio ciuitatis.

93. Certa pars est apud Oxyrhynchum sanctae plebis in cuius sacro numero plerique, quanto intentius ad res diuinas studium curamue posuerunt, tanto sollicitius diligentiusque fidem catholicam inuiolabiliter seruare contendunt, ita ut se nullis haereticis nullisque praeuaricatoribus per diuina commisceant sacramenta. 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

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 there be if we relate all the things which individuals of the faithful also suffered or are suffering? Nevertheless, a cruel crime of persecution must be brought forth in order to comprehend what was committed in Egypt at Oxyrhynchus under 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 inuiolably 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

quam fuit sanctus Antonius. Nouit hoc et ipsa ciuitas Oxyrynchus, quae hodieque sanctam Pauli memoriam deuotissime celebrat.

94. Sed haec ipsa pars plebis, ubi uidit episcopum illius ciuitatis nomine Theodorum in impiam praeuaricationem fuisse conlapsum ita ut, non solum fidem integram condemnaret neque ut tantummodo impie subscriberet, sed ut etiam laicum se fieri ab impio Georgio pateretur et denuo ab ipso haeretico episcopum ordinari, execrata est eius communionem, habens secum presbyteros et diacones illibatae fidei, per quos fruebatur diuinis sacramentis una cum supra memorato beatissimo Paulo.

Sed postea etiam episcopum sibi per tunc temporis episcopos catholicos ordinauit sanctum Heraclidam, tanto magis idoneum quanto et firmiter contra haereticos et praeuaricatores debuit ordinari, qui in uita esset perspicuus, a prima aetate Deo deseruiens contemptis bonis saecularibus et in fide et doctrina perfectus existens. Vnde et pro apostolica fide, pro doctrina euangelica, pro conuersatione caelesti apud cunctos illic uenerabilis est, solis tantummodo haereticis et praeuaricatoribus displicens! Vnde et magis *Deo placet* cum talibus displicet!

95. Sed hic tantus ac talis ita coepit exercere pontificium ut ad opinionem fidei eius et doctrinae atque ipsius

did as well. He had no less life, nor zeal, nor divine grace than holy Antony.<sup>97</sup> That city, Oxyrynchus, 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>98</sup>

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>99</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

sanctissimae conuersationis plerique  
etiam de longissimis regionibus  
aduenirent, execrantes nefariam  
praeuaricatorum societatem eiusque  
sacrosanctum consortium desiderantes!

96. Sed ille egregius bis episcopis hoc  
non patitur! Et primum quidem uexat per  
publicas potestates, ita ut aliquoties  
solum intempesta nocte raptum per  
lancearios de urbe sustulerit. Sed cum  
eadem potestates non in hoc  
perseuerant 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!), tunc egregius iste bis  
episcopus iam propriis uiribus nititur et  
mittit turbam clericorum ad ecclesiam  
beati Heraclidae catholici episcopi  
eamque euertit destruens undique  
parietes, ita ut ipsum altare Dei securibus  
dissiparet, cum horrore totius ciuitatis et  
gemitu, quod illa ecclesia euerteretur  
cuius episcopum etiam diuersae partis  
homines rectae et illibatae fidei  
confitentur.

97. Aduertite, quaesumus, piissimi  
imperatores et rectae fidei uindices!  
Numquid pro tam impiis episcopis edicta  
proponitis? Ut hi affligantur qui ob  
meritum fidei et sanctissimae uitae  
mundo ipso pretiosiores sunt? Credite,  
religiosissimi imperatores, beatum  
Heraclidam unum esse de illo numero  
sanctorum de quibus refert Scriptura  
Diuina dicens, “*Circuierunt in melotis et*

the furthest places came to the 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>100</sup> twice-bishop<sup>101</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>102</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  
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

*caprinis pellibus indigentes, in tribulationibus et doloribus afflicti, quorum non erat dignus mundus.”*

98. Quomodo enim beatus Heraclida non talis est, qui omnia saecularia respuens oblectamenta, per ipsas amaritudines confragosae uitae istius, aemulans dominica uestigia, nudus expeditusque uirtutum *iter salutare* sectatur, qui sic pro diuiniae fidei amore conspirat sicuti et sanctos legimus conspirasse, nihil habens de saeculo quam pro fide *“tribulationes et dolores,”* sic uiuens, sic incedens, sicuti et illi sancti de quibus supra positum est testimonium? Merito ergo et beatus Gregorius ceterique sancti episcopi sanctimoniae istius uenerabili consortio in tot malis afflictae Ecclesiae uelut diuinis solatiis releuantur.

99. Non solum autem in tam uenerabilem episcopum grassatus est Theodorus sed et in ipsam sanctissimam plebem eius, quae pro sincerissimi et fidelissimi sacerdotis doctrina et moribus instituta est. Et longum est referri quae contra pudorem propositumue sacrarum uirginum molitus est, quarum monasteria pro merito sanctimoniae earum ciuitas ipsa ueneratur. Sed et ipsos seruos Dei aliquotiens atrocibus afflixit iniuriis quos magis probauerat sanctiores! Sed quid mirum si oues ut lupo affligeret, quarum bonum pastorum frequenter affligit?

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>103</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>104</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>105</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.

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

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! Hic est egregius  
et sanctissimus illi episcopus, qui, cum  
fuisset primum a catholicis episcopis  
episcopus ordinatus, postea, ab impio  
Georgio in laicorum numerum redactus,  
nihilominus ab ipso Georgio episcopus  
ordinatus est in uexationem fidelium,  
sedens et communicans in una eademque  
ciuitate cum Apollonio Melitianorum  
episcopo consentienti impietatibus  
Georgii et cum ipso item Apollonio idem  
Theodorus persequens beatum  
Heraclidam catholicae fidei vindicem!

101. Ecce cui, quasi catholico, basilica  
nunc tradita est Apollonii ex generalis  
edicti uestri auctoritate, cum utique idem  
Theodorus, qui quasi catholicus haeretici  
Apollonii basilicam accepit, similiter  
impie gessit ut gessit et Apollonius, nisi  
quia atrocius gessit Theodorus, cum de  
episcopo catholico fit laicus, damnans  
piam fidem et subscribens Arrianae  
impietati ut ab haeretico iterum  
episcopus ordinetur! Sane hinc se uult  
catholicum uideri quod et ipse nunc  
quosdam presbyteros seu diacones  
Apollonii facit suasu quodam laicos et  
eos iterum ordinat, ut uideatur  
turpissimae istius ordinationis uicem  
referre quam passus est. Numquid non  
excedit omne sacrilegium haec ludibria

wolf he should assault the sheep whose  
good shepherd he frequently assaults?

100. Look at who, under you pious  
emperors who come out on behalf of the  
catholic faith, boasts 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

sub nomine catholico uindicare in afflictionem fidelium sacerdotum atque laicorum?

102. Sed et apud Palaestinam in Eleutheropoli est sacra uirgo Christi nomine Hermione generosis quidem edita natalibus, sed fide et sanctimonia multum facta generosior, ipsam uirginitatem condecorans contemptu rerum saecularium et humanae gloriae, ad quam plerique affectant, etiam qui se saeculo et concupiscentiae carnis adrenuntiasse gloriantur.

103. Haec, in quantum castimoniam corporis sacro rigore custodit, in tantum animae puritatem casta piae fidei obseruatione conseruat, non haeticis, non praeuaricatoribus communicans, eo quod intellegat uirginitatem corporis nihil prodesse nisi et integritatem animae sacra confessione tueatur, labem adulterinae communionis effugiens et sectans salutaria sacramenta fidelium sacerdotum.

Denique, suppliciat religiosis litteris apud beatum Heraclidam ut eius sacris uisitationibus iuuaretur.

104. Sed, pro beato Heraclida, sanctus Ephesius uisitat, qui id temporis, ob utilitates ecclesiasticas, ad episcopum

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

Heraclidam de urbe Roma uenerat. Hic est Ephesius quem supra diximus illibatae plebi Romanae episcopum a constantissimo Taorgio episcopo ordinatum. Sed cum uenisset Eleutheropolim, non solum Hermione cum suo sacro monasterio releuatur, sed et quidam fidelissimi serui Dei; inter quos etiam nobilis domus religiosi ad catholicam fidem Seueri ex tribunis. Diu quidem non communicans haereticis et praeuaricatoribus; sed nondum qui inuenisset catholicorum sacram communionem.

105. Vbi autem uidit sanctum Ephesium, post multas examinationes probans eum catholicum, traditit se ei in sacram communionem, beatum se iudicans quod domum suam ex insperato diuina misericordia uisitasset tam sancti sacerdotis aduentu, ductus in eius admirationem non solum uitae eius puritate sed et quibusdam caelestibus documentis: est enim tantae fidei et sanctimoniae beatus Ephesius ut, quocumque perrexerit, eum gratia diuina comitetur. Probauit hoc et plebs sancta apud Oxyrynchum beato Heraclidae communicans: quae illum ob meritum diuinae gratiae pia eius dilectione constricta ut quondam Asiani apostolum Paulum cum magno fletu deduxit proficiscentem.

106. Non haec laudandi studio loquimur, sed ut scire possitis quam sanctae et fideles animae sub uestri nominis auctoritate grauissimis persecutionibus

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 relieved, 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>106</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

affliguntur ab his quos constat,  
ignorantibus uobis, etiam nunc usque aut  
haereticos esse, aut praeuaricatores, aut  
socios talium.

107. Sed aduersus sanctum Ephesium  
modicum quid conati in Palaestina hi  
quibus sacra ueritas onerosa est; postea  
destiterunt metuentes in illo et fidei  
libertatem et constantiam animi et hoc  
ipsum cogitantes quod magis haeresis  
eorum et impietas prodi poterat, si sub  
uobis catholicis imperatoribus integrae et  
constantis fidei episcopum acrius  
inquietassent. Vbi autem idem beatus  
Ephesius, inuitatus fidelium litteris, in  
Africam nauigauit, nobis apostolico  
more dans praeceptum ut circa sanctam  
fraternitatem diuinis et ecclesiasticis  
officiis 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, nesciens quod Christi Dei  
gratia etiam minimissimis seruulis eius  
patrocinetur, maxime pro causa rectae  
fidei laborantibus.

108. Namque hic Turbo, posteaquam  
audiuit quosdam se integrae fidei  
copulare et per Dei gratiam rem ueri  
crescere, nobis exitia minitatur et turbas.  
Sed et Seueri domui incendium  
minitatum ueritati, qui tanto magis fidem  
Dei uindicat quanto et Romano imperio  
fideliter militauit. Temptat quoque et  
sacram uirginem Hermionem insequi,

harshest 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 Ephesus 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 Ephesus, 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>107</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  
Ephesus. 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 faction was growing through  
the grace of God, this Turbo threatened  
us with devastations and disturbances.<sup>108</sup>  
But Turbo's fire was also threatening the  
truth at Severus' house. Severus, as  
much as he had faithfully served the  
Roman Empire, defended the faith of

illam feminam quam quicumque didicit, ut aliquam de euangelicis feminis admiratus est. Sed et singulis quibusque tendit insidias qui nobiscum sacrae communionis consortio copulantur, ueluti nefas obiciens, ex lege illa Babyloniae, quod intra nostra domicilia, sine labe haeresos et sine communionem perfidiae, secundum euangelicas et apostolicas traditiones desiderantibus fidelibus diuina sacramenta celebremus. Simili enim furore et quondam Babyloniae sanctum Danihelum hostilibus odiis insecuti sunt quod in sua domo Deum obseruantia diuinae legis adoraret.

109. Hic est Turbo qui diaconus fuit Eutychi haeretici, sub quo beatus Lucifer Eleutheropolitanae ciuitatis patiebatur exilium, qui et ipsum Luciferum fidem libere uindicantem atrocitatibus uehementer afflixit. Sunt adhuc hodie in Palaestina qui illo tempore, istis insequentibus, poenas grauissimas dederunt eo quod cum catholicae fidei episcopo Lucifero conuenirent. Negent, si non inter cetera sua atrocita ianuam clausam securibus effregerunt, si non irruentes in Luciferum fidelissimum sacerdotem diuina quoque sacramenta euerterunt, unumquemque illic de his gratibus qui conuenerant impia caede mulcantes! Negent, si non hodieque apud se mystica uasa, quae tunc impie Lucifero diripuerunt, cum sacris codicibus possident!

God all the more. Turbo even tried to pursue the holy virgin 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>109</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>110</sup>

109. This is the Turbo who was a deacon of Eutyclus 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. Tunc utique Turbo cum Eutychio haeretico uersabatur. Extunc, se catholicum dicens, catholicos persequitur sub auctoritate uestri nominis!

Auctoritatis piae contemplatione fidem catholicam uindicatis. 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 mortesque patiantur, ita ut nusquam liceat Deo pia altaria conlocare aut certe, cum conlocata fuerint, destruantur?

111. Sub impio Achab, rege Israel, occisis prophetis altariisque destructis, interpellat Helias Deum aduersum Israel in libro *Regnorum* dicens: “*Domine, prophetas tuos occiderunt, altaria tua destruxerunt et ego relictus sum solus et quaerunt animam meam.*” Hanc inuidiosam interpellationem etiam uestris temporibus sinitis ad Deum fieri a singulis quibusque fidelibus sacerdotibus?

112. Si enim et taceant, numquid Deus haec ipsa fieri ignorat? Quid? 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

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 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>111</sup> Do you also allow this invidious appeal 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

unde sunt tot plagae quibus orbis  
Romanus quatitur et urguetur?

113. Non opus est nunc nos singula  
quaeque plagarum recensere, quae  
tranquillitas uestra recognoscit cum  
aestu et sollicitudine imperii sui.  
Communem istum dolorem uel tacendo  
mitigemus, ne non tam compati quam  
exulcerare uideamur. Sed hoc,  
quaesumus, piissimi imperatores,  
cogitare dignemini quibus ex causis ista  
proueniunt: utrum quia fideles serui  
Christi metuentes leges diuinas nolunt  
cum infidelibus conuenire an quia ueri  
catholici a falsis sacerdotibus  
obteruntur?

114. Quomodo enim non falsi sacerdotes  
sunt qui iam, non solum ob causam  
praeuaricationis supra expositam  
deuitandi sunt sed etiam quod plurimi  
quique eorum proprias etiam nunc  
haereses uindicant sub ementita apud uos  
catholici nominis professione? Quis  
enim iam timeat episcoporum impia  
praedicare quando totiens commissa  
impietas honorata est, cum minime  
deicitur sacerdotio? Denique, cum sint  
alii eorum Origenistae, alii  
anthropomorphitae, 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

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>112</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 alongside you so  
much as we would appear to be making  
things worse. But this, we ask, 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>113</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>114</sup> but there  
are even those too, who think that they  
believe piously among themselves,

respicientes: nihilominus hi omnes de uestris gloriantur edictis et sibi ecclesias uindicant, cum has impias sectas patres nostri apostolica semper et euangelica auctoritate damnauerint.

115. Quas quidem nunc discutere non est praesentis opusculi; sed tamen quod moueat ad horrorem intentum uerae fidei animum uestrum dicimus.

116. Vna, ut opinamur, haeresis apud Ariminum sub haeretico rege suscepta est et nunc sub uobis piis catholicis imperatoribus tot haereses uindicantur, non minus impiae quam est Arrii impietas! Et cum aduersus se libros uel epistolas singuli quique conscribant, tamen sibi omnes uel ex directo uel ex obliqua concatenatione communicant, inani studio philosophorum solis disputationibus litigantes, non etiam ut Christiani ex deuotione sacramenti alter alterum uelut impium deuitantes, ut iam, sicut in scholis, ingenii uideatur inter eos esse certamen, non autem sacra defensio uerae religionis, quandoquidem inter se sacramenta non separant, cum impiis sententiis ab inuicem separentur.

117. Hoc autem ideo faciunt quia quidam eorum gloriae humanae, quidam uero auaritiae student; et inde est quod sibi inuicem sub impia dissimulatione concludunt ut, nec possessiones perdant

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.

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! 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>115</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

ecclesiae, nec honores. Et interea, ut tot suas uelent impietates, ad inlusionem singulorum ueluti benignissimae mentis indicia praeferentes, aiunt ideo se etiam contraria sentientibus ecclesiasticae communionis consortio copulari ne bonum pacis in Ecclesia pereat, quasi uero huiusmodi pax Christo *Deo placeat* quae in eius Ecclesiam tantas recipit impietates!

118. Sed hoc qui ita putant, audiant de se scriptum: *“Et uiam pacis non agnouerunt; non est timor Dei ante oculos eorum.”* Sed apertius quoque et apud Hieremiam legimus de ea pace impia et iniqua, sicut exequitur subiectum testimonium: *“A pusillo eorum usque ad magnum cuncti perpetraverunt iniqua. A sacerdote usque ad pseudopphetam uniuersi operati sunt falsa; et meditabantur obtritioni populi mei pro nihilo constituentes et dicentes ‘Pax, pax!’ Et ubi est pax?”* Et intendendum est quam atrocia de illis prosequatur qui hac uanissima pace gloriantur. Sequitur enim: *“Confusi sunt, quoniam defecerunt et nec sic quidem confusionem sustinentes erubuerunt et ignominiam suam non cognouerunt. Propterea cadent in ruina sua et in tempore visitationis infirmabuntur.”*

119. Quid mali committimus, quid impie facimus, si seruantes fidem Christo,

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>116</sup> As if truly a peace of this sort, which accepts such great impieties into his Church, would be *pleasing to Christ, God!*<sup>117</sup>

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>118</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>119</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>120</sup>

119. What evil do we commit, what do we do impiously, if serving the faith for

huiusmodi pacem respuamus, cuius tanta confusio et ignominia grauissimique exitus describuntur? Sed isti egregii pacis amatores fidelibus sacerdotibus bellum exagitant. Quid enim uult diabolus, quam ut impii et praeuaricatores saeculi pace gloriantur? Quid enim uult diabolus, quam ut hi qui pii sunt et fideles infestantium persecutione uexentur?

120. Haec ideo prosecuti sumus ne per uestri ignorantiam diu fundatur sanguis Christianorum piissimam fidem defendentium. Quid enim prodest si sitis catholicae fidei uindices et patiamini catholicae fidei sectatores ubique cruciari, ubique effugari, nusquam libere piam fidem praedicare?

121. Habeant illi basilicas auro coruscantes pretiosorumque marmorum ambitione uestitas uel erectas magnificentia columnarum! Habeant quoque porrectas in longum possessiones, ob quas et fides integra periclitata est! Quid etiam suis impietatibus uindicant communes Romanis omnibus ciuitates ut neminem in his pie uiuere permittant, in quibus a plurimis etiam uana superstitio sine periculo colitur et sine illorum inuidia uindicatur? Liceat saltem ueritati, uel inter ipsa uilissima et abiecta praesepia, Christum Deum pie colere ac fideliter adorare, ubi et aliquando natus secundum carnem idem Christus infans iacere dignatus est.

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 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>121</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 mangers where that same Christ, born in the flesh as an

122. Hoc quod petimus, non ideo petimus quasi expauescamus pro uero interfici: *Deus testis est, qui uerus speculator est cordis*, quia per Dei gratiam nobis ut summum refrigerium est et certa spes futurae beatitudinis si pro hac fidei adsertione iugulemur. Non ergo quasi qui timeamus perpeti, ideo sumus ista prosecuti, sed ne aliorum impietatibus et crudelitatibus sanguis effusus fidelium Christianorum diu piissimum uestrae principalitatis grauet imperium.

123. Maxime sub te, religiosissime Auguste Theodosi, qui mira deuotione contra omnes haereticos Christianae religionis pia confessione conspiras, magnum nobis apud Deum fore supplicium credidimus, si apud te tam religiosum, tam piissimum imperatorem et Christo Deo diuino ac plenissimo timore consecratum quem uere ad imperium Deus Christus elegit, quae sunt uerae fidei ac uerae Ecclesiae taceremus.

Post haec non ambigimus quo sollicitus agas qua pater imperii, ne in orbe Romano professae fidei communionisque sinceritas affligatur. Quicquid in causa sacrae fidei ac professae ueritatis sanctius gesseritis, tanto gloriosius et hic et in perpetuum Christi fauore regnabitis!

infant, was also worthy to lie down at one time.<sup>122</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>123</sup> because through the grace of God the highest consolation is possible<sup>124</sup> and there is a sure hope for future blessedness<sup>125</sup> if our throats are cut for this faithful assertion.<sup>126</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.

123. We believed that God would punish us greatly, especially under you,<sup>127</sup> most religious Augustus Theodosius, who with admirable devotion works together with your pious confession of the Christian religion against all heretics, if with you, a so religious, so very pious emperor, and one dedicated to Christ, God, with divine and most complete fear,<sup>128</sup> whom truly Christ, God, chose for the Empire, we kept silent about the things which are of the true faith and of the true Church.

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

124. Ego Marcellinus presbyter, optans felicissimo imperio uestro securam quietam et in regno Christi et Dei perpetuam beatitudinem, piissimi imperatores.

Ego Faustinus, qui non possum dignus uocari presbyter Dei, optans ut et hic multos annos clementissimae diuinitatis auxilio feliciter imperetis et in futuro Christi Filii Dei regno perpetuam cum sanctis beatitudinem consequamini gloriosissimi imperatores.

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>129</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.

1. Thus establishing the *terminus post quem* for the petition; the Emperor Gratian was assassinated by agents of Magnus Maximus on August 25, 383.
2. Or, the ‘law of this age’; *ius saeculi* means the laws of this world as opposed to divine law.
3. Namely Constantius (*Lib. Prec.* 15ff) and Valens (*Lib. Prec.* 66ff).
4. As above, meaning under Constantius and Valens, though probably indicating Julian as well.
5. 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, as it is used by Jerome throughout his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* by both the Orthodox and the Luciferian speakers.
6. *Phil.* 1:29.
7. *Ex* 7:13.
8. *Rom* 12:11.
9. The Latin word *saeculum*, whence English ‘secular,’ has a deeper meaning than the English ‘age,’ ‘era,’ or ‘time’ convey. The significance here is that Constantius is the ‘king’ of this era, in contrast to Jesus, who will be king in the coming Kingdom of Heaven.
10. Cf. *Rev* 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.
11. Cf. *2 Mac* 9:5.
12. *Acts* 1:18.
13. *Prov* 10:2; *Mic* 6:10.
14. Cf. *2 Pet* 2:6.
15. *Ps* 13:3 (LXX).
16. Cf. *2 Mac* 9:9; *Isa* 66:24; *Acts* 12:23.
17. *1 Cor* 11:19.
18. In other words, he tormented them (for now) by making them remain at court, not by physical violence.

19. Cf. *Rev* 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.
20. Cf. *Isa* 66:24.
21. Note the lack of details concerning the council at Seleucia compared to that at Rimini.
22. Paulinus was exiled at the Council of Arles in 353.
23. Note how the authors refuse to name Liberius, who eventually did cave in to Constantius.
24. Lucifer exiled at the Council of Milan in 355.
25. The word for emperor here, *rex*, carries a polemical weight which *imperator* does not; see note 9 above.
26. Like Lucifer, he was exiled at the Council of Milan in 355.
27. The text is corrupt but the meaning is clear. Mazochi proposes the “*et*” which Canellis accepts.
28. Both Rhodanius and Hilary were exiled at the Council of Beziers in 356.
29. Note the play on words between *Constantium* and *constantia*.
30. 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).
31. 1 *Tim* 4:1.
32. The word *rex* is once more used. The play between the earthly and heavenly kings is apparent throughout the text.
33. Cf. *Wis Sol* 5:1.
34. Play on words between *lapso* and *inlapsa*.
35. 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*.
36. Cf. *Mt* 27:11-26; *Jn* 18:28-40.
37. Cf. *Wis Sol* 4:20-5:1.

38. Cf. *Ex* 17:11-12.
39. Cf. *Rev* 1:5; 17:14; 19:16.
40. Faustinus and Marcellinus must surely here mean the Scriptures.
41. Cf. *Acts* 19:11.
42. 1 *P* 4:5; 2 *Tim* 4:1.
43. Although the details of this story ought to be doubted, Gregory never appears to have suffered exile.
44. Cf. *Lk* 12:16-19.
45. *Lk* 12:20.
46. Cf. *Lk* 16:19-26.
47. The text is vague as to whether these events occur on the same day or over a course of several days.
48. 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 author of a work *De trinitate* as well. Canellis treats Faustinus as the sole author of the text.
49. In the manuscripts, this is just *ratione*; earlier editors quickly corrected this to *ratione ne*.
50. Cf. *Lib Prec.* 1 and 4.
51. 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.
52. Faustinus refuses to mention here or elsewhere Lucifer's actions in ordaining Paulinus at Antioch during his exile.
53. That is, since even pagan emperors like Julian have helped the Church, catholic emperors are expected to help the church all the more.
54. The manuscripts read *quam* instead of *quamquam*; Günther, Simonetti, and Canellis all accept the reading as *quamquam*.
55. Such as Hilary of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli.

56. *Mt* 10:22.

57. *Acts* 9:15.

58. *Gal* 1:8.

59. *Gal* 2:18.

60. *Rom* 8:8.

61. Constantius.

62. *Jn* 14:27.

63. *Rom* 8:8.

64. Previous scholars have considered this 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.

65. *Mt* 10:33.

66. *Mt* 10:32.

67. Cf. *Rom* 12:11.

68. Maximus and Lucifer.

69. Note the twin uses of *cessit* and *cesserat*.

70. As above with *cesso*, note the use of *amittens* and *amissione*.

71. Again, there is a play on words with *Constantio*, *Constantio*, *constantium*, and *inconstantium*.

72. Cf. *Gen* 6-9.

73. Cf. *Gen* 18:16-19:29.

74. Cf. *1 Kgs* 18:16-46.

75. Cf. *2 Kgs* 10:18-28.

76. *2 Kgs* 10:30.

77. Cf. *Rom* 7:14.

78. 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.

79. The sarcastic epithet *egregii* is used again.

80. Now the sarcastic *egregii* is matched with a sarcastic *catholici*.

81. This is a rare, early use of *Satanas* in a Latin document; more common was *diabolus*.

82. This is a rare, early use of *archiepiscopus* in a Latin document.

83. The Luciferians here draw a very close equivalence between Damasus and the Devil without explicitly stating such.

84. In other words, local government police.

85. 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.”

86. Cf. *Rom* 12:11.

87. Bassus was the *praefectus urbi* from 382-383.

88. *Mt* 23:10.

89. Cf. *Acts* 11:26; 1 *Tim* 6:3.

90. This is surely a reference to Hilary.

91. Constantius.

92. 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, penned by another.

93. The letters have long been known to be forgeries.

94. In this text, as in a few others, *virtus* can have the meaning ‘miracle;’ see, for instance, Jerome’s contemporary rendering of *Mt* 7:22 in the Vulgate: *multi dicent mihi in illa die Domine, Domine, nonne in tuo prophetavimus et in tuo nomine daemonia eiecimus et in tuo nomine virtutes multas fecimus?*

95. There is no mention of such a visit in any other extant source.
96. Cf. *Phil* 3:20.
97. This apparently refers to Paul the Hermit, described by Jerome. Jerome is not mentioned, but neither is his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*. Did the Luciferians learn of Paul in Egypt and not know of Jerome's *Dialogus*, or are they deliberately trying to lay claim to Jerome's hero-monk knowing him to be an enemy of the Luciferians?
98. It seems unlikely that Paul the Hermit was still alive in the 350s, when this incident must take place based on the term of George of Cappadocia's episcopacy in Alexandria (357-361).
99. *Rom* 8:8.
100. Again, Faustinus and Marcellinus employ the sarcastic *egregius*.
101. The term *bis episcopus* refers to his two ordinations, once by the catholic faction and again by George of Cappadocia.
102. *Lancearii* were lightly-armed soldiers who frequently functioned as bodyguards for eminent persons.
103. *Heb* 11:37-38.
104. *Ps* 49:22 (LXX).
105. *Heb* 11:37.
106. Cf. *Acts* 20:37-38.
107. Note that Faustinus is a priest. The text here takes on an autobiographical tone.
108. There is a play on words between *Turbo* and *turbas*.
109. Cf. *Dan* 3.
110. Cf. *Dan* 6.
111. 1 *Kgs* 19:10 = 19:14.
112. 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.

113. Prior to Canellis, editors corrected this to *anthropomorphistae*, but Canellis retains the manuscript readings of *D* and *E*.

114. Meaning here the Macedonians or *pneumatomachi*, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

115. The trope of Christianity v. philosophy was a traditional rhetorical tool for many Christians.

116. Cf. *Jn* 14:27 as above.

117. *Rom* 8:8.

118. *Ps* 13:3 (LXX).

119. *Jer* 6:13-14.

120. *Jer* 6:15.

121. The entire text 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. The custom of providing an easier alternative to a more difficult request was common in Greek and Latin letters of request.

122. Cf. *Lk* 2:7-13.

123. *Wis Sol* 1:6.

124. Cf. *Wis Sol* 4:7.

125. Cf. *Wis Sol* 3:4.

126. Cf. *1 Pet.* 4:12-19.

127. Here the authors switch from the plural *vos*, which has been used throughout the text, to the singular *tu*.

128. Cf. *Ps* 13:3 (LXX).

129. Rhetoric. He is elsewhere referred to as a presbyter, for instance, in the preface of the *Confessio fidei*.

*Appendix III:*  
*Translation of the Lex Augusta*

**Ad has preces ita lex augusta respondit:**

1. Salue, Cynegi carissime nobis!

Etsi nulla humanis pectoribus maior quam diuinae legis debet esse reuerentia nec adici quicquam ad eam possit, cuius ambitiosa praestantia, mundi terraeque moderatrix omne, quod sub nobis esse uoluit fauor omnipotentis Dei, propitiata custodit,

2. tamen, quia per Faustinam atque Marcellinum, plenissimos fidei sacerdotes, interpellata clementia nostra, ueriti sumus ne, si per nos nihil fuisset responsum petentibus, nos uideremur annuere his qui diuinae legi cui seruimus contra propositum nostrum aliquid addidissent. Atque ideo ita utrumque moderamur ut petitionem quae est oblata ueneremur, fidei autem nihil ex nostro arbitrio optemus uel iubeamus adiungi. Nemo enim umquam tam profanae mentis fuit qui, cum sequi catholicos doctores debeat, quid sequendum sit doctoribus ipse constituat!

3. Et sane probabilis et iusta illatio precum est, quae omnem prope seriem haereticae superstitionis, quae contraria est fidei catholicae, ordinemque complexa est. Nam et unde exorta et quo prouecta auctore fuisset aperuit, quippe

**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,

2. Nevertheless, our mercy was appealed to by Faustinus and Marcellinus, priests most filled with the faith. Because of this, we are afraid that if no response be made by us to the petitioners, we would appear to give approval to those who have added something against our purpose to the divine law which we serve. And thus for that reason, we rule both that we honor the petition which has been presented, but that in our judgment, we wish - or order - that nothing be added to the faith.<sup>1</sup> For there was no one ever of so profane a mind who thought that, since he ought to follow catholic teachers, he himself should establish for the teachers what should be followed!

3. And the presentation<sup>2</sup> of the requests, which covers nearly the whole series of heretical superstition, which is contrary to the catholic faith, is certainly worth of praise and just. For the presentation made clear both whence heretical

cum persuasu quorundam totius saeculi antiquitate mutata acti pro fide in exilium innocentes uitam cum summa laude posuerunt.

4. Sed circa eos non est dilata ultio qui insidiati bonis moribus et caelestibus institutis paulisper ex contentione non fide sed factione multorum mentes detestanda insinuatione peruerterent. Nam usque adeo omnipotentis Dei mota patientia est, ut poenam, quae criminosis post fata debetur, in exemplo omnium ante fata sentirent.

5. Sed ne hoc quidem facto conuerti ad praeceptum Dei flectique potuerunt: catholicos occultis molitionibus urgent, insequuntur, oppugnant. Tanta perseuerantia erroris est ut cum aliis diuersae obseruantiae sectatoribus cottidie peccare malint quam cum catholicis recta sentire.

6. In quo petentium laudanda illatio est qui, communicantes Gregorio Hispaniensi et Heraclidae Orientali, sanctis sane et laudabilis episcopis, optant in fide catholica sine oppugnatione alicuius ac molestia uiuere nullisque appententum insidiis conuentionibusque pulsari, quippe quibus placeat susceptam semel fidem omni in aeuum religione seruare.

superstition had arisen and by what instigator it had been carried forward.<sup>3</sup> For indeed, since the antiquity of the entire world was changed by certain men's persuasiveness,<sup>4</sup> the innocent, driven into exile for the faith, set 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, due to a struggle not in faith but in faction. They perverted the minds of many by an insinuation that ought to be detested. For the patience of all-powerful God was moved to this point, so that they experienced the punishment, which is owed to criminals *after* their fates, *before* their fates, as an example for all.<sup>5</sup>

5. But not even once this was indeed 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 assault 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

7. Sit itaque inuiolatum quicquid esse meruit aeternum. Non conuentio aliquid, non appetitio, non fraus attemptet aliena. Vtantur quo in loco uoluerint proposito suo! Vtantur ad catholicam fidem amore diuino!

Cynegi, parens carissime atque amantissime,

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 qui se parili obseruantiae dederunt ab improborum hominum atque haereticorum tueatur et defendat iniuriis sciantque cuncti id sedere animis nostris ut cultores omnipotentis Dei non aliud nisi catholicos esse credamus.

faith, once it is received, in perpetuity, with all religious conscience.

7. Thus let whatever is worthy of being eternal be inviolable. Let not any assembly, let not any assault, let not any fraud of another 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>6</sup>

8. We venerate with full support the catholic faith, without which we cannot be saved, by our serenity's command. Let your loftiness order that command to be observed in such a way that it protects and defends Gregory and Heraclida, priests<sup>7</sup> 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.

1. Perhaps 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.
2. 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 of the *Lex* as well.
3. It is unclear if Arius or if Constantius is meant here.
4. *Christian* antiquity, of course.
5. Thus referencing numerous stories of contemporary punishments found in the *Libellus Precum*.
6. *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 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.
7. Note the ambiguity of the term *sacerdotes*, used here to refer to two bishops, but in section 2 used to refer to Faustinus and Marcellinus, who identify themselves as presbyters.