

Bulgaria the hatred against the Jews is so great that, on the evacuation of Rustchuk by the Turks, the Bulgarians sent a deputation requesting the Russian commander to expel the whole Jewish community and to plunder their shops. The liberal movement of Roumania was dictated partly by a desire to obtain the sympathy of Western Europe; for until recently persecution of the Jews was carried on as vigorously there as in the neighbouring countries. Between Roman Catholics and Protestants the ancient feud has lost some of its bitterness. In Scotland and England the legal emancipation of the Catholics in 1829 has been followed by social changes of great importance, the extent of which may be estimated by the little opposition which was offered to the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Scotland in 1878. In Prussia and throughout the German empire there has been a recrudescence of animosity between the confessions; but it is to be observed that the contest is rather between the state and a political party than between the Catholics as Catholics and the Protestants as Protestants. In fact, it is only part of a wider contest which is being fought under varying forms throughout the greater part of Europe, as to whether the state or the church is to be the dominant power. Many of the measures which the Government has adopted have certainly led to what is practically religious persecution; but this persecution is totally different in its character from the persecutions of the Huguenots in the 17th century. The most extreme exertions of power have been the suppression of religious communities, the removal and appointment of priests and bishops by the civil authorities, the prohibition of religious processions, and in 1876 the closing of all Catholic schools and the assertion of complete state control over all church property. In Switzerland the movement was similar; the Old Catholic party was recognized by the state in 1875, and the cathedrals of Bern and Geneva handed over to its clergy. In Belgium the Liberal and Protestant minority have excited violent disturbances in several cities, as Ghent and Brussels, and the social fermentation has been carried to dangerous extremes; but by the constitution there is full religious liberty, all the churches are subsidized by the Government, and by a curious anomaly the heaviest subsidy is paid to the weakest denomination. The relations established between Italy and the pope, by the absolute irreconcilability of their territorial claims, has naturally led the Italian Government to adopt a strongly anti-ecclesiastical policy: the state religion is Roman Catholicism, but the suppression of monasteries has been vigorously carried out, and religious processions outside of the churches can only take place by special permission of the prefects. The constitution sanctions full religious liberty. In France Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews all receive grants from the public treasury. The Russian Government exercises its authority in favour of the Greek church in a way that frequently infringes on the liberties of other religionists, and no secession can take place from

the pale of the establishment; but at the same time the profession of any creed is legally allowed. Spain, by the last of her many revolutions, has taken a step backwards: private worship is still permitted to non-Catholic religions, and foreigners are considered inviolable, but all public manifestations, by printed notices, emblems, or otherwise, are strictly prohibited.

It has happily become impossible for even the most retrograde of nations to recall the days of the Inquisition,—a fact that is at least partly due to the influence of another great movement, which may be distinguished as humanitarianism. This movement is evident in so many departments of thought and action, here introducing a less painful process of killing into the slaughter-house, and there affecting the decision of questions of speculative theology, that only a few suggestive facts need be mentioned. The penal codes of all European nations have been cleared of most of their mediæval barbarism; and the infliction of direct physical suffering is reserved for the more brutal class of criminals. Instruments of torture are mere antiquarian curiosities. The punishment of death, once the common penalty for trivial and heinous offences, already appears to many minds as altogether inhuman, and has been completely abolished or discontinued in Holland, Belgium, Portugal, Switzerland, and Roumania. The bill for its abolition in Italy in 1875 was lost by 73 to 36, and the district of Tuscany, which had adopted the abolition about twenty years before, was forced to conform to the general law. In 1876, however, the committee for the revision of the penal code unanimously voted for the abolition. The introduction of private instead of public executions is a step in the same direction, though like many other partial measures it may delay the complete disuse of capital punishment. Mention may also be made of the amelioration of prison discipline, of the magnificent progress in the treatment of the insane which has been effected by the philanthropists of the last two generations, of the enormous increase which has taken place in the number of our hospitals, asylums, and benevolent institutions, and of the growing attention that is paid to relief of the sufferings of the lower animals. Whatever be the wisdom of the measure, the law of 1876 in England in regard to vivisection speaks volumes for the advance of the humanitarian movement. In this respect as in others the various European nations are in very different stages: while the English magistrate is fining a collier or carter for lending his countenance to a cockfight, the Spanish magistrate is applauding the exploits of a *picador* or *matador*. That we are approximating to a unity of sentiment is shown among other things by the support which has been given to the Geneva convention for the mitigation of the sufferings of the wounded in war, which was formed in 1864 by the representatives of Baden, Belgium, Denmark, France, Hesse, Italy, the Netherlands, Prussia, Switzerland, and Württemberg, and which has since obtained the adhesion of Greece, Great Britain, and Turkey. (H. A. W.)

## INDEX.

Animals, 693; domestic, 696.  
Birds, 694.  
Botany, 690.  
Boundaries, 681.  
Canals, 710.  
Charlemagne, empire of (with map), 714.  
Cities, population of, 7.5.  
Climate, 689.  
Coast-line, 681.  
Commerce, 707.  
Countries, table of, 703.  
Crusades, period of (with map), 715.  
Cultivated plants, 691.  
Debts, national, 706.  
Domestic animals, 696.  
Earthquakes, 683.

Education, 710.  
Ethnology, 697.  
Extent, 681.  
Fishes, 695.  
Forests, 692.  
Geological formations, 687.  
Highlands and lowlands, ratio of, 683.  
Humanitarianism, 720.  
Industries, 707.  
Insects, 695.  
Internationalism, 719.  
Lakes, 687.  
Land and sea, changes of, 682.  
Languages, 699.  
Mammals, 693.  
Manufactures, 702.

Metals, 688.  
Military forces, 705.  
Minerals, 688.  
Mountains, 684.  
National debts, 706.  
Nationalism, 718.  
Naval forces, 706.  
Plants, cultivated, 691.  
Political divisions, 702; historical changes in, 713-718.  
Population, 704.  
Races, 697.  
Railways, 709.  
Rainfall, 689.  
Relief, 683.  
Religion, 712.

Reptiles, 695.  
Rivers, 684; table of, 686.  
Roman empire (with map), 713.  
Sea and land, changes of, 682.  
Sexes, proportions of, 704.  
Shipping, commercial, 707.  
Snow-line, 690.  
Telegraphs, 709.  
Tendencies, general, 718.  
Territorial distribution, changes of, 713-718.  
Tolerant, 719.  
Universities, 711.  
Volcanoes, 683.  
Winds, 690.  
Zoology, 692.

EURYDICE. See ORPHEUS.

EURYMEDON, an Athenian general, who, in the 5th year of the Peloponnesian war, 428 B.C., was sent by the Athenians, with a fleet of 60 vessels, to intercept the Peloponnesian fleet which was sailing to attack Corcyra, at that time rendered defenceless through internal feuds. On his arrival he found that Nicostratus with a small squadron from Naupactus had placed the island in security, but he took the command of the combined fleet, which, however, the absence of the enemy prevented from achieving any other end than merely to countenance and support by its presence the cruelties inflicted by the democratic party on their political opponents. In the following summer, in joint command along with Hippocles of the land forces of the Athenians, he, in concert with the fleet commanded by Nicias, ravaged the district of Tanagra; and in 425 B.C., conjointly with Sophocles, he was sent in command of an expedition destined for Sicily. After leaving they learned that the enemy's fleet was at Corcyra, but they were delayed by stormy weather from arriving there in time to attack them. They had been commanded in any case to touch at Corcyra, in order to deliver the democratic party from the attacks of the oligarchical exiles, who had taken up a position on a hill near the city, and were threatening it with capture. On the arrival of the Athenian fleet the oligarchical leaders surrendered themselves on condition that they should be sent to Athens to be judged; but they were treacherously induced to make an attempt to escape, and on that account were delivered up to the fury of their opponents. Eurymedon then proceeded to Sicily, but immediately on his arrival there a pacification was concluded by Hermocrates, to which Eurymedon and Sophocles were induced to agree. The terms of the pacification did not, however, satisfy the Athenians, who attributed its conclusion to bribery, and punished two of the chief agents in the negotiation by banishment; while Eurymedon was sentenced to pay a heavy fine. In 414 Eurymedon, sent with Demosthenes to reinforce the Athenians at the siege of Syracuse, was defeated and slain in the first of two battles fought before its walls.

EURYSTHEUS. See HERCULES.

EUSEBIUS, of Caesarea, surnamed Pamphilus, i.e., the friend of Pamphilus, and well known as the father of ecclesiastical history, was born probably in Palestine about the year 265. The date of his birth is, however, uncertain, and varies between 260 and 270. We know little of his youth beyond the fact that he was a diligent student of sacred literature, his biography by his episcopal successor Acacius having perished. It was as a student, and probably as holding some inferior office in the church at Caesarea, that he became connected with Pamphilus who was at the head of a theological school there, and devoted himself to the collection of a church library, especially to the care and defence of the writings of his great master Origen. In the course of the Diocletian persecution, which broke out in 303, Pamphilus was imprisoned for two years, and finally suffered martyrdom. During the time of his imprisonment (307-9) Eusebius distinguished himself by assiduous devotion to his friend, spent days with him in affectionate intercourse, and is supposed to have actively assisted him in the preparation of an apology for Origen's teaching, which survives in the Latin of Rufinus (*Routh, Reliq.*, iv. 339). After the death of Pamphilus, Eusebius withdrew to Tyre, where he was kindly received by the Bishop Paulinus, and afterwards, while the Diocletian persecution still raged, went to Egypt, where he was imprisoned, but soon released. His release at the time suggested an accusation made against him more than twenty years afterwards by Pctamon, the fiery bishop of Heraclea, that he had apostatized. "Who art thou, Eusebius," exclaimed Pctamon at the famous

council of Tyre, which condemned Athanasius, "to judge the innocent Athanasius. Didst thou not sit with me in prison in the time of the tyrants? They plucked out my eye for my confession of the truth; thou camest forth unhurt. How didst thou escape?" The coarseness of the accusation, however, was only in the spirit of the times, and it rests on no evidence whatever. The elevation of Eusebius to the see of Caesarea so soon afterwards, in 310 at latest—probably 313—is of itself sufficient to dispose of any such charge. Here Eusebius laboured and became a conspicuous figure in the church till the year of his death, 340. The patriarchate of Antioch was put within his offer in 331, but he preferred the less eminent sphere associated with his early studies and friends, and as probably more congenial to his literary tastes and pursuits.

The character of Eusebius, both as a man and a theologian, is intimately bound up with the part which he took at the council of Nicea, and afterwards in the great controversy connected with the work of that council. His conduct and his views have been differently judged, according to the estimate which later critics have formed of the merits of this controversy, and the dogmatic prejudices which on one side or the other it is apt to engender. Dr Newman, for example, in his history of the Arians in the 4th century, speaks of him as "openly siding with the Arians, and sanctioning and sharing their deeds of violence," while most Anglican scholars, from Bull and Cave to Dr Samuel Lee of Cambridge, who translated the *Theophania* of Eusebius in 1843 from a recently recovered Syriac MS., have warmly defended his orthodoxy. The same division of opinion regarding him has prevailed more or less in other quarters, and even in the age succeeding his own. It is only in the scientific theology of Germany, and especially in Dorn's great work on the *Person of Christ*, that his true theological position can be said to have been made clear. He was certainly not Arian, however he may have defended Arius personally, any more than he was Athanasian. He was really the representative of the indeterminate theology of the church on the great point in dispute, before the lines of controversy on the one side and the other had hardened into the formula which have become identified with the two positions known as Arianism and Athanasianism. To judge and still more to condemn him from one side or the other is to mistake the law of the historical development of dogma, and to apply to him conclusions which belong to a later type of thought than that in which he had been trained. This will be best seen by a brief explanation of his stand-point, both personal and theological, throughout the controversy.

When the Arian controversy broke forth, about 319, Arius, who possibly may have known something of Eusebius during his stay in Egypt, besought his intervention to pacify the misunderstanding between him and his bishop, Alexander. Eusebius responded so far as to write two letters to Alexander explaining that Arius was misrepresented (Fragm. in Mansi, xiii. 316). This fact is of interest, as showing his natural attitude in the controversy before the calling of the council of Nicea. At this council he attended as the special friend of Constantine, whom he was appointed to receive with a panegyric oration, and at whose right hand he enjoyed the honour of sitting. Not only so, but he prepared and submitted the first draft of the creed which was afterwards, with well-known and significant additions, adopted by the council. The whole difference between Eusebius and the Athanasians centred in these additions, and in fact in the famous expression "Homousion"—"of the same substance" which was judged necessary by the council to express the true relation of the Father and the Son. He resisted this expression to the last, and only at length accepted it and subscribed the creed



at the dictation of the emperor. After the Council he continued to identify himself with the fortunes of the Arian rather than of the Athanasian party, and his great favour at court and his influence with the imperial authorities enabled him to protect the one party at the expense of the other. It is this personal attitude which has mainly identified him with Arianism. In so far as he was a partisan, and lent himself to the persecution of the "orthodox" or Athanasians, the conduct of Eusebius is deserving of the censure that has been bestowed upon it. But it is to be remembered that from his own theological stand-point he was disposed to regard the treatment of Arius by his opponents as indefensible, and to consider his opinions as tenable within the church. In short the Athanasians were to him the innovators in doctrine rather than Arius, who only maintained a stand-point that many had held in the church before him, even if he restlessly drew unfounded conclusions from it, whereas the Athanasian development evidently appeared to Eusebius to go beyond the older and less determinate doctrine in which he had been trained. The special defect of Eusebius seems to have been a lack of that spiritual and speculative insight which sees the true drift of opinions, and detects below the surface of language a true from a false line of development of Christian thought. As Dorner says of the theological position at the time, it was clear that the church had arrived at a point at which it could not stand still, but must choose one or other of two courses,—either to take a step in advance and define the indefinite, or to go backwards either into heathenism or into Judaism.

The opinions of Eusebius himself may be summarized as follows. God is with him One, or the Monas, exalted in his supreme essence above all plurality. He is Being absolutely, τὸ ὄν, or the primal substance, ἡ πρώτη οὐσία. Thus essentially conceived, God is infinitely above the world, His relation to which is in and through the Son, "who is the image of the invisible, the first born of every creature" (Col. i. 15). He would have substituted the Greek of the latter expression, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, instead of the formula finally adopted in the Nicene creed, that the Son is ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ, "of the same substance with the Father." But in no sense did he recognize the Son as Himself a creature or as sprung like other creatures, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. He was not "the same as the Father, of equal power and glory," because the idea of the Divine is conceivably complete in God as One; but He was begotten of the Father before all worlds or æons. He was in a true sense ἀνάρχος, "without beginning in time." Eusebius repudiated therefore the Arian formula, "There was a time when the Son was not," he could even say, "the Son was always with the Father," τῷ πατρὶ ὡς ἕνδι πάντος συνόντα (Dem. Ev., 4, 8), yet he shrunk from calling the Son συναίδιος or "co-eternal" with the Father. While holding, in short, in his own sense to the true divinity of the Son, he shrunk from attempting to define either with the Arians or the Athanasians the relation between the Father and the Son, as beyond human conception. The nearest image by which the relation could be conceived was that of εὐωδία (Dem. Ev., 4, 3), or the relation between a flower and its perfume. He seems to have preferred this to the image of light and its brightness, or "light of light,"—although both this phrase and the associated phrase "God of God" surviving in the Nicene creed were in the original "profession of faith" which he submitted to the council. From this brief statement it is evident that Eusebius was not himself doctrinally an Arian, however he may have favoured the Arian party. He was separated from it on the essential point, that the Son was in no sense a creature or made, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. The name Exouontian, by which the Arians came to be specifically known, could never have been

applied to him. On the other hand, he is separated from the Athanasians chiefly by the twofold conception of Deity, now as the semi-Platonic Monas or ὄν, abiding in unapproachable self-existence, and now as the Divine Father self-revealing Himself in the Son, and in the world created by the Son. As his mind dwelt on the idea of Deity pure and simple, or as absolute Being, he seems to have recoiled from the identity of the Supreme God with the Logos; but as he dwelt on the idea of the Divine in relation to the world, he saw in the Logos or Son the full expression of the Divine—the organ or power through whom all created existence is called into being. There is, in other words, with him a "sensus eminens" in which God is One, alone in power and glory; but the Christian or revealed conception of God is nevertheless acknowledged by him as Trinitarian. According to Dorner's explanation of the Eusebian theology, "God's being a Trinity depends on His will. At the same time this does not mean that God might be other than Trinitarian, for it is impossible to God not to will the perfect."

These views of Eusebius are chiefly contained in his well-known *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in the first book of his lately discovered treatise on the *Theophania*, and in his treatise against Marcellus, who in extreme reaction from Arianism taught a doctrine approaching Sabellianism.

It only remains further to add that Eusebius is undoubtedly more of a writer and critic than of a thinker. He is admitted to have excelled in mere erudition all the church fathers, hardly excepting Origen and Jerome. But his writings are arid and artificial in style, with an air of compilation rather than of original power. His *Ecclesiastical History* is destitute of method or graphic interest of any kind, but is a valuable repository of the opinions of the Christian writers of the 2d or 3d century, whose works have otherwise perished. It has been charged with personality and inaccuracy by Gibbon, but without adequate evidence. (See general estimate of Eusebius as an historian, article CHURCH HISTORY, vol. v., p. 764.) The personal relations of Eusebius to Constantine have been, like other points of his life, variously judged. He was undoubtedly more of a courtier than was becoming in a Christian bishop, and in his *Life of Constantine* has written an extravagant panegyric rather than a biography of the emperor. Altogether he is a conspicuous and significant, rather than a great or noble figure in the history of the church.

Of Eusebius's works the most important are the following:—  
1. The *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books,—comprising the history of the church from the ascension of Christ to the defeat and death of Licinius, 324 A.D. 2. The *Chronicon*, in two books,—comprising an historical sketch, with chronological tables, of the most important events in the history of the world from the days of Abraham till the twentieth year of the reign of Constantine. This work, which is one of great importance in the study of ancient history, was published in its complete form for the first time at Milan in 1818. 3. The *Preparatio Evangelica*, in fifteen books,—a collection of facts and quotations from the work of nearly all the philosophers of antiquity, intended to prepare the reader's mind for the acceptance of the Christian evidences. 4. The *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in twenty books, of which ten are extant,—a learned and valuable treatise on the evidences themselves. It is intended to complete the Christian argument for which the previous work was a preparation. In addition there are various minor works of Eusebius, viz., the *Theophania*, in four books, translated from a Syriac MS., discovered by Tattam in an Italian monastery in 1839; his treatises against Marcellus in two books, and against Hierocles; his *Life of Constantine—De Vita Constantini*, and his *Onomasticon*, a description of the towns and places mentioned in Holy Scripture, arranged in alphabetical order. For accounts of Eusebius himself and his opinions, see Herzog's *Encyc.*, s. voc.; Schaff *Church Hist.*, ii. 872-9; Introd. to Lee's translation of the *Theophania*; Dorner's *Hist. of the Person of Christ*, ii. 217, et seq.; Translation in Clark's *Foreign Theological Library*. (J. T.)

EUSEBIUS, of Emesa, a learned ecclesiastic of the Greek church, was born at Edessa about the beginning of the 4th century. After receiving his early education in

his native town, he studied theology at Cæsarea and Antioch, and philosophy and science at Alexandria. Among his teachers were Eusebius of Cæsarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis. The reputation he acquired for learning and eloquence led to his being chosen in 341 by the synod of Antioch to succeed Athanasius as archbishop of Alexandria, an appointment which he, however, declined. He accepted instead the small bishopric of Emesa in Phœnicia, but, on account of his reputation as an astrologer, the people opposed his settlement, and although they were ultimately induced, through the intervention of the bishop of Antioch, to receive him peacefully, he soon afterwards, either because of the discontent of his flock or on account of his love for a studious life, resigned his office and retired to Antioch. His fame as an astrologer commended him to the notice of the emperor Constantine, with whom he became a great favourite, and whom he accompanied on many of his expeditions. The theological sympathies of Eusebius were with the semi Arian party, but he seems not to have had a very strong interest in the controversy. He has the reputation of having been a man of extraordinary learning, great eloquence, and considerable intellectual power, but of his numerous writings only a few fragments are now in existence.

EUSEBIUS of Nicomedia is the only other of the many early fathers or bishops of the church bearing the name who claims our notice. He was the defender of Arius in a still more avowed manner than his namesake of Cæsarea, and from him the Eusebian or middle party specially derived their name. He was known amongst them by the epithet of Great. He was a contemporary of the bishop of Cæsarea and united with him in the enjoyment of the friendship and favour of the imperial family. He is said to have been connected by his mother with the emperor Julian. He was first bishop of Berytus (Beirut) in Phœnicia, but his name is especially identified with the see of Nicomedia, which, from the time of Diocletian till Constantine established his court at Byzantium, was regarded as the capital of the Eastern empire. He warmly espoused the cause of Arius in his quarrel with his bishop Alexander, and wrote a letter in his defence to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, which is preserved in the *Church History* of Theodoret. His views appear to have been identical with those of his namesake in placing Christ above all created beings, the only begotten of the Father, but in refusing to recognize Him to be "of the same substance" with the Father, who is alone in essence and absolute being.

At the council of Nicæa Eusebius of Nicomedia earnestly opposed, along with his namesake of Cæsarea, the insertion of the Homousion clause, but after being defeated in his object he also signed the creed in his own sense of ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν. He refused, however, to sign the anathema directed against the Arians, not, as he afterwards explained, because of his variance from the Athanasian theology, but "because he doubted whether Arius really held what the anathema imputed to him" (Sozom., ii. 15). After the council he continued zealously to espouse the Arian cause, and was so far carried away in his zeal against the Athanasians that he was temporarily banished from his see, and visited with the displeasure of the emperor as a disturber of the peace of the church. But his alienation from the court was of short duration. He retained the confidence of the emperor's sister Constantia, through whose special influence he is supposed to have been promoted to the see of Nicomedia, and by her favour he was restored to his position, and speedily acquired an ascendancy over the mind of the emperor no less than that of his sister. He was selected to administer baptism to him in his last illness. There seems no doubt that Eusebius of Nicomedia was more of a

politician than a theologian. He was certainly a partisan in the great controversy of his time, and is even credited (although on insufficient evidence) with having used disgraceful means to procure the deposition of Eustathius, the "orthodox" bishop of Antioch (Theodoret, i. 21). His restless ambition and love of power are not to be denied. To the last he defended Arius, and at the time of the latter's sudden death, 337, it was chiefly through his menace, as representing the emperor, that the church of Constantinople had been thrown into such anxiety as to whether the leader should be re-admitted to the bosom of the church. Eusebius himself died in 342.

EUSTATHIUS, Sr, bishop of Bercæ, was a native of Side in Pamphylia. By the council of Nice, in which he distinguished himself by his zeal against the Arians, he was promoted in 325 to the patriarchate of Antioch. So violent was the feeling among the Arians against him, that a synod of Arian prelates, convened at Antioch in 330, brought about his deposition on a charge of Sabellianism, as well as of various instances of unfaithfulness to his vows of celibacy. He was banished to Thrace, where he died probably in 359 or 360. Of several works attributed to Eustathius there is only one which can with certainty be pronounced his—an address, namely, to the emperor Constantine, delivered during the sitting of the council of Nice.

EUSTATHIUS, archbishop of Thessalonica, was a native of Constantinople, and flourished during the latter half of the 12th century. He was at first a monk, and afterwards teacher of rhetoric in his native city. In 1174 or 1175 he was chosen bishop of Myra in Lycia, and shortly afterwards archbishop of Thessalonica. Such of his works as have descended to our times display a comprehensiveness and variety of erudition that fairly entitle him to the praise of being the most learned man of his day. The most important of these is his *Commentary on the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer*, a work valuable as comprising large extracts from the scholia of other critics, whose works have now perished, such as Apton, Heliodorus, Aristarchus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, &c. This commentary was first published at Rome, 1542-50, in 4 vols., and was reprinted at Leipsic, in 1825-29, under the editorial care of G. Stallbaum. Eustathius also wrote a commentary on Dionysius the geographer, first printed by Robert Stephens in 1547, and frequently reprinted since. A commentary on Pindar, which he is known to have written, has been lost. He is also the author of various religious works, chiefly against the prevailing abuses of his time, which almost anticipate, though in a milder form, the denunciations of Luther. The year of Eustathius's death is uncertain, some placing it in 1194, and others a few years later. The funeral orations pronounced in his honour by Euthynius and Michael Choniates are still in MS. in the Bodleian library.

EUTERPE, the muse of lyric poetry. See MUSES.

EUTROPIUS, a Roman historian who lived in the latter half of the 4th century. Both his surname and the place of his birth are unknown, but from certain statements in his history it appears that he held the office of a "secretary" under Constantine the Great; and the fact that his history is dedicated to Valens shows that he was alive in the reign of the latter emperor. This work, published under the title of *Breviarium Historiæ Romanæ*, is a compend in ten books of the entire Roman history from the foundation of the city to the accession of Valens. This treatise has been compiled with considerable care from the best accessible authorities, and is written generally with impartiality, and in a clear and simple style. Besides chronicling events, Eutropius usually gives brief characteristics of the leading historical personages. Although his Latin