

**A HISTORY OF THE HOLY EASTERN  
CHURCH: THE PATRIARCHATE OF  
ALEXANDRIA**





**A History of the Holy Eastern  
Church: The Patriarchate of  
Alexandria**

**JOHN MASON NEALE**



**GORGAS PRESS  
2008**

First Gorgias Press Edition, 2008

The special contents of this edition are copyright © 2008 by  
Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

Published in the United States of America by Gorgias Press LLC, New Jersey

This edition is a facsimile reprint of the  
original edition published by Joseph Masters, London, 1846

**ISBN 978-1-59333-050-7**



GORGias PRESS  
180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA  
[www.gorgiaspress.com](http://www.gorgiaspress.com)

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the  
American National Standards.

Printed in the United States of America

TO HIS HOLINESS

A R T E M I U S,

BY DIVINE MERCY

POPE AND PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA,

LIBYA, PENTAPOLIS, AND ALL THE PREACHING OF S. MARK,

AND ŒCUMENICAL JUDGE,

**This History of the Church of S. Athanasius**

IS, WITH ALL HUMILITY,

INSCRIBED.



## P R E F A C E .

---

1. THE sources whence a History of the Church of Alexandria is to be derived, are so many and so various, and some of them so little known, that it will be perhaps useful to particularize them. They naturally divide themselves into two branches; those which treat of the whole, and those which only embrace a portion, of Alexandrian History.

2. There are four works which relate the Annals of the Egyptian Church from the preaching of S. Mark to the time at which their respective authors lived; those of Le Quien, Renau-  
Historians who have treated on the whole of it.  
dot, Sollerius, and Wansleb.

3. The treatise *De Patriarchatu Alexandrino* of the learned  
Le Quien.  
Dominican Father, Michael Le Quien, is contained in the Second Volume of his *Oriens Christianus*, pp. 329—368. The plan of this work is well known. It commences with a general sketch of the rise, progress, rights, privileges, and character of the Church of Alexandria: of the heresies by which it has been infested, and the duties which were claimed from it by the Church Catholic. It proceeds to a list of the Patriarchs, both heretical and Melchite; giving, under each, a slight and brief review of his actions. It concludes with a catalogue of all the Sees which are known to have been its suffragans; and a list under each,

of all the Prelates who are recorded as having filled that particular See. The patient industry, accuracy, fairness, and moderation of this work are above praise: it did not, however, receive the last touches of its author; and occasionally self-contradictions may be discovered in it. It is evident also from many accidental hints that the writer was not acquainted with Arabic; a circumstance which must considerably detract from the worth of such a history. Nevertheless, it is very valuable as an outline which may be filled up from other sources; and it is the only complete history which we possess of the Catholic Church of Alexandria.

Renaudot.

4. Very different is the character of the next work I have to mention; the "History of the Jacobite Patriarchs of Alexandria," written by the learned Eusebe Renaudot. It extends from the time of S. Mark to the year 1703; but, after the great schism, leaving the Catholic succession of Patriarchs, it confines itself to the heretical successors of Dioscorus. It is extracted principally from the "Patriarchal History;" that is to say, the history of the Jacobite Patriarchs commenced by Severus, Bishop of Aschumin, and carried on by Michael of Tanis, Mauhoub the son of Mansour, Mark the son of Zaraa, and others, as far as the conclusion of the Patriarchate of Cyril the son of Laklak; that is to say, down to the year 1243. The immense learning of Renaudot, his acquaintance with nearly thirty languages, his devotion to Eastern literature, and the advantage which he enjoyed in being able to consult the unrivalled collection of Manuscripts in the King's Library at Paris, have rendered his work, so far as it goes, more complete than probably any other scholar could have made it. Besides his translations from the historians whom I have just mentioned, and whose works yet remain manuscript, he has enriched his history from other writers, both such had been already printed in his time, as Eutychius and Elmacinus, and those which have been given to the world since, as is the case with Makrizi. His pages also embrace very copious accounts of the succession of Caliphs, and of the rise and fall of the various Mahometan Dynasties; and occasionally refer to the doings or sufferings of the Catholic Patriarchs. But with all these merits, the work has also all the faults of Renaudot; it is insufferably long, tedious and confused; learning is wasted



in the discussion of points known to all the world; and the thread of the history broken and taken up again in the most perplexing manner imaginable. In this place we may also mention the *Discursus* of the same author *de Patriarcha Alexandrino*, pp. 365—466 of his Collection of Oriental Liturgies.

5. The next work I shall mention is that of Wansleb, a <sup>Wansleb.</sup> Dominican Missionary in Egypt. It also relates entirely to the Jacobite succession; and had the merit of being the first work in which their history was introduced to Europe. It is divided into seven parts. The first treats of the constitution of the Jacobite Church; the second of its customs and present state; the third of its belief; the fourth of its ceremonies; the fifth of its canons: the sixth gives a catalogue of its Patriarchs; and the seventh of its principal writers. The small size of this volume, its continual inaccuracies, and the scanty information which it furnishes on any subject, renders it nearly useless, except for occasional reference. The catalogue of Patriarchs is translated from the Arabic of Abu'lberkat; with a continuation by later hands in the manuscript which Wansleb consulted.

6. The fourth history is the "Chronological Series of <sup>Sollerius.</sup> Alexandrian Patriarchs," written by the Jesuit, John Baptist Sollerius; and prefixed to the fifth volume of June, in the Bollandist Acts of the Saints. This treatise, which fills a hundred and sixty closely printed folio pages, is little more than an amplification of the work of Wansleb. Sollerius, besides his general acquaintance with Ecclesiastical history, had little to fit him for the task; he was not acquainted with the Eastern languages; he had access to no manuscripts; nor had he any private sources of information, except a communication from the Jesuit Bernati, then a missionary in Ethiopia. The consequence is that he relies too much on the comparatively worthless materials which were in his possession; he is anxious to reconcile dates with each other, which are none of them consistent with truth; and he endeavours to settle minute points of chronology in times when an approximation to accuracy is all that can be hoped for. His treatise does not pretend to be a history, and, except for its dates, adds little to our know-

ledge of the Alexandrian Church. Of the Catholic Patriarchs this writer takes hardly any notice.

Hierotheus,  
late Patri-  
arch of  
Alexandria.

7. Besides the works which I have mentioned, the latest of which only comes down to the year 1730, I have had two other sources of information. I applied in the spring of 1844 to His late Holiness, Hierotheus, then Catholic Patriarch of Alexandria, for the history of his predecessors since the beginning of the eighteenth century; and the results of that inquiry will be found in their proper place. I also obtained, through the kindness of a Jacobite Priest, a complete list of the Patriarchs of that sect from Dioscorus to Peter VII., who now fills that post; and from the same quarter I also received some interesting information as to the present state of the Jacobites in Egypt.

Eutychius.

8. I come now to speak of those authors who have treated of a part of the period which this work embraces. The first of these is Eutychius. Of his history of the Catholic Patriarchs of Alexandria I have spoken in treating of his own Patriarchate; and it is needless therefore to say anything further here, than that I believe that nothing which he relates of interest down to the time when his annals terminate, namely the year 938, will be found to have been omitted in this work. Without professing any very great obligations to him, I may yet observe that some of the facts which he relates in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, are mentioned only by himself.

Elmacinus.

9. The next author whom I shall name is the Jacobite Elmacinus, as translated and edited by Erpenius. His Saracenic History only incidentally mentions the Jacobite Patriarchs of Alexandria; but his accuracy and truth stand very high: and when he fixes a date, his testimony is to be received beyond that of any other author. I have in the history already given his character; and need therefore say nothing more of him here.

Makrizi.

10. I will next mention the Mahometan Makrizi, who, while he draws great part of his information from Elmacinus, nevertheless adds considerably to it, and is highly to be commended for his accuracy and fairness. Of his work, which extends to the year 1327, I have also spoken in the proper place.

11. The "History of Dynasties," written by Abu'lpharaj, Abu'lpharaj. better known by his name of Gregory Bar-Hebræus, and translated and edited by Pococke, is also not without its value as a contribution to Alexandrian History. We are frequently indebted to it for some hint as to the actions of the Caliphs, which may serve to clear up points left in the dark by Elmacinus or Makrizi.

12. I now come to speak of the Ethiopic Church. The character of Ludolph's History, and Commentary on his History, is too well known to need any observations here. It is only wonderful that a man possessing an acquaintance with the Ethiopic language, which has been attained by no other European before or since his time, should have added so little to our knowledge of that country. The facts which are to be gleaned from this vast folio lie scattered thinly among the heap of rubbish with which they are surrounded; and his ignorance of everything but the language itself, his absurd confidence in some worthless Ethiopic compositions, and his blind prejudice, manifest themselves throughout.

13. The "Church History of Ethiopia" of Dr. Michael Michael Geddes. Geddes is one of the most despicable compositions which was ever inflicted on the public. His only qualification for historian of that country was his knowledge of Portuguese, and a tolerable acquaintance with the various works in which the proceedings of the missionaries in that country are related. His prejudice against everything connected with Rome is such, that nothing can be taken upon his testimony: his principal value lies in his pointing out original sources of information. He had been Chaplain to the British Factory at Lisbon; and was under the patronage of Bishop Burnet.

14. A much fairer work is the "History of Christianity in La Croze. Ethiopia," written by the celebrated La Croze. It does not pretend to the same fulness as Geddes, and is derived from nearly the same sources: but, although a Protestant, the author is unable, like the English Divine, to see nothing but excellence in the Ethiopian, or faults in the Roman, Church.

15. The first book of this History extends from the Foundation First Book. of the Church of Alexandria to the rise of the Nestorian heresy. Besides the ordinary Church historians, such as Eusebius,

Sozomen, and Socrates, the works of S. Athanasius are of course my chief authority. But I am also bound to express my obligation to the very able Life of S. Dionysius by Byæus the Bollandist; to the Propaganda edition of the works of the same Father; to the Benedictine Life of S. Athanasius, and to Tillemont's Annals of that Patriarch. In a less degree, De la Rue's Life of Origen and Huet's Origeniana have been of service to these pages.

Second  
Book.

16. The second book comprises the controversy on the Incarnation, from the first outbreak of Nestorius, to the deposition of Dioscorus. Here, of course, I am principally indebted to the works of S. Cyril; to Tillemont's Life of that Father; to Garnier's edition of Marius Mercator; to the two editions of S. Leo's works,—the one by Cacciari, the other by the Ballerini: and to the very accurate chronological researches of Pagi.

Third Book.

17. The third book comprises the history of the Alexandrian Church, from the commencement of the great schism to the subjection of both Catholic and Jacobite Communions to the arms of the Caliphs. Here we begin to derive assistance from the works of Eutychius, Elmacinus, Makrizi, and Severus: Liberatus, Evagrius, and the Chronicon of Victor are also our guides. The Patriarchate of S. John the Almoner is indebted to the labours of Stillingfleet the Bollandist in the fourth volume of September in the Acts of the Saints;—and the Epistles of S. Gregory throw some light on the Alexandrian annals of that period. To the Life of S. John the Almoner, in the second volume of the Bollandist January, I am less indebted.

Fourth  
Book

18. In the fourth book, which extends from the Conquest of Amrou to the Vizirate of Saladin, Severus and his continuers are my chief guides. Of the Catholic Church, when Eutychius deserts us, we know nothing more than can be picked up by incidental notices of the Byzantine historians. These are generally few and far between; with the exception of a tolerably detailed account of the proceedings of Athanasius II. afforded in the prolix pages of George Pachymeres. For the Crusades, so far as they affected Egypt, I have depended principally on Wilken's *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, and the authors alleged by him. I have also derived, in Jacobite history generally, very

important assistance from the Chronicle of Gregory Bar-Hebraus, as epitomized in the second volume of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Asseman.

19. The fifth book embraces the period between the elevation of Saladin and the first interference of the Portuguese in Ethiopia. Here we are worse off for materials than at any other period. Its most important event is the great confessional controversy,—and the remarkable history of Mark the son of Kunbar. But from A.D. 1243, when the *Patriarchal History* ends, to 1490, I am compelled to confess that Alexandrian annals are hardly more than catalogues of names. Fifth Book.

20. The sixth book comprises the remainder of my task, and divides itself into two distinct portions. The first of these is the rise, progress, and decline of Roman Influence in Ethiopia. Here, besides Geddes, La Croze, and Ludolph, we have the advantage of Bruce's very clear Abyssinian history; and the original authorities are Alvarez, Tellez, and the account of the Patriarch João Bermudez; which latter is translated in Purchas's Pilgrimage, and thence retranslated by La Croze. The other subject is the attempt made, in the seventeenth century, to engraft Calvinism in the Oriental Church; and as this part of history is extremely important, and very little known, I have preferred rather to overstep the bounds I proposed to myself than to treat it cursorily. My authorities, on the Roman side, are, principally, the *Perpetuité de la Foy*, and the *Defense de la Perpetuité*; the *Creance de l'Eglise Orientale* of Simon; the *De Consensu* of Leo Allatius; and the incidental notices of Le Quien and Renaudot. On the Oriental side,—the Councils of Constantinople, Jassy, and Bethlehem, as given in Labbe; the History of the Russian Church by Mouravieff; the Chronicon of Philip of Cyprus: to which I may add the "Present State of the Greek Church" of Ricaut,—a very fair writer. On the Calvinistic side,—Crusius's *Turco-Græcia*; Claude's Reply to the *Perpetuité*, and his *Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, which is a Reply to the *Defense*; Aymon's Memoirs of the Greek Church; Smith's *Account of the Greek Church*, both in English and Latin: to which may be added Dr. Covell's account of the same Church. I also applied to the Public Library at Geneva, for permission to copy all the hitherto unpublished letters of Cyril Sixth Book.

Lucar's preserved in that Library; and among these the reader will find a very important and hitherto unprinted one, to the Archbishop De Dominis, on the publication of his work *De Republicâ Christianâ*. To all these I must add, the Life of Cyril Lucar from the pen of Dr. Beaven, which appeared in several numbers of the *British Magazine*.

21. I had intended to affix an excursus in defence of the very early chronology adopted in the first Section: want of space has obliged me to forbear. A vindication of it may, however, be found in the Bollandist Life of S. Peter under the 29th of June. For the same reason, I have been obliged to omit the list of Egyptian martyrs in the Tenth Persecution, to which reference is made at its conclusion.

22. Two remarks connected with orthography may not be out of place. The first is, that I have adopted the two different spellings, Diœcese and Diocese, to signify two different things. By the former I mean its old sense, the jurisdiction of an Exarch or Patriarch, as the Diocese of Ephesus, the Diocese of Alexandria: by the latter, that of a Bishop. Fleury, in like manner, speaks of *le* and *la* Diocese. The other is, that I have followed the Oriental method of spelling names, after the Mahometan invasion. Thus, Chail is written for Michael; Chenouda for Sanutius: Abdel-Messiah for Christodulus. I have not done so, however, where the name is that of one well known as an author. Thus, I do not refer to Said Ebn Batric, but to Eutychius.

23. I have now to express my obligations for the valuable assistance I have received in this work. I desire gratefully to commemorate the kindness of His late Holiness, Microthcus, to whom I had hoped to inscribe the History of his Church. My thanks are also especially due to the Rev. Edmund Winder, British Chaplain at Alexandria, for the indefatigable kindness with which he has collected and transmitted to me information; to Alfred S. Walne, Esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Cairo, who was so obliging as to wait on the Patriarch with the queries I had transmitted to him; and to the Vicar of the Jacobite Patriarch at Alexandria, (whose name I regret not to know,) who furnished me with a great deal of valuable information as to the state of that Communion.

But, in a most especial manner, my warmest thanks are due to the Rev. W. H. Mill, D.D., late Principal of Bishop's College, who, with the greatest kindness, gave me the advantage of his remarks on most of the sheets, as they passed through the press; and to whom I am indebted for several corrections, and for some important references to sources of information with which I was previously unacquainted. Of him I may well say, as Davies of Bentley, *Quodcunque de istis lucubrationibus feretur judicium, illius certe rectissimo stant talo; et ut quæ olim edidit doctiores omnes legunt avidissime, ita quæ apud se premit, expectant cupidissime*. I have also to express my obligations to my friend the Rev. B. Webb, M.A., who finally read through most of the sheets of this history before they were struck off; a work of which he only who has tried it can calculate the trouble or the use.

I am indebted also to D. José Xavier Cerveira e Sousa, Bishop of Funchal and Arguim, for the kindness with which he furnished me with any book which was contained in his Episcopal Library: and to Canon Antonio Pestana, Rector of the Seminary in Funchal, for the obliging manner in which he put the valuable library of that institution completely at my disposal. Portuguese libraries are especially valuable to a historian of the Alexandrian Church: for the works of Tellez and Alvarez are not to be procured in England. Lastly, I would thank M. Chastel, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Librarian of the public library at Geneva, for the great pains which he took in procuring the transcription of Cyril Lucar's letters; and M. Grivel, for the success with which he decyphered them. They are written in a mixture of bad Latin, bad Italian, and (occasionally) bad Greek: and the handwriting is as bad as the language.

I trust that, whatever judgment may be formed of this history, while its deficiencies are noted, its difficulties will also be remembered. If the chronology shall sometimes appear unsatisfactory, it is no shame to fail where Renaudot, Le Quien, and Sollerius are often egregiously wrong. If I appear sometimes to compress a century into comparatively *few* pages, it is a century to which, as connected with Alexandria, Baronius and Fleury do not devote *one*.

I have reserved, for my Introduction to the study of the History of the Oriental Church, some remarks which it seems right to make on the spirit in which such a book should be written. The historian should write, not as a member of the Roman, not as a member of the English, Church; but, as far as may be, with Oriental views, feelings, and even, perhaps, prepossessions. Mouravieff's history is a perfect example in its kind. It was intended that this Introduction should have been prefixed to the present volumes. But it swelled to a size which precluded the possibility of that arrangement; and has been also kept back for valuable information which I hope to receive from Constantinople and Damascus.

SACKVILLE COLLEGE,

EAST GRINSTED.

*S. Mark's Day, 1847.*



# CONTENTS

OF

## VOLUME I.

---

### BOOK I.

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA TO THE RISE  
OF NESTORIANISM.

	Page.
SECTION I. The Foundation of the Church . . . . .	3
II. The Foundation of the Church . . . . .	12
III. Origen . . . . .	19
IV. The Octapla . . . . .	31
V. The Decian Persecution and its results . . . . .	39
VI. The Millenarian Controversy . . . . .	55
VII. Question of Re-Baptism . . . . .	58
VIII. Valerian persecutes the Church . . . . .	65
IX. Rise of the Sabellian Heresy . . . . .	69
X. War, Famine, and Plague in Alexandria . . . . .	76
XI. End of S. Dionysius . . . . .	80
XII. S. Maximus and S. Theonas . . . . .	85
XIII. Persecution of Diocletian . . . . .	90
XIV. S. Antony and the Rise of Monasticism . . . . .	106
XV. The Arian Heresy . . . . .	113
XIV. The Great and Œcumenical Council of Nicæa . . . . .	137
XVII. Conversion of Ethiopia . . . . .	152
XVIII. Athanasius falsely accused concerning Ischyra and Arsenius . . . . .	157
XIX. First Exile of S. Athanasius . . . . .	169
XX. Egyptian Monasticism . . . . .	176
XXI. Second Exile and Return of S. Athanasius . . . . .	180
XXII. Third Exile of S. Athanasius . . . . .	188
XXIII. Fourth and Fifth Exiles of S. Athanasius: his Return and Death . . . . .	195
XXIV. Pontificate of Peter . . . . .	203

	Page.
SECT. XXV. Pontificate of Timothy . . . . .	208
XXVI. Destruction of the Temple of Serapis: Theophilus at Constantinople . . . . .	210
XXVII. The Early Pontificate of S. Cyril . . . . .	225

## BOOK II.

FROM THE RISE OF THE NESTORIAN HERESY TO THE DEPOSITION OF  
DIOSCORUS, AND THE GREAT SCHISM.

SECTION I. Nestorius preaches and defends his Heresy . . . . .	233
II. The Œcumenical Council of Ephesus . . . . .	256
III. Reconciliation of Antioch with Alexandria . . . . .	270
IV. The Rise and Progress of Eutychianism . . . . .	278
V. The "Robbers' Meeting" at Ephesus . . . . .	290
VI. The Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	299

# BOOK I.

---

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA,

CIRCA A.D. 40,

TO THE RISE OF NESTORIANISM,

A.D. 428.

Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ πάντα δεύτερα ποιῆσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν συγγραφέα προσήκει· ἔπειτα δὲ τὸ δόγμα τῆς καθόλου Ἐκκλησίας γνησιώτατον ὅτι μάλιστα φανεῖται, πολλάκις μὲν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν ἐνάντια δοξαζόντων δοκιμασθέν· οἷα δὲ Θεόθεν τὸ κρατεῖν λαχόν, αὐθις εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπανεληθὼν δύναμιν, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ πλήθη πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀληθείαν ἐπισπασάμενον.—Τρέπομαι δὲ ἡδὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀφήγησιν τῶν πραγμάτων, συνεργὸν καὶ ἔλεων τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλεσάμενος.

SOZOMEN. PROLOG.

## Patriarchate of Alexandria.

---

### SECTION I.

It is the constant and unvarying tradition of both the East<sup>1</sup> and the West, that S. Mark the Evangelist was the founder of the Church of Alexandria. The history, however, of his labours in Libya, Pentapolis, and Egypt, is involved in considerable obscurity: a circumstance in which there is nothing to excite surprise, nor to weaken our belief in the truth of the general statement. If the rise of the Church in such a city as Rome, which has always, since primitive times, been under Christian government, and always retained the same ecclesiastical language, is, in a great degree, unknown to us, and if the succession of its Bishops is implicated in historical difficulties, much more may we expect the case to be so in one which, like Alexandria, has been for many ages subject to Mahometan tyranny, and where the change of language has introduced many errors into its historical records.

The Church of Alexan-  
dria,

though its  
early history  
is obscure,

That, however, S. Mark the Evangelist was not the same with Mark, the nephew of S. Barnabas, can hardly, notwithstanding the ingenious arguments of several learned men, be now doubted: and by considering the two as distinct personages, we are

founded by  
S. Mark ;

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, H. E. ii. 16.

enabled to reconcile conflicting statements, the authors of which appear equally worthy of credit.<sup>1</sup>

yet others  
might have  
preached in  
Egypt before  
him;

Yet, though antiquity agrees in bestowing on S. Mark the title of the Apostle of Egypt, we are not compelled to suppose that the faith had not previously been preached in that country, even did it appear that his mission were postponed as late as A.D. 50. There were dwellers "in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene,"<sup>2</sup> who were present at Jerusalem at the outpouring of the HOLY GHOST on the day of Pentecost, some of whom were probably converted by S. Peter's sermon. The Eunuch of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, that is, of the Abyssinians, must, on his return to his own country, have passed through Egypt. Simon, who bore the Cross, was a native of Cyrene, and his sons, Alexander and Rufus, were evidently persons well known in the Church: and it is remarkable, and affords an argument in favour of the tradition we have been narrating, that S. Mark, who, from his connexion with Cyrene, would have been likely to be acquainted with the principal persons among its inhabitants, should alone of the Evangelists have particularized the family of Simon the Cyrenian. Again, among the prophets and teachers at Antioch whom the HOLY

<sup>1</sup> The question of the identity of S. Mark with the nephew of Barnabas, has been much and warmly disputed. Its decision will depend, in great part, on the year assigned for the Martyrdom of the Evangelist. The learned dissertation of Sollerius, prefixed to the fifth volume of the Bollandine June, seems, notwithstanding the opposite sentiments of Henschenius, in the third volume of April, and of Stilling in the seventh volume of September, to have proved the correctness of the chronology of Eusebius, to which we shall presently have occasion to refer: and to have made it extremely probable that the Evangelist's mission dates from A.D. 37. If, therefore, S. Mark founded the Church of Alexandria about A.D. 40, whereas John Mark was with SS. Paul and Barnabas in A.D. 43 or 44;

if the former were some years in Egypt, and the latter were in Cyprus at the death of S. Barnabas,—as his Acts testify,—in A.D. 51; if the former suffered in A.D. 62, and the latter were with S. Paul at Rome in A.D. 62 or 63 (Philemon 24) nay, even as late as A.D. 65 were summoned by him (2 Timothy iv. 11); it follows evidently, that the two must be different persons. Stilling, however, has shewn, in opposition to Cotelierius, that John Mark is identical with Mark, the nephew of Barnabas. His other arguments appear to us unworthy of his great learning; he confines himself principally to replying to Tillemont, an easier antagonist than Sollerius, because he allows the Evangelist to have lived until A.D. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Acts ii. 10.

SPIRIT commanded to lay hands on S. Barnabas and S. Paul,<sup>1</sup> we meet with the name of Lucius, of Cyrene. He was probably one of those men of Cyrene, whom the sacred historian mentions before, as the first after S. Peter<sup>2</sup> to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. It is hardly likely that so many natives of Egypt should, in their labours for the sake of CHRIST, have entirely neglected their own country.

There is a celebrated passage in Philo Judæus, in which he mentions the Therapeutæ, who inhabited the mountain and valley of Nitria, on the western side of the Nile. It has been much disputed who these men were: but we may be content to believe with all the early writers, among whom is Eusebius,<sup>3</sup> that they were Christians. Thus it will appear that the Gospel had already been proclaimed in more than one province of Egypt, when S. Mark arrived at Alexandria.

Yet this circumstance by no means forbids us to regard him as the founder of that Church, nor deprives the city of a title in which it gloried, THE EVANGELICAL SEE. There were many Christians both at Antioch and at Rome before S. Peter set foot in either place; yet antiquity always considered<sup>4</sup> him as the founder of the Churches in each. Again, S. Paul had not only himself dwelt at Ephesus, but had ordained S. Timothy first Bishop of that See; and yet that Church acknowledges S. John the Evangelist as its founder. So that the received belief with respect to S. Mark does not invalidate another tradition, that S. Simon the Canaanite was the first to proclaim the Gospel in Egypt.

as was the  
case in other  
instances.

For some time after the day of Pentecost, the Evangelist<sup>5</sup> is said to have preached in Jerusalem and the neighbouring

<sup>1</sup> Acts xiii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xi. 19.

<sup>3</sup> H. E. ii. 17. Scaliger will have it that they were Essenes; Valesius refutes this opinion, but denies that they were Christians. It seems now, however, to be generally agreed that this learned commentator was mistaken. A summary of the arguments on both sides may be seen in Mangey's "Lettres pour et contre sur la fameuse

question, si les Solitaires, appellés Therapeutes, étoient Chrétiens."—Paris, 1712.

<sup>4</sup> Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii. 332.

<sup>5</sup> In the absence of authentic testimony, we have given no account of S. Mark's previous life. According to the tradition of the Egyptian Church, which confounds the Evangelist with S. John Mark, he was a native of Pentapolis. His family was

villages, particularly in Bethany. S. Peter, however, about the year 37, appears to have sent him into Egypt; and it would seem that he entered Alexandria in, or towards, the year 40.<sup>1</sup>

Conversion  
of S. Annia-  
nus.

Here his first convert was one Annianus, or Hananias, a shoemaker by trade; on whom the Evangelist wrought a miracle, and who, in consequence, received him into his house. Having preached the Gospel with great success, and having, in a proportionate degree, irritated the idolatrous inhabitants of the city, than whom no idolaters were more strongly attached to Pagan superstition, S. Mark returned for a season to Jerusalem, first, if we may believe Coptic tradition, having ordained Annianus

S. Mark  
goes to  
Jerusalem;

rich; and his father, Aristobulus, was brother to S. Barnabas. An expedition of the Nubians having reduced him to poverty, he migrated, with his household, to Palestine, and settled in one of the villages adjacent to Jerusalem. S. Mark, then known only by the name of John, had early given proofs of a pious and reverent disposition; and S. Peter, who by marriage had become a connexion of Aristobulus, had thus an opportunity of instructing his son in the Faith. Passing by the various miracles which the pious belief of the Alexandrian Church has, without any good grounds, attributed to S. Mark, such as his putting to flight a lion in the vicinity of Jordan, and throwing down, by his prayers, a tree that was the object of superstitious veneration near Ashdod, we may remark that, according to the same tradition, S. Mark was one of the Seventy. It is also asserted that he was one of the servants at the marriage of Cana; that he was the man whom the Apostles met, carrying a pitcher of water, before the Last Supper; that in his house it was that our Lord celebrated that Passover; in his house, also, that the Apostles were assembled secretly for fear of the Jews, when our SAVIOUR appeared to them.—Such, as we said, is Egyptian tradition; among other

writers there is the greatest discrepancy as to his native country and the time of his conversion. Some will have it that it was after the Ascension of our Lord; (S. Augustin. de Consensu Evang. 1;) others, that he had been converted by CHRIST Himself, was one of those who were offended at His declaration concerning His Flesh and Blood, and was afterwards recalled by S. Peter. (S. Epiphani. Hær. 51. (i. 428.) Cornel. à Lapide. Comm. in Act. 219.)

<sup>1</sup> We have in this account followed Sollerius, whose hypothesis seems the only method of reconciling Eusebius with himself. In his *Chronicon* he says, under the second year of Claudius, (i. e. A.D. 42 or 43,) "Mark the Evangelist preaches CHRIST in Egypt and at Alexandria." This implies that he had been there sometime previously. But, by a comparison of the 15th and 16th chapters of the second book of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, that writer would seem to place the mission of S. Mark after the writing of his gospel. The *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, Anastasius, and George Syncellus, are agreed in placing it in A.D. 40. A double mission, the one from Jerusalem, the other from Rome, explains the apparent contradiction.



Bishop of the new Church, with three Priests and seven Deacons as his assistants. This seems to have taken place in the year 44.

From Palestine, S. Mark accompanied S. Peter to Rome. <sup>to Rome;</sup> It was here that, under the direction of the Apostle, he wrote his Gospel, whether, as some will have it, in Latin, or, as it seems more probable, in Greek; for the Egyptian tradition which assigns to it a Coptic original is not for a moment to be received. It matters little to Alexandrian History whether he founded the Church at Aquileia, or whether that tradition is to be rejected as fabulous. We find him mentioned in the first Epistle of S. Peter, under the affectionate title of "Marcus my son": but this is the only certain information that we possess with respect to the Evangelist, while residing in Rome.<sup>1</sup>

It was, apparently, towards the year 49, that S. Mark <sup>returns to</sup> returned to Egypt; and there, till the time of his decease, he laboured with great success. And during this period, the first church in Alexandria is said to have been built, at a place called Boucalia, near to the sea shore, and thence called Boucalis, or Baucalis. The name Boucalia arose, if we may believe Strabo, from the fact, that in former times the spot had been appropriated for the pasturage of cattle.

The Egyptians, indignant<sup>2</sup> at the progress made by the

<sup>1</sup> Le Quien, ii. 340. Renaudot, Pat. AL 3.

<sup>2</sup> The date of S. Mark's Martyrdom is a question of almost insuperable difficulty. Eutychius makes it to have taken place in A.D. 54; the Chronicon Orientale, in A.D. 67; the Acts of the Evangelist, in A.D. 68. Eusebius, on the contrary, (H. E. ii. 24.) says expressly *Νέρωνος δὲ ὄντος ἔργοντος τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος πρῶτος μετὰ Μάρκον τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ Ἐυαγγελιστὴν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας Ἀννιανὸς τὴν λειτουργίαν διαδέχεται*. S. Jerome (de Scriptoris Ecclesiasticis) confirms this:—*Mortuus est autem octavo Neronis anno*. To which may be added the common Martyrologies. Now the eighth year

of Nero began October 13, A.D. 61; and, as it is agreed on all hands that S. Mark suffered on the 25th of April, it must have been in A.D. 62. To this a difficulty, arising from ancient traditions, is opposed. The Evangelist is said, in the most ancient Martyrologies, to have departed to his reward on the 29th or 30th of the month Pharmuthi, that is, the 24th or 25th of April, and on Easter Day. Now it is certain that from the year 45 to the end of the first century, Easter Day never fell on the 24th or 25th of April. It might be sufficient to reply that the uncertainty of the time of the celebration of Easter, even at a period much subsequent to this, forbids us to draw any very definite con-

Gospel, resolved to be avenged on its first preacher. A feast in honour of Serapis, held annually on the twenty-fifth of April, was approaching. Advantage was taken of the circumstance to excite and organize a riot, on the preceding day, Saturday, April 24: the rather, that the Evangelist had denounced the approaching festivity as idolatrous and impious. Seizing S. Mark, and tying a rope round his neck, they drew him through the principal streets of the city, till the blood gushed from his sides: and, at evening, they threw him into prison, while consulting with respect to his fate. On the same night the sufferer was cheered by the appearance of an Angel, who

and suffers  
Martyrdom  
April 25,  
A.D. 62.

clusion from the assertion of the Martyrologies, even if we admit it to be true. Yet that the Evangelist suffered on a Sunday seems, from this tradition, extremely probable; and it is well nigh certain that it was on a great feast of Serapis, for on this all historians are agreed. Now there was a Feast of Serapis on the 25th of April; and since the Dominical letter of A.D. 62 is C, the 25th of April in that year fell on a Sunday. Nor is it difficult to explain how it afterwards came to be asserted that S. Mark suffered on Easter Day. The genuine Acts may have mentioned the fact, that he was slain on April 25, which was Sunday, and a great Festival; meaning thereby, a great Festival of Serapis. On which some ignorant transcriber, supposing a great Christian Festival to be meant, inserted the word *Paschali* before *Dominica*. Or again, this Sunday may have been called the Paschal Sunday, because it fell within the Paschal time; i. e., the period between Easter and Whitsunday. Or lastly, the Paschal Festivity may mean any Sunday, as being the Feast of the Lord's Resurrection. And all the MSS. Acts consulted by Sollerius, say simply, *Beatissimam festivitatem nostram Paschalem, id est, Dominicum diem*. Bonjour has col-

lected other examples, where Sunday is spoken of in a similar manner. (Append. ad Diss. de nomine Pat. Joseph. p. 45).

So far the date, Sunday, April 25, A.D. 62, seems satisfactory. Another difficulty, however, meets us. It is expressly affirmed by the Acts, that S. Mark suffered on the Sunday, but was not slain till the next day. In the year 62, therefore, he must have finished his course on Monday, April 26; but this is contrary to all testimony. We answer that, though the Acts assert that the confession of the Evangelist lasted two days, they also introduce the Pagans saying, *Quod Serapis, in sua hodie festivitate, hunc virum voluit invisere*. In this case, the Evangelist must have been arrested on Saturday, April 24. If, however, it should be insisted that the Evangelist was arrested on Sunday, and slain on the Feast of Serapis, there is no occasion, with Tillemont and Bonjour, to postpone his Martyrdom to 68:—it would be enough, with Pontac, to place his passion on Sunday, April 24, being the 3rd Sunday after Easter, and his death on Monday, April 25, A.D. 63. We prefer, however, to rest on the authority of Eusebius, and to attribute a slight inaccuracy to the Acts.

comforted him with the assurance that his name was in the Book of Life; and shortly afterwards by a Vision of the SAVIOUR Himself, Who, addressing him by the title of Mark the Evangelist, bade peace be with him. To Whom S. Mark replied, "I yield Thee thanks, O SAVIOUR, that Thou hast counted me worthy to suffer for Thy Name." On the next day, the Pagans drew the Evangelist around the city, as before, until with the words, "Into Thy Hands I commend my spirit," he went to his rest. It was by the side of the Martyr's tomb in the church of Baucalis, that the election of the Patriarchs took place in after times.

We must not pass over in silence the celebrated account which Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century, has given, with respect to the custom introduced by S. Mark concerning the election of Bishops in that See. Though this writer's statement has been repeatedly noticed and confuted, it still remains a staple argument with Presbyterians, and a History of the Church of Alexandria were incomplete without an examination into its truth.

The words of Eutychius are as follows: "S. Mark along with Ananias, ordained twelve Presbyters, to remain with the Patriarch; so that when the Chair should become vacant, they might elect one out of the twelve, on whose head the other eleven should lay their hands, give him benediction, and constitute him Patriarch; and should after this choose some other man, to supply the place of the promoted Presbyter, in such sort that the Presbytery should always consist of twelve. This custom continued at Alexandria till the time of the Patriarch Alexander, one of the Three hundred and eighteen"; (the writer, of course, means the Fathers of Nicæa;) "who forbade the Presbyters in future to ordain their Patriarch, but decreed that on a vacancy of the See the neighbouring Bishops should convene for the purpose of filling it with a proper Patriarch, whether elected from those twelve Presbyters, or from any others." Eutychius adds, that during the time of the first ten Patriarchs there were no Bishops in Egypt; Demetrius, the eleventh, having been the first to consecrate them.

If, then, we are to take this writer's words in their literal sense, we must believe that the Second See in the Catholic Church was for

Early constitution of the Alexandrian Church,

as described by Eutychius,

the space of one hundred and fifty years governed by Arch-Priests; that these men, during that period, refrained from the ordination of other Bishops, though presuming to lay hands on Priests and the inferior orders of the hierarchy: that the eleventh Patriarch asserted his claim to consecrate Bishops; and that six of his successors, for nearly a hundred years, persevered in this practice without a remonstrance from, and enjoying communion with, every other branch of the Church.

and S.  
Jerome,

So monstrous a story at first leads us to regard its author as grossly misinformed, or a pure fabricator. Yet the authority of S. Jerome forbids us to do this. That Father, in an epistle to Evagrius,<sup>1</sup> while dwelling on the dignity of the Priesthood, thus expresses himself: "At Alexandria, from the time of S. Mark the Evangelist to that of the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius," (that is, till the middle of the third century,) "it was the custom of the Presbyters to nominate one, elected from among themselves, to the higher dignity of the Bishoprick; just as the army makes an emperor, or the Deacons nominate as Archdeacon any man whom they know to be of active habits in their own body."

The above quoted passage from Eutychius was first published by the learned Selden, with a very prolix commentary, as a prop to the falling cause of Presbyterianism. It was refuted at the time by Abraham Echellensis, and afterwards by Renaudot and Le Quien. Two different explanations have been given, either of which is perfectly satisfactory.

not Presby-  
terian.

In the first place, it may well be asserted that the words of Eutychius refer to the election, not to the consecration, of the Bishop. It was the custom in the early Church, that not only Presbyters, but even laics, laid their hands on the head of the party so chosen; and this was the case more especially in the Coptic Church, as writers, both Catholic and Jacobite, allow. And Echellensis has clearly proved, that, in many instances at least, a triple imposition of hands took place; of the people voting, of the Presbyters electing, of the Bishops consecrating.

Privileges of  
the Alexan-  
drian Pres-  
byters,  
what.

At the same time, the Presbyters of Alexandria had certain privileges which the Presbyters of other Churches did not enjoy; and these two facts, coming together to the knowledge

<sup>1</sup> Opp. i. 1082. [Ed. Vall.]

of an ignorant writer like Eutychius, may have occasioned the fable to which the unhappy consequences of the Western Reformation have given such undue celebrity. S. Jerome's testimony is decided against those who bring him forward as a witness; for, at the very time he is stretching to their very utmost the privileges of the Priesthood, he asks, "What is there which a Bishop may do, EXCEPT ORDINATION, that a Presbyter may not do?"<sup>1</sup> Again, as it has been well remarked, how could the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 339, have decided against the orders conferred by one Coluthus, himself a Presbyter, when, within the memory of living men, the Patriarch had received no other ordination? Or is it likely that among the various charges brought in succeeding ages against the Church of Egypt, this of Presbyterian ordination should never have been one?

It may, however, be granted, that the Patriarch was really ordained by these twelve Presbyters.<sup>2</sup> It is, then, certain that they were an Episcopal College, retaining the name, which in

<sup>1</sup> Yet even this passage proves that S. Jerome is stretching the point to its very utmost. For in his dialogue against the Luciferians, (Opp. ii. 181,) he also reserves the power of confirming to the Bishop alone.

<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis, however, is stoutly denied by Pearson, Abraham Echellensis, and Sollerius, and they affirm that Diocesan Bishops existed in the Alexandrian Patriarchate from the very first. In confirmation of this view, they quote the Melchite Martyrology, the Acts of S. Mark by Severus, Simeon Metaphrastes, and, above all, the letter of Hadrian to Servianus, quoted in the life of Saturninus by Vopiscus, where he distinctly mentions some, *qui se CHRISTI Episcopos dicunt*. They also observe that Heraclas, had he increased the number of Bishops, would in all probability have been commended for it by his encomiast Eusebius; and that in the time of S. Alexander there were a hundred Bishops in Egypt, while we find no

hint of a recent addition to the Episcopal body. At the same time, it must be confessed that none of these arguments can in any respect be considered decisive, except that adduced from the letter of Hadrian; and he might easily have been mistaken on this point, as he is in the same letter on others, regarding the Christians.

It is easy to reconcile the discrepancy between the two narrations of the early constitution of the Alexandrian Church, by imagining that at first, as we said, it consisted of seven Deacons and three Priests; but that the Evangelist, on his second visit to Alexandria, found the number of the Faithful so much increased, as to call for the establishment of a Presbyteral (or Episcopal) College. This whole subject is most ably treated by Sollerius, Parergon I., Hist. Chron. Pat. Alex. pp. 9\*, 10\*, 11\* of the fifth volume of the Bollandine June; and by Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii. 342.

and whence  
possibly  
arising.

the Primitive Church was used synonymously with Bishops. That the case is so in the Acts is well known. S. Paul, for example, having called the Presbyters of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, warned them to take heed unto all the flock, over the which the HOLY GHOST had made them *Bishops*. And that there was such an Episcopal College at Alexandria appears likely from two considerations. The one, that the account of Eutychius as to the absence of any Bishops in Egypt till the third century thus receives some confirmation, since we may well suppose that this College governed the country jointly, and that till the time of Demetrius it was not divided, to use the word in the modern sense, into Dioceses; the other, that we may thus account for the extraordinary privileges retained by the College when it became really Presbyteral, more especially that of provincial letters being addressed in its name jointly with the Patriarch's.

Let the case, however, be as it may, Eutychius's authority is little worth, since, in asserting that till the Nicene Council the Patriarchs were invariably elected from the order of Presbyters, he asserts that which is contrary to fact, Demetrius for example having been a layman till called to the Chair of S. Mark. And among the many frivolous objections raised against S. Athanasius, his immediate elevation from the Diaconate to the Patriarchate does not appear.

## SECTION II.

Peace enjoyed by the early Alexandrian Church.

IT pleased God, that the Church which was afterwards to be exposed to such fierce persecution from the Pagan power, and to struggle for its very existence with heresy under two forms, should, in its infancy, be in great measure protected from the storms which fell upon its sister Churches. Time was thus given for its establishment and consolidation; the True Faith took deep root in the hearts of the people of Alexandria, and, in due season, brought forth fruit to perfection. During the first two centuries, Egypt enjoyed unusual quiet; and little is known of its ecclesiastical history beyond the names of its Patriarchs.

On the decease of S. Mark, S. Annianus<sup>1</sup> succeeded to the government of the Church. He was a man, says Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> beloved of God, and admirable in all things. In his time the number of the Faithful was increased exceedingly.<sup>3</sup> His memory was held in great veneration by the Egyptians, and a church under his invocation long existed<sup>4</sup> at Alexandria. He governed the See<sup>5</sup> twenty-two years: and had for his successor Abilius,<sup>6</sup> or Melianus, who is said to have been the first of the three Presbyters whom S. Mark, at his first visit to Alexandria, had ordained. The remark of the *Chronicon Orientale*, "the Church during his time was in peace," renders it probable that the case had been otherwise during the Episcopate of Annianus. And it is not unlikely that, in the massacre of the Alexandrian Jews which followed the siege of Jerusalem, some of the Christians might have suffered. On this subject, however, we have no certain information. The persecution of Domitian does not appear to have extended to Egypt. Abilius governed the Church for nearly fourteen years: and was succeeded by Cerdo,<sup>7</sup> one of the Presbyters whom S. Mark had ordained. He presided over his diocese for about nine<sup>8</sup> years; and there is an obscure tra-

Succession  
of S. Annia-  
nus, Patr.  
II., A.D. 62.

S. Abilius,  
Patr. III.,  
A.D. 84.

S. Cerdo,  
Patr. IV.,  
A.D. 98.

<sup>1</sup> He is also called Anianus; and in the Latin Acts of S. Mark, published by Wolfgang Lazius, Anizanus. Reuterdahl will have the name spelt Ammianus; Eutychius Hananias.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. ii. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Severus, ap. Renaud. 2.

<sup>4</sup> S. Epiphanius, Hær. 69.

<sup>5</sup> So Eusebius, (iii. 12,) S. Nicephorus, Eutychius, Severus, Makrizius; though they do not agree as to the year of his decease, dating the commencement of his episcopate differently.

<sup>6</sup> Eusebius, both in his History and in his Chronicle, with the other Greek and Latin authors, calls him Abilius; the Coptic writers name him Miloi, the Arabs, Melianus. In Eutychius, by a manifest error, he is termed Philetus. The author of the Apostolic Constitutions asserts that

he was consecrated by S. Luke; (vii. 48,) which is contrary to Eastern tradition.

<sup>7</sup> The *Chronicon Orientale* asserts that the See was vacant for three years after the decease of Abilius, and Tillemont follows its authority. But Sollerius (p. 15\*) amply disproves this assertion, and indeed the reason assigned in the *Chronicon*, "because at that time the destruction of Jerusalem happened," destroys whatever authority the statement might otherwise possess.

<sup>8</sup> There is a discrepancy between the Chronicle and History of Eusebius; the former gives eleven years to Cerdo, the latter merely asserts that he died about the twelfth year of Hadrian. (H. E. iv. 1.) We follow Sollerius.

Primus,  
Patr. V.,  
A.D. 107.

A.D. 115.

S. Justus,  
Patr. VI.,  
A.D. 119.

S. Eumenius,  
Patr. VII.,  
A.D. 130.

dition that he suffered Martyrdom under Trajan. Primus,<sup>1</sup> who is also called Ephraim, next ascended the Evangelical Throne. He was a layman, and was advanced for his angelical purity of life.<sup>2</sup> His Episcopate was in all probability a season of trouble. The Jews<sup>3</sup> of Egypt and Cyrene, as if possessed by an evil spirit, fell on the Pagans among whom they dwelt, massacred them without mercy, carried every thing before them, and compelled their enemies to retire within the walls of Alexandria, where they revenged themselves by enslaving or murdering such of the Jews as were dwelling in that city. Nor was it till Marcus Turbo, into whose hands Trajan committed the conduct of the war, had defeated the rebels in several battles, and had slaughtered many thousands of them, that peace was restored to the country. Primus, after an Episcopate of twelve years, was succeeded by Justus;<sup>4</sup> a man who was good and wise,<sup>5</sup> and beloved<sup>6</sup> of God. He is said to have been baptised by the Evangelist;<sup>7</sup> and, doubtless, the Egyptian Church would delight in honouring such, more especially at a time when few who had personally known S. Mark could be yet surviving. To Justus succeeded Eumenius;<sup>8</sup> and it is remarkable that history is still silent as to the sufferings, which there almost certainly must have been, of the Alexandrian Church,<sup>9</sup> during the time that Hadrian was in Egypt, where he restored the pillar of Pompey, and attended the apotheosis of his favourite Antinous. And in the great and last insurrection of the Jews, led on by the impostor Barcochebas, the Egyptian Christians<sup>10</sup> suffered severely from

<sup>1</sup> He is called Primus by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 4) and other Greek and Latin writers. See Dodwell's Supplement to Pearson's Dissertation, p. 58. But by Eastern writers he is termed Abrimius or Aprimius; and Papebrochius supposes his real name to have been Ephrem. (Conf. Soller. p. 16\*).

<sup>2</sup> Severus, ap. Renaudot, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 2. This rebellion is also mentioned by Orosius, Dion, and Spartianus.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 4. He is called Justinus by Nicephorus.

<sup>5</sup> Severus, ap. Renaudot, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Chronicon Orientale. Sollerius, 7\*.

<sup>7</sup> Such is the tradition of the Ethiopic Church. Renaudot, p. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Eusebius (H. E. iv. 11) calls him Eumenes; but in his Chronicle, Hymenæus.

<sup>9</sup> The only author who mentions that Alexandria suffered in the persecution of Hadrian, is Macrizius; and he refers it to the Episcopate of Primus, when, indeed, that persecution might have commenced in Egypt; though it did not attain its utmost fury till after the succession of Justus.

<sup>10</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 8. Sollerius, 18\*.



the fury of the rebels, who would have had them join in their revolt. At the same time Alexandria was infected by the fanatic teaching of Basileides<sup>1</sup> and Carpocrates, both natives of that city. To enter into an exposition of the Gnostic heresy would lead us too far from our immediate subject: inasmuch as it does not appear that the Alexandrian Church was peculiarly interested in its rise, or opposed to its progress.

Marcian<sup>2</sup> was the successor of Eumenius, of whom nothing whatever is known: and Marcian was followed by Celadion.<sup>3</sup> Of this Bishop nothing is related except the love that his flock bore to him; and that he was succeeded by Agrippinus.<sup>4</sup> He, in his turn, left the Patriarchal Throne to Julian.<sup>5</sup>

A barren list of names is all that history has left us with respect to these early Bishops of Alexandria; all of whom, however, with the exception perhaps of Primus, are reckoned among the Saints. With the successor of Julian we leave uncertain traditions, and uninteresting catalogues, and enter on the real History of the Church of Alexandria.

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 7. On the different tenets of the stricter followers of Basileides, and the Carpocratians, the reader cannot do better than consult Fuldner, Dritte Denkschrift, &c., p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 6, terms him Mark; and it is probable, as Sollerius has observed, that this was his real name, but was altered by the Egyptians out of reverence to the Evangelist; just as in the Roman Church no Pope has ever been named Peter. No Alexandrian Patriarch bore the name of Mark till the beginning of the ninth century.

<sup>3</sup> So he is called by Eusebius, Nicephorus, George Syncellus; Celasdiannus in the Coptic Index; Claudian by Severus, Eutychius, the Chronicon Orientale, Elmacinus, Makrizi. Abu'lberkat also names him Beladion; our Jacobite Catalogue

كالازيانوا

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, H. E. iv. 19. Abu'lberkat calls him Agrippius or Agrippa. The chronology of his Patriarchate, which is involved in some obscurity by an apparent self-contradiction on the part of Eusebius, is ably expounded by Sollerius.

<sup>5</sup> Eusebius, H. E. v. 9. Severus has a strange observation, connected with this Prelate; after his time, says he, no Bishop remained at Alexandria. The most intelligible explanation of this assertion, which is also confirmed by the authority of the Chronicon Orientale, is that the increasing severity of persecution rendered the succeeding Bishops, at one time or other, fugitives from their See; which till then they had not been compelled to leave. In the chronology we have followed Sollerius, though we have not considered it necessary to swell our pages with an exposition of his arguments.

S. Marcian, Patr. VIII., A.D. 143.

S. Celadion, Patr. IX., A.D. 155.

S. Agrippinus, Patr. X., A.D. 167.

S. Julian, Patr. XI., A.D. 179.

## SECTION III.

Demetrius,  
Patr. XII.,  
A.D. 189.

how elected.

WHILE the Patriarch Julian—so runs the Egyptian legend,—was on his death bed, he was informed by an Angel, that the man who should, on the succeeding day, bring him a present of grapes,<sup>1</sup> was designed as his successor. On the morrow, a countryman, who could neither read nor write, and who was married, made his appearance in the predicted manner, and Julian acknowledged him as the future Patriarch. Demetrius was so unwilling to receive the proffered dignity, that he was ordained by main force; and, from the time of his consecration, he became another man. He immediately applied himself with success to the study of the Scriptures, and became one of the most learned prelates of his time. His being a married man rendered his flock, if we may trust Severus, unwilling at first to receive him as Patriarch, as it happened that, from S. Mark downward, none such had been promoted to the See. This indisposition, however, was shortly removed, probably by the exemplary character of the new Prelate; for the miracle which, according to Coptic tradition, established his continence, is unworthy of relation, and far more so of belief.

Conversion  
of Philip.

Demetrius had presided over his Church fourteen years, when the terrible persecution of Severus, reckoned as the sixth, broke over the Church. <sup>2</sup>Philip was at the time Prefect of Egypt: one of the most honourable posts which it was in the power of

<sup>1</sup> This tale is related or referred to by Severus, the *Chronicon Orientale*, and *Elmacinus*. Renaudot, pp. 20, 21. The Copts, on the twelfth of Bermaha, (=March 8) commemorate the miracle by which Demetrius proved his continence.

He displayed, this day, the power of virginity by the Grace of CHRIST: He covered fire in a basket, and the vest of his wife, says the Ethiopic poet. See Ludolf, *Comm. ad Hist. Ethiop.* p. 448.

ἸΣΑΪΡ : Ε-ΨΟ : ΞΕΛΑ : Ε-ΞΥΛΑΙ : ΟΛΥΤΟΖΤ :  
ἸΔΑΔ :  
ΟΦΥΛ : ἸΟΥΤ : ΟΥ-ΔΔ : ΘΑ-ΠΛΟΥΤ : ΟΔΧΔ :

<sup>2</sup> Baron. Ann. 204, vi.