Heather Barkman

The Church of the Martyrs in Egypt and North Africa: A Comparison of the Melitian and Donatist Schisms

Abstract

Although Christianity became a *religio licita* under Constantine in 313, this did not lead to the establishment of a single version of Christianity. Indeed, the end of the imperial persecutions saw increasing tensions between diverse Christian groups and their beliefs and practices. In both Egypt and North Africa, these disagreements hardened into schisms with the emergence of the rigorist Melitians in Egypt and Donatists in North Africa. While mainstream opponents named these groups by their leaders, the groups identified themselves as the "Church of the martyrs." The Melitians remained a minority group while the Donatists grew to become the majority Church in North Africa for much of the fourth and early fifth centuries. This article will compare the main issues involved in each schism in order to provide insight into some of the complex issues facing Christians in Egypt and North Africa in the fourth century. It also addresses the question why the Donatists were able to exert influence within their province than the Melitians.

INTRODUCTION

The martyr was a central figure in early Christian narratives and martyrs were often rallying points for Christians during the formative years of the religion. After the persecutions ended, the martyr continued to play a significant role in shaping Christian identity. However, as Christianity shifted from a persecuted religion to a *religio licita* under Constantine (306–337), the diversity of Christian beliefs and practices came to the forefront as groups differed on how to best frame their identity moving forward. In both Egypt and North Africa, groups emerged who identified themselves as "the Church of the martyrs." In both cases, these groups were depicted as opposing the mainstream Church and came to be identified by the names of prominent leaders; in Egypt, they were called the Melitians, and in North Africa, the Donatists.[1]

1 The names "Melitians" and "Donatists" are pejorative titles given to these groups by their opponents and were not used by the groups when talking about themselves. Rather, both the "Melitians" and the "Donatists" saw themselves either as simply "Christians" or as "the Church of the martyrs." The act of naming the members of a faction after their leader was a common rhetorical tool and represented a step closer to identifying them as "heretics." It also stripped away their identities as Christians and thus made them easier to target (Shaw, 2011: 344). In the

Despite their numerous superficial similarities, the Melitians and Donatists were products of their respective contexts. As such, an examination of both groups reveals important aspects of Christianity in North Africa and Egypt in the fourth century. This article will provide an overview of each of the schisms from their emergence following the Great Persecution, the expansion of their support base, and the groups' confrontations with the imperial government and the mainstream Church authorities. Comparing these two similar schisms will provide greater insight into the way in which religious diversity in Egypt and North Africa influenced the establishment of Christian identity in the broader empire in Late Antiquity.

Both the Melitian and Donatist schisms were particularly affected by the Great Persecution (303–311).[2] Probably as a result of Diocletian's order to imprison all Church leaders,[3] four Egyptian bishops were arrested in 303; in their absence, Melitius, bishop of Lycopolis, entered their bishoprics and ordained bishops to replace them.[4] It is unclear why Melitius engaged in this unconventional (and inflammatory) behavior. Earlier scholars suggest that Melitius may have been driven simply by ambition and seized an opportunity that presented itself.[5] However, others note that the only evidence for Melitius' arrogance and ambition are found in later anti-Melitian works. Thus, it is just as likely that Melitius was motivated by a sincere desire to ensure the stability of the Egyptian Church by replacing the absent clergy.[6] As the power of ordaining new bishops had traditionally been the prerogative of only the Bishop of Alexandria, Melitius' actions were, not surprisingly, seen as the acts of a usurper.[7] Certainly, he must have known that entering these bishops' dioceses and transferring their authority to new bishops presented serious risks.[8]

By the time of the bishops' execution in 306,[9] Peter, the bishop of Alexandria (300–311) had fled from further persecution.[10] The divide between Peter and Melitius intensified as Melitius began ordaining new

interests of clarity and brevity, however, I will continue to use these terms while acknowledging their problematic origins.

2 This persecution has been studied extensively. See e.g. Twomey and Humphries, 2003; Rees, 2004. For primary sources and discussion, see e.g. Corcoran, 1996.

3 Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.6.8–9 (text: Schwartz, Mommsen, and Winkelmann, 1999: 750, 752; translation: Oulton, 1932: 269). Valerian used the same strategy in his earlier persecution, specifically targeting leaders in an attempt to remove Christianity from the empire. On the Decian and Valerian persecutions, see Selinger, 2002.

4 Hauben, 1989: 274; Davis, 2004: 36. Little is known about Melitius outside of his involvement in the schism, as evidenced by the unknown dates of his episcopacy and death. Timbie, 1991: 1585, asserts only that it is "probably" before 332 and Camplani, 2011: 629, gives a date of death of 327.

5 E.g. Barnard, 1973: 182.

6 E.g. Carroll, 1989: 59–63.

7 Bagnall, 1993: 307.

8 The bishops themselves wrote a letter condemning his actions, on which see Stevenson, 1987: 275–276.

9 Hauben, 1989: 274–276.

10 On Peter of Alexandria, see Vivian, 1988. Flight was a common and justifiable response to persecutions and was undertaken by many prominent bishops, who continued to minister to their flocks through letters. Peter justifies his flight in his *Canonical Letter*, citing Matt. 10:23 (*Canon* 9, text: Migne, 1857: 483–488; translation: Hawkins, 1886: 273). For an overview of the justifications for flight in Egyptian Christianity, see Carroll, 1989: 52–55.

clergy who were willing to oppose the imperial ban against conducting services.[11] During the Easter period of 306, Melitius was arrested and Peter issued his provisional excommunication from his place of hiding. At the same time, Peter released a *Canonical Epistle* that exonerated those who resorted to bribery or flight as a way to avoid being forced to sacrifice.[12] Although the exact sequence of events is unclear, it appears to have been only at this point that the issue of the *lapsi* came to the forefront of the dispute between Peter and Melitius. Thus, it is perhaps best to understand the schism as a series of escalating misunderstandings.[13] Following his arrest by imperial forces, Melitius was banished to the mines of Palestine until Galerius' edict of toleration of 311.[14]

Despite the fact that the treatment of the *lapsi* seems to have been only one among many issues dividing the two bishops, the heresiologist Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 320–403) places the disagreement about the readmission of the *lapsi* at the center of his description of the beginning of the Melitian schism.[15] He asserts that it began when Peter and Melitius were imprisoned together in Alexandria during the persecution under Diocletian:

> Melitius was confined in the prison, he and the martyrs we spoke of, with Peter the archbishop of Alexandria … those who had even been forced to partake of sacrifices once they had fallen away, and had offered sacrifice and committed the transgression, applied to the confessors and martyrs for the mercy of penance.… Peter spoke for mercy and kindness, and Melitius and his supporters for truth and zeal. Then and there a schism was started.[16]

By attributing the schism to a disagreement over the *lapsi*, Epiphanius represents a later version of the events promulgated by Melitian sources striving to give their group legitimacy by placing its origins in one of the most significant and divisive ecclesiastical issues of the day.[17] As the issue of the *lapsi* eventually took a more central role in identifying the differences between the mainstream and Melitian Churches, it can perhaps be said that Epiphanius' claims are "historically false but essentially true."[18] In other words, they do not relay the factual origins of the group, but they do demonstrate what the group came to represent.

---

11 Davis, 2004: 36–37.

12 Hauben, 1989: 279. While his lenient attitude towards flight is to be expected since he himself fled to avoid persecution, he went further and imposed a relatively light period of penance for those who lapsed in other ways. For example, those who readily lapsed had previously been obligated to lifelong penance but were now only instructed to add three or four years to the time already spent in repentance (*Canon* 3, text: Migne 1857: 477–480; translation: Hawkins, 1886: 270). For further discussion of the concessions in the epistle, see e.g. Vivian, 1988; 139–172; Bryant, 1993: 329–330.

13 Hauben, 1989: 279.

14 Timbie, 1991: 1585. For Galerius' edict of toleration, see Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 34 (text and translation: Creed, 1984: 52–53). Peter himself was forced to flee again and was martyred in 311. See Brakke, 1995: 5.

15 Many scholars e.g. Griggs, 1990: 99; Bryant, 1993: 329, still focus on the *lapsi* as the central cause of the schism, although Hauben's 1989 article convincingly demonstrates that the issue of the *lapsi* is not what initially caused a split between the Melitian and Petrine Churches. The current consensus is that this explanation should be seen as apocryphal. See e.g. Davis, 2004: 38; Camplani, 2011: 632.

16 Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 68.1.5–3.2 (text: Holl, 1933: 140–143; translation: Williams, 2012: 324–325).

17 Hauben, 1989: 280.

18 Hauben, 1998: 339.

By the time of the Council of Nicaea in 325, there were three Christian groups in Alexandria: the Petrine group, now under the Bishop Athanasius (328–373) and recognized by the imperial government as the legitimate Christian Church in Egypt; Melitius' group which had its own bishops, priests, and churches; and the Arians, who were united by their support for the ideas of the priest Arius.[19] As will be made clear in the subsequent sections on imperial support and conflict with the mainstream Church, the relationship between these three groups would play a vital role in the development of Christianity both in Egypt and throughout the empire.

Unlike the Melitians, the Donatists emerged in North Africa as a direct result of disagreements over the proper way to deal with the *lapsi.* The question of whether or not the *lapsi* should be re-accepted in the Church had been an issue in North Africa throughout the persecutions as prominent bishops debated its merits.[20] However, this debate did not provoke a schism until after the end of the Diocletianic persecution. After Galerius' edict of toleration in 311, the division between the rigorists and laxists hardened into a schism when Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, died. Mensurius had long been unpopular with the rigorist faction because he was said to have condemned the imprisoned confessors.[21] As such, the rigorist faction hoped that they could install a more worthy bishop in Mensurius' place. However, despite the fact that custom dictated that twelve bishops of the region should gather to elect a successor, the tolerant Carthaginians pushed ahead with the election of Caecilian before the rigorist Numidian bishops could arrive in Carthage. The Numidian bishops unanimously opposed Caecilian on the grounds that his ordination was invalid because it was undertaken by a *traditor*, Felix of Apthungi, and on the charges that he denied food to the Abitinian martyrs.[22] In protest, the Numidians (and their supporters in Carthage) elected their own bishop, Majorinus, who was succeeded shortly by Donatus. The installation of two bishops in Carthage clearly demonstrates the starkness of the division that was the culmination of nearly a century of conflict.

Neither the Melitians nor the Donatists emerged as a result of doctrinal differences but rather out of issues related to the persecutions. While the Melitian schism seems to have arisen initially because of the actions of an individual, it spread because many others in Egypt agreed with Melitius' views against the flight of clergy and, later, against the reconciliation of the *lapsi*. Thus, it is reasonable to assert that there existed in Egypt a rigorist tendency similar to the one that was overt in North Africa. In contrast to Melitius' actions against tradition, however, the Donatist schism only emerged in response to the untraditional election of Caecilian. Ultimately, both groups emphasized their origins within the persecutions and their commitment to honoring the sacrifices of the confessors and martyrs by identifying themselves as the "Church of the martyrs."

19 Brakke, 1995: 3–5.

20 For example, Cyprian of Carthage (249–258) advocated for a separation of the faithful from the lapsed, asserting that if Christians entered into communion with sinful bishops, they would be contaminated (Cyprian, *Epistle* 67.3 [text: Hartel, 1871: 737–738; translation: Clarke, 1989: 22–23]). However, Cyprian also allowed reentry into the Church after the persecutions following appropriate periods of penance, on which see *De lapsis* 13, 35 (text: Bévenot, 1972: 227–228, 240–241; translation: Brent, 2006: 116–118, 140–142). For further analysis on Cyprian and the persecutions, see e.g. Burns, 2002; Brent, 2010.

21 Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum* 1.17 (text: Ziwsa, 1893: 9; translation: Edwards, 1997: 16–17).

22 Frend, 1971: 17–21; cf. *Acts of the Abitinian Martyrs* (text and translation: Maier, 1987: 59–92).

EXPANSION AND SUPPORT

Both the Melitians and the Donatists quickly grew in popularity throughout their respective regions, but the unique situation in each province determined the composition of the groups' adherents. While some earlier scholarship portrayed the Melitians as gaining support primarily from the rural indigenous population as a way of voicing their dissatisfaction with Alexandria and its allegedly lax discipline,[23] more-recent scholarship argues that there is no evidence to support a description of the Melitian Church as a rural, nationalist movement.[24] Indeed, Melitian clergy were found in both rural and urban settings, including eventually in the Egyptian capital of Alexandria.[25] The catalogue of bishops and clergy following the council of Nicaea demonstrates clearly that the proportion of Melitian bishops found in the northern and southern regions are the same as they are for the mainstream Church.[26]

The backing of monastic communities was also an important factor and from an early period on the Melitians could rely on a well-organized network of monastic communities.[27] This assisted in the spread of the Melitian Church, as these communities enjoyed a great deal of support among lay followers throughout Egypt.[28] Furthermore, the central Melitian monastic figures had been confessors during the persecutions, thus reinforcing the Melitians' identity as "the Church of the martyrs."[29] Despite their growing popularity throughout monastic circles in Egypt, however, the ideology of the Melitians did not spread throughout the empire and remained a relatively marginal Egyptian phenomenon.[30]

In contrast, the Donatists quickly gained a majority in both rural and urban North Africa. A strong presence in large cities, including Carthage, allowed the Donatists to exercise political power, as is evidenced by the Donatists' ability to convene regional councils attended by hundreds of bishops.[31] Their mainstream opponents relied heavily on the official but distant support that they received from the imperial government and could not claim nearly the amount of local assistance as could the Donatists.[32] Because of their success in North

23 See e.g. Griggs, 1990: 130–131; Bryant, 1993: 330; Brakke, 1994: 411.

24 See e.g. Wipszycka, 1992; Hauben, 1998: 344–345.

25 Hauben, 1998: 346–347. The Melitians were able to elect a bishop in Alexandria in 328. They do not appear to have been able to use their presence there to exercise political power, which is in large part due to its mainstream bishop, Athanasius.

26 Hauben, 1990: esp. 163–167; Hauben, 1998: 344–345. A study of the makeup of the Egyptian Church in general during this period can be found in Martin 1974; for the catalogue, see in particular pp. 32–40 and Bagnall, 1993: 307. There were 36 Melitian bishops and 57 mainstream bishops.

27 Hauben, 1998: 339; Camplani, 2011: 629.

28 Wipszycka, 1994: 1–3.

29 Hauben, 1998: 340.

30 Griggs, 1990: 133.

31 Several of the Donatist councils are discussed in Shaw, 2011: 112, 113–118, 122, 125–130, 154. For example, 310 Donatist bishops attended the Council of Bagai in 394 (p. 126).

32 Brown, 2000: 215. For a brief overview of the growth of the Donatist Church in the fourth century, see e.g. Frend, 1971: 162–192.

Africa, the Donatists sent bishops to lead a Donatist congregation in Rome and established a small community in Spain, but these groups struggled and Donatism ultimately remained a North African phenomenon.[33]

As neither group was able to gain firm support outside of their home region, both the Melitians and the Donatists had limited power within the empire. This was largely rooted in the fact that neither group was formed out of disagreements over more universal theological or doctrinal issues. Their emergence during the persecutions meant that they were tied to these local historical events. As the persecutions ended, and memories of them began to fade, many Christians turned their attention towards other issues.

INTERACTIONS WITH THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT

Despite their essentially local nature, both the Melitians and the Donatists interacted with the distant imperial government. The Melitians' main contact with the state was during the council of Nicaea, an ecumenical council called for and attended by the Emperor Constantine.[34] While the Melitians formed a minor aspect of this council, the official imperial position against the Arians affected the Melitians greatly.[35] First, it is significant that later sources, such as the fifth-century Church historian Sozomen, posit a relationship between Melitius and Arius that predated Arius' controversial teachings.[36] However, Sozomen's charge that Arius was originally a follower of the Melitians is not corroborated elsewhere and should be seen as a rhetorical attempt to unite the two heresies so that both could be discounted.[37]

Whether or not the members of the group were closely associated in the early years of the movements, by the time of the council of Nicaea both were considered to be enemies of the mainstream Church. The outcome of the council was different for each schism: Arius was exiled while Melitius was readmitted into the Church. Although Melitius' reacceptance came with the *caveat* that he was not permitted to regain any official episcopal authority, the fact that he was not further punished, unlike Arius, suggests that the two movements were perceived differently. As the leader of a small schism whose reach did not extend beyond Egypt, accepting Melitius back within the mainstream Church would have been a relatively minor concession to make in the

33 On Donatist communities outside Africa, see Frend, 1971: 164, 169–171.

34 More details on Constantine's involvement in the council of Nicaea can be found in Barnes, 1981: 208–223.

35 As with the Melitians and Donatists, the term "Arian" is a pejorative title given to the group by its opponents. They would have identified themselves simply as Christians. Unlike the Melitians, who came into existence in opposition to Petrine Christianity, the Arians arose out of theological and social differences *within* the Petrine hierarchy. As with the Melitian schism, the exact chronology of events is uncertain. Sometime between 318 and 321 Arius, a priest under the Bishop Alexander, began teaching that the Son of God was not divine in the same sense as was God the Father. Alexander condemned the teachings and excommunicated Arius. However, just as Peter's excommunication of Melitius had not stopped his supporters, neither did Arius' excommunication end the controversy. As with the Melitians, Arius had followers outside of Alexandria and enjoyed support among monks, although the Arian viewpoint quickly spread beyond the borders of Egypt. For further information about these and other issues of the Arian controversy, see e.g. Gregg and Groh, 1981; Kannengiesser, 1982; Williams, 1987; and Gwynn, 2007.

36 See Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.15.1–2 (text: Bidez and Hansen, 1995: 32; translation: Hartranft, 1890: 251–252).

37 For further insight into the relationship between the Melitians and Arians and the literary tendency to conflate the two groups, see e.g. Griggs, 1990: 119–125.

name of unity.[38] It is further significant that there is no evidence of a specifically anti-imperial attitude within the Melitian Church, despite their disagreements with the mainstream Church,[39] thus once again making them less threatening than the Arians.

Constantine's relatively lenient attitude towards the Melitians can perhaps be explained by examining his earlier interactions with the Donatists, which began almost immediately after Constantine's defeat of Maxentius in 312 and the subsequent "Edict" of Milan in 313. As Constantine favored Christianity, this provided the first opportunity for Christians to take their disputes to the imperial level. In 313, the Donatists appealed to Constantine to judge the contested episcopal election.[40] Since, like any Roman emperor, he sought the highest number of supporters possible, Constantine favored an inclusive form of Christianity. Thus, after a series of consultations Constantine ultimately sided with the party of Caecilian.[41] The Donatists' attempt to be recognized as legitimate had the inadvertent affect of making them an imperial enemy.

Unlike the Melitians, who came into contact with Constantine during a later and more stable part of his reign, the Donatists invoked Constantine during a period of strife when his right to rule was still contested and the success of his reign was anything but certain. Between 317 and 321 Constantine attempted to suppress the Donatists using measures similar to those of the persecuting emperors. Imperial authorities confiscated Donatist churches and property, sent bishops into exile, and massacred a congregation inside a basilica.[42] However, this military action only succeeded in solidifying a Donatist identity by creating martyrs around whom the Donatists could unite.

In 321 Constantine called off the persecution. The fact that Constantine did not persecute other schismatic movements in the way he did the Donatists suggests that he realized that this approach could not be successful. Indeed, killing Christian leaders only served to create martyrs around whom the group could unite, while

38 Hauben, 1998: 348. On the Melitians' presence at the council of Nicaea, see Martin, 1974. The imperial focus on unity can further be seen when Constantine readmitted a nominally repentant Arius back into the Church at the council of Nicomedia. However, Athanasius refused to accept the Arians on the grounds that condemned heretics could never receive communion. See Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.18 (text: Bidez and Hansen, 1995: 74; translation: Hartranft, 1890: 270).

39 However, the mainstream Church did not enjoy uniform imperial support, as the emperor could (and did) object to certain practices or specific Church authorities (Hauben, 1998: 348 and n. 175).

40 Greater detail about Constantine's relationship with the Donatist bishops can be found in Drake, 2000: 210–223.

41 Gaddis, 2005: 52. The first hearing took place in Rome in 313, with Miltiades of Rome presiding and ultimately siding with Caecilian. The following year, the Donatists accused Miltiades himself of being a *traditor* and requested a second hearing before bishops from Gaul, whom they thought would be free of contamination since they had escaped persecution under Constantius. Constantine granted this request but the council of Arles in 314 likewise decided against Donatist faction (Gaddis, 2005: 50–51).

42 He may have underestimated the conviction of the Donatists and expected that a show of force would be enough to cause their surrender (Frend, 1971: 159–162; Shaw, 2011: 191–193). Additionally, a war with Licinius was becoming more apparent, meaning that securing Africa became more important than resolving the schism (Gaddis, 2005: 57–58).

sending leaders like Arius into exile made imperial opinion known with fewer side effects. Schismatics who were exiled could later be made to repent; those who were killed became martyrs forever.

The next period of Donatist repression occurred under the Emperor Constans (337–350), who, like his father, sought to strengthen his position by enforcing Christian unity. While the immediate catalyst for his actions is unclear,[43] at some point in 347 Constans issued an edict that called for the forced unification of North African Christianity and sent two officials, Paul and Macarius, to enforce his desires. In the town of Bagai the local bishop Donatus summoned an army of supporters to help defend the Donatists.[44] In response, Macarius received military protection from the *comes Africae*, Silvester, who sent scouts ahead to the town. The Donatists in the city attacked the scouts, and, upon hearing of this, the soldiers were so enraged that they massacred the Donatists. This event seems to have provided the reason needed for a more widespread repression of Donatism by force.[45] However, this period of violence was short-lived, and in 348, Gratus, the mainstream bishop of Carthage, called a council where both factions acknowledged that they had committed errors.[46]

CONFLICT WITH MAINSTREAM CHRISTIAN AUTHORITIES

Clearly, as the two schisms had similar origins and agendas, the disparate reactions of the imperial government reflect broader issues within both the provinces themselves and the empire in general. This difference in repressive tactics can also be seen in the opposition each group faced by members of the mainstream Churches within their respective provinces. In Egypt, the most public opponent of the Melitians was Athanasius; in North Africa, both Optatus of Milevis (mid-fourth century) and Augustine of Hippo (395–430) composed works against the Donatists.[47] Much of what is known about these groups comes through these mainstream writings. Although they are inherently biased, the methods that were used to try to discredit the Melitians and Donatists provide important insight into the way that the opposition viewed the schisms.

The conflict between the Melitians and the mainstream Church is best understood as a disagreement between competing episcopal organizations, in part framed around differing conceptions about the proper way to honor martyrs both through rigor and the willingness to become martyrs themselves, should the need arise. Thus, Athanasius undertook tactics befitting a political struggle, including intimidation through physical vio-

43 The most commonly cited reason is that Donatus, the Donatist bishop of Carthage, approached the emperor following the death of the mainstream bishop of Carthage. He appealed to Constans to uphold the protocol established at Arles in 314 that whenever the bishop of a city died, the next most senior bishop (whether mainstream or Donatist) should be recognized as Primate, meaning therefore that he should become Primate over his mainstream counterpart Gratus (Frend, 1971: 177; Tilley, 1996: xvi). However, Shaw, 2011: 163–164 calls this viewpoint "a modern fiction," saying that it is based on a misreading of Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum* 3.1 (text: Ziwsa, 1893: 67–68; translation: Edwards, 1997: 57–58). Shaw further asserts that it was rather the mainstream Christians, who were often at court lobbying the emperor.

44 Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum* 3.4 (text: Ziwsa, 1893: 81–85; translation: Edwards, 1997: 68–69), on which see Shaw, 2011: 162–167.

45 Frend, 1971: 185; Gaddis, 2005: 106–107.

46 Tilley, 1996: xvii. On the dating of the council, see Shaw, 2011: 820–821.

47 For Athanasius, see e.g. Martin, 1996. For background on Optatus and a translation of his work, see Edwards, 1997. For Augustine and the Donatists, see e.g. Brown, 2000: 212–243 and Shaw, 2011: 587–629.

lence, channeling Church funds in directions more beneficial to him, and installing allied bishops and priests in areas controlled by the Melitians whenever possible.[48] However, while Athanasius occasionally used violence and exile to assert his authority, this was not a persecution like the one that took place against the Donatists.[49]

In addition to physical intimidation, Athanasius engaged in intellectual debates with the Melitians. He composed several works aimed at establishing Church unity by undermining the Melitians and other opposing factions. One text in which his strategies are particularly evident is his *Festal Letter* 39, written around 367. In this letter, Athanasius attempts to establish a closed canon of Christian scriptures, listing not only the acceptable works but also their acceptable interpretations. As the Melitians seem to have used apocryphal texts,[50] this would have served to render their central texts false. Furthermore, identifying specific interpretations of texts allowed Athanasius to delegitimize the charismatic authority of martyrdom upon which the Melitians relied.[51]

The fact that the Melitians derived their authority from the martyrs (and not from the typical Church hierarchy) threatened to undermine Athanasius' position. That they set up a parallel episcopal and priestly structure in the name of the Church of the martyrs would have further antagonized Athanasius. He attempted to revoke the Melitians' authority by linking their actions with both the Jews who condemned Jesus and the Arians.[52] Connecting the Melitians with other undesirable groups was a common strategy employed by Athanasius, who, elsewhere in his writings, stigmatizes a variety of problematic practices by labeling them either "Arian" or "Melitian," regardless of whether or not these practices actually had any affiliation to these groups.[53] The fact that the Melitians chose to align themselves with the Arians made it easy for writers like Athanasius to draw parallels between them, thus obscuring the real sources of the controversy.[54]

In addition to listing acceptable scriptures,[55] Athanasius also condemns apocryphal texts, arguing that they are "an invention of heretics, who write these books whenever they want and then grant and bestow on them dates, so that, by publishing them as if they were ancient, they might have a pretext for deceiving the simple

48 Brakke, 1994: 411.

49 An example of Athanasius' violence is recorded in a letter written ca. 335 by a Melitian to his fellow priests. The letter tells that Athanasius sent men to a military camp where some Melitian priests had taken refuge and subsequently beat some of the priests and sent others into exile. See *P.Lond.* VI 1914 (text and translation: Bell, 1924). While the incident described in this letter is not confirmed by other sources, its contents can be seen as reliable since the writer seems to expect the recipients to be able to verify his accounts with some of the other people involved. Additionally, as it is a private letter, the events in question are less likely to have been distorted for propaganda purposes (Griggs, 1990: 128; cf. Gaddis, 2005: 277). On the other hand, the highly emotional nature of the letter does allow for the possibility of exaggeration and the occasionally confusing aspects leave it open for interpretation (Hauben, 1981: 448).

50 Brakke, 1994: 413; Hauben, 1998: 341–342. On the Melitians' use of apocryphal texts more generally, see e.g. Orlandi, 1982.

51 Brakke, 1994: 417.

52 Athanasius, *Epistula festalis* 39 (text: Elanskaya, 1994: 379–380; translation: Brakke, 1995: 328).

53 Brakke, 1994: 411.

54 Bagnall, 1993: 307.

55 This is the first extant document to list the twenty-seven books that now form the New Testament (Brakke, 1994: 395).

folk."[56] Attributing authorship of the apocryphal texts to the Melitians (here only identified as "heretics") is representative of Athanasius' intellectual strategy for opposing the Melitians; he discredited the group by making their sacred texts illegitimate.

In contrast, the mainstream discourse against the Donatists was more focused on physical violence. As the division between the two groups deepened, the question of Church involvement in anti-Donatist violence became more prominent. Both Optatus and Augustine addressed this issue in different ways. As was discussed above, one of the most noteworthy incidents of violence occurred in 347 in the town of Bagai, about which Optatus writes:

> Whatever harsh measures may have been taken to bring about unity, you see, my brother Parmenianus, who ought to bear the blame for it. You say that we catholics requested military force; if that is the case, why did no one at that time see an armed military force in the proconsular province? Paulus and Macarius were coming to relieve the poor in every place and exhort individuals to unity.[57]

Optatus rejects the Donatists' allegations of mainstream Church involvement in the massacre at Bagai and instead places the blame on the Donatists themselves. He writes that it was Donatus, the bishop of Bagai, who first gathered together a group of armed men, thus causing the imperial representatives, Paul and Macarius, to defend themselves. Since the Donatists caused the escalation of violence, they ultimately caused the deaths of their own people.[58] By employing this strategy, Optatus removed the mainstream Church from the uncomfortable place of being responsible for the deaths of fellow Christians (and therefore for the creation of martyrs). Additionally, the Donatists are depicted as irrational and inherently violent; it was because of their lust for violence that the imperial guards were forced to defend themselves. According to Optatus, there was no persecution of the Donatists and as such no martyrs were created at Bagai. The implication is that all of the Donatists' worship is similarly misguided.

In contrast to Optatus' desire to distance mainstream Christians from involvement in this kind of violence, Augustine writes that violence is sometimes required in order to enact the appropriate change. In *Epistle* 93, written in 407 or 408 to Vincent, bishop of a group derived from the Donatists, he writes,

> If, then, we scorned and endured these people who were once our fierce enemies and who were attacking our peace and quiet with various sorts of violence and ambushes, so that we devised and did nothing at all that might be able to frighten and correct them, we would really have repaid evil with evil.[59]

Augustine believed that the Donatists could (and perhaps should) be made to return to the proper Church through mild persecution.[60] Like Optatus, Augustine describes the Donatists as the perpetrators of violence, but he asserts that the Christians must occasionally respond with more violence in order to influence them to return to the "true Church."

---

56 Athanasius, *Epistula festalis* 39 (text: Elanskaya, 1994: 379–380; translation: Brakke, 1995: 330).
57 Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum* 3.4 (text: Ziwsa, 1893: 81; translation: Edwards, 1997: 68).
58 Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum* 3.4 (text: Ziwsa, 1893: 82–84; translation: Edwards, 1997: 68–69).
59 Augustine, *Epistula* 93.2 (text: Goldbacher, 1898: 446; translation: Teske, 2001: 378).
60 Frend, 1971: 234.

Nevertheless, Augustine also writes against the Donatists and their veneration of newly created martyrs by following Optatus' charge that Donatist martyrs are not true martyrs. In one sermon, illustrative of his argument,[61] he says:

> Blessed are those who suffer persecution for the sake of justice. The addition of these last words distinguishes the martyr from the bandit; the bandit too, after all, suffers persecution for his evil deeds, and he is not competing for a prize, but paying the penalty that is his due. It is not the penalty that makes the martyr but the cause.[62]

Thus, Augustine rejects the existence of Donatist martyrs because they did not die for the proper reason. Their martyrs are like common criminals, not people to be admired. Both the bandit and the Donatists are persecuted justifiably because both engage in evil activities worthy of punishment.

However, the attention Augustine devotes in his sermons to undermining the image of the Donatist martyr suggests that many within his congregation continued to believe that there was something admirable simply in the endurance of pain. Since the Donatist martyrs suffered bodily punishment, imprisonment, and exile just as earlier martyrs had, they could emphasize their continuity with past martyrs.[63] This is what made the Donatists particularly dangerous. Augustine attempts to distance the Donatist martyrs from past martyrs by asserting that their suffering is invalid; it is not undertaken for the right reasons. Augustine is struggling to fight the popular movement by reconfiguring its experience of violence. While Optatus sought to distance the mainstream Church from violence against the Donatists, Augustine tried to reshape and justify the Donatist experience of violence.

CONCLUSION: THE CHURCH OF THE MARTYRS AS A LIMITING IDENTITY

As is clear from the writings of their opponents, an underlying point of tension between the schismatic groups and the mainstream Church was the Melitian and Donatist claim that they alone continued the authentic tradition of the Church of the martyrs. At the beginning of the schisms, the title of "Church of the martyrs" provided an ideal image around which supporters could gather and grow. However, as time went on, and the memories of the persecutions faded, the salience of martyrdom declined. This was less pronounced among the Donatists than the Melitians since the Donatists experienced more violence in the course of the fourth century, but for both groups the ability to respond to their opponents and move beyond the age of the martyrs was central in determining longevity. The different circumstances of the two groups affected the extent to which they could or would want to do this, and the extent to which it ensured their continuing existence.

Athanasius antagonized both the Melitians and the Arians. As a result of this confrontation, although they had little in common either doctrinally or ideologically, the Melitians and Arians chose to unite to face their

61 This argument can be found in some of Augustine's other writings, such as *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 129.11 (text: Dekkers, 1956: 1897; translation: Boulding, 2004: 136). For an overview and list of Augustine's anti-Donatist works, see Tilley, 1999: 34–39. For further discussion of Augustine's writings against the Donatist Church, see e.g. Willis, 1951; Frend, 1971; Bonner, 1963; Brown, 2000; Shaw, 2011.

62 Augustine, *Sermo* 53A.13 (text: Hamman, 1961: 684; translation: Hill, 1990: 83–84).

63 For further discussion of the way Augustine combated the idea that the endurance of punishment was seen as something worthy of admiration, see Shaw, 2011: 613–615.

mutual enemy.[64] Over time, the distinctions between the two groups disappeared. Since the Arians were both more prominent and more numerous outside of Egypt, many Melitians in Egypt came to be called Arians.[65] Thus, while the decision to unite initially would have increased both groups' power, the dominance of the Arian group gradually overtook the Melitians and the Melitians were classified as heretics. Furthermore, as the borders between all groups were fluid, some former Melitians and Arians returned to the mainstream Church. The combination of absorption by the Arians and defections to the mainstream Church resulted in the Melitian schism being reduced to a tiny monastic movement that was largely disconnected from the ecclesiastical organization of Egypt.[66]

After the time of Athanasius, mentions of Melitians in the extant literary sources are connected with monasticism and contain no indication of the number of Melitians or the ways in which their concerns differed from the mainstream Church.[67] Additionally, representations of the Melitians from later writers such as Bishop Constantine of Lycopolis (569–605) rely on Athanasius' descriptions rather than on independent sources.[68] The Melitians' decision to associate themselves with the Arians was a strategy that may have temporarily increased their visibility, but it ultimately overshadowed their central identifying issues, thereby making it difficult to attract new members. In 335 the Synod of Tyre both expelled Athanasius and briefly restored the Melitians to their clerical posts. However, the Melitian attempts to occupy vacant positions within Egypt swiftly led to their recondemnation by Constantine and the exile of the important leader John Archaph.[69] After this brief resurgence, the Melitians fade from view.[70]

In contrast, the Donatists enjoyed greater influence in North Africa. Initially, the fact that they were persecuted solidified their identity as the "Church of the martyrs," as new martyrs continued to be created. These new martyrs helped to draw more adherents to the group and to create a shared memory unique to the Donatists. The Donatist survival even during periods of relative peace was made possible in part because of their conception of themselves as the pure assembly among unclean enemies.[71] This conception guarded against

64 This likely began in 330, when the Melitians sent a delegation to Nicomedia to petition Constantine for the right to worship without repression. There they met Eusebius of Nicomedia, an Arian who was openly hostile toward Athanasius. Eusebius apparently agreed to intercede on the Melitians' behalf if they agreed to unite with the Arians against Athanasius (Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 68.5–6 [text: Holl, 1933: 145–147; translation: Williams, 2012: 327–329]; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.21.1–5 [text: Bidez and Hansen, 1995: 76–77; translation: Hartranft, 1890: 271–272]). Scholars have treated Epiphanius' account as reliable, at least in its characterization of the alliance as strictly tactical. See e.g. Hauben, 1998: 334–335. For an overview of the Melitian-Arian attempts to unseat Athanasius, see Carroll, 1989: 133–139.

65 Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.21.4 (text: Bidez and Hansen, 1995: 77; translation: Hartranft, 1890: 272).

66 Griggs, 1990: 124–125; Hauben, 1998: 341.

67 Griggs, 1990: 124–129. As Athanasius (and others) labeled groups "Melitian" as a rhetorical device, even these identifications must be regarded with some hesitation.

68 Van Minnen, 2006: 76 (n. 66).

69 Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.25, 31 (text: Bidez and Hansen, 1995: 84–87; 96; translation: Hartranft, 1890: 275–276, 280).

70 Carroll, 1989: 144.

71 Tilley, 1997: 23 and throughout.

assimilation or re-absorption back into the mainstream Church, something that the Melitians failed to establish.[72] Whereas the Melitians gradually drifted away from what caused the schism in the first place to the extent that many simply returned to the mainstream Church, the Donatist identification as a pure Church among the mainstream's contagious enemies made such a peaceful assimilation impossible. Thus, the shifting focus from the worship of martyrs to include a self-identification as a *collecta* ensured the Donatist survival long after the persecutions had ended.[73]

The comparison of the Melitian and Donatist schisms provides an opportunity to examine the central issues involved in the emergence, establishment, and marginalization of religious divisions in early Christianity. The persecution of the Donatists gave them more time to shape their discourse and gain adherents. As a result, they were better able to adapt to their changing circumstances and survive as a distinct group. In contrast, the Melitians were not persecuted violently but instead were encouraged to rejoin the mainstream Church largely through rhetorical means and political pressure. Instead of seeking to establish themselves as a separate entity, they joined forces with the Arians against their common enemies, Athanasius and the mainstream Church. The association of the Melitians with the more dominant Arians resulted in a blurring of the boundaries between the two groups and a loss of what made the Melitians distinct. Ultimately, both the Melitians and the Donatists remained local schisms that were unable to spread throughout the empire. However, their presences in Egypt and North Africa influenced the way that important thinkers such as Athanasius and Augustine understood and wrote about their Christianity. In this sense, ironically, the Melitians and Donatists did ultimately transcend their provincial borders and remain important subjects of study in the development of early Christianity.

72 However, the martyr continued to be of central importance to Donatist self-identity even during times of peace, as is evidenced by the fact that Augustine writes against them in part by delegitimizing their martyrs. The continued salience of the earlier martyr imagery, in conjunction with the new self-conception as a ritually pure assembly, helped to establish firmer boundaries between the Donatists and the mainstream Church.

73 Tilley, 1997: 30–34. Nevertheless, the Donatists fade from view during the time of the Vandal invasions in the mid-fifth century, as North Africans' attentions understandably shifted elsewhere. For an analysis of Donatism after the Vandal invasion, see e.g. Markus, 1964 and 1994.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bagnall, R.S. 1993. *Egypt in Late Antiquity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barnard, L.W. 1973. "Athanasius and the Melitian Schism in Egypt." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 59: 181–189.

Barnes, T.D. 1981. *Constantine and Eusebius.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bell, H.I. 1924. *Jews and Christians in Egypt: The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy.* London: Greenwood.

Bévenot, M. 1972. *Sancti Cypriani episcopi opera*, vol. 1. Brepols: Turnhout.

Bidez, J., Hansen, G.C. 1995. *Sozomenus, Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Bonner, G. 1963. *Saint Augustine of Hippo.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Boulding, M. 2004. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century. Vol. 3/20: Expositions of the Psalms (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*) 121–150.* Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.

Brakke, D. 1994, "Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria's Thirty-Ninth *Festal Letter*." *Harvard Theological Review*, 87: 395–419.

———. 1995. *Athanasius and Asceticism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2010. "A New Fragment of Athanasius's Thirty-Ninth *Festal Letter*: Heresy, Apocrypha, and the Canon." *Harvard Theological Review* 103: 47–66.

Brent, A. 2006. *St Cyprian of Carthage. On the Church: Select Treatises.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

———. 2010. *Cyprian and Roman Carthage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. 2000. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bryant. J.M. 1993, "The Sect-Church Dynamic and Christian Expansion in the Roman Empire: Persecution, Penitential Discipline, and Schism in Sociological Perspective." *British Journal of Sociology*, 44: 303–339.

Burns, J.P. Jr. 2002. *Cyprian the Bishop.* London: Routledge.

Camplani, A. 2011. "Melitianer." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 24. Edited by Klauser, T., et al. Stuttgart: Hiersemann: 630–638.

Carroll, S. 1989. *The Melitian Schism: Coptic Christianity and the Egyptian Church.* PhD diss., Miami University.

Clarke, G.W. 1989. *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*, vol. 4. New York: Newman.

Corcoran, S. 1996. *The Empire of the Tetrarchy: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284–324.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Creed, J.L. 1984. *Lactantius: De mortibus persecutorum.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Davis, S. 2004. *The Early Coptic Papacy: The Egyptian Church and Its Leadership in Late Antiquity.* Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.

Dekkers, E. 1956. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos*, vol. 3. Turnhout: Brepols.

Drake, H.A. 2000. *Constantine and the Bishops.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edwards, M. 1997. *Optatus: Against the Donatists.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Elanskaya, A.I. 1994. *The Literary Coptic Manuscripts in the A.S. Pushkin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow.* Leiden: Brill.

Frend, W.H.C. 1971. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gaddis, M. 2005. "*There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ": Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goldbacher, A. 1898. *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae*, vol. 2. Vienna: Tempsky,

Gregg, R.C. and Groh, D. 1981. *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Griggs, C.W. 1990. *Early Egyptian Christianity from Its Origins to 451 C.E.* Leiden: Brill.

Gwynn, D.M. 2007. *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the "Arian Controversy."* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamman, A. 1961. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina, supplementum*, vol. 2. Paris: Garnier.

Hartel, J. 1871. *S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani opera omnia.* Vienna: Apud C. Geroldi filium.

Hartranft, C. 1890. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series.* Vol. 2: *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen.* New York: Christian Literature Publishing.

Hauben, H. 1981. "On the Melitians in P. London VI (P.Jews) 1914: The Problem of *papas* Heraiscus." In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology, New York, 24–31 July 1980.* Edited by Bagnall, R.S., et al. Oxford: Oxbow: 447–456. Reprinted in Hauben, H. 2012. *Studies on the Melitian Schism in Egypt (AD 306–335).* Farnham: Ashgate Variorum: Ch. I.

———. 1989. "La première année du schisme mélitien (305/306)." *Ancient Society*, 20: 267–280. Reprinted in Hauben, H. 2012. *Studies on the Melitian Schism in Egypt (AD 306–335).* Farnham: Ashgate Variorum: Ch. III.

———. 1990. "Le catalogue mélitien réexaminé." *Sacris Erudiri*, 31: 155–167. Reprinted in Hauben, H. 2012. *Studies on the Melitian Schism in Egypt (AD 306-–335).* Farnham: Ashgate Variorum: Ch. IV.

———. 1998. "The Melitian 'Church of the Martyrs': Christian Dissenters in Ancient Egypt." In *Ancient History in a Modern University*, vol. 2. Edited by Hillard, T.W., et al. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans: 329–349. Reprinted in Hauben, H. 2012. *Studies on the Melitian Schism in Egypt (AD 306–335).* Farnham: Ashgate Variorum: Ch. VII.

Hawkins, J.B.H. 1886. *Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 6: Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius the Great, Julius Africanus, Anatolius and Minor Writers, Methodius, Arnobius.* New York: Christian Literature Publishing.

Hill, E. 1990. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century.* Vol. III/3: *Sermons 51–94.* New York: New City Press.

Holl, K. 1933. *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, vol. 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Kannengiesser, C. 1982. *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis.* Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union and University of California.

Maier, J.-L. 1987. *Le dossier du Donatisme*, vol. 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Markus, R.A. 1964. "Donatism: The Last Phase." In *Papers Read at the First Winter and Summer Meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society.* Edited by Dugmore, C.W., Duggan, C. Leiden: Brill: 118–126. Reprinted in Markus, R.A. 1983. *From Augustine to Gregory the Great: History and Christianity in Late Antiquity.* London: Variorum: Ch. VI.

———. 1994. *Sacred and Secular: Studies on Augustine and Latin Christianity.* London: Ashgate.

Martin, A. 1974. "Athanase et les Mélitiens (325–335)." In *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie.* Edited by Kannengisser, C. Paris: Beauchesne: 31–62.

———. 1981, "Aux origines de l'Église copte. L'implantation et le développement du christianisme en Égypte (I^er^–IV^e^ siècle)." *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 83: 33–56.

———. 1996. *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373).* Rome: École française de Rome.

Migne, J.-P. 1857. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, vol. 18. Paris.

Orlandi, T. 1982. "A Catechesis against Apocryphal Texts by Shenute and the Gnostic Texts of Nag Hammadi." *Harvard Theological Review*, 75: 85–95.

Oulton, J.E.L. 1932. *Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rees, R. 2004. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Schwartz, E., Mommsen, T., Winkelmann, F. 1999. *Eusebius Werke. 2. Band 2. Teil: Historia Ecclesiastica*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Selinger, R. 2004. *The Mid-Third Century Persecutions of Decius and Valerian.* Frankfurt: Lang.

Shaw, B. 2011. *Sacred Violence: African Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stevenson, J. 1987. *A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to A.D. 337.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Teske, R., 2001. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century. Vol. II/1: Letters 1–99.* Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.

Tilley, M.A. 1996. *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

———. 1997. "Sustaining Donatist Self-Identity: From the Church of the Martyrs to the *Collecta* of the Desert." *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 5: 21–35.

———. 1999. "Anti-Donatist Works." In *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia.* Edited by Fitzgerald, A.D. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans: 34–39.

Timbie, J. 1991. "Melitius." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5. Edited by Atiya, A.S. New York: McMillan. 1585.

Twomey, D.V. and Humphries, M., eds. 2003. *The Great Persecution.* Dublin: Four Courts Press.

Van Minnen, P. 2006. "Saving History? Egyptian Hagiography in Space and Time." In *The Encroaching Desert: Egyptian Hagiography and the Medieval West.* Edited by Dijkstra, J.H.F. and van Dijk, M. Leiden: Brill: 57–92.

Vivian, T. 1988. *St. Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Williams, F. 2012. *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2nd rev. ed., vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.

Williams, R. 1987. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition.* London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.

Willis, G. 1951. *St. Augustine and the Donatist Church.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Wipszycka, E. 1992. "Le nationalisme a-t-il existé dans l'Égypte byzantine?" *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, 22: 83–128. Reprinted in Wipszycka, E. 1996. *Études sur le Christianisme dans L'Égypte de L'Antiquité Tardive.* Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum: 9–61.

———. 1994. "Le monachisme égyptien et les villes." *Travaux et mémoires*, 12: 1–44. Reprinted in Wipszycka, E. 1996. *Études sur le Christianisme dans L'Égypte de L'Antiquité Tardive.* Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum: 281–336.

Ziwsa, C. 1893. *S. Optati Milevitani libri VII*. Vienna: Tempsky.

Heather Barkman
PhD-candidate
Department of Classics and Religious Studies
University of Ottawa