

Henri Valois.  
Socrates and Sozomen.

Anthony Alcock

The text translated here has been taken from Robert Hussey *Socratis Scholastici Ecclesiastica Historia* vol. 1 (1853) pp. viii- xxii, essentially a republication with additions of Henricus Valesius *Socratis Scholastici et Hermiae Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica* (Mainz 1677), the first edition of which was published in 1673. The section translated here, entitled *de vita et scriptis Socratis et Sozomeni*, provides informative details about the writers and critical observations about the content and gives some idea of what other contemporary and slightly later writers thought of the two writers and their works. I have added one or two notes.

Henri Valois (1603-1676) was a student of classical and church history. His first work was the extraction of passages of classical historians from a manuscript containing an essay of the 10th cent. Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus on virtue and vice (*de virtutibus et vitiis*). He was commissioned by the Assemblée du Clergé de France, a body that was set up in 1590 and continued until 1789 to protect and administer the wealth of the French Church, to produce editions and translations of the most notable early church historians.

Our<sup>1</sup> Socrates therefore, for we will start with him, was from Constantinople. He bears witness in c. 24 of Book 5 of *HE* that he was born and brought up in that city, and for this reason narrated principally those things that had happened in that city. As a youth he was instructed in the study of language and literature by Helladius and Ammonius, who at that time had perhaps taken refuge in Constantinople from Alexandria. Anyone wishing to know why those teachers left Alexandria will find the reason in c. 16 of Book 5 the *HE*. When the pagan temples at Alexandria were destroyed, as a result of the commitment and zeal of Theophilus the Bishop of that city, the teachers Helladius and Ammonius, one a priest of Zeus<sup>2</sup> and the other of Simius<sup>3</sup> at Alexandria, found this violence perpetrated on their gods difficult to bear and left the city for Constantinople, where they made their home.

---

1 Henri Valois uses 'noster' regularly before the name of Socrates. I think one instance is enough.

2 Serapis was a Greco-Egyptian god, the Egyptian 'parts' being Osiris and Apis, the Greek 'parts' Zeus, Helios, Dionysos and others. A statue of an Apis bull was found at the Serapeum in 1895, but most of the statues depicting Serapis are in the Greek style.

3 Probably the baboon. These creatures were associated with sun-worship in pharaonic Egypt. The text known as the *Amduat* (copied in royal tombs of the New Kingdom c. 15th cent. BC), the 12 hour journey of the sun-god through the Duat (underworld). In the first hour nine baboons can be seen worshipping the sun god, each of them named.

The temples of the pagans at Alexandria were destroyed when Timaeus and Promotus were consuls, as Marcellinus<sup>4</sup> writes in his *History*, which was the eleventh year of the Emperor Theodosius. It is clear that Socrates was first saw the light of day around the beginning of the reign of Theodosius: it was customary to start the education of boys when they were about ten years of age. After this Socrates studied rhetoric<sup>5</sup> with Troilus the sophist, who was one of the best-known teachers at Constantinople. Socrates does not say this explicitly. However, the attentive and diligent reader easily gathers what I have just said from his words. For so often and with such admiration does he mention him that he appears to be paying tribute<sup>6</sup> to his master. For he says that he came from Side in Pamphylia.<sup>7</sup> He mentions quite a few of Troilus' pupils: Eusebius the scholar, of course, and the Bishops Silvanus and Ablabius. Finally, in the seventh book he writes that the Praetorian Prefect Anthemius, who ran the state when Theodosius was still a boy, notably made use of Troilus' counsel. He writes of Troilus the following words of praise: 'who, in addition to his native understanding of philosophy, was the equal of Anthemius in political thinking.' In consideration of these reasons I think that Socrates made use of Troilus as a teacher in matters of rhetoric. But each person will have decide individually on this matter. It should further be known that the ancients worked at their eloquence, not hastily and precipitately as is the modern custom, but with good deal of time. To be sure, Gregory of Nazianzus testifies in a poem about his life<sup>8</sup> that he left Athens when he was thirty, having taught rhetoric in that city. After this Socrates, having left Troilus' school, went to the bar<sup>9</sup> and practised law at Constantinople, where he acquired the nickname of 'pupil'. This is what lawyers were called at that time, as has been observed previously by others, not because they were still at school, but because, as young men who had come from lawyers' schools, they professed this skill.

At length he abandoned the law and applied himself to the writing of church history, in which he displayed singular judgement and diligence. The judgement is expressed in the observations

---

4 Ammianus Marcellinus (writing c. 380) *Res Gestae* 22, 16, 12. The most important of these was the Serapeum. An attempted reconstruction of the building, based on the excavation reports of 60 years previously and the extant artefacts from the site, indicates that it was largely Classical Greek in style with a couple of Egyptian features, such as foundation plaque and Nilometer. cf. J. Mackenzie 'Reconstructing the Serapeum' *Journal of Roman Studies* 94 (2004): 73ff.

5 Rhetoric in this context has to do with public speaking, especially in law courts. It has nothing to do with the academic discipline of the same name practised in modern continental European and North American universities.

6 *Minerval solvere*: the term as a payment for instruction is used in Varro *De agricultura* 3,2,18

7 SE coast of modern Turkey. Apparently prosperous during the Roman period, from which most of the visible ancient monuments date.

8 The autobiographical poems of Gregory are published in J.P. Migne *Patrologia Graeca* 37: 969-1451.

9 The (British) English equivalent of *ad forum se contulit*. The (British) English term 'pupil' is more or less the equivalent of *scholasticus*

and statements incorporated into his books, which in my opinion are of outstanding brilliance. There are many of examples of his diligence, but foremost among them his attention to dates, often noted by consulships and olympiads,<sup>10</sup> particularly when writing of significant events. He was not lax or negligent in his writing, like Rufinus of Aquileia,<sup>11</sup> who seems to me to have composed his two books of church history, which he added to the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, from memory. Socrates is quite different: he has faithfully and scrupulously composed his history using the best textual material he could find, that is, letters of leading prelates, acts of synods and books of church historians. In the first edition of his work he followed Rufinus and wrote of the Synod of Tyre and the exile of Athanasius to Trier as having happened during the reign of Constantius, but recognized his error after reading the works of Athanasius. For this reason he considered it necessary to produce a new edition of his history, in which he corrected the error I have just mentioned. He also added things that were missing in the earlier publication, as he tells us at the beginning of Book Two. It is clear from this how much we should value the history of Socrates, to which the author himself put the finishing touches. Socrates employs a simple and humble style in his work, and for a good reason: that it might more easily be understood by all, as he tells us at the beginning of Books One and Three. He thought that the sublime and ornate style was more fitted to panegyrics and speeches than to the history of church matters. Moreover he dedicated his work to a certain Theodore, whom he calls a holy man of God at the beginning of Book Two, in the same way that Eusebius addresses Paulinus the Bishop of Tyre at the beginning of Book Ten. I have not been able to discover who Theodore is. I am inclined not to believe that it was Theodore of Mopsuestia, because he was dead when Socrates wrote his history. But is now time to enquire about religious beliefs and allegiance, as we promised at the beginning.

Baronius<sup>12</sup> in the *Annals* and Philip Labbaeus<sup>13</sup> in his book on ecclesiastical writers maintain that Socrates was a Novatian.<sup>14</sup> Nicephorus<sup>15</sup> said the same thing before them: *Socrates, 'pure' of name, but not so much in spirit.* This does not mean that his nickname was 'pure' but rather that

---

10 The Christian dating system, devised c. 525, which Bede for example was able to use in the 8th cent., was not available at this time. There were several dating systems used in the East: the Coptic Year of the Martyrs (284) and the Year of Alexander the Great, still used as late as the 10th cent. in the *Chronicle of Séert*, a Syriac history of which an Arabic translation has been preserved.

11 A friend of Jerome who travelled and studied in the Eastern Mediterranean and wrote a church history of his own as well translating that of Eusebius.

12 Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1538-1607) wrote twelve volumes of *Annales Ecclesiastici*

13 Philip Labbaeus (d. 1667) wrote 18 vols of *Sacrosancta Concilia*

14 Novatian held the title anti-pope from 251 to his death in 258. Like Donatus he opposed the readmission of baptized Christians who had lapsed during the Decian persecution into the Church.

15 Presumably Patriarch of Constantinople 806-815, an opponent of the iconoclastic movement.

he was a Novatianist, for the Novatians called themselves 'pure', as we learn from Canon 8 of the Council of Nicaea. Similarly in c. 14 of Book Two Nicephorus writes about Socrates that he did not distance himself from the Novatians. There are several important reasons why Socrates was considered to a Novatianist. In the first place, he diligently records that there was a series of Novatianist bishops who ruled the Church from the time of Constantine, with details of the consuls, to whom individuals migrated from this light. In the second place, he praises each one of them, especially Agerius and Sisinius, Chrysanthus and Paul. And by his prayers, he writes, a certain miracle was performed at Constantinople. In the third place, everything that relates to the Novatianist sect, he examined with such care and diligence that he seems to have been a follower of the sect. But if one were inclined to examine them more accurately, one would find nothing in them to prove that Socrates was a Novatian. For he enumerates the Arian bishops who administered the Church at Constantinople just as scrupulously, and he is never said for that reason to have been Arian. He relates everything that happened to Arians, Eunomians and Macedonians at Constantinople as carefully as the things that happened to the Novatians. He himself gives the reason for this in Book 5 chap. 24, where he writes that it was his resolve to record as far as possible what had happened at Constantinople, partly because he lived there and had been born and brought up there and partly because the things that had happened there were more illustrious and worthier of memory. If anyone objects that Arian bishops did not receive praise equal to that bestowed upon the Novatians, the response is easy: there were far fewer Arian bishops in Constantinople than Novatian ones. The Church at that time was bristling with prominent Novatian priests. Sozomen, who records the praises of them, similar to those of Socrates, also confirms this by his own testimony. As a result it has to be said that Sozomen was also Novatian, as Socrates has to be absolved of this slander. Nevertheless, he states that Sozomen was not Novatian, not to mention the testimony of Theodore the Reader, who according to a letter which he added to his Tripartite History<sup>16</sup> calls him 'most blessed' and writes in Book Nine that he had attended a public procession celebrated in honour of the 40 Martyrs at Constantinople, when Proculus administered the church of that city. From which it can be clearly gathered that Sozomen was of the Catholic communion, because he was present at a public supplication together with Catholics. I admit that Socrates was very favourable to Novatians, as when he numbers the founder of the Novatian sect among the martyrs and says that the Novatians were attached to the Catholics by close ties of well-meaning benevolence and prayed with them in the same church; when he praises the speech

---

<sup>16</sup> Τριμερής Ἱστορία, compiled by Theodore the Reader of Hagia Sophia in the 6th cent. He continued this history as far as 518.

that Sisinnius <sup>17</sup>made against that saying of Chrysostom: *even if you have done penance ten thousand times, come to us*. It is one thing to be partial to Novatians and other thing to be one. Socrates was able to be partial to them, either because he was tied to them for reasons of friendship or family or because he approved of their discipline and abstinence. He was, as we are able to gather from his books, rather strict, but I find it difficult to believe that he was a Novatian, especially since I seem to understand the opposite from some passages in his history. First, in c. 38 of Book 2 he does not once call 'those of the church' Catholics, but contrasts them with Novatians. He therefore recognizes that Novatians were outside the Church.<sup>18</sup> He would not have done this if he had embraced the Novatian sect. But in cc. 20 and 23 of Book Six he calls Novatians heretics, with Arians of course, Macedonians and Eunomians. In the second place, he clearly reprehends the advice of Nectarius to remove the penitentiary priests.<sup>19</sup> For he says that if this is done licence is given to sinners, for there would be nobody to prove conclusively that they were sinners. This view cannot come from a Novatian, for as Socrates tells us, Novatians would never admit penance or the priest of penances. There is also the testimony of Theodore the Reader, who in a letter that prefixes his History calls both writers 'God-loving men', pious and acceptable to God. Moreover, Theodore lived in the same city and almost at the same time as Socrates, that is when Anastasius was Emperor. Finally Peter Halloix<sup>20</sup> agrees with us in his Life of the Blessed Irenaeus (p. 664). Disputing with Baronius, who had written about the year 159 AD : *Socrates the Novatian,<sup>21</sup> celebrating the Pasch on the 14th of the month, together with the Jews ...says this. And the statement that Socrates is Novatian can be understood in two ways. One, that from time to time he wrote approvingly of Novatians, according to the description of Bellarminus<sup>22</sup> in his book Ecclesiastical Writers for the year 440 about both writers. Another, that he was of the Novatian heresy. In the chapter cited he shows neither that was a Novatian nor that he favoured them. For he castigates them and uncovers their disagreements and faults. So that he seems not to be a friend, but an enemy, or perhaps neither but someone who told the truth. Because this is the task of the historian*. So much for Socrates. It is now time to talk of Sozomen.

Hermias Sozomen was also a lawyer at Constantinople, at the same time as Socrates. His parents were not without nobility, from Palestine, a town near Gaza called Bethelia. At one time it was populous village, with very beautiful and ancient temples. The outstanding temple

---

17 Patriarch of Constantinople c. 426, about twenty years after Chrysostom had held the same office.

18 In fact one of the phrases used in § 25 of this chapter is 'those of the Church and the Novatians'.

19 These were priests who could give absolution to those who had lapsed during the persecution (c. 19 of Book Five)

20 A Belgian Jesuit. 1571-1656

21 Since Latin does not have an article of any sort, this could also be 'Socrates, a Novatian, ...'

22 Roberto Bellarmino, a Jesuit Cardinal (1542-1621). This work was published in 1618.

among them was the Pantheon, positioned on an artificial hill. It was a sort of citadel of Bethelia,<sup>23</sup> according to Sozomen in c. 15 of Book 5 . His grandfather was also born in the town and was converted to Christianity by Hilarion the monk.<sup>24</sup> When Alaphio <sup>25</sup>of the same town was being tormented by a demon and the Jews and doctors who had tried to heal him were unsuccessful with their incantations, it was Hilarion who, in the name of God alone, drove out the demon. Sozomen's grandfather was astonished by this miracle. Both he and Alaphio, with their entire families, embraced Christianity. His grandfather excelled in explaining the Scriptures, because he had a subtle intellect and large intelligence. He was moreover otherwise reasonably well educated. So, for the Christians living in Gaza, Askalon and neighbouring places he was precious, because he was useful and necessary to the religion as one who could easily untie the knots of Scripture. Alaphio's family,, with the sancitivity of their life and kindness to the poor, achieved great celebrity. They were among the first to found monasteries and churches there, as Sozomen tells us in the passage quoted. He adds that certain men of the Alaphio family had survived to his own day, with whom he had had dealings when he was a young man and of whom he promises that he will speak later. He undoubtedly means Salamensis, Fusco and the brothers Malchio and Crispio, of whom he speaks in c. 32 of Book Six. He says that these brothers, instructed in the monastic life by Hilarion, became stars in Palestinian monasteries during the reign of Valens: they lived near Bethelia, a town in Gaza, where they were nobility. He mentions them in c. 14 of Book Eight where he says that Crispio had been the archdeacon of Epiphanius. It is therefore clear that the brothers I mentioned were of the Alaphio family: Alaphio was joined by family ties with the grandfather of Sozomen. From this I guess that Sozomen's grandfather converted to Christianity with the whole household because he admired the caretakership of Alaphio, who had been cured by Hilarion using only the name of almighty God. Second, from what Sozomen writes, as a young man he had spent family time with the old monks of the Alaphio family. Finally, he took the name, from what Sozomen writes, from those sons and nephews of Alaphio. He was called Salamanes Hermias Sozomenus, according to Photius in the Bibliotheca,<sup>26</sup> after that Salamanes who, as I noted above, was the brother of Fusco, Malchio and Crispio. For this reason the mistake made by Nicephorus and others is to be corrected, viz. that Sozomen was called Salamanes because

---

23 Perhaps the village of Beit Lahiya.

24 Presumably the Hilarion who came from a town near Gaza and whose Life was written by Jerome.

25 Known only in connection with Sozomen.

26 The 9th cent. Patriarch of Constantinople Photius compiled an extraordinary collection of book reviews (279), which he compiled before becoming ambassador to Abbasid court and dedicated to his brother Tarasius, so that, among other things, it might alleviate the painful separation of the two. The *editio princeps* of the work was published in 1601.

he was from Salamis in Cyprus. But, as I have shown, the evidence of Sozomen himself was that he was not Cypriot but Palestinian. Not only was his grandfather, as said earlier, but Sozomen himself was educated in Palestine, among the monks of the Alaphio family. In my view, it was from this education that Sozomen appears to have drawn his love of the monastic life and discipline, which he displays throughout his work. Not merely content to relate the fathers and authors of monastic philosophy, he also scrupulously commemorated their successors and disciples, in Egypt, Syria, Palestine as well those in the Pontus region, Armenia and Osrhoene. Hence the eulogy of the monastic life in c. 12 of Book One, as if it were to be read as an introduction. He thought it would be an act of ingratitude if he were not to express his thanks, at least in this way, to those in whose society he lived and from whom as a young man he had learned so many outstanding examples of good conversation. He indicates this in the preface of Book 1. Another passage that shows that Sozomen was Palestinian may be found at the end of Book 8, where he says that he had seen Zeno the Bishop of Maiuma.<sup>27</sup> Maiuma was the port of Gaza. It is true that Zeno was almost 100 years old, but he never missed matins or vespers, except when he was severely ill. Sozomen then took up the study of law, and studied civil law in Beirut, a neighbouring Phoenician city, where there was a well-known school of jurisprudence. He also fought cases at Constantinople, as is clear from c. 3 of Book Two. While practising law at Constantinople he wrote his Ecclesiastical History, as can be gathered from his own words. Thus, on p. 48 of this edition,<sup>28</sup> he writes: *The things that happened to Aquilinus, a man with whom I still have contact today and practises law in the same forum, I have partly heard from him and partly seen for myself, I will speak of necessity.* Moreover, Sozomen had written a breviary of ecclesiastical matters, from the Ascension to the dismissal of Licinius,<sup>29</sup> before he wrote his 9 books of church history. This work consisted of two books, as he says in the preface of his first book. But there was a long interval between these two books.

In writing the history Sozomen's style was neither too low-key nor turgid, but somewhere in between. It was indeed a style best suited to a writer on church matters. In his *Bibliotheca* Photius says he prefers the style of Sozomen to that of Socrates, with which we are happy to agree. Sozomen wrote elegantly, but Socrates showed better judgement. For Socrates's judgement about people and church matters was always excellent. He never wrote anything that was not serious and important. There is nothing you can delete as superfluous. In

---

27 Approx. 3 miles from Gaza. Both places had a bishop. Zeno was bishop around 400.

28 p. 446 of Valois' text. Book 2 § 85.

29 Licinius was rather unceremoniously dismissed by Constantine, in terms of both his life and reputation.

Sozomen, on the other hand, there is a certain amount that is light and juvenile. In Book One there is a passage about the founding of the city of Hemona<sup>30</sup> and the Argonauts who carried the Argo on their shoulders for several stades. Book Five has a description of the suburbs of Daphnae<sup>31</sup> (p.209). There is also an observation about the beauty of the human body, in which he expresses about the Virgin what the blessed Athanasius adumbrated at such length. Finally, Book Nine contains almost nothing events connected with war, which have nothing to do with church history. But Sozomen's style, which Photius preferred to that of Socrates, is not lacking in faults. For I have observed that his sentences are connected with each other only by the particles δέ and τε, which is really rather laboured. If one carefully reads the letter written in which Sozomen mentions his work to the younger Theodosius, one will definitely find what I said earlier, that Sozomen was not a great orator.

It remains for us to ask which of the two wrote first and which borrowed from the other, or rather purloined. Both wrote almost the same things about the same events, both started and finished historically in the same period, that is to say from the reign of Constantine to the 17th consulship of the younger Theodosius, so it is inevitable that one compiled the material used by the other. The sort of plagiarism practised by many Greek writers is evidenced by Porphyrius in Book Ten of Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*. But which of the two was the plagiarist is difficult to say, since they were contemporaries and wrote their works in the reign of the younger Theodosius. Accordingly, this question is a matter of conjecture. Thus, Porphyrius in the above-mentioned work, in the doubtful matter of whether Hyperides had purloined from Demosthenes or the other way round because they were contemporaries, pronounced that conjecture had to be used. Let us therefore see upon which of them the suspicion of theft falls. It is my opinion that the lesser writer purloined much from the greater and the younger from the older. In my view Sozomen is inferior to Socrates by a long way, and was younger than Socrates when he started writing his work. For he wrote it when he was a lawyer, as I said earlier. The profession of advocate among the Romans was not a permanent occupation but temporary. Ultimately the one who added to and occasionally corrected the work of the other appears to have been the later writer. But Sozomen occasionally added to the work of Socrates and, in some places, disagreed with him, as Photius observes and we have pointed out in our notes. Accordingly, Sozomen appears to have been the later writer. And this

---

30 Mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus *Res Gestae* 28, 43 as the birthplace of Simplicius, who played a prominent part in rather grisly events in 4th cent. Rome

31 Page 625 of Valois' publication. A largely Greek city in the E. Delta region of Egypt, which went rapidly into decline after the foundation of the Greek trading emporium of Naucratis in the W. Delta in the 6th cent. BC



is the opinion of almost recent authorities, who place Socrates before Sozomen. Thus, Bellarminus in his book on *Ecclesiastical Writers*, followed by Miraeus, Labbaeus and Vossius. Among the ancients Cassiodorus, Photius and Nicephorus put Socrates in first place, though Cassiodorus is found to entertain different views. In the preface of his *Tripartite History Tripartita* he changes the order, placing Theodoret first, Sozomen second and Socrates third. This too is the judgement of Theodore the reader in the letter which he prefixed to the *Tripartite History*. So much for Sozomen. It is now time for us to hear the testimony of the ancients about both writers.

## Testimony of the ancients about Socrates and Sozomen

### **Cassiodorus the Senator in his book about divine readings [de institutione divinarum litterarum] c. 17**

*Eusebius' history, in Greek, was followed by those of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. We, with the help of God, have had these writers translated by the learned Epiphanius<sup>32</sup> in one corpus consisting of twelve books: let not eloquent Greece exult that it is necessary to have what it judges to have been removed from you.*

### **Cassiodorus in the preface of his Tripartite History**

*There is admirable consensus that this History, which all Christians believe to be essential, was written by three Greek writers: Theodoret, a venerable bishop, and the two scholars, Socrates and Sozomen. We had them translated into Latin by Epiphanius Scholasticus, in uniform style, with God's help, and reduced the diction of three writers to one.*

### **Liberatus the Deacon in his breviary of Nestorian history c. 2**

*In his Ecclesiastical History Socrates detaches Nestorius from Paul<sup>33</sup> and creates a difference between them. It appears, he said, that Nestorius was unaware of the writings of the ancients. For this reason, as I have said, he was rooted in speech alone. And not only did he give that speech for examination, but he*

---

32 Epiphanius Scholasticus, a 6th cent translator about whose work there is a monograph by Franz Weissengruber *Epiphanius Scholasticus als Übersetzer* (1972), of which I know only the title.

33 Paul of Samosata (born c. 200), who rejected the Trinity to preserve the unity of the Godhead.

also denied totally that it was God who had been born. We confess that the one born of the Blessed Virgin and crucified is the Lord of glory, as the Apostle says : If they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory. Nestorius also said: Jews, do not exult. You have not crucified God. He may be the Lord of glory, but he is not God. Now, he did not say that Christ was a mere mortal, as Paul of Samosata and Photinus had said, also the sermons that he preached show this. Never does he take away the subsistence of the Word God, as Paul and Photinus had done. This is what Socrates says of Paul and Nestorius. Liberatus Breviar. 2

This passage of Socrates is described by Liberatus from Book Twelve of the Tripartite History. The passage reads differently in the Greek texts.

### **Theodore the Reader of the church in Constantinople in the letter prefixed to the Ecclesiastical History**

Eusebius, known as Pamphilius and famed for having summarized so diligently the historians of such ecclesiastical subjects, and I mean not only among Christians, but also among Hebrews, and having made this historical compilation as far as the twentieth year of Constantine the Christ-loving and truly elected by God, the celebrated and blessed Emperor, God-loving and most intelligent men have expended much effort, as their books show, and tackled the subject with much accuracy. I mean, of course, Theodoret, the one of blessed memory who became Bishop of Cyrrhus, Sozomen and Socrates, who concerned themselves with later periods but wrote differently, each one seeking wisdom in the construction of his own discourse.

### **Same letter**

I will start my subject with the history of the blessed Sozomen.

### **Evagrius Scholasticus, c. 1 Book One of the Ecclesiastical History**

Eusebius Pamphilius, Sozomen, Theodoret and Socrates have dealt best of all with the arrival of man-loving God among us and His ascent to heaven, the achievements of the divine apostles and the martyrs who have struggled, and anything else worthy of mention, into the reign of Theodosius.

### **Gregory the Great, Letter 31 Book Six**

The History of Sozomen has something to say about a certain Eudoxius, who is said to have seized the see of Constantinople. But the apostolic see refuses to accept this History on the grounds that it is full of lies and praises Theodore of Mopsuestia too much and relates that he was a great doctor of the Church up to

the day of his death. [Letter 7, 34. Ind. 15]

**(Note by Henri Valois)**

*This praise of Theodore of Mopsuestia is not in Sozomen's History today, but can be found in c. 40 of Book Five of Theodoret's History. Either it has to be said that Gregory suffered a lapse of memory in attributing to Sozomen what was written by Theodoret, an opinion shared by Melchior Canus in Book Two of his Theological Passages.<sup>34</sup> Or, following Baronius in his notes on the Roman Martyrology, it has to be said that the largest part of Book Nine of Sozomen Hermias is missing today, that is the 18 years from the consulship of Agricola and Eustathius to the 17th consulship of Theodosius Augustus; and in those chapters that have been lost through the carelessness of age, Sozomen wrote of Theodore of Mopsuestia what is reported by Gregory the Great. But this response of Baronius, though acceptable to Miraeus and Vossius, in no way satisfies me. Who can believe that the manuscripts of Sozomen's work were more complete in the time of Gregory than they are now? For in the time of Cassiodorus, who predates Gregory, the texts of Sozomen were no greater than those we have now, and this is easy to see from the Tripartite History of Cassiodorus.*

**Seventh Council, Nicaea 787: First Sitting [Mansi 12: 1035]<sup>35</sup>**

*Constantine the most reverent deacon and notary read out from the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates: 'Photinus, who became the Bishop of Sirmium, was a pupil of Marcellus of Ancyra<sup>36</sup> and, like Marcellus, said that the Lord was a mere mortal. ' Again he read out from the same History: 'Those in Serdica condemned their 'ἐρήμην'.<sup>37</sup> They confirmed the definition of faith made at Nicaea and rejected and anathematized 'anomoion'<sup>38</sup>. They gave back their thrones to Paul and Athanasius, as well as Marcellus of Ancyra, whose defence was that they had not understood what was published in the books. For he himself rejected those who said that the Lord was a mere mortal.'*  
Socrates cc. 18 and 20 of Book Two, but not in these words.

**Same Council, later [Mansi 12: 1042]**

*Stephen the most reverent monk and librarian read out from the Ecclesiastical History of Rufinus\*: 'This*

---

34 This 16 cent. Spanish theologian is believed to have attempted to introduce 'scientific' principles into the theological discourse, not least by examining the credibility of historical documents.

35 This council dealt with the worship of images.

36 Died c. 374. Attended the Council of Nicaea, opposed Arianism but was non-Trinitarian, so he was expelled from Nicaea.

37 The council seems to have been held in 343 to settle the Arian controversy. The Greek term is used by Eusebius to describe Marcellus' position as leaving the body of Christ 'bereft' of the Logos cf. J. P. Migne *Patrologia Graeca* 24: 724a

38 see note 39

*domestic persecution, originally of short duration, was prolonged when Macedonius became bishop. Acacius and Patrophilus expelled Maximus from Jerusalem and restored Cyril.*<sup>39</sup>

\* Scribal error for 'Socrates' cf. cc. 27 and 38 of Book Two.

### **Photius Bibliotheca c. 28**

*Read: the History of Socrates, the successor to the work of Eusebius. It starts with the reign of Constantine and goes as far as the reign of the younger Theodosius. The historian, who studied language and literature as a boy, attended classes of Ammonius and Helladius, teachers at Alexandria, Hellenists who were driven out of their native city because of political disagreements and subsequently practised their profession in Constantinople. His book covers a period of 140 years. The entire history comprises seven books. The style is unremarkable, but it is none too accurate in its teachings.*

*Read: the History of Salaminus Hermias Sozomen Scholasticus in nine books. It addresses the history until Theodosius the Younger. It starts with the consulship of Crispus and the reign of Constantine and goes down to Theodosius the Younger.*

*Nicephorus Callistus c. 1 of Book One of his History*

*Hermias Sozomen, also called the Salaminian, and the wise Theodoret Bishop of Cyrrhus, who went to battle in the Third Synod. Also the God-hating Philostorgius.<sup>40</sup> As well as Socrates, pure in terms of address but of persuasion, starting from beyond that one<sup>41</sup> and pursuing their history to Theodosius, all of them somehow tackling the same subject.*

### **Same c. 14 of Book Eleven**

*Socrates, who openly declares in this passage that he does not find Novatians abhorrent, writes that these things were rejected by a certain old man who said that he was the son of a presbyter with whom he had attended the synod.*

---

39 For a study of Cyril see J.W. Drijvers *Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City* (2004)

40 An 'anomoios' Church historian of the 4th-5th cent., who rejected not only the 'homoousios' (same substance) but also 'homoiousios' (similar substance) aspect of the relationship between God and Jesus.

41 Eusebius

**Greco-Roman Law Book Four, chapter about the translations of bishops**

*Hermias of Sozomen writes that Meletius<sup>42</sup> Bishop of Sebaste in Armenia was translated to Antioch at the time of Constantine.*

**Cedrenus, Chronicon p. 275**

*Sozomen says that he was made worthy of a divine vision. He is speaking of Pulcheria Augusta.<sup>43</sup>*

---

42 Died 381.

43 398-453. Daughter of Arcadius and Eudoxia. She took a vow of virginity and had considerable political power when her brother Marcian was emperor and ecclesiastical power in the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.