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Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus wrote church histories in the middle of the fifth century A.D. Each history covered the same period, from Constantine to Theodosius II. Sozomen wrote his history after Socrates' and although it tells many of the same stories, some striking dissimilarities can be identified. One way that Sozomen's history differs from Socrates' is in the author's view of conversion from paganism to Christianity. Sozomen's view is more process-oriented and more transformational than Socrates'.

In this thesis, Sozomen's and Socrates' views of conversion are explored through an analysis of conversion narratives found in the two histories. After discussing some of the recent scholarship on conversion in late antiquity, I survey various historical views of conversions from Plato (fifth century B.C.) to Rufinus (fourth century A.D.) An examination of the background and sources of Sozomen and Socrates also prepares us for a comparison of the two authors. Then I examine five conversion narratives that both Sozomen and Socrates relate in their histories.

For each conversion narrative, I provide the Greek text and an English translation. When the story is clearly derived from Rufinus of Aquilea (another fifth-century church historian), I provide the Latin and an English translation of his account as well. By comparing terminology, metaphors and overall narrative style, I analyse the different conversion accounts in order to understand each author's view of conversion.
Research on conversion in history has increased recently, but it still relies primarily on autobiographical accounts. This thesis provides a different perspective by analyzing two lay historians who tell stories about conversions in the crucial period just after the conversion of Constantine. These authors' views on conversion inform scholars who research their historiography, but they also provide the historian of the period with some insight into how conversion was perceived. Thus, the implications of this study have ramifications for both historiographical and historical research in the fifth-century Roman empire.
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NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS

The most recent translation of Sozomen's history in English is the 1890 version in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* series. Likewise, the most recent of Socrates' is from the same year, the same series. For this reason, I have chosen to translate each conversion narrative—in both Sozomen's and Socrates' histories—at the beginning of each chapter. These translations are based on the editions listed in the bibliography with reference to the English and French translations also listed there.

Since a more recent English translation of Rufinus' history is readily available (1997, by Philip R. Amidon, S.J.), I have chosen to use it rather than re-translate Rufinus' work myself. I have still included the text and Amidon's translation for quick reference and comparison within the chapters.

Any incidental translations within the body of this paper are my own, unless otherwise marked.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Socrates and Sozomen wrote church histories in Greek during the first half of the fifth century A.D., both of which cover the period from Constantine to Theodosius II. The two works contain many similarities, yet important distinctions can also be identified. Sozomen almost certainly wrote his history with a copy of Socrates before him.\(^1\) Although style has been identified as a primary reason for Sozomen to rewrite Socrates' history, I believe that a more substantive cause for such a massive undertaking existed. An examination of different views of conversion in antiquity along with a comparison of five narratives in Sozomen's and Socrates' church histories will demonstrate that one reason Sozomen rewrote Socrates' history was to refine the concept of conversion, which was in flux because of Constantine's acceptance of Christianity.\(^2\) Sozomen's more precise explanations and descriptions of conversions manifest a process-oriented view of conversion as well as a perspective that is more transformational than Socrates'.

In this introduction, I discuss the definition of conversion, taking particular note of some recent scholarship on conversion in antiquity. The second chapter contains a

\(^{1}\)Georg Schoo. Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sozomenos (Berlin 1911).
\(^{2}\)For other reasons Sozomen rewrote Socrates' history see Theresa Urbainczyk, "Observations on the Differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen," *Historia* 46 (1997), 355-373.
survey of conversion in antiquity from Plato to the fifth century A.D. In the third chapter, I discuss the background and sources of Sozomen and Socrates. Chapters four through eight each cover one set of parallel conversion narratives from Socrates' and Sozomen's histories. In these chapters, I offer the text and a translation of each passage followed by an analysis and comparison of the narratives. The final chapter brings the discussion to a conclusion by demonstrating how these five narratives illustrate the distinction between Sozomen's and Socrates' views of conversion.

A.D. Nock wrote the classic work on conversion from a historical perspective, called Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo (1933). He posited two categories of religions: religions of tradition (those in which practice or ritual is the essential element) and prophetic religions (those in which the underlying idea is essential and practice is secondary).³ To become a part of the former requires no difficult decision, but to join the latter entails a renunciation of a former way of life.⁴ Nock called the process of becoming a part of these religions adhesion and conversion, respectively.⁵ Thus, he defined conversion as “reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another, a turning which implies a consciousness that a great change is involved, that the old was wrong and the new is right.”⁶

Based on this understanding of conversion, Nock traced the history of conversion from the ancient Greeks to Augustine. Before the arrival of Christianity on

⁴ Nock. Conversion, 5.
⁵ Nock. Conversion, 7.
the scene, religious ‘conversion’ was merely adhesion, with few exceptions.\(^7\) New cults were received with little emotion.\(^8\) From the fifth century B.C to the first century A.D., Greeks and Romans maintained a cool respect for traditional religion, recognizing that it should be retained but sometimes reinterpreted.\(^9\) Nock suggested that although “we conceive of religion as ‘all or nothing,’” worship for the ancients had no key to life’s meaning; rather, it rested on emotion and not conscious theory and thinking. “So long as you did not try to take from these men anything which they had in religion, they could not as a rule object to new methods and new processes.”\(^10\)

Philosophy was the ancients’ source of meaning, according to Nock. With philosophy, “we can use the word conversion for the turning from luxury and self-indulgence and superstition...to a life of discipline and sometimes to a life of contemplation, scientific or mystic.”\(^11\) Nock also found it interesting (and relevant to a discussion of conversion) that philosophers often use the metaphor of initiation or a series of initiations to describe the ascent into philosophical truth.\(^12\)

The final chapter of Nock’s book, “Three Types of Conversion,” studied three conversions: Justin, Arnobius and Augustine. Justin came to Christianity after a disappointing intellectual search. Arnobius was “interested in a way of escape from mortality and fate;”\(^13\) in addition, he attempted to show how Christianity was different

---

\(^7\) One exception is Orphism, a fifth-century way of living based on the sacred literature of Orpheus and Musaeus. “Its emergence is the product of social unrest and of a religious anxiety which showed itself in a desire for purifications...This literature could lead to a rejection of one’s old life and the entering on a new life, which is conversion...Orphism [produced] an idea of conversion and a sacred literature but no church” (Nock, 26-32)

\(^8\) Nock. Conversion, 37.

\(^9\) Nock. Conversion, 120.

\(^10\) Nock. Conversion, 163.

\(^11\) Nock. Conversion, 179.

\(^12\) Nock. Conversion, 182. For instance, Seneca (Epistles, 90.28) and Persius’ satires.

\(^13\) Nock. Conversion, 258.
from the "normal pagan present." Augustine's conversion (the only post-
Constantinian one of the three) "rests in the last resort on the permanence of an early
impression and of the religious atmosphere with which his mother had invested his
childhood."15

In an article written the same year, Nock concluded that "the result of a miracle
is πίστις, that is to say, those present or some of them take up an attitude of
submissive reliance in the new δύναμις and its representatives."16 Ramsay MacMullen
noted the contradiction between this view (i.e., "conversion may follow on a person's
watching two holy men in competition with each other") and the aforementioned view
that conversion "is defined or prescribed by authority—there is a right way and a
wrong way—and it must involve our whole selves."17 MacMullen suggested that Nock
had neglected to discern between conversion of elite and masses. According to
MacMullen, Nock's book generally reflected conversion among the elite, whereas his
article described conversion among the masses.

In response to MacMullen's article, William S. Babcock suggested that the
division between elite and masses was not so great. He noted that Theodoret, as a
member of the elite, told the story of the conversion of the bedouins that MacMullen
used as an example of the masses. He posited that there was a link between high-
brow and low-brow, rather than a strict dichotomy between elite and masses; i.e.,
normal Greco-Roman religion led some individuals to embrace philosophy.

14 Nock. Conversion, 259.
15 Nock. Conversion, 266.
Moreover, he proposed that Christianity held high-brow and low-brow together—which was part of its genius.\textsuperscript{18}

MacMullen also discussed how the Greco-Roman understanding of religion differed significantly from the Christian view. Greco-Roman religion was a set of rites and an unsystematic amalgam of beliefs; Christianity, on the other hand, was a set of rules for life and had a very specific orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{19} Many who try to understand ancient religion impose their own Christian framework on the ancients and thereby misunderstand them.\textsuperscript{20} This is essential to conversion when we consider that those who were converted came from the ancient matrix rather than the Christian matrix. Both the reason they converted and the way they understood their conversion most likely came more from their past understanding than from the Christian perspective.

As MacMullen has pointed out, the greatest problem for the historian who attempts to understand conversion is the confusion of theology with history, from which Nock suffered.\textsuperscript{21} Nock’s view, which was based on William James’ \textit{Varieties of Religious Experience}, focused on extraordinary personal experiences rather than the normal or typical.\textsuperscript{22} As we examine conversion in the fifth century, we must be careful not to impose 20th-century, Judeo-Christian presuppositions on the definition of conversion. R.A. Markus suggested that a renunciation of one’s prior religion is all that is required of a convert. He continued:

\textsuperscript{18} William S. Babcock. “MacMullen on Conversion: A Response,” \textit{The Second Century} 5:2 (1985/6), 82-89. I think, however, that the categories of higher and lower are better, albeit not perfect, as general categories for religious experiences in Late Antiquity, even though the labels of elite and masses may work.

\textsuperscript{19} MacMullen, “Conversion,” 71-2. Nock tried to pick and choose what conversions were valid based on his Christian understanding rather than attempting to view conversion from the pagan standpoint.

\textsuperscript{20} MacMullen gave Theodoret’s story of the conversion of the bedouins by Symeon as an example. Many modern readers misunderstand the conversion of the bedouins by following carefully what Theodoret wrote, which was clearly a ‘Christian matrix’ understanding.

\textsuperscript{21} Ramsay MacMullen. \textit{Christianizing the Roman Empire}: A.D. 100-400 (New Haven 1984), 1.

\textsuperscript{22} Eugene V. Gallagher. \textit{Expectation and Experience: Explaining Religious Conversion} (Atlanta 1990), 126.
But where does that religion end, and his manner of life, his 'secular' customs or 'culture', begin? What are the boundaries of Christianity, part of its essential substance? What, minimally, will make a convert a 'Christian'? There may be a universally valid and unchanging answer to that question; but a historian can only note the uncertainties, the shifts, doubts, and debates concerning it.\(^23\)

One purpose of this paper is to note the shifts and debates in views of conversion in the fifth century, using Sozomen and Socrates as case studies to that end.

Conversion has recently become a significant topic of discussion. A panel at the 27th International Congress on Medieval Studies in May 1992 discussed conversion in the Middle Ages, which ultimately led to further panels and the publication of a book of essays.\(^24\) Several scholars have made a beginning at studying conversion in ancient and medieval history, but much work remains to be done. Several prefaces to recent works have called for a discussion of the "full range of conversion experiences in order to provide a baseline or starting point for further study of the conversion experience."\(^25\) This thesis is a contribution to such an endeavor.

Many autobiographies of conversion, such as the seminal Confessions of Saint Augustine, have already been carefully analyzed and dissected. Scholars use such personal accounts to describe elite, intellectual views of conversion. Other scholars—such as MacMullen—use historical accounts to examine the spread of Christianity, but only in general terms. In this thesis, I analyze Sozomen's and Socrates' historical accounts of conversion (i.e., conversion narratives) to determine their views of conversion. This focus on historical accounts rather than autobiographies (or even

---


\(^{24}\)James Muldoon, ed. Varieties of Religious Conversion in the Middle Ages (Gainesville 1997), preface.

\(^{25}\)Muldoon, preface.
biographies) adds a new perspective to understanding how conversion was viewed and understood in the ancient world.

Third-person conversion narratives—such as the ones studied in this thesis—are second-order explanations of experience. Unlike Augustine and others who describe their own personal conversions, Sozomen and Socrates tell the stories of others' conversions, from a distance. This narrative distance allows for not only a less emotional, more objective account, but also for more interpretation by the author. Since Sozomen and Socrates are not referring to any real experience in their own lives (at least not directly), certain generalized patterns in their thinking affect their presentation more easily. Thus, their hermeneutics of conversion (which are informed by their views of conversion and of religion in general) are more clearly evident to the historian.

Rather than focusing on the conversion experience itself, which can only be known imperfectly through fictive accounts, I discuss the way the narratives are constructed. Each conversion narrative I analyze is certainly influenced by the historical events it represents, but what is more important for my analysis is how each author describes the historical events, rather than the events per se. Understanding the lens through which these authors interpret the Christianization process will help us in a couple of ways. First, as I have already said, this analysis will provide a basis for further study of conversion through history, particularly in the ancient and early medieval context. Second, it will inform the historian who uses Sozomen's and Socrates' histories for any purpose—whether for the Christianization accounts or for general history of the empire in this period. This thesis makes a contribution both to

---

the study of historical views of conversion and to the historiography of these two authors.

In the history of the idea of conversion, few more important periods exist than the fifth century A.D. Christianity, in which conversion plays a central role, had recently become acceptable in the Roman empire through the conversion of Constantine in 312. Moreover, in the period between Constantine and Theodosius, Christianity spread rapidly through the world and gained in prominence within the empire, ultimately becoming not just a tolerated religion, but even the preferred one. By the fifth century, Christianity had become the required religion and other religions were actively persecuted. Thus, Sozomen and Socrates wrote at the beginning of an era of church domination, but they described a period when the church was developing to that point. The radical change in the status of the church (from persecuted to persecutor) affected the perception of conversion. The old, pre-Constantinian ideas underwent a transformation to the new, early medieval paradigm. One of the reasons for such a shift is the change in the social ramifications of becoming a Christian. Rather than a move down the social hierarchy, it became a move up. Political considerations also became important since the emperor and his court were Christians.

In the new post-Constantinian era, written accounts of conversion began to be produced and influenced future conversion experiences. For an intellectual, no finer model could be found than Augustine in his Confessions, but for others, different models were needed. Socrates and Sozomen provide such models. Indeed, my analysis will show that deficiency in Socrates' representation of conversion was a primary motivating factor for Sozomen's writing a history that covered the same period of time. Socrates' preoccupation with political and doctrinal aspects of
conversion lacked the individual touch and transformational power that Sozomen perceived in the conversion process.

Sozomen's accounts demonstrate the influence of individuals and the transformational aspect of conversion by emphasizing a process-oriented paradigm, in which transformation occurs often through the influence of an individual, apart from any doctrinal concerns. The analysis of the five parallel conversion narratives in chapters four through eight demonstrates this difference between Socrates' and Sozomen's views of conversion.
CHAPTER 2

Conversion in Antiquity

Much has been written in recent years about conversion in various periods of antiquity. A brief historical sketch of portrayals of conversion prior to the fifth century A.D. will provide some framework for the discussion of Sozomen and Socrates.

Plato provides the first expression of the concept of conversion in Republic 518c-d. In this passage he discusses the turning of the soul from darkness unto light (στρέφειν πρὸς τὸ φαντα κατ' αὐτόν), a metaphor for conversion which has remained common throughout the ages. Moreover, the word he uses, στρέφειν, became a widely used term for conversion. Among both philosophers and Christians, its close relative εἰπτρέφειν (εἰπτροφή) was often used to signify a changing of attitude or perspective (i.e., conversion).\(^{27}\) He does not, however, limit his description to one word, but even in the same passage refers to conversion as περιπλανώμενος "a turning around." Regardless of what terminology he uses, Plato clearly describes the conversion of the soul from a lower realm to a higher realm (from an old view to a new one, in Nock's words).

Cicero first translated the idea of εἰπτροφή into the Latin conversio. In De Natura Deorum 1.77, he writes

\(^{27}\)For a comprehensive study of εἰπτρέφειν, see Paul Aubin, Le problème de la 'conversion' (Paris 1963). He catalogs over 1500 uses of εἰπτρέφειν in ancient texts, both pagan and Christian.
Primum omnium quis tam caecus in contemplandis rebus umquam fuit ut non videret species istas hominum conlatas in deos aut consilio quodam sapientium, quo facilitis animos imperatorum ad deorum cultum a vitae pravitate converterent...

To begin with, was anyone ever so blind in his survey of realities as not to see that these human shapes have been ascribed to the gods for one of two possible reasons? Either some strategy of the philosophers sought to divert more easily the minds of the unsophisticated from debased living towards observance of the gods...

Thus, Cicero applies the term specifically to religion, even if in a satirical way. Unfortunately, the context does not provide much depth to the definition of the word, but one wonders whether his use of convertere in a religious context implies that such terminology was commonly used in reference to religion. Before Apuleius (see below), however, no instance of conversion to any pagan religion is found in ancient texts.

Judaism, unlike paganism, embraced the concept of conversion. Forms of the Hebrew word shub are used to discuss the relationship between God and his people. The concept of return to relationship and of fidelity versus infidelity is the basis of the Hebrew view of conversion. This perspective derives from the importance of covenant in Judaism. When the Greek-speaking Jews of the second century B.C. wrote the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, they often translated shub with forms of ἐπιστρέψεως. For example, Psalm 51:13 reads καὶ ἀσέβείς ἐπιστρέψοι σε ἐν κύριῳ and sinners will turn back to you. Later, in the writing of the 'pseudepigrapha' of 200 B.C. to 200 A.D., another term—μετάνοια—is used as a synonym of ἐπιστρέψεως to

---

30 New International Version.
emphasize the aspect of repentance. The Testament of Abraham contains the following example: "I have mercy upon the sinners that they may turn [ἐπιστρέψοντες] and live [ζωόντες] and repent [μετανοεῖν] of their sins and be saved [σωθεῖνται]."\textsuperscript{31} The parallel construction between turning/living and repenting/being saved demonstrates the similarity of ἐπιστρέфаω and μετανοεῖν.

The New Testament provides a variety of perspectives on conversion. The synoptic gospels portray conversion as penitential, often combining references to repentance [μετάνοια] and belief [πίστις] (Mk 1:14, Mt 4:17).\textsuperscript{32} In Paul’s letters, the two metaphors of ‘darkness to light’ and ‘new creation’ emphasize the idea of transformation. John also consistently uses the idea of rebirth or reformation to describe conversion. Luke focuses on conversion in Acts, including twenty one accounts of it. He describes conversion as a process of faith, repentance (and forgiveness), discipleship, baptism and transformation by the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, in the New Testament variations on the theme of repentance and transformation characterize the portrayal of conversion.

The story of Paul provides a basic model for conversion to Christianity.\textsuperscript{34} The narrative of his conversion experience is among the clearest and longest in Acts.\textsuperscript{35} Luke tells the basic story in Acts 9:1-18. Paul, a known persecutor of Christians, was on his way to Damascus when he and his companions were surrounded by a light and fell to the ground (v. 1-4). Out of the light Paul heard a voice saying "Why are you

\textsuperscript{32} Finn. Death to Rebirth, 25.
\textsuperscript{33} Finn. Death to Rebirth, 27-8. For a list of the various conversion accounts see footnote 25 on Finn Death to Rebirth, 27.
\textsuperscript{34} Alan F. Segal. Paul the Convert (New Haven: 1990), 147.
\textsuperscript{35} Among the twenty plus accounts of conversion that Finn identifies, only five are longer than ten verses. Of these five, three are accounts of Paul’s conversion (9:1-18, 22:6-16 and 26:12-23).
persecuting me?” (v. 4). He was told to go to the city and await instructions (v. 6). When Paul stood up, he was blind from the encounter (v. 8). At the same time, a disciple in Damascus named Ananias was receiving instructions in a vision to lay hands on Paul and restore his sight (v. 10-12). Ananias went to Paul and said the Lord had sent him so that Paul could see again and be filled with the Holy Spirit (v. 17). When Paul’s vision was restored he got up and was baptized (v. 18). Paul recounts this story in Acts 22:1-16, calling it his ἀπολογία. In it he identifies himself as a zealous Jew and persecutor of Christians until his experience on the way to Damascus. In Acts 26:12-23 he tells the story again before King Agrippa, adding that the Lord sent him to "open their eyes and turn [ἐπιστρέψαι] them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, so that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me” (v. 18).36 Thus, the basic element of turning from the old to the new prevails in Paul’s conversion narrative, as told by Luke.

Philostratus wrote his Vita Apollonii during the late second century A.D. Apollonius himself lived in the early first century A.D. and was known as a philosophical holy man. As for conversion, Philostratus portrays Apollonius as blessed from birth (and even before), but if a moment of conversion can be indentified it is his sixteenth year when προελθὼν δὲ ἐς ἑτος δέκατον καὶ ἑκτὸν ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Πυθαγόρου βίον, πτερωθεὶς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τινὸς κρείττονος "he felt an impulse towards the life of Pythagoras, being given wings to get there by some higher power" (V.A. 1.7).37 Later, however, someone suggests to him that he should convert his brother: εἰπόντος δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὸς, ὡς σωφρονίσατο τὸν ἄδελφον προσήκοι αὐτῷ καὶ μεταβαλέν τοῦ τρόπου "someone said to him that it was his duty to

36 New International Version.
correct his brother and convert him from his evil ways" (V.A. I.13). Apollonius responds with "how can I who am the younger one correct and render wise and older man? but so far as I can do anything I will heal him of these bad passions" (V.A. I.13). Furthermore, his oratorical skills resulted in conversions among the basest of people: ἐπεστρέφειν ἐς ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώπους ἀμουσοτάτους, "he converted to himself the most unrefined people" (V.A. I.17). Philostratus uses vocabulary in an interesting way (as we will see later à propos Sozomen and Socrates)—i.e., μεταβαλεῖν to mean transformation of life, ἐπιστρέφειν to indicate a change of perspective brought about by oratory.

Lucian of Samosata, another writer of the middle to late second century A.D., also describes conversion to a philosophical life. In Nigrinus, he addresses a character who has changed all of a sudden—ἐξελθεῖν μεταβεβλησάτε, "you have changed all of a sudden" (Nigr. 1). The addressee claims he was once a slave, now free; once poor, now rich; once witless and befogged, now saner (Nigr. 1). He then proceeds to explain that his contact with the philosopher Nigrinus effected a transformation in him. As the speaker recounts the words of Nigrinus, the concept of conversion pervades his speech. For example, Nigrinus believes the inclination to philosophy should not be delayed—ἀμέλελθητον ἔχασα τὴν πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὀρμήν, "an inclination toward the higher life brooked no delay" (Nigr. 27). Furthermore, at the end of the dialogue, the listener has been profoundly affected—μεταξύ σοῦ λέγοντος ἔπαισκόν τι ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, "as you talked I felt something like a change of heart" (Nigr. 38). Thus, in this

dialogue the words of a wise man (as well as perhaps an inherent inclination) bring about a conversion to a different kind of life.

Justin Martyr underwent a conversion from Platonism to Christianity around 130 A.D. Eusebius mentions the change briefly in his Historia ecclesiastica 4.8:

Ἐν ταύτῳ δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπὶ τὴν θεοσέβειαν μεταβολὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μὴ ἀλόγως, μετὰ κρίσεως 8 αὐτῶ γεγόνει δηλών, ταύτα γράφει...

In the same volume, he also shows that his conversion from Greek philosophy to true religion was not made rashly, but after reflection. Thus he writes...

Eusebius then quotes a passage from Justin's Apology in which Justin describes his change of opinion about the Christians (but not his own acceptance of Christianity). A better autobiographical account of his conversion is found in his Dialogue with Trypho. In chapter 8.1-2, Justin explains that after an encounter with an old man who helped him recognize the futility of his old beliefs, "a fire was kindled in [Justin's] soul." He yearned for the prophets and Christ's friends. He considered Christ's words true philosophy and thereby called himself a philosopher. After this confession, he tries to convince Trypho to make the same decision. Thus, in Justin we see an experience that combines the philosophical and the religious. "It is described as a conversion from pseudophilosophy to True Philosophy."

Apuleius, who was born in Africa around 125 A.D., wrote the only narrative of conversion to pagan religion that remains extant. The eleventh book of the

---

44 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 4.8.
45 Van Winden. An Early Christian Philosopher, 118.
46 The Greek text for this account can be found in Van Winden An Early Christian Philosopher, 14.
47 Oskar Skarsaune, "The Conversion of Justin Martyr" Studia Theologica 30 (1976), 71. For more discussion of Justin's conversion and how it relates to the typical Hellenistic Jewish view of conversion, see Skarsaune's article.
Metamorphoses, or Golden Ass, gives a narrative of conversion from a lowly state to a holy one. Isis rescues the character (whether it be Apuleius himself or Lucius, the narrator of the book) and asks for his devotion in return. Whether this account can be called conversion and how it is to be taken (autobiographical, satirical, etc.) has been a subject of debate, but Nancy Shumate proposes the possibility that the entire story (not just book eleven) recounts an epistemological crisis which is solved by a conversion to Isis.\textsuperscript{48} Nock and others have suggested conversion to paganism (as seen in Apuleius) only appeared as a reaction to Christianity. This is a likely influence on Apuleius, considering the early Christianization of Africa, but that does not lessen the importance of his perspective of conversion.

Origen, like other theologians of the early church, had his own theory of conversion. John Smith has described his view as a process consisting of three modes.\textsuperscript{49} The first stage is the struggle with aisthesis (love of things physical and mental which belong to the world of appearances and superficiality).\textsuperscript{50} The second is the struggle for moral excellence (arete) and practice (praxis), a movement toward virtuous acts and thoughts.\textsuperscript{51} The third is the mode of spirit—mystical communion with Christ and the Holy Spirit. Origen's view combined these three modes into one experience. Conversion cannot completely occur without all three stages, but the process itself "is the continuous result of the coincidence of all three."\textsuperscript{52} Thus essentially Origen's concept of conversion resembles the Platonic ascent of the soul from the material realm to the spiritual. It is a return to a previous, higher state.

\textsuperscript{48}Nancy Shumate. Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses (Ann Arbor 1996).
\textsuperscript{50}Smith, "Conversion," 227.
\textsuperscript{51}Smith, "Conversion," 228.
\textsuperscript{52}Smith, "Conversion," 240.
Synesius of Cyrene underwent a conversion to philosophy at the school of Hypatia in the late fourth century. He devoted himself to Hypatia and considered her an example of the philosophical life. In addition, his letters "reveal him embracing a new and noble way of life."53 The question of his conversion to Christianity is debatable. According to Jay Bregman, Synesius never really converted to Christianity, but rather Christianity merely fit into his philosophical (Neoplatonic) understanding of the world. His philosophy allowed him to accommodate Christianity, even to the point of becoming a bishop.54 Alan Cameron, however, demonstrates that Synesius was actually raised in a Christian home and therefore conversion was unnecessary.55 The close tie between Neoplatonism and Christianity was both prevalent and accepted in the fourth century.

Augustine, the most famous convert of late antiquity, was converted in the late fourth century. He tells his story in the Confessions, which was written shortly before 400. For him, conversion is both intellectual journey and inner transformation. He had gone through several other belief systems, only to find his fulfillment in Christianity. Like Synesius, he was highly influenced by Neoplatonism. His conversion did more than answer his search for intellectual satisfaction; it also transformed his passions and lifestyle. The Confessions is a classic in religious autobiography, and its perspective on conversion has had a profound effect on the definition of the term.56

Eusebius of Caesarea, the father of church history, does not include any extended narratives of conversion in his Church History, which was written in the early

54 Bregman. Synesius, 36-40.
fourth century. He commonly makes short references to conversions, such as Justin Martyr's (4.8), using both μεταβολή and ἐπιστροφή to describe the idea of conversion. When he does mention conversion, he focuses on individuals rather than groups. Beyond this, his conversion accounts are too short to tell us much about how he perceived conversion beyond the idea of transition from old to new.

Rufinus of Aquileia was asked to translate and augment Eusebius' *Church History* around 400. The two books he wrote to bring the history up to date contain multiple conversion narratives. Most of these focus on the conversion of entire nations or communities rather than individuals. He portrayed conversion as closely linked with the process of Romanization (a change in political and social structures as well as religious ones). In each case, a simple Christian individual plays a central role in the conversion of the nation or individual. Thus the ascent from lower to higher or the inner transformation is generally lacking; in its place is a transformation of external affairs and a change in society.

As brief and cursory as it is, this summary demonstrates that conversion is a relatively flexible concept. Almost all students of conversion come to the conclusion that although the term has a basic element (perhaps the movement from the old to the new), its real meaning is both defined by and defines the culture in which it is used.

---

57 For ἐπιστροφή see Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.43; for μεταβολή see Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 4.8.
58 These will be discussed below.
61 For example, the tearing down of old temples and building of churches is often stressed. Likewise the setting up of priestly, or relations with the emperor are given more space than any spiritual or even behavioral transformation.
"Every community develops its own definition of conversion." In fact, multiple conceptions of conversion are often accepted in a culture or community. Some basic archetypes include forced, crisis-induced or sacramental. Indeed any number of models exist in theory and simply await identification and analysis. Although many may argue that religious experience defies analysis, the reality is that "experience always seems more comprehensible, and even more meaningful, when it is perceived as a patterned and organized process."

Language plays an important role in understanding how different individuals and communities perceive conversion. Several different Greek verbs (and related nouns) were used to describe religious experience. χριστιανεῖσθαι means simply to become Christian or to act like a Christian. προσβεβλάω means to honor or worship a deity. ἐπιστρέφω refers to a turning toward something. μεταβάλλω signifies the act of transforming, which according to Webster’s dictionary means "changing in character or condition." Thus, these words emphasize different aspects of conversion. Further study of the Greek and Latin terminology would enhance our understanding of the idea of conversion, but such an endeavor is beyond the scope of this paper.

Understanding how conversion is viewed or portrayed in a certain society informs the historian about the world his subject inhabits. Conversion models are formed by society, by governments and by cultural experience. The historian learns about conversion from narrative—didactic, autobiographical, biographical, encomiastic,

---

62 Segal, Paul, 72.
64 For some background on -πεῖ verbs in Greek, see David F. Graf, "Medism: the Origin and Significance of the Term" Journal of Hellenic Studies 104 (1984), 15-30.
65 Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary.
poetic, or whatever—but narratives of religious experience always result in a
discursive loop.\textsuperscript{67} Narratives, which more or less represent experience, are shaped by
previous narratives as well as cultural norms. Moreover, accounts of conversion
(written or otherwise) ultimately affect experience.\textsuperscript{68} For the historian, the cultural
norm—the impact of both experience and narrative—provides information that
enhances both the historical and the historiographical understanding of the period.

By the fifth century, a large and expanding corpus of personal conversion
narratives existed. The philosophers, Paul, Justin, Augustine and others provide
various models of the individual undergoing a transformation from an old way of life to
a new—from a lower existence to a higher. Theories of how conversion should
happen, rituals for individuals to experience and the stories of certain individuals are
available, but what is lacking in our evidence are examples of mass conversion. Whole
communities never converted to philosophy; it was a personal decision and process.
Other than Apuleius' \textit{Metamorphoses}, there is little evidence of conversion in pagan
religion, much less mass conversion. Potential exists for large groups to convert to
Christianity, but little if any narrative evidence of this survives, especially for the period
prior to the fourth century.\textsuperscript{69}

Conversions of groups and communities were occurring in the fourth century as
a result of Constantine's becoming Christian. These were often due to palpable

\textsuperscript{67}Shumate. \textit{Crisis}, 16-7.
\textsuperscript{68}An unmistakably clear example of this is Puritan New England. Conversion was a necessary element
of the church member's life and was expected to follow certain guidelines to be accepted as genuine.
Puritans such as Richard Baxter clearly delineate the course to be followed. For further clarification,
read any Puritan theologians or modern studies on their concept of conversion such as Norman Pettit
\textsuperscript{69}Some reports of group responses to preaching, such as the large crowds in the New Testament book
of Acts do occur, but extended narratives are hard to find.
dispays of power, such as miracles of healing.\textsuperscript{70} The process of Christianization must not have been happening fast enough, however, since it was necessary to legislate the suppression of paganism as evidenced in book sixteen of the Theodosian Code, which contains a collection of laws against paganism that were promulgated in the late fourth and early fifth century.\textsuperscript{71} For example, "a law (16.5.63) issued to the proconsul of Africa from Aquileia in the summer of 425, after the suppression of Johannes' usurpation, opens with...we prosecute all heresies and perfidies, all schisms and superstitions of the pagans, all false doctrines inimical to the Catholic faith."\textsuperscript{72}

Such legislation was intended to speed up the Christianization process. Theodosius and other emperors of the late fourth and early fifth centuries wanted as much of the empire as possible to convert. Entire communities were pressured and persuaded into conversion. Whether by force of legislation or by persuasive demonstrations of power by monks and holy men, pagans were expected to convert. The experience of people undergoing conversion under such circumstances must have been quite different from the model that prevailed in the literature of the ancient (i.e., pre-Constantinian) world. Conversion did not occur just among those who investigated various philosophical options or among the intellectually curious, but it happened (or was supposed to happen) to everyone. The ordinary inhabitant of the Roman empire at this time would not be able to identify with the spiritual/intellectual journey of philosophers.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{70}For more on miracles and displays of power as causes of conversion see Ramsay MacMullen. \textit{Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400} (New Haven 1984).
\textsuperscript{72}Hunt, "Christianizing," 145.
\textsuperscript{73}For further discussion of conversion among non-intellectuals, see Ramsay MacMullen's works cited in the bibliography.
As the imperial hierarchy was increasing the pressure to convert, a noticeable trend occurs in conversion narratives. Although conversion as intellectual journey continues to be a theme (e.g., Augustine wrote his *Confessions* around 400), a new kind of narrative appears. Around 402 or 403, Rufinus published his translation of Eusebius' *Church History* with an additional two books, in which he included five extended narratives of conversion.  

Four of these involved large groups of people: the Indians (10.9), the Iberians (10.10), an island community (11.4) and the Saracens (11.6). Sozomen and Socrates copied these conversion narratives and added other examples of mass conversion (such as the Goths and a crowd of pagans at the destruction of the Serapeum in Alexandria).

Eusebius' *Church History* contains no extended narratives of conversion, so one must wonder what prompted Rufinus to add so many in the small addendum he included with his translation. Eusebius wrote his history during the reign of Constantine. Christianity had just been granted new status by Constantine's acceptance of the Christian God, but Eusebius had grown to maturity in the period following the persecutions of the late third century. Based on his experience, he typically portrayed conversion as an individual (or small group) decision as a response to preaching or to the life of a martyr, but never as a communal activity. Moreover, he never provides extended third-person narratives, but merely a few lines reporting that the conversion occurred.

Even when group conversions resulted from preaching, Eusebius describes them in terms of the individual. For example, responding to the preaching of evangelists, a crowd of men immediately received in their souls the worship of the

---

74 By extended narratives of conversion I mean narratives that are more than a few lines long.
Creator (ἀθέτως αὐτανῆρα πλῆθνα προθύμως τὴν εἰς τὸν τῶν ὠλαν Δημιουργόν εὑσέβειαν αὐταῖς ψυχάς καταδέχεσθαι). The use of αὐτανῆρα stresses the men in the crowd and the phrase αὐταῖς ψυχάς puts an unmistakable emphasis on the individual's experience. In Rufinus' history, however, conversion narratives center on entire people groups accepting Christianity, such as the Indians and Iberians. Even if the passages themselves often contain references to the individuals, a shift toward a more communal type of conversion was occurring.

The narrative of the communal conversion first appears in Rufinus' Church History. He completed his translation with addendum at the request of the bishop Chromatius of Aquileia around 402 or 403. Chromatius wanted to encourage his people who were under pressure from Alaric and the Goths. Rufinus intended to display the power of God to give hope to a down-trodden people. This explains his emphasis on holy men who bring about conversions, particularly among large masses of people. Narratives of communal conversions demonstrate God's power to affect the world on a large scale. To balance the impersonal and indirect nature of mass conversions, Rufinus sometimes mentions the individuals in the process. For instance, in his narrative about the conversion of the Iberians, he states that men followed Christ because of the king's influence and women because of the queen's. He is not, however, concerned to show a profound impact on the individual; rather he strives to demonstrate the power of a religion that can affect so many people. This marks a shift from the Eusebian perspective, but Rufinus' continuators take it even one step further.

75 Eusebius Hist. eccl. 3.37.
77 Rufinus. Hist. eccl. 10.11.
Sozomen and Socrates repeat and reshape Rufinus' conversion narratives for inclusion in their own histories. When they reproduce the stories, the emphasis on the individual that survived to a certain extent in Rufinus erodes even further. One passage in which this is particularly noticable is the conversion of the Indians. Sozomen leaves out the phrase *infinitus numerus Barbarorum converteretur ad fidem*, "an infinite number of barbarians were converted to the faith."78 This omission is rather remarkable considering Sozomen's interest in conversion and in the power of the holy man. For Sozomen, however, it is enough to say that "the Indians shared in the doctrine (of the Christians) through Frumentius" (τοὺς ἐνθὸν τῶν καθ ἡμᾶς Ἰνδῶν μετασχεῖν...τοῦ δόγματος ὑπὸ Φρομμεντίω).79 Thus, Sozomen and Socrates consistently show less of an interest in the individual than Rufinus.

This progression from a stress on individual conversions to stories of mass conversions demonstrates a shift in the perception of conversion. In addition to the model of an individual decision, the idea of conversion en masse has become a possibility. The obvious problem when such a shift occurs is that conversion becomes watered down. The carefully thought out decision of an individual (or even the powerful persuasion of an individual) is replaced by a group following the leader. The differences in Socrates' and Sozomen's accounts of conversion narratives are a result of Sozomen's concern to deal with this slipping definition of conversion. He does not abandon the mass conversion model, but alters it and expands it to strengthen the idea of conversion. In order to analyze this concept, we will examine five parallel passages in Socrates' and Sozomen's histories, with reference to Rufinus' where necessary.

First, however, we will discuss the authors and their sources.

---

CHAPTER 3

Sozomen and Socrates

Sozomen and Socrates wrote their church histories from differing perspectives and backgrounds. Each gleaned their information from a variety of sources. To understand their views of conversion and to assess their conversion narratives, we must first discuss their background and sources.

Sozomen

Sozomen can be used as a source for a fifth-century view of conversion, but only after a careful analysis of him and his HE.\textsuperscript{80} Sozomen was a Christian layman who came from near Gaza to Constantinople to practice law during the reign of Theodosius II (r. 408-450). He wrote the HE sometime between 439 and 450.\textsuperscript{81} His grandfather had converted from paganism when he witnessed a man being healed of demon possession by a monk.\textsuperscript{82} Sozomen was educated by monks, but never became one himself. He came to Constantinople to make a name for himself.\textsuperscript{83} At the court of Theodosius II, literary works glorifying the emperor and his Christian empire were

\begin{footnotes}
\item[80] henceforth, HE = \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}.
\item[81] Charlotte Rouché, "Theodosius II, the Cities, and the Date of the 'Church History' of Sozomen" \textit{Journal of Theological Studies} 37 (1986), 130-132.
\item[82] Sozomen. Hist ecd. 5.15.
\end{footnotes}
highly praised and rewarded. Sozomen revealed in his dedication of the HE that this was his goal in writing it.

Certain aspects of Sozomen's cultural and social environment affected his selection and presentation of history. Brian Fitzgerald went so far as to call this a "theological agenda" in his recent dissertation on the early church historians. Fitzgerald accurately identified many themes on which Sozomen concentrated, but the phrase "theological agenda" seems extreme; more likely, these themes represent the combination of the unconscious result of Sozomen's background with the conscious process of selection that any historian must undertake. Sozomen's themes included the struggle of Christianity with paganism, the conversion of pagans to Christianity, and the description of local pagan rites and customs; in addition he focused on monastic hagiography and events related to southern Palestine. All of these themes can easily be attributed to his being from Gaza (which was a highly pagan area), to his grandfather's conversion and to his relationship with the neighboring monks.

His interest in Christianity's struggles with paganism gives us good material for our study of conversion. Nevertheless, as we attempt to discern Sozomen's view of conversion, we must keep a few caveats in mind. First, Sozomen had a propensity to exalt the monks—particularly their role in the spread of Christianity. This may have caused him to distort the conversion stories to the advantage of the monks, but this bias should not obscure too greatly his view of the process itself, except perhaps the swiftness or ease with which it occurs. Second, writing as a Christian and for the glorification of Theodosius II, he was inclined to magnify the spread of the church.

86 Glenn Chestnut even proposes that Sozomen's history "was intended to be a sort of Christian prose epic" in the vein of Josephus' Jewish War and Virgil's Aeneid. (The First Christian Histories, 202-5)
Fortunately, this is balanced somewhat by his proximity to paganism, both because his father was a convert (when his grandfather converted with many others from his family) and because Gaza was a highly pagan area.\textsuperscript{87} Nevertheless, we still must take into account his desire to make Christianity look as good as possible. As a result, the view of conversion he expressed in the HE might be an idealized version of his actual perspective, but even if it is, it still tells us what he thought the basic elements of the conversion process should be.

\textit{Socrates}

Although Scholasticus has been appended to Socrates' name for many centuries, Theresa Urbainczyk has made a compelling argument against assuming he was a lawyer.\textsuperscript{88} Whether or not he was a lawyer, we can be certain he was a layman who lived in Constantinople his whole life.\textsuperscript{89} Most likely, he was born around 379/80.\textsuperscript{90} He was educated by two grammarians, Helladius and Ammonius, who were not only pagans, but priests—one to Zeus, the other to the Ape god.\textsuperscript{91}

Since Socrates lived in a period of theological struggles, his theological perspective is important and has been carefully studied. Like Sozomen, his adherence to the orthodox church is clear, but the attitude he expresses toward the Novatians raises questions. Valesius claimed that Socrates' occasional positive treatment of Novatianism is "due to the extreme impartiality of the historian, his sense of the justice due to a sect whose good he appreciated, together with his lack of interest in

\textsuperscript{87} Glanville Downey. \textit{Gaza in the Early Sixth Century} (Oklahoma, 1963), especially 16.
\textsuperscript{88} Urbainczyk. \textit{Socrates}, 14.
\textsuperscript{89} Socrates. \textit{Hist. eccl.} 5.24.
\textsuperscript{91} Socrates. \textit{Hist. eccl.} 5.16. see also Urbainczyk. \textit{Socrates}, 15.
the differences between their standpoint and that of the Catholics.\textsuperscript{92} Urbainczyk concluded that while Socrates seems more favorable to Novatians than other sects, there is no evidence that he was a member. She also suggested that he may have had friends or sources who were Novatians. Perhaps we should follow Socrates' own judgment that they hold to the same doctrine as homoousians and therefore are not heretics, but schismatics with whom cooperation is appropriate.\textsuperscript{93}

Valesius' comments concerning Socrates' attitude toward the Novatians highlight an important aspect of Socrates' theory of history. Zenos claimed he made a "persistent and successful attempt...at impartiality."\textsuperscript{94} According to his own words in the introduction to book six, he strives to record the facts as accurately as possible with as little obfuscation from flowery or laudatory language as possible. He also claims to write for all classes of men, both the literate and the "masses and illiterate men."\textsuperscript{95} To accomplish this he promises to write with a style that is "divested indeed of all affectation of sublimity, but at the same time clear and perspicuous."\textsuperscript{96}

The focus of Socrates' history is the East, particularly Constantinople. Zenos noted that he "always was a resident of Constantinople, and was evidently proud of his native city, and fond of alluding to its history as well as its actual condition."\textsuperscript{97} He cited several examples, including Socrates' writing "of its populousness, and at the same time of its ability to support its many inhabitants from its abundant resources" and his attention to many of the city's physical details.\textsuperscript{98} The West is only mentioned insofar

\textsuperscript{92}Zenos, "Introduction," x.
\textsuperscript{93}Urbainczyk. Socrates, 26-28.
\textsuperscript{94}Zenos "Introduction," xv.
\textsuperscript{95}Socrates. Hist. ecd. 6.Intro.
\textsuperscript{96}Translation by A.C. Zenos.
\textsuperscript{97}Zenos, "Introduction," ix.
\textsuperscript{98}See Zenos, "Introduction," ix for a complete list.
as it relates to the East. Urbainczyk even explains Socrates’ relative lack of interest in the pagans as indicative of his focus on Constantinople.99

The Eastern empire held great significance in Socrates’ understanding of ecclesiastical history. More than his predecessor (Eusebius) and his contemporaries (Sozomen and Theodoret), Socrates perceived a close relationship between church and empire. He used the emperors of the Eastern empire as the basic framework for his history, devoting one book to each emperor.100 Moreover, in the introduction to book five, he defends his inclusion of secular affairs:

Τούτο γὰρ πολλῶν ἔνεκα ποιούμεν τοῦ εἰς γνῶσιν ἁγείν τὰ γινόμενα ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοῦτος ἐνυπαχάροντας μὴ προσκορεῖς γενέσας, ἐκ τούτου μὴ σχολάζειν τῇ φιλονεία τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ οἷς κατ’ ἀλήθειαν ἐπίσκοπον πρὸς τούτων ἦν γνωσθεὶς ὅπως τῶν δημοσίων ταραττομένων, ὡς ἐκ τινος συμπαθείας καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐταράττετο.

We have done this for many reasons: first, to lay before our readers an exact statement of facts; but secondly, so that the minds of the readers might not become satiated with the repetition of the contentious disputes of bishops, and their insidious designs against one another; but more especially that it might be made apparent, that whenever the affairs of the state were disturbed, those of the Church, as if by a certain sympathy, became disordered also.101

Glenn Chesnut explained this sympathy as "a chart of disrupting historical events in [which] one separate line of historical development (the state) would always tend to peak at the same time as...in another separate line...(the church)."102 He went on to point out a third "range of phenomena" involved—the destructive forces of nature.103 Chesnut considered this concept of sympathy to be a sub-category of

99 Urbainczyk. Socrates, 30.
100 Except for Julian and Jovian whose short reigns he combined into one book. see Zenos, "Introduction," xiii.
101 Socrates. Hist. eccl. 5.intro
103 Chesnut. First Christian Histories, 193. For example, see Soc.IV.3-4 and Soc.IV.11.
Socrates’ use of καιρός as a substitute for the classical use of τύχη. In this way, Socrates could still hold the ancient view that history moved forward through fortuitous acts, but he did not have to use the actual word for Fortune (τύχη) since it had a negative, pagan connotation.\textsuperscript{104}

If we can believe Socrates when he claims to write sincerely what he thinks, we should be able to learn what he thought about conversion. Even if he wrote in a translucent way, however, we must take into account who he is and how he thinks before we can truly understand his view of conversion. Although he probably travelled outside the capital, his primary experience derives from Constantinople. His information about events outside of the capital is more likely obtained from external sources and merely interpreted (or reported), which limits his experience with pagans since Constantinople was heavily Christianized.\textsuperscript{105} Growing up in the capital would also give Socrates a different perspective on the outer provinces of the empire and the conversion of the barbarians than Sozomen, who was raised in Gaza.

Socrates’ view of the relationship between church and empire also affects his perspective on conversion. "He does not see the Christian Church as separable from the rest of the Empire. Consequently he did not write his church history as if it were a separate entity."\textsuperscript{106} His understanding of the sympathy between secular and ecclesiastical events demonstrates his perception of intertwined unity. The relationship was not strictly causal, nor was it based on political, social or economic inter-dependence; rather, the link was supernatural, only occasionally scrutable to human eyes when negative circumstances were precipitated by human sin. For the

\textsuperscript{104}See Chesnut. \textit{First Christian Histories}, 190-198. Socrates does use τύχη, but only a few times, as compared with many instances of καιρός.
\textsuperscript{105}Urbanczyk. \textit{Socrates}, 30.
\textsuperscript{106}Urbanczyk. \textit{Socrates}, 5.
most part, the cosmic sympathy relied on factors that remained hidden to human reason.

Chesnut stressed Socrates' adherence to Origenist and Platonist ideas. The allegorical hermeneutic he learned from Origen "enabled [him] to approach biblical history (and therefore any other kind of history) with a free, critical, inquiring spirit." Moreover, he "invoked the so-called Academic ἐπίθετος, the skeptical suspense of judgment," and had a "fundamental antidogmatic skepticism." This trait provided him with a good "historical instinct," and a "marvelous spirit of tolerance that was [his] most outstanding and endearing characteristic." Furthermore, he held to a Christian humanism that derived from Basil and the other Cappodocius Fathers.

Socrates' motives in writing the Ecclesiastical History are several. Zenos cited "his love for history, especially that of his own times, his respect for Eusebius, and the exhortation of Theodorus, to whom the work is dedicated." More fundamentally, since "in the Church, conformity with the origins is the evidence of truth," the role of a church historian is "to write the history of an institution which began in a precise moment...and developed with clear changes." Socrates' history documents the changes in the church from the end of Eusebius' account to 439, thus providing contemporary and future Christians with precedents by which to judge themselves. He also clearly sees the narration of battles between orthodoxy and heresy as a worthy subject of history, if not the only proper subject of church history; which derives from the ancient notion of wars as the stuff of history. Finally, the

---

107 Chesnut. First Christian Histories, 179-82.
110 Zenos, "Introduction," xv and Chesnut. First Christian Histories, 182, respectively.
111 Chesnut. First Christian Histories, 186. see Soc.III.16.
112 Zenos, "Introduction," xii. see Socrates Hist. eccl. 6.1, 2.1, 6.intro.
correspondence between the terminus of Socrates’ history and the introduction of the Theodosian Code belies a relationship between Socrates’ writing and the court of Theodosius II. Very likely he was writing in celebration of Theodosius II, just as Eusebius wrote in celebration of Constantine.\textsuperscript{114} Some mixture of these elements provided Socrates with the impetus to write his history, but as Urbainczyk has argued, his "major preoccupation is unity—unity of the Church, which is inextricably linked with the state."\textsuperscript{115}

Sources

Both Sozomen and Socrates drew their information from a variety of sources. For detailed studies on each history, one may consult the Quellenforschungen cited in the bibliography.\textsuperscript{116} A brief summary of source usage by each author combined with a specific investigation of sources used in conversion narratives will suffice for our purposes.

At the beginning of his work (book 1, chapter 1), Sozomen lays out his purpose and method. In the first half of the chapter he discusses the reasons for which he is writing a history. The first sentence represents the question that compelled him to study the history of the church:

\textit{τί δὴ ἄρα τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων ἔτοιμότερα συνέβη ἢ περὶ τῶν θεὸν λόγων πίστις, Ἑβραίοις δὲ δύσπιστος καίτοι τὰ θεία προσβεβείν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρευληφός καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐστα, πρὶν γένηται μαθοῦσα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν}

Why did faith in the Word of God readily succeed among other men, while disbelief prevailed among the Jews although in the past from the

\textsuperscript{114}Urbainczyk. Socrates, 23.
\textsuperscript{115}Urbainczyk. Socrates, 39.
\textsuperscript{116}Schoo. Sozomenos and Geppert. Socrates.
beginning they honored divine things and they learned of the coming of Christ, as it would occur, beforehand through the prophets.117

He then claims that one reason he decided to write a history is because "such a divine and miraculous change occurred in the world" (Τοιοαύτης οὖν θείας καὶ παραδόξου μεταβολῆς τῇ οἰκουμένῃ συμβάσει).118 These statements demonstrate that conversion—both in the macrocosm of the world as a whole and in the microcosm of individuals and nations—is his theme.

The second half of the first chapter includes his description of his source material. He promises to use his own experience, the oral reports of others, and written sources including laws, proceedings of synods and letters of kings and churchmen. He warns that heresies have skewed the writing of history and collecting of sources to a certain extent, but he vows to examine all the material carefully for such bias.119

Sozomen uses a variety of authors as sources, including especially Eusebius and Rufinus, but his primary resource was Socrates' history. Numerous passages could be adduced to prove such a connection, but one will suffice for our purpose.120 Socrates tells the story of Eutychian the monk in HE 1.13, reporting that he heard the story from Auxanon, a very aged presbyter of the Novatian church:

Αὐξάνων τις τῆς Ναυατιανῶν Ἐκκλησίας πρεσβύτερος, μακροβιώτατος γέγονεν ὄς καὶ τῇ ἐν Νικαιᾷ συνόδῳ κομιδῇ νήπιος ὄν, ἀμα τῇ Ἀκεσίῳ παρέβαλε, καὶ τὰ κατὰ Ἀκέσιον ἐμὸν διηγήσατο...καὶ νεωτέρῳ μοι σφόδρα πτυχάνοντα, τὰ περὶ Εὐτυχιανοῦ διηγήσατο.

Auxanon a very old presbyter in the Novatian church, who in his youth accompanied Acesius to the Council of Nicaea, related to me what I

118 Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 1.1.
120 For a more in depth analysis, see Schoo. Sozomenos, 16-27.
have said about him...and when I was just a youth, he related to me these things concerning Eutychian.\(^{121}\)

Sozomen tells the same story about Eutychian, but rather than citing a source, he merely includes the word λέγεται—it is said. His story and even his language so closely mirror Socrates’ that it can hardly be doubted he drew his account from Socrates.\(^{122}\)

Although Sozomen often drew from Socrates, he did not always take Socrates’ information at face value. When he could, he returned to Socrates’ sources and reassessed the material.\(^{123}\) In HE 2.26, Socrates—following the report of Athanasius—says that Paul, the orthodox bishop of Constantinople, was strangled by the Macedonians. Sozomen, in his account in HE 4.2, leaves the question open: ἐνθα δὴ καὶ τετελεύτηκε, πότερον δὲ νόσῳ ἢ βίᾳ, ἢγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἄκριβω, φήμη δὲ εἰσέτη
νῦν κρατεῖ βρόχῳ αὐτῶν ἀναρεθήκα παρὰ τῶν τὰ Μακεδονίων φρονοῦντων "I have never been able to to determine whether or not he died a natural death; it is still reported he was strangled by the adherents of Macedonius."

Another instance of Sozomen referring back to another source to check Socrates’ account is found in Sozomen HE 2.28. Socrates tells the story of Athanasius’ banishment to Gaul in HE 1.35, saying that it was based on the charge of Athanasius’ threatening to block the corn supply. Sozomen, however, writes that the banishment was based on the breaking of the chalice. Thus, it appears Sozomen referred to another source for his information.\(^{124}\)

---

\(^{121}\) Socrates. Hist. eccl. 1.13.
\(^{122}\) Another example of the same nature is Socrates Hist. eccl. 2.38 and Sozomen Hist. eccl. 4.21.
\(^{124}\) Schoo. Sozomenos, 13.
Sozomen uses Rufinus' history to check (and correct) certain accounts reported by Socrates. Both Socrates and Sozomen used Rufinus heavily. Rufinus of Aquileia translated Eusebius' history into Latin around 402 A.D. at the request of bishop Chromatius of Aquileia. The Goths were attacking Italy and Chromatius hoped that a translation of Eusebius' history would take his peoples' minds off the impending trouble. Rufinus agreed and not only translated Eusebius' history, but also added two more books to cover up to the year 395.

One example of Sozomen's use of Rufinus is in HE 2.17, in which Sozomen tells the story of Athanasius playing the part of a bishop as a child. Socrates includes the same narrative in HE 1.15, specifically citing Rufinus as his source. Socrates, however, leaves out several details that are found in Rufinus' history and included in Sozomen's account, such as the location of the game and the baptism of some of the boys by Athanasius. Sozomen recounts these specific details from Rufinus; moreover, his language is so similar in some places that one must conclude he used Rufinus' history as a source to correct Socrates' account.\textsuperscript{125}

Sozomen derives all of his conversion narratives from either Socrates or Rufinus (or both). Some are augmented by oral sources or other local sources Sozomen was able to procure (e.g., the story of Zocomus in HE 6.38).

Socrates lays out his purpose and method in book one, chapter one of his history, just as Sozomen does. His purpose is clearly to build on the history that Eusebius had written, adding the events he left out or did not properly cover. He mentions specifically that Arius was passed over too superficially by Eusebius.

\textsuperscript{125}Schoo. Sozomenos, 29-30. See Schoo, page 30, for specific examples of similar language.
γράφων δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν βίον Κωνσταντίνου, τῶν κατ᾽ Ἀρεαον
μερίκως μνήμην πεποίηται, τῶν ἐπαίνων τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ τῆς
πανηγυρικῆς ύπηγορίας τῶν λόγων μᾶλλον, ὡς ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ
φροντίσας, ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀκριβῶς περιλαβεῖν τὰ γευόμενα.

The same writer [Eusebius] wrote about the life of Constantine, in
which he made too little mention of Arius. He wrote in praise of the
emperor, as a panegyric written with lofty language, which is more
appropriate for encomium, rather than carefully covering what
happened.

Yet Socrates’ introduction does not explain his reason for wanting to continue
Eusebius’ work. Unlike Sozomen, Socrates does not reveal the question that
motivates him nor does he divulge his theme. Arius is mentioned as one topic of
discussion, but the expansion of this topic into the theme of heresy is not explicit in
the introduction. In addition, one may assume that emperors were an important
theme to Socrates—particularly in view of the completed history—but only on the
basis of Socrates’ beginning with Constantine and his conversion, not by any explicit
declaration.\textsuperscript{126}

From the very beginning, Socrates shows less interest in conversion than
Sozomen. Conversion is not featured as prominently in his introduction, and when it
is mentioned at the end, only the word \textit{κριστιανίζω} is used. Sozomen’s first few
chapters are full of more descriptive, transformational words (e.g., \textit{μεταβαλεῖν}); such
words indicate an inner change in character or condition (i.e., a transformation).
Sozomen’s first chapters also demonstrate his desire to understand further why the
world has undergone a change (\textit{μετάβολη}) from paganism to Christianity.\textsuperscript{127}

As for sources, Socrates probably followed very similar procedure as
Sozomen. He writes only briefly about his methodology in the first chapter of the first

\textsuperscript{126}Urbaniczky. Socrates. 42-43.
\textsuperscript{127}Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 1.1.
book: οὗ φράσεως ὑγκοῦ φρουτίζοντες, ἀλλ' ὡς ἤ ἐγγράφως εὑρομεν, ἥ παρὰ τῶν ἱστορισάντων ἱκουσάμεν διηγομένων "not using erudite phrasing, but passing on written records I have found or things I have heard from those who were present."128

Socrates' critical use of Rufinus and other writers is apparent in his preface to chapter 2:

'Rουφίνος, ο τῇ 'Ρωμαίων γλώττῃ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἰστορίαν συντάξας, περὶ τοὺς χρόνους ἐπλανήθη, τά γὰρ κατὰ Ἀθανάσιον νομίζει μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦ βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου γεγενηθαί. ἄγνοει δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν Γαλλίας γενομένην αὐτοῦ ἔξοριαν, καὶ ἔτερα πλείονα. ἢμείς οὖν πρότερον 'Ρουφίνῳ ἀκολουθήσαντες, τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον τῆς Ἰστορίας βιβλίον, ἣ ἐκείνῳ ἐδόκει συνεγράφαμεν ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου ἀχρι τοῦ ἐπιθέμου βιβλίον, τὰ μὲν παρὰ 'Ρουφίνου λαβόντες, τὰ δὲ ἐκ διαφόρων συναγαγόντες, τίνα δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπὶ ζωντων ἀκούσαντες, ἐπιπλησάμεν. οὔτερον μὲντοι συντόχοντες Ἀθανασίου συντάγμασιν, ἐν αἷς τὰ καθ’ ἐαυτὸν ὀδύρεται πάθη, καὶ ὅπως διὰ τὴν διαβολὴν τῶν περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἐξωρίσας, ἐγνώμεν δὲν πιστεύειν μᾶλλον τῷ πεποιθήτι, καὶ τοῖς γινομένων τῶν πραγμάτων παρούσις, ἢ τοῖς καταστασισμένοις αὐτών, καὶ διατούτο πληροφέρειν. ἔτι μὴν καὶ ἐπιστολῶν τῶν τότε διαφόρων ἐπιτευχθηκότες, ὡς οὖν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἀπεχείσαμεν...

Rufinus, who wrote a church history in Latin, made mistakes in chronology. For he thinks the actions against Athanasius happened after Constantine's death. He does not know about his exile in Gaul or several other matters. Formerly I followed Rufinus and wrote the first and second books of my history according to his account. From the third to the seventh book I took some things from Rufinus, others from different writers, and completed it with what I heard from people still living. Later I came across the works of Athanasius in which he laments his own sufferings and how he was exiled because of the slanders of the Eusebian party. I decided it was better to believe him who had suffered and those who were present when the events occurred than those who had to guess at them and, because they guessed, made mistakes. I also came across some letters by people who were important at that time and so pieced together the truth as well as I could.129

According to his own report, Socrates carefully used his sources. In addition to Rufinus, whose writings clearly played an important role in the writing of his history,

129Translation by Theresa Urbanczyk. Socrates. 49.
he also used Athanasius’ writings. The major influence that Athanasius’ letters and books had on Socrates’ writing may account for his focus on heresies.

Athanasius was the bishop of Alexandria who succeeded Alexander. He had attended the Council of Nicaea as Alexander’s deacon and personal secretary. It was even thought that Athanasius was responsible for Alexander’s opposition to Arius. As bishop, Athanasius was exiled multiple times and was always in the midst of controversy. For this reason, his works are mostly polemical; this focus may have tinted Socrates history toward controversy and heresy.  

Socrates puts a higher value on written rather than oral sources. He uses oral sources to support written ones, such as his report on Spyridon’s miracles. Although he uses the oral story from the Cypriots, he also cites the written record from Rufinus: Ταύτα δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ ἀκοῦ ἐπὶ πολλῶν Κυπρίων παρέλαβον, καὶ συνάγματι Ἐρυθίου τινὸς πρεσβυτέρου ἐκείνων, Ἐρυμακὴ λέξει συγγεγραμμένω. Ἅφεν ταύτα καὶ ἔτερα τῶν τῶν μετ’ οὐ πολύ ῥηθησομένων συνήγαγον "these things I heard from the Cypriots, and I also found a treatise of Rufinus the presbyter, written in Latin, from which I report these things and others that come forth a little later."

When multiple written records exist and contradict each other, Socrates tries to compare and correct them. His critical use of Rufinus’ history is clear from the first chapter of book two cited above. He makes similar claims in other places, such as in HE 5.19: πᾶσαν σπουδὴν παρ’ ἑκάστου τῶν εἰδώτων ἔδησαν μανδάνειν τὰ πράγματα, καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐρευνάν, ὅποι μὴ ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας τι γράφομεν "I have

---

130 Urbainczyk. Socrates 51.
131 Socrates. Hist. eccl. 1.12.
done everything to learn what happened from those who know, and to scrutinize every report, lest I should write something untrue."\textsuperscript{132}

One example of Socrates using Rufinus' history critically is in the account of Athanasius' trial for cutting off Arsenius' hand. In Rufinus \textit{HE} 1.17, the story is told including a scene in which a woman accuses Athanasius of improper sexual behavior. Sozomen also includes this episode, but Socrates leaves it out.\textsuperscript{133} It is possible he had another account of the story that caused Socrates to question the veracity of the charge of fornication.

Another example of a change Socrates makes to Rufinus' narratives is found in one of the conversion stories. Socrates adds a detail that is not included in Rufinus' history—the marriage of Mavia's daughter to Victor, a Roman army commander.\textsuperscript{134} Thus, Socrates uses Rufinus' history, but also attempts to bring to bear any other information he has available.

Sozomen borrowed heavily from Socrates, sometimes referring back to the original source, sometimes relying on Socrates' account.\textsuperscript{135} By examining all the conversion passages that cover the same events, we will see more clearly the changes Sozomen made to Socrates' history.\textsuperscript{136} In his portrayal of conversions, Sozomen changed Socrates' accounts to use more transformational language, to reflect a process and to increase the distinction between doctrinal issues and other aspects of conversion. Each of these changes represents an effort to reinforce the meaning of

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{132} Socrates. \textit{Hist. ecle.} 5.19.
\textsuperscript{136} I will exclude the Constantine conversion narratives found at the beginning of each work.
conversion in an age when mass conversions could have caused a watering down of the concept.
CHAPTER 4

"The Conversion of the Goths"

Socrates 4.33 (Greek)

Οι πέραν τοῦ Ἰστροῦ Βάρβαροι οἱ καλοῦμενοι Γότθαι ἐμφύλιον πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς χυμίζοντες πόλεμον εἰς δύο μέρη ἐτιμῆσαν, ὅλον τὸν ἐνὸς ἡγεῖτο Φριτίγερνης, τοῦ δὲ ἐτέρου Ἀθανάριχος. ἔπεκαθοστέρων δὲ τοῦ Ἀθανάριχου φανέρτος Φριτίγερνης προσφεύγει. Ὁμαλοὶ καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀντιπάλον ἐπικαλέστηκαν βοηθεῖαι. γυναῖκες τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ βασιλέα Οὐάλεντι, καὶ κελεύει τοὺς ἐνδρυμένους κατὰ τὴν Ἐρακήν στρατιῶτας βοηθεῖν τῶν βαρβάρων κατὰ βαρβάρων στρατεύουσας καὶ πολλάκις νικηθῆναι κατὰ Ἀθανάριχου πέραν τοῦ Ἰστροῦ τοὺς πολεμίζουσας ἐς συνεχῶς τρέφομεντες. αὐτὴ πρόσφατος γέγονε τῷ Χριστιανῷ γενέσθαι τῶν βαρβάρων πολλοὺς ὃ γὰρ Φριτίγερνης χάριν ἀποδίδον ὄν εὐρυγένετο τὴν θρησκείαν τοῦ βασιλέως ἕσπασε καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ ἑαυτὸ ταύτα ποιεῖν προετρέπετο. διὸ καὶ μέχρι τῶν πλείως οἱ Γότθαι τῆς Ἀρειανῆς θρησκείας ὄντες τυγχάνοντο, τότε διὰ τῶν βασιλέωτα ταύτη προσδέμενοι.

Τότε δὲ καὶ Οὐλίφλασ ὁ τῶν Γότθων ἐπίσκοπος γράμματα ἐφεύρετο Γοτθικά, καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ἑς τὴν Γότθων μεταβαλὼν τοὺς βαρβάρους μανθάνειν τὰ θεία λόγια παρεσκεύασεν. ἐπειδῆ δὲ Οὐλίφλασ οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑπὸ Φριτίγερνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ Ἀθανάριχου ταττομένους βαρβάρους τῶν Χριστιανομόν ἐξεδιδάκεν, ἡ Ἀθανάριχος ἐς παραχαρατομένης τῆς πατρίδος θρησκείας πολλοὺς τῶν χριστιανισῶν τιμωρίας ἑπέβαλεν, ὥστε γενέσθαι μάρτυρας την καθὰ βαρβάρους ἀρειανίζοντας. ἀλλὰ Ἀρειος μὲν πρὸς τὴν Σαβελλίου τοῦ Ἀβυσσοῦ δόξην ἀπαντήσας μὴ δυνηθῆς τῆς ἄρθρως ἐξέπεμψε πίστεως, πρόσφατον θεὸν τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν θεὸ δογματίζοντας; οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ἀπόλυτη τῶν Χριστιανομόν δεξάμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως τῆς ἐνταῦθα εὐθύς κατεφύγουσιν.

Socrates 4.33 (English)

The barbarians dwelling beyond the Ister who were called Goths were divided in civil war into two parties, one of which Fritigern led, the other Athanaric. When Athanaric seemed to have the advantage, Fritigern went for help to the Romans and asked for assistance against his rival. When this was reported to the emperor Valens, he ordered the soldiers stationed in Thrace to help the barbarians fight against the other barbarians. They achieved victory against
Athanaric beyond the Ister and turned the enemy to flight. This was the reason that many of the barbarians became Christians. For since Fritigern was grateful for the kindness he received, he embraced the religion of the emperor and urged those under his authority to do the same. Therefore even now many of the Goths hold to the religion of the Arians, since they were brought to this by the influence of the emperor.

Ulphilas, the bishop of the Goths, after inventing Gothic letters and translating the sacred scriptures into Gothic language, prepared to teach the sacred doctrines. When Ulphilas taught Christianity not only to those under Fritigern, but also to those under Athanaric, Athanaric considered it a violation of the religion of his ancestors and subjected the Christians to many punishments, so that many of the Arian Goths became martyrs. Arius, however, was unable to refute the teaching of Sabellius the Libyan and fell from the orthodox faith, asserting that the son of God was a new God. The barbarians received Christianity with simplicity and despised this life for faith in Christ.

Sozomen 6.37 (Greek)

Ἐκ δὴ τοιούτων θειοστίου λόγων φιλανθρωπότερον πως διατεθείς ὁ
βασιλεὺς οὐ χαλεπῶς οὕτως ὡς πρότερον τὰς τιμωρίας ἔπηγεν. οὐ μὴν
tελείως εφεδρεῖ τής κατὰ τῶν ιερωμένων ὄργης, εἰ μὴ κοινών
πραγμάτων ἐπιγενὸςμὲν φρονίμες οὐκέτι τοιάδε συνεχόμουμεν σπουδᾶσθαι.
Γότθων γὰρ, οἳ δὴ πέραν τοῦ Ἰστροῦ ποταμοῦ τῷ πρὶν ἄκουν καὶ τῶν
ἄλλων βαρβάρων ἐκράτουν, ἐξελάθησαν παρὰ τῶν καλουμένων Οὐνών ἐν
τοὺς Ῥωμαίων ὄρους ἑπεραμένοι. τούτῳ δὲ τὸ ἔνθος, ὡς φασιν,
ἀγνοοῦν μὲν πρὸ τοῦ Θρακί τοῖς παρὰ τῶν Ἰστροῦ καὶ Γότθως αὐτῶς,
ἐλάνθανον δὲ προσοκούντες ἄλληλος, καθὼς λίμνης μεγίστης ἐν μέσῳ
καμένης ἐκαστοι τέλος ἐναι ἕρας ὕφους τὴν κατ᾽ ἀυτοὺς οἰκουμένην,
μετὰ τούτῳ δὲ ἔλαθασι καὶ ὑδωρ ἀπέριοτον, συμβᾶν δὲ βοῶν
ἀλστροφήγῳ διαδραμεῖν τὴν λίμνην ἐπηκολουθησαῖ βουκόλος, καὶ τὴν
ἀντιπέρα τὴν θανατήν τοῦ οἰκουμένου ἤγεετε τοῦ ὄμφυλος.
ἀλλὰ δὲ λέγοντως ὡς ἔλαφος διαφυγούσα τοις τῶν Ὀνών ἀποφεύγει εἰςθές τὴν
ἠδῶν, εἰ ἐπιπολῆς καλυπτομένην τοὺς ὤδας τοὺς δὲ τότε μὲν
ὑποστρέφει διαλάταντας τὴν χώραν ἀεὶ μετριωτέρῳ καὶ γεωργίᾳ ἤμερον
οὐσιν καὶ τῷ κρατοῦντι τὸν ἔνθος ἀγγέλαις ἐθεάσαντο. δὲ ὀλίγων
δὲ τὸ πρῶτα καταστήματος πείραν τῶν Γότθως, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πασσοῦν
ἐπιστρατεύσας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν αὐτῶν γῆν κατασχέτεν. τοὺς δὲ διωκομένους τὸν ποταμὸν περασθῆναι, καὶ εἰς τοὺς Ῥωμαίων ὄρους διαβάντας προσέβει πέμψαν πρὸς βασιλέα, συμμάχους ἔσεσθαι τοῦ
λοιποῦ σφαῖρας ὑποσχουμένους καὶ δεσμόνες συγχωρεῖν αὐτῶς ὡς βούλεται
κατακεφάλ. ταύτης δὲ τῆς προσβεβείας ἄρξα Οὐλφίλαν τοῦ τὸν ἔνθος
ἐπισκόπησεν κατὰ γνώμην δὲ αὐτοῦ προσωρισάσας ἐπετράπη ἀνὰ τὴν
Θράκην οἰκεῖν. οὐκ δὲ οὐσὶν πρὸς τὸν παρὰ αὐτῶς στασάσας
διὰ τὸ διατρείμενα ἤγετο δὲ τῶν μὲν Ἀθανάρχους, τῶν δὲ νεκραγέρνης
εἰς τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλων ἑπολέμησαν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν 
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ἐνῆκεν καὶ τοὺς ἀμφὶ Ἀθανάρχον εἰς φυγήν ἔτρεψεν. Ἕσπερ δὲ χάριν ἀποθεώθης Ὀυδέλεντι καὶ διὰ πάντων φύλως εἶναι πιστοῦμενος ἐκοινώσεσ τῆς αὐτοῦ θησαυρέος καὶ τοὺς πειθωμένους αὐτῷ βαρβάρους ἐπείξετο ὡς φρονεῖν. οὗ τούτῳ δὲ μόνῳ αἴτημα ἔγονεν εἰσείτι νῦν τὸ πᾶν φύλον προσεύχεται τοῖς τὰ Ἀρείου φρονούσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ὀυδέλας ὁ παρ᾽ αὐτῶς τότε ἐρμηνεύς τὰ μέν γὰρ πρῶτα οὐδὲν διεφέρετο πρὸς τὴν καθόλου ἐκκλησίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου βασιλείας ἀπερικέπτως ὤμαι μετασχύσει τῶν ἀμφὶ Ἐνδούλου καὶ Ἀκάκιου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνόδῳ διέμεινε κοινωνῶν τοῖς ἑρεύθη τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων· ὡς δὲ εἰς Κωνσταντινουπόλιν ἀφίκετο, λέγεται διαλέξουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ δόγματος τῶν προεστῶν τῆς Ἀρείου ἀρέσεως καὶ τὴν προσεβαίνειν αὐτῷ συμπράξειν πρὸς βασιλέα υποσχομένων, εἰ ὡς ὑμῖν αὐτῶς δοξάσῃς, βιοσθεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς ἤκτεαι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀληθῶς νομίζας ἄμεινον ὥστιν περὶ θεοῦ φρονεῖν, τοῖς Ἀρείου κουσωθήσαι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ πᾶν φύλον ἀποτεμείν τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας. ὑπὸ διασκόρπω ἥγα αὐτῷ παλαιοδόντες οἱ Γότθοι τὰ πρὸς εὔσεβεῖσθαι καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῶς μετασχύνσεις πολιτείας ἠμερωτέρας πάντα ὑδάτως αὐτῷ ἐπείθοντα, πεπαγμένοι μιθὲν εἶναι φαύλον τῶν παρ᾽ αὐτὸν λεγομένων ἡ πραττομένων, ἀπαίτα τὸ διατελεῖν εἰς χρήσιμον τῶν ἡλικίας. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείοντα δέδωκε πέραν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀρετῆς μυρίους μὲν ὑπομείνας καυδίνους ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος ἐπὶ τῶν εἰρημένων βαρβάρων Ἐλληνοκόσμος θρησκευόμενοι πρῶτος ἵνα εἴη αἰσθήτης ἐγένετο καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν φωνὴν μετέτραψε τὰς ηδράς βίβλους. καθότι μὲν οὖν ὡς ἔπιπαν οἱ παρὰ τὸν Ἰστρόν βαρβαροῖ τὰ Ἀρείου φρονοῦσι, πρόφασις ἤδε. κατ’ ἐκεῖνο δὲ καρποῦ πλῆθος τῶν ὑπὸ Φρυγικὴν διὰ Χριστὸν μαρτυροῦντες ἀνηρεύθησαν. οὐ γὰρ Ἀθανάρχος καὶ τοὺς υπ᾽ αὐτῷ τεταγμένους Ὀυδέλα πείθοντος χρησιμοῖς ἁγανακτοῦσι, ως τῆς πατρίδος θρησκείας καινοτομούμενης, πολλὰς πολλάς τιμωρίας ὑπέβελε, καὶ τοὺς μὲν εἰς εὐθύνας ἁγανακτομουμένους ἀνδρέως ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος, τοὺς δὲ μηδὲ λόγῳ μεταβοῦσιν ἀνήλθε. λέγεται γὰρ ὡς τι ἔδαϑεν ἐφ᾽ ἄρμαμάξεις ἐστός, οἱ γε τοῦτο πολλοί ὑπὸ Ἀθανάρχον προσετέχθησαν, κατ᾽ ἐκατόν σκηνὴν περαγόμενοι τῶν χρησιμοῖς καταγελλομένων ἐκείνων τοὺπ προσκυνεῖν καὶ θυεῖν τῶν δὲ παραπτομένων σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀνδρῶν σὺν σκηνὰς ἐνεπώπιησαν. περιπαθεότερον δὲ τούτων τότε καὶ ἑτερον συμβὰρι σάδος ἐπιθυμία. ἀπειρηκότες γὰρ πολλὰ τῇ βίᾳ τῶν θυεῖν ἀναγκαζόμενων ἀνδρὲς ταῖς γυναῖκες, ἀν αἱ μὲν παιδάρια ἐπήγγετο, αἱ δὲ ἄρτιτικα βρέθη ὑπὸ τοῦ μαζός ἐτεροῦν ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τῆς ἐνθάδε ἐκκλησίας κατέφυγον· προσωμαίνοντες δὲ πάξ χριστιανῶν ἁμαρτησαν. Οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν δὲ οἱ Γότθοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑμενόσαν καὶ εἰς ἀπόνοιαν ἐπαρέχεσθαι τοὺς Θράκας ἐκακούργουν καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν πόλεις καὶ κώμας ἐδούρην. πυθέμενοι δὲ Ὀυδέλα τῇ πεῖρᾳ μεμάθηκεν ὡσιον ἤματεν. οἱ δὲ γὰρ αὐτὸ τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων χρησιμῶν ἔσεθαι τοὺς Γότθοις, φοβόρεις δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ὡς ὑπὸ ὅπλως ἀν κατερρίχασαμενοὺς, τῶν Ὑπακόων ταγμάτων ἤμελεν καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν εἰσβοῦσιν εἰσέπλησαν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Ὑπακόων πόλεως τα τα κωμῶν χρυσῶν εἰσπράπτετο. ὁμολαβίς δὲ τῇ ἐλπίδας καταληπτῶν τὴν Ἀντικόρειαν σπουδὴ εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλιν ἀφίκετο ἡμῖν δὴ ὁ κατὰ τῶν ἐτέρως αὐτῷ χρησιμοῖς διωγμὸς ἀνακωχὴν ἔσχεν. Ἐνδούλου δὲ
Sozomen 6.37 (English)

By these words of Themistius, the emperor became somewhat more humane, and imposed punishments less severe than before. He would not have completely restrained his anger against the priests, except that anxieties of public affairs prevented him from pursuing such matters. For the Goths, who formerly lived beyond the Ister river and conquered other barbarians, were driven out by those called the Huns and crossed over into the Roman territories. This nation, it is said, was unknown to the Thracians beyond the Ister and to the Goths themselves. They remained unnoticed although living near to each other, because a great lake lay in the middle. Each nation thought where they lived was the end of the land, with sea and endless water beyond. It happened, however, that an ox—driven mad by insects—ran into the lake and was pursued by a herdsman, who saw the opposite land and announced it to his fellow citizens. Others said that a deer was fleeing and showed some of the hunters of the Huns a path, which was hidden from the surface by the water. They were amazed at the beauty of the land—the suitability of the air and farmland—and reported what they saw to their leader. At first, they attempted to attack the Goths with a few soldiers, but afterwards they marched out in force and vanquished them in battle, occupying their whole land. The Goths being pursued crossed over the river and passed into Roman territories. They sent ambassadors to the emperor, promising they would remain allies and vowing to unite with them if he allowed them to live nearby. This embassy, led by Ulphilas, the bishop of the nation, succeeded in its goal; they were allowed to live in Thrace. Not much later, they fought among themselves and divided in two. Some were led by Athanaric, others by Frigern. When they attacked each other, Frigern fared poorly in battle and asked the Romans to help him. The emperor ordered the troops in Thrace to ally with him. When they fought again, he won and put those with Athanaric to flight. Therefore, in gratitude to Valens and because of friendship, he believed and shared in the emperor's religion and persuaded the barbarians under his authority to do the same. I think this is not the only reason the whole race even now agrees with the Arian doctrines. Ulphilas was then bishop among them. At first he differed in no way from the catholic church, but in the reign of Constantius I think he thoughtlessly took part in the council of Constantinople with the party of Eudoxius and Acacius. He remained in agreement with the doctrines of those who had gathered in Nicaea. When he arrived in Constantinople, it is said he dialogued concerning doctrine with the leaders of the Arian heresy, who promised to take the interests of the embassy before the emperor if he would believe as they did. Compelled by necessity or perhaps even genuinely considering it better to think thus about God, he agreed with the Arians and separated himself and the whole nation from the catholic church. For he had instructed the Goths in the basics of worship and through him they lived in a more civilized way. They obeyed everything he said with no dispute; they believed nothing that he said or did could be false, but everything he said or did
was worth emulating. He had given convincing proofs of his virtue and endured countless dangers for the faith while the aforesaid barbarians practiced pagan religion. He was the first to invent an alphabet for them and to translate the sacred books into their own language. For this reason the barbarians along the Ister followed Arianism. At that time, a great number of Fritigern's subjects who professed Christ were killed. For Athanaric was displeased that his subjects were persuaded by Ulphilas and became Christians, since they had abandoned their ancestors' religion. He subjected many people to various punishments: some who spoke out boldly in support of the faith were dragged before tribunals, others were killed without being allowed to speak. It is said that when some statue was brought in on a carriage, those who were appointed to do this by Athanaric led those who were suspected of being Christianized to a tent where they were ordered to prostrate themselves before it and worship it. The tents of those who refused were burned with the men still in them. I learned of another calamity that happened about the same time. Many who refused were violently forced to sacrifice, both men and also women, some who were leading young children, others who were nursing newborns at the breast; all fled to the tent of the assembly. The pagans set fire to the tent and all were destroyed.

After a short time, the Goths made peace with each other; then they began to ravage the Thracians and pillage their cities and villages. Valens learned by experience how great a mistake he had made, for he had thought the Goths would be useful to the empire—formidable to its enemies, always prepared for war. For this reason he neglected the Roman soldiers and instead of taking the customary allotment of soldiers from the cities and villages under the Romans, he collected gold. When his hope was frustrated, he left Antioch and hurriedly returned to Constantinople. Thus the persecution against the Christians who differed from him stopped. Euzoius died and, according to proper succession, Dorotheus was chosen as leader of the Arians.

Analysis

The first set of parallel passages describes the conversion of the Goths.

Socrates 4.33 and Sozomen 6.37 contain similar accounts, but indications of Sozomen's editorializing on Socrates are manifest in the passage. The story narrates how the Goths came to Christianity through the influence of their leader, Fritigern. After Valens helped Fritigern defeat Athanaric in a civil war, Fritigern and his followers converted to the religion of the emperor. When Ulphilas, bishop to the Goths,
extended his efforts to minister to some of Athanaric's followers, Athanaric became upset and subjected his followers to persecution, even to martyrdom.

Socrates gives this basic narrative, to which he adds this judgment: "Therefore even now many of the Goths hold to the religion of the Arians, since they were brought to this by the influence of the emperor."\(^{137}\) Sozomen directly addresses this statement: "I think this is not the only reason the whole race even now agrees with the Arian doctrines."\(^{138}\) He then proceeds to explain how the bishop Ulphilas formerly held catholic (Nicene) opinions, and only later changed over to Arianism. Thus Sozomen claims the Goths followed the tenets of Arianism as a result of Ulphilas' decision to become Arian, not because of the emperor's inclination.

One possible reason for the shift of focus from Valens to Ulphilas is Sozomen's view of conversion. His description of the events separates the conversion to Christianity from the change to Arianism. In fact, Sozomen states that ἵπτο διδασκάλω γὰρ αὐτῷ παιδευόμενες οἱ Γοθοὶ τὰ πρὸς ευσέβειαν, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ μετασχόντες πολιτείας ἡμεραυτῆρας "he had instructed the Goths in the basics of worship and through him they live in a more civilized way"\(^{139}\) before the switch to Arianism. This demonstrates Sozomen's particular desire to separate the activity of conversion from the struggle over doctrine. The shift of focus from the emperor to the bishop could be explained by Sozomen's desire to highlight the power and efficacy of the bishops over the emperor.\(^{140}\) To emphasize the bishop, however, he could have left the story much the same merely substituting the bishop for the emperor as

\(^{137}\) Socrates. Hist. eccl. 4.33.
\(^{138}\) Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 6.37.
\(^{139}\) Sozomen. Hist eccl. 6.37.
\(^{140}\) Urbainczyk. Socrates, 107-138.
the effective cause of the Goths' Arianism, but he goes further in order to demonstrate the two distinct stages of the Goths' religious conversion (Christianity, then Arianism).

In addition to this change, Sozomen expands on the basic narrative found in Socrates' history in two ways. First, he adds more background about the Goths' situation leading up to the civil war. More significantly, he expands on the interaction between the Goths and Ulphilas. He describes how Ulphilas held Nicene doctrines until he needed to have a hearing before the emperor and was only allowed to come before the emperor if he converted to Arianism. He did so, and as a consequence he and the whole nation split away from the catholic church. The nation followed him because he had taught them the basic principles of Christianity and given proof of his virtue; he had even risked danger in the period before the mass conversion by teaching the scriptures in their own language.

The shift of Ulphilas' influence from after conversion (as Socrates reports it) to before conversion also indicates Sozomen's different perspective on conversion. The bishop's role in the conversion process is much larger according to Sozomen, reaching back to the period before Valens' assistance and the subsequent mass conversion. He portrays Ulphilas preparing the Goths, teaching them and even converting some before Valens helps the Goths and a mass conversion occurs. This certainly elevates Ulphilas, but it also indicates a different perspective on how the conversion happened. Rather than a simple reaction to Valens' intervention, the conversion is a process—guided by Ulphilas—that culminates in the conversion. Sozomen's readjustment of the sequence of events makes this clear.

The brevity of Socrates' account as well as the use of ἀπλότητι "with simplicity" in the last phrase indicate his straightforward view of this conversion, which
is: the Romans helped the Goths in battle, the Goths accepted the Romans' religion in return. Sozomen clearly sets out to attack this view. Without denying the veracity of the central event (the mass conversion through the influence of Valens), Sozomen shifts the focus to a longer process. Ulphilas held orthodox beliefs until he attended the council of Constantinople (in the time of Constantius). Before this time, however, he had already had an influence among the Goths in various ways, thus establishing his credibility. Then, after he becomes Arian, the Goths follow with him because they trust him, not just because so many of them converted under the influence of Valens. Therefore, Sozomen presents the conversion as a longer, more complex process as opposed to a simple, one-time event.

Another distinction Sozomen makes in his relating of the account concerns the martyrdom of some of the Christian Goths. Socrates claims Ulphilas' extension into Athanaric's territory caused Athanaric to persecute and martyr some of his own subjects, "so that many of the Arian Goths of that period became martyrs." Sozomen, on the contrary, states "At the same period, there were many of the subjects of Fritigern who testified to Christ, and were martyred. Athanaric...subjected individuals to many punishments...some he put to death." Sozomen then expands on Socrates' account by describing some of the punishments and executions carried out by Athanaric.

The mention of martyrdoms under Fritigern indicates conversions occurred before the mass conversion after Valens' intervention. Once Fritigern became Christian, he persuaded all his followers to convert with him. He would not, at this point, have martyred those who followed his orders. Rather, Sozomen refers to the period when Ulphilas was teaching and converting some individuals before the mass
conversion. Sozomen's addition of this sentence right before the description of the persecutions and martyrdoms under Athanaric emphasizes his view that the conversion process had begun before Valens assisted Fritigern.

Sozomen must have had sources other than Socrates that allowed him to augment Socrates' account. Unfortunately, he only further compounds Socrates' errors.\textsuperscript{141} The chronology of Ulphilas' involvement, the wars and migrations of the Goths, their conversion and their persecutions is quite confused. Peter Heather straightens all of this out in a recent article and book.\textsuperscript{142} For our purpose, it is important simply to note that Sozomen's concern to expand the over-simplified conversion narrative given by Socrates is evident—even if it was done ineffectively—in his editorializing on the passage and, furthermore, that this demonstrates a significantly different view of conversion.

In this passage, Sozomen highlights three aspects Socrates passes over. First, the bishop Ulphilas plays a more prominent role in the conversion process, particularly vis-a-vis the emperor Valens. Second, the shift from pagan to Christian is distinct from the change from catholic to Arian. Third, the conversion happens over a period of time, starting with the teaching of Ulphilas and culminating in the mass conversion after Valens' assistance. Thus, Sozomen stresses not only that doctrine was not an important part of conversion, but also that conversion was a multi-faceted process rather than a simple event.

\textsuperscript{141} Peter Heather and John Matthews. \textit{The Goths in the Fourth Century}. (Liverpool 1991), 104.
\textsuperscript{142} Peter Heather, "The Crossing of the Danube and the Gothic Conversion," \textit{GRBS} 27 (1986), 289-318. For his book, see previous footnote.
CHAPTER 5

"The Egyptian Monks"

Socrates 4.24 (Greek)

Τοῦ τοῖν ταῖς βασιλείς οὐδέντος νόμῳ κελεύσαντος διώκεσθαι τοῦς τ’ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ τοὺς κατ’ Ἀγάμπτον πάντα ἐπορθεῖτο καὶ ἀνετρέπετο, τῶν μὲν ἐλκομένων εἰς δικαστήρια, τῶν δὲ βαλλομένων εἰς δεσμωτήρια ἄλλων τε ἄλλως στρεβλομένων. διὰφορα γὰρ τιμωρεῖται κατὰ τῶν ἱσχαζειν φιλούμενον ἐγίνοντο. ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἢ ἐδοκεῖ Λουκίῳ ἐπέπραξτο, Εὐζώδους μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀντίδρεσιν αὐθαίρετα ὑπέστρεψεν, οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς Ἀγάμπτου μοναστηρία ἔχωραν, ὁ τε στρατηγὸς σὺν πλῆθει πολλῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ ὁ Ἀρειανὸς Δοῦκιος.

οढὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀπελεύστετο, ἀλλὰ στῆφος ἄγιων ἀνδρῶν οὐδαμοῦ ἀκτιζομένων χειρῶν τῶν στρατιωτῶν διεπράττετο. ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἐγίνοντο, κατελάμβανον τοὺς ἄνδρας τὰ συνήθη πράττοντας, εὐχομένους, πάθη θεραπεύοντας, δαίμονας ἐξελαύνοντας. οἱ δὲ μικρὰ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ θαυμάτων φροντίζοντες οὐδὲ τὰς συνήθεις εὐχὰς ἐν τοῖς εὐκτηρίοις τόποις συνεχῶρου ἐπιτελείαν, ἀλλὰ αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔξωβαλον. καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτων μόνον ἔστησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ προϊόντες τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐκέχρησαν κατ’ αὐτῶν. ταύτα καὶ ὁ Ῥουθίνος ἐωρακέναι παρὼν καὶ πεποιηθέναι φησιν. ἀνενευόται τε καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τά τοῦ ἀπόστολου λεγόμενα ἐνεπαύσατο γὰρ καὶ μαστίγων πείραν ἑλάμβανον, ἐγκυμονότα ἐδεσμοτύμων, ἐλθάντων, ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπεθάνησον, ἄνδρες περιεργομένους κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον ἐν μηλωτᾷ, ἐν αἰγείας δέρμαις, υποστροφομενοῖς, θλιβόμενοι, κακοχυμένοι, ὡς οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ἡ κόσμος, ἐπὶ ἐρμίλας πλανώμενοι καὶ δρεσὶ καὶ σπελλαῖς καὶ ταῖς ὅποις τῆς γῆς, καὶ ταῦτα μαρτυρούντες ὑπὸ τε τῆς πόστεως καὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν ἱματίων, ὦς ἐν ταῖς χεραῖς αὐτῶν ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ χάρις εἰργάζετο. ἀλλ’, ὡς εὐκενή, ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοια ταῦτα παθέν τοὺς ἄνδρας συνεχώρησεν, κρείττον τι προβλεψεν, ἥν δὴ ἄν αὐτὸν κακῶς ἔπασχον, ἔτερον τὴν ἐν θεῷ σωτηρίαν εὑρώσαν καὶ τοῦτο ἡ ἀπόβασις ἔβεβη.

‘Οσί ὁμίλοι ἐκεῖνοι ἄνδρες κρείττονες τῆς ἐπιφερομένης ἀνάγκης ἐγίνοντο, ἀποκήρυκας ὁ Δοῦκιος γνώμην δίδωμι τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ τάγματος ὑποβάλλειν ἐξορία τοὺς πατέρας τῶν μοναχῶν ἐν αὐτῶς δὲ ἰσον ὁ Ἀγάμπτως Μακάριος καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς ὁ τοῦτο ἐπώνυμος. ἐξωρίζομεν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες εἰς νόσιμον τινα, ἕτες ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰχεν πολλοὺς, οὐδένα δὲ Χριστιανόν εἰχεν οἰκίτορα· κατ’ αὐτὴν τε τὴν νήσον ἔπνευσαν ὅτι λευθεριακέν ἐν λευθερίᾳ καὶ λευθερίᾳ ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ πάντες
οἱ ἐκεῖ Ἰσα θεῷ ἔσεβον. γενομένων δὲ τῶν θεοφιλῶν ἄνδρῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πάντα μὲν τὰ ἐκεῖ δαμόσυνα ἐν τούτῳ καὶ σῴζουσι καὶ ἐγίνοντο. συνεβαίνειν δὲ κατὰ ταὐτόν καὶ τοιοῦτόν τι πράγμα γενέσθαι. ἢ τοῦ ἱερέως ὅμοιον ἀφόντι ὑπὸ δαίμονος κάτοχος γενομένη ἐξεμάνη καὶ πάντα ἀνέτρεπεν, ἀκατάχειτος τε ἦν καὶ ὀὐδεὶς τρόπῳ ἠσθενοῦσα ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἐβοῦλα μεγάλα καὶ πρὸς τούς θεοφιλεῖς ἐκείνους ἄνδρας τί φησίν ἠλλατε καὶ ἐντεύθεν ἐξελάσαι ἡμᾶς. πάλιν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖ τὸ ἱδίον ἔργον, ὅ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας χάριτος ἐλήφθησαν, ἐπεδεικνυόταν ἐξελάσαντες γὰρ τὸν δαίμονα τὴς παρθένου καὶ ὑπὴ αὐτὴν τῷ πατρὶ παραδόντες εἰς πίστιν τοῦ Χριστιανοῦ ἡγαγον τὸν τε ἱερέα καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ. εὐθὺς οὖν τὰ μὲν ἀγάματα ἐξεβαλον, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τοῦ ναοῦ εἰς ἐκκλησίας τύπον μεταποιήσαντες ἐβαπτίζοντο τε καὶ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Χριστιανοῦ χαράντες ἐδιδάσκοντο.

Οὔτω μὲν δὴ ἐλαυνομένοι διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὁμοιουμένου πίστιν οἱ θαυμάσιοι ἐκεῖνοι ἄνδρες αὐτοῖ τε δοκιμάστηκαν ἐγίνοντο καὶ ἄλλους ἔσωξαν καὶ τὴν πίστιν βεβαιοτέραν εἰργάζοντο.

**Socrates 4.24 (English)**

The emperor Valens ordered by a decree that those in Alexandria and in the rest of Egypt were to be persecuted; everything was destroyed and overthrown, some were taken to court, some thrown in prison, others were tortured. Various punishments were inflicted on those who sought to live at peace. When these things had been done in Alexandria—as Lucius deemed appropriate—Euzoius returned to Antioch with a general, a number of troops and Lucius the Arian, and proceeded immediately to the monasteries of Egypt. He himself did not pity the holy men living there, but attacked them with greater zeal than the soldiers. When they came to the place, they seized the men doing their usual things: praying, healing diseases, casting out demons. They considered these miracles of God unimportant, and did not let them finish their customary prayers in the prayer chapels, but drove them off by force. They not only stopped these things, but also advanced against them with weapons. Rufinus said he saw such things and even suffered them himself. These things revived the sayings of the apostle: "for they were mocked and received a trial of beatings, were stripped naked, were imprisoned, stoned, slain with the sword, went about in the wilderness dressed in sheep skins and goat skins, were destitute, afflicted, maltreated, of whom the world was not worthy, wandering in deserts, in mountains, in caves and holes of the earth; they witnessed for their faith by such deeds and healings, such as the grace of God worked in their hands." But, as is fitting, the providence of God allowed men to suffer such things, although something better was provided, so that through them some suffered badly, others found salvation in God; subsequent events will prove this.

When these amazing men proved to be above the violence imposed on them, Lucius in despair ordered the leader of the soldiers to send the fathers of
the monks into banishment. Among these were the Egyptian Macarius and the Alexandrian named after him. The men were banished to a certain island where there were many men, but no Christians. On this island, there happened to be a temple and priest, whom all who lived there worshiped as a god. When the God-loving men came to the island, all the demons of that place were filled with fear and turmoil. At the same time, the priest's daughter became suddenly possessed by a demon. She was driven mad and overturned everything; she could not be stopped and was in no way able to be still, but she shouted loudly to those men of God: "Why did you come here to drive us out?" Then the men demonstrated the unique power, which they had received through God's grace. For after they cast the demon out of the girl and presented her cured to her father, they led the priest and all the inhabitants of the island to the Christian faith. Immediately, the inhabitants broke their images and changed the form of their temple into a church. After they were baptized, they joyfully learned all the doctrines of Christianity. Thus, after enduring persecution for the 'homoosian' faith, these wonderful men became highly esteemed, brought salvation to others and worked for the true faith.

Sozomen 6.20 (Greek)

Ὁ δὲ Λούκιος παραλαβὼν τὸν ἴγμηνα τῶν ἐν Ἀλυσίῳ στρατιωτῶν σὺν πλήθες ἐπεστράτευε τὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμουσι μοναχοῖς. ὑπὲρ γὰρ θεοῦ, ἐνδοξολήσας αὐτοὺς ἴγμηνα ἐρώτας, πεθηνίως ἔβηκε καὶ ταύτῃ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεις Χριστιανοῖς πρὸς αὐτῶν μετατηθεῖσιν· καθότι πολλοὶ καὶ θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες προσταταντό τότε τῶν αὐτῶν μοναστηρίων καὶ πάντες τὴν Ἄρειον ἄραν ἀπεστρέφοντο· τῇ δὲ μαρτυρίᾳ τούτων καὶ τῷ πλήθος ἐπόμενον ὡριῶς ἐφόρων, διαλέγονταν μὲν καὶ περὶ δογμάτων ἀδόλεσχην ὡστε θέλον ὡστε ἐποτάμενον, παρ᾽ ἐκείνων δὲ πειθόμενον εἶναι τὴν ἄλλην, οἱ τῶν ἔργων τὴν ἀρετὴν ἑπεθέκυντο· ὑπὸ δόντος τότε τῶν Ἀλυσίων ἀσκητῶν ἴγμηνα γενέονταν ἀκούομεν τοὺς δύο Μακαρίους, οὐς ἐν τοῖς πρόθεθεν ἐγνωμεν, καὶ Παμβύς καὶ Ἰρακλείδη καὶ λοιποῖς Ἀντωνίῳ μαθηταῖς. λογοσάμενος δὲν Λούκιος, ωὐ οὐκ ἐγεννήσεται τοῖς Ἄρειον βεβαιῶς κρατήσας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ μὴ τοὺς μοναχοὺς τούτους ὡριῶς συνέτειλεν, ἐπεχείρησε βιαζόσατο: πλήθος γὰρ οὐκ ἠὑστατο. δυσμάρτατε δὲ καὶ οὕτως τοῦ σκοποῦ, εἰ καὶ ἀπαιδανείδα ὠφελεί, παρεσκευασμένων αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς αὐχένας ἐπόμενος ὑποβαλλόντως τοὺς ἐφέσειν, ἢ τῶν ἐν Νικάλα δοξάτων ὑπέρθειν. λέγεται δὲ τότε πρὸς τοὺς ἴγμηναν αὐτῶς ἐπιθύμησαν τῶν στρατιωτῶν, διακοιμηθήσαται τινὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐκ πολλῶν τὰ ἄφρα ἀπεσκελήσοται καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ποιῶν στήναι μὴ δυναμένον. ἔπει δὲ ἐλαίῳ τούτῳ ἔρχονται, παρεκκλεισαντες ἐπὶ ὅνωμα χριστοῦ, ὅν δὲ Λούκιος διώκει, ἐξανίστασθαι καὶ ὀκάδε ἀπέναντι ἐξαπήνθης ἡ γνώμην ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἁναφανών ἐπέδειξεν παραπλήσας χρήμα οὔτης οὖσα καὶ θεοῦ αὐτὸς ἄλλησαν ἐπεισημάθαι καθηγουμένου Λούκιου, καὶ καλοῦσαν εἰπακούσας καὶ τὸν κάμυντα ἰασάμενος.

'Αλλ᾽ οὐ παρά τούτῳ μετεμειλήθησαν ἀπὸ τούτου τῶν μοναχῶν ἐπιθυμεύοντες, εἰςοδὲ δὴ νύκτωρ αὐτοὺς συλλαβόμενοι διήγαγον εἰς Ἀλυσίαν τινὰ νήσου ὑπὸ λιμνῶν κυκλομένην. ὑκοῦν δὲ ταύτῃ ἄνδρες
Sozomen 6.20 (English)

Lucius went with the leader of soldiers in Egypt and a number of soldiers and marched against the monks in the desert. He thought perhaps if they loved peace, they would be persuaded to come out, and by this particularly those Christians in the cities would be persuaded to change over to his party. Many excellent men led the monasteries at that time and they all opposed the teachings of Arius. The people, who neither wished nor were capable of discussing and reasoning about doctrines, followed their testimony; for they were persuaded that the truth came from those who demonstrated virtue by their deeds. We hear that the leaders of the Egyptian ascetics were the two men named Macarius, whom we mentioned above, Pambo, Heraclides and other of Antony's disciples.

Lucius thought that the Arians could never succeed in establishing ascendency over the catholic church, unless the monks showed they agreed with them. He attempted to force them, since he was unable to persuade them, but he failed. For the monks would die if necessary; they prepared their necks immediately, submitting to the sword, rather than despising the Nicene teachings. It is said that at the time the soldiers began to chase them, a certain
man, whose joints were withered and who was unable to stand on his feet, was brought to them. When they anointed him with oil, and commanded him in the name of Christ, whom Lucius persecuted, to rise up and go home, all the sudden the man became healthy. This visibly demonstrated it was necessary to believe what those to whom God himself confirmed the truth believed and Lucius was condemned because God heard their prayers and healed the sick.

But those who were plotting against the monks were not made repentant by this miracle. Arresting them by night, they took them to some Egyptian island surrounded by marshes. The men living there were uninitiated in the teaching of the Christians and were demon-worshipers. The island had a temple of great antiquity that was held in great reverence. It is said that at the same time as the monks arrived on the island, the daughter of the priest, under the influence of a demon, went to them. The girl ran screaming up to them and the people of the island followed, because they were astounded at her sudden and strange behavior. When she came to the ship, which brought the holy messengers, she shrieked, rolled on the ground and loudly cried out: "Why did you come to us, O servants of the great God, for this island has long been our home. We cause trouble for no one. We have remained unknown to other men by these marshes all around. If, however, it is pleasing to you, receive our possessions and make you home here; we will yield." She said these things. When Macarius and the other monks rebuked the demon, the girl recovered her senses. Then her father with his household and the inhabitants of the island converted to Christianity, and without delay they destroyed the temple and transformed it into a church.

When these things were reported in Alexandria, Lucius was overcome with immoderate grief. For he risked being hated by his own followers, since he had clearly declared war not against men, but against God himself. Immediately, he secretly ordered Macarius and the other monks to return to their own dwellings in the desert. In this way, Lucius stirred up Egypt. Around this time, not only Didymus the philosopher flourished, but many other famous men also received great renown, who focused on the virtue of the monks, opposing the partisans of Lucius. The persecuted church of Egypt greatly surpassed the Arians in number.

Rufinus 11.4 (Latin)\textsuperscript{143}

Sed in his omnibus Lucius non erubuit, nec aliquid reverentiae virtutum mirabilibus detulit; quinimo jubes patres ipsos ablatos a grege suo imo clam raptos, in insulam quandam Aegypti paludium deportari, in qua compererat neminem prorsus esse Christianum, quo per hoc vel absque solatiis, vel absque consuetis actibus viverent. Senes igitur cum duobus solis pedisse quis noctu ad insulam deducuntur, in qua erat templum quoddam summa veneratione a loci.

\textsuperscript{143}This is only the last part of 11.4.
incolis observatum. Cumque, primum navicula se num oram soli illius contigisset, ecce subito sacerdotis templi illius virgo filia correpta spiritu, cum ingenti vociferatione et clamoribus usque ad coelum datis, agi per medios populos coepit, et crebros ducens rotatus, stridens huc atque illuc rabida ora vibrare. Cumque ad spectaculum tam ingentis monstri, maxime quod esset sacerdotis filia (qui in honore praecipuo apud illos erat) populi convenissent, per auras eam raptam sequentes, perveniunt usque ad naviculam se num. Ibi vero projecta eorum pedibus et prostrata clamare coepit: Quid venistis huc o servi Dei summi, antiquis nos et veternosis evolvere domiciliis? in hoc loco depulsi undique latebamus, quomodo vos nequaquam latere potuimus? Cedimus antiquis sedibus, populos vestros terrasque recipite. Cum haec diceter, increpatus ab eis erroris spiritus effugatur. Et puella sana una cum parentibus suis jacebat ad pedes nostri temporis Apostolorum. Qui talibus exordiis praedicantres eis fidem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, in tantam conversionem repente eos perduxerunt, ut statim die ipsa manibus suis antiquissimum templum, et in summa veneratione habitum destruerent, et Ecclesiam confessim aedificarent. Nec ad deliberandum spatio temporis eguerunt, quibus fidem rerum fecerant, non verba, sed virtus. Sed hoc cum fuisset Alexandriæ nunciatum, veritus Lucius, ne forte etiam suorum in eum oda justa consurgerent, qui aperte jam bellum non hominibus, sed Deo indiceret, occulter eos revocari, et in eremum remitti jubebat. Dum haec in Aegypto geruntur, ne in aliis quidem locis persecutionis flamma cessabit.

Rufinus 11.4 (English)\textsuperscript{144}

But none of them caused Lucius any shame, nor did he show any respect for the miracles. On the contrary, he ordered those fathers to be taken from their flock, or rather clandestinely seized and brought to an island in one of the marshes of Egypt, on which he had found out that there was not a single Christian, to live there deprived of any comfort and of their usual activities. The elders were thus taken by night, with only two attendants, to the island, on which there was a temple greatly revered by the inhabitants of the place. And behold, when the elders' boat touched shore there, the virgin daughter of the priest of the temple was suddenly seized by a spirit, and moving through the midst of the people began to give vent to loud shouts and shrieks which echoed to heaven, whirling about repeatedly and with shrill cries jerking her head frenziedly in every direction. And when the people gathered to watch this enormous portent, especially since it was the priest's daughter, whom they held in particular honor, she was snatched into the air and they followed her to the elders' boat. There, cast down at their feet and lying prostrate, she began to cry, "Why have you come here, O servants of God most high, to drive us from

our ancient and long-held habitations? In this place we hid when we were driven out everywhere else. How is it that we have found no way to hide from you? We yield our ancient dwellings; take your peoples and lands." When she had spoken thus, the spirit of error fled at their reprimand, and the girl, restored to her senses, lay with her parents at the feet of the apostles of our time. They used this as the starting point to preach to them the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, and brought them at once to such a complete conversion that with their own hands they immediately tore down the temple, ancient and greatly revered though it was, and lost no time in building a church; nor did they need any time to consider, since their faith had been produced not by words but by power. When this was made known in Alexandria, however, Lucius, afraid that even his own people might rightly come to hate him, seeing as he had now openly declared war not on men, but on God, ordered that they be called back secretly and returned to the desert. While this was taking place in Egypt, the flames of persecution did not die down even in other places.

Analysis

The story of the banishment of some Egyptian monks to an island where Christianity was unknown provides another set of parallel passages in Sozomen 6.20 and Socrates 4.24. Lucius, the Arian bishop who replaced Athanasius as bishop of Alexandria, sent several monks who would not embrace Arianism to an island where no one had heard of Christianity. The monk Macarius healed a pagan priest's daughter on the island who was possessed by a demon. Consequently, her father and all the inhabitants of the island converted to Christianity. Then they destroyed their temple and built a church.

Socrates adds to the end of the story,

After they were baptized, they joyfully learned all the doctrines of Christianity. Thus, after enduring persecution for the 'homoousian' faith, these wonderful men became highly esteemed, brought salvation to others and worked for the true faith.

ἐβαπτίζοντο τε καὶ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ χαίροντες ἐνιαδάκοντο. Οὕτω μὲν δὲ ἐλαυνόμενοι διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου πίστιν οἱ θαυμάσται ἐκεῖνοι ἄνδρες αὐτοὶ τῇ δοκιμώτεραι ἐγένοντο καὶ ἄλλους ἔσωσαν καὶ τὴν πίστιν βεβαιοτέραν ἐφράζοντο.
(The last sentence refers to the monks mentioned earlier in the chapter, not the inhabitants of the island.) Both Sozomen and Socrates use Rufinus 11.4 as a source for this account. Rufinus' account is similar, but the phrase about baptism and instruction is not included, which indicates it must have been added by Socrates. Although Sozomen may have drawn the account directly from Rufinus, he could have included the statement that Socrates added, but he did not.

Socrates follows Rufinus for most of the account, sometimes even truncating Rufinus' story (e.g., the statement by the priest's daughter is shorter in Socrates, but clearly of the same intent). Nevertheless, Socrates adds to the end of his account that the inhabitants were baptized and taught the doctrines of Christianity. Rufinus merely states that they were quickly led to a conversion through the preaching of the monks. Unless Socrates was using some other source, which seems unlikely considering the similarity of his narrative to Rufinus', Socrates must have chosen to interpret Rufinus' tantam conversionem "such a conversion" as including baptism and instruction. Furthermore, he indicates that all these effects (i.e., conversion, changing the temple to a church, baptism and instruction) occurred in a very short amount of time by his use of the word εὐθύς "immediately."

Sozomen chose to follow Rufinus more completely than Socrates. He, like Rufinus, reports the names of the monks who were exiled and the miracle performed on the paralyzed man just before Lucius exiled the monks. Rather than including the line that Socrates added about baptism and instruction, however, Sozomen leaves it out, indicating a different understanding of Rufinus' phrase tantam conversionem. His view of conversion as a process allowed him to separate the various aspects of the Christianization process and report only one (in this case the transformation, or
μεταβολή, itself), unlike Socrates who tended to lump different aspects of the process together uncritically.

The language used by each author to translate a key sentence in the narrative also demonstrates the differing perspectives on conversion. Rufinus: *Qui talibus exordii praedicantes eis fidem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, in tantam conversionem repente eos perduxerunt* "they used this as the starting point to preach to them the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, and brought them at once to such a complete conversion." Socrates: *eis píston toú Χριστιανισμοῦ ἡγαγον τῶν τε ἱερέων, καὶ πάντας τούς ἔκει ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν τῇ νησίῳ* "they led the priest and all the inhabitants of the island to the Christian faith." Sozomen: *έντευξεν δὲ ὁ ταύτης πατήρ τῶν τῶν ὀικείων* "then her father with his household and the inhabitants of the island converted to Christianity." Thus, Socrates maintains the idea of 'leading to' faith in his choice of ἡγαγον to translate *perduxerunt*. Sozomen, however, uses an entirely different phrase to describe the conversion. Instead of 'leading to faith,' he writes *eis Χριστιανισμὸν μετέβαλλε*—converting to Christianity.

By using the word μετάβαλλω, Sozomen shifts the focus from 'being led into something' to an inner transformation. μετάβαλλω generally means to change one’s mind and as we have seen it was a word commonly used to describe conversion among philosophers and Christians.¹⁴⁵ In this passage he uses it to signify a transformation, not necessarily intellectual, but certainly effectual (e.g., they replaced their temple with a church). Moreover, μετάβαλλω takes the agency away from the monks (who act as agents in Socrates' and Rufinus' accounts), which is unexpected considering Sozomen's view of monks and holy men. In this case, however, his understanding of conversion

---

¹⁴⁵See above, Chapter 2.
affected his word choice more than his desire to elevate and demonstrate the efficacy of the monks.

Thus in these two passages we again see the process paradigm affecting Sozomen's editing of Socrates. Sozomen describes the conversion as a transformation, apart from any outside effects (other than the building of the church); whereas Socrates adds baptism and instruction to the 'leading to' the faith. Furthermore, Sozomen's portrayal of the inner transformation contrasts with Socrates' (and Rufinus') view of the convert 'being led' to religion.
CHAPTER 6

"The Conversion of the Iberians"

Socrates 1.20 (Greek)

Καὶ δὲ ἢδη λέγειν, ὅπως καὶ Ἰβηρες ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων ἐχριστάνθησαν. γυνὴ τις βίον σεμύνει καὶ σώφρονα μετερχομένη θεία τινὶ προνά οὗ Ἰβήρων αἰχμάλωτος γίνεται. Ἰβηρες δὲ οὕτω προσοκούσι μὲν τῶν Εὐχετῶν πόλιν, ἄποκας δὲ εἰς Ιβήρων τῶν ἐν Σπαίνα. ἡ γυνὴ τούτων ἡ αἰχμάλωτος ἐν μέσῳ οὖσα τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐφιλοσοφεῖ· σὺν γὰρ πολλὴ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀκοὴσει νηστεία τῇ βασιλέᾳ καὶ συντόνως προσέκειτο ταῖς εὐχαῖς. τοῦτο ὀρώμενε οἱ βαρβάροι τῶν ξεναγοῦν τοῦ πραττομένου ἑθαίμαζεν. συμβαίνει δὲ τὸν βασιλέα κοινήν ἐπὶ πάντα ὡς ἄρρωστόν τινὶ περιπεσείν, καὶ ἔθει τινὶ ἐγχώρῳ παρὰ ταῖς ἀλλαζ ἀγνώσκας ἡ τοῦ βασιλέας γυνὴ τὸν παῖδα βεβαιευθοδόσιμον ἔστηκεν, ἐξ ποίῳ τῇ βοήθεια πρὸς τὴν νόσον ἐκ πείρας ἐπισταται. ὡς δὲ περιασθεὶς ὁ παῖς ὑπὸ τῆς τροφῆς παρὰ ὀδήμια τῶν γυναικῶν θεραπεῖς ἐτύγχανε, τέλος ἀγαθὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν αἰχμάλωτον. ἢ δὲ ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ παλλῶν γυναικῶν ὑλικὸν μὲν βοήθημα ὁ προσέφερεν (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡπίστατο). δεξαμένη δὲ τὸν παῖδα καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐκ τριχῶν ὑψαμένον αὐτὴν στρωμάτων ἀνακλίνασα λόγον ἐπεν ἀπλοὺν. ὁ Χριστός φησὶν ὁ πολλοῦς ἔσταμεν καὶ τὸ τὸ ἔθος οἵτινος. ἐπενεξαμένης τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐτύγχανε, τὸν τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἑτεροτέρα ἐγωνίῳ ἡ αἰχμάλωτος, μετ᾽ οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως γυνὴ ἀρρωστή τινὶ περιπέσοντός την αἰχμάλωτον γυναῖκα μετεπέμπετο. τῆς δὲ παρατηρομένης μετραζοῦσας τὸν τοῦτο ἠθεῖσαν αὐτῇ φέρεται παρ᾽ αὐτῷ, ποτέ τε ἡ αἰχμάλωτος ἡ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παῖδος πεποιηκεῖ τὸ πρότερον, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἢ νοσοῦσα ἐρρώσθη καὶ εὐχάριστη τῇ γυναικί. ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἐμὸν ἔφη τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου, ὡς ὑπὸ ἔστι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τῶν κόσμων ποιήσασιν, τοῦτον τὸ ἐπικαλεῖται παρηκύπτει καὶ ἀληθῇ γνωρίζειν θεόν. θωμάς δὲ ὁ βασιλέας τῶν Ἰβηρίων τὴν ἐκ τῆς νόσου εἰς γειάν ταχύτητα, πυθομένος τε, τίς εἶ ὁ θεραπεύως, δύος ἦμερες τὴν αἰχμάλωτον. ἢ δὲ οὐκ ἔφη δέοντα πλοῦτον ἔξεν γὰρ πλοῦτον τὴν θεονείσαν καὶ μέγα δέχεσθαι δώρον, εἶ γαρ ἐπηνεύσεις τῶν θεοῦ τῶν ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς γυναικοκμένου. ταύτα εἰπόνα τὰ δώρα ἀντέπεμπε. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν μὲν λόγον ἐταυτευωδέστατο, μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας δὲ ἐξελθόντα αὐτῷ ἐπὶ θήραν τούτω θυμήσει. τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων καὶ τὰς νάπας ἐνεάνθα ἐθήρα
κατέσχεν ὁμίχλης σκότος πολύ, καὶ ἦν ἄπορος μὲν ἡ θῆκα, ὀδυτήτης δὲ ἡ ὀδὸς. ἐν ἀμηχανίᾳ δὲ γενόμενος πολλῆ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπεκαλέτο ὅφεις ἔσεβεν. ὦς δὲ οὐδὲν ἦρεν πλεόν, τέλος εἰς ἔννοιαν τὸν θεὸν τῆς αἰχμαλωτοῦ λαμβάνει, καὶ τούτων καλεῖ βοήθην. ἀμα τῇ ἱκέτευ τοῖς ἐκ τῆς ὁμίχλης εὐθὺς διελύετο σκότος. θαυμάζω δὲ τὸ γενόμενον, χαῖρον ἐπὶ τὰ οὐκετα χωρεῖ καὶ τὸ συμβεβοῦς δηγείται τῇ γυναικί, καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλώτου μεταπέμπεται καὶ τῆς εἴη ὁν οἴοι θεοὶ ἐπιμεῖναν. ἦ δὲ εἰς πρόσωπον ἐλθοῦσα κήρυκα τοῖς Χριστῷ τῶν τῶν Ἱβήρων βασιλέα ἐποίησεν. παστεύσας γὰρ τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τῆς ἐνεστοῦ ψυχικός, πάντας τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν Ἰβηραῖος συγκαλεῖ, καὶ τὰ συμβάντα περὶ τὴν τεθεικαν τῆς γυναικός καὶ τοῦ παιδίου, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν θυράν ἐκθέμενος παρῆλθεν σέβεσθα τῶν τῆς αἰχμαλώτου θεοῦ. ἐγίνοντο οὖν ἀμφότεροι κήρυκες τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μὲν βασιλέα τοῖς ἁνδράσι, ἦ δὲ γυνὴ τᾶς γυναικί, μᾶθω δὲ παρὰ τῆς αἰχμαλώτου τὸ σχήμα τῶν παρά Ῥωμαίος ἐκκλησίας, εὐκτικῆν οὖκ ἐκέλευσεν γενέσθαι, εὐθὺς τε τά πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν εὐτρεπτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ὁκος ἠγείρετο. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς στῦλους ἀνορθόδοξον ἐπετρήστο, οἰκονομεῖ τε πρὸς πίστην τοὺς ἐνοκοίτας ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἠκουσών πρὸνα. εἰς γὰρ τῶν στῦλων ἀκάνθος ἔμενε, καὶ οὐδεμιὰ ἡφάντητο μικρὴ ἢ διαμεῖσα κινήσι τοῖς, ἀλλὰ τά μὲν καλωδίων δερρήγνυτο, τά δὲ μικράματα καταστεῖσθαι. ἀπεγνωκότες οὖν ἀπεξάρων ἐς οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τότε δὴ δεικνύεται τῆς αἰχμαλώτου ἢ πόσις-νύκτωρ γὰρ μηθεὸς ἐγνωκότος καταλαμβάνει τὸν τόπον καὶ διανικητεῖ τῇ εὐχῇ σχολάζουσα, προνοεῖ τα νεωθροθετήτω τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνορθότηταν ο στῦλος καὶ ψηλάτερος τῆς βαίνει ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐντύμοτα, μηδαμῶς τῆς κρηπίδος ἀπτόμενος. ἡμέρα δὲ ἦν, καὶ ο βασιλεὺς ἐμφυρνεῖ ὑπὶ τὴν οἰκοδομίαν παρῆν, ὥρα τοῦ στῦλον ἐπὶ τῆς ἱδρας κρεμάμενον βάσεως, καὶ ἐκπλήστητε μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ γεγονότι, ἐκπλήστητο δὲ πάντες οἱ συμπαράντες αὐτῷ, μετ’ οὐ πολὺ γὰρ ἐπὶ ὑφαλμαὸς αὐτῶν τῇ ἱδρα βάσει κατὰ βραχὺ κατιῶν ὁ στῦλος ἱρύεται. βοή ἐντεῦθεν ἐπηκολούθῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πολλῆ, ἀλὴθεῖ τὴν πίστιν ἄνακαλυότων τοῦ βασιλέας καὶ ὑμνοῦτων τῶν τῆς αἰχμαλώτου θεοῦ. ἐπίστευον τε λοιπόν καὶ σὺν προσθύμη πολλῆ τοὺς ὑπολοίπους στῦλους ἀνώρθωσι, καὶ οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν αὐτῶς τῇ ἐργον τετέλεστο. προσβείει τοῦ ἐντεῦθεν ἐπάν τοῦ βασιλεα Κωνσταντίου ἐγενέτευ, παρεκάλεσεν τε ὑπόσπονθα μὲν τοῦ λυπηθοῦ Ῥωμαίμενας λαμβάνει δὲ ἐπισκοποῦ καὶ λέβων κλῆρον πιστεύει γὰρ εὐλογίως ἐλευθοὶ τῷ Χριστῷ. ταῦτα φησίν ὁ Ρουμάνος παρὰ βασιλείους μεμακηκεῖν, ὡς πρότερον μὲν ἤρμανικάς Ἰβήρωσι, ὡςτερον δὲ Ῥωμαίοις προσελθὼν ταξιαρχεῖ τοῦ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ στρατιωτικοῦ κατέστη καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα στρατηλατῶν τῶν κατὰ Μαξίμου τοῦ τυράννου πόλεμον τῷ βασιλεὶ Θεοδοσίῳ συνηγωνίσατο.

Socrates 1.20 (English)

Now is the right time to tell how the Iberians were Christianized during this period. A certain woman who led a holy and chaste life was taken captive by the Iberians through divine providence. These Iberians dwell near the Euxine sea and are colonists of the Iberians in Spain. Now while in captivity, the woman
lived a life of virtue among the barbarians; for she practiced much moderation and serious fasting, and she devoted herself to earnest prayers. Seeing this, the barbarians were amazed at the strangeness of her behavior. It happened that the young son of the king was attacked by some disease, and according to a certain custom in the country, the king's wife sent the boy to the other women to be healed, hoping they knew some cure for the illness through their experience. After the boy was carried around by his nurse and no one was found to help, she finally came to the captive who in the presence of many women professed no knowledge of medicine. She received the boy and laid him on a bed she made from horsehair and simply said: "Christ, who has healed many will also heal this child." After she added prayer to this statement of faith and called on God, the boy was immediately restored and was well from that time on. Then the rumor spread to the barbarian women and the wife of the king, and the captive became well-known. Soon afterwards, the wife of the king was attacked by some sickness and sent for the captive woman. Since the woman was modest and had excused herself from going, the queen was brought to her, and the captive did what she had done to the boy before. Immediately, the sickness was removed and she thanked the woman. But she said, "the work is not mine, but Christ's, who is the Son of God who made the universe. Call on him and acknowledge him as the true God." The king of the Iberians was amazed at his wife's speedy return from sickness to health. When he learned who was the healer, he repaid her with gifts, but she said she did not need wealth. For her the worship of God was wealth, and she would receive a great gift if he would acknowledge the God she knew. She said these things and sent the gifts back. The king stored up this thought in his mind, and on the next day when he went out to the hunt, the following thing happened. The mountain tops and the forests where he was hunting were covered with mist and thick darkness; the hunt was impossible and the path was impassible. Since he was in great trouble, he called on the gods he worshiped. Since this accomplished nothing, he decided to call on the God of the captive for assistance. As soon as he prayed, the darkness of the mist immediately dissipated. He was amazed at what happened and he returned to the palace rejoicing. He described to his wife what had occurred and sent for the captive. He asked her who was the God she worshiped. She came into his presence and made the king of the Iberians a priest of Christ. After he believed in Christ through the pious woman, he called together all the Iberians under him and related what happened in the healing of his wife and son and also in the experience of the hunt. Therefore he advised them to worship the captive's God. Thus both became priests of Christ—the king to the men, his wife to the women. He learned the plan for churches among the Romans and ordered a house of prayer to be built. Immediately he prepared things for the building and the structure was begun. When they tried to set up the pillars, divine providence intervened for the confirmation of the inhabitants' faith. One of the columns remained immovable and no machine was found that was able to move it, but their ropes broke and the machines fell apart. The workers gave up and went away; then the faith of
the captive was demonstrated. At night, with no one knowing, she went to the place and spent the night devoting herself to prayer. By the providence of God, the column was raised and it stood higher than the base in the air, not touching the foundation at all. When day broke, the king, who was an intelligent person, came to the building, saw the column suspended, and was amazed. Moreover, all those with him were astounded. Shortly after, before their very eyes, the column quickly descended onto its own base and was fixed there. Then with a great shout, the people attested the truth of the king’s faith and hymned the captive’s God. They believed and with great zeal raised the remaining columns. The whole building was soon completed. Then an embassy went to the emperor Constantine. They asked to be in treaty with the Romans and that they might receive a bishop and clergy. It is said they sincerely believed in Christ. Rufinus said he learned these things from Bakkorius, who formerly was a prince of the Iberians and later went over to the Romans and was made a commander of soldiers in Palestine. Afterwards, he led the war against Maximus the tyrant and assisted the emperor Theodosius.

**Sozomen 2.7 (Greek)**

Επὶ δὲ τῆς προκειμένης βασιλείας λέγεται τοὺς Ἰβερας τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιγνώναι. ἔδνος δὲ τοῦτο βαρβαρόν μέγα τε καὶ μαχμῶταν, οὐκεὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀρμενίων ἐνδότερον πρὸς ἄρκτον. παρασκεύασα δὲ αὐτοῦ τῆς πατρίδος θρησκείας ὑπερεῖδεν Χριστιανὴ γυνὴ αἰχμαλώτος· ἢ δὲ πιστοτάτῃ καὶ θεοσεβής ἄγαν ὡς οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις καθιστήκη τῆς συνήθους πολιτείας. φίλον δὲ τὶ αὐτὴν χρῆμα ἐτύγχανε νηστεία καὶ μάκτωρ καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν εὐχεσθαι καὶ τὸν Θεὸν εὐλογεῖν. οἱ δὲ βαρβαροὶ ἐπιστάντο μὲν ὄντος χαίρει τούτο ὑπομένει· τῆς δὲ ἀπλούστερον λεγοῦσιν οὕτω χρῆναι σέβειν τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔξων αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει καὶ τοῦ θρησκευομένου τὸ ὅνομα καὶ τῆς θρησκείας ὁ τρόπος. συμβανό τε μειράκων ἐντάσσα δευνὸς ἄσθενειν, περιφέρουσα καὶ έκαστον οὐκόν τε μήτηρ ἐπεδείκνυον ἐθῶν γὰρ Ἰβηροὶ τούτου ποιεῖν, ὡς τε τῆς εὐρεθείη τοῦ νοσήματος λατρεύ, εὐπόροστος γένηται τοῖς κάμνουσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους ἀπαλλαγῇ. ἔπει δὲ μηδαμοῦ θεραπευθὲν καὶ παρὰ τὴν αἰχμαλώτου ἐκομίζη τὸ παιδίον, φαρμάκων μὲν, ἑφη, οὕτω χριστῶν οὕτε ἐπιπλάστην ἐδῆσαν ἢ πείραν ἔχων πιστεῦε δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀν σέβω, τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ μέγαν Θεόν, σωτῆρα τοῦ σοῦ παιδὸς γενέσθαι, ὡς γάρ. παραρθηκαὶ τε ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ εὐφανεμένη τῆς οὐδὸν ἀπηλλαγέν αὐτὸν δοσιν οὕτω τεθνήσεσθαι πρῶσκωμενοι. οὐ πολλῷ δὲ υστερον καὶ τὴν γαμητὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος τοῦ ἐδνοῦς ἀπάτῳ πάθει διώλυσαν μελλουσαν τῷ ἱων τρόπῳ δείσεσσε, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ γνῶσιν ἐπαιδευει, ὑγείας τωρίζαν καὶ ζωῆς καὶ βασιλείας καὶ πάντων κύριον αὐτὴν ἐσωμομενήν. καὶ μὲν τὴν πείρα τοῦ ἑπί αὐτῇ συμβεβιβακτὸς ἀληθεὶς εἶναι πιστεύουσα τοὺς τῆς αἰχμαλώτους λόγους, τὴν Χριστιανὴν θρησκείαν ἐπρέπειεν καὶ διὰ πολλῆς τιμῆς ἔχε τὴν ἀνθρωπον. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς θυμιάσας τὸ ταχὺ καὶ παράδοξον τῆς πόσεως καὶ λάσεως ἐμαθε τὴν αὐτὴν παρὰ τῆς γαμητῆς καὶ ὅρους ἐκέλευσεν ἀμεβδεσθαι τὴν αἰχμαλώτους. ὅλα τοῦτων, ἑφη ἢ βασιλῆς, ὁλίγος αὐτὴς λόγος, καὶ πάνιν τίμια νομίζητα: μόνην δὲ περὶ
πολλού ποιείται τήν εἰς τοὺς θείου λόγου θεραπείαν. ἦν οὖν αὐτῇ χαριέσθαι βουλομένη καὶ ἀσφαλῶς πράττει καὶ καλῶς σπουδάζομεν, ἀγε δὴ καὶ ἁμεῖς τοῦτον σεβόμεθα, κραταῖον δὲν ὄντα καὶ σωτήρα καὶ βασιλέα, ἢ μουμῆνται, ἐν οἷς εἰς διαμένειν ποιῶντα, πάλιν τ' αὖ ἱκανόν ῥαδίως τοὺς μεγάλους μοιροῦς ἀποφαίνει καὶ τοὺς ἄδοξους ἐπιφανέιας καὶ τοὺς ἐν δεινοῖς δύνας σώζειν. τοσάττα πολλάκις εὖ λέγειν δοκοῦσης τῆς γυναῖκος ἁμφίβολος ἢν ὁ τῆς ἴππηρίας ἀγούμενος καὶ οὐ πάντως ἐπείθετο, τοῦ πράγματος τὸ νεώτερον ὑπονόοι καὶ τὴν πατρίναν θρησκεῖαν ἀδούμενος. μετ' οὖν πολὺ δὲ ἁμα τέσσερις αὐτὸν ἔργα ἐκήρυκα. ἔξεπεν' ὁ τοῦ ἄξονος πυκνοτάτη καὶ παχύς ἄρρη ἐπιποθεῖς αὐτοῦ πάντων τοῦ ὑπονόου καὶ τὴν ἱματίαν ἐκάλυψε· νῦν δὲ βαθέα καὶ σκότος πολύ τήν ἅπαν κατείχε. ἡ προσομοιότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὸν ἡγεότα καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ σέβεται κατὰ νοῦν ἐδοκίμασεν, εἰ τὸ παρὸν διαφύγων κακῶν. ἔτσι δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα ἐνθουμομένου παραχρῆμα διελήφη ἡ ἁμαρτία καὶ ὁ ἀθως εἰς αἰετιαν μετέβαλεν, ἐμβαλοῦσα τῇ αἰετίᾳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐνακισάθε. καὶ τῷ συμβάν τῇ γαμετῇ κοινωνίᾳ μετέπεμψε τὴν ἀγαλματίαν καὶ τύχα τρόπον προσφέρει τοῦ Χριστοῦ θρησκείαν ἑκέλευε διδασκεί. τῆς δὲ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς πάντων λέγειν τε καὶ ποιεῖται ἑσταγμηνικής ἁγείρας τοὺς ὑπόκους ἀκείνους ταύτας συμβάσεις αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῇ γαμετῇ δείκει εὐεργεσίας εἰς κοινῷ ἐξήγγειλε· μήπω δὲ μην οἷς τοῖς δόμοις μετέδωκε τοῖς ἀρχιμένοις· καὶ τὸν Χριστόν πανδημείλε σέβει πείθους, αὐτὸς μὲν τοὺς ἄνθρους· ἢ δὲ βασιλισσά ἀμα της ἀγαλματίας τῆς γυναικός. καὶ ἐν τῇ καθότητι κοινῇ συνθηκῇ παντός τοῦ ἔνθους φιλοτιμώτα παρεσκευάσατο ἐκοιμήθησεν ἀκομοῦντες. εἰπὲ δὲ κύκλῳ τοῦ μεν τοῖς περὶ βλογοῦν ἤγεοιν, στήησετε μηχανάς αἰμαίνων τοὺς κόσμους καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βάσεως ἐπτιθέμενον. λέγεται δὲ τοῦ τε πρῶτου καὶ δεύτερου ὄρθωτος ἐργώδη γενέσθαι τοῦ τρίτου κόσμου τήν οὗτον καὶ μήτε τέχνη τῶν ἐπιστημών καταρωθήναι μήτε λοξὴ βιασύνην, κατὰ πολλῶν ὑπόλοιπων τῶν ἐλκόντων. ἐστιν δὲ ἐπεγενεμένης μόνη ἡ ἀγαλματίας αὐτοῦ διευκολύνειν ἰκτεύουσα τοῦ ἔνθους εὐπορίας γενέσθαι τῶν κύριων τῆς διάθεσιν, οἵ δὲ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀνοχώρησαν διαφορούστες καὶ μάλιστα ὁ βασιλεὺς· ὀρθωθεὶς γὰρ μέχρι τοῦ μέσου ὁ κῶν ἐγκαθίστατο εἰς καὶ τῷ ἐδάφει ἐμπνευσε τῆς κάτωθι ἀρχής ἀκίνητος ἦν. ἐμμελεί δὲ διὰ τοῦτο ἢ τὰ πρὸ τοῦτου παράδοξο βέβαιοτον καὶ περὶ τὸ ἄθεὸν ποιήσειν τῶν Ἰησοῦς. περὶ γὰρ τῆς ἐν παραγενομένων αὐτῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίαν· ἡ ἡρμῆ προσφέρει ἡ ἐκκλησία διευκολύνεις, ὑποδεικνύεις τῆς ἀγαλματίας πέμπουσι πρέπεις πρὸς ἱστοτυχεῖν τοῦ βασιλέα· ῥωμαίων συμμαχεῖ καὶ συνοδικώς φέροιται, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦτον ἠρείας τῇ ἐφέεις ἀποσταλητικὸς δομούς. διεσπερώτων δὲ τῶν πρέσβεων, οἷα παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ συνεβεβη, καὶ ἔχετε τὸ πάν ἔνθος ἐν
During this reign, it is said that the Iberians, a large and very belligerent barbarian nation, acknowledged Christ. They lived inside Armenia to the north. A Christian woman who was held captive prepared them to reject their ancestors' religion. She was very faithful and pious, and she did not slacken her accustomed way of life among the foreigners. It was important to her to fast, to pray day and night, and to praise God. The barbarians asked for what reason she continued on in this manner. She simply said it is necessary to worship the Son of God in this way; but the name of him to be worshiped and the way of worshiping seemed strange to them. It happened then that a boy of the country was taken ill, and his mother carried him around from house to house—as is the custom of the Iberians—so that if anyone is found who can heal the disease, an easy deliverance from suffering may come for the sick. Since no one capable of healing the boy was found, she brought him to the captive, who said "I know nothing of medicines, nor do I have any experience with salves or plasters, but, dear woman, I believe the Christ whom I worship, the true and great God, will be the saviour of your son." She immediately prayed for him and delivered him from his sickness, even though it was expected he would die. A little while later, the wife of the ruler of the nation suffered from an incurable disease and was about to die—the captive saved her in the same way and thus taught the knowledge of Christ. She introduced him as the dispenser of health and the lord of life, kingdom and all things. The ruler's wife, convinced by her experience, believed that the words of the captive were true and honored the Christian religion. She held the captive in high esteem. The king was amazed at the speed of the cure and the miracle of faith. He learned the cause from his wife and ordered the captive to be repaid with gifts. But the queen said that the gifts were of little import to the captive, whatever their value may be. The only thing she holds dear is the worship of her own God. Therefore, if we wish to please her and desire to do what is right, let us worship this God, who is a powerful God and a Saviour who—if he wishes—gives continuance to kings, makes the great small and reveals their lack of honor, and saves those in bad straits. The queen continued to argue well, but the king doubted her and was not persuaded, because he suspected the novelty of the matter and he respected his ancestors' religion. After a short time, the king went on a hunt with his attendants. Suddenly, darkness closed in and thick air poured all around them, eclipsing the sky and the sun. Deep night and darkness covered the whole forest. Then, fearing what was around him, each was scattered from the others. The king was wandering alone and, as often happens to men
who are lost and in bad straits, he thought of Christ. He decided that if he should escape the evil before him, he would follow God and worship him. As soon as he took these things to heart, the darkness immediately dispersed and the air changed to nice weather. The rays of the sun burst forth and he was brought safely through the forest. He shared the experience with his wife and sent for the captive, asking her to come and teach him how to worship Christ. When she had instructed him as much as was right for a woman to say and do, he called his people together and described the divine mercies that had been granted to him and his wife. Even though not yet initiated, he changed the minds of his subjects about the doctrines and persuaded the whole people to worship Christ—he persuaded the men, the queen, and the captive persuaded the women. Quickly, by common agreement, the entire nation prepared most zealously to build a church. When they raised the wall in a circle, a machine was used to raise up the columns and place them on the bases. It is said the first and second were set upright in this way, but the third column could not be positioned, neither by the skill of the workers nor by strength, although many were pulling. When evening fell, the captive remained there alone, praying to God that the correcting of the columns would be easy. The others were all sad and they withdrew, especially the king: for the column stood only half raised and it was fixed to the bottom so that it was impossible to move it from below. It was intended through this or the miracles before this to make the Iberians more firm in the divine. Around dawn they came to the church and beheld a wonderful, dreamlike event—the column that appeared immovable on the day before was straight, having been lifted up to its base. Everyone present was awe-struck and acknowledged Christ as the only true God. While they were watching, the column slipped quietly and spontaneously onto its own base. After this, the other columns were easily set straight and the Iberians more zealously completed the remaining building. The church was built with all speed. The Iberians, at the recommendation of the captive, sent an ambassador to Constantine, the Roman emperor, carrying treaties and alliances, and requesting him to appoint priests to the nation. When the ambassadors related the events that had occurred and that the whole nation faithfully worshiped Christ, the Roman emperor was pleased and sent the ambassadors away with everything they wanted. In this way the Iberians came to know Christ and even now faithfully worship him.

Rufinus 10.10 (Latin)

Per idem tempus etiam Iberorum gens, quae sub axe Pontico jacet, verbi Dei faedera, et fidem futuri susceperat regni. Sed huius tanti boni praestitit caussam mulier quaedam captiva, quae apud eos reperta, cum fidelem et sobriam satis ac pudicam duceret vitam, totisque diebus ac noctibus obsecrationes Deo pervigiles exhiberet, in admiratione esse ipsa rei novitas Barbaris caepit, et quid hoc sibi velit, curiosius perquirebant. Illa, ut res erat, simpliciter Christum se Deum hoc ritu colere fatebatur. Nihil ex hoc amplius Barbari praeter
novitatem nominis mirabantur. Verum (ut fieri solet) ipsa perseverantia curiositatem quandam mulierculis inferebat, si quid emolumenti ex tanta devotione caperetur. Moris apud eos esse dicitur, ut si parvulus aegrotet, circumferatur a mater per singulas domos, quo scilicet si quis experti aliquid remedii noverit, conferat laboranti. Cumque mulier quaedam parvulum suum per omnes circumulisset ex more, nec aliquid remedii, cunctas domos lustrando, caepisset, venit etiam ad captivam. ut si quid sciret, ostenderet. Illa se humani quidem remedii nihil scire testatur, Deum tamen suum Christum quem colebat, dare ei desperatam ab hominibus posse salutem, confirmat. Cumque cilicio suo parvulum superposuissest, atque ipsa desuper orationem fudisset ad Dominum, sanum matre reddidit infantem. Sermo defertur, ad plures, factisque fama magnifici usque ad aures reginae perlabitur. Quae dolore quodam gravissimo corporis afficta, in desperatione maxima erat. Rogat ad se captivam deduci. Illa ire abnuit, ne praesumere amplius aliquid quam sexus sinus. Ipsam se regina referri ad captivae cellulam iubet. Quam similiter supra cilicium suum positam, invocato Christi nomine, continuo post precem, sanam et alacrem fecit exsurgere. Christumque esse Deum, Dei summi Filium, qui salutem hanc contulerit, docet: eumque quem sibi actuorem suae sciret esse incolunmitatis et vitae, commonet invocandum. Ipsum namque esse, qui et regibus regna distribuat et mortalibus vitam. At illa cum laetitia domum regressa, marito percontanti caussam tam subitae sanitatis aperuit, quique cum pro salute coniugis laetus, et mulieri munera deferri iuberet, illa: Horum, inquit, o rex, nihil captiva dignatur: aurum despicit, argentum respuit, ieunio quasi cibo pastitur: hoc solum ei muneris dabimus, si eum, qui me,illa invocante, sanavit, Christum Deum colamus. Ad hoc tunc rex seignior fuit, et interim distulit saepius licet ab uxore communitus, donec accidit quadem die venante eo in silvis cum comitibus suis, obscurari densissimis tenebris diem, et per tetrae noctis horrorem luce subducta, caecis iter gressibus denegari. Alius alio diversi ex comitibus oberrant, ipse solus densissima obscuritate circumdatus, quid ageret, quo se verteret nesciebat: cum repente anxios salutis desperatione animos cognitatio talis ascendit. Si vere Deus est Christus ille, quem uxori suae captiva praedixerat, nunc se de his tenebris liberet, ut ipsum ex hoc ommissis omnibus colet. Illico ut haec nondum verbo, sed sola mente devoverat, redditu mundo dies, regem ad urbem perduxit incolumem. Quique reginae rem protinus ut gesta est pandit. Evocari iam iamque captivam, et colendi ritum ut sibi tradat, exposcit: neque se ultra alium Deum quam Christum veneraturum esse confirmat. Adest captiva, edocet Deum Christum: supplicandi ritum venerandique modum, inquantum de his aperire feminae fas erat, pandit. Fabricari tamen Ecclesiam monet, formamque describit. igitur rex, totius gentis populo convocato, rem ab initio quae erga se ac reginam gesta fuerat, exponit, fidem que edocet, et nondum initiatus in sacris, fit suae gentis Apostolus. Credunt viri per regem, feminae per reginam: cunctisque idem volentibus Ecclesia exstruitur instanter: et elevato iam perniciter murorum ambitu, tempus erat quo columnae collocari debearent. Cumque erecta prima vel secunda, ventum fuisset ad tertiam, consumtis omnibus machinis, et boum

Rufinus 10.10 (English)\(^{146}\)

It was at this time too that the Georgians, who dwell in the region of Pontus, accepted the word of God and faith in the kingdom to come. The cause of this great benefit was a woman captive who lived among them and led such a faithful, sober, and modest life, spending all of her days and nights in sleepless supplications to God, that the very novelty of it began to be wondered at by the barbarians. Their curiosity led them to ask what she was about. She replied with the truth: that in this manner she simply worshipped Christ as God. This answer made the barbarians wonder only at the novelty of the name, although it is true, as often happens, that her very perseverance made the common women wonder if she were deriving some benefit from such great devotion.

Now it is said that they have the custom that, if a child falls sick, it is taken around by its mother to each of the houses to see if anyone knows of a proven remedy to apply to the illness. And when one of the women had brought her child around to everyone, according to custom, and had found no remedy in any of the houses, she went to the woman captive as well to see if she knew of

anything. She answered that she knew of no human remedy, but declared that Christ her God, whom she worshipped, could give it the healing despairs of by humans. And after she had put the child on her hair shirt and poured out above it her prayer to the Lord, she gave the infant back to its mother in good health. Word of this got around to many people, and news of the wonderful deed reached the ears of the queen, who was suffering from a bodily illness of the gravest sort and had been reduced to a state of absolute despair. She asked for the woman captive to be brought to her. She declined to go, lest she appear to pretend to more than was proper to her sex. The queen ordered that she herself be brought to the captive's hovel. Having placed her likewise on her hair shirt and invoked Christ's name, no sooner was her prayer done than she had her stand up healthy and vigorous, and taught her that it was Christ, God and Son of God most high, who had conferred healing upon her, and advised her to invoke him whom she should know to be the author of her life and well-being, for he it was who allotted kingdoms to kings and life to mortals. She returned joyfully home and disclosed the affair to her husband, who wanted to know the reason for this sudden return to health. When he in his joy at his wife's cure ordered gifts to be presented to the woman, she said "O king, the captive deigns to accept none of these things. She despises gold, rejects silver, and battens on fasting as though it were food. This alone may we give her as a gift, if we worship as God the Christ who cured me when she called upon him."

But the king was not then inclined to do so and put it off for the time, although his wife urged him often, until it happened one day when he was hunting in the woods with his companions that a thick darkness fell upon the day, and with the light removed there was no longer any way for his blind steps through the grim and awful night. Each of his companions wandered off a different way, while he, left alone in the thick darkness which surrounded him, did not know what to do or where to turn, when suddenly there arose in his heart, which was near to losing hope of being saved, the thought that if the Christ preached to his wife by the woman captive were really God, he might now free him from this darkness so that he could from then on abandon all the others and worship him. No sooner had he vowed to do so, not even verbally but only mentally, than the daylight returned to the world and guided the king safely to the city. He explained directly to the queen what had happened. He required that the woman captive be summoned at once and hand on to him her manner of worship, insisting that from then on he would venerate no god but Christ. The captive came, instructed him that Christ is God, and explained, as far as it was lawful for a woman to disclose such things, the ways of making petition and offering reverence. She advised that a church be built and described its shape.

The king therefore called together all of his people and explained the matter from the beginning, what had happened to the queen and him, taught them the faith, and before even being initiated into sacred things, became the apostle of his nation. The men believed because of the king, the women because of the queen, and with everyone desiring the same thing a church was put up without
delay. The outer walls having quickly been raised, it was time to put the columns in place. When the first and second had been set up and they came to the third, they used all the machines and the strength of men and oxen to get it raised halfway up to an inclined position, but no machine could lift it the rest of the way, not even with efforts repeated again and again; with everyone exhausted, it would not budge. Everyone was confounded, the king's enthusiasm waned, and no one could think what to do. But when nightfall intervened and everyone went away and all mortal labors ceased, the woman captive remained inside alone, passing the night in prayer. And when the worried king entered in the morning with all his people, he saw the column, which so many machines and people had been unable to move, suspended upright just above its base: not placed upon it, but hanging about one foot in the air. Then indeed all the people looking on glorified God and accepted the witness of the miracle before them that the king's faith and the captive's religion were true. And behold, while everyone was still in the grip of wonder and astonishment, before their very eyes the column, with no one touching it, gradually and with perfect balance settled down upon its base. After that the remaining columns were raised with such ease that all that were left were put in place that day.

Now after their church had been magnificently built and the people were thirsting even more deeply for God's faith, on the advice of the captive, an embassy of the entire people was sent to the emperor Constantine, and what had happened was explained to him. They implored him to send priests who could complete God's work begun among them. He dispatched them with all joy and honor, made far happier by this than if he had annexed to the Roman empire unknown peoples and kingdoms. That this happened was related to us by that most faithful man Bacurius, the king of that nation who in our realm held the rank of comes domesticorum and whose chief concern was for religion and truth; when he was dux limitis in Palestine he spent some time with us in Jerusalem in great concord of spirit. But let us return to our topic.

Analysis

Sozomen 2.7 and Socrates 1.20 report the conversion of the Iberians. These two passages follow closely an account in Rufinus 10.10. A pious woman by her lifestyle and her healing talents convinced the king and queen of Iberia to worship Christ. Subsequently the entire nation was converted. Sozomen and Socrates, however, portray the conversion in different ways.
Socrates uses the generic verb \( \chiριστανίζειν \) to describe the conversion taking place in the passage. He uses it at both the beginning and the end to summarize what the chapter is about. Within the passage, however, he never directly refers to a conversion of the people (i.e., a change or transformation); rather, he mentions the king believing, the king and queen becoming priests, and the people being encouraged to worship.

Sozomen primarily emphasizes the knowledge and worship of Christ rather than any sort of transformation. Unlike Socrates, he never even uses the word \( \chiριστανίζειν \). He begins the chapter with \( \lambdaέγεται \ τοὺς \ 'Ιβηρας τὸν \ Χριστὸν \ ἐπίγνοναι \ "it is said the Iberians acknowledged Christ." In the final sentence, he summarizes the chapter with the phrase \( \Ωδὲ \ μὲν \ 'Ιβηρας τὸν \ Χριστὸν \ ἐπέγνωσαν, \ καὶ \ εἰσέπε \ νῦν \ ἐπιμελῶς \ σέσωσιν, "In this way the Iberians came to know Christ and even now faithfully worship him," thereby stressing the ideas of knowledge and worship as his focus for the chapter.

The lack of conversion words in Sozomen stands out because in both the former chapter and the following, he uses words that indicate change. The former chapter (2.6) contains a foreshadowing of 6.37 (the conversion of the Goths). It contains the word \( \chiριστανίζω \) in the beginning, then the phrase \( \πάλα \ \μετασχόντες \ τῆς \ εἰς \ Χριστὸν \ πίστεως \ "long ago they shared in the Christian faith." The subsequent chapter (2.7) is a brief account about the Armenians being the first to be Christianized, in which Sozomen uses both \( \chiριστανίζω \) and \( \γενέσθαι \ \Χριστιανόν \). Thus the lack of transformative words in 2.7 is most likely an intentional choice by Sozomen. He closely follows Rufinus, who also tended not to use transformative
words in this passage. Nevertheless, in another way Sozomen presents this account as a transformation.

Sozomen adds the queen's conversion, which is not included in Socrates' or Rufinus' accounts, in order to inject a more transformational element into his narrative. The queen responds to being healed by believing the captive's words and honoring the Christian religion (πιστεύσασα τοὺς τῆς αἰχμαλώτου λόγους, τὴν Χριστιανῶν θρησκείαν ἐπέστησεν). Although προέβην is not necessarily a word that indicates inner transformation, the change of heart is evident in this case as the queen speaks on the captive's behalf and plays an instrumental role in the king's (and therefore the nation's) conversion.

The addition of the queen's conversion also indicates more of a process-oriented perspective. According to Sozomen's account, the king has not only heard of the healings done by the captive, but has also been directly influenced by the queen's conversion, before he undergoes his own conversion experience. Thus, the king's conversion begins with the seed planted by the healing of his wife and child, is continued through discussion with his wife and is brought to completion by his own dramatic experience on the hunt.

In the story of the king's conversion, Sozomen uses his conversion word μεταβαλλω as part of the narrative, but not in direct reference to the king. As the king decides to put his faith in Christ, the dark forest in which he was lost becomes light. Sozomen uses μεταβαλλω to describe this transformation from darkness to light, one of the most common and most ancient metaphors for conversion.\textsuperscript{147} This is certainly

\textsuperscript{147}See above, Chapter 2.
no accident, but rather a literary device used by Sozomen to ascribe transformation to the king's conversion experience.

Another change Sozomen makes to Socrates' account is in his description of the conversion of the nation. Socrates states: "he [the king] advised them to worship the captive's God." Sozomen, however, gives a more detailed description of the change and divides it into two discrete events: "he changed the minds of his subjects about the doctrines and persuaded the whole people to worship Christ." By his more direct statement of the conversion, he demonstrates his view that people were changed (not just advised to change) and that multiple stages of change occurred (people's minds changed, then their worship).

Even though he does not use the same kind of conversion language he employs in other passages, Sozomen still presents this account differently than Socrates. Where Socrates leaves the details vague, Sozomen provides concrete explanation. For example, instead of the king and queen merely becoming priests, they actually persuade the Iberian people to worship Christ. Instead of the generic Χριστιανική of the Iberians, they learn about Christ and worship him. This more detailed description indicates Sozomen perceived inadequacies in Socrates' presentation and wanted to demonstrate more concretely what was going on in the conversion process. Sozomen conveys a more transformative and process-oriented understanding of conversion by his inclusion of the queen's conversion and his unique description of the nation's conversion.
CHAPTER 7

"The Conversion of the Indians"

Socrates 1.19 (Greek)

Αὔθως οὖν μημονευτέον καὶ ὅπως ἐπὶ τῶν καρῶν τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ Χριστιανισμὸς ἐπιλαύσετος· τηρήκατα γὰρ Ἰνδών τε τῶν ἐνδοτέρων καὶ Ἰβηρίων τὰ ἔθη πρὸς τὸ χριστιανίζειν ἐλάβαμεν τὴν ἀρχὴν. τίνος δὲ ἐνεκεν τῇ προσθήκῃ τῶν ἐνδοτέρων ἔχρησάμην, διὰ βραχείων ἔρωτι ἡμικαὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι κλῆρῳ τὴν εἰς τὰ ἔθη πορείαν ἐποιοῦντο, θωμᾶς μὲν τὴν Πάρθων ἀποστολὴν ὑπεδέχετο, Ματθαῖος δὲ τὴν Αἰγυπτιαν, Βαρθολομαίος δὲ ἐκλήρωσε τὴν συνημμένην ταύτῃ Ἰνδίαν. τὴν μὲν τῶν ἐνδοτέρων Ἰνδίαν, ἢ προσακεί βαρβάρων ἔθνη πολλά διαφοράς χρώμενα γλώσσας, οὐδὲν πρὸς τῶν Κωνσταντίνου χρόνων ὁ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ λόγος ἔφωτεν. τίς δὲ ἡ αἵτια τοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦς χριστιανίσας ἡμῖν, ἔρχομαι καταλέξων.

Μερόπος τῆς φιλόσοφος τῷ γένει Τύρως ἰστορήσα τὴν Ἰνδίων χώραν ἐσπευσαν, ἀμφισβάζοντός πρὸς τὸν φιλόσοφον Μητρόδωρον, ὃς πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἰνδίων χώραν ἰστόρησεν. παραλαβὼν οὖν δόῳ παντάρια συγγενὴς Ἕλληνος πασχείας οὐκ ἄμορα καταλαμβάνει πλοῦς τὴν χώραν, ἰστορήσας τε, δόσα ἴ-TVολετο, προσσορμίζει χρεία τῶν ἐπιθυμίων τῆς λιμένα ἔχουν ἀσφαλῆ, συμβεβήκει δὲ τότε πρὸς ὅλον τὰς σπουδὰς διεσπάσας τὰς μεταξὺ Ἥρωμας τε καὶ Ἰνδών. συλλαβόντες οὖν οἱ Ἰνδοὶ τὸν τοὺς φιλόσοφον καὶ τοὺς συμπλέοντας, πλην τῶν δύο συγγενῶν πανταρίων ἀπάντας διεχρήσαντο, τοὺς δὲ δύο παίδας οὐκτὶ τῆς ἥλικας διασώσαντες δῷρον τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἰνδών προσκομίζουσιν. ὃ δὲ ἦθελε τῇ προσδοκεῖ τῶν νέων ἐνα μὲν αὐτῶν ὁ νόμοι Αἰθέσιον αἰ νοχοῦ τῆς ἕαυτον τραπέζης κατέστησε, τὸν δὲ ἔτερον (Φρουμέντο κύμα αὐτῷ) τῶν βασιλικῶν γραμματοφιλάκων φροντίζειν προσέβαζεν. μετ’ οὗ πολὺ δὲ τελευτῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ νῦν κομιδῆ νέω καὶ γυναικὶ ἐλευθέρους τούτους ἀφίσαν. ἢ δὲ γυνὴ τοῦ βασιλέως παρεκάλει τοὺς νεανίκους, τῶν νῦν ἐν ἡλίκα καταλειμμένον μικρά μὴ ἀποληπίειν, ἀλλά κηθομιζῶν αὐτῶν ποίησασθαι, ἄριστη δὲ εἰς ἀνδρας γένηται· ἢ πείθονται οἱ νεανίσκοι καὶ προνοοῦσι μὴ παριδεῖ τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως πραγμάτων. Φρουμέντο δὲ ἄρα οἱ διοικών μάλιστα σύμπαντα ἔργον δὲ ἐποιεῖτο τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας τῆς χώρας Ἦρωμας ἐμπόρους ἐπιζήτειν, εἶ δὲ πιὰ τῶν χριστιανίζοντων ἐφεύρα. εὔρων δὲ καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἐαυτῶν διδάσκεις παρεκάλει τόπους καταλαμβάνειν ιδίαζοντας ἐπὶ τῶν χριστιανικὰς εὐχὰς ἔκτελεν. κατὰ βραχὺ δὲ προοίμιο τοῦ χρόνου καὶ εἰκτήριον ὅρκον κατεσκεύασαν καὶ
Socrates 1.19 (English)

We mention again in what manner Christianity spread at the time of this emperor. At this time, both inner India and the nation of Iberia began to be Christianized. I shall briefly explain why I used the adjective 'inner.' When the apostles made journeys by lot among the nations, Thomas received the apostleship of the Parthians, Matthew the Ethiopians, and Bartholomew was chosen for the part of India that joined to that country. Inner India, however, in which many barbarian nations using various languages lived, was not enlightened by the idea of Christianity before the time of Constantine. I will now tell the cause of their being Christianized.

Meropius, a certain Tyrian philosopher, was eager to explore the land of the Indians, competing against the philosopher Metrodorus, who explored the land of the Indians before him. He took with him two little boys related to him, who both had a Greek education, and arrived at the land by ship. When he had explored it, as much as he wished, he anchored at some safe harbor to get some necessities. It happened that a little before that time, the treaties between the Romans and Indians were broken. The Indians seized the philosopher and his shipmates and killed everyone except the two boys. They spared the two boys, pitying their youth, and brought them as a gift to the king of the Indians. The king took pleasure in the appearance of the youths and made the one, Edesius by name, cupbearer of his table, the other (named Frumentius) he entrusted with the care of the royal records. Not long after, the king gave them their freedom since he was dying and his wife and very young son were to take over the kingdom. The king's wife summoned the youths,
asking them not to abandon the son who was left in his youth, but to act as his
guardian until he should reach manhood. The youths were persuaded and they
planned so as not to neglect the matters of the kingdom. Frumentius
controlled most all things. He made it a task to seek for those Roman
merchants living in the land, to see if he could discover any who had become
Christians. When he found them, he told them about himself and ordered
them to select places to set apart for Christian prayers. In a short time they
built a house of prayer: they also taught some of the Indians and prepared to
pray with them. When the king's son reached the end of his youth, Frumentius
and his associates handed over the matters that had been well-managed by them
and asked to return to their homeland. The king's son and his mother asked
them to stay, but they could not be persuaded, so they left with desire for their
homeland. Edesius hurried to Tyre to see his parents and relatives.
Frumentius, however, came to Alexandria to report to the bishop Athanasius,
who had recently been ordained bishop, all the details of his journeys and the
hopes the Indians held of accepting Christianity. He urged him to send a bishop
and clergy there, and by no means to neglect those who could be saved.
Athenianus considered how this could best be accomplished and urged
Frumentius himself to accept the bishopric, saying he had no one more suitable.
This was done and Frumentius was ordained bishop to the Indians. He
returned there, became a teacher of Christianity and established many houses
of prayer. Aided by God's grace, he did many miracles and healed many bodies
as well as souls. Rufinus says he heard these things from Edesius who
afterwards was ordained to the priesthood in Tyre.

_Sozomen 2.24 (Greek)_

'Τπο δὲ τούτου τον χρόνον παρειλήφαμεν καὶ τοῦς ἐνθον τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς
Ἰνδῶν, ἀπειράτους μείναντας τῶν Βαρθολομαίου κηρυγμάτων, μετασχέειν
τοῦ δόγματος ὑπὸ Φρουμεντίου, ἵπτετο καὶ καθηγητὴ γενομένων παρ’ αὐτοῦς
tῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων. Ὡς δὲ γνώριμεν καὶ ἐν τῷ παραδόξῳ τοῦ
συμβάντος περὶ τούς Ἰνδῶν ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων, ὡς τοις τερατολογεῖσθαι
δοκεῖ, τὴν σύστασιν λαβεῖν τοῖς Ἰδιομαντῶν δόγμα, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὴν
αἰτίαν τῆς Φρουμεντίου χειροτονίας διεξελθεῖν ἐξειλήθην δὲ ὡδέ.
περὶ πολλοῦ
τοῖς παρ’ Ἐλλησιν εὐδοκιματάτος φιλοσόφος ἐγίνετο πολείς καὶ τόπους
ἀγνώσας ἤστρεψεν. οὕτω γοῦν Πλάτων ὁ Ἡσυχαστὸς ἐτάρτος Ἀλκιβίας
ἐνεδίημος τὰ παρ’ αὐτοῦ μαθημάτως, ἔπελε σὺ καὶ εἰς Σικέλιαν ἐπὶ
θέα τῶν αὐτοῦ κρατήρων, ἐν ὃς αἰὴ μὲν ὡς ἄπειρας ἀναδόμενον
αὐτόματον παφλάζει πῦρ, πολλάσθας δὲ ὑπερχέον ποταμοῦ δίκην ἐξ
καὶ τὴν γείτονα γῆν ἐπιβαίνεται τουσοῦν, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸν πολλοῦς ἄργος
φαίνεσθαι κατακεκαμένους καὶ μῆτε σπόρον δέχεσθαι μῆτε φυτεύαν
δενδρῶν, οὐδ’ ἔνεπερ τῆς Συκομομῆς χώρας καταγγέλλουσα. ποτέ δὲ
τούτους κρατήρας καὶ ἴκπεδοκλίς ἤστρεψεν, ἀνὴρ λαυρᾶς παρ’ Ἐλλησι
φιλοσόφος καὶ ἐν ἄπειραν ἡμέρας τὴν ἐπιστήμην πραγματευόμενος
διαποροδέμενος δὲ περὶ τῆς ἀνάδοσεως τοῦ πυρός, ὡς τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ
ἀμείνου ἀποθανεῖν δοκιμᾶσας, ἢ τὸ γε αἰθέστερον εἰπεῖν – οὐδὲ αὐτὸς
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ائكς εἶδος οὐ χάριν πρὸ καιροῦ τὴν τοιαύτην εὑρεν έαυτῷ τοῦ βίου ἀπαλλαγήν, ἦπατο εἰς τὸ πῦρ καὶ διφάρη, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Δημόκριτος οὐ Κώστος πλέοσας ἱστορέσα πόλεις, ἀερὰ τε καὶ χώρας καὶ ἕστη καὶ ἐπὶ ἔστην οὐδέποτα διαγαγέν ἐπὶ ἕξερν ἄντως που περὶ ἐαυτῷ φησιν. ἀλλοι τε ἐπὶ τούτους μιμείτα τῶν παρ’ Ἑλληνος σοφών, ἀρχάγχα καὶ νεώτεροι, τούτῳ ἐσπούδασαν. οὐς ἡλίας Μερούσης τῆς φιλόσοφος Τύρως τῆς Φουκίδης παραγένετο εἰς Ἰνδοὺς. εἴποντο δὲ αὐτῷ παῖδες δύο, Φρουμέντιος τε καὶ Ἐδέσιος, ἅμως δὲ γενεί αὐτῷ προσήκοντες. οὐς διὰ λόγων ἦν καὶ ἐλευθερώς ἐπαιδεύειν ἱστορήσας δὲ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς δοὺς γε αὐτῷ ἔξερεν, τῆς ἐπιστοῖς ὑπὸς ἐπιτυχών στελλομένην εἰς Ἀγριππαν. συμβαίνω καὶ ταῦτα ἔστη ἤθασεν ἔτη τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιτυχών εἰς ὅρμον πιο προσαχθεῖν τῆν οὐς κατάφραστες οἱ τῆς Ἰνδοῦ κτείνομοι πάντας καὶ τῶν Μερόπον. ἐπιχόν γὰρ τότε λυπᾶντες τὰς πρὸς Ἰρώμων εἰσφιάσας, τοὺς δὲ παῖδας νέους δυστα ὀκτείταις ἐξώγησαν καὶ βασιλεύς τῇ ἐαυτῶν προσήχαν, ὁ δὲ τὸν πᾶν νεώτερον οἰκοχόν κατέστησε, μεῖονα δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας τὸν φρουμέντιον καὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἐπηρρόποιοι ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχεφον καὶ διοικεῖν ίκανωτάτων. ἐν πολύν δὲ χρημάτων χρημάτως σφάδ παράποιημένος, τελευτῶν ἐπὶ παιδί καὶ γαμητὶ, ἐλευθερά τῆς εὐνοίας αὐτοῦς ἣμείσιμο χρόνον διάγειν ἐπέτρεπε. καὶ οὐ μὲν εἰς Τύρων πρὸς τοὺς οἰκεῖοις ἐπανελθέν θοποιαδός ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βασιλείας ὑπὸ νέον κομίδι οὔτος ἐξερήμη ἤ τοῦτο μίτηρ ἐπὶ ὅλην χρόνον περιμένει ἅμως τὴν βασιλείαν ἐπιτροπήντως, ἅρις δὲς ἀπὸ ἀναρριθήνει. αὐτηλοῦσαν δὲ τὴν βασιλία ἱδέσισθαν, καὶ τὰ βασιλεία καὶ τὴν ἤγερθαιν Ἰνδοῦς ὑμέως. ὁ δὲ φρουμέντιος θείας ίως προσπελείς ἐπομαινείς καὶ καὶ αὐτοπάθως τοῦ θεοῦ κυνοῦ τοῦ ἐπικαθαρίστος, ἔδρα δὲ παρὰ Χριστιάνων παρ' Ἰνδάς ή ᾿Ρωμαίων τοῖς εἰσπλείτων ἐπιτρόπων. ἐπεμελεῖς δὲ τούτους ἀναστάτων μετεκαλέστο πρὸς οὐαντον' ἁμιαισάζων τε καὶ φιλοφοινόμενος εἰκῆς ἤνεκεν συνειδείς ἐπολείς καὶ ή ᾿Ρωμαίων ἔδος ἐκκλησάζεις, καὶ διὰ πάντων προτρέπετο τὸ θεῖον προσβείεις, εὐκτηρίους οἰκος οἰκοδομῆς. ήδὲ δὲ τοῦ βασιλείας ὑπὸς εἰς ἅμως τελοῦτος, παραστησάμενον αὐτόν καὶ τὴν βασιλία ὑπὸ αἰετῶν ἡγεμόνως χιλιόσεβας σφόδ, πεινάτες καὶ φίλοι ἀπαλλαγέντες, παρεγένοντο εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων ὑπήκοον. καὶ Ἐδέσιος μὲν τοὺς οἰκεῖος οἰκυμένος εἰς Τύρων ἤλθεν, εἵνε ἰδι μετὰ ταῦτα προσβυπηρεῖτο ἡμῖν. φρουμέντιος δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ Φουκίδη ὅδων τέως ἀναβαλλόμενος ἄφηκε εἰς ᾿Αλεξάνδρεαν ἔδειξε γὰρ αὐτῷ οὐ καλῶς ζηέει πατριδὸς καὶ γένους δευτερεύει τὴν περὶ τὰ θεία σπουδήν. συμπτυχόν καὶ ᾿Αλκαστῆς τοῦ προστατέων τῆς ᾿Αλεξάνδρεως ἐκκλησίας τὰ καὶ Ἰνδοῦς διεγέρσαν καὶ ώς ἐπισκόπους δούς αὐτοῦς τῶν αὐτῶν Ἰδριστίων ἐπιμέλησομεν. οὐ δὲ ᾿Αλκαστῆς τοὺς εὐδομοῦσα τερεάς ἄγελας ἐρυθεύεσον περὶ τούτου καὶ χειροτεύει αὐτοῦ τῆς ᾿Ινδικῆς ἐπιστοικικοῦ, λογομένους ἐπιτηδεύτετο εἶναι τούτου καὶ ἰκανον πολλὸν ποιήσας τὴν ἤφησεν, παρ’ οὐς πρῶτος αὐτὸς ἐθύει τὸ Χριστιάνων ὄνομα καὶ σπέρμα παρέχει τῆς τοῦ σωματος μετουσίας. οὐ δὲ φρουμέντιος πάλιν εἰς ᾿Ινδοῦς ὑποστρέφας λέγει τούτου εὐκλείας τὴν ἔρωσιν μεταλληθεῖν, ώς ἐπαινεθήρην παρὰ πάνων τῶν αὐτοῦ περαβρετίων, οὕτως ἤττων ή τοὺς ἀποστόλους θανατόωσιν, καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστημότατον αὐτῶν ὁ θεὸς ἀπέφηνε, πολλὰς καὶ παραβολάς λάσεις καὶ σημεία καὶ τέρατα δὲ.
Sozomen 2.24 (English)

We have learned that about this period some within what we call India who did not know of the teaching of Bartholomew shared in our belief through the influence of Frumentius, who became a priest and teacher of the sacred teachings among them. But so that we may know even by the miracle of what happened among the Indians that the doctrine of the Christians takes its origin not from men; since to some it seems right to tell fantastic tales, it is necessary to narrate completely the cause of the ordination of Frumentius. It happened as follows. It was important for the most highly esteemed among the Greek philosophers to explore the unknown cities and places. Thus Plato, the companion of Socrates, lived among the Egyptians to discover their ways. He also sailed to Sicily for a look at the craters there, in which fire bubbles as from a spring, spontaneously bursting forth and often flowing like a river. The fire consumes the nearby earth so much that even now many fields appear consumed by burning and neither receive seed nor produce trees, just as they say about the land of Sodom. These craters were also explored by Empedocles, a man who practiced philosophy brilliantly among the Greeks and put forth his knowledge in heroic verse. He set out to investigate the eruptions of fire, when either because he found no better way than this to die or—to say it more truthfully—he perhaps knew no reason not to find such a release for his life, he jumped into the fire and perished. Democritus of Kos explored many cities—climates, lands and people—and he says he spent eighty years in foreign lands. Other than these, countless Greek wisemen, ancient and modern, earnestly pursued this. Emulating these men, Meropius, a philosopher from Tyre in Phoenicia, came to India. They say he had with him two boys, Frumentius and Edesius, who were related to him. He conducted their lessons and educated them liberally. After exploring as much of India as possible, he returned, finding a ship that was preparing to sail for Egypt. It happened that the ship entered a certain harbor, because of a need for water or some other necessity, and the Indians rushed in and killed everyone, including Meropius. It happened that they had dissolved their treaties with the Romans. They had pity on the boys, since they were young, and took them to their king. He appointed the younger one cupbearer and the older, Frumentius, he put over his household and made him administrator of treasury, for he saw he was sensible and very capable of managing. For a long time, they were useful and served faithfully. When the king was dying, his son and wife were still living, but he repayed the boys' kindness with freedom and allowed them to go wherever they wished. They were eager to return to Tyre to their relatives, but because the king's son was still young, his mother wanted them to stay a short time and act as guardians of the kingdom until the boy becomes a man. They had pity on
the queen's entreaties and they directed the government and kingdom of India. Frumentius, perhaps prompted by some divine appearance or even spontaneously moved by God, inquired whether there were any Christians among the Indians or among the Roman merchants who sailed into India. Discovering them carefully, he called them to himself. Greeting them warmly and embracing them, he brought them together for prayer and assembled them according to the Roman custom. When he had built a house of prayer, he urged them through everything to honor God. After the king's son reached manhood, they begged him and the queen, and not without difficulty, they persuaded them to separate and they were released as friends, returning as Roman subjects. Edesius went to Tyre to see his relatives. There, afterwards, he was considered worthy to be an elder. Frumentius, however, putting off a journey to Phoenicia, came to Alexandria because it did not seem right to him to hold religious zeal as secondary to homeland and family ties. He spoke with Athanasius, the head of the Alexandrian church, and described how things were in India and that it was necessary for a bishop to have charge over the Christians there. Athanasius called together the local priests and considered this. He chose him as bishop of the Indians, considering him most suitable and competent to do much for religion among those among whom he was the first to manifest the name of Christian and the seed of participation in our doctrine was supplied. Frumentius went back to India and it is said he discharged the duties of priesthood so gloriously that he was praised by all who knew him and was revered no less than the apostles. In this manner, God proclaimed him most distinguished and worked many miraculous cures, signs and miracles among them. Such was the beginning of the priesthood among the Indians.

Rufinus 10.9 (Latin)

In ea divisione orbis terrae, quae ad praedicandum verbum Dei sorte per Apostolos celebrata est, cum aliae aliis provinciae obvienissent, Thomae Parthia, et Matthaeo Aethiopia, eisque adhaerens ceterior India Bartholomaeo dicitur sorte decreta. Inter quam Parthiamque media, sed longo interior tractu, India ulterior jacet, multis variisque linguis et gentibus habitata, quam velut longe remotam, nullus Apostolicae praedicationis vomer impresserat, quae tamen temporibus Constantini tali quadam ex caussa semina fidei prima susceptit. Metrodorus quidam philosophus, inspiciendorum locorum, et orbis perscrutandi gratia, ulterior dicitur Indian penetrasse. Cuius exemplo etiam invitatus Meropius quidam Tyrius philosophus simili ex caussa adire Indian voluit, habens secum duos puerulos, quos liberalibus litteris ut pote propinquos instituebat. Quorum unus qui erat iunior Edesius, alter Frumentius vocabatur. Igitur pervisis, et in notitiam captis his quibus animus pascebatur, cum philosophus redire caepisset, aquae vel caeterorum necessariorum caussa ad portum quendam navis, qua vehebatur applicuit. Moris est inibi Barbarorum, ut siquando foedus sibi cum Romanis turbatum vicinae nuntiaverint gentes, omnes qui apud eos ex Romanis inventi fuerint iugulentur. Invaditur navis

Rufinus 10.9 (English)\footnote{Translation by Philip R. Amidon, S.J. in The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia (Oxford 1997), 18-20.}

In the division of the earth which the apostles made by lot for the preaching of God's word, when the different provinces fell to one or the other of them, Parthia, it is said, went by lot to Thomas, to Matthew fell Ethiopia, and Hither India, which adjoins it, went to Bartholomew. Between this country and
Parthia, but far inland, lies Further India. Inhabited by many peoples with many different languages, it is so distant that the plow of the apostolic preaching had made no furrow in it, but in Constantine's time it received the first seeds of faith in the following way. A philosopher named Metrodorus, they say, penetrated to Further India for the purpose of viewing the places and investigating the continent. Encouraged by his example, a philosopher of Tyre named Meropius decided to go to India for the same reason; he had with him two small boys whom as his relatives he was instructing in letters. The younger was called Aedesius and the older Frumentius. When therefore the philosopher had seen fully and taken note of the things on which his mind was feasting, and he had set out on the return voyage, the ship in which he was sailing put in to some port to obtain water and other necessaries. It is the custom of the barbarians there that whenever the neighboring peoples announce that relations with the Romans have been disturbed, they kill all the Romans they find among them. The philosopher's ship was attacked and everyone with him put to death together. The boys, who were discovered under a tree going over and preparing their lessons, were saved because the barbarians pitied them and brought them to the king. He made one of them, Aedesius, his cupbearer, while to Frumentius, whose intelligence and prudence he could see, he entrusted his accounts and correspondence. From that time on they were held in high honor and affection by the king. Now when the king died and left as heir to the kingdom his wife and her son, he also left it to the free choice of the youths what they would do. But the queen begged them to share with her the responsibility of ruling the kingdom until her son should grow up, as she had no one more trustworthy in the kingdom, especially Frumentius, whose prudence would suffice to rule the kingdom, for the other gave evidence simply of a pure faith and sober mind.

Now while they were doing so and Frumentius had the helm of the kingdom, God put it into his mind and heart to begin making careful inquiries if there were any Christians among the Roman merchants, and to give them extensive rights, which he urged them to use, to build places of assembly in each location, in which they might gather for prayer in the Roman manner. Not only that, but he himself did far more along these lines than anyone else, and in this way encouraged the others, invited them with his support and favors, made available whatever was suitable, furnished sites for buildings and everything else that was necessary, and bent every effort to see that the seed of Christians should grow up there. Now when the royal child whose kingdom they had looked after reached maturity, then, having executed their trust completely and handed it back faithfully, they returned to our continent, even though the queen and her son tried very hard to hold them back and asked them to stay. While Aedesius hastened to Tyre to see his parents and relatives again, Frumentius journeyed to Alexandria, saying that it was not right to conceal what the Lord had done. He therefore explained to the bishop everything that had been done and urged him to provide some worthy man to send as bishop to the already numerous Christians and churches built on barbarian soil. Then Athanasius, for
he had recently received the priesthood, after considering attentively and carefully what Frumentius had said and done, spoke as follows in the council of priests: "What other man can we find like you, in whom is God's spirit as in you, and who could achieve such things as these?" And having conferred on him the priesthood, he ordered him to return with the Lord's grace to the place from which he had come. When he had reached India as bishop, it is said that such a grace of miracles was given him by God that the signs of the apostles were worked by him and a countless number of barbarians was converted to the faith. From that time on there came into existence a Christian people and churches in India, and the priesthood began. These events we came to know of not from popular rumor, but from the report of Aedesius himself, who had been Frumentius's companion, and who later became a presbyter in Tyre.

Analysis

The narratives concerning the conversion of the Indians found in Socrates 1.19 and Sozomen 2.24 also reflect Sozomen's more precise description of the conversion process. In the story, two youths accompany a philosopher on a journey through India. The philosopher and all other adults on the trip are killed, but the youths are saved and conveyed to the king. The king makes Frumentius, the older, an administrator. Frumentius gathers the Christians together and supports them. Later, Athanasius ordains him bishop of India.

At the beginning of the passage, Sozomen states his reason for including the narrative: "so that we may know even by the miracle of what happened among the Indians that the doctrine of the Christians takes its origin not from men; since to some it seems right to tell fantastic tales, it is necessary to narrate completely the cause of the ordination of Frumentius" ("Ἰνα δὲ γνωσθῆναι καὶ ἐν τῷ παραβόλῳ τοῦ συμβάντος περὶ τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς, οὕτως ἔστω τοὺς τερατολογεῖσθαι θοκεῖ, τὴν σύστασιν λαβεῖν τὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν δόγμα, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς φρουμεντίου χειροτονίας διεξελθεῖν). Socrates, on the other hand, says he "will now tell the cause of their being Christianized" (ἡ αἰτία τοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦς χριστιανίσαι).
Thus, from the beginning Sozomen has a different purpose for this passage than Socrates.

Once again, Sozomen nowhere in the passage refers specifically to conversion. Frumentius was driven "by some divine appearance" (θελασ ἵως προτραπελς ἐπιφανειας) to gather the Christians together, convening them for prayer, building houses of prayer and encouraging them to honor God continually. Later, Athanasius ordained Frumentius because he was the first among them "to manifest the name of Christian" (παρ ἀτος πρώτος αὐτὸς ἐδειξε τὸ Χριστιανῶν ὄνομα). Sozomen ends the chapter with "such was the beginning of the priesthood among the Indians." Thus, his focus throughout is Frumentius and his activities in India, rather than any conversion per se.

Socrates makes no effort to explain why Frumentius gathers Christians together. He merely states "Frumentius controlled all things and made it a task to inquire...[whether] there were any Christians to be found." He then reports that Frumentius and the Roman Christians he has found "taught some of the Indians and prepared to pray with them" (πινας τῶν Ἰνδῶν κατηχοῦντες συνεύχεσθαι αὐτῶς παρεσκεύασαν). When Frumentius arrives back at Alexandria he reports the "hopes Indians had of receiving Christianity" (ἐλπίδας ἐχουσι τῶν χριστιανισμὸν παραδεξασθαι). These passages do not indicate any conversions occurred among the Indians.

Even though neither Sozomen nor Socrates speak directly of conversions in these passages, they still indicate something about the authors' views of conversion. Socrates specifically identifies his theme in this chapter as "the cause of the Indians' being Christianized." Sozomen, on the other hand, states that his intent is to tell of the
"beginning of the priesthood among the Indians." Thus Socrates equates Christianization with the establishment of a priesthood and churches, whereas Sozomen makes no such claim. Sozomen's more precise representation of what the chapter covers demonstrates his more precise view of conversion.

The time aspect of the Christianization of the Indians also differs between the two authors. Socrates states that "Inner India...was not enlightened by the idea of Christainity before the time of Constantine." Sozomen, however, leaves 'the time of Constantine' out of his account and implies that Christianity had some impact in India for some time before Frumentius. Moreover, Sozomen claims that Frumentius searched among both Indians and Romans (ἐὰν τινὲς ἔλευν Χριστιανὸν παρ᾽ Ἰνδῶν Ἦς Ἐρμαῖος τῶν ἑσπερέων ἐμπόρων), whereas Socrates, following Rufinus, states that he searched only among Roman merchants. For whatever reason Sozomen added the Indians, it shows he thought some Indians may be Christians, which demonstrates the conversion of the nation took place over a period of time, rather than at a distinct moment.

Sozomen's account contains no transformational language in reference to the Indians, but that is expected since he was reporting the beginning of the priesthood, not the conversion of the nation. One phrase of Rufinus' that is left out of Sozomen's history is infinitus numerus Barbarorum converteretur ad fidem "an infinite number of barbarians converted to the faith." This is an odd omission on Sozomen's part, considering his interest in conversion and his propensity to attribute the ability to cause many conversions to monks and bishops such as Frumentius. This illustrates, once again, how Sozomen viewed this chapter as the establishment of a priesthood rather than the conversion of a nation.
This set of passages demonstrates Sozomen's desire to be more precise concerning conversion than Socrates. Rather than confusing the establishment of a priesthood and churches with the actual conversion of the Indians—as Socrates does—Sozomen more precisely identifies his purpose in the chapter. Furthermore, Sozomen does not name a particular period when Christianity came to Inner India, but rather leaves it vague and implies that it occurred over a period of time. Sozomen gives up the opportunity to embellish an account of Frumentius' influence among the Indians and merely tells the story as the beginning of the priesthood, showing that for him conversion signifies more than infrastructure; conversion means transformation.
CHAPTER 8

"The Conversion of the Saracens"

Socrates 4.36 (Greek)

'Αναχωρήσατος δὲ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας τοῦ βασιλέως Σαρακηνοῦ οἱ πρώην ὑπόσκουδοι Ρωμαίοι τότε ἀπέστησαν στρατηγοῦμενοι ὑπὸ Μαυρίας γυναικὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος αὐτῆς τελευτήσαντος. πάντα ὡς τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Σαρακηνῶν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπορθεῖτο χρόνον ἀλλὰ τῆς θεοῦ πρόνοιας τὰ Σαρακηνῶν κατέστειλεν δὲ αὐτὰν τοιαύτην.

Μωυσῆς τις ὄνομα, Σαρακηνὸς τὸ γένος, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῶν μοναχικῶν μετερχόμενος βλέπῃ εὐλαβεία καὶ πιστεὶ καὶ τεραστίας πέριπλοκότος ἦν, τούτων ἢ τῶν Σαρακηνῶν βασιλισσας Μαυρία ἐπισκόπον τοῦ ὀίκειου ἔθνους ἤτει λαβεῖν ἐπὶ συνήκαις τοῦ καταλίθα τοῦ πόλεμου. ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ Ῥωμαίοι στρατηγοῦ ἀγαπητὸν ἡγήσαντο ἐπὶ τοιαύτας συνήκαις εἰρήνην ποιήσασθαι, εὐθὺς τῇ πόλεμῳ ἐπέπτατον τούτο γενέσθαι. καὶ συλληφθές ὁ Μωυσῆς ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου ἤγετο εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὡς ἐκεί τὴν ιερωσύνην δεξάμενος. ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντα τὸτὲ τῶν ἐκκλησίων Δούκαν ἥχηθη, τὴν χειροτονίαν ἀπέφυγεν, τοιαύτα εἰπὼν πρὸς Δούκαν ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι τῆς ιερωσύνης ἀνάξιον· εἶ δὲ λυσīτελε τούτο τοῖς δημοσίοις πράγμασιν, οὐκ ἐποίησε μια χείρα Δούκιος· πεπλήρωται γὰρ αὐτοῦ αἰμάτων ἢ δεξιά. τοῦ δὲ Δούκαν λέγετος μὴ δεῖ νῦν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ πρότερον μανδάν μεταχειρίσασθαι τῆς θρησκείας τὰ δόγματα, ὁ Μωυσῆς ἀλλ᾽ οὐ δογμάτων λόγος ἔφη νῦν ζητεῖται, ἀλλ᾽ αἱ πράξεις σοι αἱ κατὰ τῶν ἰδεών γενόμενα ἐξελέγχοναι οὐκ ἐν Χριστιανικαῖς ἔχεις δογματα. ὁ γὰρ Χριστιανὸς οὐ πλήσεις, οὐ λοιπὸν οὐδὲ μᾶχεσαι· δοῦλον γὰρ κυρίον οὐ δεῖ μάχεσαι. σοὶ δὲ τὰ ἔργα βοῶς θαλάτων πειθεῖν μεν εἰς ἔξορους καὶ θηρίους παραβαλλέσῳ καὶ πορπ. παραβολῆς μεν εἰς μείζονα γὰρ ἐχεῖ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ὑμῖν ἢ τὰς άκοας διηπέδειμαι. ταῦτα καὶ ταῦτα λέγει τὸν Δούκαν ἀπήγον οἱ ἐπιτηδεῖοι πρὸς τὸ ὄρος, ὥσπερ ἢν τὴν χειροτονίαν παρὰ τῶν εἰς ἐξορίαν τυχανόντων δέχηται. οὕτως ὡς τότε τοῦ Μωυσέως χειροτονηθέντος ὁ Σαρακηνὸς έβασίθη πόλεμος, εἶχε τὸ πρὸς τὸν λοιπὸν οὐδὲν Μωυσῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίοις ἐδείχνη, ὡς καὶ θυγατέρα αὐτῆς τῷ στρατηλάτῳ κατεγγυθαίτεί τοίς δυστυχώς Βίκτορι. ταῦτα περὶ Σαρακηνῶν.
Socrates 4.36 (English)

When the king departed from Antioch, the Saracens, who had been under treaty with the Romans, then revolted under the leadership of Mavia, a woman whose husband was dead. The Saracens ravaged everything in the East at this time. But the providence of God kept the Saracens under control in the following manner.

A person named Moses, a Saracen by birth, pursued the monastic life in the desert and was known for piety, faith and miracles. Mavia, the queen of the Saracens, wanted him to be made bishop over her nation, and promised by such an agreement to terminate the war. The Roman generals considered peace on such terms to be very pleasing, so they ordered it to be done immediately. Moses was seized from the desert and led to Alexandria to be ordained into the priesthood there. When he was brought to Lucius, the leader of the Alexandrian churches, he refused to be ordained by him. He said to Lucius, "I consider myself unworthy of the priesthood. But if it benefits the public, it will not be Lucius who lays his hand on me; for his hand is full of blood." When Lucius said he must not be proud, but must first learn from him the doctrines of religion, Moses said, "matters of doctrine are not now in question, but your actions against your brothers expose that you do not hold Christian doctrines. For a Christian does not strike, nor abuse, nor fight. The servant of the Lord does not have to fight. Your deeds cry out against you: those who were sent into exile, those who were exposed to wild beasts and those who were given over to fire. The things we see with our own eyes are more convincing than those we have learned from others." After he said these things, Moses was led by his friends to the mountain, so that he could receive ordination from those who lived there in exile. Thus, the war of the Saracens was stopped by the ordination of Moses. Mavia held to the Roman peace so strongly that she even betrothed her daughter to the general Victor. Such is the story of the Saracens.

Sozomen 6.38 (Greek)

Τι πό δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τούτον χρόνον τελευτήσαντος τοῦ Σαρακηνῶν βασιλέως αἱ πρὸς τοὺς ᾽Ρωμαίοις οποιαὶ ἐλύσασαν, Μαῦλα δὲ ἡ τούτου γαμετή τὴν ἤγεμονίαν τοῦ ἤδειν εἰπτρίπτυσσα ἐδίδη τὰς Φουκίδων καὶ Παλαιστίνων πόλεις μέχρι καὶ Ἀλγυπτίων, ἡς ευνυμίως ἀναπλέοντι τὸν Νείλου τὸ Ἀράβιον καλοῦμενον κλίμα οὐκοίμων. ἢν δὲ οὖν ὁς νοµίζεσθαι βάθως ὁ πόλεμος ώς παρὰ γυναικὸς παρακεναζόμενος, καρτερὰν δὲ καὶ δυσκαταγώγισσον φασὶ γενέσθαι ᾽Ρωμαίων ταύτην τὴν μάχην, ὡς καὶ τὸν ἤγεμον τῶν ἐν Φουκίδῃ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ στρατωτῶν εἶς συμμαχίαν ἐπικαλέσαντο τὸν στρατηγὸν πάσης τῆς ἀκα τὴν ἐκθετικής τε καὶ πείςς στρατιάς. τὸν δὲ γελάσα τὰν τὴν κληρίου καὶ ἀπόλαχον ποιοῦσα τὸν καλέαντα· παραστάζομεν δὲ πρὸς Μαῦλα ἀντιστρατηγοῦσαν τραπέζην καὶ μόλις διασώθησαν παρὰ τοῦ ἤγεμόνος τῶν Παλαιστίνων καὶ Φουκίδων στρατιώτων. ώς γὰρ εἰδὲν αὐτὸν
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κυνωνεύοντα, μένεν εκτός τῆς μάχης κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πρόστασιν εὑρήσεις ἐνόμισε. προσβραμοὺς δὲ ἤπιτετο τῶς βαρβάρας καὶ τῶς μὲν καρδίνον ἐξοίκεν ἀσφαλεστράς φυγῆς, αὐτός δὲ ὑπαναχώρων ἐν τῷ φεύγειν ἐτέσευκα καὶ τῶς πολέμιν ἐπικεψίμενος ἀπεκρούσε τοῖς τοξεύμασι. ταῦτα δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν τῆς προσοκούσων εἰσέτη τούν ἀπομιμήμενοσ, παρὰ δὲ τῶς Σαρακνοὺς ἐν τῶς ἄστις ἐστίν. ἐπιφανοῦς δὲ τοῦ πολέμου ἀναγκαίον ἔδοκεν περὶ εἰρήνης προσβεβάζεσθαι πρὸς Μαυθαί. τὴν δὲ λόγον τῶς περὶ τούτου προσβεβεβαιῶσας ἀντίκρυς ἀπεπέλευ τός πρὸς 'Ρωμαίονς σπουδάς, εἰ μὴ τῆς ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀρχομένους ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονθεῖν 

Μωσῆς τις ἐν τῇ πέλας ἐρήμῳ τηρικάθει φιλοσοφῶν, ἀντὶ ἀπὸ βιών ἀρετῆς σημείων τε καὶ παραδόξων πράξεων ἐπίσημως. ἐπιτρέπετες δὲ παρὰ βασιλέως οἱ τάδε μεινάντες τῶν στρατωτῶν ἡγεμόνες συλλαμβάνουσιν τὸν Μωσῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν Λουκίους ἄγουσιν. οὗ δὲ παρόντων τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τὸν συνελέγοντα πλήθους ἐπίσχειν, ἔφη οὖν οὗτος τε γὰρ εἰμὶ φέρειν ἀρχερεῖς ἄνωμα καὶ τιμὴν ἀξίωσε· εἰ δὲ ἄρα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀναδείκνυς ἰτή τούτῳ ἐπινεύοι τεος, μαρτυρομαι τὸν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς δημιουργόν, ὡς τὸς σάτι οὐκ ἐπιμείζεις μοι χεῖρας αὐτίκα καὶ λύθρῳ πεφυρμένος ἄγων ἄνδρων. ὑπολαμβάνει δὲ Λουκίος εἰ μὲν ἔτι, φησιν, ἀγνοεῖ τὴν ἐμὴν πάσιν, οὐ δύκαια ποιεῖς πρὶν μαθεῖν ἀποστρέφομεν· εἰ δὲ διαβαλόντων πινόν, ἄξε δὲ καὶ νόν ἄκοψον παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ καὶ κρίνῃς γενό τοὺς λεγομένους. ἀλλ᾽ ἔμοιγε, ἐφ᾽ Μωσῆς, λέγειν σαφῆς φαίνεται ἢ σὲ πᾶσιν, καὶ μαρτυροῦν ὅτι τὰς ἐστὶν ἐπίσκοποι ταῖς καὶ προδότεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἐν ὑπεροχάς φυγαῖς καὶ μετάλλοις ταλαπωροῦμεν ταῦτα ἐν περὶ θεοῦ νομίζεις τὰ γνωρίσματα, ἢ παντελῶς ἐστίν ἀλλήλων ἁριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ὁρῶν περὶ θεοῦ δοξαζόντων. ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτων λέγων ἐπώμενο ὑπέπτοτο δούκης χειροτονοῦτος ὑποδέχεσθαι τὴν ἐρωσύνην, παρατηρήσαμες Λουκίοις οἱ 'Ρωμαίοις ἀρχοντες ἄγουσι Μωσῆν πρὸς τοὺς ἐν φυγῇ ὡς ἄντας ἐπίσκοπος, παρ᾽ ἀν χειροτονθεῖς ὡς τοὺς Σαρακνοὺς ἐδέξασθε· καὶ διαλλάξας αὐτοῦς 'Ρωμαίοις αὐτῶν διήγεν ἱερωμένους καὶ πολλοὺς χρηστάζοντα παρεσκεύασε, κομηθεὶς όλίγους εὐρέως τοῦ δόγματος μετασχάνοτας.

Τούτῳ γὰρ τὸ φύλον ἀπὸ Ἰσμαήλ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ παῖδος τὴν ἀρχήν λαβὼν καὶ τὴν προσγοράν εἶχε, καὶ Ἰσμαήλλης αὐτοῦς οἱ ἄρχοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ προπάτορος ἑνώμαζεν, ἀπορμοῦμεν δὲ τοῦ νόθου τῶν ἐλεγχοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἰσμαήλη μητρίς τὴν διοικεῖον (δουλὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Σαρακνοῦς φρασις ὑνώμαζαν ως ἀπὸ Σάρας τῆς Ἀβραὰμ γαμητῆς καταγομένους. τούτων δὲ τὸ γένος ἐλκυντες ἀπαντες μὲν ὁμοίως Ἐβραίοις περιτεύομενα καὶ κενῶν κρέων ἀπενέκοπος καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τῶν παρ᾽ αὐτῶς ἑυόνοι φιλάττουσι. τὸ δὲ μὴ πάντα ἐπίδειαν αὐτοὺς πολεμεώθηκαν χρώνῳ λογιστέον ἢ ταῖς ἐμπρός τῶν περὶ ἔθνων. Μωσῆς τε γὰρ πολλοὶ ύπερτορον χρόνονις γεγομένων μίνον τοῖς ἀπ᾽ Ἀγυπτίων ἐξελθούσιν ἐνομοθετήσαν· καὶ οἱ προσκούσιν αὐτῶς εἰσάγαν δειδωβλομενες ὡς εἰκὸς διέθεραν τὴν Ἐσμαήλ πατρῶν διαγωγήν, καθ᾽ ἡν καὶ μόνην ἐπολυτεύεοντοι οἱ πάλαι Ἐβραίοι πρὸ τῆς Μισσωύς νομοθεσίας ἀγράφοις έθεσαν κρησθανεῖν. ἀμέλει τα αὐτὰ δαίμονα τοῖς ὁμόροις ἔσεβον καὶ παραπληθῶσα αὐτὰ τιμώμενες καὶ δουλάκτοντες ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς πέλας ὁμοιότητι τῆς θρηκείας τὸ ἀπόν τεδεκάνῃ τῆς παραποκέισθες τῶν πατρῶν νόμων. οἷς δὲ φιλεῖ, χρόνῳς πολὺς ἐπιγενόμενος τὰ μὲν λήθη
παρέδωκε, τὰ δὲ προσβεβεβαία παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν, μετὰ δὲ ταύτα τινὲς αὐτῶν συγγενοῦντες Ἰουδαίως ἐμαθοῦν, ἢ τὸν ἐγένοτο, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν συγγενῆς ἐπανήλθον καὶ τοῖς Ἐβραῖοις ἔθεσε καὶ νόμοις προσέδετον. ἢς ἐκείνου τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐλεύθερον ὑπὸ πολλὰ Ἰουδακώς λέον, οὐ πρὸ πολλὸν δὲ τῆς παρούσης βασιλείας καὶ ἁρισταντεῖν ἤρχαντο. μετέσχους δὲ τῆς ἔλεγεν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως ταῖς συνοικίαις τῶν προσωκούντων αὐτῶν ἱερεῖς καὶ μοναχῶν, οἱ ἐν ταῖς πέλαγες ἐρημιτῶν ἐφιλοσόφοι ἐφιλοσόφοι καὶ ἀναπλουροφύτες. λέγεται δὲ τότε καὶ ψυχῆν ἄλλην ἐλεγεν Ἰεροσολυμοῦ μεταβαλέτων Ζωκόμου τοῦ ταύτης φυλάρχου ἢς αὐτῆς χολάσθη βαπτισθήτως. ἂν αὐτὴν τὸν κατὰ κλέος ἄνθρωπον μοναχὸν ἤλθεν αὐτῷ συνυποκάμονος καὶ τὴν συμφορᾶν ἀπώδρατό περὶ πολλόν γὰρ ἐστὶ πανδοκούμα Σαρακνηνῶς, ομοιοὶ δὲ καὶ πᾶσιν χαρίσμοις οὔ δὲ ταρατέων παρακελευσάμονος ἢξυρτο καὶ ἀπερίγραμμος, ἢς ἔστων ὑπὸ υποσχήματος, ἢς πιστεύοντες ἔλεος Χριστοῦ. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸς ἐργά σὴν ὑπὸ συνυποκάμονος ἐξελέγη καὶ εὐηκῆ αὐτῷ παῖς, αὐτὸς τὸ Ζωκόμος ἐμισθῆ καὶ τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τούτο ἔγχαιρε. ἢς ἐκείνου τοῦ ταύτην τὴν ψυχήν γενέσθαι φασά τοῦ ἐνδοιμάντων καὶ πολυκάλλων, Πέροιςε τοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Σαρακνηνῶς φοβερῶν. ὄν μὲν δὴ τοῦλ Σαρακνιν ἑλεος Ἰεροσολυμοῦ μετέβαλεν καὶ όλα περὶ τοῦ πρώτου παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπισκοπῆσαντος παρελιθάμεν, Ὑδί ἔγχαιρε.

Sozomen 6.38 (English)

Around this time, the king of the Saracens died and the treaties with the Romans were dissolved. Mavia, his wife, became leader of the nation and ravaged the cities of Phonecia and Palestine all the way to Egypt, the region on the left as one sails up the Nile, called Arabia by the inhabitants. The war was not taken lightly, even though it was conducted by a woman. It is said this battle was such a great struggle for the Romans, that the leader of the troops in Phonecia and Palestine called for assistance to the leader of all the cavalry and infantry in the East. He ridiculed the summoms and although not fighting, he gave orders. He attacked Mavia and turned against the enemy generals. He was just barely saved by the leader of the troops of Palestine and Phonecia, because when he saw the danger, he decided not to remain outside of the battle according to his orders. He attacked the barbarians and provided opportunity for a safe retreat. He yielded slowly, shooting arrows, and the enemies who were pressing upon him were warded off by arrows. Many of those who live nearby even now remember this event, and among the Saracens it is celebrated in songs. While the war was weighing heavily upon them, the Romans thought it right to send an embassy to Mavia to seek peace. She denied the request for peace brought by these ambassadors, unless Moses, a certain monk living in the nearby desert at this time who was known for a life of virtue and for divine and miraculous deeds, was ordained bishop in the regions under her authority. When this was announced to the emperor, the leaders of the army apprehended Moses and led him to Lucius. In the presence of the rulers and others, he addressed the crowd saying, “I am not worthy to bear the name and
honor of priest, but if God decides this is for me, I take the creator of heaven and earth as my witness that he will not ordain me with those hands, which are stained with the blood and gore of holy men." Lucius replied, "if you are ignorant of my faith, you do not do justice to judge me before learning about it. If you have listened to those who accuse me, judge me now by my words." But Moses said "your faith is very clear to me. The things that bishops and presbyters and deacons are suffering grievously in foreign exile and in mines testify against you. The doctrines you adopt concerning God are completely alien to Christ and to right thinking about God." When he said these things, he swore an oath that he would not receive ordination at the hands of Lucius. The Roman leaders interceded with Lucius and led Moses to the bishops who were in exile, by whose laying on of hands he went to the Saracens. He reconciled them to the Romans and lived there as a priest, preparing many to be Christianized although he found few who shared in his doctrine.

The tribe took its beginning and its name from Ishmael, son of Abraham. The ancients called them Ishmaelites after their progenitor. Getting rid of the shame of their illegitimacy due to the low birth of Ishmael's mother (who was a slave), they named themselves Saracens, as if descended from Sarah the wife of Abraham. From such an origin, they all practiced circumcision and refrained from pork, like the Jews, in addition to maintaining all their other customs. Their not following all the customs just like them must be attributed to the passage of time or interaction with nearby nations. Moses, who lived much later, only legislated for those he led out of Egypt. They imported religions from those living nearby, so that the way of life of their ancestor Ishmael was destroyed. By this way of life alone, the ancient Jews lived following unwritten customs before the lawgiving of Moses. They worshipped the same divinities as their neighbors, honoring and naming them similarly; by their similarity to their neighbors they demonstrated their departure from the ancestral laws. As usually happens, after much time passed, they gave these things up into oblivion and other customs took their place. Afterwards, some of them came in contact with the Jews and learned where they came from. They returned to their kin and submitted to Jewish customs and laws. From then until now many among them live like Jews. Not much before the current reign, they began to be Christianized. They shared in the faith in Christ by contact with monks and priests living nearby who lived virtuous lives and worked miracles. It is said a whole tribe, under the leadership of Zocomus, converted to Christianity and were baptized. Zocomus was childless, so he went to a famous monk and lamented bitterly his misfortune. Bearing children is very important for the Saracens, as I think it is for all barbarians. He told him to have no fear, prayed and sent him away, promising he would have a son if he believed in Christ. When God confirmed this promise with a sign and a son was born to him, Zocomus was initiated and led his subjects to do the same. From that time, it is said this tribe was fortunate and well-populated, inspiring fear among the Persians and other Saracens. In this way, the Saracens began to be converted to
Rufinus 11.6 (Latin)
Rufinus 11.6 (English)\textsuperscript{49}

During this time the church shone with a purer light than gold in the fire of persecution. For the faith of each was tried not in words but in exiles and imprisonments, since being Catholic was not a matter of honor but of punishment, especially in Alexandria, where the faithful were not even free to bury the bodies of the dead. While Lucius was behaving thus with all arrogance and cruelty, Mavia, the queen of the Saracens, began to rock the towns and cities on the borders of Palestine and Arabia with fierce attacks, and to lay waste the neighboring provinces at the same time: she also wore down the Roman army in frequent battles, killed many, and put the rest to flight. Sued for peace, she said she would agree to it only if a monk named Moses were ordained bishop for her people. He was leading a solitary life in the desert near her territory and had achieved great fame because of his merits and the miracles and signs God worked through him. Her request, when presented to the Roman sovereign, was ordered to be carried out without delay by our officers who had fought there with such unhappy results. Moses was taken and brought to Alexandria, as was usual, to receive the priesthood. Moses, when he saw him, said to the officers who were there and were anxious to make haste, and to the people, "I do not think that I am worthy of such a great priesthood, but if it is judged that some part of God's providence is to be fulfilled in me, unworthy as I am, then I swear by our God, the Lord of heaven and earth, that Lucius shall not lay on me his hands, defiled and stained as they are by the blood of the saints." Lucius, seeing himself branded with so heavy a reproach in the eyes of the multitude, said, "Why, Moses, do you so easily condemn one whose faith you do not know? Or if someone has told you something different about me, listen to my creed, and believe yourself rather than others." "Lucius," he replied, "stop trying to assail even me with your delusions. I know well your creed, which God's servants condemned to the mines declare, as do the bishops driven into exile, the presbyters and deacons banished to dwellings beyond the pale of the Christian religion, and the others handed over some to the beasts and some even to fire. Can that faith be truer which is perceived by the ears than that which is seen by the eyes? I am sure that those with a correct belief in Christ do not do such things." And thus Lucius, now loaded with even more disgrace, was forced to agree that he might receive the priesthood from the bishops he had driven into exile, since the need to look to the welfare of the state was so pressing. Having received it, he both preserved the peace with that fiercest of peoples and maintained unimpaired the heritage of the Catholic faith.

\textsuperscript{49}Translation by Philip R. Amidon, S.J. in The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia (Oxford 1997), 67-68.
Analysis

The conversion of the Saracens under Mavía is another story told by Rufinus (11.6), Socrates (4.36) and Sozomen (6.38). Mavía, queen of the Saracens, ravaged the East for a while after her husband died. She wanted Moses, a monk known for his piety, to be ordained bishop over her nation before she would settle any peace. Moses was seized and taken to Lucius, the Arian bishop of Alexandria with whom he did not agree, particularly because of his brutal treatment of other Christians.

Socrates then has Moses being ordained by monks in the desert, taking up his post as bishop of the Saracens and Mavía ending the hostilities with Rome. No conversion is mentioned in the passage. Only the title, which was likely added later, hints at conversion with Ως καὶ Σαρακηνῶν την καθάτης τὴ πίστει Χριστοῦ προσέθεντο "How the Saracens came at this time to belief in Christ." In the text of the passage, Socrates closely follows Rufinus, whose title is De Moyse, quem Regina Sarracenorum gentis suae poposcit Episcopum "Concerning Moses, whom the Queen of the Saracens made bishop." Both Socrates and Rufinus focus on Moses and his dispute with Lucius over doctrine and Christian practice.

Sozomen, on the other hand, expands the story with specific details and adds to it the later conversion of a tribe of Saracens under Zocomus. Schoo explains Soz. hat durch eigene Erkundigungen den Bericht seiner Vorlagen ergänzt, und zwar hat er sich an Ort und Stelle erkundigt. "Sozomen complemented the report of his predecessors through research, and even made inquiries on location [i.e., among the Saracens]." Sozomen confirms such an interpretation when, at the beginning of the history, he promises to μεμνήσομαι δὲ πραγμάτων ὅσ παρέτυχον καὶ παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων ἢ θεασαμένων

150 Schoo. Sozomenos, 92.
ἀκίμων, κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν καὶ πρὸ ἡμῶν γενέαν "record the transactions with which I have been connected, and also those concerning which I have heard from persons who knew or saw the affairs in our own day or before our own generation." 151 Since the Saracens lived close to Palestine, where Sozomen was born and educated, he probably heard stories from neighboring monks concerning the conversion of the Saracens. Indeed, Sozomen makes reference to such a source: ταύτα δὲ πολλά τῶν τῆς προσωπούντων, εἰςέτο νῦν ἀπομνημονεύοντι παρὰ δὲ Σαρακενώς, ἐν ὥδεις ἐστίν "These things are still remembered among many who live near that area, and celebrated in songs by the Saracens." 152

Sozomen also shifts the focus toward the conversion of the Saracens, even though Moses and his struggle with Lucius is still an important part of the passage. After describing the same events as Socrates and Rufinus in more detail, when Sozomen arrives at the debate of Moses with Lucius, he ends it with Moses protesting Lucius' doctrine and faith, refusing ordination from him, returning to the Saracens, reconciling them to the Romans and preparing many to be converted to Christianity (καὶ πολλοὺς Χριστιανίσας παρεσκευάσαε).

Sozomen's neglecting to mention the ordination of Moses (even if by monks in the desert as Socrates relates) demonstrates his desire to separate doctrine from conversion. Orthodoxy is assumed (because of Moses' disagreement with Lucius), but Sozomen does not focus on Moses' ordination or theology; rather, the emphasis is on his life and actions. By expanding the narrative to describe the conversion of Zocomus, Sozomen takes the spotlight away from the doctrinal or political controversy swirling

151 Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 1.1.
around Moses’ ordination and puts it on the individual transformation through Zocomus.

After a brief digression concerning the Jewish background of the Saracens, Sozomen then relates how "some of the Saracens were converted to Christianity not long before the present reign" (Οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ δὲ τῆς παρούσης βασιλείας, καὶ Χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο). After this follows the story of how Zocomus and his whole tribe were converted (εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν μεταβαλεῖν). Sozomen ends the chapter with the sentence Ὑπὸ μὲν δὴ τρόπον Ἀρακινουτὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν μετέβαλον, καὶ οίκερ περὶ τοῦ πρῶτου παρὰ αὐτῶς ἐπισκοπήσαντος παρειλήφαμεν, ώστε ἔχει. "In this way the Saracans converted their nation to Christianity, and the first bishop arrived among them—this much I have learned."

Twice in the short section about Zocomus Sozomen uses the word μετάβαλλω. By using this word, he indicates a transformation in Zocomus and his tribe. The change in this individual and tribe is what leads to the conversion of the whole nation, as opposed to the mere appointment of a bishop. He describes this as the beginning of the Christianization of the Saracens (Χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο).

Sozomen refocused this story about the Saracens to describe their conversion, seen as a process over a period of time. What began with Mavia under Valens, who was emperor from 364 to 378, continued even shortly before the reign of Theodosius II, which began in 408. His familiarity with the area (Palestine and Syria) probably provided extra sources for describing the conversion of the Saracens, whereas Socrates could only recount Rufinus’ story about Moses becoming bishop. Sozomen
used this as an opportunity to demonstrate conversion among the Jews, which is noticably lacking in Socrates.\textsuperscript{153}

Sozomen changed the focus of this narrative from a controversial ordination that demonstrated the persecution to which the Arians subjected orthodox individuals (which was Socrates' and Rufinus' purpose) to the conversion of a nation. This conversion narrative illustrates his perspective that conversions occurred over a period of time, through the influence of several individuals and in varying stages. The Saracens were converted by the influence of Moses, many monks of the region and the particular monk who healed Zocomus' child. Thus Sozomen transformed the narrative he found in Socrates' and Rufinus' history into a conversion story that followed his processual, transformational paradigm.

\textsuperscript{153} Theresa Urbainczyk, "Observations," \textit{Historia} 46 (1997), 365.
CHAPTER 9

Conclusion

All of these sets of passages reveal important differences between Socrates and Sozomen. The changes Sozomen made are neither cosmetic nor superficial. Since Photius it has been commonly held that Sozomen wrote to produce a more literary work than Socrates: ἔστι δὲ Σωκράτους ἐν τῇ φράσει βελτίων "he is better than Socrates in style." Yet Sozomen clearly brought his own perceptions concerning conversion (and other topics) to his writing. We can see the influence of his conversion paradigm in his choice of words, his editorializing and his selective use or omission of Socrates’ information. In the end, his view of conversion appears as a multi-faceted, complex process, which extends over time and is not integrally bound up in doctrinal debate.

Sozomen rarely uses χριστιανίζειν to describe conversion. Instead, he prefers to illustrate more descriptively the various parts of the multi-faceted, complex process of conversion. A passage that lists many of these aspects of the conversion process is found in Sozomen 2.6:

Πλήθυσμός δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τούτου τὸν τρόπον ἀνὰ πάσαν τὴν Ἡρακλίου ὄκουσιν, καὶ δὲ ἀντί οἰ ὑπάρχον ἡ θρησκεία ἐξαφανείται. Ἡδὲ γὰρ τὰ τέ αμφὶ τὸν Ῥήμον φύλα ἐκκλησιαστεῖν, Κελτοὶ τε καὶ οἱ Γαλατῶν ἐνδοῦ τελευταίοι τῶν ἱστορίων

prosoikoiv, kal Gόtthoi, kal διοι τούτοις ώμοροι το πρὶν ήσαν ἀμφὶ τὰς ὄχυρας 'Ἰστροῦ ποταμοῦ, πάλαι μετασχόντες τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ἐπὶ τὸ ἡμερώτερον καὶ λογικὸν μεθημόθεντο. πάσι δὲ βαρβάροις σχεδὸν πρόφασις συνεβί προσθέειν τὸ δόγμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν οἱ γενόμενοι κατὰ καπνὸν πόλεμοι 'Ρωμαίοις καὶ τῶν ἀλλοφυλῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Γαλλίην τῆς ἀγεμονίας καὶ τῶν μετ’ αὐτῶν βασιλέων. ἐπεὶ γὰρ τότε πλῆθος ἄφατον μιγάδων ἐδύναν ἐκ τῆς θάραξις περαιώθην τῆν Ἄσιαν κατέδραμεν ἀλλοι τὰς ἀλλαγὰς βαρβαροί ταύτων εἰργάσαντο τοὺς παρακείμενους 'Ρωμαίους, πολλοὶ τῶν ιερέων τοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰχμαλώτοι γενόμενοι σὺν αὐτοῖς ἦσαν. ὡς δὲ τοὺς αὐτόδιοι ἀναστὰς ίσως καὶ τοὺς δαμοσθέναις ἐκαταριον Ἀρχιτόν μόνον ὄνομαζοντες καὶ ἄδικον ἐπικαλοῦμενοι, προσέπτωσι δὲ καὶ πολιτείαν ἁμέρας ἐφιλοσοφοῦν καὶ ταῖς ἄρεταις τῶν μῶν ἐνίκους, βασιλεύσαντες οἱ βαρβαροὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν παραδότων ἔργων εὖ φιλοῦν συνείδαν καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἵλεον ἔχειν, εἰ τῶν ἁμέλειας φανέντα: μιμήσαντο καὶ ὁμοίως αὐτοῖς τὸ κρέβττον θεραπεῦον. προβαλλόμενοι σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸ πρακτεῖν καθηγοῖτας ἐνιδάκοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο, καὶ ἀκολούθος ἐκκλησίας.

After the church spread in this way through the whole Roman world, the religion made advancements even among the barbarians. The tribes on both sides of the Rhine were Christianized, the Celts, the Gauls who lived on the extreme edge of the ocean and the Goths along with those who lived next to them on both banks of the Ister river. They had shared in faith in Christ and had changed to a more civilized and rational way of life. All the barbarians had professed to honor the Christian teaching, from the time of the war between the Romans and foreign tribes under the leadership of Gallienus and the emperors after him. When a huge crowd of mixed nations passed over from Thrace into Asia and overran it, and when other barbarians did the same to the Romans living nearby, many priests of Christ were taken captive and lived with the tribes. They healed the sick and cleansed the demon-possessed, naming Christ alone and calling on the son of God. They also lived a blameless life and were above reproof due to their virtues. The barbarians were amazed at the life and miraculous deeds of these men; they thought it prudent and pleasing to God if they would imitate those who were better and serve the deity as they do. Thus when teachers of what they should do came among them, they were instructed, baptized and subsequently organized into churches.

The subject of conversion among the Goths taken up in this passage is treated more fully under 6.37. The passage quoted above, however, sketches a basic list of some of
the components of conversion, which appear to occur over an extended period of
time. In the passages dealt with earlier in this paper, Sozomen intentionally discusses
aspects such as these, specifically identifying those which occur rather than generalizing
(see, for example, the discussion of Sozomen 6.20 above). One aspect that does not
appear in 2.6 but plays an important part in several of Sozomen’s narratives is the idea
of μετάβαλλω—the actual transformation of mind/will. Sozomen emphasizes this inner
transformation more than Socrates (who never uses μετάβαλλω in relation to
conversion). He often substitutes it for a phrase in Socrates that connotes being led to
religion or for the generic χριστιανίζεων. Transformation—the idea of a change in
character or inner condition—plays a central role in Sozomen’s representation of
conversion. Nevertheless, the conversion narratives in Sozomen (both those studied
here and the others listed in the appendix) do not have a sine qua non. Sozomen
describes different conversions in different ways; some have certain aspects, others
have others. Therefore, Sozomen’s view is a broad processual paradigm, in which
various aspects are brought together to effect change in an individual or community.

Another key part of Sozomen’s view is the extent of time involved in the
process of conversion. Sozomen’s presentation of the conversion of the Goths
illustrates this concept well. In the chronological section covering Constantine,
Sozomen claims the Goths have already undergone some aspects as early as the reign
of Gallienus and then lists other parts of the process they have been through since.\(^{155}\)
Sozomen implies they were in some aspect of the process at the time of Constantine,
yet even in the time of Valens the Goths were still in the process of Christianization
(see 6.37). Moreover, Sozomen makes an important chronological adjustment to

Socrates' account to indicate the conversion was in process before the intervention of Valens. The Saracens' conversion provides another example of Sozomen's extension of the conversion process through time. Under Valens, the Saracens begin the process with Moses and Mavia, yet the process is still working itself out among Zoocomus' tribe just before the reign of Theodosius II. Sozomen amends Socrates' report by adding the Zoocomus story, thereby expanding Socrates' simple account into a broader diachronic explication of the conversion process. Even though not all of Sozomen's conversion narratives include this aspect of time, none exclude the possibility of it (i.e., some passages give only a synchronic look, showing only a part of the process). His expansion of Socrates' accounts of the Goths and Saracens demonstrate his distinctive view.

By expanding the chronological extent of the process, Sozomen is able to make finer distinctions of various aspects within it, one of which is the separation out of doctrine. The changes Sozomen made to 6.37 indicate his intention of separating doctrine from other parts of conversion. The small part doctrinal issues play in the conversion passages within a history that are devoted primarily to tracing the struggle over bishoprics and creeds supports the idea that Sozomen tries to separate doctrine from the other aspects of conversion. He even addresses the issue directly, after discussion of Eunomius and his innovations concerning the tradition of baptism:

Εὐθυρήγει μὲν οὖν ὧν μετάρθη καὶ ταῦτα τὴν ἐπισκελην. καὶ τοὺς θέλουσιν Χριστιανίζειν ἐμπόριον ἐγένετο το διάφορον τῶν ἐπιγεγομένων δογμάτων "These doctrines cause much trouble for the faith. In addition, the differing teachings hinder some who wish to become Christian." Although these lines address the Eunomian

---

\(^{156}\) Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 6.37.

heresy directly, they are indicative of Sozomen's view of doctrinal struggles in general. Soon after this statement, Sozomen shifts from debates over heresies to stories about the monks, who held right doctrine but also manifested their virtue by works, thus attracting the admiration of the people. Several chapters are filled with monks and their deeds, culminating in the conversion narratives concerning the Goths (6.37) and the Saracens (6.38). In general Sozomen makes more of an attempt to shift attention away from doctrinal debates, which Socrates sees as the sine qua non of his history, to individuals and individual acts of piety. "Tales of individual piety occur in every book of Sozomen's history; they are there not simply to entertain but to inspire." As we have seen in the conversion narratives, however, his ultimate purpose is not the raising up of individuals, but the power of God over pagan communities. Thus, the focus of the conversion narratives and the fact of their proliferation in Sozomen's work (see appendix) are part of a more general program to shift attention from doctrinal disputes to more essential issues (Christianity versus paganism). Sozomen's perspective from being raised in Gaza probably gave him more perspicuity in this matter compared with someone who had been raised in Constantinople where doctrinal debates were more common.

Sozomen emphasized these aspects of conversion because he felt they were lacking in Socrates' accounts. With the shift of conversion from the individual to the community after Constantine, a new understanding of the concept had to be developed. Stories of conversion are an important part of shaping new ways of

\[158\] A comparison of Sozomen, Hist. eccl. 6.26 with Socrates, Hist. eccl. 4.7. demonstrates clearly that Sozomen had a stronger dislike of doctrinal disputes than Socrates.

\[159\] Urbanczyk, "Observations," Historia 46 (1997), 364.
thinking. Not only do they describe how the event occurs, emphasizing the important characteristics of it, but they also shape how the event should occur in the future. The link between individual conversion and communal conversion is a tenuous one. The model of the intellectual journey does not fit well with entire communities. Another prominent, pre-Constantinian model of conversion—persuasion by a holy individual through words or miracles—can be adapted to societal conversion. In fact, the step from large crowds (as seen in the Biblical Acts and in the lives of the monks that were common in the fourth century) to entire communities is not a difficult one. This is the model that Rufinus, Socrates and Sozomen follow in their accounts of the Indians, Iberians and Saracens. Certain adaptations must be made, however, to fit the model into a community conversion.

The character of the holy man (or woman) who by example or by miraculous deed begins the conversion changes very little from individual accounts to communal accounts. The reaction, however, must be adapted to a large group rather than individuals. The focus is away from belief (the simple "I believe") to structural changes in society, such as the implementation of an ecclesiastical hierarchy (e.g., the request to Rome for priests and bishops) and the construction of buildings to represent the new religion.

Sozomen attempts to relate the individual conversion experience—with as much of its transformative impact as possible—to the communal. His emphasis on conversion as a process with various steps that happen over time as well as his increased use of transformative words like μεταβάλλω indicate a desire to portray conversion, even among whole communities, in a personally transformative type of

\[ \text{160 For more information about miracle-based conversion see MacMullen Christianization.} \]
way. To this end, he includes two individual conversion stories, whereas Socrates' history contains no extended narratives of personal conversion. Sozomen relates the conversion of a philosopher who showed up at the Council of Nicaea because he was upset about the suppression of paganism. The philosopher is convinced by debate with a simple old man and not only believes but also encourages others to do likewise.

Sozomen also tells the story of his grandfather's conversion. Although one would expect this to be focused highly on the individual, Sozomen relates it to a communal conversion. Following a similar model as other conversions, Sozomen's grandfather is converted to Christianity by the miraculous exorcism performed on Alaphion by the monk Hilarion. The entire account, however, focuses attention on the community and specifically its buildings. Sozomen begins the story in this way:

καθότι πατρὸς Ἑλληνὸς ὦν, αὐτός τε πατουκά καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους Ἀλαφίωνος Χριστιανοὶ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο ἐν Βηθελέα κώμῃ Γαζαίᾳ, πολυαναπόμονοι τε οὕση καὶ ιερὰ ἱεράσια ἀρχαγωγίᾳ καὶ κατασκευῇ σεμνῆ τοῖς κατοικοῦσι, καὶ μᾶλιστα τὸ πάνθεον ὃς ἐπὶ ἀκροπόλεως χειρόποιητο πολὺς λόφου κείμενος καὶ πανταχόθεν πάσης τῆς κώμης ὕπερέχον.

My grandfather was of pagan parentage; and, with his own family and that of Alaphion, had been the first to embrace Christianity in Bethelia, a populous town near Gaza, in which there are temples highly revered by the people of the country, on account of their antiquity and structural excellence.

He then continues to describe the Pantheon, which was a building of paramount importance to the town. Only then does he turn to describe the conversion of his grandfather and Alaphion, followed by his grandfather becoming an important teacher of Scripture. Then, he returns to buildings:

τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου γένους σχολῆ γε’ ἀν τῆς τήν ἀρετῆν διηγήματο πρῶτοι γαρ οὕτως εἰπάει ἐκκλησίας καὶ μοναστερία

161Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 1.18. See also Rufinus. Hist. eccl. 1.3.
162Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 5.15.
Thus even in a conversion story that is overtly individual and involves his own family, Sozomen links the conversion of the individual with the conversion of buildings (and therefore of the community).

The only extended conversion narrative Socrates includes and Sozomen does not is the conversion of the Burgundians. In this account, Socrates does not mention any individuals who were instrumental in the conversion. The Burgundians choose to follow the God of the Romans because they are being attacked by the Huns and consider the Roman God to be powerful. They request a bishop to provide baptism, then they go out and defeat the Huns. After this time, they are "zealously attached to the Christian religion." This account portrays conversion as an almost entirely political, community affair, with no elements of individual conversion at all. No holy men, no miracles, no decisions on the part of any individual exist in this narrative. Sozomen's choice to leave this account out of his own history may reflect his desire to see some degree of "individual conversion" in any communal conversions he relates.

To understand why Sozomen changed the traditional conversion stories available to him, we must understand why these narratives were included in the

---

163 Sozomen. Hist. eccl. 5.15.
164 Socrates. Hist. eccl. 7.30.
165 Socrates. Hist. eccl. 7.30.
histories at all. A key aspect of the religious transition that occurred in late antiquity is the demonstration of power. Conversion narratives illustrate the power of the Christian God and his followers to effect change among individuals and communities. The tangible displays of power such as healings and exorcisms support the claims of Christians and were necessary to illustrate its power to outsiders. In writings that would be read mostly by Christian converts, demonstration of power probably fulfilled the role of encouragement. A more transformative perspective of conversion intensifies the perceived power of God.

For Rufinus and Sozomen especially, the exaltation of the simple holy man was also a motivation for including these stories. Men of virtue were praised for their ability to bring about conversion. Beyond merely praising extraordinary individuals, however, these could also be intended to inspire the practice of good deeds and the sharing of the gospel among Christians. The individuals who bring about conversions are not presented as having great intelligence or special abilities, rather they are ordinary individuals—the ultimate role models.

A third reason involves the understanding of conversion itself. Stories about conversions interpret past conversions in order to describe how future conversions should (or should not) occur. In the process, these stories give models through which individuals can understand their own conversion. For the ordinary individual, Augustine would not be an appropriate model, particularly if the individual lived in a community that had undergone a mass conversion. The stories presented in Sozomen, Socrates and Rufinus, however, could act as good examples. Along with rituals such as baptism, narratives play an important role for individuals who are trying to confirm their identity and understand their world.
The different representations of conversions found in various authors impact our understanding of the history of the period. Sozomen and Socrates wrote for a similar audience at the same time, yet their portrayals of conversion stories are different. This indicates a debate was occurring during the middle fifth century over how conversion should be understood. Since both Sozomen and Socrates wrote for the emperor and his court's attention, this debate seems to have reached the highest levels. Further study is necessary to understand more fully the implications of the differing views of conversion found in Sozomen and Socrates.

Sozomen's treatment of conversion narratives betrays an intentional reshaping of Socrates' perspective. Although he admits—and even focuses on—the communal model of conversion, he makes an effort to tie it to individual conversion. In an age when community-based conversions were becoming more frequent (and necessary), Sozomen's shaping of the discourse demonstrates an intention to maintain the transformative aspects of conversion. Although he no longer use the word ἐπιστροφή, he maintains the concept of conversion from a lower existence to a higher through uses of words like μεταβάλλω and through metaphors. His descriptions of conversion as a process, which happens over an extended period of time and is distinct from doctrinal debate, illustrate his perception of conversion as a transformative process. This viewpoint certainly affects his writing of history, but it also plays an important role in the Christianization of the Roman empire—affecting both the way it is understood and the way it proceeds to occur.
APPENDIX

List of Conversion Passages

This appendix is a list of the passages on conversion from Sozomen and Socrates' church histories. The passages in **bold** are fuller, more thorough accounts of conversion, whereas many of the other passages may just be one or two lines referring to a conversion within another context. The passages compared in this paper are listed in *italics*. These lists are as complete as possible. I have tried to list all the passages where conversion (pagan to Christian, or Christian to pagan) is explicitly mentioned.

**Sozomen**

1.1 Some statements about conversion of Jews versus pagans.
1.3-5 Conversion of Constantine.
1.12 Brief statement that Philo said some Jews embraced Christianity.
1.18 **Conversion of two pagan philosophers.**
2.3 Foundation of Constantinople causes conversions. A doctor converted by a miracle.
2.5 Constantine's actions led some to Christianity.
2.6 **Conversion of the Goths under Constantine.**
2.7 **Conversion of the Iberians.**
2.8 Armenians were the first to convert.
2.9 Conversion in Persia.
2.23 Churches in Egypt increase by conversions of pagans and heretics.
2.24 **Conversion of India.**
3.17 Spread of Christianity.
3.19 Constantius begins to be Christianized.
A cross in the heavens induces some to convert.

Someone feigns conversion.

Julian converted from Christian to pagan.

Some areas were “wholly Christianized.”

Julian attempts to compel conversion.

Mark elevated pagans to Christianity.

Sozomen's family converted.

Pagan priests' families converted.

Julian attempts to convert people to paganism.

Julian and conversion of the Jews.

People of Edessa are “wholly Christianized.”

Monks heal girl and entire island embraces Christianity.

Many are deterred from embracing Christianity due to disputes.

Monks convert some areas slowly to Christianity.

Conversion of the Goths under Valens.

Conversion of Mavia, the Saracens and Zoecomus.

Serapeum and conversions.

Many Egyptians embrace Christianity because Nile floods.

Arcadius defeats would-be usurpers and people convert.

John persuaded many pagans and heretics to join him.

Socrates

Conversion of Constantine.

Emperor abolishes paganism.

Conversion of India.

Conversion of Iberians.

“lead them into paganism”

Monks heal girl and entire island embraces Christianity.

when they first embraced Christianity”

Conversion of the Goths.

Conversion of the Saracens under Mavia.

Serapeum and conversions.

“a converted Jew”

Jew is healed and converted.

Christianity in Persia.

“pretending to be converted”

Conversion of the Burgundians.

Jews in Crete convert.
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