This book focuses on the works of three authors: the *Ecclesiastical Histories* of Eusebius, texts written by a non-Nicene Chronicler, Rufinus, and the writings of Philostorgius. Of these works, those of the non-Nicene chronicler and Philostorgius’ *Ecclesiastical History* are probably the least familiar, though the Greek text of Photius’ epitome has appeared previously in a scholarly edition.1 The fragments of the non-Nicene Chronicler have only appeared as compiled by Joseph Bidez in his 1913 critical edition of Philostorgius’ *Ecclesiastical History*. When compiling the text of Philostorgius, Bidez also included several other texts that demonstrated non-Nicene sources. These texts included the *Vita* of Lucian of Antioch, claimed as an authoritative teacher by some non-Nicene traditions, and the martyrdom of Artemius, as well as fragments by the non-Nicene chronicler. Bidez’ reconstruction of the non-Nicene2 chronicler in turn leans heavily on two Byzantine chronicles: the *Chronicon Pascale* and the *Chronicle* of Theophanes the Confessor. It has long been recognized that there were non-Nicene emphases in, and perhaps even non-Nicene sources for, these two chronicles. Theophanes the Confessor himself substantially reworked sections of the *CP* which he felt showed undue “Arian” influence.3 Given that the *CP* and Theophanes reveal numerous similarities, particularly with regard to non-Nicene material, one needs to ask what kind of source material the two chroniclers were using. In the introduction to their translation of the *CP*, Whitby and Whitby propose that the Byzantine chroniclers Malalas and Theophanes were drawing from a common source, perhaps the *CP*, for their non-Nicene material.4 It is more likely, however, that

---

2 The term Bidez uses is “Arian,” (“Fragmente eines arianischen Historigraphen”) but in keeping with my hermeneutic that this term is increasingly unhelpful, I have continued to use the descriptor “non-Nicene.”
3 This can be seen, for instance, in Theophanes’ discussion of the baptism of Constantine.
4 Whitby and Whitby, xv.
there was a common body of non-Nicene historical materials available to Theophanes, Malalas, and the compiler of the CP.\(^5\) In their introduction to Theophanes’ Chronicle, Mango and Scott are in general agreement with this hypothesis. They dispute that the CP could have been a source for Theophanes, noting that it was not readily available in Constantinople around the year 800 when Theophanes was writing—for example, there is no mention of it in Photius’ Bibliotheca nor does it appear to have been a source for other texts produced at that time, such as Nicephoras’ Short History.\(^6\) Thus it would seem that Theophanes accessed the non-Nicene material either through a single hypothetical chronicle that served as a common source (which the authors refer to as Hypoth. Arian) or from other available sources containing the same material.

Another issue which needs to be addressed is how Theophanes and the CP treat their common source material. By comparing the CP to other extant material, Whitby and Whitby conclude that the compiler was more or less faithful in reproducing sources, and therefore conclude that the chronicler would perhaps be equally faithful in reproducing non-Nicene materials. Yet Whitby and Whitby also caution that “it would be wrong to assume that an origin can, or should, be found for every word: the author was prepared on occasions to think about his material and to adapt it, not necessarily correctly, when he saw fit.”\(^7\) Mango and Scott likewise assert that Theophanes was relatively faithful in reproducing his sources, noting that the Chronicle is a “file” of more than twenty different sources. Despite this, Theophanes is not without his editorial issues—he at times corrects the non-Nicene source material where he thinks it to be erroneous, and the Chronicle contains various doublets and variant place and personal names due to the numerous sources. The question remains, however, as to whether the CP and Theophanes were accessing these non-Nicene materials directly or through various intermediaries. It is most likely impossible to determine this, and, moreover, is not so important for the purposes of this work: the mere existence of a non-Nicene historical tradition is far more important for the issues which are raised in this book. This issue is addressed

\(^5\) Whitby and Whitby, xvi, especially footnote 26.
\(^6\) Mango and Scott, lii–liv.
\(^7\) Whitby and Whitby, xx.