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Introduction to Tomus Ad Antiochenos.

The word ‘tome’ (τόμος) means either a section, or, in the case of such a document as that before us, a concise statement. It is commonly applied to synodical letters (cf. the ‘Tome’ of Leo, a.d. 450, to Flavian).

Upon the accession of Julian (November, 361) the Homœan ascendancy which had marked the last six years of Constantius collapsed. A few weeks after his accession (Feb. 362) an edict recalled all the exiled Bishops. On Feb. 21 Athanasius re-appeared in Alexandria. He was joined there by Lucifer of Cagliari and Eusebius of Vercellæ, who were in exile in Upper Egypt. Once more free, he took up the work of peace which had busied him in the last years of his exile (see Prolegg. ch. ii. §9). With a heathen once more on the throne of the Cæsars, there was everything to sober Christian party spirit, and to promise success to the council which met under Athanasius during the ensuing summer. Among the twenty-one bishops who formed the assembly the most notable are Eusebius of Vercellæ, Asterius of Petra, and Dracontius of Lesser Hermopolis and Adelphius of Onuphis, the friends and correspondents of Athanasius. The rest, with the exception of Anatolius of Eubœa, were all from Egypt and Marmarica, and (probably three only) from S.W. Asia. The council (Newman, Arians, v. i.; Gwatkin, Stud. p. 205, Krüger, Lucif. 45–53, was occupied with four problems: (1) The terms on which communion should be vouchsafed to those Arians who desired to re-unite (§§3, 8). They were to be asked for nothing beyond the Nicene test, and an express anathema against Arianism, including the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is a Creature. The latter point had been rising into prominence of late, and had called forth from Athanasius his four Discourses to Serapion of Thmuis. The emphatic way in which the point is pressed in §3, implies that an attempt was being made in some quarter to subscribe the Nicene Creed, while maintaining the Arian position with regard to the Holy Spirit. The language of §3 cannot be reconciled with the hypothesis (Gwatkin, Studies, 233), that no formal requirement was made by this council on the subject. The person aimed at was possibly Acacius, who (Serap. iv. 7) had treated the subject with levity, and yet was now disposed to come to terms (as he did a year later, Socr. iii. 25). It is true that we find the names of Macedonius and his followers (N.B. not Eleusius) in the number of the 59 who betook themselves to Liberius (Socr. iv. 12), and neither in their letter nor in his reply is there any allusion to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; and that Basil (Ep. 204), with the sanction of Athanasius (cf. below, Letters 62, 63), did not press the test upon those who were otherwise orthodox. But the council of 362 has Syrian circumstances specially in view; and however we may explain it, its language is too clear to be mistaken. (On the general subject, cf. Letter 55.) (2) The Arian Christology also occupied the council (§7). The integrity of Christ’s human nature on the one hand, its perfect Union with the Word on the other, are clearly emphasised. This question had begun to come into prominent discussion in several parts of the Christian world (e.g. at Corinth, see infr.
Letter 59), and was soon to give rise to the system of Apollinarius, who, however, it is interesting to note, was a party, by his legates, to the present decision. (3) The state of the Church at Antioch was the most practical problem before the council. Meletius was returning to the presidency of the main body of the Antiochene church, whose chief place of worship was the ‘Palaea’ (§3). Since the deposition of Eustathius (c. 330), the intransigent or ‘protestant’ body had been without a bishop, and were headed by the respected presbyter Paulinus. Small in numbers, and dependent for a church upon the good will of the Arians, they were yet strong in the unsullied orthodoxy of their antecedents, in the sympathy of the West and of Athanasius himself, who had given offence at Antioch in 346 by worshipping with them alone. Clearly the right course was that they should reunite with the main body under Meletius, and this was what the council recommended (§3), although, perhaps in deference to the more uncompromising spirits, the union is treated (ib. and 4) as a return of the larger body to the smaller, instead of vice versa. (For the sequel, see Prolegg. ubi supra.) (4) With the rivalry of parties at Antioch, a weighty question of theological terminology was indirectly involved. The word ὑπόστασις had been used in the Nicene anathema as a synonym of οὐσία (see Excursus A, pp. 77 sqq. above), and in this sense it was commonly used by Athanasius in agreement with the New Testament use of the word (Westcott on Heb. i. 3), with Dionysius of Rome, and with the West, to whom ὑπόστασις was etymologically identified with ‘Substantia’ their (perhaps imperfect) equivalent for οὐσία. On the other hand, the general tendency of Eastern Theology had been to use ὑπόστασις in the sense of Subject or Person, for which purpose it expressed the idea of individual essence less ambiguously than πρόσωπον. This was the use of the word adopted by Origen, Dionysius Alex. (supr. de Sent. Dionys.), Alexander of Alexandria (in his letter Thdt. H. E. i. 4. p. 16, l. 19), and by Athanasius himself in an earlier work (p. 90, supr.) At Antioch the Eustathians appear to have followed the Nicene and Western usage, using the word to emphasise the Individual Unity of God as against Arian or Subordinationist views, while the Meletians protested against the Marcellian monarchianism by insisting on three Hypostases in the Godhead. The contradiction was mainly verbal, the two parties being substantially at one as to the doctrine, but varying in its expression. Hence the wise and charitable decision of the council, which came naturally from one who, like Athanasius, could use either expression, though he had come to prefer the Western to the Eastern use.

It may be well to trace briefly the sense of these technical terms, the history and significance of which is a forcible reminder of the inability of Theology to bring the Infinite within the categories of the Finite, to do more than guard our Faith by pointing out the paths which experience has shewn to lead to some false limitation of the fulness of the Revelation of God in Christ. The distinction (drawn out Prolegg. ch. ii. §3 (2) b) between the primary and secondary sense of ὑπόστασις in Greek metaphysics does not easily fit the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The common to Father and Son is not the name of a Species, as ‘Man’ applies to Peter and Paul. But neither can the idea of be reconciled with inherence in three distinct personal existences. (Cf. supr. p. 409, note 7.)

But here the word comes in to help our imagination. The word (see Socr. H. E. iii. 7. Westcott, ubi supra. and Newman, Arias, App. 4), from various literal senses came to be transferred to the philosophical vocabulary, doing duty as verbal substantive not only for
The Tome was carried to Antioch by the five bishops named at the beginning of §1, and there subscribed by Paulinus and Karterius of Antaradus. As to its effect among the friends of Meletius our information is only inferential (see Gwatkin, Studies, p. 208). On the supposed disciplinary legislation of this council in relation to the Syntagma Doctrinæ, see Prolegg. ch. ii. §§9.

N.B. The translation of the present tract as well as that of the ad Afros and of Letters 56, 59, 60, 61, was made independently of that by Dr. Bright in his Later Treatises of S. Athanasius (see Prolegg. ch. i. §2), but has been carefully collated with it, and in not a few cases improved by its aid. For a fuller commentary on these pieces than has been possible in this volume, the reader is referred to Dr. Bright’s work.

Tome or Synodal Letter to the People of Antioch.

To our beloved and much-desired fellow-ministers Eusebius, Lucifer, Asterius, Kymatius, and Anatolius, Athanasius and the bishops present in Alexandria from Italy and Arabia,

but for . Like the concrete it was applied (a) to matter as underlying form, (b) to substance as underlying attributes. In this latter use it served to distinguish from , expressing moreover a complete self-contained existence in a way that did not. When therefore the idea of personal individuality has to be expressed, is more suitable than . But the ambiguity of the latter word remains. Those who preferred to speak of thought of the Divine Essence rather as , and of One Personal God, with whom Father, Son, and Spirit were each absolutely and fully identified ( ), while with those who preferred the idea of the Divine approximated to , and guarded against Tritheism solely by holding fast to the Monarchia of the Father. The corrective to each position lay in the recognition of the other, i.e. of its own incompleteness. (See further Prolegg. ubi supr. and Zahn, Marcell. p. 87, sq.)


The following are all the details that can be collected with regard to the bishops named in the text. Asterius (Hist. Ar. 18 note); Kymatius of Paltus in Syria Prima (Apol. Fug. 3; Hist. Ar. 5); Anatolius of Eubœa (not in D.C.B.); Gaius (Apol. Fug. 7; Hist. Ar. 72, D.C.B. i. 387, No. 197?); Agathus, Hist. Ar. 72 (not in D.C.B.); Ammonius (see Hist. Ar. 72 sub.-fin.; Ap. Fug. 7, Letter 49. 7, and infr. Appendix, note 1 as to names in D.C.B.); Agathodæmon (Hist. Ar. ibid.); Dracontius and Adelphius (Letters 49, 60); Hermæon (Hermion in §10) unknown, unless the ‘Hermes’ of Hist. Ar. 72; Marcus (2), (cf. D.C.B iii. 825 (7) for works ascribed to one or the other); Paphnutius, (Hist. Ar. 72; D.C.B. iv. 184 (4)); Zoilus of Andropolis (Harduin, &c., suo jure, identify him with the bishop of the Syrian Larissa, who signs at Antioch in 363, Conc. i. 742; D.C.B. iv. 1220); Andreas, George, Lucius,
Egypt and Libya; Eusebius, Asterius, Gaius, Agathus, Ammonius, Agathodæmon, Dracontius, Adelphius, Hermæon, Marcus, Theodorus, Andreas, Paphnutius, another Marcus, Zoilus, Menas, George, Lucius, Macarius and the rest, all greeting in Christ.

We are persuaded that being ministers of God and good stewards ye are sufficient to order the affairs of the Church in every respect. But since it has come to us, that many who were formerly separated from us by jealousy now wish for peace, while many also having severed their connection with the Arian madmen are desiring our communion, we think it well to write to your courtesy what ourselves and the beloved Eusebius and Asterius have drawn up: yourselves being our beloved and truly most-desired fellow-ministers. We rejoice at the said tidings, and pray that even if any be left still far from us, and if any appear to be in agreement with the Arians, he may promptly leave their madness, so that for the future all men everywhere may say, ‘One Lord, one faith’.

For as the psalmist says, what is so good or pleasant as for brethren to dwell in unity. But our dwelling is the Church, and our mind ought to be the same. For thus we believe that the Lord also will dwell with us, who says, ‘I will dwell with them and walk in them’ and ‘Here will I dwell for I have a delight therein.’ But by ‘here’ what is meant but there where one faith and religion is preached?


We then of Egypt truly wished to go to you along with our beloved Eusebius and Asterius, for many reasons, but chiefly that we might embrace your affection and together enjoy the said peace and concord. But since, as we declared in our other letters, and as ye may learn from our fellow-ministers, the needs of the church detain us, with much regret we begged the same fellow-ministers of ours, Eusebius and Asterius, to go to you in our stead. And we thank their piety in that although they might have gone at once to their dioceses, they preferred to go to you at all costs, on account of the pressing need of the Church. They therefore having consented, we consoled ourselves with the consideration that you and they being there, we all were present with you in mind.

3. The ‘Meletians’ to be acknowledged, and all who renounce heresy, especially as to the Holy Spirit.

Macarius, Menas, and Theodore, are unknown and not in D.C.B. The names all recur (excepting those of George, Lucius, Macarius), in §10, where the sees are specified.

367 Eph. iv. 5.
368 See Ps. cxxiii. 1.
369 2 Cor. vi. 16, and Lev. xxvi. 12.
370 Ps. cxxii. 14.
As many then as desire peace with us, and specially those who assemble in the Old [Church] and those again who are seceding from the Arians, do ye call to yourselves, and receive them as parents their sons, and welcome them as tutors and guardians; and unite them to our beloved Paulinus and his people, without requiring more from them than to anathematise the Arian heresy and confess the faith confessed by the holy fathers at Nicæa, and to anathematise also those who say that the Holy Spirit is a Creature and separate from the Essence of Christ. For this is in truth a complete renunciation of the abominable heresy of the Arians, to refuse to divide the Holy Trinity, or to say that any part of it is a creature. For those who, while pretending to cite the faith confessed at Nicæa, venture to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, do nothing more than in words deny the Arian heresy while they retain it in thought. But let the impiety of Sabellius and of Paul of Samosata also be anathematised by all, and the madness of Valentinian and Basilides, and the folly of the Manichæans. For if this be done, all evil suspicion will be removed on all hands, and the faith of the Catholic Church alone be exhibited in purity.

4. The parties at Antioch to unite.

But that we, and they who have ever remained in communion with us, hold this faith, we think no one of yourselves nor any one else is ignorant. But since we rejoice with all those who desire re-union, but especially with those that assemble in the Old [church], and as we glorify the Lord exceedingly, as for all things so especially for the good purpose of these men, we exhort you that concord be established with them on these terms, and, as we said above, without further conditions, without namely any further demand upon yourselves on the part of those who assemble in the Old [church], or Paulinus and his fellows propounding anything else, or aught beyond the Nicene definition.

5. The creed of Sardica not an authorised formula. Question of ‘hypostasis.’

And prohibit even the reading or publication of the paper, much talked of by some, as having been drawn up concerning the Faith at the synod of Sardica. For the synod made no definition of the kind. For whereas some demanded, on the ground that the Nicene synod was defective, the drafting of a creed, and in their haste even attempted it, the holy synod assembled in Sardica was indignant, and decreed that no statement of faith should be drafted, but that they should be content with the Faith confessed by the fathers at Nicæa, inasmuch as it lacked nothing but was

---

3681 Ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ, cf. Theodt. H. E. i. 3: possibly the old Town is meant, viz. the main part of Antioch on the left bank of the Orontes, so called in distinction from the ‘New’ town of Seleucu Callinicus which occupied the Island in the river. The ‘Old’ Church, or Church of the Apostles, was situated in the Old Town, and was at present occupied by the orthodox party of Meletius. The old orthodox party of Paulinus had only one small church in the New Town, granted for their use out of respect for Paulinus by the Arian Bishop Euzoius (Socr. H. E. iii. 9.).

3682 The draft is given by Theodt. H. E. ii. 8; it insists vehemently on the ‘One Hypostasis.’
full of piety, and that it was undesirable for a second creed to be promulged, lest that drafted at
Nicæa should be deemed imperfect, and a pretext be given to those who were often wishing to draft
and define a creed. So that if a man propound the above or any other paper, stop them, and persuade
them rather to keep the peace. For in such men we perceive no motive save only contentiousness.
For as to those whom some were blaming for speaking of three Subsistences\textsuperscript{3683}, on the ground that
the phrase is unscriptural and therefore suspicious, we thought it right indeed to require nothing
beyond the confession of Nicæa, but on account of the contention we made enquiry of them, whether
they meant, like the Arian madmen, subsistences foreign and strange, and alien in essence from
one another, and that each Subsistence was divided apart by itself, as is the case with creatures in
general and in particular with those begotten of men, or like different substances, such as gold,
silver, or brass;—or whether, like other heretics, they meant three Beginnings and three Gods, by
speaking of three Subsistences.

They assured us in reply that they neither meant this nor had ever held it. But upon our asking
them ‘what then do you mean by it, or why do you use such expressions?’ they replied, Because
they believed in a Holy Trinity, not a trinity in name only, but existing and subsisting in truth, ‘both
a Father truly existing and subsisting, and a Son truly substantial and subsisting, and a Holy Spirit
subsisting and really existing do we acknowledge,’ and that neither had they said there were three
Gods or three beginnings, nor would they at all tolerate such as said or held so, but that they
acknowledged a Holy Trinity but One Godhead, and one Beginning, and that the Son is coessential
with the Father, as the fathers said; while the Holy Spirit is not a creature, nor external, but proper
to and inseparable from the Essence of the Father and the Son.

6. The question of one Subsistence (Hypostasis) or three, not to be pressed.

Having accepted then these men’s interpretation and defence of their language, we made enquiry
of those blamed by them for speaking of One Subsistence, whether they use the expression in the
sense of Sabellius, to the negation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, or as though the Son were
non-substantial, or the Holy Spirit impersonal\textsuperscript{3684}. But they in their turn assured us that they neither
meant this nor had ever held it, but ‘we use the word Subsistence thinking it the same thing to say
Subsistence or Essence;’ ‘But we hold that there is One, because the Son is of the Essence of the
Father, and because of the identity of nature. For we believe that there is one Godhead, and that it
has one nature, and not that there is one nature of the Father, from which that of the Son and of the
Holy Spirit are distinct.’ Well, thereupon they who had been blamed for saying there were three
Subsistences agreed with the others, while those who had spoken of One Essence, also confessed
the doctrine of the former as interpreted by them. And by both sides Arius was anathematised as

\textsuperscript{3683} ὑποστάσεις
\textsuperscript{3684} ἀνουσίου, ἀνυποστάτου, the words are rendered ‘unessential’ and ‘not subsisting’ in another connection, \textit{supr.} p. 434, &c.
an adversary of Christ, and Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata, as impious men, and Valentinus and Basilides as aliens from the truth, and Manichæus as an inventor of mischief. And all, by God’s grace, and after the above explanations, agree together that the faith confessed by the fathers at Nicæa is better than the said phrases, and that for the future they would prefer to be content to use its language.


But since also certain seemed to be contending together concerning the fleshly Economy of the Saviour, we enquired of both parties. And what the one confessed, the others also agreed to, that the Word did not, as it came to the prophets, so dwell in a holy man at the consummation of the ages, but that the Word Himself was made flesh, and being in the Form of God, took the form of a servant\(^{3685}\), and from Mary after the flesh became man for us, and that thus in Him the human race is perfectly and wholly delivered from sin and quickened from the dead, and given access to the kingdom of the heavens. For they confessed also that the Saviour had not a body without a soul, nor without sense or intelligence; for it was not possible, when the Lord had become man for us, that His body should be without intelligence: nor was the salvation effected in the Word Himself a salvation of body only, but of soul also. And being Son of God in truth, He became also Son of Man, and being God’s Only-begotten Son, He became also at the same time ‘firstborn among many brethren\(^{3686}\).’ Wherefore neither was there one Son of God before Abraham, another after Abraham\(^{3687}\): nor was there one that raised up Lazarus, another that asked concerning him; but the same it was that said as man, ‘Where does Lazarus lie\(^{3688}\);’ and as God raised him up: the same that as man and in the body spat, but divinely as Son of God opened the eyes of the man blind from his birth\(^{3689}\); and while, as Peter says\(^{3690}\), in the flesh He suffered, as God opened the tomb and raised the dead. For which reasons, thus understanding all that is said in the Gospel, they assured us that they held the same truth about the Word’s Incarnation and becoming Man.

8. *Questions of words must not be suffered to divide those who think alike.*

These things then being thus confessed, we exhort you not hastily to condemn those who so confess, and so explain the phrases they use, nor to reject them, but rather to accept them as they desire peace and defend themselves, while you check and rebuke, as of suspicious views, those who refuse so to confess and to explain their language. But while you refuse toleration to the latter,

---

\(^{3685}\) Phil. ii. 7, &c.

\(^{3686}\) Rom. viii. 29.

\(^{3687}\) John viii. 58.

\(^{3688}\) Ib. xi. 34.

\(^{3690}\) Mark viii. 22, &c.

\(^{3690}\) 1 Pet. iv. 1.
counsel the others also who explain and hold aright, not to enquire further into each other’s opinions, nor to fight about words to no useful purpose, nor to go on contending with the above phrases, but to agree in the mind of piety. For they who are not thus minded, but only stir up strife with such petty phrases, and seek something beyond what was drawn up at Nicæa, do nothing except ‘give their neighbour turbid confusion to drink’, like men who grudge peace and love dissensions. But do ye, as good men and faithful servants and stewards of the Lord, stop and check what gives offence and is strange, and value above all things peace of that kind, faith being sound. Perhaps God will have pity on us, and unite what is divided, and, there being once more one flock, we shall all have one leader, even our Lord Jesus Christ.

9. The above terms unanimously agreed upon.

These things, albeit there was no need to require anything beyond the synod of Nicæa, nor to tolerate the language of contention, yet for the sake of peace, and to prevent the rejection of men who wish to believe aright, we enquired into. And what they confessed, we put briefly into writing, we namely who are left in Alexandria, in common with our fellow-ministers, Asterius and Eusebius. For most of us had gone away to our dioceses. But do you on your part read this in public where you are wont to assemble, and be pleased to invite all to you thither. For it is right that the letter should be there first read, and that there those who desire and strive for peace should be re-united. And then, when they are re-united, in the spot where all the laity think best, in the presence of your courtesy, the public assemblies should be held, and the Lord be glorified by all together. The brethren who are with me greet you. I pray that you may be well, and remember us to the Lord; both I, Athanasius, and likewise the other bishops assembled, sign, and those sent by Lucifer, bishop of the island of Sardinia, two deacons, Herennius and Agapetus; and from Paulinus, Maximus and Calemerus, deacons also. And there were present certain monks of Apolinaris the bishop, sent from him for the purpose.

10. Signatures.

The names of the several bishops to whom the letter is addressed are: Eusebius of the city of Virgilli in Gaul, Lucifer of the island of Sardinia, Asterius of Petra, Arabia, Kymatius of Paltus, Cœle-Syria, Anatolius of Eubœa.

Senders: the Pope Athanasius, and those present with him in Alexandria, viz.: Eusebius, Asterius, and the others above-mentioned, Gaius of Paratonium in Hither Libya, Agathus of Phragonis

---

3691 Hab. ii. 15.
3692 John x. 16.
3693 Of Laodicea, the later heresiarch.
3694 i.e. Vercellæ, in ‘Cisalpine’ Gaul, or Lombardy.
3695 In Marmarica or ‘Libya Siccior’ near the Ras el Harzeit.
and part of Elearchia in Egypt, Ammonius of Pachnemunis and the rest of Elearchia, Agathodæmon of Schedia and Menelaitas, Dracontius of Lesser Hermopolis, Adelphius of Onuphis in Lychni, Hermion of Tanes, Marcus of Zygra, Hither Libya, Theodorus of Athribis, Andreas of Arsenoe, Paphnutius of Sais, Marcus of Philæ, Zoilus of Andrôs, Menas of Antiphra.

Eusebius also signs the following in Latin, of which the translation is:

I Eusebius, according to your exact confession made on either side by agreement concerning the Subsistences, also add my agreement; further concerning the Incarnation of our Saviour, namely that the Son of God has become Man, taking everything upon Himself without sin, like the composition of our old man, I ratify the text of the letter. And whereas the Sardican paper is ruled out, to avoid the appearance of issuing anything beyond the creed of Nicæa, I also add my consent, in order that the creed of Nicæa may not seem by it to be excluded, and [I agree] that it should not be published. I pray for your health in the Lord.

I Asterius agree to what is above written, and pray for your health in the Lord.

11. The ‘Tome’ signed at Antioch.

And after this Tome was sent off from Alexandria, thus signed by the aforesaid, [the recipients] in their turn signed it:

I Paulinus hold thus, as I received from the fathers, that the Father perfectly exists and subsists, and that the Son perfectly subsists, and that the Holy Spirit perfectly subsists. Wherefore also I accept the above explanation concerning the Three Subsistences, and the one Subsistence, or rather Essence, and those who hold thus. For it is pious to hold and confess the Holy Trinity in one Godhead. And concerning the Word of the Father becoming Man for us, I hold as it is written, that, as John says, the Word was made Flesh, not in the sense of those most impious persons who say that He has undergone a change, but that He has become Man for us, being born of the holy Virgin Mary and of the Holy Spirit. For the Saviour had a body neither without soul, nor without sense, nor without intelligence. For it were impossible, the Lord being made Man for us, that His body should be without intelligence. Wherefore I anathematise those who set aside the Faith confessed at Nicæa, and who do not say that the Son is of the Father’s Essence, and coessential with the

3696 Capital of the Sebennytic nome, near Handahur.
3697 A town and custom-house near Andropolis, between Alxa. and the Canopic arm of the Nile.
3698 Chief town of a nome in the Delta.
3699 ‘Zoan.’
3700 West of Alxa. toward the Libyan dessert, and not far from Zygra in Marmarica.
3701 A very important town near the head of the Tanite arm. See Amm. Marc. xxii. 16. 6, who calls it one of the four largest cities in Egypt proper.
3702 i.e. Andropolis (above, note 11).
3703 West of Alxa. toward the Libyan dessert, and not far from Zygra in Marmarica.
Father. Moreover I anathematise those who say that the Holy Spirit is a Creature made through the Son. Once more I anathematise the heresy of Sabellius and of Photinus\textsuperscript{3704}, and every heresy, walking in the Faith of Nicæa, and in all that is above written. I Karterius\textsuperscript{3705} pray for your health.

\textbf{Appendix.}

\begin{quote}
Exile of Athanasius under Julian, 362–363.
\end{quote}

The fragment which follows, containing an interesting report of a story told by Athanasius to Ammonius, Bishop of Pachnemunis, is inserted here as furnishing undesignedly important details as to the movements of Athanasius in 363. See Prolegg. ch. v. §3 h, also ch. ii. §9. It is excerpted by Montfaucon from an account of the Abbat Theodore, written for Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria (385–412) by a certain Ammon (\textit{Acta SS. Maii}, Tom. iii. Append., pp. 63–71). The writer was at that time a bishop (see unknown): he was born about 335, as he was seventeen years old when he embraced the monastic life a year ‘and more’ after the proclamation of Gallus as Cæsar (Mar. 15, 351). About the time of the expulsion of Athanasius by Syrianus he retired to Nitria, where he remained many years, and finally returned to Alexandria, where he appears (\textit{infra}) as one of the clergy; the date of his elevation to the Episcopate cannot be fixed, but it obviously cannot be as early as 356–7 (so D.C.B. i. 102 (2), and probably is much later even than 362, in which year he would still be hardly twenty-eight. (He mentions the objections to the election of Athanasius, who was probably 30 in 328, on the ground of his youth.) Accordingly (apart from the different form of his name) he cannot\textsuperscript{3706} be identified with either of the Ammonii referred to in \textit{Tom. ad. Ant.} 1, 487

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{3704}{See Prolegg. ch. ii. §3 (2) \textit{ad fin.} This is remarkable as the first Eastern condemnation of Photinus by name from the Nicene side. He had been condemned at Sirmium in 347, and under pressure from the East apparently at Milan in 345 and 347, as well as in the Councils of Antioch in 344, and Sirmium in 351 (supr. pp. 463, 464). On the document of Paulinus, see Epiph. \textit{Hær.} lxxvii. 20, 21, also Dr. Bright’s note.}
\footnote{3705}{Bishop of Antaradus on the Syrian coast (D.C.B. i. 410 (3)); see \textit{de Fuga}, 3, and \textit{Hist. Ar.} 5. note 6a.}
\footnote{3706}{The Articles in D.C.B. i. 102 (2) and (3), combine variously data belonging to three distinct persons. (1) The old bishop ordained by Alexander (see unknown, see \textit{Hist. Ar.} 72 init.). Signs the synodal letter of the Sardican Council; is one of the infirm prelates cruelly expelled by George, along with coffins to bury them in case of the journey being fatal (see also \textit{Apol. Fug.} 7). (2) Another Ammonius, probably not a signatory of Sardica (cf. \textit{Apol. Ar.} 50, with \textit{Ep. Fest.} for 347), but a contemporary of Serapion, sent by Athanasius with Serap. to Constantius in 353. He had been a monk, but was then (\textit{Dracont.} 7) bishop of Pachnemunis and part of Elearchia (\textit{Tom.} 10), in which capacity, along with other exiles of 356–7 (\textit{Hist. Ar.} 72; \textit{Ap. Fug.} 7), he}
\end{footnotes}
note 3; Hist. Ar. 72, &c. The elder of the two does not concern us here; the younger (supr. pp. 483, 486), is the Ammonius to whom Athanasius told the story in the hearing of Ammon, and was now dead. Of Hermon, Bishop of Bubastis, mentioned as present along with Ammonius, Theophilus, and Ammon when the story was told, nothing is known (except that the date D.C.B. iii. 4 (2) is over 25 years too early). As he is not ‘of blessed memory,’ he was possibly still living during the Episcopate of Theophilus and Ammon. (There is nothing to identify him with the bishop of Tanes in Tom. Ant. 1, 10.)

The story itself is given at second-hand, from Ammon’s recollection of a statement by Athanasius some 12 to 15 years (at least) before he wrote. The prophetic details about Jovian may therefore be put down to natural accretion (Letter 56, note 2). But (apart from the fact that Julian’s death must have been rumoured long before the tardy official announcement of it, Tillem. Emp. iv. 449 sqq., Prolegg. ubi supr.) that Athanasius told of the φήμη of Julian’s death among the monks of the Thebaid need not be doubted. The story is one of a very large class, many of which are fairly authenticated. To say nothing of the φήμη at the battle of Mycale; we have in recent times the authority of Mr. R. Stuart Poole, of the British Museum, for the fact that on the night of the death of the Duke of Cambridge (July 9, 1850), Mr. Pooles’s brother ‘suddenly took out his watch and said, “Note the time, the Duke of Cambridge is dead,” and that the time proved to be correct;’ also the case of Mr. Edmonds who saw at Leicester, early in the morning of Nov. 4, 1837, an irruption of water into the works of the Thames tunnel, by which a workman was drowned; (other curious cases in ‘Phantasms of the Living’ vol. 2, pp. 367 sqq.). The letter or memoir from which this ‘Narratio’ is taken, was published by the Bollandists from a Medicean ms., and it bears every internal mark of genuineness. In what way it is integrally connected with the Vita Antonii (Gwatkin, Studies, p. 101), except by the fact that it happens to mention Antony, I fail to see. On the subject of Theodore of Tabenne, the main subject of the memoir, see Amélineau’s S. Pakhôme (ut supra, p. 188), also infr. Letter 58, note 3.

“As I think your holiness was present and heard, when his blessedness Pope Athanasius, in the presence of other clergy of Alexandria and of my insignificance, formerly related in the Great Church something about Theodorus, to the Ammonius of blessed memory, bishop of Elearchia, and to Hermon, bishop of the city of Bumastic, I write only what is necessary to put your...
reverence in mind of what he said. When the famous bishops were wondering at the Blessed Antony, Pope Athanasius—for Antony was often with him—said to them:—

I saw also at that season great men of God, who are lately dead, Theodorus chief of the Tabennesian monks, and the father of the monks around Antinoopolis, called Abbas Pammon. For when I was pursued by Julian, and was expecting to be slain by him—for this news was shewn me by good friends—these two came to me on the same day at Antinoopolis. And having planned to hide with Theodorus, I embarked on his vessel, which was completely covered in, while Abbas Pammon accompanied us. And when the wind was unfavourable, I was very anxious and prayed; and the monks with Theodore got out and towed the boat. And as Abbas Pammon was encouraging me in my anxiety, I said ‘Believe me when I say that my heart is never so trustful in time of peace as in time of persecution. For I have good confidence that suffering for Christ, and strengthened by His mercy, even though I am slain, I shall find mercy with Him.’ And while I was still saying this, Theodorus fixed his eyes on Abbas Pammon and smiled, while the other nearly laughed. So I said to them, ‘Why have you laughed at my words, do you convict me of cowardice?’ and Theodorus said to Abbas Pammon, ‘Tell him why we smiled.’ At which the latter said, ‘You ought to tell him.’ So Theodorus said, ‘in this very hour Julian has been slain in Persia’ for so God had declared beforehand concerning him: ‘the haughty man, the despiser and the boaster, shall finish nothing. But a Christian Emperor shall arise who shall be illustrious, but shall live only a short time. Wherefore you ought not to harass yourselves by departing into the Thebaid, but secretly to go to the Court, for you will meet him by the way, and having been kindly received by him, will return to your Church. And he soon shall be taken by God.’ And so it happened. From which cause I believe, that many who are well pleasing to God live unnoticed, especially among the monks. For those men unnoticed also, such as the blessed Amun and the holy Theodorus, in the mountain of Nitria, and the servant of God, the happy old man Pammon.”

3710  Opposite Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt.
3711  Habak. ii. 5.
3713  On this Theodore, see D.C.B. s.v. no. (67).