

ANALECTA.

I. A LAODICEAN BISHOP.

THE epitaph of the Roman soldier and Christian bishop discovered by my friend Mr. Calder, and published with learning, accuracy and sympathy in the preceding pages, is one of the outstanding and exceptional historical documents that the soil of Anatolia has preserved to modern times. It ranks along with or next to the epitaph of Bishop Avircius Marcellus, and far surpasses in importance the interesting document intermediate in age, the epitaph of the Makarios Papas, Bishop Theophilus.¹

As Mr. Calder mentions, almost every word in the closely compressed biography suggests a new train of thought, for it plunges us into the heart of the final struggle between Christianity and Paganism in Anatolia. Here we have a person who played a leading part in the great drama, not indeed on the greater stage of the empire, but on the narrower stage of a Province. Like most of the leading figures in the development of the Orthodox Church in Anatolia, he belonged to one of those wealthier country-families about which we are beginning to learn a little through recent discoveries—families which could command the highest education of the time and thus have access to the higher career ;² for in that civilized time education was the necessary passport for entrance to public life (except for the man of rare and outstanding genius, who is always largely independent of circumstances).

Mr. Calder has treated with tact and knowledge the earlier part of Engenius's career ; and has indicated with the brevity which circumstances required the most important

¹ Published by Miss Ramsay in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 22.

² See on this *Pauline and other Studies*, p 376.

aspects of this fresh evidence. It may not be out of place for me to add a short discussion of the career of Eugenius as a church leader in his own Province. We can imagine that, immediately after the decree of toleration issued by Galerius in A.D. 311, the soldier who had kept the faith so nobly¹ was regarded with peculiar veneration in his own city, and was raised by acclamation to the highest position in the local church at the earliest opportunity. The reference to his having resided only "a short time" in Laodicea before he became bishop, must be taken as full of meaning in this brief epitaph, where every word is carefully weighed and nothing is stated except what is vitally important. We may assume confidently that he was raised very quickly to the supreme rank without passing in the usual way through all the lower stages of the ministry.

In his episcopate Julius Eugenius devoted himself to the restoration of the church at Laodicea, which had evidently been destroyed in the great persecution and had to be rebuilt from the foundations. This is in striking agreement with the History of Eusebius, who, immediately after the final edict and the death of Maximin, proceeds to describe the restoration of the churches. The new churches were far more splendid than those which had been destroyed. Christianity was now dominant and prosperous; money flowed in; and the Imperial bounty contributed to the rebuilding.² The emperors had always made a practice of contributing liberally to works of public utility; and churches were now regarded as a necessary part of municipal equipment. As here the Laodicean church was restored *ἐκ θεμελίων*, so Eusebius tells that they were rebuilt *ἐκ βάρων*. As

¹ The earlier part of Eugenius's career evidently had its scene in Pisidian Antioch, the capital of the Province. His wife's family doubtless had their seat in the capital.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, x. 2: compare also x. 6 on Constantine's African donations.

Eugenius mentions the "adornment" or "equipment" (*κόσμος*) of his church, so Eusebius, x. 4, in the panegyric which he addressed to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, on the dedication of the new-built church speaks of "the splendid ornaments of this temple" (*τὰ τοῦδε τοῦ νεῶ περικαλλῆ κοσμήματά*).

We may fairly take the rest of Eusebius's very full description of the church at Tyre as an illustration of what Eugenius did. Paulinus used the old site, which had been purposely polluted with all kinds of impurities, so that the cleansing of it was a troublesome work. In the old establishment, the outer gates (*πύλαι*) had been cut down with axes, the holy books had been destroyed and the church had been burned;¹ but Paulinus built a new, much larger and more magnificent church and series of constructions, surrounded by a wider enclosing wall (*περίβολος*). On the east side he built a large and lofty entrance (*πρόπυλον*), calculated to attract the attention even of strangers and enemies, to astound them by the contrast of the present splendour and the former desolation, to afford them, as they stood far outside, a good view of all that was inside, and entice them to enter. Passing through the outer gateway or Propylon, the visitor or the devotee came next into a wide square space, open to the heavens, surrounded by four covered porticoes supported on columns: from column to column stretched screens of wooden lattice-work.² This atrium is what Eugenius calls a *tetrastoon*.³ In the open space of the atrium there were fountains of flowing water, so that all visitors might

¹ ἐνεπύρισαν ἐν πυρὶ τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

² στοαῖς κίονων πανταχόθεν ἐπαιρομέναις· ὧν τὰ μέσα διαφράγμασι τοῖς ἀπὸ ξύλων δικτυωτοῖς ἐς τὸ σύμμετρον ἤκουσι μήκους περικλείσας.

³ The word *tristoon*, which I proposed in an inscription of the Phrygian city *Akmonia*, has been accepted by Mommsen C.I.L. iii. 12236; it implies either a triangular chamber, or more probably one in which the fourth side for some structural reason, had no stoa. There is such a chamber in the 'House of the Tragic Poet' at Pompeii.

enter the holier buildings purified and not with unwashed feet. Opposite the outer entrance Paulinus made another gateway (*πρόπυλον*) with three gates, the largest and loftiest in the middle. These caught the rays of the rising sun, like the outer gateway. The church itself (*ναός, βασιλειος οίκος, ὡς ἂν βασιλῆς*) was surrounded with porticoes (*στοαί*) on both sides. In the church the holy place (*θυσιαστήριον*) was partitioned off by beautifully wrought wooden screens of lattice-work,¹ to the admiration of spectators. He made the pavement of marble, and on each side he constructed chambers and exedrai for various hieratic purposes of purification, baptism, etc.

The analogy of this contemporary church at Tyre not merely shows what was the arrangement and appearance of the Laodicean buildings, but also proves that the same type was widely accepted in the Christian world of the fourth century. Another example has recently been uncovered in the excavations conducted by Dr. Wiegand at Miletus.² Here also the Propylon leads to an atrium of the usual form ; and through the atrium one enters the church (which has the form of a basilica). A variety of other buildings are grouped closely around, forming one single complex structure. The entrance is from the west, not from the east, as at Tyre.

There was no wall to enclose the whole group of buildings at Miletus ; but this was not required, for the space was contracted and surrounded by other buildings ; hence the ecclesiastical establishment was hemmed in on every side by other structures ; and there was no space as well as no need for a boundary wall.

¹ τοῖς ἀπὸ ξύλου περιέφραττε δικτύοις, εἰς ἄκρον ἐντέχνου λειτουργίας ἐξησκημένοις, ὡς θαυμάσιον τοῖς ὀρώσι παρέχειν τὴν θέαν.

² *Sechster vorläufige Bericht*, p. 28 ff. (Berlin, 1908; *Anhang zu den Abhandl. d. Akad.*).

There is, therefore, no doubt as to the character of Eugenius's constructions. The whole was surrounded by an enclosing wall or peribolos. This wall is implied by the entrance gateway (*πρόπυλον*), and is summed up among the works of masonry, which are comprehensively mentioned at the end of the list.

The gateway in this surrounding wall admitted to an open space in which there were at least two atriums (*tetrastoa* in the plural), or square spaces open to the sky and surrounded by porticoes. The church also was bordered by porticoes. There was a water-tank instead of the fountains of the Tyrian church ; but at Laodicea (which lies close under the hills, and has abundance of running water brought by artificial channels) the tank was certainly filled with water which was always flowing in fresh, and running off at the opposite side. The church and perhaps the atria were decorated with paintings. There remain the *κεντήσεις*, a word not elsewhere quoted in the technical sense here employed. There can, however, be no doubt that Mr. Calder is right in taking the word to denote carved work, made by piercing holes in wood. I should unhesitatingly identify them with the lattice-work screens, which were used at Tyre both in the church and in the atrium.

Eusebius in his panegyric makes no reference to the municipal side of this Tyrian work. He regards it as intended for the faithful alone, and speaks only of its ecclesiastical purpose. The pagan strangers look from outside, and the hope is entertained that the interior splendour may allure them to qualify for entrance. But it is clear that these great structures were intended to be a centre of social life for the faithful ; and, as the cities became entirely Christianized, the church buildings formed the centre of city life generally.

This architectural enterprise must have absorbed all the energy of Bishop Eugenius for the twenty-five years of his

episcopate,¹ and was perhaps the reason why he did not attend the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325 (though the situation of Laodicea on the great road made it easier for him to attend than it was for such distant bishops as those of Barata, Isaura, Vasada, and others in Pisidia and Lycaonia). It was necessary for him to find the workmen and the money, as well as to exercise constant supervision over the work. The well-known letter of Gregory to Amphilochius about the much smaller building which he intended to erect at Nyssa² shows how much depended on the bishop in such a case.

The social and charitable idea which is embodied in Basil's group of buildings at Caesareia might conceivably have been attributed to Syrian influence; and the example of Tyre might perhaps have been quoted as a proof of this origin. But the Laodicean constructions show the same idea in Asia Minor at a date contemporary with the Tyrian buildings. Moreover, it seems clear that Eugenius considered himself to be restoring the church and accompaniments which had been destroyed. Doubtless, the new buildings were likely to be larger and more magnificent than the old, for the Church was now dominant in the land; but Eugenius clearly implies that the same idea of the church with its surrounding constructions had existed before and was restored by him. This type of ecclesiastical centre for the social and common life of the Christian community must, therefore, have been at least as old in Asia Minor as the third century. In fact, as is pointed out in the *EXPOSITOR*, October, 1908, p. 298, this is the original idea of the Christian world. The Church

¹ He may have lived long after writing his epitaph on his tomb, and his bishopric may have lasted some years more.

² It is translated and commented on by Bruno Keil in Strzygowski's *Kleinasiens ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*. This church was only a martyrion or memorial of a martyr; and was a single small church of the usual type.

originated in the house. Meetings were held in the house before they were held in specially constructed buildings. The Church claimed, in opposition to the Empire, to be the parent, adviser and guide of the people—advancing the claim first of all as being the assembly of the saints, the faithful, afterwards as being a monarchically organized body in which the bishop as head was director and representative of the whole community. Hence the church-building was the centre of the common life.

Basil's ecclesiastical and social group of buildings at Caesareia was on such a great scale as to be popularly called "the New City"; and the name clearly indicates this character which belonged to them. It also shows probably that, like other similar groups of buildings, they were surrounded by an enclosure or wall, and so resembled a city.

We trace the same idea, perhaps, in the following century, or, a little later still, at Barata,¹ where two of the churches, No. 1 and No. 7, seem to have formed part of a complex of buildings, one of which at least, viz., No. 7, was surrounded by a wall, and contained a large construction which can hardly have served any other than a social purpose, as an exedra. It is probable that these ecclesiastical establishments were gradually developed into monasteries, or at least formed one of the causes which contributed to the growth of monasteries. In such an establishment as Basil's New City it was necessary to have a considerable staff of attendants and officials. Naturally, these were formed into an order of persons who devoted themselves to the life; and the circumstances of their situation and of the period favoured the growth of a certain character for this class of persons, which fixed itself as the monastic order. The rules were systematized by Basil himself.

¹ See EXPOSITOR, August-October, 1907.

It is clear that Eugenius was (as might have been confidently expected) a bishop after the fully developed monarchical type. He speaks for his church. Action which must have been the work of the whole Laodicean Church is stated by him in the first person singular. He controls the church finances. The expenses of rebuilding may have been, and probably were, in part paid by him, and his birth from a family of distinction suggests that he was in a position to spend considerable sums for this purpose. But it cannot be supposed that the Church finances were not applied to pay in part the expense of the new building. The bishop, when he says "I rebuilt," means that he, as the head of the local Church, the director of its action and the manager of its money, was the constructor of the new buildings.

It is also worthy of note that the form of the epitaph is of the old, native type. It begins with the name of the maker of the tomb, states who he is, and ends with the definition of the legal rights regarding use of the tomb. The denunciation of legal proceedings or the invocation of Divine wrath against the unlawful intruder or destroyer (common but not universal on pagan tombs, and common on earlier Christian tombs) is not added.

The old Phrygian custom was still retained. People commonly prepared their own tomb in their lifetime. Whether the pagan idea was still maintained that the making of the tomb was a religious duty and an act of homage to the deity (with whom the dead are united in death), we cannot determine with certainty. But, if it had fallen out of the memory and heart of some, it was still certainly retained in the popular mind, and it revived again in later Byzantine time (as is pointed out in the last number of the *EXPOSITOR*). In Eusebius and other authorities various incidental allusions show that old customs

of pagan society, especially in relation to graves and sepulchral religion, continued to have a strong hold on the Christians in the early centuries : see, e.g., a passage from Theodoret (Schulze, iv. 923 f.), quoted by Harnack, *Expansion of Chr.*, Bk. IV., ch. iii. § 9B., and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, viii. 6, 8.

Incidentally, it may be observed that this confirms in a general way the dating of Christian epitaphs in Lycaonia, which was advocated in a series of articles in the *EXPOSITOR*, 1905-6. A group of metrical epitaphs which unite the old formula with the new custom, stating at the opening the name of the dead and afterward mentioning who had constructed the tomb, were there dated about A.D. 350-380.

In later life, then, Julius Eugenius, according to the old Phrygian custom, proceeded to prepare his own grave and sepulchral monument. It consisted of *pelta* and a sarcophagus. The curious term *pelta*¹ is probably a native word (used as a neuter, *πέλτον*, in Greek), indicating the basis or substructure on which the sarcophagus was placed : the substructure is called in West-Phrygian epitaphs by various names indicating the whole or parts.²

Following the example of St. Avircius Marcellus, a century and a half earlier, Eugenius caused to be engraved on his sarcophagus a record of his life, and this record has been revealed by Mr. Calder's important discovery. Contrary to the usual custom, the bishop makes no mention of his immediate family except in the vague general phrase of the conclusion (which shows that he had children). He mentions his wife at the beginning in such a way as to suggest that her noble birth was a cause of pride to him ; but he does not say that she was to be buried in the same grave. Possibly, she was already dead and buried at Pisi-

¹ Πέλτα, palisade or latticed barrier surrounding the grave, Keil, *Hermes*, 1908, p. 541. On the term see also Mr. Calder's remarks above.

² βαθρικόν, σύγκρουστον, γράδος, etc. (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., p. 367).

dian Antioch, the city to which her family probably belonged. The bishop's attention, however, was fully occupied in the task of compressing into the brief limits of an epitaph the account of his own career; and we must be grateful to him for bequeathing so noteworthy a record of this critical period, which furnishes so striking a confirmation of Eusebius's historical sense in selecting for record the typical acts and processes of the period.

In the above-quoted article (*EXPOSITOR*, October 1908) it is pointed out that the Lycaonian Christian inscriptions contain no trace of the close alliance between the Orthodox Church and the Imperial government, but show us the former still as the Church of the people. In fact, during the second half of the fourth century the Church was forced into opposition against the Arian tendency of the Emperors. But the alliance was already in process of formation from the moment of Constantine's triumph. Mr. Calder rightly traces it in the Canons of the Council of Arles A.D. 314, and the Council of Nicaea 325. It is difficult to suppose that the stern decree of the latter Council had any connexion with the old times of Diocletian and Maximin. The persons who are there punished with such severe penalties are probably soldiers who retired in consequence of Licinius's decree ordering Christians to leave the army during his struggle against Constantine A.D. 315 and 323. It seems natural and highly probable that some of these may have been tempted to rejoin the standards and to fight against Constantine. In the final struggle, when Licinius was in need of every man, he apparently held out great inducements to good officers and soldiers to return. The Council of Nice denounced very severe penalties against all who thus resumed military service: they were, doubtless, a marked class. This must be regarded as an intrusion of political feeling into Church business. It is true, indeed, that Licinius was the champion

of paganism against Constantine : but though this is quite clear to us to-day, it was by no means so clear to the soldiers of the Eastern legions in A.D. 323. It is highly probable that inducements of many kinds were used by Licinius in his extremity, and that the true issue was hidden. Loyalty to the colours (which was enjoined by the Council of Arles) was a strong motive in 323 ; but the Council of Nice saw in such action only opposition to the right Emperor, the champion of the Faith.

In an address delivered to the Congress of Historical Sciences at Berlin, I spoke of this epitaph as an example of the character of church establishments in the fourth century ; but, in publishing the address in the *EXPOSITOR*, October, 1908, I cut out this part, in order to leave to Mr. Calder the pleasure of first publishing his own discovery. I now print an enlargement of the paragraphs on this subject.

W. M. RAMSAY.