EUSEBIAN FRAUDS IN THE *VITA CONSTANTINI*

T. G. ELLIOTT

ON THE BASIS OF EUSEBIUS' ACCOUNT one might describe the religious character of Constantine, which he says in 1.11 will be his subject, as that of a heaven-sent deliverer, patron, and impartial peacemaker. The nouns can all be accepted. That he was heaven-sent in the manner described by Eusebius is debatable: it can depend on what one thinks of the evidence regarding Christianity in his family, and of Eusebius' conversion story. That he was impartial regarding theological disputes is implied in Eusebius' accounts of the Councils at Nicaea in 325, Antioch in 326, and Tyre in 335. However, in 3.66 Eusebius represents Constantine as banning the books of heretics who were not Arians. In fact, Constantine's council at Nicaea in 325 anathematized Arianism, and its decisions were not tampered with during his lifetime. Eusebius' Constantine was also aggressively anti-pagan and I shall discuss the prohibition of pagan sacrifice which he recounts in 2.45.

I

Other emperors, says Eusebius in 1.24, owe their accession to their fellowmen. Constantine alone was made emperor only by God. Eusebius has nothing on the officers of Constantius, and nothing on the Alamann king Crocus.[1] In 1.22 he had told us exactly how this accession had come about. Constantine had put on his father's imperial mantle in order to conduct his funeral, and after the funeral everyone saluted him as Augustus. The claim that God made Constantine emperor is interesting both in itself and in conjunction with Eusebius' conversion story.

In an earlier discussion of that story (see "Conversion") I did not express a view on whether Eusebius produced it because he misunderstood what Constantine told him or because he wished to mislead. I believe that

Bibliographical survey by F. Winkelmann, "Zur Geschichte des Authentizitätsproblems der Vita Constantini," *Klio* 40 (1962) 187–243. More recent work is noted L. Tartaglia's edition, *Eusebio di Cesarea, Sulla Vita di Costantino* (Naples 1984), and the review thereof by F. Winkelmann in *BZ* 79 (1986) 57–58.

The following works are cited in an abbreviated form. T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981) as *CE*; T. G. Elliott, "Constantine's Conversion: Do We Really Need It?," *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 420–438 as "Conversion"; H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke 3.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites* (Berlin 1934) as Opitz.

[1] On Constantine's accession cf. *Panegyrici Latini* 7(6).5; 6(7).2; Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 24.8; *Epitome de Caesaribus* 41.3.

PHOENIX, VOL. 45 (1991) 2.

Eusebius' story must be fraudulent. The splendour of the conversion theme entitled it to a very large place, not only in the *Vita Constantini*, but in Constantine's own sermonizing. In the latter it does not appear at all. In the former it is brought in along with the story of how God showed Constantine how to make the *labarum*, and requires patent absurdities in Eusebius' account. The fact that the conversion is not mentioned at all in the panegyric on Constantine delivered by Eusebius on the occasion of the *tricennalia*[2] is a clear indication that the conversion theme could not be produced until the emperor was safely dead. It may be thought that presentation of Constantius Chlorus as a Christian rules out the possibility that Eusebius meant to mislead his readers as to Constantine's religious development.[3] However, on his account Constantine was very young when he was taken to the court of Diocletian (1.12), and did not see his father until just before Constantius' death.[4] Both of these points are false, and the claim that Helena had not been a Christian until Constantine converted her was contradicted by Theodoret, perhaps on the basis of statements by Gelasius of Caesarea (3.47; "Conversion," 422 and n. 6). I think that it is much easier to explain the reappearance of Helena after 312 on the basis of Theodoret's account. It seems, therefore, that Eusebius has taken some care, and perhaps much care, to exclude family influence. The effect is to present Constantine as a man whose religion was the result of divine intervention—*caelitus invitatus ad fidem*, as Rufinus was later to put it (*HE* 9.8). The story of how God made Constantine emperor is a fitting introduction to it.

Eusebius' misrepresentation of Constantine's age in about 302[5] harmonizes with Constantine's own misrepresentations in the panegyrics of 307, 310, and 321,[6] and in *VC* 2.51, but not with Eusebius' knowledge based on autopsy in about 302, and not with his knowledge of the date of Constantine's birth when he wrote the work (cf. "Conversion," 425–427). In my earlier article I argued that Constantine had lied about his age in order to avoid answering embarrassing questions about how he, a Christian, had escaped from the court of Diocletian (*ibid.*). That does not supply Eusebius with a motive for accepting Constantine's misrepresentations, for his

[2]H. Grégoire, "L'Authenticité et l'historicité de la *Vita Constantini* attribué à Eusèbe de Césarée," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, Classe des Lettres 39 (1953) 462–479, at 472.

[3]See T. G. Elliott, "Constantine's Early Religious Development," *JRelH* 15 (1989) 283–291.

[4]In 1.20–21 Constantius leaps up from his deathbed to greet Constantine, but obligingly gets right back into it. Cf. "Conversion," 428.

[5]In 1.5 and 4.53 Eusebius gives Constantine's correct age at death (i.e., 64), but in 1.19 he gives his age in 301/2 as about fourteen, and in 1.12 as about sixteen in 303.

[6]T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 40.

Constantine was a pagan until 312. I take it that he had gone along with Constantine on the question of Constantine's age, although it was not necessary to do so once he had invented the conversion. Perhaps this indicates that the conversion was added in a later draft.

The general effect of all of these misrepresentations is that at 1.32 Eusebius has a hero whose imperial office and religion have come straight from God. This was all to the good, but this Constantine lacked the religious motive of the real Constantine for fighting Maxentius.[7] Equal to the task, Eusebius put in 1.33–36, full of the sort of moralizing reasons which might have been obtained from Constantine's own contemporary propaganda.[8] However, he did not quite cover his tracks, because these chapters should have followed ch. 26, not ch. 32. They appear after ch. 32 because it was the conversion story that made them necessary. Even after Eusebius had christianized Constantine, he was in some difficulty with the first war of 316/17 against Licinius, since he did not know of any persecuting activity of Licinius prior to 316. Hence his virtual conflation of the wars of 316/17 and 324 in 1.49–2.18. This presentation differs from the explicit and repeated testimony of Constantine to the effect that all of his civil wars were fought for religious reasons.

II

In his letter to the Caesareans after the Council of Nicaea Eusebius gave his readers to understand the following three things, all of which were false: 1) the Nicene Creed had been modelled on the creed of Caesarea;[9] 2) the *homoousios* was really acceptable, after all, to persons who held his own views; 3) Constantine agreed with his views.[10] Because of doubts regarding the falsehood of the last two points the thing most damaging to Eusebius has been the claim that the creed of Nicaea was modelled on that of Caesarea. Kelly made strenuous efforts to show that it was not absolutely necessary to believe that Eusebius had misled his readers deliberately on this point. However, Kelly was not the first person to read Eusebius' letter carefully, and other readers have had trouble with it because it was meant

[7] 1.26–27. On five occasions Constantine said that all of his civil wars had been part of his christianizing mission. Cf. *VC* 2.28, 2.64; *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints* 22, 25, 26; Gelasius of Cyzicus, *HE* 2.7.35–38.

[8] T. G. Elliott, "The Language of Constantine's Propaganda," *TAPA* 120 (1990) 349–353.

[9] Opitz 22.1–6. On Eusebius and the Nicene creed, cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*[3] (London 1972) 211–230.

[10] Opitz 22.7–16. That Constantine agreed with the anti-Arian doctrinal views of the Council is abundantly clear from three letters which he wrote after it (Opitz 25, 27, 28). The whole idea that he was at all uncertain about the doctrinal issue is due to efforts of scholars to save the credit of Eusebius, and Athanasius.

to mislead, while keeping outright falsehood to a minimum. At Nicaea Eusebius tendered the creed of Caesarea, as Kelly saw, not as a model for the creed of Nicaea, but as evidence in his own defence against the charge of heresy. It is obvious that the *homoousios* was not at all welcome to Eusebius (Opitz 22) and that he had subscribed it because the alternative was confirmation of the excommunication pronounced against him at Antioch by Constantine's episcopal agent.[11] On Eusebius' own account of the matter Constantine required the addition of the *homoousios* to the Caesarean creed (Opitz 22.7). The effect of that little proviso was to make it clear to all the Christians of Caesarea that their bishop's expression of the faith had not been perfect. In view of Eusebius' desperate circumstances and of Constantine's agreement with the doctrinal views of the Council, I am not disposed to accept the claim that Constantine agreed with Eusebius' views. Constantine may have said that Eusebius' most orthodox statements would agree with his own views *if* the *homoousios* were added to them, but that is another matter. Constantine could be polite, and he had no wish to exile more bishops than was absolutely necessary.

The discovery by Eduard Schwartz of the synodal letter of the council at Antioch which excommunicated Eusebius early in 325 (Opitz 18) has not yet led to appropriate scepticism in all quarters about the evidence of Eusebius regarding the Council of Nicaea. Schwartz himself tried to solve the problem presented by Eusebius' evidence by supposing that Constantine thought that the word *homoousios* was susceptible of a variety of (unspecified) interpretations.[12] Such an idea should certainly not be pressed so far as to assume that Constantine deliberately ignored the Nicene anathemas against Arians. During his reign a bishop could not publish Arianism and remain in the Church.[13] The proper response to the discovery of the synodal letter of the council at Antioch is close and sceptical scrutiny of Eusebius' evidence regarding Nicaea.

In *VC* 3.4–24 Eusebius is completely vague about the doctrinal question, says that Constantine's dearest wish was for peace, and makes the most of the controversy regarding the date of Easter. His reader is given the impression that this calendrical disagreement was as important to Constantine as the doctrinal one.

[11] Once Eusebius had escaped from the Council he could say anything he liked about the rigorous scrutiny to which he had subjected the creed of those bishops who had just tried him for heresy.

[12] E. Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts," *ZNTW* 34 (1935) 129–212, at 152.

[13] Barnes (in *CE* 226) claimed that in his letter to the Caesareans Eusebius interpreted "in a fundamentally Arian sense" the phrases "of the substance of the Father" and "being of one substance with the Father." I think that Eusebius' language is too evasive to support Barnes's view. I do not know of any Arian writing during the period 325–337.

Another misrepresentation connected with the Council of Nicaea occurs in *VC* 2.63 and 73 where Eusebius seems to have represented Ossius as an impartial peacemaker in 324–325.[14] This was the Ossius who had interrogated him at Antioch, denounced him as an Arian, and a dishonest one at that, excommunicated him, and taken him to Nicaea to have him required to change his theology (Opitz 18.14–15). Eusebius certainly did not believe his own account of Ossius, and his willingness to praise him indicates urgent business. He must have represented him as an impartial peacemaker because he was representing Constantine as a peacemaker unconcerned about the theological issue, and his readers all knew that Constantine and Ossius worked together. The claim about Ossius shows how little actual falsehood was necessary in order to produce a considerable misrepresentation. In the letter which Ossius took to Alexandria Constantine deliberately concealed the fact that Ossius had instructions to bring back the chief Alexandrian Arians to a council which would condemn their doctrine.[15] Eusebius quotes this diplomatic (and misleading) letter as if it were sincere.[16]

In addition to suppressing the doctrinal discussions at Nicaea in 325, Eusebius very briefly describes the council of Nicaea (or Nicomedia) in late 327 as an additional peacemaking operation concerned with unnamed troubles in Egypt. He had undoubtedly been present at it when Arius subscribed the *homoousios* and was readmitted to communion.[17] This council, which reaffirmed the decisions at Nicaea in 325, was important. Among other things it was the cause of many of Athanasius' troubles from the moment when he became bishop, having set himself against its decision to re-admit ex-Arians who subscribed the Nicene Creed. Eusebius misrepresented it because Constantine's success in procuring Arius' subscription of the *homoousios* was a profoundly unattractive subject for him, and refuted his whole presentation of Constantine's view of Arianism. This council was more important than that at Antioch, which deposed several bishops for

[14]That the messenger was Ossius is agreed on the strength of Athanasius *Apologia contra Arianos* 74.3, 76.3; Socrates 1.7; Sozomen 1.16. The conjecture of B. H. Warmington, in *Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1983* (Kalamazoo 1985, *Studia Patristica* 18.1) 95–97, that the messenger was actually the notary Marianus, does not take the Athanasius passages into account.

[15]Opitz 27.15. That Constantine was referring to Alexandrian Arians is proved by his chilly letter to Theodotus of Laodicaea (Opitz 28), in which he says that Eusebius and Theognis were exiled because they had gone back to their old absurdities. The reference must be to Arianism, not to intrigue with Meletians or Colluthians. It would be interesting to know whether Eusebius of Caesarea received a letter like the one to Theodotus, who had been excommunicated with him at Antioch.

[16]On this letter, H. Lietzmann (tr. B. Woolf), *A History of the Early Church* (London 1961, repr. 1967) 3.115.

[17]For Arius' subscription then of the *homoousios* see Jerome *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* 19–20 (*PL* xxiii, 182–183). The subscription by Arius is, of course, implied by Constantine's later letter to Arius and the Arians (Opitz 34).

Sabellianism (among other reasons) in 326, and which Eusebius was careful to associate with Constantine.[18] Admittedly Eusebius does not say why Eustathius was deposed, but that would have taken him into discussion of the sort of question which he had already avoided. It may also be admitted that the genre of his work may not have called for discussion of theological details, but they need not have been so rigorously excluded. The controversy over the date of Easter was not, and that issue was certainly of much less importance.

In 3.64–66 Eusebius discusses an edict in which the emperor deprived of their churches the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulianists, and Montanists. After quoting an admonitory letter which Constantine sent along with the edict, Eusebius states in 3.66 that by the same law Constantine also banned their books. The location of these chapters implies a date after Eusebius had refused a request by some Christians of Antioch that he become their bishop, i.e., in 327 or later.[19] Now, the Novatians certainly had been excepted from any such law by the time when Eusebius implies that this law was made, as Eusebius knew.[20] Moreover, Eusebius' story of a ban of books by the named heretics is suspicious: no ban is mentioned in the letter which he quotes and which seems to reflect the entire law. Constantine did indeed ban books by a Christian, namely Arius, in an edict of 332 or 333 (probably; cf. Barnes, *CE* 232–233), and when he did so, he said that Arius and like-minded Arians were to be known as Porphyrians so that they might bear the name of those enemies of Christ whose punishment had been a precedent for theirs.[21] There is no other evidence of a Constantinian ban on the books of a heretic. Socrates says that the writings of Asterius were still extant in his time (*HE* 1.36) and Sozomen says that they circulated after Nicaea, and that Marcellus of Ancyra had written against

[18] 3.59–62. For the reason for Eustathius' deposition, see R. P. C. Hanson, "The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch," *ZKG* 95 (1984) 171–179.

[19] 3.59–62. Cf. H. Chadwick, "The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch" in *JThS* 49 (1948) 27–35; T. G. Elliott, "Constantine and 'the Arian Reaction after Nicaea'," forthcoming in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*.

[20] Barnes, *CE* 218 and 224. Following O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart 1919) 177, Barnes says that *CTh* 16.5,2 of September 25, 326 relaxed as regards the Novatians, in accordance with decisions at Nicaea in 325 (i.e., canon 8), this edict quoted by Eusebius, which dates to a period soon after the defeat of Licinius in 324. Barnes agreed with A. H. M. Jones (*The Later Roman Empire, 284–602* [Oxford 1964] 953 ff.) that Valentinian, Marcionite, and Montanist conventicles continued to exist.

[21] Opitz 33. The edict is very well attested. See Gelasius, *HE* 2.36.1–2; Socrates, *HE* 1.9; Cassiodorus, *HE* 2.15; the *Nestorian History* (*PO* 4.279–280); Agapius' *Universal History* (*PO* 7.550–551); a Syriac version translated by B. H. Cowper in *Syriac Miscellanies* (London 1861) 6–7. (These references are from P. R. Coleman-Norton, ed., *Roman State and Christian Church* [London 1966] 1.182.) See also below on *CTh* 16.5,66.

them.[22] Asterius' writings presumably were not banned, even though they caused some trouble. I think it quite unlikely that if Constantine had been in the habit of banning books by heretics he would have been at such pains to assimilate Arius to Porphyry, and only Porphyry.[23] A century later the action against Arius was the precedent cited at the beginning of a law (*CTh* 16.5,66) of August 3, 435, which went on to ban the books of Nestorius.

> Nestorius, the author of a monstrous superstition, shall be condemned, and his followers shall be branded with the mark of an appropriate name, so that they may not misuse the name of Christians. But just as the Arians, by a law of Constantine of sacred memory, are called Porphyrians, from Porphyrius, on account of the similarity of their impiety, so adherents of the nefarious sect of Nestorius shall everywhere be called Simonians, in order that they may appear rightly to have received the name of him whose crime they have imitated in deserting God. (tr. by Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions* [New York 1952])

Eusebius' chronological displacement, his inadequate treatment of the provision regarding the Novatians, and his suppression of the ban on Arius' books indicate that he tried to mislead his readers about this matter. He selected for quotation a letter about an edict which did not mention Arians simply because it antedated Nicaea, inserted it into his text in such a way as to imply that Constantine had no policy against Arianism after Nicaea, and claimed that he had banned the books of the named heretics, instead of those of Arius.

This performance by Eusebius was certainly not a series of accidents. He would have known that the churches of Novatians had been threatened only for a short time, and that he was misleading his readers by implying that the law operated against them late in the reign. He knew all about Constantine's ban on the books of Arius and all about his declaration of excommunication of Arius, because he was one of the bishops at the Council of Tyre (and Jerusalem) which re-admitted Arius to communion in 335.[24] Since Constantine had declared Arius excommunicate in the belief, whether correct or not, that Arius had reverted to Arianism (Opitz 34.17), Eusebius

[22] *HE* 2.23. On Asterius, *RE* 2 (1896) 1786–87. Jerome dated his works (presumably referring to his homilies on the Psalms) to the reign of Constantius. His Arian tract was probably written before Nicaea. Cf. Philostorgius' complaint about Asterius in *HE* 2.14–15.

[23] The connection between actions against Porphyry and Arius was correctly understood by N. H. Baynes in his *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*[2] (London 1972 = reprint of 1931 edition with a preface by H. Chadwick) 29.

[24] Arius' first excommunication had been confirmed at Nicaea in 325. He had been readmitted to communion by the council at Nicaea in 327, and once more excommunicated by Constantine in 332 or 333. Cf. Barnes, *CE* 229–240 and Elliott (above, n. 19).

certainly knew that Constantine treated Arianism as grounds for excommunication. I note here that the vindication (by a papyrus) of Eusebius' quotation of one document[25] does not vindicate his *presentation* of any, and that caution is in order. Given the large amount of material available to him, he did not need forgery in order to mislead his readers about the policies regarding heretics.[26] Eusebius has not gone without credit for his quotations of documents, by which he greatly improved historiography. However, there is no need to believe that the first historian to quote a great many documents had much to learn from his successors about selective quotation or quotation out of context.

The general effect of these misrepresentations is to portray Constantine as a neutral on the Arian question. That he was not such is amply demonstrated by his law (Opitz 33) and letter to Arius of 332 or 333, of which Eusebius makes no mention (Opitz 34). Although the authenticity of these documents is not disputed, scholars are reluctant to admit what they prove—namely, that Constantine was firmly anti-Arian long after the period when he had exerted himself to get Arius received back into communion, in 326–328. Since Athanasius too had nothing to gain by presenting Constantine as orthodox, we are short of such material. Eusebius' suppressions of the Arian controversy seem to me understandable, but I think that the treatment of the law against heretics shows a willingness to invent in order to mislead.

III

Finally there is the question of the alleged prohibition of pagan sacrifice. Despite his criticisms of Eusebius (*CE* 267–271), Barnes defends his "accuracy and probity" and accepts his claim in 2.45 (cf. 3.54, 4.23, 4.25) that Constantine did prohibit it. In his review of Barnes's book H. A. Drake disputed that view, which he thought "central to his thesis of an aggressively anti-pagan Constantine."[27] Barnes replied, restating his position.[28] R. M. Errington recently tried to combine what he thought each scholar had gotten right by arguing that Constantine had indeed made such a law

[25]A. H. M. Jones, "Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius's Life of Constantine," *JEH* 5 (1954) 196–200.

[26]Baynes, for example ([above, n. 23] 25 with n. 71), seems to have dated the edict after 330, when "the Donatists had been left to the judgement of Heaven." It is worth noting here that this fraud is a reason for confidence in Eusebius' quotation, for although he was trying to deceive his reader he did not include his fictitious ban on books in the text of the letter.

[27]H. A. Drake, *AJP* 103 (1982) 462–466, at 464.

[28]T. D. Barnes, "Constantine's Prohibition of Pagan Sacrifice," *AJP* 105 (1984) 69–72.

in 324, but revoked it almost immediately. I quote Errington's view of Eusebius' statement:[29]

> This solution to the problem of apparently conflicting sources over a concrete detail has, of course, wide-ranging general implications for the way in which Eusebius interpreted the authentic documents that he included or made reference to in his panegyric, as well as for its reliability as a historical source in general, which go far beyond the limited aims of this short article. But it might be worth pointing out that this late product of Eusebius' literary activity shows us the good bishop actively and apparently deliberately contributing to the creation of the myth of Constantine by knowingly creating a false impression of his actual practice and long-term policy in the central field of suppression of paganism.

Errington's compromise is attractive, and it can be paralleled by Constantine's relaxation of his law against heretics.[30]

To the present writer it seems that the answer to the problem of Eusebius' evidence regarding pagan sacrifice is provided by 2.60, where Constantine, in urging toleration, says that he understands that there are some who say that the rites of the pagan temples have been entirely removed. Surely this reflects a situation in which he has issued a law which has been construed as a prohibition of sacrifice (whether justifiably or not), and he has decided (whatever he had said earlier) to make it clear that he does indeed allow sacrifice. The question here is not so much whether Constantine ever forbade sacrifice as whether Eusebius deliberately misled his readers regarding the emperor's "long-term policy." I am satisfied that he did, although I believe that Constantine hoped for the death of paganism, as Eusebius clearly implies in 2.60.[31]

IV

The reason for making the dead Constantine into such an aggressive anti-pagan and a neutral regarding Arianism was presumably the hope that his successors would adopt the policies invented. Firmicus Maternus is not the only author from whom Constantius II and Constans could have gotten the advice to ban sacrifice. Eusebius' attention to the Constantinian

[29]R. M. Errington, "Constantine and the Pagans," *GRBS* 29 (1988) 309–318, at 315.

[30]Barnes's argument about the law of Constantius II and Constans banning sacrifice in 341 might be improved slightly by reference to the laws of Constantine and Constantius regarding tax exemptions for clerics. However, the awkward possibility remains that the sons of Constantine used the *Vita Constantini* as their evidence for Constantine's law.

[31]In a recent discussion, "*Superstitio* in the *Codex Theodosianus* and the Persecution of Pagans," *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987) 172–188, Michele Salzman has argued that Constantine and others deliberately used the word ambiguously so that laws against paganism could be applied with more or less force according to local conditions.

dynasty and his pretence[32] that he was a close associate of Constantine are in accord with such a view, as is his treatment of events after the death of Constantine (4.65–75; *CE* 267). However, the near-disappearance of the *Vita Constantini* for several decades after Eusebius' death[33] has removed the possibility of much further argument regarding the use for which it was made.[34]

The present argument deals with several issues which have been basic to the discussion of the problem of the authenticity of the *Vita Constantini*, notably the conversion story and the Arian question. In the past scholars have pointed to them as evidence that Eusebius did not write the work. I regard them as indicators of his purposes—of exalting Constantine to the status of one sent by God, and of implying very clearly that his religious policies were in accord with Eusebius' theological views.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
ERINDALE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO L5L 1C6

[32]Barnes demonstrated in *CE* 265–268 that the relationship between Constantine and Eusebius was not close.

[33]For Eusebius' low posthumous reputation, see F. Winkelmann, "Die Beurteilung des Eusebius von Cäsarea und seiner *Vita Constantini* im griechischen Osten: ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der griechischen hagiographischen *Vitae Constantini*" in J. Irmscher, ed., *Byzantinische Beiträge* (Berlin 1964) 91–119.

[34]The Arians of Sozomen, *HE* 3.19, were presumably using both Eusebius' conversion story and his suggestion in 3.59 that the emperor might become disaffected.