APPENDIX A

HISTORY IN OUTLINE OF SOME LESSER NATIONS OF ASIA MINOR

Our studies of Roman history have brought us into incidental contact with several nations of Asia Minor that from time to time have held friendly or hostile relations with the Romans. The two most important of these, the Parthians and the Sassanids, who successfully disputed the mastery of the Orient with the Romans, will be given fuller individual treatment in a later volume. But the lesser kingdoms of Pergamus, Bithynia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, each of which had a somewhat picturesque and interesting history when taken by itself, were hardly of sufficient importance from a world-historical standpoint to be given individual treatment in context. It will be of interest, however, and will aid the reader in gaining a clear idea of the opponents of Rome, and of the true relations of the Roman Empire to the eastern peoples, if a brief outline of the history of each of these nations is introduced. Such a chronological epitome of their history is given here.

THE KINGDOM OF PERGAMUS (283–133 B.C.)

283 Philetærus, governor of the Greek fortress of Pergamus, in Mysia, revolts and founds a small principality. Owing to the troubles incident to the Gallic invasion of Greece and Asia Minor, he is not disturbed.

263 His nephew, Eumenes I, succeeds. His power increases, and he defeats the Seleucids in a battle.

241 Attalus I succeeds. He achieves a decisive victory over the Gauls, and makes friends with Rome. Pergamus becomes a great art centre.

197 Eumenes II succeeds. Height of splendour of the kingdom, which now covers the greater part of western Asia Minor. Eumenes becomes the ally of Rome in her wars against the Persians and Syrians. Building of the temple of Zeus Soter to commemorate the great victory over the Gauls.

159 Attalus (II) Philadelphus, his brother, succeeds.

138 Attalus (III) Philometor, son of Eumenes II, succeeds.

133 Death of Attalus III, who bequeaths his kingdom to the Romans. They form it into the province of Asia.
THE KINGDOM OF BITHYNIA (278–74 B.C.)

278 Nicomedes I assumes title of king, and maintains himself on the throne in spite of civil discord and threatened invasion by Antiochus I. He allies himself with the Gauls, who have invaded Asia Minor.

250 His son, Zelas, succeeds after asserting his rights against his half-brother.

228 His son, Prusias I, succeeds.

220 Prusias at war with the Byzantines in conjunction with the Romans.

216 Prusias defeats a Gallic army invited into Asia by Attalus.

207 Prusias assists Philip of Macedon in war with Romans, and invades Pergamus.

198 Prusias at war with Eumenes II of Pergamus. Hannibal lends him assistance.

190 Prusias II succeeds his father.

166 War with Pergamus. Defeat of Attalus II.

149 Peace with Pergamus.

149 Prusias slain in a revolt in favour of his son Nicomedes II, who succeeds.

131 Nicomedes assists the Romans in their war against Aristonicus.

102 He unites with Mithridates VI of Pontus in the conquest of the vacant throne of Paphlagonia.

98 Nicomedes marries Laodice, widow of Ariarathes VI of Cappadocia, and attempts to seize the kingdom. Rome compels him to abandon it. The senate also deprives him of Paphlagonia.

91 Nicomedes III succeeds his father.

90 Mithridates VI of Pontus drives Nicomedes from his throne.

84 He is restored by Rome.

74 Death of Nicomedes. He bequeaths his kingdom to Rome and it becomes a province.

THE KINGDOM OF PONTUS (337 B.C.–63 A.D.)

The dynasty of Pontine kings is reckoned from Ariobarzanes I, about the beginning of the fourth century B.C. But both he and his son Mithridates I, and grandson, Ariobarzanes II, are Persian satraps, and it is not until 337 that Mithridates II, son of the last satrap, makes himself independent. His rule is not uninterrupted.

318 About this time, Antigonus I forms a plan to kill him, and flees to Paphlagonia, and afterwards supports Eumenes against Antigonus. He then recovers his throne and fixes himself firmly on it.

302 Mithridates III succeeds his father. He adds part of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia to his dominions. He allies himself with the Heracleans, and obtains help of the Gauls to overthrow a force sent against him by Ptolemy, king of Egypt.

266 Ariobarzanes III succeeds his father.

240 Mithridates IV succeeds his father. He repels the Gauls shortly after his accession.

220 Unsuccessful attempt to capture Sinope.

190 Pharnaces I succeeds his father.

183 Capture of Sinope. The frontiers of Pontus are extended to Bithynia.

161 Pharnaces Stacks Eumenes of Pergamus and Ariarathes of Cappadocia.

179 Pharnaces purchases peace, ceding all his possessions in Galatia and Paphlagonia, excepting Sinope.

156 Mithridates (V) Euergetes succeeds his father.

154 He assists Attalus II of Pergamus against Prusias II of Bithynia.

149–146 During the Third Punic War, Mithridates makes alliance with Rome, supplying ships and men.

131–129 Mithridates aids Rome against Aristonicus, for which he receives Phrygia.

120 Assassination of Mithridates at Sinope. Succeeded by his son Mithridates (VI) Eupator, the Great. The Romans take Phrygia from him. In the early years of his reign he subdues many warlike tribes, and incorporates the kingdom of Bosporus in his dominions. He attempts to gain control of Cappadocia, and drives Nicomedes III of Bithynia from his throne.

88 War breaks out with Rome on account of the Bithynian succession. Mithridates overruns Asia Minor, massacring Roman citizens.

84 Mithridates makes peace with Sulla.

83 Murena invades Pontus without reason and is defeated the following year.

74 War with Rome renewed.

72 Mithridates flees to Armenia, taking refuge with his son-in-law, Tigranes.

65 Total defeat of Mithridates by Pompey.
63 revolt of the troops. It is put down, but Mithridates orders a Gallic mercenary to kill him. His son, Pharnaces II, who has been in revolt, succeeds him. He submits to Pompey, who grants him the kingdom of the Bosporus.

4 Death of Pharnaces in putting down the rebellion of Asander, governor of Bosporus.

36 Antony puts Polemon I, son-in-law of Pharnaces, over a part of Pontus known as Pontus Polemoniacus. He is succeeded about 2 B.C. by his son Polemon II, whose mother is nominal ruler until 39 A.D., when Caligula invests Polemon with the kingdom.

63 Polemon abdicates the throne and Pontus becomes a Roman province.

THE KINGDOM OF CAPPADOCIA (c. 333 B.C. - 17 A.D.)

The Cappadocian dynasty dates back to the time of Alexander the Great, when Ariarathes I maintains himself on the throne after the fall of the Persian monarchy.

322 Ariarathes captured by Perdiccas and crucified.

315 Ariarathes II, his nephew, recovers Cappadocia at death of Eumenes. He is succeeded by his son, Ariamnes II, and he in turn by Ariarathes III (date unknown).

220 Ariarathes IV succeeds his father. He joins Antiochus the Great against the Romans, and afterwards assists Rome against Perseus of Macedon.

163 Mithridates, afterwards called Ariarathes V, succeeds his father.

168 Ariarathes deprived of his kingdom by Orophernes (Olophernes), a creature of Demetrius Soter, but is restored by the Romans.

154 Ariarathes assists Attalus II in his war against Prusias II.

130 Death of Ariarathes in war of the Romans against Aristonicus. His wife Laodice kills all her children except the youngest, in order that she may rule. The people put her to death and place her surviving child, Ariarathes VI, on the throne.

96 Ariarathes poisoned at instigation of Mithridates the Great of Pontus, whose daughter he has married. Nicomedes II of Bithynia seizes Cappadocia, but Mithridates soon expels him and places Ariarathes VII, son of Ariarathes VI, on the throne. This prince goes to war with and defeats Nicomedes.

93 He quarrels with Mithridates, who stabs him during an interview. The Cappadocians recall the late king's brother, Ariarathes VIII, from exile and make him king. Mithridates compels him to abandon his kingdom. The Romans now intervene and appoint Ariobarzanes I king. He is several times expelled by Mithridates and Tigranes of Armenia, but always recovers his throne.

63 Ariobarzanes resigns Cappadocia to his son Ariobarzanes II. He remains, like his father, the true ally of Rome and is

42 put to death for refusing to join Brutus and Cassius. (Some writers say this was an Ariobarzanes III, who succeeded Ariobarzanes II about 52.) Ariarathes IX, brother of Ariobarzanes II, succeeds.

36 Antony puts him to death, and appoints Archelaus king. Although an ally of Antony, Octavian leaves him in possession of the kingdom and even adds to it.

14 Tiberius summons Archelaus to Rome.

17 Death of Archelaus. Cappadocia becomes a Roman province.
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DURING the period between the reign of Diocletian and the fall of the Western Roman Empire, were laid the foundations of the history of the Middle Ages; and of these the most important was the recognition of the Christian church by the state and the privileged position thus accorded to it. This union of state and church involved an amalgamation of their intellectual forces, their rights and powers, and also to a certain extent of their system of government. There arose a type of culture and literature which was profane and Christian at one and the same time, a Roman-Christian system of law, and an established church. An alliance was made which would have passed for impossible down to the middle of the third century. Had Tertullian been told that a time was coming when the emperors would be Christians he would have stigmatised the prophecy as impious; had any man proclaimed to Decius that in his persecuting edict he was fighting against the future pillars of the state, he would have flouted the suggestion as absurd. Even as late as the third century the state and church seemed to be irreconcilable antagonists.

And yet Constantine's resolution to recognise the church and grant her privileges has a long and well-marked preliminary history — and that in the case of both parties, state and church alike. If we study this preliminary history, Constantine's act appears in the light of the close of a historic process of development which could not have ended otherwise than it did. Constantine's greatness is not impaired by this fact; he realised and accomplished the one thing needful, and no statesman can do more.

In the following pages we shall attempt to sketch this preliminary history of the alliance between state and church. More than a mere sketch, in which headings take the place of detailed statements, is out of the question, since detailed statements would involve voluminous treatment of the subject; but anyone familiar with the historical facts will be able easily to fill in the brief outline. Our principal task will be to show how the line of
development in the Christian church during the first three centuries tended
towards conformity with the state; and in conclusion we shall point out in
a few brief touches how the state on its part, as it developed, drew towards
the church.

I

The Christians of the first century felt themselves aliens in the world,
and consequently in the state likewise. They had put faith in a super
natural message which told them that they were citizens of a heavenly king-
dom, that this world would shortly come to an end, and the new kingdom,
the visible reign of God upon earth, begin. What further interest could
they take in things temporal or in the state? Yet the state was not a mere
matter of indifference to them. Since it protected idolaters and enforced
the worship of idols, it was obviously under the influence of demons; and,
being the strongest prop of polytheism, was manifestly the chief seat of the
devil. The whole world "lieth in wickedness," and the state no less. Be-
tween church and state, between Christ and Belial, there could be no fellow-
ship. Such, for example, is the spirit in which John wrote his Revelation.

But from the very beginning this simple and confident view was traversed
in the minds of many Christians by other views which seemed no less certain:
such as (1) this same state, with the emperor at its head, punishes evil-doers
and checks injustice in countless instances; (2) this same state not unfre-
quently protects Christians, the friends of God, against outbreaks of savage
hatred on the part of the godless people of the Jews; (3) by the destruction
of Jerusalem and of the temple this same state has accomplished the judg-
ment pronounced upon the Jewish nation by the prophets and Christ, and
wreaked vengeance upon it for Christ's death; (4) Jesus and his Apostles
did not permit men to revolt against the state, but rather commanded them
to obey it and to submit willingly to the punishment it imposed; nay, the
Apostles actually commanded that men should pray for the emperor and the
magistrates by him appointed.

The early Christians thus occupied an anomalous position towards the
state: they judged it to be the chief seat of demons on the one hand, and on
the other "the minister of God"; they abhorred it and prayed for it; they
besought God that "this world might pass away" and prayed for the con-
tinuance of the emperor's sovereignty. It was as though they had been
commanded to adopt different views alternately. They must also have
watched with varying feelings the extension of the empire over the "whole
world." When they saw, after the time of Augustus, how one ruler was rever-
enced upon earth and glorified as king and saviour, nay, as Lord and God,
when they were led away to death because they would not worship his image,
how could they fail to conclude that here the mystery of sin was revealed
and Satan sat upon the throne of God? And yet, on the other hand, was
not this rule of a single monarch on earth a type of the rule of God in heaven,
the blessed conjunction of all men in one body, the victory over the divisions
and animosities of the nation? 

And how about the culture of this same state, with its precepts, institu-
tions, and usages? At first sight it all seemed reprehensible, since it was
everywhere permeated with idolatry, and not least in philosophy and litera-
ture. "Be ye not seduced by philosophy" was the Christian watchword; nay,
men went a step further, saying that the Christian had no need of inquiry and learning; in his religion he possessed all things and held the
key to the riddles of the world. He was to shut up his reason in prison and
despise the lore of the heathen; he was to read the Holy Scriptures, but no worldly books. And yet, does not this same lore teach much that religion teaches? Was nothing but lies to be met with in Socrates, Plato, and the poets? Nay, more, is there not a natural knowledge of God, a natural grasp of truth, and has not every soul obtained a spark of the eternal light? Has it not received knowledge, freedom, and immortality from God? Or are these false doctrines? Yet if they be false, how is it possible to lead men to God? But if they are not lies, a man must read and learn what poets and philosophers have written, and study the inner life that he may learn to know the soul and see what God the creator has bestowed upon it.

Thus here again we have a hesitating "yes," side by side with an uncompromising "no." That which but now seemed to be the darkness that opposed itself against the light appears in another aspect as itself a dim degree of light—nay, as the early twilight before the rising sun. Nevertheless, during the first two or three generations the spirit of repudiation was in the ascendant. We can only see that hidden at the heart of things were the germs destined to bring about a change of opinion. A religion which claims to be not national but universal cannot permanently take up a wholly negative attitude towards the history of the human race, nor can it persist in recognising its own preliminary history only along the narrow line of the history of a few prophets or a single small nation. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, had taught that God had everywhere manifested his being and his will, and in moments of lofty inspiration and joy had proclaimed to the little flock of his brother converts, "All things are yours."

II

In the second century of the existence of Christian communities (circa 130–230) the development of a tendency towards reconciliation with the state and society is apparent in every direction. This I will proceed to demonstrate as regards (1) the constitution and organisation of the communities; (2) their life; (3) their doctrine; (4) their literature; (5) their form of worship; and (6) their estimate of the state.

(1) As was the year 140 most Christian communities possessed a system of government widely different from their original organisation. The question of how it came into being is one upon which we cannot enter here. It appears as a combination of monarchical and collegiate government. At the head of the community stood the bishop, with the college of presbyters—in some cases on an equal footing with him and in others his subordinates—at his side; the assistant and executive officers were the deacons. The duties and rights of these clergy extended to matters of discipline, financial administration, the care of souls and the relief of the poor, doctrine, and public worship. The officers were elected by the community, but nevertheless formed a superior class which, decade by decade, assumed more and more the guardianship of the "lay people." Thus, out of a communion in which the "Spirit" and brotherly love alone were to bear sway, there had arisen a legally constituted community with ordinances in many points analogous to those of municipal administration. The community acquired property and administered it; the officers, under the superintendence of the bishop, cared for the needy; and, together with the oversight of discipline, it exercised a certain amount of jurisdiction in family affairs.

But statutory organisation was not confined to the individual community; the various communities of one province joined in closer bonds and formed a
larger confederation. Provincial synods arose, corresponding to the diet of the provinces, met once or twice a year, and dealt with matters of common interest under the direction of a president (the metropolitan). But even this association did not suffice. From the very beginning Christians were conscious of belonging to one great and holy fellowship, to one universal brotherhood. Conceived of, in the first instance, as something ideal and supernatural, it had nevertheless been held with strong and lively convictions, and at this stage the attempt was made to realise it upon earth. The outward conditions were in its favour; Christian doctrine had assumed many forms. A large number of which appeared very questionable in the eyes of the bishops and the majority of the church, and they consequently desired to define their own position in contradistinction to these "pseudo-Christians." Hence after the end of the second century a great number of communities in the West and East joined to form a single confederation, and presently asserted that only those who belonged to this confederation, the one Holy Catholic church, were real Christians. At the beginning of the third century there was no longer only a heavenly church,—the children of God scattered throughout the world and waiting for the revelation of the kingdom of which they were citizens,—but a visible church extending from the Euphrates to Spain, resting upon fixed laws and ordinances, and thus constituting a political organisation within boundaries that coincided roughly with the frontiers of the Roman Empire.

By this development the church approximated to the state—as its rival in the first instance, it is true; but rivals may become friends. The decisive factor was that Christianity had assumed definite political form.

(2) The Christian life was to be "unsullied from the world." Most Christians of primitive times interpreted this to mean that they should have as little as possible to do with "the world." Nor was this a difficult matter, for the greater number of them were people in humble life whose conduct was subject to little outward control if only they performed the hard work required of them. Few of them were "in society"; and hence it was of no consequence what religion they professed or what manner of life they led.

By degrees, however, the situation changed, and the labours of missionaries drew men of all ranks into the church. As early as the reign of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, Christians were numerous in every class, even among officials and scholars and men of rank and wealth. The question of the attitude one should assume towards the world, which had hitherto been a difficult problem only in individual cases, now became pressing to the whole community. In addition to this the state police and the public (especially the mob) took far more heed of Christianity than before. Any man who made an open confession of Christianity exposed himself to great danger, nay to death itself. What was the church to do? Should she say to the faithful, "You must confess your faith under all circumstances, and avoid all contact, even the most superficial, with idolatry"? The consequences were obvious: the soldier would be bound to leave his colours, for they bore a heathen emblem; the magistrate to resign his office, for he could not protest against the worship of the emperor; the teacher to cease to teach, for he could not avoid mythological subjects; the tailor to abandon his handicraft, since he could not work on the roof of a temple; the goldsmith, the joiner, the merchant—they all ran the risk of abetting idolatry. The austere members of the communities did actually insist that every Christian ought to renounce his calling if it rendered him liable to the risk of the remotest contact with idolatry. Tertullian explicitly makes this denunciation.
in his pamphlet, De Idololatria, nor did he suffer himself to be confounded by the retort: "We shall die of starvation."—"Who is he that hath promised ye shall live?"

But the great majority of Christians, and first and foremost the bishops their leaders, decided otherwise. It was enough for a man to keep God in his heart and to confess him when open confession was required by magisterial authority—it was enough to refrain from actual idolatry; for the rest the Christian might abide in any honest calling, might come, in the pursuit of it, in contact with the externals of idolatry, and ought to conduct himself prudently and discreetly so as neither to defile himself nor call down persecution upon himself and others. The church everywhere adopted this attitude after the beginning of the third century; and the state thus became the richer by numbers of peaceable, law-abiding, and conscientious citizens, who, far from placing difficulties in its way, were pillars of order and peace in society. The fact that the Christians were remarkable for morality was acknowledged by Galen, the famous physician, as early as the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Thus, by abandoning her attitude of uncompromising repudiation of the "world," the church developed into a force that made for public order.

(3) There was nothing in Christian doctrine, considered on its merits, that either was dangerous to the state or was bound to be judged dangerous by it, except its exclusiveness. The utterances of Christians concerning Christ their "king" might, indeed, have a revolutionary sound; but the fact that they were harmless was soon patent to all observers. It was not what Christianity taught but what it precluded — tolerance of other religions and the worship of the emperors—that roused well-grounded objections. For the rest, Christian doctrine showed a double face, so to speak, to the Greeks and Romans. Its teaching concerning God, the world, the creation, divine providence, immortality, and the freedom, dignity, and responsibility of man, was both sublime and akin to the loftiest intuitions of the honoured philosophers of old; but mixed up with it was much that sounded to them like myth or fable, or seemed actually repulsive. Such, above all, was the history of Christ (his birth of a virgin, miracles, crucifixion, and ascension). Ordinary Christians laid stress upon the latter element, and hence their religion appeared "outlandish," absurd, and full of lies. After the time of Hadrian, however, there arose men who expounded and brought to light the philosophico-religious element in Christianity,—monotheism more particularly,—and endeavored to remove the offence excited by the history and worship of Christ by conceiving of him as the corporeal manifestation of the Logos, the existence and operation of which was recognized by many of the Greeks. At the same time they endeavored to force their opponents to accept the facts of his history by demonstrating them to be the fulfilment of prophecy; for that which has been prophesied is brought about by God himself, and human criticism must keep silent in face thereof.

During the course of the second century Christian doctrine did not abandon its peculiar character, but it assimilated more and more the ideas of Greek philosophy and so rendered itself more intelligible. At the beginning of the third century a great Greek philosopher testified of Origen, the most eminent teacher of the church, that concerning God and the world he thought like a Greek; the philosopher only deplored the intermixture of alien fables. When this same Origen is invited to lecture upon immortality before the queen-mother at Antioch, when another doctor of the church corresponds with an empress upon religious questions, and the emperor Alexander Severus listens with admiring attention to the words of Christ, we cannot but see how
"docetism" is becoming by degrees a connecting link between Hellenism and Christianity. Such a fact could not be devoid of consequences as regards the relations between state and church, for no state can permanently maintain a hostile attitude towards a spiritual movement which is held in high esteem by large bodies of its citizens.

(4) Nor must literature be ignored in this connection. Christianity was never altogether without literature, nay, rather, it possessed from the outset a literary work of the highest rank in the Old Testament, of which it had usurped possession. But its title to ownership was contested by the Jews and the heathen, and moreover early Christians produced the impression that they were unlettered folk. This made their claims appear singularly presumptuous and unjustifiable. But the beginning of the second century witnessed a change; the Christians, who at first would have nothing to do with the scribbling art—for why should one write if the end is at hand?—began to make use of this method.

Even in the first century brief writings, gospels, epistles, and apocalypses, had been drawn up for the edification of the congregation, but, being regarded as memorabilia to keep the truth in remembrance and in a measure as a gift of the Holy Ghost, they differed in plan and style from what was known as "literature." Now, however, works began to be composed in which Christianity was endowed with the garment of literature. Between the years 140 and 170 the smaller Christian party which is known as the Gnostic party all at once began to avail itself of every literary form, scientific monograph, commentary, systematic statement, scientific dialogue, didactic epistle, polemic, historical description, the novel, the tale, the ode, the hymn, etc. The great church, less apt and more cautious, gave place to this development slowly and hesitatingly. She was fully conscious of her responsibility; she was not blind to the lurking danger—the danger, that is, of the profession of religion; nevertheless she gradually admitted one literary form after another, until, at the beginning of the third century, she also had a Christian literature, with every means of expression that Greek art and learning had created at command. But the fact that she was thus equipped with literary forms could not but have some bearing on the relations between state and church, for no state can persist in regarding a movement which has taken literature into its service as a negligible quantity. Through the medium of literature it influences all political conditions, and in so far as the state itself is the exponent of culture, and not merely of law and authority, such a spiritual movement becomes a part of it by the mere fact of its literary existence.

(5) Though public worship is essentially esoteric and the private concern of any particular religion, yet we must here take its development into consideration. As long as Christian worship consisted only in homely prayers, rude psalmody, and preaching, and in the simple celebration of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, it differed so widely from other forms of worship that the adversaries of Christianity did not regard it as worship at all. A few Greeks, it is true, were impressed by this purely spiritual worship, but the great multitude despised it. They saw no images, and consequently concluded that the Christians were "atheists"; they saw no priests, and felt that their worship lacked legitimate authority, solemnity, and dignity; they saw no sacrifice, and consequently doubted its efficacy with the Deity. Many of them held that the Christians had other religious services which they carefully concealed from other men, and that there they exhibited the secret "Sacr.," held wild orgies, and feasted at horrible banquet. There were, as a matter of fact, a few small Christian communities which practised
evil rites in secret. But it is unlikely that these constituted the starting-point of the vile aspersions cast upon all Christians; they arose rather from the evil tendency, prevalent in all ages, to regard adherents of an alien faith as persons of evil life and to say the worst that can be said concerning both them and their assemblies. The populace takes every religion which differs from its own and which it does not understand for devil worship.

This view of Christian worship underwent no great change in the second century, but towards the end of that period the preliminary signs of change set in, and the development of Christian worship met the change halfway. Three great alterations were made in the services, and brought it nearer to the comprehension of the Graeco-Roman mind: (1) after circa 190 a separate class of priests arose (under that title) in the Christian church; (2) the Lord's Supper was elaborated into a solemn sacrificial rite; (3) the Lord's Supper and certain other acts of public worship were invested with the glamour of mysteries. By these developments, which are to be accounted for by the unconscious influence of the world around, Christian worship approximated to the ceremonials of the Greeks and Romans. The absence of image worship, it is true, still marked the distinction between them, but there was no lack of pictures of saints and symbols of holy things. Already there began to grow up about the sacramental elements, the water of baptism, the sign of the cross, etc., a superstitious second to none of the fancies of the heathen, and the sensuous element steadily encroached upon the spiritual. These changes were likewise bound to exercise a certain though indirect influence on the relations between state and church, the Christian religion adapted itself to conditions in which it could act upon the widest possible circle, and in the process modified the exclusiveness it had resolved to maintain.

(6) But perhaps the point best worth noticing is the way in which, in spite of persecution, the Christian estimate of the state grew more favourable in the course of the second century — not indeed in the whole body, by a long way but among the most influential teachers. It is true that the suspicion that the Roman Empire was the kingdom of antichrist never wholly died away, and that it still came to the surface occasionally; but a succession of admirable emperors—Trajan, Hadrian, Pius, and Marcus Aurelius—made a profound impression upon Christians, and the world-wide monarchy of which Augustus had laid the foundations bore the aspect of peace, and hence of a fulfilment of the divine will. Justin was convinced — as was even Tertullian — that the “good” emperors could not have been and were not unfriendly to Christians; both believed that none but the wicked were really the adversaries of the Christian religion, and that nothing but better information was required to make the emperors extend toleration to their faith. It is possible that even Luke had a dim sense of a certain solidarity between the empire and Christianity, between Augustus and Christ; the apologists of the age of the Antonines were more decided in their utterances, the most decided of all being Bishop Melito of Sardis. In the Apology for Christianity which he dedicates to Marcus Aurelius, he writes:

"This our philosophy did indeed first flourish among an alien people. But when it began to prosper in the provinces of thy empire under the rule of thy mighty predecessor Augustus it brought a rich blessing upon thy empire in singular wise. For from that time forth the Roman Empire hath ever increased in greatness and glory, whereof thou art and wilt be the desired ruler, even as thy son also, if thou wilt protect this philosophy which began under Augustus and hath grown with the growth of the empire, and which
thy forefathers likewise held in honour among other religions. And the strongest proof that our religion hath arisen together with the monarchy so happily begun and for the benefit of the same is supplied by the fact that since the reign of Augustus the latter hath been smitten by no calamity, but on the contrary, all things have but augmented the fame and glory thereof, according to the desires of all men. The only emperors who, led away by malicious men, strove to cry down our religion were Nero and Domitian, and from their time forward calumnious falsehoods concerning the Christians have been propagated abroad by the evil custom of the common people, who believe all rumours without examination."

We read these words with amazement, for they imply nothing less than an assertion that the empire and the Christian religion are fellow-institutions. God himself, so this bishop teaches, joined them together, for he has brought them into being at the same time as brethren, as it were; and to Christianity is due the greatness and glory of the monarchy. True, we must not forget that these are the words of an apologist, and of an Asiatic apologist to boot—and emperor worship flourished in Asia more than elsewhere; but the fact that he should have gone so far in his bold and flattering historical speculation is in the highest degree remarkable. "God," "Saviour," "Prince of Peace," were titles bestowed upon the emperor in Asia, and his appearance was there spoken of as an epiphany of the Deity. Hence Melito deduced the conclusion that a "pre-established harmony" existed between the emperor and Christ, to whom these same titles were applied. His "philosophy of history" was an augury of the future.

We have seen that down to the reign of the emperor Alexander Severus the church approximated to the state along every line of development; but in practical life the two were still remote from each other. The state firmly upheld the opinion that it was impossible, on principle, to extend toleration to the intolerant Christian religion—though many governors and some emperors tolerated it tacitly; while the church was still far from taking Melito's idea seriously.

III

In the seventy years that elapsed between the death of the emperor Alexander Severus and the rise of Constantine, the affairs of the church continued to develop in the same direction as they had taken during the preceding century. This I shall again proceed to prove from (1) its constitution, (2) life, (3) doctrine, (4) literature, (5) worship, and (6) its estimate of the state.

(1) The political organisation of the church attained its complete development, and the result was a structure so stable, homogeneous, and comprehensive that no other association within the empire could vie with it. While the framework of the state grew looser and looser, and the several parts began to exhibit symptoms of falling apart, the edifice of the church grew steadily firmer and stronger. The bishops, as successors of the Apostles, everywhere concentrated the power in their own hands and suppressed all other forms of authority; the church became an episcopal church. But the bishops were not only united among themselves by provincial synods, they kept up an active and intimate correspondence throughout the whole empire by means of letters and emissaries, and even at this time all matters of importance were settled by common consent. If we take the provincial synods as corresponding to the diets of the provinces, the organisation of the church had advanced a step beyond the latter. As early as the second
half of the third century synods were held at Rome to which bishops came from every part of Italy, and sixty years before the Council of Nicea a synod sat at Antioch to which bishops flocked from all the countries between the Halys and the Nile. Thus the episcopal confederation which ruled the Christian communities was a state within a state. The fact could not be hidden from the chiefs of the state. Under Maximinus Thrax the bishops had borne the brunt of persecution; Decius is reported to have said that he could sooner endure a rival emperor in Rome than a Christian bishop; and the persecutions of Gallus, Valerian, Diocletian, Galerius, and Maximinus Daza were directed in the first instance against the bishops. Gallienus and Aurelian addressed letters to the bishops, the former to those of Egypt, the latter to those of Syria, and thus made it plain that they were well aware of the authoritative position of the bishops in the churches.

More than this, Aurelian appreciated the value of the episcopate which had Rome for its centre as a conservative and patriotic element in the state; for when a quarrel was raging at Antioch as to the ecclesiastical party to which the church buildings, and consequently the church property, belonged of right, he ignored the theoretical disqualifications of the church before the law and decided that possession was due to that party which was “in epistolary correspondence with the bishops of Italy and the city of Rome.” That is to say, he was already using the church to reinforce the Roman spirit in the East. But what warrant had he to interfere? Thus much: the disputant parties in the church had themselves applied to him to decide their quarrel. Thus, forty years before the time of Constantine the church had appealed to the emperor to arbitrate in a question of canon law, and the emperor had practically acknowledged the existence of the church and its value as a pillar of imperial authority.

If, in addition to this, we consider that the church already possessed buildings, land, and property in every province of the empire; that the clergy, in the large towns, at least, were very numerous and represented a strictly organised scale of hierarchical degrees; that by their assistance the bishops directed and superintended all the affairs of the communities in even the most trivial details; that each community was likewise an effective organisation for the relief of the poor; and, finally, that in many provinces the country districts were overspread by a close network of provincial bishoprics and parishes, we shall no longer be surprised that even the emperor Alexander regarded the system of church government with envious eyes.

The civil and military system of the empire was falling into decay, the legions were permanent centres of revolution, the generals born pretenders; but the milites Christi were everywhere united in compact squadrons, and, though many internal dissensions might prevail amongst these troops, they confronted the state as a single army. The state had no other alternative than to try and destroy this army, as Decius, Valerian, Diocletian, and Maximinus Daza would fain have done, or to enter into alliance with it, as Constantine did. After the middle of the third century a policy of laissez-aller or weak toleration was an impossibility. The church seems also to have been numerically strong — though this is a point which has not been exhaustively examined as yet. As early as the year 251 the Roman bishop Cornelius wrote: “Besides the one bishop, there are at Rome forty-six priests, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, lectores, and ostinarii, and more than fifteen hundred widows and needy persons all of whom are maintained by the grace and goodness of the Lord.”
(2) During the last decades of the third century Christian life underwent a virtual amalgamation with that of the world. The Christian who desired to live a life apart from the world became a member of a distinct class, the ascetics, or withdrew into the desert; the rest — i.e., the vast majority, had come to terms with the world. There was no class, from senators to artisans, in which Christians were not to be found, and in each class they fulfilled the obligations of their station. They were, indeed, bound to eschew certain callings (e.g., municipal appointments, which were all too closely bound up with "idolatry," the theatrical profession, etc.), but the admonitions and penalties which were promulgated and denounced against the infringement of these prohibitions show that they were not always regarded. Certain facts, such as that, in the year 255, a Christian bishop in Spain was at the same time a member of a pagan society and had his children entered in the burying-ground of the said society; that a Syrian presbyter was director of the imperial purple-dye factory at Tyre; that a metropolitan bishop of Antioch was a ducenarius; that not a few of the clergy engaged in trade and travelled to the annual fairs — give us a clear insight into the amalgamation of Christian life with the life of the world. And it is very significant that Origen, in his pamphlet against Celsus, draws a comparison between Christian and municipal communities in order to commend the moral advantage of the former, and merely demands an admission of their superiority. That is, he insists on a difference of degree only, and refrains from contrasting the Christian communities with the municipal communities, like light with darkness.

Thus Christianity was no longer separated from the "world" in practical life, as every persecution made abundantly plain, for at last the number of apostates always exceeded that of confessors. The Christians only gathered strength as the persecutions proceeded. They were practically "exclusive" no longer, except in matters of religion in the strict sense of the word. Why should not the state tolerate them? The malicious aspersions on their moral character had died away into silence. Was it not madness on the part of the government to continue to persecute people, who were more conscientious and peaceable citizens than many others, and did not disturb the organisation and functions of public life? If they would not give up their exclusive faith, then the government must give them leave to hold it — a way out of the difficulty so simple that it would have been adopted long before the time of Constantine if the Christians, on their part, had not stipulated for certain conditions. Their God was not to be merely tolerated, he was to reign alone in the sphere of belief. With the world they had already come to terms.

(3) With regard to doctrine, the astounding labours of Origen brought the preparatory work of earlier Christian theologians to a kind of conclusion in the East; in the West, doctrine and learning never played more than a subordinate part. Origen worked the doctrines of Christianity up into a religious system which was able to vie with the systems of the neo-Platonists and give them battle upon equal terms. His schools at Alexandria and Cæsarea were attended by even pagan young men, and continued to flourish after his death; his pupils and their pupils occupied the episcopal sees of the most important cities. It was no longer possible to esteem Christianity a religion for mechanics, slaves, and old women. The Christian "mythology," which gave so much offence was not actually altered, but it was spiritualised by the application of the allegoric method. In this form the majority of philosophers and men of culture found endurable for they
were accustomed to employ the allegoric method in the interpretation of
their own religious traditions, and to transmute base images and repulsive
tales into sublime conceptions and the history of ideas. Even the solemn
confession of Jesus Christ was so expressed by philosophical bishops that it
sounded like a brief philosophical dissertation.

Strictly speaking, there were only three points on which Christian dogma
differed essentially from the neo-Platonic which was then in the ascendant;
the former taught the creation of the world in time, the incarnation of the
Logos, and the resurrection of the flesh; the latter rejected all these three
doctrines. Nevertheless the pupils of Origen conceived of these theological
propositions in such wise that the assertion was very like a denial, and they
made common cause with the neo-Platonists in their contest with the dual-
istic-pessimistic school of philosophy. Christian philosophy was in the mid-
current of the intellectual movement, and it was therefore a singular
andcrpism that the state could not as yet bring itself to place those who
professed it upon the same footing as other citizens.

(4) The literature produced and read by Christians was by this time
hardly to be distinguished from literature in general. It differed only
in name; the spirit was the same, if we leave out of consideration the texts
of Scripture which the Christians interwove in their books. The legends
of Apostles and Martyrs took the place of the old stories of gods and heroes,
and adopted from the latter whatever element of fiction they could make
serve their turn. The forms of epistolary and literary correspondence had
already won full acceptance among Christians; their dedications, plots, titles,
and headings were those of pagan literature. In this last connection we note particularly how ceremonious the "brethren" have become.
Finally, educated Christians were familiar with the whole body of profane
scholastic literature, lervied their culture from it and used it for example
and quotation. The shoot of Christian literature had been grafted on the
stock of Hellenism, and the sap of it streamed through the new branch.

(5) With regard to public worship we note the following changes during
the sixty years before the time of Constantine. In the first place the ritual
became more solemn and mysterious; the prayers more studied and rhetori-
cal; symbols and symbolic acts were multiplied: and secondly, there was an
increased tendency to meet halfway the polytheistic leanings which swayed
the Christian masses. This is indicated, on the one hand, by the constantly
increasing importance attached to "intercession" (angels, saints, and mar-
tyrs) both in public worship and in private life; and, on the other, by the
"naturalisation" and differentiation of religious rites after the manner of
pagan ceremonial. An observer watching a Christian religious service
about the year 300 would hardly have realised that these Christians were
monotheists, and in words proudly professed their monotheism and spiritual
worship. Except the bloody sacrifice, they had adopted almost every part
and form of pagan ritual ceremonial; and, in fact, the bloody sacrifice was not
lacking, for the death of Christ and the celebration of the Lord's Supper
were dealt with in materialistic fashion as bloody sacrifices. They were
fond of appealing to the Old Testament to warrant the innovations and in
virtue of this appeal nearly the whole pagan system of worship could be
dragged into the church.

Chapels were dedicated to angels, saints, and martyrs and decorated on
their festivals; a habit grew up of sleeping in churches or chapels in the
expectation of holy dreams or miraculous cures; holydays were multiplied
and differentiated more and more; superstitious ceremonies, usually asso-
ciated with the holy cross or consecrated bread, were woven into the tenor of ordinary life; nor were charms in the name of Jesus or of holy men, nor even amulets wanting; works and banquets for the dead were celebrated; the relics of saints were collected and adored, etc. What more was lacking to complete the analogy with heathen cults? Was not a sagacious Roman statesman bound to confess that this church, with the form of divine worship it had adopted, met every religious need? And how then could he fail to wish that the senseless state of war that prevailed between state and church should come to an end? A monotheistic form of doctrine, combined with a worship so diversified, so adapted to every need — no better device could possibly be invented.

(6) In considering the church’s estimate of the state there are two points of importance to be observed. In the first place we note that Christians now began to profess that those emperors who had not shown active hostility towards the church, or whose personal piety had borne a certain kindred likeness to that of Christians, had really been Christians in secret. Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria (about 260 A.D.) merely repeats an opinion widely received when he states that Alexander Severus and Philip the Arab were Christians; of Philip it was even reported that he had on one occasion done penance at the bidding of a bishop.

Such legends are eloquent; they disclose the daring wishes of the Christians and show that they no longer thought the empire and Christianity incompatible. This is likewise evident from the fact that this same Dionysius does not shrink from applying a Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament to the emperor Valerian. Gallienus had cancelled his father’s writ for the persecution of Christians, and Dionysius therefore applies to him the prophecy of Isaiah, and styles him, moreover, “our sanctified emperor, well-pleasing in God’s sight.” This is the very language which Christian bishops used of Constantine sixty years later. Secondly, it is a significant token of change that Origen, in his great work against Celsus, written towards the end of his life, in the reign of the emperor Philip, expressed the hope that by gradual advances Christianity would attain to victory in this world. This is the exact opposite of what primitive Christians had believed and hoped. Origen could not have put the anticipation into words, unless, in spite of all the differences which still subsisted between state and church, these two great powers had drawn considerably nearer to each other. At bottom the only question was that of the removal of “misunderstandings”; in actual fact, nothing blocked the way to the conclusion of peace except the church’s demand not for mere toleration but for exclusive recognition.

In the foregoing pages we have shown how the church, as it developed, drew nearer to the state; all that now remains to be done is to point out how, in the second century, and still more in the third, the state, on its part, drew nearer to the Christian religion and to the church. I will confine myself to few suggestive indications.

(1) During the imperial period the Roman state wielded no real influence upon the religious life of the citizens of its domains, except by means of the worship of the emperors; the other Roman cults were of local importance only, and were perpetually being thrust into the background by alien religions. Under these circumstances the state had made an attempt to develop emperor worship into the actual universal religion of the empire. Sagacious
statesmen and religious politicians were, however, constrained to own that this cult, the adoration of the secunda majestas, was not enough. The state accordingly had recourse to the expedient of officially recognising as many alien religions as it possibly could (indeed, it was in a manner forced to accord them recognition), in order that these alien religions might not constitute a barrier between it and its subjects. By this means there gradually arose a medley and diversity of religions in the empire which was bewildering and rendered a sound religious policy impossible.

A single, new, universal religion was the crying need of the hour. It seemed that this need might be met in various ways. Elagabalus, Alexander Severus, and Maximinus Daza were the emperors who tried to strike out a fresh line before the time of Constantine. Elagabalus wished to do this by exalting one Syrian divinity to the position of Supreme God of the empire and giving a subordinate place to all other cults; Alexander by endeavouring to discover the common element in all religious doctrines and forms of worship and uniting them in peaceful conjunction (as all, at bottom, meaning the same thing); Maximinus Daza by making regulations for the administrative union of all the religions and cults of a single province under one high priest appointed by the state, and for the control of these priests by the civil government. These were all attempts to create a new church, and an established church to boot, and must all be regarded as preliminaries to Constantine's achievement.

A certain bias towards monotheism was involved in the case of Elagabalus and Alexander; towards an oriental monotheism in the former. Diocletian, indeed, attempted once more to make the old Roman religious system serve the purpose; but as he had placed the political administration and government of the empire on an entirely new basis, and introduced a new oriental and despotic system after the dissolution of the ancient state, his reactionary religious policy was a grave error. It was foredoomed to utter failure—the new state could not possibly rest upon the scanty foundations of the old cults; and Constantine, who witnessed its collapse, drew from it the only correct inference. The new basis of the state must be a monotheistic religion—an oriental monotheism. So much the third century had taught.

(2) The Roman state approximated to Christianity and the church by a steady process of levelling up from within and by its transformation from a Roman state into a state of provinces. Caracalla bestowed the rights of Roman citizenship on the inhabitants of all the provinces; the influence of the old Roman aristocracy steadily declined, the state became really cosmopolitan. But the church was cosmopolitan likewise; indeed, Christianity was at bottom the only really universal religion. It was not bound up with Judaism, like the religion of the Old Testament; nor with Egypt, like Isis-worship; nor with Persia, like Mithras-worship; it had shaken itself free from all national elements. Hence every step by which the state lost something of its exclusively Roman character brought it nearer to the church.

(3) The legislation begun by Nerva and Trajan and continued by the Antoninos and the emperors of the first half of the third century under the guidance of great jurists marked an enormous advance in the sphere of law. The Stoic ideas of the "rights of man" and the leavening of law by morality were introduced into legislation and operated by countless wholesome ordinances. By this means the state met halfway the feeling which prevailed in the church as a matter of principle. By the beginning of the fourth century there were but few points in Roman civil law to which
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the church (which, it must be owned, had somewhat lowered its moral standard) could fairly take objection, and many, on the other hand, which it hailed with joyful assent. Thus the development of Roman law must be recognised as a preliminary step to the amalgamation of state and church.

(4) At first sight it seems as though after the middle of the third century the state had met the church in a far more hostile spirit and had therefore been far less capable of appreciating it than in the preceding epoch. But although it is true that the systematic persecution of the church first began under Decius, yet the conclusion that therefore the state cannot have appreciated the church does not hold good in fact. Rather, the persecutions of Decius and Valerian prove, as has been suggested before, that these emperors realised the danger the old political system implied in the existence of the church more clearly than their predecessors had done. They accordingly endeavoured to extirpate the church, as Diocletian's co-emperor did likewise. But these attempts must be regarded as desperate and (with the exception of the last named) short-lived experiments. During the early years of the reign of Valerian and from 260 to 302 the church enjoyed almost absolute peace within the empire; and, above all, the imperial government recognised the importance of the bishops and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. This is proved not only by the persecutory edicts, but, as has been said above, by peaceful acts. Gallienus and Aurelian wrote letters to the bishops, and the latter even tried by peaceful means to use their influence to strengthen Roman dominion; nay, Maximinus Daza actually attempted to copy the constitution of the church and to organise the pagan system of worship in similar fashion. Under the circumstances it was much simpler to ally the hierarchy of the church itself with the state than to make any such attempt. That the strength of the church lay in the hierarchy the despots had long recognised. Accordingly as soon as he had decided in favour of Christianity, Constantine joined hands with the bishops. He not only joined hands with them, but he honoured them and bestowed privileges upon them, for he was anxious to secure their power for the state. His success was immediate; the hierarchy put itself — unreservedly, we may say — at his disposal whenever he had set the cross upon his standard. Thus the state within the state was abolished; the strongest political force then existent, to wit, the church, was made the cornerstone of the state. Both parties, the emperor and the bishops, were equally well pleased; history seldom has a conclusion of peace like this to record, in which both contracting parties broke forth into rejoicings. And both were fully justified in their rejoicing, for a thing for which a way had been slowly made ready now had come to light; the empire gained a strong support and the church was delivered from an undignified position, in which she could not avail herself freely of the forces at her disposal. The church of the fourth century not only accomplished much more than the church of the period between 250 and 325, but she brought forth men of greater distinction and more commanding character.
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A. Classical and Later Latin Works


Ammianus Marcellinus, by birth a Syrian Greek, served many years in the imperial bodyguards. His history covered a period of 282 years, from the accession of Nerva, 96 a.d., to the death of Valens, 378 a.d. Of its thirty-one books the last eighteen have been preserved. These include the transactions of twenty-five years only, but they are valuable as a source because of the author's conscientious effort to be truthful and of his first-hand knowledge of the events he describes.


The foregoing annals of the German monasteries possess varying historical value. They have all been edited by Pertz, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hanover, 1819, in progress.


Augustan History is the title given to a series of biographies of the Roman emperors from Hadrian to Carinus, ostensibly written by the six authors above mentioned in the time of Diocletian and Constantine. The most recent research tends to show that the collection,
at least, in the form in which we have it, is a compilation of the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century and that the authors’ names formerly attached to it are entirely fictitious. The authenticity of the official documents contained in it is also questioned. It is, nevertheless, an important, for many facts almost the only, source of our knowledge of imperial Rome.


Cæsar, Caius Julius, Commentarii de bello Gallico; Commentarii de bello civili, Rome, 1416; edited by Jungerman, Frankfort, 1006; by C. E. Molony, with English notes, 1871–1872; 1877; 1882 (translated by Edmunds); Cæsar’s Commentaries, on the Gallic and Civil Wars, London, 1609 (translated by W. H. McDevitte and W. S. Bohn, London, 1857).

Julius Cæsar, who shares with Alexander and Napoleon the honours of an unapproachable military genius, was born on July 12th, B.C. 100, or according to Mommsen, in B.C. 112. His merits and demerits as a soldier and statesman have been fully dealt with in volume V. Here note need only be taken of his celebrated writings—the Commentaries—which relate the history of the first seven years of the Gallic War, and the progress of the Civil War up to the Alexandrine, and the main object of which was the justification of the author’s course in war and in politics. The opening words of De bello Gallico are often noted as a model of literary perspicuity, and throughout the whole work there is a rigorous exclusion of every expression for the use of which no standard authority could be found. Is it the utterance of a man who, knowing precisely what he means to say, says it with directness and lucidity. The Commentaries may indeed be regarded as a kind of high-class classical journalism, written down, as we have reason to assume, from day to day from the dictation of the chief actor in the events narrated.

Capitolinus, Julius, see Augustan History. — Cassiodorus, Senator Magnus Aurelius, Variarum (Epistolarum) Libri XII; Libri XII De Rebus Gestis Gothorum, Augsburg, 1533; Paris, 1584; Rouen, 1679, 2 vols.

Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus (about 480–575 A.D.), although a scion of a noble Roman family, spent the best part of his long life in the service of the Gothic kings, and filled the most important offices under Theodoric and his successors. In his later years, after retirement to a monastery, he was no less active as a writer and a protector of learning. His most important work, De Rebus Gestis Gothorum, is preserved only in the barbaric version of Jordanes. The Variarum, a collection of letters and official documents, forms the best source of information concerning the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy.

Chronicle of Moissiac (Chronicon Moissiacense), in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hanover, 1819–1904, in progress.

The Chronicle of Moissiac, which seems to have had its origin in Aquitaine, is of some value for the history of southern Gaul in the early part of the ninth century.

Chronicon Cuspinianum, Basel, 1592.

These annals, an outgrowth of the consular fasti and more recently known as Fasti in duas ordinem or Consularia Italica, are important for their accurate chronological data of the fourth and fifth centuries.


Claudian was the last Latin classic poet. He was a native of Alexandria, but came to Rome about the end of the fourth century. He enjoyed the patronage of Stilicho, who granted him wealth and honours, but probably shared his patron’s ruin in 408. Claudian wrote numerous panegyric poems, three historical epics, and many occasional verses. His epics are not without value as historical sources, as they follow the facts of history closely.


The Codex Carolinus, Letters from the Popes to the Frankish Kings, collected by the order of Charlemagne, is one of the most important of historical sources.

Codex Gothaur, edited by Waiz, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Langobardicearum et Italiaein, Hanover, 1819, in progress.

Composed probably about 510, and prefixed to a manuscript of Lombard laws now in the Ducal Library at Gotha.

A collection in the year 438, of the constitutions of the Roman emperors from Constantine the Great to Theodosius II. It formed the basis for the Code of Justinian, and is the great authority for the social and political history of the period. These decrees with their appendices were officially recognized in the eastern empire, but in the west they had force only in an abbreviated version. The original work was in sixteen books, arranged chronologically by subjects, but at least a third of the entire work exists only in the abbreviated form.


Dion Cassius Cocceianus, born 155 A.D. at Nicea, in Bithynia, was a grandson of Dion Chrysostus. He held many official positions under different Roman emperors from Commodus to Alexander Severus, but about 230 returned to Nicea where he passed the remainder of his life. His great work consists of 80 books, divided into decades. It originally covered the whole history of Rome from the landing of Xerxes in Italy down to 229 A.D., but unfortunately only a small portion of it has come down to us entire. We have books 36-54 complete, but of all the rest of the work only fragments and abridgments are extant. It was compiled with great diligence and judgment, and is one of the most important sources for the later republic and the first centuries of the empire. We have had occasion to quote the abridgment of Xiphilinus.

Dion Chrysostomos Cocceius, λόγοι περὶ βασιλείας, edited by D. Paravisinus, Milan, 1476; and by Reiske, Leipzig, 1784, 2 vols.

Dion Chrysostom one of the most eminent rhetoricians and sophists, was born at Prusa, in Bithynia, about 50 A.D. His first visit to Rome was cut short by an edict of Domitian expelling all philosophers. After extended travels through Thrace and Scythia, he returned to Rome in the reign of Trajan, who showed him marked favour. He died at Rome about 117 A.D. Almost all his books are still extant, all the production of his later years. They possess only the form of orations, being in reality essays on moral, political, and religious subjects. They are distinguished for their refined and elegant style, being modelled upon the best writers of classic Greece.


Eusebius was abbot of the monastery of St. Severinus in the sixth century. His work is valuable as a picture of life in the Roman provinces after the barbarian invasions.

Eusebius, Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, edited by Valesius, with Latin translation, Paris, 1659; edited by Dindorf, Leipzig, 1871; English translation by Hamner, 1584; by C. F. Cruse, New York, 1865; Χρονικοί, edited by A. Schone, Berlin, 1866; 1875.

Eusebius, who has been called the "Father of Church History," was born in Palestine about 260 A.D.; died at Cesarea in 340. He was made bishop of Cesarea in 313, and became one of the leaders of the Arians, and a conspicuous figure in the church in the time of Constantine. Both his Ecclesiastical History and his Chronicle are important sources.

Eutropius, Breviarium Historie Romanae, Rome, 1471; Basel, 1546-1562; edited by Grose, Leipzig, 1825; translated from the Latin by J. S. Watson, under the title of Abridgment of Roman History.

Flavius Eutropius, a Latin historian of the fourth century, was a secretary of Constantine the Great, and accompanied Julian in his Persian expedition. He wrote an abridgment of Roman history, in ten books, from the founding of the city to the accession of Valens, 364 A.D., by whose command it was composed, and to whom it is inscribed. Its merits are impartiality, brevity, and clearness, but it possesses little independent value.


The identity of this author is unsettled. The work is of scarcely any value as a source.

Frontinus, Sextus Julius, De Aquae ductibus Urbis Roma Libri II, edited by Bucheler, Leipsic, 1858.

Sexus Julius Frontinus was governor of Britain from 75–78 A.D. In 97 he was appointed curator aquarum. He died about 106. Frontinus was possessed of considerable engineering knowledge, and is the main authority upon the water system of ancient Rome.


Born about 170 (?) A.D., died about 240 A.D.; a Greek historian, resident in Italy. Author of a Roman history for the period 180–238 A.D. (Commodus to Gordian). Historical Miscellany, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hanover, 1819, in progress. A compilation in three parts; the first a version of Eutropius, ascribed to Paulus Diaconus, the second and third are credited to Landulf the Wise (eleventh century). It includes extracts from the annalists as well as from Jordanes and Orosius.


Isidore, bishop of Seville, was born 560 A.D. at Carthagena, or Seville; died at the latter city April 4, 636. He was a man of extensive scholarship and was zealously concerned for the maintenance and spread of the learning of classical times. To this end he compiled his Originae seu etymologiarum libri XX, a sort of encyclopedia of the sciences as known to his day. His historical works comprise a Chronicorum, or series of chronological tables, from the creation to the year 627; Historia Gothorum, Vandalarum et Suevorum.


Very little is known of the personal history of Jordanes except that he was a Goth, perhaps of Alanic descent, that he was a notary and afterwards became a monk. De Getarum origine actibusque. He is taken from the lost histori of Cassiodorus, is highly important for our knowledge of the Gothic kingdom in Italy. The other quoted cited above possessess barely any value.

Josephus, Flavius, Ἱστορία τῶν Ἰουδαίων τόλμων καὶ Ἰουδαίων ἱστορίας περὶ Ἰδούσων (History of the Jewish War) and Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἱστορία (Jewish Antiquities), Augsburg, 1470; Basel, 1544; edited by Hudson, Oxford, 1720; translated from the Greek by William Whiston, The Works of Josephus, London, 1737, 2 vols. A biographical notice upon this author will be found in vol. II, p. 232.


Myrcellinus, Comes, Chronikon, Paris, 1696. Myrcellinus was an officer of the court of Justinian in the sixth century. His chronicle covers the years 379–534 and deals chiefly with affairs of the Eastern Empire.

Monumentum Ancyranum. (This is the title of an inscription preserved at Ancyrn, of which the text has been published by Mommense, 2985; and Bergk, 1793. Look which see these authors in the third section of the bibliography, pages 691, 697.) The text also appears in the Delphic Classics, London, 1827.
WITH CRITICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Notitia dignitatum omnium, tam civilium quam militarium, in partibus orientis et occidentis, edited by E. Böcking, Bonn, 1839-1883.

This work is an official directory and army list of the Roman Empire, compiled about the end of the fifth century, and was preserved in a (now lost) Codex Sperensis.

Olympiodorus, Ἰστορίκοι λόγοι, abridgment edited by Ph. Labbe, in his Eclogae Historiorum de Rebus Byzantiniis, included in D. Hoeschilii Excerpta de Legationibus, Paris, 1645.

"Olympiodorus, a native of Thebes, in Egypt, lived in the fifth century. His history which is preserved only in the abridgment of Photius was in 22 books, and dealt with the Western Empire under Honorius from 407 to 425. It was a compilation of historical material, rather than a history. Olympiodorus wrote a continuation of Eunapius, one of the Byzantine historians.

Orogo Gentis Longobardorum, edited by F. Bluhme, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hanover, 1819, in progress.

The oldest document for the history of the Lombards, prefixed to the code of King Rothari.

Orosius, Paulus, Historiarum adversus Paganos Libri VII: Vienna, 1471; edited by Havelcamp, Leyden, 1738; English translation edited by D. Barrington and J. R. Foster, with the Anglo-Saxon, by Alfred the Great, London, 1773.

Paulus Orosius, born probably at Tarragona in Spain; lived in the first part of the fifth century, A.D. At the request of the Bishop of Hippo (St. Augustine) Orosius in early manhood compiled a history of the world, remembered partly because Alfred the Great translated it into Anglo-Saxon.

Panegyrici Veteres latine, edited by H. J. Arntzenius, Utrecht, 1790; edited by Bährs, Leipzig, 1874. A collection of eleven complimentary orations delivered at Rome, in praise of different emperors. While these orations are notable examples of rhetorical skill, they are naturally worthless for historical study, being coloured and distorted to suit the occasion. — Paterculus, Caius Velleius, Historiae Romanae, ad M. Vinicium Cos. Libri II, Basel, 1520; Leyden, 1789; (translated by J. S. Watson, London, 1861).

Caius Velleius Paterculus, born about 19 B.C.; died after 30 A.D., contemporary with Augustus and Tiberius. The work of Paterculus, apparently the only one he ever wrote, appears to have been written in 30 A.D. The beginning of the work is wanting, and there is also a portion lost after the eighth chapter of the first book. It commenced apparently with the destruction of Troy, and ended with the year 30 A.D.

Paulus Diaconus, Historia Langobardorum, edited by Lappenburg, in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hanover, 1819 in progress.

Paulus Diaconus, "Paul the Deacon," born about 720-725 A.D.; died at Monte Cassino, Italy, before 800 A.D. The first important historian of the Middle Ages. His chief works are a History of the Lombards, and a continuation of the Roman history of Eutropius.


Philostorgius was born in Borissus, Cappadocia, 358 A.D. His history of the church, from the heresy of Arius, 300 A.D., to the accession of Valentinian III, 425 A.D., exists only in an abstract by Photius. He possessed considerable learning but was strongly prejudiced in favour of the Latins and Eunomians, and unsparing in abuse of their opponents.

Plinius (Minor), C. Caecilius Secundus, Epistolae, Venice, 1485; Amsterdam, 1734; edited by W. Keil, Leipzig, 1853; 1873; English translation by W. Melmoth, The Letters of Pliny the Younger, 1746; 1878.

Pliny "The Younger" (Caius Plinius Caecilis Secundus), Born at Como, Italy, 62 A.D.; died 113. Nephew of the elder Pliny. He was a consul in 100, and later (111 or 112) governor of Bithynia and Pontica. He was a friend of Trajan and Tacitus. His Epistles and a eulogy of Trajan have been preserved. The most celebrated of his letters is one to Trajan concerning the treatment of the Christians in his province.


Possidius or Possidienus was bishop of Calama, in Africa. He gives an account of the siege of Hippo by the Vandals in 430.
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Prosper Aquitanicus, Chrouçon, edited by LeBrun and Mangeant, Paris, 17 bl.
Prosper Aquitanicus, born in Aquitania, probably in the last decade of the fourth century, Died at Rome, date unknown. His Chronicle is in two parts; the first, to the year 378, is an extract from Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine; the second, to 455, is original.

Salvianus an accomplished ecclesiastical writer of the fifth century, was born near Trèves, and passed the most of his life at Marseilles. His writings are mainly theological, but are valuable for their portraiture of the life and morals of the period.

Sidonius was born at Lyons about 431 a.D. He became the son-in-law of the emperor Avitus, and afterwards a favourite of Anthenius, who raised him to senatoral rank, made him prefect of Rome, and placed his statue in the library of Trajan. In 472, though not a priest, he was made bishop of Clermont in Auvergne. His writings afford considerable historical information.

Solinus (Grammaticus), C. Julius Polyhistor, Venice, 1473; Salmiasi, Utrecht, 1689; English translation. The excellent and pleasant works of Julius Solinus Polyhistor, containing the noble actions of humane creatures, the Secretes and Providence of Nature, the description of Countries, the manners of the People etc. etc. (translated out of Latin by Arthur Golding, Gent.), London, 1587. (The work consists mainly of selections from the Natural History of Pliny, the additions of the author being practically worthless.)

The history of Sozomenos extends from 323 to 439.

Spartianus, Ælius, see Augustan History.—Suetonius, Caius Tranquillus, Vitæ duodecim Caesarum, Rome, 1470; English translation by Philemon Holl. nd, London, 1606; English translation by A. Thompson, The Lives of the Twelve Caesars, London, 1796; 1855.
Nothing is known of Suidas’ life, but he probably lived in the tenth or eleventh century. His Lexicon is a sort of encyclopaedia of biography, literature, geography, etc. Under the head of “Adam,” he gives a chronology which extends to the tenth century.

Q. Aurelius Symmachus was a distinguished scholar and orator of the fourth century, and a strong adherent of the ancient paganus religion of Rome. His letters furnish much minute detail of the life of the period.

C. Cornelius Tacitus was born about 61 A.D., died probably after 117 a.d. Nothing is known of Tacitus’ ancestry. He tells us in the first chapter of his history that “his advancement was begun by Vespasian, forwarded by Titus, and carried to a far greater height by Domitian.” His first employment is said to have been as procurator in Gaul. Upon his return to Rome, Titus advanced him to a questorship, and we have Tacitus’ own testimony that he was made pretor by Domitian. He became consul under Nerva. Little further is known of his life, except his marriage to Julia, daughter of Agricola, whose life he wrote. We learn from the Epistles of Pliny the Younger, the great respect and veneration paid to Tacitus by his contemporaries, and above all by Pliny himself.

Thietmar of Merseburg, Chronicon, edited by Lappenberg, in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, vol. III, Hanover, T319 in progress; German translation by Laurent, 1840.
Thietmar of Merseburg was born July 25th, 978, died December 1, 1018. Became bishop of Merseburg in 1009. The last four books of his chronicle comprising the reign of Henry II (1002–1018) are especially important.

Trebellius Pollic, see Augustan History.

WITH CRITICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Fragment (Anonymous Valesii). This title is derived from Henricus Valesius (Henri de Valois, 1605-1767) who was the first to publish the fragmentary writings which bear this name. They generally form an appendix to editions of Ammianus Marcellinus and have for subject the history of Constantine the Great and that of Italy between the years 371 and 526. — Valesius (Valois, Adrien de), Gesta Francorum, seu de rebus Franciis, I ari 1646-1654, 3 vols.

Valesius' history begins with the year 254 and ends with 572. It is written with care and in elegant Latin, but is more of a commentary upon ancient writers than a history.

Victor, Sextus Aurelius, De Casaribus, Amsterdam, 1733; edited by Schröter, Leipzig, 1831.

Sextus Aurelius Victor, a Latin writer of the fourth century, who rose to distinction by his literary ability. He was made governor of Pannonia by Julian, prefect of Constantinople by Theodosius, and is perhaps the Sextus Aurelius Victor who was consul in 373.


Walsafred Strabus, De exordii et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum, in Hittorp's Scriptores de officiis divinis, Cologne, 1568.

Walfred Strabus was of German birth, and in 812 A.D. became abbot of Reichenau. He died July 17, 849. A very prolific writer on both ecclesiastical and historical subjects.


B. The Byzantine or Later Greek Histories

Agathias, Ἀγαθιας, Ιστορια Ε, edited by B. Vulcapius, Leyden, 1594.

Agathias, of Myrina, in Ιστορια, was born about 536 A.D., and died about 580 A.D. He was an epigrammatist, edited a poetical anthology, and extended and repeated the history of Procopius for the years 553 to 558, a brief but remarkable period, comprising the exploits of Narses and Belisarius, the beginning of the wars with the Franks and with the Persians, the rebuilding of St. Sophia, the earthquakes of 554 and 557, and the great plague of 558, all related in a pleasant, diffuse, and impartial manner, but without much display of general knowledge. It is the work of a man practically acquainted with the affairs of his age, presented with poetical reminiscences, but never going below the surface. This work was continued by Menander Protector.

Acropolita, Georgius, Χρονικων, edited by Theodorus Douza, with a Latin translation, Le den, 1614; edited by Leo Allatius, Paris, 1651 (included in the Venice reprint, 1729).

Georgius Acropolita was born at Constantinople in 1250. He studied at Nicea under distinguished scholars, and was employed as a diplomat under the emperor, John Vatatzes Douca. His history begins with the taking of Constantinople in 1204, to its delivery in 1261, the sequence of events being afterwards taken up by Pachymeres. Acropolita appears to have prepared his history for educational purposes.

Anagnostes, Joannes, Διηγησις περι της τελευταίας ἁλώσεως της Θεσσαλονίκης συντεθείσα πρὸς τοὺς ἀξιολόγων πολλάκις αἰτήματα περὶ ταύτης, εν ἑπτάμῳ, edited by Leo Allatius, in his Συμμετεχόντα, a Latin translation, Rome, 1653.

Anagnostes, of whose life little is known, was present at the siege of his native city, Thessalonica, in 1430 A.D., and wrote an account of its conquest by Murad II.

Anonymous,

'H βασιλεία τῶν πόλεων πός Ἰταλοίς ἑλών
Καὶ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις ἵπτερον πός ἀπέθανεν πάλιν, Ἰγράφῃ κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, εἰ ὦν δὲ βούλη, μάθων.'

The poem, in 749 "political" verses, generally designated by quoting the first three lines, as above, gives an account of the fall and recapture of Constantinople and other events up to the year 1282, the author stating in the course of the poem that it was composed in 1392. The facts as recorded are based upon Nicetas Acominatus and Georgius Acropolita, and are related in a picturesque manner. The work has been published by Bekker, in the Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy, 1841, and by J. A. Buchon, in his Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée, Paris, 1845.

Attalidai, Michael, Ιστορια ἐκτεθείσα παρὰ Μιχαήλ αὐξεσμωτάτων κριτῶν ἕπο μετὰ τοῦ ἱστορομαν καιρών ἔλθην τοῦ Ἀτταλιάτου, translated into Latin by M. Freileri, Frankfurt, 1596.

Michael Attalidai, a native of Attalia, served as a judge and proconsul under the emperor, Mic.-ael Ducas, by whose command he prepared a legal digest. His history treats of
the period 1034–1079, a time notable for the fall of the Macedonian dynasty and the rise of the family of Comnenus and Ducas, palace revolutions and feminine intrigues playing a large part in these events.


Bryennius, born at Orestias in Macedonia, in the middle of the eleventh century, was the husband of Anna Comnena, daughter of the emperor Alexis. Distinguished for his physical and mental gifts, Bryennius took an active part against the Crusaders. The design of his history was to deal with the reigns of the emperors from Isaac Comnenus, and so far as it extends,—to Michael VII Ducas,—it affords a lucid narrative, written with all the judgment and directness of a leader and eye-witness of the times. His work was continued by his wife.


Camennata, Johnes, Ἰωάννου κεραυκοῦ καὶ κοινουκλείσου τοῦ Καμενατοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀλαλον τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης (De excidio Thessalonicensi), edited by Leo Allatius, with a Latin translation, in his Συμμετοχή, Rome, 1653.

Johnes Camennata, a cross-bearer to the bishop of Thessalonica, witnessed the taking of that city by the Arabs on July 31st, 904. Camennata was himself carried away to Tarsus, and while held there as a prisoner for exchange, he wrote an account of the fall of Thessalonica, a narrative at once lively and valuable.

Candidus Isaurus, Ιστορία, fragments as preserved by Photius and Suidas, edited by Labbé in his Eclogae Historiorum de Rebus Byzantinis, in D. Hoeschelius’ Excerpta de Legationibus, Paris, 1648.

Candidus Isaurus, whose Byzantine history exists now only in fragments, was a native of Isauria, and lived in the reign of the emperor Anastasius (491–518). His history appears to have related to the period 407–491.


Cecaumenus was a Byzantine aristocrat of the eleventh century, who late in life devoted himself to writing a treatise, presumably in imitation of Leo Diaconus, dealing with military tactics, morals, household economy, and an ethnological and historical account of the Byzantine Empire from the times of Basilios II to Romanus Diogenes.

Cedrenus, Georgius, Σύνοψις ιστοριών (Compendium Historiarum ab Orbe Condita ad Isiacum Comnenum), edited by G. Xylander, Basel, 1566.

Georgius Cedrenus, a Greek monk, lived in the eleventh century, and compiled, largely from the synopsis of Johnes Scylitzes, an historical work which extends from the creation of the world to the year 1057 A.D. He was very deficient in historical knowledge and his work should be used with great caution.


Chaiconylles was a native of Athens, but little is known of his life except that during the siege of Constantinople, in 1446, he was sent by the emperor, John VII, as an ambassador to the Sultan. The ten books of his history deal with the Turks and the later period of the Byzantine Empire, from 1298 to the conquest of Corinth in 1463. The author has chosen a difficult period to describe, when Byzantine affairs were being merged in those of the Turks, Franks, Slavs, and of the Greek despots, and Constantine no longer formed the chief centre about which events grouped themselves. The book is one of the most important sources for the history of the time. The style is interesting, but the matter is not well arranged. Extraneous observations are frequently introduced, and the author’s knowledge of European geography is amusingly deficient. England, according to his account, consists of three islands united under one government, with a flourishing metropolis, Δωρόνη; her inhabitants being courageous, and her bowmen the finest in the world. Their manners and habits, he says, were exactly like the French, and their speech had no affinity to any other language.

Cinannus, Johnes, Επτωμα τῶν κατοικημάτων τῷ μακαρ ἐτῆ βασιλεύ καὶ πορφυρογεννήτου κόρας Ἰωάννη τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀδύνατος τῶν προδότων τῷ ἄσω μισθῷ αὐτῷ τῷ βασιλεύ καὶ πορφυρογεννήσφρυρῳ Μακρινῷ τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ κοινήδων. Ἰωάννη βασιλείος γραμματεὺς τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ, edited by Cornelius Tollius, with a Latin translation, Utrecht, 1652.

Johnes Cinannus lived in the twelfth century. He was engaged as an imperial notary under Manuel Comnenus, who reigned from 1143 to 1180, and accompanied him on his many
military expeditions in Europe and Asia, the office of notary being equivalent to that of a modern secretary of state. His history of the reign of Manuel and of his father, Colono-Joannes, is one of the best of the Byzantine histories.

Commnen, Anna, Alexac, Augsburg, 1610. Anna Commnena, daughter of Alexis I Comnenus, was born 1083 A.D. Gifted by nature with rare talent, she was instructed in every branch of science. After the accession of John, 1118, she was exiled for conspiring to place her husband upon the throne. During her retirement she composed the biography of her father. The Alexius is history in the form of artist's romance. The truth is embezzled to suit the purpose of the author, whose aim was to glorify the father and his daughter; but with all its defects, it is still the most interesting and one of the most valuable products of Byzantine literature. Her work is practically a continuation of that of her husband, Nicephorus Bryennius, already mentioned.

Comnena and Proclus. Ιστορία Προκλείου καὶ ἀλλων διαφόρων Δεσποτῶν τῶν Ισακίνων ἀπὸ τῆς διάλεκτος αὐτῶν παρά τῶν Σιέσιων ἐκ τῆς παραδόσεως εἰς τῶν Τούρκων, edited by Andreas Mustoxides, in his Ελληνικομέμβρα (Corfu), 1814-1817; edited by G. Destunis, with a Russian translation, St. Petersburg, 1858.

This is a fragment of an alleged history of Epirus.

Constantinus VII, Flavius Porphyrogenitus, Ιστορική διήγησις τοῦ βίου και τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Βασιλείου τοῦ ἀδόξου βασιλέως (Vita Basili), edited by Leo Allatius, in his Σύμμικτα, with a Latin translation, Cologne, 1653.

Constantinus VII, Flavius Porphyrogenitus, only son of the emperor Leo (VI) Philosophus, was born in 905. He reigned nominally from 911 to 959, but from 912 to 944 the Eastern Empire was usurped by Lecapenus. In his enforced retirement he devoted himself to scholarship, and became an assiduous writer, compiler, and patron of learning. Besides the Life of Basilius, he wrote works dealing with imperial and provincial government, military and naval warfare, and court ceremonial. His surname, Porphyrogenitus ("born in the purple"), was acquired from παύθος, the name of an apartment in the imperial palace in which he was born, and hence the origin of the expression as applied to royalty.

Corippus, Flavius Cresconius, Corippi Africani fragmentum carminis in laudem imperatoris Justini Minoris; Carnem paneviricum in laudem Anastasiæ questoris et magistri; de laudibus Justini Augusti Minoris heroico carmine libri IV, edited by Michael Ruiz (Madrid, 1579); Antwerp, 1581; Johannes, Milan, 1820.

Flavius Cresconius Corippus, the Latin poet, left two poems which are useful in tracing the history of his times; one, Johannes, reciting the history of the war of Johannes Patricius against the Moors; the other, De Laudibus Justini, an extravagant panegyric of the younger Justin (565-578 A.D.). A remarkable fact about this work is that the identity of its author with that of the Johannes was not established until more than two centuries after its publication, for Ruiz merely asserted that he copied the book from an ancient manuscript, of which he gave no description. Corippus, however, having mentioned in his preface that he had previously composed a poem on the African wars, researches brought the missing Johnanis to light in the Royal Library at Buda in 1814, the work having been wrongly catalogued. Of the life of Corippus we know but little, except that he was born in Africa in 530 A.D. and died in 585. His works are found in best form in the Bonn "Corpus."

Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae, Bonn, 1828-1878, 49 vols.

This great work was commenced on the recommendation and under the superintendence of Niebuhr, and after his death continued by the Royal Prussian Academy. The separate volumes have been edited by Bekker, Hase, Dindorf, and other distinguished scholars.


Critoibus of Imbrs, in about the year 1470, wrote a history of the sultan Mohammed II, covering the period 1357-1467. Diffuse in style, and feebly imitating the manner of Greek classic writers, the only value of Critoibus is that he represents the Greek mind at the period when it became reconciled to the rule of the Turkish conquerors.

Dexipps, P. Herennius, fragments preserved in the Bonn "Corpus."

Dexepps wrote three historical works, only fragments of which are extant. He was a native of Attica, and distinguished himself in the Gothic invasion of Greece, 262 A.D. His history was continued by Eunapius.

Ducvs, Michael, Historia Byzantina, in the Paris, Venice, and Bonn corpora. Michael Ducvs, the historian, lived during the latter part of the fifteenth century. His history embraces the period from 1391 A.D. to the capture of Lesbos in 1462, and is valuable for judicious, prudent, and impartial statement of facts. He wrote however, in most barbarous Greek, using quite a number of foreign phrases, and being seemingly unacquainted with the Greek classics.
Eastert Chronicle, Ἠπιτομή χρόνων τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀνθρώπου ἕως κ' ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου τοῦ εὐφεβήτου καὶ μετὰ υπαίτειν ἔτους θ' καὶ ἐτῶν τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ αὐτοῦ νόον ἱδρυτικών γ' (Chronicon Paschale), edited by M. Rader, Munich, 1619.

This is a comprehensive chronological table extending originally from the Creation to 629 A.D. It gets its name from the computation of the Easter canon upon which Christian chronology is based. After Eusebius and Syncellus it is the most important and influential production of Greco-Christian chronography. The compiler of the chronicle, which is largely put together out of earlier works, was a contemporary of the emperor Heraclius (610–641). The text, as it has been preserved, breaks off at 627 A.D.

Ephraem of Constantinople, Ἐφραίμιος χρονικὸν Καίσαρες, edited by Angelo Mai, his Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Rome, 1828.

Ephraem wrote a chronicle in iambic verse, giving Roman-Byzantine history from Julius Cesar to the re-conquest of Constantinople in 1261.

Eunapius, Μετὰ Δέκατου χρονικῆς ἱστορίας, edited by D. Hoeschel, Augsburg, 1603; by A. Mai, in his Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Rome, 1828.

Eunapius was born at Sardis in 347 A.D. He wrote a continuation of Dexippus, but most of the work is lost. Eunapius exhibits pagan sympathies, admires Julian, and gives a deal of information on the manners and customs of his age, the period covered being 270–404.

Eustathius of Epiphaneia, Χρονικὴ ἐπιτομή, fragments preserved in the Bevan “Corpus.” Eustathius lived in the reign of Anastasius (491–521). His history of the world, to 502 A.D., is known only through the portions preserved by Evagrius.

Genesius, Josephus, Βασιλείων Βιβλία Δ. Genesius lived in the middle of the tenth century, and wrote his Greek history by the order of the emperor Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, whose literary activities have just been mentioned. His work comprises the histories of Leo V, 813–820, Michael II, 820–829, Theophilus, 829–812, Michael III, 842–867, and Basilus I Macedon, 867–886. The work was first printed in the Venice “corpus.”


Georgios Monachus (George the Monk), probably lived in the tenth century, and compiled a chronicle which comprehends the period from 813 to 948 A.D., being a continuation of Theophanes Isaurus.

Georgios Syncellus, Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας συνταγμένα ὑπὸ Γεωργίου Μοναχοῦ Συγκελλοῦ γεγονότος Ταρσαίον Πατραίριχον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Διοκλητιανοῦ, first printed in the Bonn “Corpus.”

George Syncellus, Albas or Monachus, lived in the eighth and ninth centuries, and gained his epithet as being the personal attendant or syncellus of the patriarch Tarsarius, who died in 806. His chronicle extends from Adam to Diocletian, but was intended to proceed to 800 A.D., Theophanes of Isaurus actually continuing it to 811. The chronicle of Syncellus, together with Eusebius, the most important work for a knowledge of Christian chronography.

Glycas, Michael, Βίβλος χρονικὸς (Annales), edited by J. Meurinus, Theodori Metochita, Historiae Romanae, etc., Leyden, 1618; Latin translation by Leucalvius, Basel, 1572.

Michael Glycas was born either at Constantinople or in Sicily, but nothing is certain about his personality or period. His Annales, from the Creation, go down to the year 1118, so that he must have lived after that date. He writes clearly and concisely, and displays a knowledge of foreign languages. Meurinus, in his edition, erroneously ascribed the book to Theodorus Metochita.


Gregoras (1293–1359) led a life of literary activity which covered nearly all fields of Byzantine learning. His history is a continuation of the work of Pachymeres, and commences with the capture of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204 and goes down to 1359.


Hesychius, called the Illustrious, was born at Mileτus, and lived in the times of the emperors Anastasius I, Justin I, and Justinian II. Accounts of his personality are vague, but he is known to be the author of the following works: Ιστορία Ρωμαϊκῆς τε καὶ ταυτοπηγῆς, or Χρονική ἱστορία, a synopsis of world history, from the time of Belus, the alleged founder of the Assyrian Empire (1402 B.C.), to the death of Anastasius I in 518; Ὄνοματολόγιον τῶν ἐν πατρίδι ὀνομαστῶν, which comprises biographies of Hellenic writers, but of
which only fragments were preserved; Ηπαίρα Κωνσταντινούπολεως, a book on the primitive history of the city of Byzantium which originally formed part of his history.


Joannes Angelus Communalis Palaiologus Cantacuzenus, emperor of Constantinople from 1342 to 1355, is also sometimes styled Joannes VI, being confused with his ward and rival of the same name, who, nominally succeeding in 1342, did not actually rule until 1355. Cantacuzenus' history covers the period from 1320 to 1357, including his own reign. Its style is easy, dignified, and discriminating, but often vain and hypocritical when relating to his own life or friends. It should be compared with the work of Nicephorus Gregoras, who writes of the same period. Cantacuzenus also wrote a confutation of Mohammedanism.

Joannes of Antioch, Ιστορία χρονική ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ (Historia Chronographica ab A mano), edited by Valesius in his Excerpta, Paris, 1634.

Joannes of Antioch wrote a chronicle at a period conjectured to be about 620 A.D. Nothing is known of his personal life, but Gelzer is inclined to identify him with the patriarch John of Antioch (631-640). His history, commencing with Adam, must have been written after the death of Phocas in 610, for he describes that ruler as "bloodthirsty," i.e. της χειρος αἷμαν ἀιματος.


Joannes of Epiphaneia flourished at the end of the sixth century, and his history deals with the Byzantine affairs from Justinian to Maurice. The manuscript of his work dates from the thirteenth century, and is in the Vatican.

Joannes Laurentius. Περί μνημον συγγραφή (De Mensis Libri), edited by Nicolaus Schow, Leipzig, 1794.

Joannes Laurentius, of Philadelphia, was a Byzantine poet of the sixth century, but his poems have not survived. His historical commentary on the Roman calendar, named above, is compiled from numerous sources, mostly otherwise unknown. He also wrote Περί ἀρχῶν τῆς ρωμαίων πολέμων (De Magistratibus Reipublicae Romane), in which he gives an unfavourable picture of the emperor Zeno.


Joannes Siculus is supposed to have written a compendium of history from the Creation to Michael III. 866 a.d., or perhaps 1294. Much of the work is lost, the extant portion being a synecdoche of the most important events of history, as known to him, laying stress on Byzantine affairs. The scope of the work is from Adam to 1294 A.D.

John of Ephesus, Ιστορία ἑκκλησιαστική. The third Book of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus, edited by William Cureton, Oxford, 1853 (other fragments have been edited by J. P. N. Land, the Dutch historian, in his Anecdota Syriaca, Leyden, 1856, 4 vols.).

John, bishop of Asia, or Ephesus, was born at Amid about 505. He led the Monophysite party and enjoyed the favour of Justinian. The third book of his history commences with the persecution under Justin in 571. He tells us that, "Most of these histories were written at the very time when the persecution was going on, and under the difficulties caused by its pressure; and it was even necessary that friends should remove the leaves on which these chapters were inscribed, and every other particle of writing, and conceal them in various places, where they sometimes remained for two or three years. When therefore matters occurred which the writer wished to record, it was possible that he might have partly spoken of them before, but he had no papers or notes by which to read and know whether they had been described or not. If therefore he did not remember that he had recorded them, at some subsequent time he probably again proceeded to their detail; and the few accidentally the same subject is recorded in more chapters than one; nor afterwards did he ever find a fitting time for plainly and clearly arranging them in an orderly narrative." This extract explains the cause of the confused condition of the History. John died in about his eightieth year. The first book of his history has been lost, the second is only in fragments; but a manuscript of the third, in the British Museum, is fairly complete.

Julianus, Flavius Claudius, Orations, edited by P. Martinius and C. Cantoclarus, in their edition of Julian's works, Paris, 1583; by Petavius, Paris, 1630; by Ezechiel Spanheim, Leipsic, 1696. (The orations have also been published separately.)
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Flavius Claudius Julianus, better known as Julian the Apostate, was born in Constantinople, November 17th, 331. Julian, great as an emperor, was remarkable as an author. He wrote an immense number of elaborate works on varied subjects which are important sources of information regarding the religion and philosophy of his period. The *Orationes* of Julian are historically valuable, especially those dealing with the family of Constantine. They also deal in them with Platonic philosophy and sun-worship, and betray in many ways his affection for Paganism opposed to Christianity.


Leo Diaconus lived in the tenth century, and was a native of Caloč, near Mt. Tomol. He was a student at Constantineople in 966, and he served as military chaplain under Basil II in the war against the Bulgarians (988). His history embraces the period between 959-975. Honest and fearless when relating contemporary events, the history although badly written, and inaccurate on geography and classical history is important, since the author is the only contemporary writer on one of the most brilliant and successful periods of Byzantine history, that of Nicephorus Phocas and Joannes Zimisces. The book contains valuable data on the history and customs of the Bulgarians and Russians, on which Leo is the oldest authority.

Leo Grammaticus, *Χρονογραφία* τά τῶν νεων Βασιλέων παράγεια (Chronographia Res a Recentioribus Imperatoribus Gestas Complectens), first printed in the Paris *Corpus.*

Leo Grammaticus was one of the continuators of Theophanes. Nothing certain is known of his life. His Chronicles extend from 813 A.D. to the death of Romanus Lecapenus in 948, or 949.


Joannes Malalas (Malelas) was born at Antioch, most probably at about the time of Justinian the Great (528-565), although some authorities assign him to the ninth century. His voluminous chronicle originally began with the creation of the world, but the commencement is lost, and the extent portion begins with the death of Vulcanus and the accession of his son Sol, and finishes with the expedition of Marcianus the nephew of Justinian the Great. Malalas relates much that is absurd, but his account of Justinian is valuable and his work is extremely important as being the first to represent the type of a Christian-Byzantine monk's chronicle, which is so important in the history of literature. The book is also the first important monument of the popular Grecised idiom, and hence has great philological interest. The influence of Malalas on later Byzantine, oriental, and even western annalists is immeasurable. For six centuries he was so copied and recopied, that the original work became superfluous and now there is only one manuscript of it in existence.

Malchus Philadelpheus, *Βυζαντινά*, printed in the Bonn *Corpus* (Excerpta).

Malchus Philadelpheus, born in Syria, and a rhetorician of Constantinople, wrote a history which was used in the *Excerpta de Legationibus*, a compilation undertaken by order of Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus. The portion of his work of which we have knowledge comprehends only the period from 473 to 480 A.D., this part having been preserved by Photius.

Manasses, Constantinus, *Σύνοψειστηροςμη*, Latin version by Leunclavius, Basel, 1573; edited by J. Meursius, Leyden, 1616; translated into Slavonic by V. Jagodan, in the Archiv für slavische Philologie, Berlin, 1877; and by J. Bogdan, in his Večhle crones Moldovenesci pana la Urechia, Bukarest, 1891.

Constantinus Manasses lived under the emperor Manuel Comnenus in the middle of the twelfth century, and composed several works in both rhyme and prose. His history, curiously written in a kind of rhetorical prose ("political verse"), is a chronicle from the Creation to the accession of Alexius I in 1081. The edition of Meursius was dedicated to Gustavus Adolphus.


Menander Protector was born at Byzantium in the middle of the sixth century. As a historian, he wrote a continuation of Agathias, from 558 to 582, and in his turn he was continued by Theophylactus Simocatta. Menander is often quoted by Suidas and is one of the best sources for the history of the sixth century.

Michael Panaretus, *Περὶ τῶν Τραπεζοφύλακων βασιλεῶν, τῶν Μ. γαλων Κομμαρίων, ὅπως καὶ πάντα καὶ πόσον ἐκατοστό βασιλευσε*, edited by L. F. Tafel, in his Ευσταθιον Μετροπολίτας Thessalonicensis opera, etc., Frankfort, 1892; and by Ph. Fallmerayer, in the Abhandlungen of the Academy of Bavaria, 1844.
Michæl Panaretus lived in the first half of the fifteenth century and gives a chronicle of the empire of Trebizond from 1204 to 1426. He was an eyewitness of many of the events described, and is particularly valuable on this account.

Neophytus, Νεοφύτου πρεσβυτέρου μοναχὸς καὶ ἐγκληματὶ περὶ τῶν κατὰ τήν χωρὰν Κύπρον σκαίνων (Neophyti Presbyteri Monachi et Inclusi, De Calamitibus Cyprus), edited by J. B. Cotsellius, in his Ecclesin Graece Monumenta, Paris, 1677-1686, 3 vols. Neophytus, was born in 1134 and lived as priest and monk in his native Cyprus. His epistle as named above, gives an account of the usurpation of Cyprus by Isaac Cononius and of the imprisonment of Isaac by Richard Cœur-de-Lion.

Niceforus Callistus Xantoupolus, Historia Ecclesiastica, Latin version, edited by Joh. Lang, Basel, 1553; reprinted with scholia, 1560 (61); Antwerp, 1560; Paris, 1562, 1566, 1573; Frankfort, 1588; Greek text, with Lang’s translation, Paris, 1630, 2 vols. Niceforus Callistus Xantoupolus died about 1350, and the date of his birth has been inferred as about 1290. There are now extant eighteen of the twenty-three books of his ecclesiastical history, which was compiled from Eusebius, Evagrius, and other writers, and covers the period from the time of Christ to the death of Phocas in 610. The work is characterised by its elegant style, which is far above that of his contemporaries. The author’s carelessness and lack of judgment, however, cause the book to abound in fables.


Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople from 806 to 815, when he was deposed by Leo Armenus, was born in 758, and held the office of notary to the emperor Constantine VI. His Breviarium begins with the murder of Maurice in 602 and is continued to the marriage of Leo IV in 770. The Chronology begins with Adam and is brought down to the death-year of the author, 828. Nicephorus is sometimes styled “Confessor” on account of his firm opposition to the iconoclasts.


Nicetas Acominatus, who was born at Chonae, Phrygia, in the middle of the twelfth century, and died at Nicæa, Bithynia, about 1216. He held high offices under Isaac II Angelus; and was at the taking of Constantinople in 1204, of which he relates an impressive account. His history in continuation of Zonares is in ten corollaries of 21 books and deals with the Eastern emperors from 1180 to 1260. In style at times bombastic, Nicetas is deeply incensed against the Latin conquerors, but he is impartial as to his facts.


Nonnus, who wrote a history of an embassy he undertook to the Saracens in 583, lived under Justinian I. His original work has perished, and exists only as an abridgment preserved by Photius.

Pachymeres, Georgius, Historia Byzantina, edited by P. Possimius, Greek and Latin text, Rome, 1666-1686, 7 vols. Georgius Pachymeres was born about 1242 at Nicæa, whither his father had fled after the capture of Constantinople in 1204. After the recapture of the city, Pachymeres went there to study divinity and law, and became advocate general of the Eastern Church and chief justice. He was also employed diplomatically, and died either in 1310 or 1340. His portrait in woodcut, alleged to be derived from an old manuscript is in Wolf’s edition of Nicephorus Gregorius, Basel, 1562. Pachymeres wrote a number of works, mainly philosophical, but the most important is his history, continuing that of Acropolita, in thirteen books, comprising the histories of the emperors Michael Paleologus and Andronicus Paleologus. It is written with calmness, dignity, and a fair amount of impartiality; but the work is often marred by the introduction of dogmatic theology in which the author seemed to take a keen delight. He was indeed the first Byzantine historian to deal with the history of a highly dogmatic age. Pachymeres was continued by Gregorius Nonnus.


Petrus Patricius, was born at Thessalonica, in the year 500. He was employed in the diplomatic service by Justinian I, and died about 562 A.D. His history is supposed to include the period from the second Triumvirate to a little later than the time of Constantine the Great, although only the part extending to the reign of Julian is expressly 
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attributed to him. The rest is from an excerpt De sententia the conclusion of which is usually called Anonymous post 1500. Only extracts from it are preserved. Petrus also wrote a work entitled, περὶ ἀνδρικῆς καταστάσεως, i.e. on state organisation.

Photius. Μητροπλέον ἢ Βασιλείαν, edited by David Hoeschelius, Augsburg, 1601; Latin version by A. Schottius, Augsburg, 1606; Greek and Latin reprints, Geneva, 1612, and Rouen, 1653; revised Greek text by L. Bekker, Berlin, 1824–1825.

Photius was related by marriage to the emperor Theophilus, and in 833 was irregularly elected to the patriarchate of Constantinople, a circumstance which ultimately led to the separation of the Eastern and Western churches. These events were fully detailed in volume VIII, in our account of the Papacy. Photius was the man of unchallengeable intellectual endowment, and held many high offices. His writings for these reasons are extremely valuable. His Βασιλείαν is a comprehensive review of the then existent Greek literature, including historians, civil and ecclesiastical works, biographers, philosophers, orators, poets, and story writers. Photius has thus preserved accounts of many writers and works that have otherwise been lost, including portions of the writings of such men as Demosthenes, Diadochus Siculus, Hypereides, and Lycurgus. Photius also wrote a number of theological and ecclesiastical works, a lexicon, and a great number of letters, all valuable for their pictures of the mentality of the age.

Phranzes, Georgios. Χρονικών Γεωργίου Φραντζη τοῦ προτοβασιλεύων. Νῦν πρώτων ἐκδόθη ἐπιμελεία φρουρίκιαν Καρολίνου Άλτερ (Alte), Vienna, 1796; Latin translation by Jacob Pontanus, Ingolstadt, 1601.

Georgius Phranzes, the last of the Byzantine historians lived during the fifteenth century and held high official position under Constantinople. After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks he entered a monastery, where he composed his Chronikon, which is a valuable authority for the details of the capture of Constantinople, and extends from 1250 to 1477. He is trustworthy when dealing with contemporary events, but indulges in long digressions. Professor Alter's edition is the standard; the translation of Pontanus was characterised by Gibson as "deficient in accuracy and elegance."

Priscus, Ιστορία Βυζαντίας καὶ κατα Λυτρίλαμ fragments, edited by D. Hoeschelius, Augsburg, 1606, Latin translation by C. Cantoclarus, Paris, 1609; both reprinted by Fabrot in his Excerpta de Legationibus, Paris, 1618; and in Labbe's Protetichon, Paris, 1648.

Priscus, an early Byzantine historian, was born in Thrace. We know hardly anything of his life, except for the years 415–417, when he was at the court of Attila as ambassador for Theodosius the Younger. His account of Attila was therefore first hand, but unfortunately only fragments of it have been preserved.


Procopius, the most important late Greek-Byzantine historian, was born at Cesaræa, in the beginning of the sixth century. After studying at Constantinople, his natural gifts gained him, in 527, a position as secretary to Belisarius, whom he accompanied in his several wars. He also served with distinction under Justinian, who created him prefect of Constantinople in 562. His literary work was extensive, and much dispute has centred around his name, some claiming, for instance, that he was a physician on account of his minute description of the plague. His History, is by far his most important work, dealing with the period 498–554, his description of his own times being written in a faithful and masterly manner. Indeed, he is said to have kept a diary when he accompanied Belisarius upon his expeditions against the Vandals. His history was continued by Agathias. The Κτισμάτα is an interesting account of the architectural endeavours of Justinian, somewhat flattering to the emperor's memory, but written with a full knowledge of the architectural art. The Ἀνεκδότα is a collection of witty and curious stories—court scandal mostly—the authorship of which is generally ascribed to Procopius, though some have doubted that it could be the work of a great statesman and historian.

* Sevillites, Ioannes, Συνοψις ιστοριῶν συγγραφείσα παρὰ Ἰωάννου κοροπολάτου καὶ ἱστορίων ἀρχοντῶν τῆς Βυζαντίας τοῦ Σκυλίτης (Synopsis Historiarum Scripser a Ioanne Sevillite Caropulato et Magni Krangario Vigilie), translated into Latin by J. L. Gabius, Venice, 1575.

Joannes Sevillites, surnamed Caropulates, held high official positions at the Byzantine court as late as 1061. The history now attributed to him, and of which the complete Greek text has never been published, resembles that of Cedrenus in several ways, and his claim to
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original authorship used to be hotly disputed. It is, however, now generally conceded that Cedrenus was the compiler. The chronicle includes the period from 811-1079.


This work, by an unknown Greek, gives events in Sicily from 827 to 965. The Greek text is preserved in two manuscripts.—Cod. Vat. 1912 and Cod. Paris, suppl. gr. 920. An old Arabic manuscript at Cambridge has been recently proved to be a translation of this history.

**Symeon Metaphrastes, Χρονογραφία** (Annales), in the Paris, Venice, and Bonn "Corpora."

**Symeon Metaphrastes**, also called *Magister* and *Logotheta*, lived in the second half of the tenth century, and served as chief secretary of state under Leo VI and Constantine VII. He was a voluminous writer and compiler, and his *Sicenorum Vitae* gives the biographies of nearly seven hundred saints. His *Annales* cover the period from Leo V, 813 A.D., to Romanus II 968. His *Chronicle*, a work somewhat different from the *Annales*, has never been published, and is contained in a number of manuscripts with varying titles.

**Themistius, Πολιτικοί λόγοι**, edited by Aldus, Venice, 1534, and by Dindorf, Leipsic, 1832. Latin version by Hermolaus Barbarus, Venice, 1481, and often reprinted.

**Themistius**, philosopher and rhetorician, lived at Constantinople and Rome in the reigns of Constantius, Julian, Jovian, Valens, Gratian, and Theodosius, all of whom regarded him with favour. He became a senator, and in the reign of Theodosius was appointed prefect of Constantinople. He was frequently employed on embassies and in other public business. Besides various philosophical works, thirty-five of his orations survive, several being congratulatory addresses to the emperors Constantius, Valentinian, and Valens. He died about the year 390 A.D.


**Theodorus Anagnostes (Lector)** lived probably in the reign of Justin I or Justinian I, and wrote a compendium of church histories from Constantine the Great to the death of Constantius II. His *Historia* covers the period from Theodosius the Younger to Justin I or Justinian I, but it survives only in extracts by Nicephorus Callistus (fourteenth century), by Joannes Damascenus, and others. He is the chief authority for the reign of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius.

**Theodorus**, bishop of Cyzicus, Χρονικόν.

**Theodorus of Cyzicus** was supposed to be the author of a chronicle of the world from Adam to the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261, but very little is known of his personality and his work exists only in fragments, which have never been published.

**Theodorus of Syracuse, Θεόδωρος Σωρακίου της Ωσάνος**, edited by B. Hase (with Leo Diaconus), Paris, 1819.

**Theodorus** was a monk of Syracuse, taken away as a captive to Panormo when the Saracens took Syracuse in 880. While the events of the catastrophe were fresh in his memory, he committed them to writing in the form of a letter to Leo Diaconus.


**Theophanes of Byzantium** lived probably in the sixth century. His history deals with the Persian War under Justin II, from the breaking of the truce with Chosroes in 567, and going down to the tenth year of the war. Theophanes preserved the record of the bringing of the silkworm to Italy, the Romans not knowing previously that silk was the product of an insect.


**Theophanes Isaurus**, named also the Confessor, was born of noble parentage during the reign of Constantine V (741-775), and while a youth married the daughter of Leo the Patriarch. After discharging sundry public offices he retired from the world and founded a monastery, his wife going into a convent. He attended the Council of Nicea in 787, where he vehemently defended image worship, and when, in 813, he was called upon to recant his views, he preferred imprisonment and banishment. His history begins with Docielitian, 284 A.D., at the point where Georgius Syncellus stopped, and continues to 813, the time of his imprisonment, his death occurring in 818. The work is of no high order, but is valuable in the absence of better sources of information. His accounts of the affairs of the Eastern Empire are far more trustworthy than those relating to the Western Empire, in regard to which he makes the most extraordinary mistakes. A continuation of Theophanes' *Chronicle* was prepared at the command of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and has come down to us under the title of *Χρονογραφία συγγραφεώς ἐκ προστάγματος Κωνσταντίου τοῦ φιλοχριστοῦ*.

Theophili Abbas was cited by N. Alenmannus, in his Anecdota, published in 1623, as the author of a Life of Justinian. Nothing, however, was known of the work or of the author until 1887, when Mr. Bryce discovered the work in manuscript in the Barberini Library, Rome. The manuscript purports to be extracted from an original Slavonic manuscript, but the work appears to be of such a legendary character as not to be of much historical value. This Theophili is not at all to be identified with the jurist Theophili, who aided Justinian in the drawing up of his Code.


Theophylactus Simocatta was of Egyptian descent, but was born in Locria. He is known to have held public office under Heraclius about 610-629 a.d. His history, in continuation of Menander's, deals with the life of the emperor Maurice, who reigned from 582 to 602, and is the oldest and best authority on the period. It is related that when the author read a passage from his work after the death of the emperor, the audience was moved to tears.

Xiphilinus, Ioannes, Επιστομία, edited by Leunclavius, Frankfort, 1592; (see also Dion-Cassius, whose works were abridged by Xiphilinus).

Xiphilinus of Trapezus, the historiographer, was a nephew of the patriarch of the same name, and lived in the second half of the 11th century. He made, at the command of Michael VII Ducas (1071-1078), an epitome of Dion-Cassius, which unfortunately excludes only books 61-80, because the earlier ones were lacking in the copy of Dion used by Xiphilinus. His copy was incomplete in other places also. The work is of value as preserving the main facts of the original, the greater part of which is lost, for from book 61-80 of the History of Rome of Dion-Cassius we have only the abridgment made by Xiphilinus, and some other epitomes which were probably made by the same person who epitomised the portion from the 55th to the 60th book.


Ioannes Zonaras lived in the twelfth century under the emperors Alexis I Comnenus and Calo-Joannes. His Chronicle is in eighteen books, and extends from the creation of the world to the death of Alexis in a.d. 1118. It is compiled from various Greek authors, such as Josephus and Dion-Cassius. Of the first twenty books of Dion-Cassius we have nothing but the abstract of Zonaras. In the latter part of his work Zonaras wrote as an eye-witness of the events which he describes. Zonaras, who also wrote a lexicon, was continued by Nicetas Acominatus.


Zosimus lived in the age of Theodosius the Younger (408-450), and probably resided at Constantinople. His history of the Roman empire, in six books, must have been written after the year 425, as appears from a record of that year, although the period actually covered by the history is from the death of Commodus (192 a.d.) to 410. It is mainly a compilation from previous historians, but when giving judgment he is strongly biased in favour of Paganism and against Constantine, Theodosius, and other champions of Christianity. He has a great love of the marvellous and his chronology is confused.

C. Modern Works

Jean Jacques Antoine Ampère, French historian, born at Lyons, August 12th 1800, died at Pau, March 27th, 1864. He was professor in the College of France and a member of the French Academy. In his book Ampère has tried to reconstruct Roman history from Roman monuments, and the first half is given up to the period of the kings. The work is rather ingenious than convincing, being based largely on conjecture, but it is full of scholarship and artistic enthusiasm.


Thomas Arnold born at West Coves, Isle of Wight, June 13th, 1795, was educated at Winchester and Oxford, being elected fellow of Oriel in 1815. He resided at Oxford until 1819, devoting himself to historical and theological studies. Upon leaving the university he settled in Lalaham, where his spare time was occupied with the study of Thucydides and the new light which had been thrown on Roman history and historical method generally by the researches of Niebuhr. In August, 1828, he entered upon his duties as head-master of Rugby. Under his superintendence this school became a sphere of intellectual, moral, and religious discipline, where healthy character was formed and men fitted for the duties and responsibilities of life. In 1841 he was appointed to the chair of modern history at Oxford, where he had delivered eight lectures, when he died very suddenly June 12th, 1842.

Owing to the author's death his History of Rome was not completed beyond the Spanish campaign in the Second Punic War (to B.C. 241). Based on Niebuhr, whose theories on early Roman history have now been abandoned, the book is thus superseded by several more recent ones, though its account of the Punic wars is as satisfactory as any in the English language. The memory of Arnold has been idealised in Tom Brown's Schooldays, a novel by Thomas Hughes (1822-1890), who was educated under Arnold at Rugby.


This work well shows the greatness of the Romans in the administration of provincial affairs. The author was a grandson of Thomas Arnold.


Wilhelm Adolf Becker was born at Dresden, 1796, and died at Meissen, September 30th, 1846. His handbook satisfied a need which was keenly felt towards the middle of the last century. The activity in the investigation of old Roman antiquities called forth by Niebuhr demanded a work giving a general survey of the certified results of previous investigation. This is precisely what the Handbuch did. Single items were carefully examined and placed in their proper position, and the whole was accompanied by valuable notes giving the most important sources, a study of which had led the author to his positions, and giving also opinions differing from his, so that the book served as a guide to a further independent study. The work was long considered indispensable to specialists, though it has of late years been superseded somewhat by the works of Mommsen. For biographical purposes it is still of great value.
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Marie Louis Gaston Boisssier, born at Nîmes, August 15th, 1825, became professor of rhetoric at Nîmes and Paris, and, in 1861, of Latin eloquence in the College of France. He is a member of the Academy, and Commander of the Legion of Honour since 1888. All of Boisssier's works are of interest, presenting often a wholly new point of view. The work on Roman religion deals with the religious revolution which took place between the time of Cicero and of Marcus Aurelius. The change was from a state of general scepticism to a period when even the philosophers were religious, and the author trace the causes of this change. The picture showing the condition of the inferior classes is particularly interesting. Also in his book on Cicero the author gives a delightful picture of the society in which the great orator moved.


Bryce's book shows the mutual relations of Rome and Germany during the Middle Ages, and is invaluable in throwing clear light on their intricacies. The author shows that the Roman Empire continued to exist throughout the Middle Ages, which is the key to an understanding of the whole period.


This is a good introduction to a study of the Middle Ages, being one of the best short histories of the time from the fall of Rome to the dissolution of the Carolingian empire. The book shows the paths leading up to the union of church and empire under Otto the Great.


Clinton's works are standards on the civil and literary chronology of Greece, Rome, and Constantinople and are indispensable to students of ancient history.

History of the Roman Empire from the death of Theodosius to Charlemagne London, 1875.

This book covers the portion of medieval history about which we have the least information. Curtius has based his work principally upon Gibbon, Milman, and Thierry and gives perhaps the most acceptable account of the period.


Charles du Fresne Du Cange, a French lexicographer, was born at Amiens in 1610. His life was devoted to research into antiquity and the Middle Ages, and he merits the surname of the French Varro. His works are very valuable to the student of ancient or medieval history.


Thomas Henry Dyer, born at London, May 4th, 1804; died at Bath, Jan. 30, 1888. He was for some time employed as a clerk in the West India House, but eventually devoted himself entirely to literature. In his history he finds fault with the scepticism of writers like Niebuhr, being himself inclined to accept early Roman history as definite. When he deals with later historic times, however, he becomes judicious and trustworthy, but the book has to do with antiquities rather than institutions and is not so much political as archæological.


A GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ROMAN HISTORY


Ludwig Friedländer's works represent the cultural side of Roman life rather than the political. His "Dargestellung aus der Sittengeschichte Roms" is one of the most important books on the subject. In it we get a lifelike picture of the more important aspects of Roman civilization during the first two centuries of the empire.


Edward Gibbon, the most eminent of English historians, was born at Putney, 1737. His delicate constitution interfered with his early studies, but at fifteen he entered Magdalene College, Oxford. In his autobiography he speaks of the fourteen months he spent there as "the most idle and unprofitable of his whole life." Becoming at this time a convert to Romanism, his father sent him to Lausanne, Switzerland, where he studied for five years under a Calvinist minister, who won him back to Protestantism. He returned to England in 1758, and in 1761 published his first work, "Essay on the Study of Literature," in French, with which language he was at the time, as he himself says in his autobiography, more familiar than with English. His visit to Rome about 1763 first suggested to him the idea of writing his famous history. The work was finished in 1787, after the author had spent eighteen years of labour upon it. It covers the whole period from Trajan to the conquest of Constantinople, relating not only the political events and situation, but representing all phases of life in a wonderfully attractive, frequently dramatic, manner. His strong bias against Christianity is the only point upon which he has been attacked. Otherwise, so thorough and exact were his investigations that although the book was completed over a century ago, few errors have been brought to light in it by the steady researches of a century. In 1783 he retired to Lausanne, where he lived for the remainder of his life. He died in London in 1794, on one of his visits to England.


Ferdinand Gregorovius was born at Neidenburg, Prussia, January 19th, 1821. He studied theology at Königsberg, but a journey to Italy in 1852, caused him to devote his future life to historical research. For his "History of Rome in the Middle Ages," Gregorovius was granted the honorary citizenship of that city. He died at Munich, May 1st, 1891.
WITH CRITICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES


Otto Hirschfeld, a distinguished German historian and epigraphist, was born March 16, 1843, at Königsberg, Prussia. After pursuing philological and historical studies at the universities of Bonn and Berlin, he was engaged in epigraphical and historical research in Italy from 1865 to 1867. He was successively professor at Prague, Vienna, and Berlin, and has for many years been director of the Institute of Archeology at Berlin. In addition to several important historical works of his own production, he has collaborated with Mommsen in the Ephemeris epigraphica, and has contributed largely to the Corpus inscriptionum latinarum and the Inscriptiones Gallica Narbonensis Latinae.


Wilhelm Ihne, German philologist and classical historian, was born February 2nd, 1821, in Fürth. He spent several years in England as a teacher and has, since 1853, been professor at Heidelberg. Ihne's history deals with the early period of Rome up to the time when Augustus became sole ruler. It is addressed to a general audience, and consequently the author attempts to establish his position in a generally comprehensible manner. He succeeds better in his undertaking when he reaches the ground of more reliable tradition where he is not obliged to clothe difficult critical analysis in popular garb. The author takes a wholly unprejudiced stand, examining all evidence, separating fact from conjecture, and leaving the reader to form his own judgment. The work is marked by sound common sense.

Ihne, W. R., Society in Rome under the Cæsars, London, 1888. (A good popular account of the daily life of the period.)

Jacobi, P., Die Quellen der Langobardengeschichte des Paulus Diaconus, Halle, 1877; Jaffé, Philipp, Geschichte des deutschen Reiches unter Lothar dem Sachsen, Berlin, 1843; (see...


Theodor Mommsen, German historian and epigraphist, was of Danish origin, and was born at Garding in Slesvig, November 30th, 1817. Educated at Altona and Kiel, he spent the years from 1844 to 1847 in archæological exploration in Rome. Appointed in 1848 a professsor at Leipzig, he lost his position by participating in the stirring politics of that year. In 1852 he became professor at Zurich and in 1858 at the University of Berlin. In 1864 he was made perpetual secretary of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin. From 1873 to 1882 he was a member of the Chamber of Deputies of Prussia. He declined an election to the Reichstag in 1891, protesting against the policy of Prince Bismarck, and particularly against the progress of socialism in the state. This criticism having roused the I. e. of the prince, Mommsen was, in 1882, prosecuted for defamation. The case gained great celebrity. He quitted upon the first trial, the judgment was reversed upon appeal, and upon a second trial, in which he defended himself, he was again victorious.

Professor Mommsen's work marks an important epoch in the field of Roman history. His history of Rome appeared first in 1854, in a series of volumes intended for a general public, so that only results of his investigation were given. There is a marked departure in Mommsen's style from the reserve of the classical historians. He by no means regards the events he describes in the light of an outsider, but takes sides for or against different parties and leading characters. He has a special antipathy, for example, against the Etruscans, also against Cicero. It is this personal element, perhaps, which seems to make the whole work live. Persons and things are introduced with the utmost vividness. The different characters, men like Gracchus, Sulla, and Caesar seem to be actually living, breathing personages, and no mere words on a page. But not alone was the style new — wholly new material was brought forward, making a new chapter of Italic history, based on a study of the country itself, on the monuments of old time, especially on finds in tombs in Italy. Above everything else the different aspects of the national development — the economic, artistic, and literary — are brought together with a master hand. The book at once aroused new interest in classical study throughout the country. Also to special departments Mommsen has contributed invaluable productions — epigraphy, numismatics, above all the constitutional law of the Romans, all have received the stamp of his genius.


Accurate texts of all the more important historical writers on Germany down to the year 1500, also laws, archives, and letters within this period. Edited by Pertz from 1826-1874, during which period 24 volumes were published. Since 1874 it has been continued by Waiz, Wattenbach, Dümmler, and others.


Muratori was born at Vignola in Modena in 1672. He was educated for the church but in the year 1700 was appointed librarian for the duke of Modena. Muratori was one of the most distinguished savants of the eighteenth century.


In this work the author declared that it was written to prove that when Providence, raising up men like César, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, it is to trace out to people the path they ought to follow; in effect it was an apology for the Napoleonic absolutism.


Berthold G. Niebuhr was born at Copenhagen, August 27th, 1776. In his early life he was secretary to the minister of finance of Denmark, and afterwards director of the bank. In 1806 he removed to Berlin, where he was councillor of state in 1808, and upon the foundation of the University of Berlin in 1810 was named as professor of history. From 1816 to 1824 he resided in Rome as ambassador of Prussia, profiting by his sojourn in the opportunity to make important researches in Roman history and philology. On his return he accepted a professorship at the University of Bonn, where he remained until his death, January 2nd, 1831. The critical methods of Niebuhr began a new era in the whole science of history; or, as Macaulay says, in the "history of European intelligence." His Roman history appeared first in 1811, being made up primarily from lectures delivered at the University of Berlin during the winter of the same year. Various causes worked together to make Niebuhr's achievement possible, his broad scholarship, his experience in political, judicial, economic, and even military questions — his acquaintance with Rome, its land and its people, his knowledge of persons gained through his travels and diplomatic positions, and above all his rare gift of combination and his comprehensive criticism. Niebuhr's work stands for all time as an example of true historical criticism; his object can best be made plain in his own words: "We must strive to single out fable and falsification, and train our vigilance to recognize the outlines of truth freed from every gloss. The identification of fable and the refutation of deceit may be enough for the critic; he desires only to expose misleading accounts. The historian needs something positive; he must at least discover the connection of facts with some probability and discover a more probable narrative in place of that which is sacrificed to his convictions."


R. Pahlmann, German geographer, historian, and publicist, born at Spremberg, June 14th, 1835. In his Völkerwanderung he attempts to prove that the migration of the nations who destroyed the Roman Empire was much less than has been supposed, and makes a very careful examination of the ancient authorities.

A GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ROMAN HISTORY


Albert Schwenger, German historian and theologian (1819–1857) was greatly influenced by the great changes which took place in Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century and the bitterness caused by the disappointment of patriotic hopes had an effect on his writing; although this is not so noticeable in Schwenger's reserved style, which addresses itself more to scholars, as in Mommsen's, who speaks to wider circles. Schwenger's History "extends only a little the Lieckman Rogations, and the author did not live even to see the third
volume published. His object was to lay bare critical investigation in the widest range and he has admirably succeeded, conducting the reader through the mazes of fable and tradition as well as through the conflicting statements of modern writers, with a wonderful security of touch. At the same time he weaves together the authenticated results into a comprehensive picture of the whole and describes developments with keen political discernment. In one important point only does he differ from Niebuhr, refusing to admit that the history of ancient Rome is a product of folk ballads, holding rather that they were elaborated in the class of aetiological fables which were so richly developed among the ancients. This work was cast into the shade soon after its appearance by Mommsen's brilliant achievements.


Ulrici, H., Charakteristik der alten Historiographie, Berlin, 1833.
