

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND

The primary object of this study is to try and reveal the position of Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, in the Syrian tradition in the history of dogma. He lived most of his life, it would seem, in the ante-Nicene age,¹ so that chronologically he ought to be placed shortly after Paul of Samosata,² and some time before the later Antiochenes,³ Flavian and Diodore, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. Both his mode of Biblical exegesis and his doctrinal outlook make it abundantly clear that he was a true member of the Antiochene school of thought. In fact, it will be seen that what he received from his predecessors he brought nearer the truth as it was revealed to him in his own generation, and in that form bequeathed it to his successors, to become in their hands a burning and a shining light.

Although we know comparatively little concerning his life and works, there is no doubt that he was one of the most influential Bishops of the Nicene age. At the Council of Nicaea in 325 he occupied a position of special prominence, and, although we hear no more of him after his deposition some five years later, it is

¹ See below, pp. 53–56, where an attempt is made to show that in all probability he died before 337, or at any rate before 343.

² Paul was appointed Bishop of Antioch in 260 and definitely deprived in 272.

³ Flavian and Diodore, when young men, cared for the spiritual welfare of the Antiochene church during the episcopates of Leontius († c. 357) and Meletius (360–381). Flavian, who succeeded Meletius as Bishop of Antioch, died in 404. In 378 Diodore became Bishop of Tarsus, dying in 394. Theodore, the pupil of Diodore, was born at Antioch c. 350, and was ordained to the priesthood c. 383. Ten years later he was made Bishop of Mopsuestia. He died in 428. In the same year Nestorius, who had lived in the monastery of Euprepus near Antioch, became Bishop of Constantinople. It seems that he died c. 452. All these were true members of the Antiochene school of thought, each interpreting the principles of the Syrian tradition in the light of his own generation.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE BACKGROUND

abundantly clear that he was recognised as one of the foremost supporters of the Nicene Definition. The Church's tradition concerning him is that he was in the vanguard of the attack on Arius as soon as that unfortunate person began to proclaim his erroneous doctrines.¹ Although, so far as we can tell, he did not attack the person of Arius, the tradition is fundamentally true, for he zealously sought to expose those principles which formed the basis of the Arian system. Such principles, we shall see, were maintained by the Lucianists, who, while they were not prepared to follow Arius in all the intricacies of his doctrinal speculation, were ready to give him their support as one of their own. These, taking their name from Lucian, the saintly and gifted presbyter of Antioch, whose pupils they had been some years before, gathered round their men of kindred thought, and arrogantly promulgated their doctrines. A born fighter, Eustathius rose to the attack. At Nicaea he played his part in exposing their tenets, and for five years after his return to Antioch he fearlessly assailed their teaching and intrigue. The time came when his opponents themselves were in the ascendant, and the Bishop of Antioch was shown no mercy. Through their instrumentality he was deprived of his bishopric and condemned to banishment.

Eustathius' history, then, cannot be appreciated thoroughly without a clear understanding of the teaching of the Lucianists. The real founder of their thought was Origen, whose work as a pioneer in the realm of Christian Doctrine influenced the minds of succeeding generations of theologians. In his day the gospel had been firmly planted in the Greek world, and Origen was essentially a Greek. It is not surprising, therefore, that his view of God as the Absolute is that of Platonism, and that the terms he uses are those of the Greek philosophical schools. His system, certainly, is many-sided, but there seems no doubt that in the vastness of its author's mind it is a complete unity. For our present purpose we

¹ Thus Jerome (*Ep.* 73; *P.L.* xxii, 677): ...*Eustathium nostrum, qui primus Antiochenae ecclesiae episcopus contra Arium clarissima tuba bellicum cecinit.* Compare also the judgment of the Second Council of Nicaea: *Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐσταθῆς πρόμαχος τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τῆς Ἀρειανῆς κακοδαίμωνίας καταλυτῆς* (*P.G.* xviii, 684).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE BACKGROUND

3

may say it has two aspects. On the one hand, viewing everything *sub specie aeternitatis*, he teaches that God is eternal, and that creation is eternal. From this point of view the Son, possessing His own personal being or *hypostasis*, is always being begotten by the Father; there never was when He was not. On the other hand, he teaches that God is altogether one, incomprehensible, and unbegotten; He is the *fons et origo* of everything, the *πηγή θεότητος*. From this point of view the Son is inferior to the Father; He is certainly *θεός*, but He is not *ὁ θεός*. As we shall see, it was this latter aspect of the system which formed the basis of the Lucianists' teaching.¹

Origen's Christology is based on his belief that all souls were created from eternity. So he teaches that the human soul of Christ, though possessing freedom like other souls, had remained pure from the beginning, and on this account was inseparably united to the Logos. With the Incarnation proper the Logos, through the medium of the soul, took to Himself a human body,

¹ Origen felt compelled to emphasise this aspect of his system against thought akin to Sabellianism. He remarks that there are some who say: *μη διαφέρειν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐ μόνον οὐσία ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑποκειμένῳ τυγχανόντας ἀμφοτέρους κατὰ τινὰς ἐπινοίας διαφόρους οὐ κατὰ ὑπόστασιν, λέγεσθαι πατέρα καὶ υἱόν (in Joh. x, 21)*. Against such teaching he affirmed the distinction (even in person and substance) between the Father and the Son. Thus: *ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκειμενὸν ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς (de Orat. 15)*. He even speaks of a *moral unity* between the two persons: *δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὁμοιότητι καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος (c. Cels. viii, 12)*. This aspect of the system was appropriated by most of the theologians of the East in the latter half of the third century. In their zeal to maintain against Sabellianism the personal distinctions in the Godhead, they lost sight of that other aspect which posited the Son's eternal generation. The outcome was Arianism proper, the teaching of the Lucianists preparing the way. At the same time it should be made clear that the system deliberately condemns Arian theories. In particular, Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation (comp. *in Jerem. ix, 4: ὅτι οὐχὶ ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατήρ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' αἰετὶ γεννᾷ αὐτόν...καὶ αἰετὶ γεννᾶται ὁ σωτήρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς*: moreover, he refutes Arius when he rejects, as in *de Princ. i, 2; iv, 8, etc.*, the *ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*) is directly opposed to the speculations of Arius. It is noteworthy that it is this latter aspect of the system which forms Origen's mighty contribution to one of the fundamental truths of Christian doctrine.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4

THE BACKGROUND

and the God-Man was set up. Human nature took upon itself the properties of the divine, and the Logos Himself, it could be said, underwent human experiences¹. Afterwards, the human nature remained no longer, but was absorbed into the divine.² Despite Origen's recognition of the place of the human soul in Christ—a truth hardly reckoned with by previous theologians—it remains true that his Christology exerted no great influence on his followers. Suspicious of his doctrine concerning the pre-existence of souls³, they fell back upon the simple teaching of the current Logos-theology. Nevertheless, even when they had discarded its fundamental principle, they could still find in their master's system authority for their assertions.

Upon his death (254 or 255), Origen's system fell to pieces. None of his admirers—and many of them occupied important sees⁴—was equal to the task of holding it together in its component parts. In particular they adopted its element of Subordinationism, feeling that they possessed therein a real bulwark against teaching which would obliterate all distinction between the Father and the Son.⁵ It has been pointed out already that

¹ Comp. *de Princ.* ii, 6, 6, where we have his celebrated image of the fire and the iron. The mass of iron is so heated by the fire that, while preserving its nature, it receives all the properties of the fire, and iron and fire are one. He continues: *Hoc ergo modo etiam illa anima, quae, quasi ferrum in igne, sic semper in Verbo, Sapientia, Deo posita est, omne quod agit, quod sentit, quod intelligit, Deus est.*

² Comp. *c. Cels.* iii, 41 (which also illustrates Origen's teaching on the union of the two natures): τὸ θνητὸν αὐτοῦ σώμα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν τῇ πρὸς ἐκείνον οὐ μόνον κοινωνία ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει τὰ μέγιστα φάμεν προσειληφέναι, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος κεκοινωνηκότα εἰς θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι.

³ Even his followers felt compelled to correct such teaching. Thus Peter of Alexandria (300–311) wrote a work: *Περὶ τοῦ μηδέ προὔπαρχειν τὴν ψυχὴν μηδὲ ἀμαρτήσασαν τοῦτο εἰς σῶμα βληθῆναι* (Migne, *P.G.* xviii, 520).

⁴ Comp. Eusebius, *H.E.* vii, 28. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Gregory Thaumaturgus and Athenodorus, Bishops in Pontus, Hymenaeus of Jerusalem, Theotecnus of Caesarea, and Maximus of Bostra were all Origenists.

⁵ So Dionysius of Alexandria, perhaps to his sorrow, emphasised this element when he found that “the Son of God was scarcely any longer preached in the Church” (Athanasius, *de Sent. Dion.* 5). It is noteworthy that some of his sayings (*ibid.* 4, 14, 16) were produced at a later date by

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE BACKGROUND

5

they could appropriate parts of his Christology. So, to illustrate their doctrinal outlook at this period (c. 270) we will turn to the Statement of Belief which is contained in a letter written by six Bishops in connection with the deposition of Paul of Samosata, and to the Christological teaching of Malchion the sophist who exposed him.

It is clear from their Statement¹ that the Bishops start from the conception of God as the Absolute. He is one, unbegotten, without beginning, unchanging, and incomprehensible to human nature save in so far as He is revealed by His Son. The Son, existing before the ages, is God and Son of God in *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. Fulfilling the paternal will, He was the agent in the creation, and He it was who appeared to the Patriarchs and Moses. Sent forth by the Father, He took flesh, which, being changelessly united to the Divinity, was deified. The Statement obviously reveals a crude form of theology, and it becomes abundantly clear that the standard set by Origen was far from being maintained by his followers. While such crude thought can scarcely be representative of the teaching of the best of Origen's followers at this period, it is altogether likely that it is characteristic of the general teaching of the age. Though it may not be expressed in so many words, there seems to be no doubt that the Bishops, in view of their conception of God, could not but look upon the Son as subordinate to the supreme being of the Father, and in their Christology they were but following current Greek thought in maintaining that the Logos had assumed flesh, without paying sufficient regard to the truth of the Lord's complete manhood.

Only a few fragments revealing Malchion's teaching have come down to us,² and of these very little is left to enable us to ascertain

the Arians, feeling that they had therein authority for their own theories. After all, Arianism is only Subordinationism writ large.

¹ The Statement is to be found in Hahn, *Biblioth. der Symb.* 3rd ed. p. 178 ff. The six Bishops were Hymenaeus, Theotecnus, Maximus (whom we have noted already as determined Origenists), Theophilus, Proclus, and Bolanus.

² Loofs in his *Paulus von Samosata* has gathered together (pp. 323–339) the original texts in connection with Paul's deposition. The above

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6

THE BACKGROUND

his views concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son.¹ Yet it is legitimate to suppose that he, too, accepted the Greek conception of God, and regarded the Logos as inferior to the Father, though he upheld His eternal and personal existence. We know more of Malchion's Christological teaching. The Logos, he maintains against Paul of Samosata, is not a mere attribute but a personality, and as a personality was "personally existent" in the body of Christ.² He describes the manhood as τὸ σῶμα or τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, and, regarding Christ as a σύνθεσις of human and divine, he is not afraid to ascribe human passions to the Logos, the personality of the σύνθεσις.³ Malchion's Christology may be an advancement upon the simple teaching we have seen in the Statement of the six Bishops, but it has the same Hellenic foundation. Like his predecessors, he must have found it difficult to posit the Lord's complete manhood, for he must have felt that if the Logos had assumed flesh, there could be no place for the rational soul, the Logos Himself being archetypal reason. We shall see that the Lucianists, following this type of

summary of Malchion's teaching has been drawn from this collection. It is evident that the fragments must be used carefully, for there seems to be no doubt that the later Christological controversies have there left their mark.

¹ The following passage takes us a certain way. Malchion speaks of the Son as τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως αἰδίως ὑπάρχοντα (Loofs, *l.c.* p. 337).

² *I.e.* οὐσία οὐσιωμένη ἐν σώματι, taking οὐσία in the sense of personality. See Raven, *Apollinarianism*, pp. 63–65.

³ *E.g.* Malchion is reported to have said: *Post unionem substantialem cum corpore suo humano omnia idem ipsum passum esse propter compositionem (σύνθεσις) et unionem substantialem (οὐσιώδης ἔνωσις) cum eo* (Loofs, *l.c.* pp. 88 and 336). Passages from the Synodical Letter may also be adduced, for we cannot be far wrong in assuming that Malchion agreed with its sentiments, if he was not responsible for its composition. Thus: οὐτε δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπινων προηγουμένως παθῶν ἀμέτοχος ἦν ὁ φορέσας καὶ ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον θεός. οὐτε τῶν θείων προηγουμένως ἔργων ἄμοιρον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν καὶ δι' οὗ ταῦτα ἐποίει. ἐπλάσθη προηγουμένως ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν γαστρὶ, κατὰ δεύτερον λόγον θεός ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ συνουσιωμένος τῷ ἀνθρώπινῳ (Loofs, *l.c.* pp. 333, 334). We shall see that it is just such teaching as this which rouses Eustathius' fury. Representing a tradition which separated the natures in Christ, he railed against thought which would attribute suffering to the divine (see quotation on p. 52 below, and other quotations, pp. 112, 113).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE BACKGROUND

7

thought, abandoned the problem and denied its existence altogether.

But this was not the only theology which prevailed in the early centuries of the Church's history. From its home in Syria there proceeded another type of teaching, established upon a totally different foundation. Whereas the former theology started from the Hellenic point of view, the starting-point of the Syrian theology was essentially Jewish. Building upon the monotheism that Israel had bequeathed to the Christian Church, it strove to make answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" That He was completely human the Syrian teaching was prepared to uphold in strictest terms. But what was the relationship between the manhood of Christ and the one supreme God? Here lay the question which successive generations of Syrian Christians attempted to solve. As we look back upon the first two centuries of the Church's life, we are able to discern relics of answers that were made to it. They were unsatisfactory inasmuch as, in over-emphasising the Lord's manhood, they lost sight of the truth of His divinity. Nevertheless, we believe that in their own day they were honest attempts at reaching a solution. The doctrinal teaching of the Ebionites, and that contained in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, may be worthless in answer to the questions of the mind and the longings of the soul, but such teaching represents a desire on the part of its upholders to express the truth which the tradition undoubtedly contains. These, it would seem, were but doctrinal experiments; the tradition reveals itself in a more developed form in the scientific theology of Paul of Samosata.¹

About the year 260, Paul became Bishop of Antioch. Political considerations enter largely into his history, for at this time Antioch was under the rule of Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, whom Paul served as *Procurator Ducenarius*, and when the Emperor Aurelian once more took charge of the city in 272 he was com-

¹ The evidence for Paul's teaching has been collected by Lawlor in his "Sayings of Paul of Samosata", *J.T.S.* vol. xix, No. 73, pp. 20-45, and ("Additional Notes") Nos. 74, 75, pp. 115-120. Loofs' work has been mentioned above, p. 5, n. 2.

pelled to take his departure. Fully determined to counteract the influence of Hellenic teaching,¹ he established his doctrinal system on the two momenta of the Syrian tradition, the unity of God, and the complete manhood of Jesus. He maintains that God is unipersonal, and that the Logos is an attribute of that Personality as reason (λόγος) is in the heart of man.² In this way, taking οὐσία in the sense of personality, he is ready to affirm that the Logos is ὁμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ,³ and when he says that the Logos is begotten by the Father, he must be understood to mean that the Logos is then προφορικός, existing only in activity.⁴ This Logos or Sophia (for he seems to use λόγος and σοφία as convertible terms), he says, inspired the prophets and especially Moses. But in Jesus it dwelt as in none before.⁵ He was a man like us, though he was better in every way.⁶ All through his life (if we accept the Λόγοι πρὸς Σαβίνον as genuine)⁷ by habit of love and

¹ Thus he forbade the use of hymns of this character. They were but "modern productions of modern men" (Eusebius, *H.E.* vii, 30).

² So Epiphanius, *Haeres.* lxxv: πρόσωπον ἐν τὸν θεὸν ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ (φασίν) ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 338).

³ Thus the synod which condemned him condemned also the use of ὁμοούσιος. See Hilary, *de Synodis*, 81 (Migne, *P.L.* x, 534), where this is referred to, and where he points out that Paul accepted the term *negata personarum proprietate*.

⁴ ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνευ παρθένου καὶ ἄνευ τινός, οὐδενὸς ὄντος πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ οὕτως ὑπέστη ὁ λόγος (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 21; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 334). Compare Epiphanius (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 37), though he is referring to Paul's followers: τὸ δὲ εἶναι (τοῦ λόγου) κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν ἐστὶ. See also (on προφορικός) below, p. 97, n. 1.

⁵ μήτε ἡ σοφία ἐν ἄλλῳ οὕτως οἰκῆ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Μωσῆι, καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν χριστῷ ὡς ἐν ναῷ (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331). But, as Loofs maintains, the indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) was κατ' ἐνέργειαν; the Logos was in him only as a quality and not as a person. It is in this respect that the two traditions differ fundamentally. Note especially the remark in the Synodical Letter: οὐ γὰρ συγγεγενῆσθαι τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ τὴν σοφίαν, ὡς ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, οὐσιωδῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 28; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 332).

⁶ ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον ἔτεκεν (Μαρία), κρείττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπ' αὐτῷ χάρις (Lawlor, *l.c.* p. 22; Loofs, *l.c.* p. 331).

⁷ Harnack (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr. iii, p. 39 n.), followed by Lawlor (*l.c.* p. 39) and Raven (*Apollinarianism*, p. 51), believes the work is genuine. On the other hand, see the forceful arguments of Loofs (*l.c.* pp. 283-

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE BACKGROUND

9

identity of will he was so united to God that finally he was made like Him. More will be said of Paul's teaching in later chapters; enough has been said at this point to make it clear that the Syrian tradition, as it is revealed in his system, was altogether different from the tradition founded on the Hellenic basis. Hence we must see in the history of Paul of Samosata the conflict between the two traditions. The work of Malchion, himself an Origenist and head of the school of Greek learning at Antioch, in exposing his tenets, and the persistence of the Origenist Bishops at the synods which were called to condemn him, amply illustrate the fact that the Hellenic tradition was seeking to oust its Syrian opponent.¹ Paul's opposition ended in his own disaster. We have yet to see how one of his successors at Antioch, "the great Eustathius," as he is called by Theodoret, carried forward the same tradition, attacked the Origenists of his own generation, and, like Paul of Samosata, met his doom.

After this introduction we should be able to appreciate the better the doctrinal position of the Lucianists. Concerning the teaching of Lucian himself, who, famed for his biblical exegesis and textual criticism, was head of a theological school at Antioch, and who died a martyr's death in the year 311, scholars have expressed different views. While Harnack² and Bethune-Baker³

293). But be this as it may, it is altogether likely that Paul maintained the *προκοπή* of the human Jesus (and this at any rate would imply an absolute unity of will) and, as its natural outcome, his deification. Compare the following passage from the *Macrostich*, which, while referring to his followers, can be taken as summing up his own teaching: *οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ὕστερον αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι λέγοντες* (Hahn², p. 193).

¹ The refutation of Beryllus of Bostra (Eusebius, *H.E.* vi, 33) shows that there had been a clash already (c. 244) between the two traditions, and that in this case, too, the Hellenic tradition proved to be more powerful. Harnack (*l.c.* iii, 36-37) has shown that he taught a form of Dynamic Monarchianism. In this way his doctrine is akin to that of Paul of Samosata. Origen was called in, and he convinced Beryllus of his error. But it is significant that c. 270 Maximus, a renowned disciple of Origen, was Bishop of Bostra.

² So he says: "This school is the nursery of the Arian doctrine and Lucian its head is the Arius before Arius" (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr. iv, 3).

³ *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 110, 111.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-42905-5 - Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine

R. V. Sellers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

see in it the meeting-place of the teaching of Origen and that of Paul of Samosata, and so regard this as the source whence Arius, the pupil of Lucian, derived his system, Gwatkin holds that "there is really nothing against him but the leaning of his disciples to Arianism".¹ Recently, however, Loofs' investigations concerning the Pauline Schism at Antioch have brought him to the conclusion that this Lucian had no connection at all with Paul of Samosata. He would infer from an important piece of evidence which hitherto has been taken to refer to this connection, that the Lucian there referred to is another Lucian, who was Paul's episcopal successor over the Paulianists². There seem to be good

¹ *Studies of Arianism*, p. 18 n.

² For a full discussion see his *Paulus von Samosata*, pp. 180–186. Loofs derives his evidence for the Pauline Schism at Antioch from Canon xix of the Council of Nicaea, and a passage from the petition of Basil the Deacon in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. The former, of course, deals with the return of the Paulianists to the Catholic Church; the latter (quoted, pp. 182, 183) mentions the schisms among the people, the revolts among the priests, and the confusion among the pastors, that occurred when Paul was expelled. Then he examines the evidence of the important passage in Theodoret, *H.E.* i, 3, to which reference has been made above. It is contained in the letter of Alexander of Alexandria to his namesake of Byzantium, warning him against Arius. The Bishop of Alexandria, after declaring that the teaching of Arius is the same as that of Ebion and Artemas, and that it rivals that of Paul of Samosata, continues: *ὁν διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανὸς ἀποσυνάγωγος ἔμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυτεῖς χρόνους*. Thus Loofs understands the *ὁν διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανὸς* to refer to Lucian the episcopal successor of Paul, who was Bishop of the Paulianists during the episcopates of Timaeus, Cyril, and Tyrannus (*i.e.* till c. 313), and not to Lucian the martyr. He agrees that hitherto there has been deduced from the passage (the *ὁν διαδεξάμενος* being understood to mean that Lucian had taken over Paul's teaching) the fact that Lucian the martyr had been an adherent of his countryman Paul of Samosata (both came from Samosata), opinions only differing as to whether Lucian had excommunicated himself or whether he had been excommunicated by the Church. But, he goes on: "a reader who did not at once think of Lucian the martyr could only have understood this *ὁν διαδεξάμενος* in the ordinary sense of episcopal succession. That we are inclined to apply this observation of Alexander to Lucian the martyr is natural, for we know that Arius was his pupil and no other Lucian disturbs us in the assumption that the martyr is meant. But could it have been obvious to the recipient of Alexander's letter, the Bishop of Byzantium, that the contemptibly-treated bearer of the truly common name of Lucian was *the* Lucian, of whose martyrdom 13 years before in the neighbouring Nicomedia he must have known, and who