

A COMMENTARY ON EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

*ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY*

BOOK VIII

by

ANDREW WILLIAM CLAY

B.A. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004

M.T.S. Duke University, 2006

M.A. University of Colorado at Boulder, 2008

A thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Colorado in partial fulfillment  
of the requirement for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Department of Classics

2012

This thesis entitled:  
A Commentary on Eusebius of Caesarea *Ecclesiastical History* Book VIII  
written by Andrew William Clay  
has been approved for the Department of Classics

---

(Noel Lenski)

---

(Andrew Cain)

---

(John Gibert)

---

(Aaron Johnson)

---

(Scot Douglass)

Date\_\_\_\_\_

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we  
Find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards  
Of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

Clay, Andrew William (Ph.D., Classics)

A Commentary on Eusebius of Caesarea *Ecclesiastical History* Book VIII

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Noel Lenski

Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 260-339 CE) was a highly productive and innovative writer of Christian history, apology, and biblical scholarship, and as metropolitan bishop of Palestine, an active participant in fourth-century ecclesiastical politics. His most famous work, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (*HE*), a history of the Church from its foundation to ca. 325, is one of our best sources for the history of early Christianity and reign of Constantine. Book eight of the *HE* is of particular importance, as it provides the focal point of the work through a critical first-hand account of the Great Persecution (303-313) and events surrounding Constantine's rise to power.

The present study is a literary and historical commentary on book eight of the *HE*. It consists of four parts: an introduction, the Greek text, an English translation, and a commentary on the Greek text. The fundamental scope of the project is quite broad and interdisciplinary: philological, insofar as it approaches a Greek text that has remained largely without critical comment; historical, since this is both the genre to which the work belongs and a large part of its scholarly significance; and religio-historical in its examination of aspects of Christian theology, doctrine, and the Church's place in the Roman world. This inherently expansive study is restricted, however, by a focused, thematic approach which centers on the theme of persecution, the author's Palestinian viewpoint, and the pervasive historical and historiographical considerations.

This work aims to furnish an essential tool, heretofore missing, to scholars in different fields for whom the study of Eusebius, early Christianity, late Greek historiography, and Roman

history plays an important role. For those who wish to approach the text itself, a theme therein, or a topic specific to the period, it will serve as an up-to-date reference and compass for further research. Its thematic approach and new interpretative suggestions, however, ensure that it will also stand in its own right as a coherent piece of scholarship that contributes to the Eusebian debate.

*uxori carissimae et patientissimae*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a great pleasure to thank everyone who was involved with my dissertation. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Professor Noel Lenski, my dissertation advisor, who supported and guided me throughout the process. His indefatigable knowledge of all things ancient is surpassed only by his kindness and generosity. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Professor Andrew Cain, Professor John Gibert, Professor Aaron Johnson, and Professor Scot Douglass. For their considerable time and expertise I am very grateful.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the financial support of the Department of Classics and the funding provided by the Graduate School and College of Arts and Sciences through the Florence Husted Lowe and F. Rex Lowe Student Support Fund.

To my family – to my uncle, and academic role model, Dr. Kenneth Bost, who inspired me from my earliest years to live an examined life; to my grandparents, who taught me the meaning of hard work, honesty, and family; and to my wife, Adrienne, who has been my steadfast companion through life's vicissitudes – I cannot begin to express my gratitude.

Ultimately, however, this project owes to my wonderful parents, who have always encouraged me to pursue my interests and passions. Their love and dedication have seen me through twenty-four years of formal schooling. Yet they are the professors of my education in life.

## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	Life and Times .....	1
	Works .....	3
	Editions and Manuscripts .....	9
	Content and Structure .....	11
	Sources .....	24
	Historical Considerations .....	26
	Style .....	37
II.	GREEK TEXT .....	41
III.	TRANSLATION .....	67
IV.	COMMENTARY .....	96
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	261

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. Life and Times

Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. CE 260-339) was a highly productive and innovative writer of Christian history, apology, and biblical scholarship, and as metropolitan bishop of Palestine, an active participant in fourth-century ecclesiastical politics. Since the biography written by Acacius, his successor to the see of Caesarea, is no longer extant, we must derive biographical details from his own writings.<sup>1</sup> We know very little about his early life. He was probably born at Caesarea around CE 260 and received the typical education of the period. His advanced education under Pamphilus perhaps resembled that of Origen's school two generations before and included the study of historians, philosophers, and the Bible.<sup>2</sup>

When Diocletian's edict reached Caesarea in March of 303, the Church had enjoyed more than four decades of freedom from persecution. Eusebius had never experienced such an attack on Christianity, and the works he produced during this period and afterwards suggest a deep impact. He seems to have remained in Palestine during the first bout of persecution (303-311), helping Pamphilus to write his *Defense of Origen* while the latter was in prison from 307. This allowed him to witness the martyrdoms of friends and fellow students which he records in his

---

<sup>1</sup> For notice of Acacius' biography, see Soc. *HE* 2.4; for his education under Eusebius, see Soz. *HE* 3.2; 4.23. L. Levine, *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (Brill: Leiden, 1975), 113-134 provides a discussion of the Christian community at Caesarea.

<sup>2</sup> A. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Brill: Leiden, 2003), 17-18. Pamphilus had come to Caesarea after receiving a philosophical and theological education at Alexandria under the presbyter Pierius, who had studied under Origen and was himself styled "Origen the Younger."

*Martyrs of Palestine*. The martyrdom of Pamphilus in December 310 prompted Eusebius to memorialize his beloved master by composing a *Life of Pamphilus* and adopting the cognomen, ὁ Παμφίλου (lit., "the son of Pamphilus"). Shortly after Galerius' edict of toleration in April 311, Maximin resumed persecution in the East. Eusebius traveled to Phoenicia and Tyre and there witnessed additional martyrdoms which he recounts in Bks VIII and IX of his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>3</sup> It seems that he was imprisoned in Egypt during this time but escaped unharmed.<sup>4</sup> The death of Maximin in 313 brought the end of persecution in the East and allowed Eusebius to complete and publish the first edition of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* in 313/14. At some point after 313, certainly by 315, he was appointed bishop of Caesarea.<sup>5</sup> He held this position until the end of his life.

As a follower of Origen, Eusebius was sympathetic to the idea that Christ was subordinate to and of a different substance than the Father. This would cause him trouble during the Arian controversy in the 320s. At the council of Antioch in the Spring of 325, Eusebius' views were declared heretical, and he was provisionally excommunicated until the council of Nicaea that summer. There he defended himself successfully against the charges of heresy and stood with the orthodox majority at the council in his endorsement of the term *homoousios*.<sup>6</sup> In a succession of councils following Nicaea, however, he again showed himself a supporter of the Arian cause.<sup>7</sup> Later in his life (ca. 335), Eusebius traveled to Constantinople where he delivered

---

<sup>3</sup> Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 148-149.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. *Apol. sec.* 8.3; Epiph. *Pan.* 68.8.3. There is no evidence to support the later claims that he compromised his faith to secure release.

<sup>5</sup> He was a bishop in 315, when he delivered a speech on the rededication of the church in Tyre (*HE* X.4). His letter to the Caesarean congregation from Nicaea reveals that he had also been a presbyter (Soc. *HE* 1.8; Theod. *HE* 1.12).

<sup>6</sup> Though this seems to have caused him some discomfort, as an explanatory letter to his congregation in Caesarea reveals (see note above).

<sup>7</sup> He was a leading participant in the councils of Nicodmedia (327), Antioch (328), Caesarea (334), Tyre (335). At the council of Antioch, he was offered the vacated see of Antioch, but declined, perhaps at the request of Constantine.

a speech in the presence of Constantine.<sup>8</sup> In 336 he was again on hand in the capital to deliver a panegyric (the *Laus Constantini*) for the Emperor's *Tricennalia* and to attend the council that deposed Marcellus of Ancyra. It has often been assumed that Eusebius was a close confidant and theological advisor of Constantine.<sup>9</sup> It is much more likely, however, that he met the Emperor only four times during his life: at the Council of Nicaea (325), the Council of Nicomedia (327), and at Constantinople in 335 and 336.<sup>10</sup> The Emperor's death in 337 led to his last great work, the *Vita Constantini*, which remained unfinished at the time of E's own death in 339.

## II. Works

Eusebius is known to historians and classical scholars primarily for three works: the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Vita Constantini*, and *Praeparatio Evangelica*. The first two are considered our best sources for the history of the early church and reign of Constantine respectively, while the latter has been appreciated for its lengthy quotations of earlier Greek authors about whom we would otherwise know very little. Yet the monumental importance of these works as source material and their documentary nature have combined with a generally negative view of his style, a perceived lack of sophistication in his theological views, and a historical prejudice against his Arianism, to relegate Eusebius to the status of purveyor of information, rather than original thinker or author in his own right. Any consideration of the breadth of his work and the innovation employed therein must challenge this view. We have no

---

<sup>8</sup> Perhaps this was a speech similar to *On the Holy Sepulcher*, which has come down to us. See H. A. Drake, "What Eusebius Knew: The Genesis of the 'Vita Constantini,'" *CP* 83.1 (1988): 22.

<sup>9</sup> This is certainly the picture Eusebius paints in his *Vita Constantini* (ca. 339).

<sup>10</sup> T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: 1981), 266.

complete list of Eusebius' works, but it seems that roughly half of his writing is extant.<sup>11</sup> These can be divided into five categories: historical works, apologetic works, biblical scholarship and exegesis, theological treatises, and letters and sermons.<sup>12</sup>

The "father of church history" might rather be called "the father of Christian historical writing" for the innovative nature of his various historical works. The first of these was the *Chronicon* (ca. 311), a chronology of world history that consisted of two parts: the first, known as the *Chronography*, comprised epitomes of national chronologies which served as the basis for the second, the *Chronici Canones*, or chronological tables in parallel columns listing and synchronizing the principal events of secular and religious history. Recent scholarship has confirmed the apologetic nature of the *Chronicon*.<sup>13</sup> It seems to have been conceived both as a demonstration of Christianity's superior antiquity to pagan religion and philosophy, in particular a response to Porphyry of Tyre's treatise *Against the Christians*, and a refutation of the Christian millenarianism of the time.<sup>14</sup>

The second of his historical works, the *Martyrs of Palestine*, is an eyewitness account of the martyrdoms in Palestine during the first bout of persecution (303-311). It exists in two versions: a long recension, extant only in a Syriac translation, and a short recension, which survives in Greek as an appendix to Bk VIII in four manuscripts of the *HE*. The latter is particularly important for the present study, since it constituted Bk VIII of the *HE* in its first

---

<sup>11</sup> A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 1. The most complete lists of his writings are found in M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Turnhout, 1974), 262-275 and J. Quasten, *Patrology 3, The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature: From the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1992), 309-345. I have counted thirty-four known works (excluding *spuria*) in the course of my research.

<sup>12</sup> T. D. Barnes, "Eusebius of Caesarea," *The Expository Times* 121.1 (2009): 4-11.

<sup>13</sup> Especially R. W. Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *JTS NS* 48.2 (1997): 471-504.

<sup>14</sup> The work survives primarily in an Armenian translation based on a Syriac original and in the revised and updated (to 378) Latin translation of Jerome.

edition, along with the current introduction, Edict of Toleration, and appendix.<sup>15</sup> A comparison between Bk VIII as we now have it and the short recension allows us to detect changes in Eusebius' thought and emphasis.

We will postpone consideration of the *HE*, the principal subject of this inquiry and the next historical work chronologically (ca. 313/14), until the end of this discussion on Eusebius' works. The *Vita Constantini* (ca. 339) is the last of the author's historical works and indeed of his life.<sup>16</sup> Left unfinished at his death in 339, the work as it stands was later edited and published, perhaps by his successor, Acacius. The author makes it clear that he desires only to describe the good deeds of the emperor, especially as they relate to his Christian undertakings. Though more encomiastic than biographical, the *VC* serves as our best contemporary source for Constantine.

Eusebian apology is difficult to define with any precision, since many of the author's major works, including the *HE*, fit into an overarching apologetic program. The following are his *primarily* apologetic works. The *General Elementary Introduction* (ca. 310-313) was originally comprised of ten books, but survives only in books 6-9, under the title *Eclogae Propheticae*, and in fragments of 10, known as the *Second Theophany*. In the *Eclogae Propheticae*, E assembles and examines the prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament as a validation of the gospel narrative; the *Second Theophany* deals with the New Testament and its prediction of Christ's second coming.<sup>17</sup> It is a preparatory work both for the *HE* and the massive

---

<sup>15</sup> See Introduction III.

<sup>16</sup> See A. Cameron and S. Hall, eds, *Eusebius' Life of Constantine: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) for a thorough scholarly treatment of the *VC*.

<sup>17</sup> Dates for all Eusebian works come from Carriker, *Library*, 37-41. Lesser works belonging to this category include *Defense of Origen* (ca. 308-310), *Contra Hieroclem* (ca. 311), *Against Porphyry* (before 324?), *Refutation and Defense* (?).

*Praeparatio Evangelica* (ca. 314-318) and *Demonstratio Evangelica* (ca. 318-323).<sup>18</sup> The *PE* is an attempt to refute pagan religion and philosophy through the mouths of its exponents and to demonstrate the superiority and priority of the Hebrew religion. The *DE* is a companion piece to the *PE* and aims to prove that Christianity is the continuation and culmination of the original Hebrew religion, in opposition to Jewish claims that Christians appropriated Judaism for their own purposes. Many of the arguments which the *PE* and *DE* explicate more fully are rehashed in the *Theophania*, which seems to represent the mature views of Eusebius the apologist.<sup>19</sup>

Caesarea's considerable library allowed Eusebius to produce a number of important works of biblical scholarship and exegesis. The *Evangelical Canons* (ca. 290's), perhaps the first of Eusebius' writings, was a concordance consisting of ten columns which allowed one to find and compare parallel passages from each of the four Gospels. Much later came his *Gospel Questions and Solutions* (ca. 320) in two parts. The first addresses difficulties surrounding the gospel narratives of Jesus' early life, and the second focuses on inconsistencies in the Resurrection narratives.<sup>20</sup> The *Onomasticon* (after 324), like the *Evangelical Canons*, enjoyed a successful afterlife both in the East and West. Still our best source for biblical geography and topography, it lists in alphabetical order the place-names which appear in the Bible, along with their contemporary appellations, and provides an historical and geographical description of each. Following in the tradition of Origen, Eusebius also produced biblical commentaries. The *Commentary on Isaiah* and the *Commentary on the Psalms* date to the period after 324 and show the author's reliance on the allegorical methods of Origen.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Scholars generally examine the *PE* and *DE* in unison, since Eusebius intended them to form two parts of a single work. See *PE* 15.1.8.

<sup>19</sup> Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 187.

<sup>20</sup> These survive only in later epitomes and fragments derived from *catenae*.

<sup>21</sup> His work on the Psalms, which was translated into Latin by Hilary of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli, was especially celebrated among later authors.

Eusebius wrote two works which are usually regarded as theological treatises, the *Contra Marcellum* and *Ecclesiastical Theology* (after 335), both directed toward Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, a vehement partisan of Nicene orthodoxy whose views the author attacks as Sabellian. A number of his letters and sermons survive. Most important among the latter are his *Speech on the Church of the Holy Sepulcher* and *Laus Constantini*.

The work for which Eusebius is most well-known, the *Historia Ecclesiastica (HE)* in ten books, covers the period from the foundation of the Church to the beginning of the sole reign of Constantine (ca. 325). The work survives fully in seven medieval manuscripts, and from differences in these, scholars have identified three major editions.<sup>22</sup> Eusebius did not intend to give a full and systematic account of the development of the church in the *HE* but chose rather to focus on six themes – apostolic succession, major events and people, heretics, the punishment of the Jews, persecution and martyrdoms, and the triumph of Christianity – on which he elaborates by quoting various documents *in extenso*. As a result, the first seven books often read as a loose collection of information on the early Church united only by the chronological framework of emperors and bishops. In Bk VIII, however, the focus of the work narrows to the singular theme of persecution in the author's own day.

The importance of Bk VIII cannot be overstated. As an historical source for the Diocletianic Persecution, it is matched only by the *Martyrs of Palestine* and Lactantius' *De Mortibus Persecutorum (DMP)*.<sup>23</sup> Problematic aspects in its presentation of material and chronology still make it a battleground for historians of the period. In Eusebian studies, Bk VIII

---

<sup>22</sup> The first was published in 313/14 and consisted of the first seven books, the short recension of *MP*, the appendix to Bk VIII, Galerius' edict, and Bk IX; the second (315/16) consisted of the first nine books (as we now have them) and X (a speech delivered at the new basilica in Tyre); and the final edition of 325/26 removed some material from Bk X (10.5-7). See Introduction III.

<sup>23</sup> This is according to Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 150. By "Diocletianic" I mean the persecution from 303-311, which ends in the West with the publication of the Edict of Toleration in April of 311. Book IX of the *HE* is our best source for the continued persecution in the East under Maximin. Much of its information is confirmed by S. Mitchell, "Maximinus and the Christians in AD 312: A New Latin Inscription," *JRS* 78 (1988): 105-24.

has been the focal point of scholarly contention about the nature of the *HE* and its relation to the rest of the author's corpus. Significant differences between Bk VIII and the first seven books of the work have led some scholars to question the unity of the composition.<sup>24</sup> Notably, T. D. Barnes has championed the view that Bks I-VII were composed before the outbreak of persecution in 303 and formed the original first edition of the *HE*; Bks VIII-IX appeared only in a second edition of the work following the end of persecution in 313/14.<sup>25</sup> He argued that the *HE* must be seen as "contemporary evidence for the standing of the Christian Church in Roman society in the late third century."<sup>26</sup> Barnes' view dominated scholarship until the end of the last decade, when Richard Burgess published an article which appears to have solved definitively the problem of dating the *HE*.<sup>27</sup> By examining Eusebius' chronological method in the *Chronicon*, he has shown that this work dates to the period between 306 and 313 (most likely 311), and thus the first edition of the *HE*, which is dependent upon the *Chronicon*, must date to the year 313/14 and include Bks VIII and IX.<sup>28</sup> This means that the *HE* can no longer reflect "the optimistic assumptions of a Christian writing in the reign of Diocletian before persecution threatened."<sup>29</sup> It is rather an account shaped by and oriented toward the persecution and triumph of Christianity in the early fourth century. Bk VIII's place in the *HE*, therefore, is of central importance. Its subject of persecution "was obviously intended as the climax and focal point of the entire work."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Such differences include the shift from the universal to the present and local, from documentary evidence to eyewitness accounts, and from broader church matters to the singular theme of persecution.

<sup>25</sup> T. D. Barnes, "The Editions of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*," *GRBS* 21.2 (1980): 191-201; Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 126-147.

<sup>26</sup> T. D. Barnes, "Some Inconsistencies in Eusebius," *JTS* 35 (1984): 471.

<sup>27</sup> Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 471-504.

<sup>28</sup> Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 482-486.

<sup>29</sup> Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 146.

<sup>30</sup> Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 499.

### III. Editions and Manuscripts

As we have noted above, recent scholarship has made great strides in the dating and numbering of the editions of the *HE*. The work of Richard Burgess and Andrew Louth in particular has resulted in a new *communis opinio* regarding the *HE*'s publication history.<sup>31</sup> Although further considerations may be merited in the future, it is beyond the scope of this work to challenge the established scholarly consensus. Nor will the study attempt a fresh analysis of the manuscript tradition, which has been clearly articulated by Eduard Schwartz.<sup>32</sup> Rather, it aims to point out major textual variants and difficulties when they arise in the text and to offer explanations when possible. Since much of the debate about manuscripts and editions hinges on Bk VIII, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of past scholarship.

According to the critical edition of Schwartz, which is the foundation for textual study of the *HE*, there are two primary groups of manuscripts, distinguished by commonalities in their inclusion/omission of certain material in Bks VIII – X. MSS ATER reflect an earlier edition of the *HE*, certainly pre-316, since it portrays Licinius as Constantine's pro-Christian ally. It includes material which is missing in the second group, such as the letter of Sabinus (9.1.3-6), the statement of divine approval for Licinius' sovereignty (9.11.8), and imperial documents attributed to both Constantine and Licinius (10.5-7).<sup>33</sup> This group is particularly important for Bk VIII, as it preserves not only important later omissions (e.g., 8.16.2b-3a; 8.17.5; 8.17.7a), but also, as we shall see, the appendix (8.app.) and short recension of the *Martyrs of Palestine*, which are indispensable for reconstructing Bk VIII's content in the first edition. The second

---

<sup>31</sup> Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 471-504; A. Louth, "The Date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *JTS* 40.1 (1990): 111-123.

<sup>32</sup> The following discussion is based on E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, eds, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, GCS III (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1909), xlvii-cxlvii; K. Lake, trans., *The Ecclesiastical History*, LCL I (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), xxvii-xxx; and R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 10-21.

<sup>33</sup> Grant, *Church Historian*, 11.

group, MSS BDM, corresponds to the edition of 325, which reflects the situation after the death and *damnatio memoriae* of Licinius and before the Council of Nicaea. In the same family as BDM are the fifth-century Syriac version ( $\Sigma$ ), what Burgess calls the “corrected edition,” which excises the mention of Crispus (10.9.4, 6) after his execution in 326, and Rufinus’ Latin translation (L).<sup>34</sup> The following manuscripts constitute our main witnesses:

A: Codex Parisinus 1430  
T: Codex Laurentianus 70, 7  
E: Codex Laurentianus 70, 20  
R: Codex Mosquensis 50  
  
B: Codex Parisinus 1431  
D: Codex Parisinus 1433  
M: Codex Marcianus 338  
 $\Sigma$ : Syriac Version (fifth century)  
L: Latin translation of Rufinus<sup>35</sup>

MSS AER preserve an ending to Bk VIII which BDM lack. This so-called appendix contains cross-references (8.app.2 to 8.13.2/*MP(s)* 3.5; 8.app.4 to 8.16.2 – 17.2) which clearly indicate that it once served as the ending to Bk VIII. Yet repetitions in the appendix of material found in other sections of the present Bk VIII (8.app.1 vs. 8.2-4; 8.app.2-6 vs. 8.13.10-15) also make it apparent that the earlier edition of the book was quite different in content. As Grant points out, we have evidence here for three editions of Bk VIII (in descending order): the edition of 325 (BDM), the pre-316 edition (ATER), and an earlier edition, probably close in time to Diocletian’s death (8.app.3), thus ca. 313/14.<sup>36</sup> Through a careful analysis of the *Chronicon*, Burgess has shown definitively that the edition of 313/14 was in fact the first edition.<sup>37</sup> It is left to consider, however, the nature and content of the first edition of Bk VIII.

---

<sup>34</sup> Burgess, *Chronography*, 67.

<sup>35</sup> This list is based on Lake, *Ecclesiastical History*, xxvii-xxviii.

<sup>36</sup> Grant, *Church Historian*, 11-13.

<sup>37</sup> Burgess, “Dates and Editions,” 471-504.

The missing link comes in the form of a document, a shorter version of the *Martyrs of Palestine* (*MP(s)*), which ATER preserve, stating that it once was a part of Bk VIII. Indeed a cursory examination of *MP(s)* clearly shows that it formed the body of another work, for it lacks an introduction and conclusion. Furthermore, parallels between *MP(s)* and Bk VIII show that both works begin and conclude at precisely the same points (*MP(s)* pref. = 8.2.4-5; *MP(s)* 1.3-5 = 8.3.1-4; *MP(s)* 13.11 = 8.16.1), and a cross-reference at *MP(s)* 12, which has no apparent referent in the work, apparently refers to 8.2.2-3 in the introduction of Bk VIII, and another at *MP(s)* 13.14 expects the “palinode” which is quoted at 8.17.3-10.<sup>38</sup> All these considerations led Laqueur to conclude that *MP(s)* once constituted the body of Bk VIII between 8.2.3 and 8.17.2.<sup>39</sup>

Thus we have the following editions:

1 <sup>st</sup> Edition (ca. 313/14):	I-VII, 8.1.1 – 8.2.3, <i>MP(s)</i> , 8.16.2 – 17.11a, Edict of Toleration, Appendix, IX <sup>40</sup>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition (ca. 315/16):	I-IX (with favorable references to Licinius) and X (with X.5-7)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Edition (325):	I-X (with Licinius excised or condemned; without X.5-7)

#### IV. Content and Structure

##### I. The Church during Persecution

1. Introduction: Pre-Persecution (8.pref – 8.2.3)
  - a) Preface (8.pref; second edition?)
  - b) Golden Age of Church before Persecution (8.1.1-6)
  - c) Fall of Church (8.1.7 – 2.3)
2. Beginning of Persecution (8.2.4 – 8.6.10)
  - a) Beginning of Persecution: Edicts 1, 2, and 3 (8.2.4-5)
  - b) Diverse Trials/Behavior of Ecclesiastical Leaders (8.3.1-4)
  - c) Persecution in the Army (8.4.1-4)
  - d) Beginning of Persecution at Nicomedia: Martyrdom of Euethius (8.5.1)
  - e) Martyrdom of Imperial Servants (8.6.1)
  - f) Martyrdom of Peter (8.6.2-4)

<sup>38</sup> Grant, *Church Historian*, 11.

<sup>39</sup> Richard Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1929), 6-33.

<sup>40</sup> 8.pref. probably belongs to the second edition. See οὐ τῆς τυχοῦσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς 8.pref.

- g) Martyrdoms of Dorotheus and Gorgonius (8.6.5)
  - h) Martyrdom of Anthimus/Fire in Palace/Intensification of Persecution (8.6.6)
  - i) Exhumation of Imperial Servants (8.6.7)
  - j) Uprisings in Melitene and Syria/Issuance of 2nd Edict (8.6.8-9)
  - k) Issuance of 3<sup>rd</sup> Edict/Introduction to Martyrs in Province (8.6.10)
3. Persecution in the Provinces (8.7.1 – 8.13.8)
- a) Egyptian Martyrs at Tyre (8.7.1-6)
  - b) Summary of Martyrdoms in Provinces (8.8.1)
  - c) Martyrs in the Thebaid/Alexandria (8.9.1-8.10.1)
  - d) Letter of Phileas to Thmuities (8.10.2-10)
  - e) Eusebius' Postscript to Phileas' Letter (8.10.11-12)
  - f) Destruction of Phrygian Town (8.11.1)
  - g) Martyrdom of Adauctus (8.11.2)
  - h) Martyrdoms in Arabia, Cappadocia, Mesopotamia, and Alexandria (8.12.1)
  - i) Martyrdoms in Antioch (8.12.2)
  - j) Martyrdom of Domnina, Berenice, and Prosdoce (8.12.3-4)
  - k) Martyrdom of Two Antiochene Sisters (8.12.5)
  - l) Martyrdoms in Pontus (8.12.6-7)
  - m) Maximin's Policy of Mutilation (8.12.8-10)
  - n) Conclusion (8.12.11)
  - o) Ecclesiastical Martyrs in Famous Cities (8.13.1-8)
- II. The Empire during Persecution
1. State of Roman Affairs (8.13.9 – 8.15.1)
- a) Time of Peace before Persecution (8.13.9)
  - b) Beginning of Persecution/Abdication of Diocletian (8.13.10-11)
  - c) Reign and Death of Constantius (8.13.12-13; reproduced from 8.app.4)
  - d) Rise of Constantine/Council of Carnuntum (8.13.14; reproduced from 8.app.5)
  - e) Rise of Maximin/Death and *damnatio memoriae* of Maximian (8.13.15)
  - f) Rise of Maxentius (8.14.1)
  - g) Maxentius' Atrocities at Rome: Lust, Slaughter, Witchcraft, Famine (8.14.2-6)
  - h) Maximin in the East: Treaty with/likeness to Maxentius, Witchcraft (8.14.7-8)
  - i) Persecution of Maximin/Pagan Revival in the East/Rapacity (8.14.9-10)
  - j) Maximin's Drunkenness and Debauchery (8.14.11)
  - k) Maximin's Lust/Contests of Male and Female Martyrs (8.14.12-14)
  - l) Contest of Dorothea et al. (8.14.15-16)
  - m) Martyrdom of Sophronia at Rome (8.14.16-17)
  - n) Conclusion to Account of Maxentius and Maximin (8.14.18)
  - o) Summary of Political and Military Affairs in Empire (8.15.1-2)
2. End of Persecution/Punishment of Galerius (8.16.1 – 8.17.2)
- a) Visitation of Divine Grace/Abatement of Persecution (8.16.1-2)
  - b) Punishment of Galerius (8.16.3-5)
  - c) Confession of Galerius and Publication of Edict of Toleration (8.17.1-2)

3. Edict of Toleration (8.17.3-11)
  - a) Imperial Titulature (8.17.3-5)
  - b) Circumstances and Past Legislation (8.17.6-9)
  - c) Provisions (8.17.9-10)
  - d) Note on Translation and Introduction to Bk IX
  
4. Appendix: Fate of Persecutors/Rise of Constantine (8.app.1-6)
  - a) Death of Galerius/Role as Author of Persecution (8.app.1)
  - b) Deaths of Diocletian and Maximian (8.app.2-3)
  - c) Reign and Death of Constantius (8.app.4)
  - d) Rise of Constantine (8.app.5)
  - e) The Remaining Emperors (8.app.6)

In the opening remarks of the *HE* (1.2-4), Eusebius presents a view of world history that will figure prominently in his later works. This section provides a brief account of salvation history, in which the author tells the story of the preexistent Logos and its interaction with humanity up to the time of Christ. The apologetic aim of this section is evident: Eusebius' goal is to demonstrate the antiquity and centrality of the Church by linking it to the broader history of Christianity (1.4.1-15), which in his view, stretches back to the beginning of time with "the first creation of man" (1.4.4). His primary concern is to counter claims that Christianity is a recent innovation which arose "somewhere in a corner of the earth" (1.4.2).

While it is generally accepted that this historical-theological approach is already reflected in his *Chronicle* and *General Elementary Introduction* and is greatly expanded in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*, there has been little effort to assess its full impact on the *HE*.<sup>41</sup> Yet evidence in the text, particularly the way in which the author arranges material within the ten-book format, suggests that the scheme outlined in 1.2-4 affects

---

<sup>41</sup> The following exposition owes much to R. M. Grant, "Civilization as a Preparation for Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius," in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams at the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, ed. F. Forrester Church et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 62-70; A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?: Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1989), 168-193; G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986), 65-95; and Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 471-504.

the very structure of the work. The following is an attempt to demonstrate that Eusebius' account of church history in the *HE* mirrors his view of world history. I argue that the historian constructed the *HE* as a microcosm of salvation history in order to connect the short history of the Church with a broader and more universal narrative.<sup>42</sup>

One particular passage in the introductory section is especially significant: 1.2.18-27. This amounts to a brief summary of world history from the creation of man up to Christ's birth at the beginning of the Roman Empire, the point from which the *HE* commences. We can break down the content of the passage as follows: After Creation (1.2.14-16) and the life of blessedness (1.2.18), the first human despises God's command and falls into the material world (1.2.18), his offspring chooses the path of wickedness and lack of civility (1.2.18-19), God's chastisement follows (1.2.20), and at the height of evil, the Logos appears first to "one or two God-loving men" (i.e., the Patriarchs) through theophanies (1.2.21). Finally, when the practitioners of the true religion have formed an entire nation (i.e., the Hebrews), God establishes the law of Moses, which serves as a civilizing force for society as a whole until it is ready for the coming of Christ at the beginning of the Roman Empire (1.2.22-23), at which point the Logos takes on human nature, imparts divine teaching, suffers, dies, is resurrected and restored to heaven. What is truly remarkable about this passage, but has been overlooked, is how closely the historical schema it outlines resembles that of the narrative of persecution which comprises the final three books of the *HE*.

A comparison of the passage summarized above (1.2.18-27) and the first two chapters of Bk VIII reveals similarities which suggest that Eusebius' view of world history has shaped his presentation of the Great Persecution. To begin with, the description of the peace and prosperity of the Church in the time between Valerian and Diocletian at the beginning of Bk VIII (8.1.1-6)

---

<sup>42</sup> To my knowledge, this has never been argued.

echoes that of the life of blessedness in 1.2.18. Like the first man's existence in the garden, which Eusebius places "in the beginning" (εὐθὺς μὲν γε ἐν ἀρχῇ 1.2.18) and before the start of historical time,<sup>43</sup> the paradisiacal existence of the Church is set at the beginning of Bk VIII (note language of beginning: ἄρξεταιί γε ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν ἐντεῦθεν 8.pref.) and before the period which Eusebius intends to narrate (i.e., the Great Persecution; πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ 8.1.1). In fact, the entire introduction to Bk VIII is a digression on the nebulous period immediately preceding persecution, the formal topic of the book, and thus stands, like its primordial counterpart, outside the proper historical scope.<sup>44</sup> According to Eusebius, the Church's prosperity and exalted standing before the persecution leads to an excess of license (ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλεόν ἐλευθερίας 8.1.7), which, we are told, causes the Church to fall into vice. Similar language can be found in the description of the original Fall, where the author speaks of an "abundance of self-chosen evil" (αὐτοπροαιρέτου κακίας ὑπερβολῇ 1.2.19). In Bk VIII church leaders push aside the law of piety (τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας θεσμὸν παρωσάμενοι 8.1.8) in language that recalls the first man's contempt of God's command (ἤττον τῆς θείας ἐντολῆς φροντίσας 1.2.18). In both instances, the fall into sin comes with a profound change, emphasized by the use of compounds of ἀλλάσσω: in the first, an exchange of divine luxury for the earth and its curse (καὶ τὴν ἐπάρατον ταυτηνὶ γῆν τῆς πάλαι ἐνθέου τρυφῆς ἀντικατηλλάξατο 1.2.18) and in the second a change to pride and sloth (ἐπὶ χαννότητα καὶ νωθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο 8.1.7). With the original Fall come descriptions of wickedness, consisting especially of war language and imagery: the first humans slaughter and slay one another, dare to do battle against

---

<sup>43</sup> Chesnut, *Christian Histories*, 68 is right to interpret the original Fall, in accordance with Origen's theology, as "a fall into *historical* time." A chronological account of history can only thus proceed from Adam's fall from the "hypercosmic realm."

<sup>44</sup> Kofsky describes *HE* 1.2-4 as a "pre-historical introduction." This is indeed true in two respects: first, its topic of the Fall is technically "before history" in Origen's view (see note above); furthermore, its subject matter precedes chronologically the proper topic of the work, which is the history of the Church from the time of Christ. Kofsky, *Against Paganism*, 102.

God and the giants, plan to fortify earth against heaven, and prepare war against the One Over All (ὡς τοτὲ μὲν ἀλληλοφθορεῖν, τοτὲ δὲ ἀλληλοκτονεῖν, ἄλλοτε δὲ ἀνθρωποβορεῖν, θεομαχίας τε καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν βοωμένας γιγαντομαχίας ἐπιτολμᾶν, καὶ γῆν μὲν ἐπιτειχίζειν οὐρανῷ διανοεῖσθαι, μανία δὲ φρονήματος ἐκτόπου αὐτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν πολεμεῖν παρασκευάζεσθαι 1.2.19). Similarly, in the time before persecution, the clergy all but wage war on one another with weapons made of words, crash into one another as in sea battles, and the laity form factions against one another (μόνον οὐχὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἑαυτοῖς προσπολεμούντων ὄπλοις, εἰ οὕτω τύχοι, καὶ δόρασιν τοῖς διὰ λόγων ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι προσρηγνύντων καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων 8.1.7). The wickedness both of the first humans and of the Church is followed by God's punishment, and in both, Eusebius describes God's chastisement as a pursuit or persecution, and God as an overseer (θεὸς ὁ πάντων ἔφορος μετήγει 1.2.20; ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνει, ἐκ τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἀδελφῶν καταρχομένου τοῦ διωγμοῦ 8.1.7). Furthermore, conflagrations and floods, the method of pursuit in Bk I, are the preferred punishments of martyrs in Bk VIII, namely burning and drowning.

After God's chastisement of the first humans, the preexistent Logos manifests itself in human form first to the Patriarchs, who, along with the law of Moses, civilize the human race in order to prepare it for the Incarnation of Christ at the beginning of the Roman Empire, when Christ imparts divine teaching, suffers, dies, is resurrected and restored to heaven (1.2.21-23). The martyrs, as the principle subject of Bks VIII and IX, seem to take on a similar role as Christ for the Church during persecution. According to an explanatory passage in Bk X, God, "with pickaxes and mattocks" (ὄρυξι καὶ δικέλλαις ταῖς πληκτικαῖς τῶν μαθημάτων διδασκαλίαις ἐξεκάθηρέν τε καὶ ἀπέσμηξεν) – that is, through the suffering and death of the martyrs – purified those souls which had been defiled with sins occasioned by the persecution (10.4.60). Eusebius

emphasizes the Christ-like role of the martyrs through his use of Logos-language in Bk VIII: those who suffered on behalf of piety are described as “martyrs of the divine Logos” (8.2.3: τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων), “shepherds of the logical flocks” (τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες 8.13.3), glorifiers of “the Logos of God” (τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον... ἔδοξασάτην 8.13.4), and “made men by the teaching of the divine Logos” (ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλίας ἠρρενωμέναι 8.14.14). Coupled with the language of divine presence and visitation which permeates the book (e.g., 8.7.2, 13.8, 16.2), we are made to recall the early theophanic manifestations of the Logos in 1.2.21. Yet the martyrs in Bk VIII are not your typical representatives of the Logos, whose visitations to humanity throughout history produce many Christ-like figures.<sup>45</sup> Rather, they are the culmination of these visitations, the representatives of the central event of divine victory in Eusebius’ day. As such, Eusebius sees the advent of the martyrs during the persecution as mirroring the central event of Christianity: the Incarnation.<sup>46</sup> He underscores this fact by connecting the beginning of the Persecution in 8.2.4 with Roman imperial rule “in the nineteenth year of Diocletian’s reign” (8.2.4)<sup>47</sup> in much the same way as he describes the Incarnation as at “the beginning of the Roman Empire” (1.2.23). The coincidence of the persecution with the Easter season (8.2.4) further strengthens the link between the martyrs in Bks VIII and IX and Christ’s actions in Bk I.

The numerology which Eusebius employs in the *HE* supports the link between the view of world history presented in the introduction (1.2.18-27) and his account of the Great Persecution in Bks VIII-X and suggests that the author intends the schema to apply to the entire

---

<sup>45</sup> As R. Mortley, *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996), 188-196 has shown, Eusebius’ view that history consists of “many Christs” is due to his “social Arianism.”

<sup>46</sup> For the significance of the Incarnation in Eusebius’ historical thought, see T. J. Morgan, "Eusebius of Caesarea and Christian Historiography," *Athenaeum* 93 (2005): 196.

<sup>47</sup> Indeed, this is the final regnal year noted in the work.

work. It is interesting that Eusebius mentions the number of only three books out of ten in the extant text (Bks VII, VIII, and X) and that this occurs only in the final books; furthermore, he describes Bk X as having "the perfect number" (ἀριθμῶ τελείῳ 10.1.3). All this suggests that numbers are significant to the structure of the work, but in what way? In his article on the dating of the *Chronici Canones* and *HE*, Richard Burgess has called attention to the significance of the number seven. He states, "seven books of apostolic succession mirror the seven days of creation, and the culmination of the narrative is the Great Persecution..."<sup>48</sup> The introduction to Bk VIII supports this interpretation. Here the pleonastic language of completion is striking: "having *completely* written an account of the succession of the apostles in seven *complete* books" (τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὴν ἐν ὅλοις ἑπτὰ περιγράφαντες βιβλίους 8.pref.). Of course, Burgess' observation fits quite well with the schema which we have described above: seven books mirroring the seven days of Creation, followed at the beginning of Bk VIII by the Church's paradisiacal existence and fall prior to persecution.

In Christian symbolism, the number eight generally signifies the start of something new. It refers specifically to the Jewish custom of circumcision on the eighth day, which established the covenant between God and the Hebrews (Gen. 17: 12-14), and by association, the new covenant established by Jesus' resurrection. Later Christian writers connect the eighth day with the Eschaton, since it is both the end of the previous week and the beginning of the new. Origen states that circumcision on the eighth day in Jewish law "signifies...that a week has been allotted to the present age; but the eighth day contains the mystery of the future age" (*Comm. Rom.* 2.13.21). Likewise, Eusebius relates this custom to the day of the Lord's resurrection on which souls are purified through regeneration (*Comm. in Ps.* PG 23.120.9; PG 23.140.20-9). As we have seen, purification is precisely the role which the author applies to the martyrs and

---

<sup>48</sup> Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 499.

Constantine in the final three books of the *HE* (10.4.60-1). Thus the number eight, as representative of the New Covenant and the coming age, aptly labels the beginning of the account of the Great Persecution, which Eusebius views as the beginning of a new era in Christian history; moreover, as a symbol of the day of resurrection, it highlights the Christ-like role of purification through suffering and death ascribed to the martyrs, and the restoration of the Church by the saving hand of Constantine.<sup>49</sup> We can go even further: the triad of Bks VIII-X, which speaks of the suffering of the martyrs, destruction of the churches, and their restoration, can be seen to mirror the three days of the Passion narrative, in which Jesus suffered, died, and was resurrected. Eusebius himself suggests this interpretation in his speech on the rededication of the church at Tyre in Bk X, where he compares the churches, after their destruction, with the crucified body of Christ, and their restoration with the resurrected spiritual body (10.4.46).<sup>50</sup> Bk X is described as having the "perfect" number, but we can also render the adjective "complete" or "fulfilled;" for insofar as Christ's resurrection fulfilled the history of salvation for Christianity, the restoration of the Church has fulfilled church history for Eusebius.

We can recap the structure of the *HE* in light of Eusebius' view of salvation history as follows: after the introduction to the entire work (1.2-4), which establishes a link between the history of the Church and world history dating back to Creation, Eusebius narrates the creation of the Church, in seven books, mirroring the seven days of Creation; the conclusion to Bk VII, then, which has long puzzled scholars in its resemblance to the conclusion of an entire treatise,<sup>51</sup> becomes clear: it represents what Eusebius views as a completed era in history (i.e., the

---

<sup>49</sup> E also views the number of the years of persecution as a matter of significance: the first eight-year period is narrated in Bk VIII, while the entire ten years of persecution is concluded in Bk X. See 8.16.1.

<sup>50</sup> ὅτι δὴ καὶ τούτων πολὺ κρείττονα λαβοῦσα παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, τὴν πολὺ μείζονα δόξαν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἐν ἀφθάρτου σώματος ἀναστάσει μετὰ φωτὸς ἀγγέλων χορείας ἐν τοῖς οὐρανῶν ἐπέκεινα τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείῳσιν σὺν αὐτῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ πανευεργέτῃ καὶ σωτῆρι διαρκῶς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐξῆς αἰῶνας ἀπολαβεῖν ποθεῖ.

<sup>51</sup> e.g., Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 31.

establishment of the Church up to the Great Persecution). The second part of the bipartite structure of the *HE*, the final triad, tells a new story and thus occasions a new proem at the beginning of Bk VIII. As the number indicates, this is an account of a new era in history marked by a dramatic narrowing in focus to the singular topic of persecution in the regions around Palestine. Following as they do the seven books of the Church's creation, Bk VIII recounts the Church's fall into sin, God's punishment through persecution, and Bks VIII and IX the redemptive and purifying role of the martyrs and Constantine in preparation for the restoration of the Church at the beginning of Bk X. Thus, the final three books, while neatly reflecting Eusebius' view of salvation history set out in 1.2.18-27, also recall the three days of the Passion narrative in the Gospels, the culmination of salvation history. The martyrs assume the Christ-like role of suffering and death (Bks VIII and IX), leading up to the resurrection of the body of the Church under Constantine (Bk X).

The pattern which we discern in 1.2.18-27 and in the final triad of the *HE* – that of paradise, fall, punishment, and restoration – occurs twice within Bk VIII itself: once in Eusebius' account of the Church in 8.1.1 – 13.8, and again in his narration of secular affairs in 8.13.9 – 17.2. This becomes immediately apparent when we compare 8.13.9-11 and 8.1.1-7. In 8.13.9, Eusebius describes the paradisiacal state of the Roman government before the persecution begins: there was an abundance of wealth and prosperity (ὀπόσης ἀγαθῶν εὐφορίας καὶ εὐετηρίας ἡξιώτο) and the emperors enjoyed their *decennalia* and *vicennalia* with feasts and celebrations (δεκαετηρίδας καὶ εικοσαετηρίδας ἐκπλήσαντες, ἐν ἑορταῖς καὶ πανηγύρεσιν φαιδροτάταις τε θαλίαις καὶ εὐφροσύναις).<sup>52</sup> The content and language parallels 8.1.1, where the Church enjoyed much glory and freedom (Ὅσης μὲν καὶ ὀποίας... δόξης ὁμοῦ καὶ παρρησίας

---

<sup>52</sup> Note also the coincidence of the persecution's onset with both the feasts of the emperors in 8.13.9 and "the feast of the Savior's passion" in 8.2.4.

ὁ...εὐσεβείας λόγος παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις...ἠξίωτο). When, however, the authority of the emperors increased steadily and without disturbance, they began the persecution, which Eusebius describes as a war, against the Christians (8.13.10: οὕτω δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπαραποδίστως αὐξούσης καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ὀσημέραι προΐούσης τῆς ἐξουσίας, ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι). This results in, among other things, a division of the Empire (8.13.11: καὶ διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται). Once again, both language and content are remarkably similar to 8.1.6-7, where the church leaders, after their growing success makes them susceptible to an excess of freedom (ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις προΐοντα ὀσημέραι τε εἰς αὖξιν καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιιδόντα... Ὡς δ' ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαννότητα καὶ νοθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο), wage war with one another and form factions within the Church (ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι προσρηγνόντων καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων). While there is no precise equivalent in 8.13 to 8.1.9 – 8.2.2, which is mostly scriptural quotation, its general theme of downfall is expressed sufficiently in 8.13.11. Rather, the narrative abruptly transitions in 8.13.12-14 from an account of the offending emperors to that of Constantius and Constantine, the divine protagonists on the imperial level. This forms a parallel with the divine martyrs mentioned at the end of 8.2.3, after Eusebius eschews further reference to ecclesiastical misbehavior. The connection is bolstered by the Logos-language which surrounds both accounts. The “martyrs of the divine Logos” (τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων 8.2.3) find their counterpart in Constantius, whom Eusebius describes as “most friendly toward the divine Logos” (τῷ τε θεῷ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα διαθέμενος 8.13.12), and Constantine, “imitator of his father’s piety toward our Logos” (ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο 8.13.14). Although Eusebius fails to execute his plan in 8.14.1 – 17.2 as systematically or symmetrically as we would like, we can discern the rough pattern of 8.2.4 – 8.13.8 and 1.2.18-27. The accounts of Maxentius (8.14.1-6) and

Maximin (8.14.7-14), mirror the tyrant-like behavior of the bishops in 8.1.8, and insofar as they narrate the emperors' shameful actions in the West and East, correspond to the geographically diverse account of martyrdoms in 8.5.1 – 8.12.11. Interestingly, the stories of the female martyrs Dorothea (8.14.15) and Sophronia (8.14.16-17) parallel those of Domnina, Prosdoce, and Berenice (8.12.3-4) and the two Antiochene sisters (8.12.5). Moreover, Eusebius' focus on the tyrants' drunkenness in 8.14 recalls language in 1.2.21 (ὁ τῆς κακίας κάρος, οἷα μέθης δεινῆς). The theme of war is resumed in 8.15.1-2, whose details of naval battles, famine, and plague in an empire divided evokes both the divine punishments against early humanity in 1.2.19-20 and the warlike factions of the Church in 8.1.6-7. Then, in 8.16.1, Eusebius explicitly links the reappearance of “the divine and heavenly grace” which “began displaying its kind and propitious oversight” (ὡς γὰρ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις ἐνεδείκνυτο) with 8.1.6, where once “the divine and heavenly hand watched over and guarded” (ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ ἔσκεπέν τε καὶ ἐφρούρει) the church, until in 8.1.8, the church leaders “were not eager to make the divinity well-disposed and propitious” (ὡς δ' ἀνεπαισθήτως ἔχοντες οὐχ ὅπως εὐμενῆς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προθυμούμεθα) but thought that their “actions went unheeded and unobserved” (ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγούμενοι). This restoration of divine favor results in an abrupt “change in opinion” (8.16.1: παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην), much like the sudden change of church affairs “to laxity and laziness” in 8.1.6 (ἐπὶ χαυνότητα καὶ νωθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο). Divine judgment then comes down upon Galerius (ταῦτ' ἐχρῆν κατὰ θείαν γενέσθαι κρίσιν 8.16.3), as it did upon the Church (ἢ μὲν δὴ θεία κρίσις... τὴν αὐτῆς ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνει 8.1.7), and is described as a divine “chastisement” which “pursues” him with sickness (μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θεήλατος κόλασις, ἐξ αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ καταρξαμένη σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς προελθοῦσα 8.16.2), just as God pursued

early humanity with punishments of disease (cf. αὐτοὺς...θεὸς ὁ πάντων ἔφορος μετῆει λιμοῖς τε συνεχέσι καὶ λοιμοῖς 1.2.20). The disease is said to “proceed to his soul” (8.16.2), even “to a point where his salvation was hopeless” (καὶ εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος 8.16.5), just as the church leaders who “suffered the shipwreck of their whole salvation” (τῶν εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων 8.2.3), and the early humans, whose condition was likened to a “terrible and most cruel disease of souls” (ὥσπερ τινὰ δεινὴν καὶ χαλεπωτάτην νόσον ψυχῶν πικροτέροις ἀνέχων τοῖς κολαστηρίοις 1.2.20). The Edict of Toleration provides a brief restoration of the Church and, presumably, a favorable state of the Empire, thus completing the pattern of paradise, fall, punishment, and restoration. Thus the pattern of salvific history which Eusebius describes in 1.2.18-27 is mirrored not only in the structure of the *HE*, but also in the events of Bk VIII.

The structure which we have outlined allows the author to make important historical-theological points. First, he can emphasize the "sameness" of the Gospel message throughout history by showing that its story and direction repeat themselves over time. This reinforces his understanding of Christian pre-history, which assumes that the holy men before Christ held to the same Gospel message as those who lived as Christians after Christ. On the other hand, he can underscore the fact that his own era in history – that of the Great Persecution and the triumph of Christianity under Constantine – is an historical apex of similar importance to an event normally viewed as the definitive moment of Christian history: the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. As the parallel accounts of Church and Empire in Bk VIII suggest, this era is characterized by the convergence of the two most important historical *politeiai* in Eusebius' thought. By demonstrating that the experience of both the Church and the Empire during the Persecution reflects the universal pattern of Christian world history, Eusebius can

argue that the two entities, which are only loosely associated at the beginning of the work through the concurrence of Christ's birth and Augustus' reign (1.2.23), have in his time become inextricably linked in God's providential unfolding of history. Now Christian is Roman, Roman is Christian. Now all history is Christian history.

## V. Sources

Bk VIII is less documentary and archival in character than the seven books which precede. This has been seen as part and parcel of the final triad's uniqueness and adduced in debates about the *HE*'s publication history.<sup>53</sup> Indeed Eusebius quotes only two documents in Bk VIII: the letter of Phileas (8.10.2-10) and the Edict of Toleration (8.17.3-10). Still, he must have relied on a number of sources for Bk VIII's narrative, for it is much less eyewitness in nature than *MP(s)*. In fact, only 8.pref. – 3.4 and 8.7.1 – 9.5 give the impression of being based primarily on autopsy. The problem is that Eusebius rarely names or even indicates sources in Bk VIII as he does with regularity in Bks I-VII. Thus it is necessary briefly to address some possible sources for Bk VIII.

While most of the introductory section (8.pref. – 2.3) probably derives, on the whole, from general knowledge and Eusebius' own observations (e.g., αὐτοῖς ἐπέιδομεν ὀφθαλμοῖς 8.2.1), the information about Dorotheus, Gorgonius, and the imperial servants seems to originate from the same source which underlies 8.5.1 – 6.7 (where these figures appear again; see below). In all likelihood, Eusebius acquired the content of the first three persecuting edicts (8.2.4-5) from the ordinances as they were posted at Caesarea.<sup>54</sup> The proximate source for 8.3.1-4, an impressionistic account of the various trials endured by church leaders following the third edict,

---

<sup>53</sup> R. Rees, *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (Edinburgh, 2004), 61 summarizes the debate; see also Louth 1990, "Date of Eusebius," 114-115.

<sup>54</sup> S. Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284-324* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 179-182 provides a brief overview of these.

is *MP(s)* 1.3-5, though the ultimate source may, again, simply be autopsy. On the other hand, the account of the persecution in the army (8.4.1-4) probably derives from a written source, as 8.app.1, the precursor to 8.4, indicates (see *λόγος ἔχει* 8.app.1).<sup>55</sup> Based on the information attributed to the source in 8.app.1 – that Galerius instigated persecution, first in the army and imperial household, and then urged his colleagues toward general persecution – which, like 8.13.9 – 14.8 and 8.16.2 – 17.2, is similar to Lactantius’ account, we are perhaps dealing with the same anonymous source that informs Eusebius of western affairs (see below). Lawlor suggests that a letter of Lucian of Antioch provides Eusebius critical information on persecuting activities in Nicomedia (see *λόγος ἔχει* 8.6.6), and Carriker conjectures that it may lie behind the account in 8.5.1 – 6.7.<sup>56</sup> Eusebius himself was an eyewitness to many of the events described in 8.7.1 – 9.5, which recounts martyrdoms in Phoenicia and the Thebaid. As such, no source would have been needed for this section. The *Acts of Phileas and Philoromus* supply Eusebius with background information on these martyrs in 8.9.6-8, and an excerpt from the letter of Phileas completes his account of persecution in Egypt (8.10.2-10).<sup>57</sup> For 8.11.1 – 13.8, which details the martyrdoms in various provinces of the East, Eusebius probably used a number of *acta*, some of which may have been included in his *Collection of Ancient Martyrdoms*. As 4.15.47 indicates, this work had been compiled by the time of the first edition. In the same section, Eusebius references a piece of legislation issued by Maximin ordering the mutilation of Christians (8.12.8-10). He undoubtedly acquired this from its publication in Caesarea.<sup>58</sup> The account of secular affairs in 8.13.9 – 17.2 may, due to its many similarities with Lactantius’ account, be attributed

---

<sup>55</sup> See Carriker, *Library*, 63-68 for E’s use of the phrase to indicate a written or oral source.

<sup>56</sup> H. J. Lawlor, *Eusebiana: Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 268-270; Carriker, *Library*, 224.

<sup>57</sup> These documents, with brief introductions, are in H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), xlv-xlviii; 320-353.

<sup>58</sup> Oddly, this piece of legislation has been overlooked in most scholarly treatments.

to a common source whose identity is no longer known.<sup>59</sup> Its origin, however, is not necessarily Christian, as has been assumed, for one can point to a number of instances in which Eusebius attempts to Christianize the content of his source (see ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ'ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο 8.14.1).<sup>60</sup> One chapter in this section, however, 8.15.1-2, seems to owe rather to Eusebius' own experience during the war between Licinius and Maximin (see ἀσπίδων ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θωρήκων παρασκευαί...κατὰ πάντα συνεκροτοῦντο τόπον 8.15.2). Finally, since the Edict of Toleration (8.17.3-10), which Eusebius translates from Latin into Greek, was not published in the East by Maximin, Eusebius probably acquired a copy between 311 and 313, perhaps from a friend, in the neighboring provinces belonging to Galerius.<sup>61</sup>

## VI. Historical Considerations

### Martyrs/Confessors

Dorotheus (imperial servant; strangled; 8.1.4; 8.6.1,5)  
 Gorgonius (imperial servant; strangled; 8.1.4; 8.6.1,5)  
 Euethius (unnamed; preeminent Roman at Nicomedia; 8.5.1)  
 Peter (imperial servant; tortured and burned at stake; 8.6.2-4; 8.13.1)  
 Anthimus (Bishop of Nicomedia; beheaded; 8.6.6)  
 Five Egyptian martyrs at Tyre (contest of the beasts, slaughtered with sword; 8.7.1-6)  
 Philoromus (imperial official; beheaded; 8.9.7-8)  
 Phileas (Bishop of Thmuis, decurion, philosopher; beheaded; 8.9.7-8)  
 Adauctus (imperial official; 8.11.2)  
 Domnina, Berenice, Prosdoce (unnamed; prominent Antiochenes; drowned; 8.12.3-4)  
 Two Sisters (prominent Antiochenes; drowned; 8.12.5)  
 Lucian (presbyter of Antioch; 8.13.2)  
 Tyrannion (Bishop of Tyre; 8.13.3)  
 Zenobius (presbyter of Sidon; 8.13.3)  
 Silvanus (Bishop of Emesa; 8.13.3)

<sup>59</sup> R. M. Grant, "Eusebius and Imperial Propaganda," in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 673 provides a list of similarities and posits a common source.

<sup>60</sup> As T. Christensen, *Rufinus of Aquileia and the Historia ecclesiastica, Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius* (Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 1989), 134 ff. argues.

<sup>61</sup> Corcoran, *Empire of the Tetrarchs*, 186-187.

Silvanus (Bishop of Gaza; 8.13.5)  
 Peleus (Egyptian bishop; burned; 8.13.5)  
 Nilus (Egyptian bishop; burned; 8.13.5)  
 Pamphilus (presbyter of Caesarea; 8.13.6)  
 Peter (Bishop of Alexandria; 8.13.7)  
 Faustus (Egyptian presbyter; 8.13.7)  
 Dius (Egyptian presbyter; 8.13.7)  
 Ammonius (Egyptian presbyter; 8.13.7)  
 Hesychius (Egyptian bishop; 8.13.7)  
 Pachymius (Egyptian bishop; 8.13.7)  
 Theodorus (Egyptian bishop; 8.13.7)  
 Dorothea (noble lady of Alexandria; exile; 8.14.15)  
 Sophronia (wife of Urban Prefect; suicide; 8.14.16-17)

It is difficult to calculate the number of martyrs in Bk VIII due to the often imprecise ways in which Eusebius refers to them. True to his generalizing tendencies, he can speak of “countless” martyrdoms (e.g., 8.4.1; 8.1) and “one or two” martyrs (8.4.4). There is little we can do with this information. Yet if we count all the individual martyrs (both named and unnamed) and references to concrete numbers, Bk VIII speaks of 293 martyrs (34 individual martyrdoms, 220 in the Thebaid, 39 at Phaeno). Although this is certainly more than the 91 mentioned in the *MP*,<sup>62</sup> some overlap occurs (Silvanus of Gaza, Peleus, Nilus, and Pamphilus [8.13.5-6]); 39 martyrs at Phaeno [8.13.5]), and the number “220” for the Thebaid should be taken with a grain of salt (see *πλειόνων ἢ δέκα* 8.9.3). Nevertheless, Eusebius succeeds in creating the impression of greater numbers, which accords with his desire to establish a more substantial narrative of persecution (see *οὐ τῆς τυχούσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς* 8.pref) in the second edition.

Quite unlike *MP(s)* and other books of the *HE*, a large number of the martyrs in Bk VIII are of noble birth, great wealth, and/or high station. Of the 34 martyrs listed individually, 12 are characterized as preeminent Romans, 12 are bishops (Phileas is also a decurion), 6 are presbyters

<sup>62</sup> According to the calculations of G. E. M. De Ste. Croix, “Aspects of the Great Persecution,” *HTR* 47 (1954): 75-109; See also G. E. M. De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy* (New York: Oxford, 2006), 176-180.

(indeed famous ones, such as Lucian and Pamphilus), and 5 are unidentified. What explains this increased focus on martyrs from the upper classes in the second edition? First of all, as we have shown, Eusebius had to rely on source material, such as martyr-acts, to a much greater degree in the second edition than in *MP(s)*, which was primarily an eyewitness account centered on local martyrs. Thus it would have been much easier for him to find accounts of well-known and high-ranking martyrs for regions outside Palestine. In addition, the shift in focus likely coincides with Eusebius' elevation to the bishopric (ca. 315; see Introduction I) and thus marks a change in his own social perspective. But we must not underestimate the historical-theological value of such an emphasis. It was a common feature of Christian apologetic to use examples of upper-class believers as evidence against the charge that Christianity was a religion of the lower classes (see θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ 8.9.6). And for the economy of the *HE* in particular, it allows Eusebius further to underscore the final marriage of Church and Empire which begins in Bk VIII (see Introduction IV).

Another feature of Eusebius' view of martyrdom is his praise for voluntary martyrdom.<sup>63</sup> De Ste. Croix has observed that 31 out of the 47 martyrdoms in *MP* whose details we know are voluntary.<sup>64</sup> In Bk VIII, 6 out of the 34 individual martyrs are volunteers (including suicides): Euethius, Philoromus (based on information in the *Acta*), Domnina, Berenice, Prosdoce, and Sophronia; Eusebius also lists three groups of volunteers without numbering the individuals therein: those who jumped on the pyre in Nicomedia (8.6.6), those who leapt on the tribunal in the Thebaid (8.9.5), and the roof-jumpers of Antioch (8.12.2). He has admiration for all of these, sometimes implicit (as in the case of Euethius; see ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκνηθεὶς διαπύρῳ τε

---

<sup>63</sup> On topic of Voluntary Martyrdom, see De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 153-200; A. J. Droge, "The Crown of Immortality: Toward a Redescription of Christian Martyrdom," in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. John J. Collins and Michael A. Fishbane (Albany: SUNY Press, 1995), 153-168; W. Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 201-242.

<sup>64</sup> De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 176.

ἐφορμήσας τῇ πίστει 8.5.1), sometimes explicit (see ὅτε καὶ θαυμασιωτάτην ὀρμὴν θεῖαν τε ὡς ἀληθῶς δύναμιν καὶ προθυμίαν 8.9.5). Indeed, Eusebius' theological-historical outlook provided the basis for a favorable view of voluntary martyrdom: if persecution is a divinely ordained punishment, as it clearly is in Bk VIII, then there will be martyrs; as representatives of the divine Logos, these should suffer without hesitation, like Christ, in accordance with God's providential plan.

Certain passages which have been seen to betray a negative view of voluntary martyrdom in earlier books are largely illusory. For example, when Eusebius admonishes Quintus for rushing to volunteer (4.15.8), his rashness and failure to persevere seem to be more problematic than his volunteerism; indeed he can also praise Germanicus for his provocations, which amount to semi-volunteerism (4.15.5-6). In the case of the young Origen, it was divine Providence which acted "for the general good through his mother" to keep him from martyrdom; Origen's impulse to volunteer was admirable (6.2.6). It appears that the primary concern for Eusebius was whether the individual martyr persevered once he committed himself to witness. This permitted Eusebius to have a favorable view of flight as well.<sup>65</sup> Eusebius' openness both to voluntary martyrdom and to flight may relate to his own experience of persecution. As the *MP* recounts, many of his friends and colleagues volunteered and endured martyrdom admirably. He recorded their ordeals with relish. Eusebius himself, however, when faced with the prospect of martyrdom – perhaps in connection with his involvement with Pamphilus while the latter was in prison – may have fled to Tyre and Egypt.<sup>66</sup> Later suspicions of his apostasy would have contributed to his disapproval of rigorist groups, such as the followers of Novatian, Meletius, and

---

<sup>65</sup> Note Eusebius' praise for Bishops Dionysius (7.pref.) and Peter of Alexandria (8.13.7), both of whom fled persecution. For a discussion of flight from persecution in the early Church, see O. Nicholson, "Flight from Persecution as Imitation of Christ," *JTS* 40 (1989): 48-65.

<sup>66</sup> He visited Phoenicia, Egypt, and possibly Arabia between 311 and 313. See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 148.

Donatus. Thus, from personal experience, Eusebius could appreciate both volunteerism and flight.

### Ecclesiastical Leaders

Much has been made of Eusebius' seemingly inexplicable decision to end the lists of bishops in Bk VIII.<sup>67</sup> This is because, in doing so, he abandons both a primary subject of the work (1.1.1) and the chronological framework of the narrative. The significance of this could not have been lost on Eusebius. Thus it appears that the termination of the episcopal lists in Bk VIII was deliberate, a suspicion which is confirmed by the theological-historical economy of the *HE*.

We should note that the cessation of the bishop-lists coincides with the Church's fall from grace at the beginning of Bk VIII, an event, we are told, which results in the Great Persecution. According to Eusebius, the ecclesiastical leaders play a particularly shameful role in this debacle (8.1.7 – 2.3). That the bishop-lists end (7.32.31) at precisely the point where the clergy fall into sin is no coincidence. Rather it demonstrates that the Church's direct link with Christ – through apostolic succession – has been broken by the ecclesiastical leaders' misbehavior, and can only be restored, as Eusebius later implies, by the martyrs' endurance of the divine chastisement which comes through persecution.<sup>68</sup> This restoration occurs in 8.13.1-7, which recounts the famous ecclesiastical martyrs. Before this, however, the narrative contains a noticeable dearth of churchmen suffering for their faith. Indeed only two out of the 18 martyrs mentioned before 8.13 are said to hold a church office (Anthimus and Phileas, to whom Eusebius also refers in 8.13). This must be seen as a deliberate condemnation on Eusebius' part of the

---

<sup>67</sup> e.g., Louth, "Date of Eusebius," 115; Burgess, "Dates and Editions," 44 despairs of finding an explanation for the phenomenon. For a detailed examination of episcopal lists in the *HE*, see R. L. Williams, *Bishop Lists: Formation of Apostolic Succession in Ecclesiastical Crises* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005), esp. 181-226.

<sup>68</sup> As we have already shown, *HE* 10.4.60 speaks of the purificatory role of the martyrs.

apostatizing tendencies of the clergy described in 8.2-3; moreover, it contributes to the perceived absence of church leadership during the persecution already created by the termination of the episcopal lists. It is only at the end of the martyrological section of Bk VIII (8.3.1-8.13.8), when the first bout of persecution has run its course, that Eusebius again mentions the ecclesiastical leaders. And he does so in a list which, quite similar to his earlier bishop-lists, contains clergy from prominent cities, including Alexandria and Antioch. This time, however, instead of a succession of bishops, we receive “a διαδογή of martyrdom.”<sup>69</sup> Although Eusebius never states it explicitly here, the implication is that the church leaders have been restored through their perseverance during the persecution. Thus the clergy whom Eusebius chastised in 8.1.8 as being more like tyrants than pastors have now become “pastors of the logical flocks of Christ” (τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες), martyrs rather than leaders (8.1.7). This is a considerable shift in Eusebius’ conception of apostolic succession: in the “new” era inaugurated by the Great Persecution, the Church’s direct link to Christ comes not through the bishops, but through the martyrs.

All of this is in keeping with Eusebius’ stated purpose in 8.2.3 of omitting lengthy descriptions of the clergy’s sins and recording only what is profitable. Yet Eusebius executes this plan much better in the second edition than he does in the first. For the initial version of Bk VIII, which comprised the current introduction (8.pref.-8.2.3), *MP(s)*, the Edict of Toleration (8.17.3-10), and the appendix, is more hostile toward ecclesiastical leaders and contains no redemption like we see in 8.13. Instead, Eusebius devotes an additional chapter in the original book (*MP(s)* 12) to a description of the church leaders’ punishment, some of which is bitterly ironic: certain leaders, instead of becoming “shepherds of the spiritual flocks of Christ,” as in the *HE*, become keepers of camels and horses. In fact, as we have seen, Eusebius re-appropriates

---

<sup>69</sup> T. Ferguson, “The Past is Prologue: Origenism in Book X of the Ecclesiastical History,” *ZAC* 7 (2003): 103-104.

this very phrase (ποιμένων τῶν λογικῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ προβάτων) in 8.13 as part of a positive assessment of ecclesiastical leaders. This can only be viewed as deliberate reassessment of church leadership at the close of persecution. What accounts for this change?

By the time he came to write the second edition of Bk VIII, Eusebius had settled into his episcopal office in Caesarea. He had become not just a bishop, but a metropolitan bishop of an influential see. Thus the expediencies of his new station would have necessitated a gentler treatment of the clergy's indiscretions during the persecution. This is even more so the case when we consider Eusebius' own status as a survivor of, but not confessor in, the persecution.<sup>70</sup> If a draft of *MP(s)* was written as early as 311, before Eusebius had his brush with the persecuting authorities in Egypt (or Caesarea?) in 312, the harsher critique of ecclesiastical leaders would make perfect sense. The more gracious treatment rendered in the current book may be as close as we come to discerning "survivor's guilt" in E's writings.<sup>71</sup>

## Emperors

Eusebius constructs the *HE* on the premise that Church and Empire are inextricably connected on an historical level (1.2.23). This is immediately apparent in the work's twofold chronological underpinning provided by the reigns of bishops and emperors. These reigns are often correlated in the passages which anchor the chronology of the work (e.g., 5.22.1; 5.28.7; 6.2.2; 7.2). The framework for this relationship probably owes to the *Chronicon*, whose numerous columns had dwindled to two by this period: Roman Empire and Christian church.<sup>72</sup> Given this interconnectedness, it is no surprise that the lists of emperors cease at the beginning of Bk VIII, just as do the episcopal lists, never to appear again in the work. In fact, the cessation of

---

<sup>70</sup> Grant, *Church Historian*, 165 discusses Eusebius' vulnerability as a survivor and non-confessor.

<sup>71</sup> What Yoshiaki Sato, "Martyrdom and Apostasy," in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 621 describes as "self-hatred."

<sup>72</sup> Chesnut, *Christian Histories*, 76.

both lists occurs at precisely the same place in the text. After Eusebius swears off the theme of apostolic succession, discussing instead the shameful behavior of the bishops leading up to the persecution, he records the last imperial reign, the nineteenth year of Diocletian, which marks the beginning of the Great Persecution (8.2.4). As with the termination of the bishop-lists, Eusebius wishes to emphasize that the Empire, like the Church, has fallen into evil and lost the protection of the divine. Undoubtedly, the structure of the Tetrarchy, which Eusebius very much dislikes on theological grounds, is also at play. To Eusebius' mind, monarchy is a better representation of divine sovereignty.<sup>73</sup> Moreover, it is difficult to have a true succession of emperors with a four-man imperial college. Thus only when we meet Constantius, whom Eusebius describes as “alone” in the Empire among his colleagues in piety and mildness, and Constantine, his “legitimate successor,” do we perceive the restoration of the “true” imperial succession, this time, that of a single monarch and his son. This occurs immediately following Eusebius' description of the restoration of the church leaders – and thereby the apostolic succession – in 8.13.1-9. The correlation, therefore, between apostolic and imperial successions in Bk VIII, indeed both their termination and restoration, is consistent with the book's structure, which, as we have shown, links Church and Empire through the universal pattern of paradise, fall, punishment, restoration.

The Christological and Trinitarian language surrounding Eusebius' description of Constantius and Constantine in 8.13.12-14 betrays a theological understanding of the latter's succession. Constantius is characterized by terminology which recalls the first person of the Trinity: he is quite friendly to the divine Logos (τῷ τε θείῳ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα 8.13.12), *alone* among his colleagues as being worthy of his office (μόνος τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως τῆς ἡγεμονίας 8.13.12), thrice-blessed (τρισμακάριον 8.13.13), *alone* to die well while still an emperor (μόνος

---

<sup>73</sup> See the discussion in Chesnut, *Christian Histories*, 77-78.

ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας εὐμενῶς...τελευτήσας 8.13.13). Constantine, like the Logos, was king from the very beginning (εὐθὺς ἀρχόμενος βασιλεὺς 8.13.14, which recalls the beginning of history at 1.2.18; also cf. 1.2.3), proclaimed as such long before this by the all-ruling God (ἔτι πολὺ τούτων πρότερον πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ ἀναγορευθεὶς 8.13.14). He was the legitimate son of Constantius (διαδόχῳ γνησίῳ παιδί 8.13.13), just as the Logos was the legitimate and only-begotten Son of the Father (τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ μονογενῆ 1.2.3). Moreover, he was an emulator of his father's piety toward the Christians' Logos (ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο 8.13.14) and "most perfect" (τελεώτατος 8.13.14), which approximates Eusebius' description of the Logos as the perfect image of the Father (e.g., *DE* 4.2.1; *ET* 2.17.6). We should note that πατρικῆς here is somewhat ambiguous, as it ostensibly refers to Constantius, but perhaps also to God the Father. In fact, Eusebius recounts Constantius' deification in 8.13.12, further strengthening the relationship between Constantius and the first person of the Trinity, and establishing a divine predecessor for Constantine. These theological-historical considerations, which appear to be programmatic, may go a long way toward challenging the view, based largely on the evidence of Eusebius, that Constantius himself was a Christian.<sup>74</sup>

## Bk VIII and History

Bk VIII has enjoyed a secondary status among the primary documents which constitute our principal historical witness to the events surrounding the Great Persecution. By contrast,

---

<sup>74</sup> e.g., T. G. Elliott, *The Christianity of Constantine the Great* (Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1996), 20-28.

Lactantius' *DMP*, the *MP*, and Bk IX of the *HE* have been held up as our most indispensable accounts of the period, because of their closer proximity to the events which they narrate.<sup>75</sup> From a modern historian's point of view, Bk VIII suffers from two major shortcomings. The first is Eusebius' historiographical method, which is characterized by generalization, action on the cosmic rather than human level, a downplaying of historical development, and a strong theological and apologetic agenda.<sup>76</sup> Due to the economy of the *HE* as a whole (see Introduction IV), these features are more pronounced in Bk VIII. The second drawback relates to Bk VIII's complex compositional history (see Introduction III). Eusebius originally intended *MP(s)* to constitute the meat of the book as an eyewitness account of the persecution in Palestine. Yet when this original narrative seemed too parochial for the universal scope of the work, *MP(s)* was replaced in the second edition of 315/16 by a rewritten form (our present book). In the revamped Bk VIII, Eusebius wished to provide a more geographically diverse representation of the persecution while retaining the original firsthand character of *MP(s)*. Since Eusebius himself could only offer his experiences in Tyre and Egypt (8.7-8; see Introduction V), he had to rely on collections of martyr-acts and sources about persecution in the West to fill out his narrative. This meant that the new book retained the eyewitness "feel" of the original but lacked the immediacy, concreteness, and historical detail which make *MP* such a valuable document from the period. At the same time, the emotive quality of the eyewitness approach probably limited the number of documents – one of the most important features of Bks IX and X – which Eusebius was willing to reproduce (e.g., the original edicts of persecution are only paraphrased). What results is a vague and often non-chronological narrative, which is largely devoid of documents and, due to his use of the anonymous source (see Introduction V), reproduces much

---

<sup>75</sup> Barnes 1981, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 150 seems to express the scholarly consensus.

<sup>76</sup> See especially Chesnut, *Christian Histories*, 65-95; Morgan, "Eusebius of Caesarea," 193-208; and Mortley, *Universal History*, 151-199.

of Lactantius' account. Despite these fundamental defects, however, Eusebius' instinct as a documentarian ensures that Bk VIII contains many historical nuggets. Thus it is necessary to give a brief catalogue of the most important contributions of Bk VIII to our understanding of the Great Persecution:

Impressionistic evidence regarding Christianity in Imperial administration (8.1.1-5)  
Church size and building (8.1.6)  
Galerius' motivation for persecuting the army (8.4.2)  
Impressionistic evidence regarding the large number of Christians abandoning the army (8.4.2-4)  
Commander in charge of persecution in army (8.4.3)  
Loss of life during military persecution (8.4.3)  
Galerius' caution about bloodshed and expansion of persecution (8.4.4)  
Large number of martyrs with Anthimus (8.6.6)  
Fire in palace; rumor went around that it was Christians' fault (8.6.6)  
Voluntary Martyrdom there (leaping on pyres)? (8.6.6)  
Imperial servants' bodies exhumed and thrown into sea (8.6.7)  
Uprisings in Melitene and Syria; connection with second edict (8.6.8)  
Prisons filled as a result (8.6.9)  
E's eyewitness description of Egyptian martyrs at Tyre (8.7.1-6)  
Description of various forms of death endured by martyrs in the provinces (8.8.1)  
Severity of persecution in the Thebaid (8.9.1-8)  
E's eyewitness of Martyrs in Thebaid (8.9.4-5)  
Letter of Phileas to the Thmuites (8.10.2-10)  
Destruction of Phrygian town and death of Aductus (8.11.1-2)  
Impressionistic description of persecution in provinces (8.12.1-2)  
Martyrdom of Domnina, Berenice, and Prosdoce (8.12.3-4)  
Martyrdom of Two Sisters at Antioch (8.12.5)  
Maximin's policy of mutilation (8.12.8-10)  
Faustus, Dius, Ammonius (8.13.7)  
Tyrannion, Zenobius, Silvanus (8.13.3-4)  
Maxentius' feigned Christianity (8.14.1)  
Maximin's alliance with Maxentius (8.14.7)  
Maximin's religious activity (8.14.9)  
Exile of Dorothea (8.14.15)  
Martyrdom of Sophronia (8.14.16-17)  
E's experience of civil war at Caesarea (8.15.1-2)  
Edict of Toleration (8.17.3-10)

## VII. Style

Translators of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* into English have generally lamented Eusebius' Greek as an obstacle to clarity and understanding which must be overcome by their efforts.<sup>77</sup> Indeed, modern scholars have been unkind to his style, which has been described as “painfully rambling and incoherent” and “florid and hard to translate.”<sup>78</sup> While their judgment in this matter owes partly to modern tastes, the ancients also found Eusebius' writing challenging and sometimes defective. For example, Rufinus clearly had difficulty translating parts of the *HE* into his native Latin. Many of his alterations, even if they miss the original sense of the Greek, are designed to improve comprehension.<sup>79</sup> Even the famous Byzantine Patriarch and scholar Photius, a native Greek speaker and writer, finds little to commend in Eusebius' style. The deficiency of expression in his works – his style is said to be “in no way elegant or brilliant” and “lacking much elegance and grace in explanation” – is only offset by his great learning.<sup>80</sup> Photius also implies that Eusebius has his own characteristic style. This gives voice to an often unstated opinion among students and scholars alike that Eusebius' Greek is somehow radically different than that of other authors whom they have studied. It is *sui generis* (which is the classicist's way of saying, “strange”).

There is nothing remarkably new or unique about Eusebius' Greek, unless one considers its hybrid nature exceptional. On a basic level, we can describe his style as a form of “variably Atticized scholarly Koine”<sup>81</sup> with eastern and bureaucratic influences. The three most

---

<sup>77</sup> According to G. A. Williamson, trans., *Eusebius: The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine* (New York: Penguin, 1965), xxxvii, he is “guilty of quite needless obscurity,” and the goal of the translator is “to make clear what the writer is trying to say.”

<sup>78</sup> A. C. McGiffert, trans., *The Church History of Eusebius*, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Henry Wace and Philip Schaff (Oxford: Parker and Company, 1890), 27.

<sup>79</sup> Christensen, *Rufinus*, passim.

<sup>80</sup> Phot. *Bibl.* 13: Τὴν δὲ φράσιν οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδαμοῦ οὔτε ἡδὺς οὔτε λαμπρότητι χαίρων. Πολυμαθῆς δὲ ἔστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ...

<sup>81</sup> G. C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 155.

“distinctive” features which characterize it and often make it difficult to translate are period length, redundancy, and hyperbaton. Williamson notes that the opening sentence of the *HE* is 166 words long, and one has to wait 153 words before he arrives at the main verb.<sup>82</sup> Nothing so dramatic occurs in Bk VIII, but period length does often compound the difficulty of complex syntactical constructions. For example, section 8.9.3 is a period consisting of 61 words which also features anacoluthon (πλειόνων... ἀναιρουμένων 8.9.3). Related to period length is a less-than-subtle redundancy, exemplified by frequent use of multiple adjectives (e.g., ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ 8.1.6; θεία καὶ ἀπορρήτω δυνάμει 8.7.4) and pleonasm (ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος αὐτοῖς θεμελίους καταρριπτουμένους 8.2.1; ὄλην... πολίχνην, αὐτανδρον, πανδημει πάντες, ὄλω δῆμω 8.11.1; πολὺς...πάντα τρόπον...περιειργάζετο 8.12.3). This tendency probably owes to the bureaucratise of the period and to his engagement with Christian writers of the Asiatic style (e.g., Melito of Sardis; 8.26).<sup>83</sup>

His use of hyperbaton, especially the separation of a noun from its modifier by a verb (ἐν ὄλοις ἐπὶ περιγράψαντες βιβλίους 8.pref.; διὰ πάσης προελθὼν ἀνὴρ τῆς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι τιμῆς 8.11.2) is characteristic of the era’s Atticism, as also are his preference for the optative, his frequent use of subordination (especially the genitive absolute: ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθонуμένων καὶ διαλοιδορουμένων 8.1.7; ὥσπερ ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος ὑποκινουμένου τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος 8.4.2), and the – ττ spelling (e.g., τάττοντα 8.2.4; θαλαττίους 8.6.6; πράττειν 8.7.2).<sup>84</sup> Other literary devices in Eusebius’ linguistic arsenal include: alliteration, which often dictates vocabulary and syntax (e.g., ἐώρας γοῦν ἡλικίαν οὐδ’ ὄλων ἐτῶν εἴκοσι δίχα δεσμῶν 8.7.4; ἄθει

<sup>82</sup> Williamson, *History of the Church*, xxxvii.

<sup>83</sup> Grant, *Church Historian*, 142-144; R. MacMullen, "Roman Bureaucratise," *Traditio* 16 (1962): 364-78; E. Fritze, *Beiträge zur sprachlich-stilischen Würdigung des Eusebios* (Borna-Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1910) is probably still the most thorough examination of Eusebius’ style.

<sup>84</sup> S. Gero, "The True Image of Christ: Eusebius' Letter to Constantia Reconsidered," *JThS* 32 (1981): 468-469; Horrocks 2010: 140.

ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα 8.1.8; Ἀντιοχείας ἀναζωπυρεῖν 8.12.2), rhetorical questions (an especially striking sequence occurs in 8.10.12; 12.1, 2), hendiadys (e.g., ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις 8.9.7); chiasm (e.g., ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβοημένοι 8.6.1; ὡς ἀμβλύνεσθαι φονεύοντα τὸν σίδηρον ἀτονοῦντά τε διαθλαῖσθαι 8.9.4), and even catachresis (e.g., κυρίτων δὲ τοῖς ποσὶν 8.7.5). His vocabulary often consists of technical terminology, such as legal (e.g., τῇ κατὰ τῶν προτέρων ἀποφάσει 8.9.5), administrative (e.g., τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης μαγιστροτήτος τε καὶ καθολικότητος 8.11.2), and philosophical/theological (τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες 8.13.3) language.

That Eusebius had “serious” stylistic concerns and could write in “pure” Attic Greek is demonstrated by the *Contra Hieroclem*, an apologetic treatise in the style of the Second Sophistic, which is now accepted to be a genuine work of the author.<sup>85</sup> This raises the question of why Eusebius chose to write in such a different way in his *magna opera*? While we may never be able to answer this question definitively, an approach for future study might be to consider how Eusebius’ Greek style complements his theological, apologetic, and historiographical aims. For example, the same prose style which scholars have criticized for lacking precision gives the action of the narrative an ethereal quality that reinforces the generalizing and universalizing tendencies in Eusebius’ historiographical approach. On some level, the repeating historical patterns in Eusebius’ view of salvific history may be reflected in his widespread use of pleonasm and redundancy, the separation of humanity from God in his heavy use of subordination, especially the genitive absolute, and the expanse of historical time in his lengthy periods. At any rate, we should approach Eusebius’ Greek not with an arbitrary

---

<sup>85</sup> For stylistic considerations, see T. Hägg, “Hierocles the Lover of Truth and Eusebius the Sophist,” *SO* 67 (1992): 147-149.

criterion of elegance which is dictated by taste, culture, or comparison, but with a willingness to gauge its effectiveness within the author's own program.

## CHAPTER II

### GREEK TEXT

**Pref.** Τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὴν ἐν ὅλοις ἑπτὰ περιγράψαντες βιβλίους, ἐν ὀγδόῳ τούτῳ συγγράμματι τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, οὐ τῆς τυχούσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς, ἐν τι τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων ἡγούμεθα δεῖν εἰς γνῶσιν καὶ τῶν μεθ' ἡμᾶς παραδοῦναι, καὶ ἄρξεται γε ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν ἐντεῦθεν.

**I.** Ὅσης μὲν καὶ ὁποίας πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ δόξης ὁμοῦ καὶ παρρησίας ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τῷ βίῳ κατηγγελέμενος τῆς εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν εὐσεβείας λόγος παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, ἠξίωτο, μεῖζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως διηγῆσασθαι· **2.** τεκμήρια δ' ἂν γένοιτο τῶν κρατούντων αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους δεξιώσεις, οἷς καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐνεχείριζον ἡγεμονίας, τῆς περὶ τὸ θύειν ἀγωνίας κατὰ πολλὴν ἦν ἀπέσφζον περὶ τὸ δόγμα φιλίαν αὐτούς ἀπαλλάττοντες· **3.** τί δεῖ περὶ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς βασιλικούς λέγειν οἴκους καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀρχόντων; οἱ τοῖς οἰκείοις εἰς πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ παρρησιαζομένοις λόγῳ τε καὶ βίῳ συνεχώρουν, γαμεταῖς καὶ παισὶ καὶ οἰκέταις, μόνον οὐχὶ καὶ ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ παρρησίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ἐπιτρέποντες· οὐς ἐξόχως καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν συνθεραπόντων ἀποδεκτοὺς ἡγοῦντο, **4.** οἷος ἐκεῖνος ἦν Δωρόθεος, πάντων αὐτοῖς εὐνούστατός τε καὶ πιστότατος καὶ τούτων ἕνεκα διαφερόντως παρὰ τοὺς ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἡγεμονίαις ἐντιμότητος, ὃ τε σὺν αὐτῷ περιβόητος Γοργόνιος καὶ ὅσοι τῆς αὐτῆς ὁμοίως τούτοις ἠξίωντο διὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον τιμῆς· **5.** οἷας τε καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν ἄρχοντας παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐπιτρόποις καὶ ἡγεμόσιν ἀποδοχῆς ἦν ὄραν ἀξιουμένους. πῶς δ' ἂν τις διαγράψειεν τὰς μυριάδους ἐκεῖνας ἐπισυναγωγὰς καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἀθροισμάτων τὰς τε ἐπισήμους ἐν τοῖς προσευκτηρίοις συνδρομάς;

ὧν δὴ ἔνεκα μηδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς πάλαι οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι, εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνά πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας. **6.** ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις προϊόντα ὀσημέραι τε εἰς αὔξην καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιδιδόντα οὐδεὶς ἀνεῖργεν φθόνος οὐδέ τις δαίμων πονηρὸς οἷός τε ἦν βασκαίνειν οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλαῖς κωλύειν, ἐς ὅσον ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ ἔσκεπέν τε καὶ ἐφρούρει, οἷα δὴ ἄξιον ὄντα, τὸν ἑαυτῆς λαόν. **7.** Ὡς δ' ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαννότητα καὶ νωθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο, ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθονομένων καὶ διαλοιδορουμένων καὶ μόνον οὐχὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἑαυτοῖς προσπολεμούντων ὄπλοις, εἰ οὕτω τύχοι, καὶ δόρασιν τοῖς διὰ λόγων ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι προσρηγνύντων καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων τῆς τε ὑποκρίσεως ἀφάτου καὶ τῆς εἰρωνείας ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ὅσον κακίας προϊούσης, ἡ μὲν δὴ θεία κρίσις, οἷα φίλον αὐτῆ, πεφεισμένως, τῶν ἀθροισμάτων ἔτι συγκροτουμένων, ἡρέμα καὶ μετρίως τὴν αὐτῆς ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνει, ἐκ τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἀδελφῶν καταρχομένου τοῦ διωγμοῦ. **8.** ὡς δ' ἀνεπαισθήτως ἔχοντες οὐχ ὅπως εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προθυμούμεθα, οἷα δὲ τινες ἄθεοι ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγούμενοι ἄλλας ἐπ' ἄλλαις προσετίθεμεν κακίας οἷ τε δοκοῦντες ἡμῶν ποιμένες τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας θεσμόν παρωσάμενοι ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀνεφλέγοντο φιλονεικίαις, αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα μόνα, τὰς ἔριδας καὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς τόν τε ζῆλον καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχθος τε καὶ μῖσος ἐπαύξοντες οἷα τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες, τότε δὴ, τότε κατὰ τὴν φάσκουσαν τοῦ Ἱερεμίου φωνὴν “ἐγνόφωσεν ἐν ὄργῃ αὐτοῦ κύριος τὴν θυγατέρα Σιών καὶ κατέρριψεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δόξασμα Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἐμνήσθη τε ὑποποδίου ποδῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὄργῆς αὐτοῦ· ἀλλὰ καὶ κατεπόντισεν κύριος πάντα τὰ ὠραῖα Ἰσραὴλ καὶ καθεῖλεν πάντας τοὺς φραγμοὺς αὐτοῦ,” **9.** κατὰ τε τὰ ἐν Ψαλμοῖς προθεσπισθέντα “κατέστρεψεν τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ δούλου αὐτοῦ” καὶ “ἐβεβήλωσεν εἰς γῆν” διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καθαιρέσεως “τὸ ἀγίασμα αὐτοῦ” καὶ “καθεῖλεν πάντας τοὺς φραγμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἔθετο τὰ ὀχυρώματα αὐτοῦ δειλίαν·

διήρπασάν τε τὰ” πλήθη “τοῦ” λαοῦ “πάντες οἱ διοδεύοντες ὁδόν,” καὶ δὴ ἐπὶ τούτοις “ὄνειδος ἐγενήθη τοῖς γείτοσιν αὐτοῦ. ὕψωσεν” γὰρ “τὴν δεξιὰν τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν τὴν βοήθειαν τῆς ῥομφαίας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀντελάβετο αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.” ἀλλὰ καὶ “κατέλυσεν ἀπὸ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτὸν” καὶ “τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν κατέρραξεν ἐσμίκρυνέν τε τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χρόνου αὐτοῦ,” καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν “κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ αἰσχύνην.” **II.** Συντετέλεσται δὴτα καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα, ὀπηνίκα τῶν μὲν προσευκτηρίων τοὺς οἴκους ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος αὐτοῖς θεμελίους καταρριπτουμένους, τὰς δ' ἐνθέους καὶ ἱερὰς γραφὰς κατὰ μέσας ἀγορὰς πυρὶ παραδιδόμενας αὐτοῖς ἐπέιδομεν ὀφθαλμοῖς τοὺς τε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμένας αἰσχυρῶς ὄδε κάκεισε κρυπταζομένους, τοὺς δὲ ἀσημόνως ἀλισκομένους καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν καταπαιζομένους, ὅτε καὶ κατ' ἄλλον προφητικὸν λόγον “ἐξεχύθη ἐξουδένωσις ἐπ' ἄρχοντας, καὶ ἐπλάνησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀβάτῳ καὶ οὐχ ὁδῷ.” **2.** ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐχ ἡμέτερον διαγράφειν τὰς ἐπὶ τέλει σκυθρωπὰς συμφορὰς, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰς πρόσθεν τοῦ διωγμοῦ διαστάσεις τε αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀτοπίας οὐχ ἡμῖν οἰκτεῖον μνήμη παραδιδόναι· δι' ὃ καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν ἱστορῆσαι περὶ αὐτῶν διέγνωμεν ἢ δι' ὧν ἂν τὴν θεῖαν δικαιοσύνην κρίσιν. **3.** οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τῶν πρὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ πεπειραμένων ἢ τῶν εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων αὐτῇ τε γνώμῃ τοῖς τοῦ κλύδωνος ἐναπορριφέντων βυθοῖς μνήμην ποιήσασθαι προήχθημεν, μόνον δ' ἐκεῖνα τῇ καθόλου προσθήσομεν ἱστορία, ἃ πρώτοις μὲν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς γένοιτ' ἂν πρὸς ὠφελείας. Ἴωμεν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων ἐπιτομῇ διαγράψοντες. **4.** ἔτος τοῦτο ἦν ἐννεακαιδέκατον τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας, Δύστρος μὲν, λέγοιτο δ' ἂν οὗτος Μάρτιος κατὰ Ῥωμαίους, ἐν ᾧ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ἐορτῆς ἐπελαυνούσης ἠπλωτο πανταχόσε βασιλικά γράμματα, τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι προστάττοντα, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους, τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκεταίαις, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν τῇ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ προθέσει, ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι

προαγορευόντα. **5.** καὶ ἡ μὲν πρώτη καθ' ἡμῶν γραφὴ τοιαύτη τις ἦν· μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐτέρων ἐπιφοιτησάντων γραμμάτων, προσετάττετο τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προέδρους πάντας τοὺς κατὰ πάντα τόπον πρῶτα μὲν δεσμοῖς παραδίδοσθαι, εἴθ' ὕστερον πάσῃ μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι. **III.** Τότε δὴ οὖν, τότε πλεῖστοι μὲν ὅσοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες, δειναῖς αἰκίαις προθύμως ἐναθλήσαντες, μεγάλων ἀγῶνων ἱστορίας ἐπεδείξαντο, μυρίοι δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ δειλίας προναρκήσαντες προχείρως οὕτως ἀπὸ πρώτης ἐξησθένησαν προσβολῆς, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἕκαστος εἶδη διάφορα βασάνων ἐνήλλαττεν, ὃ μὲν μάστιξιν αἰκίζόμενος τὸ σῶμα, ὃ δὲ στρεβλώσεσιν καὶ ξεσμοῖς ἀνυπομονήτοις τιμωρούμενος, ἐφ' οἷς ἤδη τινὲς οὐκ αἴσιον ἀπηνέγκαντο τοῦ βίου τέλος. ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πάλιν ἄλλως τὸν ἀγῶνα διεξήεσαν· **2.** ὃ μὲν γὰρ τις ἐτέρων βία συνωθούντων καὶ ταῖς παμμιάροις καὶ ἀνάγνοις προσαγόντων θυσίαις ὡς τεθυκῶς ἀπηλλάττετο, καὶ εἰ μὴ τεθυκῶς ἦν, ὃ δὲ μηδ' ὄλως προσπελάσας μηδέ τινας ἐναγοῦς ἐφαψάμενος, εἰρηκότων δ' ἐτέρων ὅτι τεθύκοι, σιωπῇ φέρων τὴν συκοφαντίαν ἀπήει· ἄλλος ἡμίθνης αἰρόμενος ὡς ἂν ἤδη νεκρὸς ἐρρίπτετο, **3.** καὶ τις αὖ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμενος μακρὰν ἐσύρετο τοῖν ποδοῖν, ἐν τεθυκόσιν αὐτοῖς λελογισμένος. ὃ δὲ τις ἐβόα καὶ μεγάλη διεμαρτύρετο φωνῇ τῆς θυσίας τὴν ἄρνησιν, καὶ ἄλλος Χριστιανὸς εἶναι ἐκεκράγει, τῇ τοῦ σωτηρίου προσρήματος ὁμολογία λαμπρυνόμενος· ἕτερος τὸ μὴ τεθυκῆναι μηδὲ θύσειν ποτὲ διετείνεται. **4.** ὅμως δ' οὖν καὶ οἶδε πολυχειρία τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦτο τεταγμένης στρατιωτικῆς παρατάξεως κατὰ στόματος παιόμενοι καὶ κατασιγαζόμενοι κατὰ τε προσώπου καὶ παρεϊῶν τυπτόμενοι μετὰ βίας ἐξωθοῦντο· οὕτως ἐξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκῆναι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο. Ἀλλ' οὐ καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῖς μαρτύρων ταῦτα προυχῶρει. ὣν εἰς ἀκριβῆ διήγησιν τίς ἂν ἡμῖν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος; **IV.** Μυρίους μὲν γὰρ ἱστορήσαι ἂν τις θαυμαστὴν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων ἐνδεδειγμένους προθυμίαν, οὐκ ἐξ ὅτουπερ μόνον ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός, πολὺ πρότερον δὲ καθ' ὃν ἔτι τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης συνεκροτεῖτο. **2.** ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι

πρῶτον ὥσπερ ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος ὑποκινουμένου τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος κρύβδην τε ἔτι καὶ ἀφανῶς μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ μεταξὺ χρόνον ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπιχειροῦντος οὐκ ἀθρόως τε τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαποδουμένου πολέμῳ, ἀλλ' ἔτι τῶν κατὰ τὰ στρατόπεδα μόνων ἀποπειρωμένου (ταύτη γὰρ καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀλῶναι ῥαδίως ᾔετο, εἰ πρότερον ἐκείνων καταγωνισάμενος περιγένοιτο), πλείστους παρῆν τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ὄρᾶν ἀσμενέστατα τὸν ἰδιωτικὸν προασπαζομένους βίον, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἔξαρνοι γένοιτο τῆς περὶ τὸν τῶν ὄλων δημιουργὸν εὐσεβείας. **3.** ὡς γὰρ ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος, ἄρτι πρῶτον ἐνεχείρει τῷ κατὰ τῶν στρατευμάτων διωγμῷ, φυλοκρινῶν καὶ διακαθαίρων τοὺς ἐν τοῖς στρατοπέδοις ἀναφερομένους αἵρεσίν τε διδοὺς ἢ πειθαρχοῦσιν ἤς μετῆν αὐτοῖς ἀπολαύειν τιμῆς ἢ τὸναντίον στέρεσθαι ταύτης, εἰ ἀντιάττειν τῷ προστάγματι, πλείστοι ὅσοι τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας στρατιῶται τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ὁμολογίαν, μὴ μελλήσαντες, τῆς δοκούσης δόξης καὶ εὐπραγίας ἣς εἶχοντο, ἀναμφιλόγως προουτίμησαν. **4.** ἤδη δὲ σπανίως τούτων εἶς που καὶ δεῦτερος οὐ μόνον τῆς ἀξίας τὴν ἀποβολήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θάνατον τῆς εὐσεβοῦς ἐνστάσεως ἀντικατηλλάττοντο, μετρίως πως ἤδη τότε τοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν ἐνεργοῦντος καὶ μέχρις αἵματος ἐπ' ἐνίων φθάνειν ἐπιτολμῶντος, τοῦ πλήθους, ὡς ἔοικεν, τῶν πιστῶν δεδιττομένου τε αὐτὸν ἔτι καὶ ἀποκναίοντος ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων ἀθρόως ἐφορμῆσαι πόλεμον. **5.** Ὡς δὲ καὶ γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο, οὐδ' ἔστιν λόγῳ δυνατὸν ἀφηγήσασθαι ὅσους καὶ ὁποίους τοῦ θεοῦ μάρτυρας ὀφθαλμοῖς παρῆν ὄρᾶν τοῖς ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς τε πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας οἰκοῦσιν. **V.** Αὐτίκα γοῦν τῶν οὐκ ἀσήμων τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγαν κατὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ βίῳ νενομισμένας ὑπεροχὰς ἐνδοξοτάτων, ἅμα τῷ τὴν κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν τῇ Νικομηδεῖα προτεθῆναι γραφήν, ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινηθεὶς διαπύρῳ τε ἐφορμῆσας τῇ πίστει, ἐν προφανεῖ καὶ δημοσίῳ κειμένην ὡς ἀνοσίαν καὶ ἀσεβεστάτην ἀνελὼν σπαράττει, δυεῖν ἐπιπαρόντων κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν βασιλέων, τοῦ τε πρεσβυτάτου τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦ τὸν τέταρτον ἀπὸ τούτου τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπικρατοῦντος βαθμόν. ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν τῶν τηνικάδε

πρῶτος τοῦτον διαπρέψας τὸν τρόπον ἅμα τε τοιαῦτα οἶα καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν, ὑπομείνας ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ τολμήματι, τὸ ἄλυπον καὶ ἀτάραχον εἰς αὐτὴν τελευταίαν διετήρησεν ἀναπνοήν. **VI.** Πάντων δὲ ὅσοι τῶν πώποτε ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβοημένοι εἴτε παρ' Ἑλλησιν εἴτε παρὰ βαρβάροις, θεῖους ἤνεγκεν ὁ καιρὸς καὶ διαπρεπεῖς μάρτυρας τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον βασιλικούς παῖδας, οἱ καὶ τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρὰ τοῖς δεσπόταις ἠξιωμένοι τιμῆς γνησίων τε αὐτοῖς διαθέσει τέκνων οὐ λειπόμενοι, μείζονα πλοῦτον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἠγῆνται τῆς τοῦ βίου δόξης καὶ τρυφῆς τοὺς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ὄνειδισμούς τε καὶ πόνους καὶ τοὺς κεκαινουρημένους ἐπ' αὐτοῖς πολυτρόπους θανάτους· ὧν ἑνὸς τινος οἶψ' ἀπέχρηται μνησθέντες τῷ τοῦ βίου τέλει, σκοπεῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμβεβηκότα τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν καταλείψομεν. **2.** ἠγετό τις εἰς μέσον κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν ἐφ' ὧν δεδηλώκαμεν ἀρχόντων. θύειν δὴ οὖν προσταχθεῖς, ὡς ἐνίστατο, γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι κελεύεται μάλιστα τε τὸ πᾶν σῶμα καταξαινεσθαι, εἰς ὅτε ἠττηθεῖς κἂν ἄκων τὸ προσταττόμενον ποιήσειεν. **3.** ὡς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα πάσχων ἀδιάτρεπτος ἦν, ὄξος λοιπὸν ἤδη τῶν ὀστέων ὑποφαινομένων αὐτοῦ σὺν καὶ ἄλατι φύραντες κατὰ τῶν διασαπέντων τοῦ σώματος μερῶν ἐνέχεον· ὡς δὲ καὶ ταύτας ἐπάτει τὰς ἀλγηδόνας, ἐσχάρα τούντεῦθεν καὶ πῦρ εἰς μέσον εἴλκετο, καὶ κρεῶν ἐδωδίμων δίκην τὰ λείψανα αὐτῷ τοῦ σώματος ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς οὐκ εἰς ἄθρον, ὡς ἂν μὴ συντόμως ἀπαλλαγείη, κατὰ βραχὺ δὲ ἀνηλίσκετο, οὐ πρότερον ἀνεῖναι τῶν ἐπιτιθέντων αὐτὸν τῇ πυρῷ συγχωρουμένων, πρὶν ἂν καὶ μετὰ τοσαῦτα τοῖς προσταττομένοις ἐπινεύσειεν. **4.** ὁ δ' ἀπρὶξ ἐχόμενος τῆς προθέσεως νικηφόρος ἐν αὐταῖς βασάνοις παρέδωκε τὴν ψυχὴν. τοιοῦτον τῶν βασιλικῶν ἑνὸς τὸ μαρτύριον παίδων, ἄξιον ὡς ὄντως καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας· Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο. **5.** οὐ χεῖρονα δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὄντα λόγου φειδόμενοι συμμετρίας παραλείψομεν, τοσοῦτον ἱστορήσαντες ὡς ὁ τε Δωρόθεος καὶ ὁ Γοργόνιος ἑτέροις ἅμα πλείοσιν τῆς βασιλικῆς οἰκετίας μετὰ τοὺς πολυτρόπους ἀγῶνας βρόχῳ τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάξαντες, τῆς

ἐνθέου νίκης ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα. **6.** Ἐν τούτῳ τῆς κατὰ Νικομήδειαν ἐκκλησίας ὁ τηνικαῦτα προεστὼς Ἄνθιμος διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίαν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμενται· τούτῳ δὲ πλῆθος ἄθροον μαρτύρων προστίθεται, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Νικομήδειαν βασιλείοις πυρκαϊᾶς ἐν αὐταῖς δὴ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἀφθείσης, ἦν καθ' ὑπόνοιαν ψευδῆ πρὸς τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπιχειρηθῆναι λόγου διαδοθέντος, παγγενεῖ σωρηδὸν βασιλικῷ νεύματι τῶν τῆδε θεοσεβῶν οἱ μὲν ξίφει κατεσφάττοντο, οἱ δὲ διὰ πυρὸς ἐτελειοῦντο, ὅτε λόγος ἔχει προθυμία θεία τινὶ καὶ ἀρρήτῳ ἄνδρα ἅμα γυναιξὶν ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὰν καθαλέσθαι· δῆσαντες δὲ οἱ δῆμιοι ἄλλο τι πλῆθος ἐπὶ σκάφαις τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέρριπτον βυθοῖς. **7.** τοὺς δὲ γε βασιλικούς μετὰ θάνατον παῖδας, γῆ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης κηδείας παραδοθέντας, αὐθις ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνορύξαντες ἐναπορρῖψαι θαλάττῃ καὶ αὐτοὺς ῥοντο δεῖν οἱ νενομισμένοι δεσπότης, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἐν μνήμασιν ἀποκειμένους προσκυνοῖέν τινες, θεοὺς δὲ αὐτούς, ὡς γε ῥοντο, λογιζόμενοι. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομηδείας κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀποτελεσθέντα τοῦ διωγμοῦ τοιαῦτα· **8.** οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν δ' ἐτέρων κατὰ τὴν Μελιτηνὴν οὕτω καλουμένην χώραν καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἄλλων ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἐπιφυῆναι τῆ βασιλείᾳ πεπειραμένων, τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας εἰρκταῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς ἐνεῖραι πρόσταγμα ἐφοῖτα βασιλικόν. **9.** καὶ ἦν ἡ θέα τῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις γινομένων πᾶσαν διήγησιν ὑπεραίρουσα, μυρίου πλήθους ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καθειργνυμένου καὶ τὰ πανταχῆ δεσμοτήρια, ἀνδροφόνοις καὶ τυμβωρύχοις πάλαι πρότερον ἐπεσκευασμένα, τότε ἐπληροῦντο ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν τε καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν, ὡς μηδὲ χώραν ἔτι τοῖς ἐπὶ κακουργίαις κατακρίτοις αὐτόθι λείπεσθαι. **10.** αὐθις δ' ἐτέρων τὰ πρῶτα γράμματα ἐπικατειληφόντων, ἐν οἷς τοὺς κατακλείστους θύσαντας μὲν ἔαν βαδίζεῖν ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας, ἐνισταμένους δὲ μυρίαὶ καταξαίνειν προστέτακτο βασάνοις, πῶς ἂν πάλιν ἐνταῦθα τῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν μαρτύρων ἀριθμήσειέν τις τὸ πλῆθος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν καὶ τὸ Μαύρων ἔθνος Θηβαῖδα τε καὶ κατ' Αἴγυπτον; ἐξ ἧς καὶ εἰς ἑτέρας ἤδη προελθόντες πόλεις τε

καὶ ἐπαρχίας διέπρεψαν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις. **VII.** Ἰσμεν γοῦν τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν διαλάμψαντας ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ, ἴσμεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν Τύρῳ τῆς Φοινίκης· οὓς τίς ἰδὼν οὐ κατεπλάγη τὰς ἀναρίθμους μάστιγας καὶ τὰς ἐν τούτοις τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς παραδόξων τῆς θεοσεβείας ἀθλητῶν ἐνστάσεις τόν τε παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὰς μάστιγας ἐν θηρσὶν ἀνθρωποβόροις ἀγῶνα καὶ τὰς ἐν τούτῳ παρδάλεων καὶ διαφόρων ἄρκτων συῶν τε ἀγρίων καὶ πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ κεκαυτηριασμένων βοῶν προσβολὰς καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν θηρίων θαυμασίους τῶν γενναίων ὑπομονάς; **2.** οἷς γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν, ὀπηνίκα τοῦ μαρτυρουμένου σωτήρος ἡμῶν, αὐτοῦ δὴ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν θείαν δύναμιν ἐπιπαροῦσαν ἐναργῶς τε αὐτὴν τοῖς μάρτυσιν ἐπιδεικνῦσαν ἱστορήσαμεν, τῶν ἀνθρωποβόρων ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον μὴ προσψαύειν μηδὲ πλησιάζειν τοῖς τῶν θεοφιλῶν σώμασιν ἐπιτολμώντων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς ἄλλους, ὅσοι δὴπουθεν ἕξωθεν ἐρεθισμοῖς παρώρων αὐτά, φερομένων, μόνων δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀθλητῶν, γυμνῶν ἐστῶτων καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν κατασειόντων ἐπὶ τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπισπωμένων (τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐκελεύετο πράττειν), μηδ' ὄλως ἐφαπτομένων, ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὅπη μὲν καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὀρμώντων, οἷα δὲ πρὸς τινος θειοτέρας δυνάμεως ἀνακρουομένων καὶ αὖ πάλιν εἰς τοῦπίσω χωρούντων· **3.** ὃ καὶ εἰς μακρὸν γινόμενον θαῦμα παρεῖχεν οὐ σμικρὸν τοῖς θεωμένοις, ὥστε ἤδη διὰ τὸ ἄπρακτον τοῦ πρώτου δεῦτερον καὶ τρίτον προσαφίεσθαι ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ μάρτυρι θηρίον. **4.** καταπληγῆναι δ' ἦν τὴν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀπτόητον τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων καρτερίαν καὶ τὴν ἐν σώμασι νέοις βεβηκυῖαν καὶ ἀδιάτρεπτον ἔνστασιν. ἑώρας γοῦν ἡλικίαν οὐδ' ὄλων ἐτῶν εἴκοσι δίχα δεσμῶν ἐστῶτος νέου καὶ τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἐφαπλοῦντος εἰς σταυροῦ τύπον, ἀκαταπλήκτῳ δὲ καὶ ἀτρεμεῖ διανοίᾳ ταῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον σχολαίτατα τεταμένου λιταῖς μηδ' ὄλως τε μεθισταμένου μηδ' ἀποκλίνοντός ποι τοῦ ἔνθα εἰστήκει τόπου, ἄρκτων καὶ παρδάλεων θυμοῦ καὶ θανάτου πνεόντων σχεδὸν αὐτῆς καθαπτομένων αὐτοῦ τῆς σαρκός, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως θεία καὶ ἀπορρήτῳ δυνάμει μόνον οὐχὶ φραπτομένων τὸ στόμα καὶ αἰθῆς παλινδρομούντων εἰς τοῦπίσω. καὶ οὗτος μὲν τις τοιοῦτος ἦν· **5.** πάλιν δ' ἂν ἑτέρους εἶδες (πέντε

γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἐτύγγανον) ἠγριωμένῳ ταύρῳ παραβληθέντας, ὃς τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους τῶν ἔξωθεν προσιόντων τοῖς κέρασιν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ρίπτων διεσπάραττεν, ἡμιθνήτας αἶρεσθαι καταλιπών, ἐπὶ μόνους δὲ θυμῷ καὶ ἀπειλῇ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ὄρμῶν μάρτυρας οὐδὲ πλησιάζειν αὐτοῖς οἶός τε ἦν, κυρίττων δὲ τοῖς ποσὶν καὶ τοῖς κέρασιν τῆδε κάκειῖσε χρώμενος καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν καυτήρων ἐρεθισμοὺς θυμοῦ καὶ ἀπειλῆς πνέων εἰς τοῦπίσω πρὸς τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀνθείλκετο προνοίας, ὡς μηδὲ τούτου μηδὲν μηδαμῶς αὐτοὺς ἀδικήσαντος ἕτερα ἄττα αὐτοῖς ἐπαφίεσθαι θηρία. **6.** τέλος δ' οὖν μετὰ τὰς δεινὰς καὶ ποικίλας τούτων προσβολὰς ξίφει κατασφαγέστες οἱ πάντες ἀντὶ γῆς καὶ τάφων τοῖς θαλαττίοις παραδίδονται κύμασιν. **VIII.** Καὶ τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ ἀγὼν τῶν κατὰ Τύρον τοὺς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἄθλους ἐνδειξαμένων Αἰγυπτίων. Θαυμάσειε δ' ἂν τις αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας γῆς μαρτυρήσαντας, ἔνθα μυριοὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἄνδρες ἅμα γυναῖξιν καὶ παισίν, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας, τοῦ προσκαίρου ζῆν καταφρονήσαντες, διαφόρους ὑπέμειναν θανάτους, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν μετὰ ξεσμοὺς καὶ στρεβλώσεις μάλιστα τε χαλεπωτάτας καὶ μυρίας ἄλλας ποικίλας καὶ φρικτὰς ἀκοῦσαι βασάνους πυρὶ παραδοθέντες, οἱ δὲ πελάγει καταβροχθισθέντες, ἄλλοι δ' εὐθαρσῶς τοῖς ἀποτέμνουσιν τὰς ἑαυτῶν προτείναντες κεφαλὰς, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐναποθανόντες ταῖς βασάνοις, ἕτεροι δὲ λιμῷ διαφθαρέντες, καὶ ἄλλοι πάλιν ἀνασκολοπισθέντες, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ μέχρις ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ βίου καταξαινόμενοι, γυναῖα τε τοῖν ποδοῖν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀποδεσμούμενα μετέωρά τε καὶ διαέρια κάτω κεφαλὴν μαγγάνοις τισὶν εἰς ὕψος ἀνελκόμενα γυμνοῖς τε παντελῶς καὶ μηδ' ἐπικεκαλυμμένοις τοῖς σώμασιν θεῶν ταύτην αἰσχίστην καὶ πάντων ὠμοτάτην καὶ ἀπανθρωποτάτην τοῖς ὀρῶσιν ἅπασιν παρεσχημένα· **2.** ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πάλιν δένδρεσιν καὶ πρέμνοις ἐναπέθνησκον δεσμούμενοι· τοὺς γὰρ μάλιστα

στερροτάτους τῶν κλάδων μηχαναῖς τισιν ἐπὶ ταυτὸ συνέλκοντες εἰς ἐκάτερα τε τούτων τὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ἀποτείνοντες σκέλη, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἠφίεσαν τοὺς κλάδους φέρεσθαι φύσιν, ἄθρουν τῶν μελῶν διασπασμὸν καθ' ὧν ταῦτ' ἐνεχείρουν ἐπινοοῦντες. **3.** καὶ ταυτὰ γε πάντα ἐνηργεῖτο οὐκ ἐπ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας ἢ χρόνον τινὰ βραχύν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν ὅλων ἐτῶν διάστημα, ὅτε μὲν πλείονων ἢ δέκα, ὅτε δὲ ὑπὲρ τοὺς εἴκοσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀναιρουμένων, ἄλλοτε δὲ οὐχ ἦττον καὶ τριάκοντα, ἤδη δ' ἐγγύς που ἐξήκοντα, καὶ πάλιν ἄλλοτε ἑκατὸν ἐν ἡμέρα μιᾷ ἄνδρες ἅμα κομιδῆ νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξίν ἐκτείνοντο, ποικίλαις καὶ ἐναλλαττούσαις τιμωρίαις καταδικαζόμενοι. **4.** ἱστορήσαμεν δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενομένοι πλείους ἀθρόως κατὰ μίαν ἡμέραν τοὺς μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀποτομὴν ὑπομείναντας, τοὺς δὲ τὴν διὰ πυρὸς τιμωρίαν, ὡς ἀμβλύνεσθαι φονεύοντα τὸν σίδηρον ἀτονοῦντά τε διαθλαῖσθαι αὐτούς τε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ἀποκάμνοντας ἀμοιβαδὸν ἀλλήλους διαδέχεσθαι. **5.** ὅτε καὶ θαυμασιωτάτην ὀρμὴν θεῖαν τε ὡς ἀληθῶς δύναμιν καὶ προθυμίαν τῶν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ πεπιστευκότων συνεωρῶμεν. Ἄμα γοῦν τῇ κατὰ τῶν προτέρων ἀποφάσει ἐπεπῆδων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι τῷ πρὸ τοῦ δικαστοῦ βήματι Χριστιανοὺς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες, ἀφροντίστως μὲν πρὸς τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τοὺς τῶν πολυειδῶν βασάνων τρόπους διακείμενοι, ἀκαταπλήκτως δὲ παρρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ μετὰ τε χαρᾶς καὶ γέλωτος καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὴν ὑστάτην ἀπόφασιν τοῦ θανάτου καταδεχόμενοι, ὥστε ψάλλειν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν μέχρις αὐτῆς ἐσχάτης ἀναπέμπειν ἀναπνοῆς. **6.** θαυμάσιοι μὲν οὖν καὶ οὗτοι, ἐξαιρέτως δ' ἐκεῖνοι θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ λόγῳ τε καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ διαπρέψαντες, πάντα γε μὴν δευτέρα θέμενοι τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας καὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν πίστεως, **7.** οἷος Φιλόρωμος ἦν, ἀρχὴν τινὰ οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως ἐγκεχειρισμένος, ὃς μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τιμῆς, ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος, ἐκάστης ἀνεκρίνετο ἡμέρας, Φιλέας τε τῆς Θμουϊτῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος,

διαπρέψας ἀνὴρ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις· **8.** οἱ καὶ μυρίων ὄσων πρὸς αἵματός τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων ἀντιβολούντων, ἔτι μὴν τῶν ἐπ' ἀξίας ἀρχόντων, πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ δικαστοῦ παρακαλοῦντος ὡς ἂν αὐτῶν οἶκτον λάβοιεν φειδώ τε παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν ποιήσοιτο, οὐδαμῶς πρὸς τῶν τοσοῦτων ἐπὶ τὸ φιλοζωῆσαι μὲν ἐλέσθαι, καταφρονῆσαι δὲ τῶν περὶ ὁμολογίας καὶ ἀρνήσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεσμῶν ὑπήχθησαν, ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ πρὸς ἀπάσας τοῦ δικαστοῦ τάς τε ἀπειλάς καὶ τὰς ὕβρεις ἐνστάντες, ἅμφω τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀπετμήθησαν. **X.** Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἑξῶθεν μαθημάτων ἕνεκα πολλοῦ λόγου ἄξιον γενέσθαι τὸν Φιλέαν ἔφαμεν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ παρίτω μάρτυς, ἅμα μὲν ἑαυτὸν ὅστις ποτ' ἦν, ἐπιδείξων, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ συμβεβηκότα μαρτύρια ἀκριβέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμεῖς ἱστορήσων διὰ τούτων τῶν λέξεων· **2.** “τούτων ἀπάντων ὑποδειγμάτων ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπογραμμῶν καὶ καλῶν γνωρισμάτων ἐν ταῖς θεῖαις καὶ ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς κειμένων, οὐδὲν μελλήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι σὺν ἡμῖν μάρτυρες, τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν καθαρῶς τείναντες καὶ τὸν ἐπ' εὐσεβείᾳ θάνατον ἐν νῷ λαβόντες, ἀπρὶξ τῆς κλήσεως εἶχοντο, τὸν μὲν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εὐρόντες ἐνανθρωπήσαντα δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα πᾶσαν μὲν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκκόψη, ἐφόδια δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν εἰσόδου ἡμῖν κατάθηται· ‘οὐ γὰρ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγάγατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν ἕως θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. **3.** δι' ὃ καὶ ζηλώσαντες τὰ μείζονα χαρίσματα οἱ χριστοφόροι μάρτυρες πάντα μὲν πόνον καὶ παντοίας ἐπινοίας αἰκισμῶν οὐκ εἰς ἅπαξ, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ δευτέρον τινες ὑπέμειναν, πάσας δὲ ἀπειλάς οὐ λόγοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργοις τῶν δορυφόρων κατ' αὐτῶν φιλοτιμουμένων, οὐκ ἐνεδίδουν τὴν γνώμην διὰ τὸ τὴν τελείαν ἀγάπην ἔξω βάλλειν τὸν φόβον· **4.** ὧν καταλέγειν τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν ἐφ' ἐκάστη βασάνῳ ἀνδρείαν τίς ἂν ἀρκέσειεν λόγος; ἀνέσεως γὰρ οὔσης ἅπασι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐνουβρίζειν, οἱ μὲν ζύλοις ἔπαιον,

ἕτεροι δὲ ράβδοις, ἄλλοι δὲ μάστιξιν, ἕτεροι δὲ πάλιν ἰμάσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ σχοινίοις. **5.** καὶ ἦν ἡ θεὰ τῶν αἰκισμῶν ἐνηλλαγμένη καὶ πολλὴν τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ κακίαν ἔχουσα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὀπίσω τῷ χεῖρε δεθέντες περὶ τὸ ξύλον ἐξηρτῶντο καὶ μαγγάνοις τισὶ διετείνοντο πᾶν μέλος, εἴθ' οὕτως διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος ἐπῆγον ἐκ κελεύσεως οἱ βασανισταί, οὐ καθάπερ τοῖς φονεῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν πλευρῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς γαστρὸς καὶ κνημῶν καὶ παρειῶν τοῖς ἀμυντηρίοις ἐκόλαζον· ἕτεροι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς μιᾶς χειρὸς ἐξηρτημένοι αἰωροῦντο, πάσης ἀλγηδόνης δεινότεραν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρθρων καὶ μελῶν τάσιν ἔχοντες· ἄλλοι δὲ πρὸς τοῖς κίοσιν ἀντιπρόσωποι ἐδοῦντο, οὐ βεβηκόσιν τοῖς ποσίν, τῷ δὲ βάρει τοῦ σώματος βιαζομένων μετὰ τάσεως ἀνελκομένων τῶν δεσμῶν. **6.** καὶ τοῦθ' ὑπέμενον, οὐκ ἐφ' ὅσον προσδιελέγετο οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἐσχόλαζεν ὁ ἡγεμών, ἀλλὰ μόνον οὐχὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς ἡμέρας. ὅτε γὰρ καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους μετέβαινε, τοῖς προτέροις κατελίμπανεν ἐφεδρεύειν τοὺς τῆ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετουμένους, εἴ ποῦ τις ἠττηθεὶς τῶν βασάνων ἐνδιδόναι ἐδόκει, ἀφειδῶς δὲ κελεύων καὶ τοῖς δεσμοῖς προσιέναι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ψυχορραγοῦντας αὐτοὺς κατατεθεμένους εἰς τὴν γῆν ἔλκεσθαι. **7.** οὐ γὰρ εἶναι κἂν μέρος φροντίδος αὐτοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' οὕτω καὶ διανοεῖσθαι καὶ πράττειν, ὡς μηκέτ' ὄντων, ταύτην δευτέραν βάσανον ἐπὶ ταῖς πληγαῖς τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἐφευρόντων. **8.** ἦσαν δὲ οἱ καὶ μετὰ τοὺς αἰκισμοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου κείμενοι, διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων ὀπῶν διατεταμένοι ἄμφω τὸ πόδε, ὡς καὶ κατὰ ἀνάγκην αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου ὑπτίους εἶναι, μὴ δυναμένους διὰ τὸ ἔναυλα τὰ τραύματα ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν καθ' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν· ἕτεροι δὲ εἰς τοῦδαφος ριφέντες ἔκειντο ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν βασάνων ἀθρόας προσβολῆς, δεινότεραν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῖς ὀρῶσιν παρέχοντες, ποικίλας καὶ διαφόρους ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν φέροντες τῶν βασάνων τὰς ἐπινοίας. **9.** τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων οἱ μὲν ἐναπέθνησκον ταῖς βασάνοις, τῇ καρτερίᾳ καταισχύναντες τὸν ἀντίπαλον, οἱ δὲ ἡμιθνήτες ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ συγκλειόμενοι, μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας ταῖς ἀλγηδόσι συνεχόμενοι ἐτελειοῦντο, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς θεραπείας ἀνακτήσεως τυχόντες τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τῇ τῆς

φυλακῆς διατριβῆ ἑταρσαλεώτεροι ἐγίνοντο. **10.** οὕτω γοῦν, ἠνίκα προσετέτακτο αἰρέσεως κειμένης ἢ ἐφασάμενον τῆς ἐναγοῦς θυσίας ἀνενόχλητον εἶναι, τῆς ἐπαράτου ἐλευθερίας παρ' αὐτῶν τυχόντα, ἢ μὴ θύοντα τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δίκην ἐκδέχεσθαι, οὐδὲν μελλήσαντες ἀσμένως ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον ἐχώρουν· ἤδεσαν γὰρ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἡμῖν προορισθέντα. ὁ ‘γὰρ θυσιάζων,’ φησὶν, ‘θεοῖς ἑτέροις ἐξολοθρευθήσεται,’ καὶ ὅτι ‘οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ.’” **11.** Τοιαῦται τοῦ ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλοσόφου τε ὁμοῦ καὶ φιλοθέου μάρτυρος αἰ φωναὶ ἄς πρὸ τελευταίας ἀποφάσεως, ὑπὸ τὴν δεσμοτικὴν ἔθ' ὑπάρχων τάξιν, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ παροικίαν ἀδελφοῖς ἐπεστάλκει, ἅμα μὲν τὰ ἐν οἷς ἦν, ἀνατιθέμενος, ἅμα δὲ καὶ παρορμῶν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπριξέεσθαι καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ὅσον οὐπω τελειωθησόμενον τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας. **12.** ἀλλὰ τί χρὴ πολλὰ λέγειν καὶ καινοτέρας ἐπὶ καινοτέραις τῶν ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην θεοπρεπῶν μαρτύρων ἀθλήσεις παρατίθεσθαι, μάλιστα τῶν οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμου δὲ τρόπῳ πεπολιορκημένων; **XI.** Ἦδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὐτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὀπλιταὶ πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες κατέφλεξαν αὐτοῖς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναῖξιν τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἐπιβοωμένοις, ὅτι δὴ πανδημεὶ πάντες οἱ τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες λογιστῆς τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν καὶ ὄλῳ δήμῳ Χριστιανοὺς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες, οὐδ' ὀπωστιοῦν τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν. **2.** καὶ τις ἕτερος Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀξίας ἐπειλημμένος, Ἄδαυκτος τοῦνομα, γένος τῶν παρ' Ἰταλοῖς ἐπισήμων, διὰ πάσης προελθὼν ἀνὴρ τῆς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι τιμῆς, ὡς καὶ τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης μαγιστρότητός τε καὶ καθολικότητος ἀμέμπτως διελθεῖν, ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις διαπρέψας τοῖς ἐν θεοσεβείᾳ κατορθώμασιν καὶ ταῖς εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁμολογίαις, τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου διαδήματι κατεκοσμήθη, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ καθολικοῦ πράξεως τὸν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ὑπομείνας ἀγῶνα. **XII.** Τί με χρὴ νῦν ἐπ' ὀνόματος τῶν λοιπῶν μνημονεύειν ἢ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμεῖν ἢ τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας ἀναζωγραφεῖν τῶν θαυμασίων μαρτύρων, τοτὲ μὲν πέλυξιν

ἀναιρουμένων, οἷα γέγονεν τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀραβίας, τοτὲ δὲ τὰ σκέλη κατεαγνυμένων, οἷα τοῖς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ συμβέβηκεν, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἐκ τοῖν ποδοῖν εἰς ὕψος ἀναρτωμένων καὶ μαλθακοῦ πυρὸς ὑποκαιομένου τῷ παραπεμπομένῳ καπνῷ τῆς φλεγόμενης ὕλης ἀποπνιγομένων, οἷα τοῖς ἐν Μέσση τῶν ποταμῶν ἐπήχθη, ποτὲ δὲ ῥίνας καὶ ὄτα καὶ χεῖρας ἀκρωτηριαζομένων τὰ τε λοιπὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη τε καὶ μέρη κρεουργουμένων, οἷα τὰ ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἦν; **2.** Τί δεῖ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὴν μνήμην, ἐσχάραις πυρὸς οὐκ εἰς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μακρᾷ τιμωρίᾳ κατοπτωμένων, ἐτέρων τε θάπτον τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτῷ πυρὶ καθιέντων ἢ τῆς ἐναγοῦς θυσίας ἐφαπτομένων; ὧν τινες τὴν πεῖραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἐλθεῖν, ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὑψηλῶν δωμάτων ἑαυτοὺς κατεκρήμνισαν, τὸν θάνατον ἄρπαγμα θέμενοι τῆς τῶν δυσσεβῶν μοχθηρίας. **3.** καὶ τις ἱερὰ καὶ θαυμασία τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν, τὸ δὲ σῶμα γυνὴ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ εὐδοξίᾳ παρὰ πᾶσι βεβοημένη, παίδων ξυνωρίδα παρθένων τῇ τοῦ σώματος ὥρα καὶ ἀκμῇ διαπρεπουσῶν θεσμοῖς εὐσεβείας ἀναθρεψαμένη, ἐπειδὴ πολὺς ὁ περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος πάντα τρόπον ἀνιχνεύων λανθανούσας περιειργάζετο, εἶτ' ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς αὐτὰς διατρίβειν μαθῶν πεφροντισμένως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκάλει δικτύων τε ἤδη στρατιωτικῶν εἴσω περιβέβληντο, ἐν ἀμηγάνοις ἑαυτὴν καὶ τὰς παῖδας θεασαμένη καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δεινὰ τῷ λόγῳ παραθεῖσα τό τε πάντων δεινῶν καὶ ἀφορητότερον, πορνείας ἀπειλήν, μηδὲ ἄκροισ ὥσιν ὑπομεῖναι δεῖν ἀκοῦσαι ἑαυτῇ τε καὶ ταῖς κόραις παρακελευσαμένη, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ προδοῦναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῇ τῶν δαιμόνων δουλείᾳ πάντων ὑπάρχειν θανάτων καὶ πάσης χεῖρον ἀπωλείας φήσασα, μίαν τούτων ἀπάντων εἶναι λύσιν ὑπετίθετο τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγὴν, **4.** κᾶπειτα ὁμοῦ τῇ γνώμῃ συνθέμεναι τὰ τε σώματα περιστείλασαι κοσμίως τοῖς περιβλήμασιν, ἐπ' αὐτῆς μέσης γενόμεναι τῆς ὁδοῦ, βραχὺ τι τοὺς φύλακας εἰς ἀναχώρησιν ὑποπαραιτησάμεναι, ἐπὶ παραρρέοντα ποταμὸν ἑαυτὰς ἠκόντισαν. **5.** Αἶδε μὲν οὖν ἑαυτὰς· ἄλλην δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας

ξυνωρίδα παρθένων τὰ πάντα θεοπρεπῶν καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀδελφῶν, ἐπιδόξων μὲν τὸ γένος, λαμπρῶν δὲ τὸν βίον, νέων τοὺς χρόνους, ὡραίων τὸ σῶμα, σεμνῶν τὴν ψυχὴν, εὐσεβῶν τὸν τρόπον, θαυμαστῶν τὴν σπουδὴν, ὡς ἂν μὴ φερούσης τῆς γῆς τὰ τοιαῦτα βαστάζειν, θαλάττη ρίπτειν ἐκέλευον οἱ τῶν δαιμόνων θεραπευταί. **6.** ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παρὰ τοῖσδε· τὰ φρικτὰ δὲ ἀκοαῖς κατὰ τὸν Πόντον ἔπασχον ἕτεροι, καλάμοις ὀξέσιν τοῖν ἐξ χεροῖν ἄκρων ὀνύχων τοὺς δακτύλους διαπειρόμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοι, πυρὶ μολίβδου διατακέντος, βρασσοῦση καὶ πεπυρακτωμένη τῇ ὕλῃ τὰ νῶτα καταχεόμενοι καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἀναγκαιότατα τοῦ σώματος κατοπτώμενοι, **7.** διὰ τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων ἕτεροι μελῶν τε καὶ σπλάγχμων αἰσχυρὰς καὶ ἀσυμπαθεῖς καὶ οὐδὲ λόγῳ ῥητὰς ὑπέμενον πάθος ἃς οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ νόμιμοι δικασταὶ τὴν σφῶν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δεινότητα, ὥσπερ τινὰ σοφίας ἀρετὴν, φιλοτιμότερον ἐπενόουν, αἰεὶ ταῖς καινότερον ἐφευρισκομέναις αἰκίαις, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀγῶνος βραβείοις, ἀλλήλους ὑπερεξάγειν ἀμιλλώμενοι. **8.** τὰ δ' οὖν τῶν συμφορῶν ἔσχατα, ὅτε δὴ λοιπὸν ἀπειρηκότες ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν κακῶν ὑπερβολῇ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν ἀποκαμόντες πλησμονὴν τε καὶ κόρον τῆς τῶν αἱμάτων ἐκχύσεως ἐσχηκότες, ἐπὶ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτοῖς χρηστὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἐτρέποντο, ὡς μηδὲν μὲν ἔτι δοκεῖν δεινὸν καθ' ἡμῶν περιεργάζεσθαι. **9.** μὴ γὰρ καθήκειν φασὶν αἵμασιν ἐμφυλίοις μαιίνειν τὰς πόλεις μηδ' ἐπ' ὠμότητι τὴν ἀνωτάτω διαβάλλειν τῶν κρατούντων ἀρχὴν, εὐμενῇ τοῖς πᾶσιν ὑπάρχουσαν καὶ πραεῖαν, δεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς φιλανθρώπου καὶ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς πάντας ἐκτείνεσθαι τὴν εὐεργεσίαν, μηκέτι θανάτῳ κολαζομένους· λελύσθαι γὰρ αὐτῶν καθ' ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν τιμωρίαν διὰ τὴν τῶν κρατούντων φιλανθρωπίαν. **10.** τῆνικαῦτα ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύττεσθαι καὶ τοῖν σκελοῖν πηροῦσθαι θάτερον προσετάττετο. ταῦτα γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς τὰ φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν τιμωριῶν τὰ κουφότατα, ὥστε ἤδη ταύτης ἔνεκα τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν φιλανθρωπίας οὐκέτ' εἶναι δυνατὸν ἐξειπεῖν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὑπὲρ πάντα λόγον τοὺς μὲν δεξιούς ὀφθαλμοὺς ξίφει πρότερον ἐκκοπτομένων κάπειτα τούτους πυρὶ καυτηριαζομένων, τοὺς δὲ λαιοὺς πόδας κατὰ

τῶν ἀγκυλῶν αὐθις καυτῆρσιν ἀχραιομένων μετά τε ταῦτα τοῖς κατ' ἐπαρχίαν χαλκοῦ μετάλλοις οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας τοσοῦτον ὅσον κακώσεως καὶ ταλαιπωρίας ἔνεκεν καταδικαζομένων πρὸς ἅπασί τε τούτοις ἄλλων ἄλλοις ἀγῶσιν, οὐς μηδὲ καταλέγειν δυνατόν (νικᾷ γὰρ πάντα λόγον τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἀνδραγαθήματα), περιπεπωκότων. **11.** ἐν δὴ τούτοις ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης διαλάμψαντες οἱ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μάρτυρες τοὺς μὲν ἀπανταχοῦ τῆς ἀνδρείας αὐτῶν ἐπόπτας εἰκότως κατεπλήξαντο, τῆς δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θείας ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀπορρήτου δυνάμεως ἐμφανῆ δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰ τεκμήρια παρεστήσαντο. ἐκάστου μὲν οὖν ἐπ' ὀνόματος μνημονεύειν μακρὸν ἂν εἴη, μὴ τί γε τῶν ἀδυνάτων. **XIII.** Τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων πρῶτος ἡμῖν ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἀνηγορεύσθω μάρτυς ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Νικομηδέων πόλεως, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεὶς, Ἄνθιμος, **2.** τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτύρων τὸν πάντα βίον ἄριστος πρεσβύτερος τῆς αὐτόθι παροικίας, Λουκιανός, ἐν τῇ Νικομηδεῖα καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος τὴν οὐράνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν λόγῳ πρότερον δι' ἀπολογίας, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἔργοις ἀνακηρύξας. **3.** τῶν δ' ἐπὶ Φοινίκης μαρτύρων γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπισημότατοι τὰ πάντα θεοφιλεῖς τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες, Τυραννίων ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Τύρον ἐκκλησίας πρεσβύτερός τε τῆς κατὰ Σιδῶνα Ζηνόβιος καὶ ἔτι Σιλβανός τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Ἑμισαν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος. **4.** ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν θηρίων βορὰ μεθ' ἑτέρων ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἑμίσης γενόμενος χοροῖς ἀνελήφθη μαρτύρων, τὼ δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας ἄμφω τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον διὰ τῆς εἰς θάνατον ὑπομονῆς ἐδοξασάτην, ὃ μὲν θαλαττίοις παραδοθεὶς βυθοῖς, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ὁ δὲ ἰατρῶν ἄριστος Ζηνόβιος ταῖς κατὰ τῶν πλευρῶν ἐπιτεθείσαις αὐτῶ καρτερῶς ἐναποθανὼν βασάνοις. **5.** τῶν δ' ἐπὶ Παλαιστίνης μαρτύρων Σιλβανός, ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Γάζαν ἐκκλησιῶν, κατὰ τὰ ἐν Φαινοῖ χαλκοῦ μέταλλα σὺν ἑτέροις ἐνὸς δέουσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τεσσαράκοντα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμενεται, Αἰγύπτιοί τε αὐτόθι Πηλεὺς καὶ Νεῖλος ἐπίσκοποι μεθ' ἑτέρων τὴν διὰ πυρὸς ὑπέμειναν

τελευτήν. **6.** καὶ τὸ μέγα δὲ κλέος τῆς Καισαρέων παροικίας ἐν τούτοις ἡμῖν μνημονευέσθω Πάμφιλος πρεσβύτερος, τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς θαυμασιώτατος, οὗ τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων τὴν ἀρετὴν κατὰ τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν ἀναγράφομεν. **7.** τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας καθ' ὅλης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος διαπρεπῶς τελειωθέντων πρῶτος Πέτρος, αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος, θεῖον τι χρῆμα διδασκάλων τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας, ἀναγεγράφω, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέρων Φαῦστος καὶ Δῖος καὶ Ἀμμώνιος, τέλειοι Χριστοῦ μάρτυρες, Φιλέας τε καὶ Ἡσύχιος καὶ Παχύμιος καὶ Θεόδωρος, τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοποι, μυριοὶ τε ἐπὶ τούτοις ἄλλοι διαφανεῖς, οἱ πρὸς τῶν κατὰ χώραν καὶ τόπον παροικιῶν μνημονεύονται· ὧν ἀνὰ τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας ἠγωνισμένων γραφῆ παραδιδόναι τοὺς ἄθλους ἐπ' ἀκριβές τε ἕκαστα τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς συμβεβηκότων ἱστορεῖν οὐχ ἡμέτερον, τῶν δ' ὄψει τὰ πράγματα παρεληφόντων ἴδιον ἂν γένοιτο· οἷς γε μὴν αὐτὸς παρεγενόμενος, τούτους καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς γνωρίμους δι' ἑτέρας ποιήσομαι γραφῆς. **8.** κατὰ γε μὴν τὸν παρόντα λόγον τὴν παλινοιδίαν τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰργασμένων τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπισυνάψω τά τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ συμβεβηκότα, χρησιμώτατα τυγχάνοντα τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις. **9.** Τὰ μὲν οὖν πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας, ἐν ὅσοις δὴ χρόνοις τὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων φίλιά τε ἦν ἡμῖν καὶ εἰρηναῖα, ὀπόσης ἀγαθῶν εὐφορίας καὶ εὐετηρίας ἠξίωτο, τίς ἂν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος διηγῆσασθαι; ὅτε καὶ οἱ μάλιστα τῆς καθόλου κρατοῦντες ἀρχῆς δεκαετηρίδας καὶ εἰκοσαετηρίδας ἐκπλήσαντες, ἐν ἑορταῖς καὶ πανηγύρεσιν φαιδροτάταις τε θαλίαις καὶ εὐφροσύναις μετὰ πάσης εὐσταθοῦς διετέλουν εἰρήνης. **10.** οὕτω δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπαραποδίστως αὐξούσης καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ὀσημέραι προΐούσης τῆς ἐξουσίας, ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι, πόλεμον ἄσπονδον ἐγείρουσιν· οὕτω δ' αὐτοῖς τῆς τοιαύσδε κινήσεως δευτέρον ἔτος πεπλήρωτο, καὶ τι περὶ τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν νεώτερον γεγονὸς τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει. **11.** νόσου γὰρ οὐκ αἰσίας τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισκηψάσης, ὑφ' ἧς ἤδη καὶ τὰ τῆς

διανοίας εἰς ἔκστασιν αὐτῷ παρήγετο, σὺν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν δευτερείοις τετιμημένῳ τὸν δημόδη καὶ ἰδιωτικὸν ἀπολαμβάνει βίον· οὐπω δὲ ταῦθ' οὕτω πέπρακτο, καὶ διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται, πρᾶγμα μὴδ' ἄλλοτέ ποῦ πάλοι γεγονὸς μνήμη παραδεδομένον. **12.** χρόνου δ' οὐ πλείστου μεταξὺ γενομένου βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖος τὸν πάντα βίον πραότατα καὶ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις εὐνοϊκώτατα τῷ τε θεῷ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα διαθέμενος, παῖδα γνήσιον Κωνσταντῖνον αὐτοκράτορα καὶ Σεβαστὸν ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπὼν, κοινῷ φύσεως νόμῳ τελευτᾷ τὸν βίον, πρῶτός τε ἐν θεοῖς ἀνηγορεύετο παρ' αὐτοῖς, ἀπάσης μετὰ θάνατον, ὅση βασιλεῖ τις ἂν ὠφείλετο, τιμῆς ἡξιωμένος, χρηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλέων· **13.** ὃς δὴ καὶ μόνος τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως τῆς ἡγεμονίας τὸν πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διατελέσας χρόνον καὶ τᾶλλα τοῖς πᾶσι δεξιώτατον καὶ εὐεργετικώτατον παρασχὼν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ τε καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνήσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρεάστους φυλάξας καὶ μήτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοὺς οἴκους καθελὼν μήθ' ἕτερόν τι καθ' ἡμῶν καινουργήσας, τέλος εὐδαιμον καὶ τρισμακάριον ἀπέιληφεν τοῦ βίου, μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας εὐμενῶς καὶ ἐπιδόξως ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ γνησίῳ παιδί πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ τελευτήσας. **14.** Τούτου παῖς Κωνσταντῖνος εὐθύς ἀρχόμενος βασιλεὺς τελεώτατος καὶ Σεβαστὸς πρὸς τῶν στρατοπέδων καὶ ἔτι πολὺ τούτων πρότερον πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ ἀναγορευθεὶς, ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο. καὶ οὗτος μὲν τοιοῦτος· Λικίνιος δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις ὑπὸ κοινῆς ψήφου τῶν κρατούντων αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ Σεβαστὸς ἀναπέφηνεν. **15.** ταῦτα Μαξιμῖνον δεινῶς ἐλύπει, μόνον Καίσαρα παρὰ πάντας εἰς ἔτι τότε χρηματίζοντα· ὃς δὴ οὖν τὰ μάλιστα τυραννικὸς ὢν, παραρπάσας ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀξίαν, Σεβαστὸς ἦν, αὐτὸς ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ γεγονώς. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνῳ μηχανὴν θανάτου συρράπτων ἀλοὺς ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόθεσιν ἐπανηρῆσθαι δεδηλωμένος αἰσχίστῳ καταστρέφει θανάτῳ· πρῶτου δὲ τούτου τὰς ἐπὶ τιμῇ γραφὰς ἀνδριάντας τε καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ἐπ' ἀναθέσει νενόμισται, ὡς ἀνοσίου καὶ

δυσσεβεστάτου καθήρουν. **XIV.** Τούτου παῖς Μαξέντιος, ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς τυραννίδα συστησάμενος, ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ' ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο ταύτη τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνεῖναι προστάττει διωγμὸν, εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων καὶ ὡς ἂν δεξιὸς καὶ πολὺ πρᾶος παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανείη·

**2.** οὐ μὴν οἶος ἔσεσθαι ἠλπίσθη, τοιοῦτος ἔργοις ἀναπέφηνεν, εἰς πάσας δ' ἀνοσιουργίας ὀκείλας, οὐδὲν ὅ τι μιαρίας ἔργον καὶ ἀκολασίας παραλέλοιπεν, μοιχείας καὶ παντοίας ἐπιτελῶν φθοράς. διαζευγνύς γέ τοι τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς κατὰ νόμον γαμετάς, ταύταις ἐνουβρίζων ἀτιμότατα, τοῖς ἀνδράσιν αὐθις ἀπέπεμπεν, καὶ ταῦτ' οὐκ ἀσήμοις οὐδ' ἀφανέσιν ἐγχειρῶν ἐπετήδευεν, ἀλλ' αὐτῶν δὴ μάλιστα τῶν τὰ πρῶτα τῆς Ῥωμαίων συγκλήτου βουλῆς ἀπενηνεγμένων ἐμπαροινῶν τοῖς ἐξοχωτάτοις. **3.** οἱ πάντες δ' αὐτὸν ὑποπεπτηχότες, δῆμοι καὶ ἄρχοντες, ἔνδοξοί τε καὶ ἄδοξοι, δεινῇ κατετρύχοντο τυραννίδι, καὶ οὐδ' ἠρεμοῦντων καὶ τὴν πικρὰν φερόντων δουλείαν ἀπαλλαγὴ τις ὅμως ἦν τῆς τοῦ τυράννου φονώσης ὠμότητος. ἐπὶ σμικρᾷ γοῦν ἤδη ποτὲ προφάσει τὸν δῆμον εἰς φόνον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν δορυφόροις ἐκδίδωσιν, καὶ ἐκτείνεται μυρία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων πλήθη, ἐπὶ μέσης τῆς πόλεως, οὐ Σκυθῶν οὐδὲ βαρβάρων ἀλλ' αὐτῶν τῶν οἰκείων δόρασι καὶ πανοπλίαις· **4.** συγκλητικῶν γε μὴν φόνος ὀπόσος δι' ἐπιβουλήν ἐνηργεῖτο τῆς οὐσίας, οὐδ' ἐξαριθμήσασθαι δυνατόν, ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις πεπλασμέναις αἰτίαις μυρίων ἀναιρουμένων. **5.** ἡ δὲ τῶν κακῶν τῷ τυράννῳ κορωνίς ἐπὶ γοητείαν ἤλαυνεν, μαγικαῖς ἐπινοίαις τοτὲ μὲν γυναικας ἐγκύμονας ἀνασχίζοντος, τοτὲ δὲ νεογνῶν σπλάγχνα βρεφῶν διερευνωμένου λέοντάς τε κατασφάττοντος καὶ τινὰς ἀρρητοποιίας ἐπὶ δαιμόνων προκλήσεις καὶ ἀποτροπιασμὸν τοῦ πολέμου συνισταμένου· διὰ τούτων γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς νίκης κατορθωθήσεσθαι ἢ πᾶσα ἐτύγχανεν ἐλπίς. **6.** οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς τυραννῶν οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα δρῶν τοὺς ὑπηκόους κατεδουλοῦτο, ὡς ἤδη καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων τροφῶν ἐν ἐσχάτῃ σπάνει καὶ ἀπορίᾳ καταστῆναι, ὅσην ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς οὐδ' ἄλλοτε οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι

μνημονεύουσιν· **7.** ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς τύραννος Μαξιμῖνος, ὡς ἂν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν, πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης φιλίαν κρύβδην σπενδόμενος, ἐπὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον λανθάνειν ἐφρόντιζεν· φωραθεὶς γέ τοι ὕστερον δίκην τίννυσι τὴν ἀξίαν. **8.** ἦν δὲ θαυμάσαι ὅπως καὶ οὗτος τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά, μᾶλλον δὲ κακίας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ νικητήρια τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου κακοτροπίας ἀπενηνεγμένος· γοήτων τε γὰρ καὶ μάγων οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρ' αὐτῷ τιμῆς ἠξίωοντο, ψοφοδεοῦς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ δεισιδαιμονεστάτου καθεστῶτος τὴν τε περὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας περὶ πολλοῦ τιθεμένου πλάνην· μαντειῶν γοῦν δίχα καὶ χρησμῶν οὐδὲ μέχρις ὄνυχος ὡς εἰπεῖν τολμᾶν τι κινεῖν οἷός τε ἦν· **9.** οὗ χάριν καὶ τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν σφοδρότερον ἢ οἱ πρόσθεν καὶ πυκνότερον ἐπετίθετο διωγμῷ, νεῶς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐγείρειν καὶ τὰ χρόνου μήκει καθηρημένα τεμένη διὰ σπουδῆς ἀνανεοῦσθαι προστάτων, ἱερέας τε εἰδώλων κατὰ πάντα τόπον καὶ πόλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων ἐκάστης ἐπαρχίας ἀρχιερέα τῶν ἐν πολιτείαις ἕνα γέ τινα τῶν μάλιστα ἐμφανῶς διὰ πάσης ἐμπρέψαντα λειτουργίας μετὰ στρατιωτικοῦ στίφους καὶ δορυφορίας ἐκτάσσω, ἀνέδην τε πᾶσιν γόησιν, ὡς ἂν εὐσεβέσιν καὶ θεῶν προσφιλέσιν, ἡγεμονίας καὶ τὰς μεγίστας προνομίας δωρούμενος. **10.** ἐκ δὴ τούτων ὀρμώμενος, πόλιν μὲν οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ χώραν, ὅλας δὲ ἄρδην τὰς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐπαρχίας χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χρημάτων ἀμυθήτων εἰσπράξαι ἐπισκήψεσιν τε βαρυτάταις καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις καταδίκαις ἠνία καὶ κατεπίεζεν. τῶν γε μὴν εὐπόρων τὰς ἐκ προγόνων περιποιηθείσας οὐσίας ἀφαιρούμενος, πλούτους ἀθρόως καὶ σωροὺς χρημάτων τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν κόλαξιν ἐδώρεῖτο. **11.** παροιρίας γε μὴν καὶ μέθης ἐς τοσαύτην ἠνέχθη φορὰν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πότοις παρακόπτειν καὶ τῶν φρενῶν παρεξίστασθαι τοιαῦτά τε μεθύοντα προστάττειν, οἷα ἀνανήψαντα αὐτὸν τῇ ὕστεραία εἰς μετάμελον ἄγειν· κραιπάλης δὲ καὶ ἀσωτίας μηδενὶ καταλιπὼν ὑπερβολὴν, κακίας διδάσκαλον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσί τε καὶ ἀρχομένοις ἑαυτὸν καθίστη, θρύπτεσθαι μὲν τὸ στρατιωτικὸν διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας ἐνάγων, ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ στρατοπεδάρχας δι' ἄρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας χωρεῖν κατὰ

τῶν ὑπηκόων μόνον οὐχὶ συντυραννοῦντας αὐτῷ προκαλούμενος. **12.** τί δεῖ τὰς ἐμπαθεῖς τάνδρὸς αἰσχροουργίας μνημονεύειν ἢ τῶν πρὸς αὐτοῦ μεμοιχευμένων ἀπαριθμεῖσθαι τὴν πληθύν; οὐκ ἦν γέ τοι πόλιν αὐτὸν παρελθεῖν μὴ οὐχὶ ἐκ παντὸς φθορὰς γυναικῶν παρθένων τε ἀρπαγὰς εἰργασμένον. **13.** κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προυχώρει, μὴ ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν· οἱ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες παρ' οὐθέν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρες ἀνατλάντες πῦρ καὶ σίδηρον καὶ προσηλώσεις θήρας τε ἀγρίους καὶ θαλάττης βυθοὺς ἀποτομάς τε μελῶν καὶ καυτῆρας καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν κεντήσεις τε καὶ ἐξορύξεις καὶ τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἀκρωτηριασμοὺς λιμόν τε ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ μέταλλα καὶ δεσμά, ἐπὶ πάντων μᾶλλον ὑπομονὴν τὴν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἐνεδείξαντο ἢ τὸ σέβας τὸ εἰς θεὸν εἰδώλοισ ἀντικατηλλάξαντο. **14.** αἱ δ' αὖ γυναῖκες οὐχ ἤττον τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλίας ἠρρενωμέναι, αἱ μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀγῶνας ὑποστᾶσαι ἴσα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα, αἱ δὲ ἐπὶ φθορὰν ἐλκόμεναι θᾶττον τὴν ψυχὴν θανάτῳ ἢ τὸ σῶμα τῆ φθορᾷ παραδεδώκασιν. **15.** μόνη γοῦν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων Χριστιανῆ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισημοτάτη τε καὶ λαμπροτάτη τὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου ψυχὴν δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν, ἔνδοξος μὲν τὰ ἄλλα πλούτῳ τε καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ, πάντα γε μὴν δευτέρα σωφροσύνης τεθειμένη· ἦν καὶ πολλὰ λιπαρήσας, κτεῖναι μὲν ἐτοίμως θνήσκειν ἔχουσαν οὐχ οἷός τε ἦν, τῆς ἐπιθυμίας μᾶλλον τοῦ θυμοῦ κατακρατούσης αὐτοῦ, φυγῆ δὲ ζημιώσας πάσης ἀφείλετο τῆς οὐσίας. **16.** μυρίαὶ δὲ ἄλλαι πρὸς τῶν κατ' ἔθνος ἀρχόντων, πορνείας ἀπειλὴν μὴδ' ἀκοῦσαι δεδυνημέναι, πᾶν εἶδος βασάνων καὶ στρεβλώσεων καὶ θανατηφόρου κολάσεως ὑπέστησαν. θαυμασταὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὗται, ὑπερφυῶς γε μὴν θαυμασιωτάτη ἢ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὐγενεστάτη τῷ ὄντι καὶ σωφρονεστάτη γυνὴ πασῶν αἷς ἐμπαροινεῖν ὁ ἐκεῖσε τύραννος Μαξέντιος, τὰ ὅμοια Μαξιμίνῳ δρῶν, ἐπειρᾶτο. **17.** ὡς γὰρ ἐπιστάντας τῷ οἴκῳ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα τῷ τυράννῳ διακονουμένους ἐπύθετο (Χριστιανῆ δὲ καὶ

αὕτη ἦν), τόν τε ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς, καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίων ὄντα ἑπαρχον, τοῦ δέους ἔνεκα λαβόντας ἄγειν αὐτὴν ἐπιτρέψαντα, ἐς βραχὺ ὑποπαραιτησαμένη, ὡς ἂν δὴ κατακοσμηθεῖ τὸ σῶμα, εἴσεισιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ταμείου καὶ μονωθεῖσα ξίφος καθ' ἑαυτῆς πήγνυσιν, θανοῦσά τε παραχρῆμα, τὸν μὲν νεκρὸν τοῖς προαγωγοῖς καταλιμπάνει, ἔργοις δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπάσης φωνῆς γεγωνοτέροις, ὅτι μόνον χρημάτων ἀήττητόν τε καὶ ἀνώλεθρον ἢ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ἀρετὴ πέφυκεν, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους τούς τε νῦν ὄντας καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα γενησομένους ἐξέφηνεν. **18.** τοσαύτη δῆτα κακίας φορὰ ὑφ' ἑνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συνηνέχθη καιρὸν πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν διειληφότων κατεργασθεῖσα· τίς δ' ἂν τὴν τῶν τοσοῦτων διερευνώμενος αἰτίαν διστάξαι μὴ οὐχὶ τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν διωγμὸν ἀποφήνασθαι; ὅτε γε μάλιστα οὐ πρότερον τὰ τῆς τοσῆσδε πέπαυτο συγχύσεως ἢ Χριστιανούς τὰ τῆς παρρησίας ἀπολαβεῖν. **XV.** Διὰ παντός γέ τοι τοῦ κατὰ τὸν διωγμὸν δεκαέτους χρόνου τῶν εἰς ἐπιβουλήν καὶ πόλεμον τὸν κατ' ἀλλήλων οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς διαλέλοιπεν. ἅπλωτα μὲν τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν ἦν οὐδ' ἐξῆν ποθεν καταπλεύσαντας μὴ οὐχὶ πάσαις αἰκίαις ὑπάγεσθαι στρεβλουμένους καὶ τὰς πλευρὰς καταξαινομένους βασάνοις τε παντοίαις, μὴ ἄρα παρὰ τῶν δι' ἐναντίας ἐχθρῶν ἤκοιεν, ἀνακρῖνομένους καὶ τέλος σταυροῖς ἢ τῇ διὰ πυρὸς ὑπαγομένους κολάσει· **2.** ἀσπίδων ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θωρήκων παρασκευαί βελῶν τε καὶ δοράτων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης πολεμικῆς παρατάξεως ἐτοιμασίαι τριήρων τε καὶ τῶν κατὰ ναυμαχίαν ὄπλων κατὰ πάντα συνεκροτοῦντο τόπον οὐδ' ἦν ἄλλο τι παντὶ τῷ προσδοκᾶν ἢ πολέμων κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔφοδον ἡμέραν. τούτοις καὶ ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα λιμός τε καὶ λοιμὸς ἐγκατασκίπτει, περὶ ὧν κατὰ καιρὸν ἱστορήσομεν τὰ δέοντα. **XVI.** Τοιαῦτ' ἦν τὰ διὰ παντός τοῦ διωγμοῦ παρατετακότα, δεκάτῳ μὲν ἔτει σὺν θεοῦ χάριτι παντελῶς πεπαυμένου, λωφᾶν γε μὴν μετ' ὄγδοον ἔτος ἐναρξαμένου. ὡς γὰρ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις ἐνεδείκνυτο, τότε δῆτα καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄρχοντες, αὐτοὶ δὴ ἐκεῖνοι δι' ὧν πάλαι τὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐνηργεῖτο πολέμων, παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην, παλινωδίαν ἦδον

χρηστοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν προγράμμασιν καὶ διατάγμασιν ἡμερωτάτοις τὴν ἐπὶ μέγα ἀφθεῖσαν τοῦ διωγμοῦ πυρκαϊὰν σβεννύντες. **2.** οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἶκτος, ὡς ἂν φαίη τις, ἢ φιλανθρωπία τῶν ἀρχόντων· πολλοῦ δεῖ· πλείω γὰρ ὄσημέραι καὶ χαλεπώτερα ἀρχῆθεν καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς ἐπενοεῖτο, ποικιλωτέραις μηχαναῖς ἄλλοτε ἄλλως τὰς καθ' ἡμῶν αἰκίας ἐπικαινουργούντων. ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς θείας προνοίας ἐμφανῆς ἐπίσκεψις, τῷ μὲν αὐτῆς καταλλαπτομένης λαῶ, τῷ δ' αὐθέντη τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης καὶ πρωτοστάτη τῆς τοῦ παντὸς διωγμοῦ κακίας ἐπιχολουμένης. **3.** καὶ γὰρ εἴ τι ταῦτ' ἐχρῆν κατὰ θεῖαν γενέσθαι κρίσιν, ἀλλὰ “οὐαί,” φησὶν ὁ λόγος, “δι' οὗ δ' ἂν τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχηται.” μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θεήλατος κόλασις, ἐξ αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ καταρξαμένη σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς προελθοῦσα. **4.** ἀθρόα μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὰ μέσα τῶν ἀπορρήτων τοῦ σώματος ἀπόστασις αὐτῷ γίνεται, εἴθ' ἔλκος ἐν βάθει συριγγῶδες καὶ τούτων ἀνίατος νομὴ κατὰ τῶν ἐνδοτάτω σπλάγχων· ἀφ' ὧν ἄλεκτόν τι πλῆθος σκωλήκων βρῦειν θανατώδη τε ὁδμὴν ἀποπνεῖν, τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου τῶν σωμάτων ἐκ πολυτροφίας αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸ τῆς νόσου εἰς ὑπερβολὴν πλήθους πιμελῆς μεταβεβληκότος, ἦν τότε κατασαπεῖσαν ἀφόρητον καὶ φρικτοτάτην τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν παρέχειν τὴν θέαν. **5.** ἰατρῶν δ' οὖν οἱ μὲν οὐδ' ὄλως ὑπομεῖναι τὴν τοῦ δυσώδους ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀτοπίαν οἴοι τε, κατεσφάττοντο, οἱ δὲ διωδηκότος τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου καὶ εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος μηδὲν ἐπικουρεῖν δυνάμενοι, ἀνηλεῶς ἐκτείνοντο. **XVII.** Καὶ δὴ τοσοῦτοις παλαίων κακοῖς συναίσθησιν τῶν κατὰ τῶν θεοσεβῶν αὐτῷ τετολμημένων ἴσχει, συναγαγὼν δ' οὖν εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὴν διάνοιαν, πρῶτα μὲν ἀνθομολογεῖται τῷ τῶν ὄλων θεῷ, εἶτα τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἀνακαλέσας, μηδὲν ὑπερθεμένους τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποπαῦσαι διωγμὸν νόμῳ τε καὶ δόγματι βασιλικῷ τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπισπέρχειν καὶ τὰ συνήθη διαπράττεσθαι, εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου ποιουμένους, προστάττει. **2.** αὐτίκα γοῶν ἔργου τῷ λόγῳ παρηκολουθηκότος, ἤπλωτο κατὰ πόλεις βασιλικά διατάγματα, τὴν παλινφδιαν

τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῦτον περιέχοντα τὸν τρόπον· **3.** “Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Γαλέριος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμιανὸς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος, Αἰγυπτιακὸς μέγιστος, Θηβαϊκὸς μέγιστος, Σαρματικὸς μέγιστος πεντάκις, Περσῶν μέγιστος δῖς, Κάρπων μέγιστος ἐξάκις, Ἀρμενίων μέγιστος, Μήδων μέγιστος, Ἀδιαβηνῶν μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ εἰκοστὸν, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἔννεακαιδέκατον, ὕπατος τὸ ὄγδοον, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος· **4.** καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Φλαύιος Οὐαλέριος Κωνσταντῖνος εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ πέμπτον, ὕπατος, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος. **5.** [καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Οὐαλέριος Λικιννιανὸς Λικίνιος εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ τέταρτον, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ τρίτον, ὕπατος, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, ἐπαρχιώταις ἰδίοις χαίρειν.] **6.** Μεταξὺ τῶν λοιπῶν, ἅπερ ὑπὲρ τοῦ χρησίμου καὶ λυσιτελοῦς τοῖς δημοσίοις διατυπούμεθα, ἡμεῖς μὲν βεβουλήμεθα πρότερον κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοσίαν ἐπιστήμην τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἅπαντα ἐπανορθώσασθαι καὶ τούτου πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι ἵνα καὶ οἱ Χριστιανοί, οἵτινες τῶν γονέων τῶν ἑαυτῶν καταλελοίπασιν τὴν αἵρεσιν, εἰς ἀγαθὴν πρόθεσιν ἐπανεέλθοιεν. **7.** ἐπεὶ τινὶ λογισμῷ τοσαύτη αὐτοὺς πλεονεξία [κατεσχῆκει καὶ ἄνοια] κατειλήφει ὡς μὴ ἔπεσθαι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι καταδειχθεῖσιν, ἅπερ ἴσως πρότερον καὶ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἦσαν καταστήσαντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν πρόθεσιν καὶ ὡς ἕκαστος ἐβούλετο, οὕτως ἑαυτοῖς καὶ νόμους ποιῆσαι καὶ τούτους παραφυλάσσειν καὶ ἐν διαφόροις διάφορα πλήθη συνάγειν. **8.** τοιγαροῦν τοιούτου ὑφ' ἡμῶν προστάγματος παρακολουθήσαντος ὥστε ἐπὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων κατασταθέντα ἑαυτοὺς μεταστήσαιεν, πλεῖστοι μὲν κινδύνῳ ὑποβληθέντες, πλεῖστοι δὲ παραχθέντες παντοίους θανάτους ὑπέφερον· **9.** καὶ ἐπειδὴ τῶν πολλῶν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπονοίᾳ διαμενόντων ἐωρῶμεν μῆτε τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις τὴν ὀφειλομένην θρησκείαν προσάγειν αὐτοὺς μῆτε τῷ τῶν Χριστιανῶν προσέχειν, ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν φιланθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν

διηνεκῆ συνήθειαν δι' ἧς εἰώθαμεν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις συγγνώμην ἀπονέμειν, προθυμότατα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὴν συγχώρησιν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπεκτεῖναι δεῖν ἐνομίσαμεν, ἵνα αὐθις ὧσιν Χριστιανοὶ καὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο συνθῶσιν οὕτως ὥστε μηδὲν ὑπεναντίον τῆς ἐπιστήμης αὐτοὺς πράττειν. δι' ἐτέρας δὲ ἐπιστολῆς τοῖς δικασταῖς δηλώσομεν τί αὐτοὺς παραφυλάξασθαι δεήσει·

**10.** ὅθεν κατὰ ταύτην τὴν συγχώρησιν τὴν ἡμετέραν ὀφείλουσιν τὸν ἑαυτῶν θεὸν ἰκετεύειν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ τῶν δημοσίων καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν, ἵνα κατὰ πάντα τρόπον καὶ τὰ δημόσια παρασχεθῆ ὑγιῆ καὶ ἀμέριμνοι ζῆν ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἐστίᾳ δυνηθῶσι.” **11.** Ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων φωνὴν, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν μεταληφθέντα, τοῦτον εἶχεν τὸν τρόπον. τί δὴ οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις γίνεται, ἐπιθεωρῆσαι καιρὸς. **App.** Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν τῆς γραφῆς αἴτιος μετὰ τὴν τοιάνδε ὁμολογίαν αὐτίκα καὶ οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἀπαλλαγεῖς μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον. τοῦτον δὲ λόγος ἔχει πρῶτον αἴτιον τῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ καταστῆναι συμφορᾶς, ἔτι πάσαι πρὸ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν βασιλέων κινήσεως τοὺς ἐν στρατείαις Χριστιανοὺς καὶ πρώτους γε ἀπάντων τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου παρατρέπειν ἐκβεβιασμένον καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῆς στρατιωτικῆς ἀξίας ἀποκινουῦντα, τοὺς δὲ ἀτιμότατα καθυβρίζοντα, ἤδη δὲ καὶ θάνατον ἐτέροις ἐπαρτῶντα καὶ τοῦσχατόν γε τοὺς τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων ἀνακεκινηκότα διωγμόν· ὧν καὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἄξιον τὸ τοῦ βίου τέλος παραδοῦναι σιωπῇ. **2.** τεττάρων οὖν τὴν κατὰ πάντων διειληγόντων ἀρχὴν, οἱ μὲν χρόνῳ καὶ τιμῇ προηγούμενοι οὐδ' ὅλοις δεῖν ἔτεσιν ἐπιγενόμενοι τῷ διωγμῷ μεθίστανται τῆς βασιλείας, ἧ καὶ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δεδήλωται, καὶ δὴ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον τοῦ βίου χρόνον δημῶδει καὶ ἰδιωτικῷ τρόπῳ διαγενόμενοι τέλος τοιόνδε τῆς ζωῆς εἰλήχασιν, **3.** ὁ μὲν τιμῇ τε καὶ χρόνῳ τῶν πρωτείων ἠξιωμένος μακρᾶ καὶ ἐπιλυποτάτη τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενείᾳ διεργασθεῖς, ὁ δὲ τὰ δεύτερα αὐτοῦ φέρων ἀγχόνῃ τὴν ζωὴν ἀπορρήξας, κατὰ τινὰ δαιμονίαν προσημείωσιν τοῦτο παθὼν διὰ πλείστας αὐτῷ τετολμημένας ῥαδιουργίας. **4.** τῶν δὲ μετὰ τούτους ὁ μὲν ὕστατος, ὃν δὴ καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ παντὸς ἔφαμεν γεγονέναι διωγμοῦ, τοιαῦτα οἶα

καὶ προδεδηλώκαμεν πέπονθεν, ὁ δὲ τοῦτον προάγων χρηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος, ἐπαξίως τῆς ἡγεμονίας τὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διατελέσας χρόνον [ἀλλὰ] καὶ τᾶλλα τοῖς πᾶσι δεξιώτατον καὶ εὐεργετικώτατον παρασχὼν ἑαυτὸν, ἀτὰρ καὶ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου ἔξω γενόμενος καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους διαφυλάξας καὶ μήτε τοὺς οἴκους τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καθελὼν μήθ' ἕτερόν τι μηδ' ὅλως καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπικαινουργήσας, τέλος εὐδαιμον καὶ τρισμακάριον ὄντως ἀπέλιφεν τοῦ βίου, μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας εὐμενῶς καὶ ἐπιδόξως ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ τῆς βασιλείας γνησίῳ παιδί τὰ πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ τελευτήσας· **5.** ὃς εὐθὺς ἀρχόμενος βασιλεὺς τελεώτατος καὶ Σεβαστὸς πρὸς τῶν στρατοπέδων ἀναγορευθεὶς, ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο. τοιαύτη τῶν προαναγεγραμμένων τεττάρων ἢ τοῦ βίου ἔκβασις, κατὰ παρηλλαγμένους χρόνους γεγενημένη. **6.** τούτων δὴ μόνος ἔτι λείπων ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν εἰρημένος σὺν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσποιηθεῖσι τὴν προδεδηλωμένην ἑξομολόγησιν διὰ τοῦ προεκτεθέντος ἐγγράφου λόγου τοῖς πᾶσι φανερὰν κατεστήσαντο.

## CHAPTER III

### TRANSLATION

**Pref.** Having concluded the succession of the apostles in seven complete books, in this eighth treatise we think it one of the most necessary enterprises to hand down the events of our own time, insofar as they are worthy of no trifling account, for the knowledge even of posterity. Our account then will begin from this point.

**1.** It is beyond our ability to describe in a worthy manner the degree and quality of honor and freedom which was accorded by all men, Greeks and Barbarians alike, in the time before the Persecution, to the Word of piety toward the God of the universe, which has been announced to the world through Christ. **2.** We might adduce as evidence the favors of the rulers toward our people, to whom they entrusted even governmental positions in the provinces, freeing them from the anguish of sacrifice in accordance with the great friendliness which they held for our doctrine. **3.** Why is it necessary to give an account of those in the imperial residences and of the rulers of all, who allowed the members of their households – wives, children, and servants – to speak freely in their presence on the divine word and life, all but permitting them even to boast about the openness of their faith? These they held in especially high regard, even more than their fellow servants; **4.** such was that renowned man, Dorotheus, the most well-disposed and faithful to them of all, and on account of this, the most honored, even compared to those holding high positions and governorships; and with him was the famous Gorgonius and all who were deemed worthy of the same honor as them on account of the Word of God. **5.** This kind of favor one could see being accorded even to the leaders of each church by all the prefects and procurators.

But how could one list those gatherings of countless men and the multitudes of the assemblies in every city and the famous concourses in the houses of prayer? For this reason, then, they were no longer content with the structures of old and erected from the foundations expansive churches in all the cities. **6.** No ill-will hindered these affairs as they advanced with time and daily increased in size and magnitude, nor could any evil demon hex or prevent them through the contrivances of humans, so long as the divine and heavenly hand was watching over and guarding its people as an object of worth. **7.** But when, due to an excess of license, our affairs changed to a state of conceit and idleness – we were envying and railing furiously at one another and all but waging war on ourselves with weapons, if you will, and spears made of words; leaders were crashing into each other, as if in a naval battle, and the laity were forming factions against one another; indescribable hypocrisy and pretense were advancing to the highest degree of wickedness – at precisely this point, divine judgment, sparingly, as is its custom, and while the assemblies were still bustling, was awakening its oversight gently and moderately – the persecution beginning with the brethren in the armies. **8.** But when, in our lack of perception, we were not eager to make the divinity well-disposed and propitious, but like some atheists, thinking that our actions went unheeded and unobserved, we added evil upon evil; and when those who seemed to be our shepherds cast aside the law of piety towards God and were inflamed with their usual rivalries toward one another, causing only these things to increase – arguments, threats, jealousy, and enmity and hatred toward one another – and claiming vehemently for themselves the powers for which they lusted as if these were kingships, at that very time, according to the word of Jeremiah, “the Lord shrouded the daughter of Zion in his anger and cast down from heaven the glory of Israel and did not remember his footstool in the day of his anger; but the Lord also plunged into the sea all the fruits of Israel and destroyed all his fortifications;” **9.** and

according to that which was prophesied in the Psalms: “he overturned the covenant of his servant” and “cast to the ground,” through the destruction of the churches, “his holiness,” and “destroyed all his fortifications, and made his strongholds cowardice; all those passing on the road plundered the multitudes of the people,” and in addition, “he became a source of reproach to his neighbors.” For “he exalted the right hand of his enemies and turned away the aid of his sword and did not take his part in the war;” But “he brought an end to his purification” and “tore his throne to the ground and shortened the days of his time,” and above all, “he poured shame over him.”

**II.** Certainly all things have been accomplished in our time, when we looked with our own eyes upon the houses of prayer torn down from top to bottom, foundations and all, and the inspired and holy scriptures committed to fire in the middle of the marketplaces, and the shepherds of the churches hiding shamefully in this place and that, while some were seized disgracefully and mocked at the hands of their enemies, as when even according to another prophecy, "contempt was poured out upon leaders, and he made them to wander on the untrodden path and not on the road." **2.** But it is not our place to describe their gloomy misfortunes in the event, inasmuch as it is not fit for us to transmit unto memory even their disputes before the persecution and their inappropriate behavior toward one another. For this reason, we have made up our mind not to narrate anything more about them than those aspects through which we might justify the divine judgment. **3.** Therefore, we have been led to mention neither those who have been tried by the persecution nor those who have suffered the shipwreck of their whole salvation and by their own sentence have been cast into the depths of the sea; but we shall add to the general account only those things which might be to the advantage first to us ourselves and then to those who follow us. Therefore, let us now proceed from this point to

describe in abbreviated form the holy contests of the martyrs of the divine word. **4.** This was the nineteenth year of Diocletian's reign, the month of Dystrus (this would be called March by the Romans) in which, as the feast of the saving Passion was approaching, imperial letters were published everywhere, prescribing that church buildings be leveled to the ground, and Christian writings set ablaze and destroyed, and proclaiming that those who have achieved official position should lose legal privileges, and those in the imperial households, if they should remain in the profession of Christianity, would be deprived of freedom. **5.** And that was the nature of the first legislation against us. Before long, however, when other letters had arrived in quick succession, it was prescribed that all the leading men of the churches everywhere first be thrown into prison, then later forced to sacrifice by every device.

**III.** At that very moment, then, the greater part of the churches' leaders acted eagerly as athletes in contests of terrible tortures and displayed accounts of their great contests, but countless others, having numbed their soul in advance due to cowardice, readily grew weak from the first onslaught; each of the rest, however, alternated between different forms of tortures: one had his body tortured with whips, and another was punished with unbearable rackings and scrapings; some of them by this time had carried away as prize an inauspicious end to their life. But again some came through the contest one way, others another way. **2.** For example, one person, as he was driven forcibly by a crowd of others and made to approach the all-abominable and unholy sacrifices, was released as if he had sacrificed, even if he had not. Another, who neither approached nor touched any object of pollution at all, but when others had said that he had sacrificed, went away bearing the misrepresentation in silence. Yet another, being lifted up half-dead as if he were a corpse, was tossed to the side, **3.** and still another, as he was lying on the ground, was dragged a great distance by his feet and reckoned among those who had

sacrificed. Someone would shout and testify with a loud voice his refusal to sacrifice, and another had cried out that he was a Christian, distinguishing himself by his confession of the saving name. Another maintained that he had never sacrificed and never would. **4.** Still even these were expelled by force as they were struck on the mouth by the numerous hands of a line of soldiers marshaled for this purpose, silenced, and battered on their face and cheeks. So much did the enemies of godly piety value the appearance of accomplishing their task by any means. But they did not even succeed against the holy martyrs with these measures. What account would be sufficient for me to describe them accurately?

**IV.** For one could give an account of countless people who have displayed amazing eagerness in defense of piety toward the god of the universe, not only from the time when the persecution against all people was aroused, but much earlier, when peace still prevailed. **2.** For just then, for the first time, when the one who had received authority, as if he were being awakened from a deep sleep, was attacking the churches, secretly and as yet unnoticed, in the period following the reigns of Decius and Valerian, and was stripping for battle against us, not all at once, but still making an attempt only on those in the camps – for in this way he thought the rest might be conquered easily, if he first struggled against and overcame these – it was possible to see a great many soldiers welcoming civilian life quite readily, in order to avoid becoming deniers of the piety that centers on the creator of the universe. **3.** For just when the commander, whoever he was, was engaged in persecution against the armies for the first time, sorting out those enrolled in the camps by classes and thoroughly purging them, and giving them the choice either to enjoy the honor which they shared, if they obeyed orders, or on the contrary, to be deprived of that honor, should they oppose the order, a great number of the soldiers of Christ, unquestionably and without hesitation, preferred his confession to what seemed like the

glory and success which they possessed. **4.** And already, albeit rarely, one or two of these received not only loss of position, but also death in exchange for their pious resistance, since the one executing the plan was at that time daring to go as far as blood only in some instances; for it seemed that the large number of faithful still worried him and deterred him from attempting all-out war against them all. But when he stripped even more thoroughly for battle, it is not even possible to give an account of the number and character of the martyrs which those who live throughout the cities and lands could see.

**V.** For example, a certain man, not lacking in distinction, but very much held in esteem according to what is normally considered preeminence in life, as soon as the edict against the churches was published in Nicomedia – for he was stirred by zeal towards God and urged on by a fiery faith – took up the writing, which had been published in a conspicuous and public place, and tore it to pieces as something unholy and utterly profane; this occurred while two of the emperors were present in the same city, the most senior of the rest and the one who held the fourth rank of command. Nevertheless, he was the first at that time to carry this distinction, and at the same time, he endured the natural consequences for such an act of daring. He maintained a pain-free and undisturbed state until his very last breath.

**VI.** Among those who have ever yet been hymned in praise as amazing and celebrated for their courage, whether by Greeks or barbarians, that time brought forth as divine and distinguished martyrs those who were imperial slaves in the company of Dorotheus. These were deemed worthy of the highest honor by their masters and were treated no differently by them than legitimate children, but they considered the reproaches against their piety and toils and many forms of death cooked up against them to be truly greater riches than life's glory and luxury. Recalling the type of death one of these suffered, we will leave it to our readers to

consider from his example what also happened to any number of others. **2.** A certain person was led into public view in the city mentioned above, in the presence of the rulers whom we have named. When he was commanded to sacrifice and resisted, he was ordered to be hoisted into the air naked and to have his entire body shredded with lashes, until he was worn out and would thus do what was being commanded, even if unwillingly. **3.** But when he persevered even in the midst of these sufferings, they proceeded to mix vinegar with salt and pour the mixture on the putrefied parts of his body, for his bones were already showing through. But when he scorned even these sufferings, a lit brazier was then drawn into their midst, and the remains of his body were consumed by the fire, in the manner of edible flesh, not all at once, but little by little, so that he would not be released quickly from the suffering. Those who placed him on the pyre were not allowed to relent before he should assent – even after so many tortures! – to what was being commanded. **4.** Yet the man, while holding firm to his profession, died victoriously amid these very tortures. Such was the martyrdom of one of the imperial servants, a death worthy of his name: for he was called Peter. **5.** We will spare the symmetry of the account and pass over what happened to the rest, though this was not inferior, committing to record only that Dorotheus and Gorgonius, along with very many others of the imperial service, after their manifold contests, met the end of their life through strangulation and carried away for themselves the prizes of inspired victory. **6.** At this time, Anthimus, then the leader of the church in Nicomedia, was beheaded on account of his witness to Christ. To him were added a great number of martyrs all at once, when in the palace at Nicomedia – I do not know how – a fire was set over the course of these very days and the rumor went around, according to a false suspicion, that it was started by us; with imperial approval, some of the God-fearers there were slaughtered with the sword, while others met their end through fire, in heaps along with their entire families; the record holds that

at that time men and women jumped upon the pyre through some divine and unspeakable eagerness; the public executioners bound another crowd of people upon boats and cast them into the depths of the sea. **7.** As for the imperial servants, after they had died and were entrusted to the earth with fitting devotion, their so-called masters thought it necessary to dig them up again and throw them too into the sea, so that certain individuals would not worship them as they lay in their tombs (since they supposed that such people reckoned them divine). Such were the events that occurred in Nicomedia at the beginning of the persecution. **8.** Not long afterwards, after some had attempted to attack the imperial government in the region called Melitene, and still others in the area around Syria, the imperial command went around ordering that the leaders of the churches everywhere should be bound in prisons and chains. **9.** And the spectacle of what happened after this transcends all description: since an inestimably large number was being incarcerated in every place, the prisons everywhere, which had been equipped long before for murderers and tomb-robbers, were at that time filled with bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers, and exorcists, such that there was no longer any space left there for those condemned of wrongdoing. **10.** And once more, when the first letters had been overtaken by others, in which it had been ordered that the prisoners should be allowed to go free if they sacrificed, but should be mangled with countless tortures if they resisted, again how could one number the countless martyrs in each province, and especially those in Africa, Mauretania, the Thebaid, and Egypt; from the latter, some of them came into other cities and provinces, as well, and became distinguished for their martyrdoms.

**VII.** We know at least of those among them who were distinguished in Palestine, and we know also of those at Tyre in Phoenicia. Who, when they saw them, was not amazed at the countless lashings and the acts of resistance of the truly incredible athletes of piety amid these,

and the contest among the man-eating beasts immediately following the lashings, and in it, the attacks of the leopards, various kinds of bears, wild boars, and bulls burned by a hot iron, and the marvelous examples of endurance offered by the noble martyrs in the face of each of the wild animals? **2.** We ourselves were present at these events when they occurred, when, as witness was being given to our Savior, Jesus Christ himself, we observed that the divine power was present and was clearly showing itself to the martyrs, while the man-eating beasts for a very long time did not dare to touch or even approach the bodies of the beloved-of-God, but rushed upon the others, in fact upon those who were inciting them with goads from the outside; but the holy athletes alone, standing naked, waving their arms, and attracting the beasts upon themselves (for they were commanded to do this), were not touched at all, but in some way, as by some greater divine power, the beasts, even as they were rushing at them, were pushed back and retreated to the rear. **3.** And since this happened for a long time, it provided the spectators with no little amazement, such that, on account of the inactivity of the first, now a second and third beast were let loose upon one and the same martyr. **4.** One could be amazed at the endurance, undaunted in the face of these things, which belonged to those holy individuals, and at the firm and stubborn opposition that resided in young bodies. Indeed you would see a youth, not even twenty years old, standing without chains, unfolding his hands in the form of a cross, and with calm and unmoved resolve, engaging most leisurely in prayers to the Divinity, and in no way changing his position or turning away from the place where he stood, although the bears and the leopards, breathing fury and death, were nearly touching his very flesh; but somehow (I do not know how), by some divine and unspeakable power, their mouths were not only blocked, but they also ran back to the rear. Of such a character was this young man. **5.** Again, you could see others (for there happened to be five in all) thrown to the side by a raging bull, which, with his horns, cast

into the air and tore to pieces some of the people who approached from the outside, leaving them there to be picked up half-dead; but while he started menacingly against the holy martyrs, those alone he was not able even to approach, but kicking with his feet, making attacks here and there with his horns, and breathing fury and menace on account of the goads from the branding irons, was drawn back by divine providence, such that other wild animals were let loose upon them, since this one had not harmed them at all. **6.** Finally, after terrible and various attacks from these, all of them were slaughtered with the sword and, instead of burial, were committed to the waves of the sea.

**VIII.** And such was the contest of the Egyptians at Tyre who displayed struggles on behalf of piety. One might also marvel at those among them who were martyred in their own region, where countless numbers of men, women, and children, despising their present life, endured different forms of death on behalf of our Savior's teaching: some among them, after scrapings, rackings, lashings most painful, and various other tortures innumerable and terrible to hear, were committed to the fire; some were drowned in the sea, others bravely stretched their heads out to the executioners; some even died amid their tortures, while others wasted away with starvation; and still others were fixed to a stake, some in the way customary for criminals, but others, in a worse manner, nailed upside down, and kept alive until they died of starvation on the very stakes.

**IX.** But the torments and sufferings which the martyrs in the Thebaid endured transcend every possible account. They were scraped with potsherds, in the place of nails, over their entire body, even to the point of surrendering their lives, and small women were bound by one foot and hoisted up from the ground to a great height in the air by machines, and with their completely naked and exposed bodies, provided this most shameful, cruel, and inhuman sight of all to the

entire body of onlookers. **2.** Still others died bound to trees and trunks. For they drew together the very stiffest of the branches with wenchers so that they met at the same point, extended the legs of the martyrs upon each of these, and let the branches fly back to their natural position, intending a sudden tearing-apart of the legs of those against whom they implemented these things. **3.** And all this was carried out not over a few days or for a short time, but over the long span of entire years, during which, sometimes more than ten, and at other times more than twenty people were executed; and at other times no less than thirty, now nearly sixty, and yet at another time one hundred men on a single day, along with young children and women all together, were killed, condemned to varied and ever-changing punishments. **4.** Even we ourselves, since we were at these places, observed a very large crowd of people who suffered beheading all at once on a single day, and others the punishment by fire, such that the murderous iron was dulled, and being weakened, was broken, and the executioners, completely exhausted, relieved one another in turns. **5.** Also at that time, we were able to see the most wonderful impulse and truly divine power and eagerness among those who had put their faith in the Christ of God. Just when the sentence was being passed against the former, others began to jump, one from one place, one from another, upon the tribunal before the judge, confessing themselves to be Christians, and being heedless in the face of the terrors and diverse modes of tortures, and speaking freely without concern on the piety towards the God of the universe, and receiving the final sentence of death with joy, laughter, and good cheer, such that they sang hymns and sent up thanksgivings to the God of the universe until their very last breath. **6.** These too were admired, but especially those who were distinguished for their wealth, noble birth, good reputation, erudition, and philosophical learning, and yet who considered all things secondary to the true piety and faith toward our Savior and Lord, Jesus Christ. **7.** Such a person was Philoromus, who

had been entrusted with a certain position, not without prestige, in the imperial administration at Alexandria. He sat in judgment each day, having a bodyguard of soldiers, in accordance with his dignity and position among the Romans; and Phileas, bishop of the church of the Thmuites, a man distinguished for his civic *munera* and service and for his philosophical works. **8.** And although countless family members and other loved ones, even those who held high positions, were entreating them – and, in addition, the judge himself was exhorting them to take pity on themselves and to spare their children and wives – in no way were they led by such entreaties to choose in favor of the love of life and to look with contempt upon the commandments of our Savior regarding confession and denial, but with manly reason and love of wisdom, or rather with a pious and a god-loving soul, standing firm in the face of all the threats and insults of the judge, they both were beheaded.

**X.** Since we have said that Phileas was worthy of much regard, even on account of his secular learning, let him come forward as his own witness, both to demonstrate who he was, and to recount through the following text, more accurately than we are able, what martyrdoms happened at Alexandria in his time.

**2.** “Since all these patterns, models, and noble tokens exist for us in the divine and holy writings, the blessed martyrs with us made no delay, but having directed the eye of their soul purely toward the God over the universe and having resolved upon death for piety’s sake, held fast to their calling, for they realized that our Lord, Jesus Christ, had taken on human flesh for our sake, to erase all sin and to establish the means for entrance into eternal life. ‘For he did not consider being equal to God a prize to be grasped but emptied himself out, having taken the form of a slave; and having found himself as a man in form, he humbled himself to the point of death, death on a cross.’ **3.** On account of

this, the Christ-bearing martyrs, having emulated the greater gifts, endured every suffering and all kinds of tortures which had been devised, not once, but in some cases even twice; and although the guards were vying with them not only verbally, but also in their actions, they did not yield their purpose, due to perfect love's casting out of fear. **4.** What account would be sufficient to record their valor and bravery in the midst of every torture? For when license was granted to all who wished to insult them, some beat them with clubs, others with rods, some with whips, still others with leather straps, and some with cords. **5.** And the spectacle of the tortures was constantly changing and had much evil in it. For some were hung upon a beam with their hands tied behind their backs and all their limbs were severely stretched by machines; then, as they were in this state, the torturers, acting upon command, applied treatment throughout their entire bodies: they not only inflicted punishment on their sides with their instruments, as they do for murderers, but also upon their stomach, shanks, and cheeks. Others were hung from the colonnade by one hand and hoisted into the air, enduring a tension in their joints and limbs more terrible than any pain. Others were bound facing toward the columns, their feet not touching the ground, with the bonds pressed hard by the weight of their bodies and drawn taut with tension. **6.** And they endured this, not for as long as the governor was addressing them or attending to them, but nearly the entire day. For even when he passed on to others, he left behind those serving under his authority to watch over the first prisoners, bidding them, if someone grew weak under the tortures and seemed to give in, to add to the constraints without mercy, and after this, when they were about to expire, to set them upon the ground and drag them off; **7.** for he commanded that they should have not the slightest bit of concern for us, but should think and act as if we no longer existed:

our adversaries having discovered this second form of torture in addition to the blows. **8.** Some were placed in the stocks even after the tortures, and both feet were stretched entirely through the four holes, such that they were forced to lie supine in the stocks, for they were unable to rise due to their having fresh wounds over their entire body. Others were cast to the ground and lay there as a result of the overwhelming onslaught of the tortures, providing the onlookers with a sight more terrible than the actual enterprise and carrying the manifold and varied inventions of torments upon their bodies. **9.** This being the case, some died amid the tortures, having dishonored their rival with their endurance; others were shut up in prison half-dead and, not many days later, died under the affliction of their sufferings; still others met with recovery from the medical care which they received and became more confident due to the long duration of their detention. **10.** As such, when the order had been given that they had the choice either to be unharmed, if they should touch the polluted sacrifice, obtaining from them the freedom which carries a curse, or if they did not sacrifice, to receive the punishment of death, without hesitation they went gladly to death. For they knew what had been preordained for us by the holy writings. For ‘the one who sacrifices,’ it says, ‘will be destroyed by other gods,’ and ‘you shall have no other gods except me.’

**11.** Such were the words of the truly philosophic and god-loving martyr which he had sent to the brethren in his congregation before his final sentence, while he was still under the condition of imprisonment, at one time communicating the circumstances in which he found himself, and at another, urging them to hold firm to the godly piety in Christ even after his impending death. **12.** But why is it necessary to speak at length and to add ever newer instances of the contests of the godly martyrs throughout the world, especially of those besieged no longer by common law, but

in the manner of war.

**XI.** For example, heavily-armed soldiers surrounded an entire town of Christians, men and all, in some part of Phrygia, lit it on fire, and burned it to the ground, along with the children and women as they were crying out to the God of the universe. This was because every single one of the city's inhabitants, including the curator himself and the duumvirs, along with all the magistrates and the entire people, confessed themselves Christians and in no way whatsoever obeyed those who were ordering them to commit idolatry. **2.** Another person who had received Roman *dignitas*, by the name of Adauctus, was from a distinguished family of Italians; he was a man who had progressed through every rank under the emperors, such that he even made his way without blemish through the financial posts which the Romans call *magister rei privatae* and *rationalis summae rei*; but on top of all of this, he was distinguished for his accomplishments in godly piety and his confessions of the Christ of God and was adorned with the diadem of martyrdom, enduring the contest on behalf of piety while in the very office of *rationalis*.

**XII.** Why is it necessary for me now to recall the rest by name, or to count the large number of men, or to depict the various tortures of the awe-inspiring martyrs, who, at one time, were executed by axes, as occurred to those in Arabia, at other times had their legs broken, as happened to those in Cappadocia; sometimes they were suspended in the air head-down, and after a slow fire was kindled, were choked by the smoke of the burning wood as it rose – this was applied to those in Mesopotamia; at other times, they had their noses, ears, and hands amputated, and the remaining limbs and body parts were butchered – this was the case in Alexandria. **2.** Why is it necessary to rekindle the memory of those in Antioch who were slow-roasted on fiery hearths not as a death-sentence, but as a form of lengthy punishment; and of others who thrust their right hand into the very fire rather than touch the cursed sacrifice; some of them, fleeing the

trial before they were seized and, coming into the hands of those plotting against them, threw themselves from above off high buildings, considering death a spoil seized from the wickedness of ungodly men. **3.** A certain person, holy and marvelous in the excellence of her soul, but in body a woman, and otherwise celebrated among all of the residents of Antioch for her wealth, noble birth, and good reputation, raised in the laws of piety a pair of virgin daughters distinguished for the ripe young age of their body; when the excessive envy which was aroused against them went to inordinate extremes in tracking them down as they hid, and when it learned that they were passing their time in a foreign location, it took great pains in summoning them to Antioch, and they were presently caught up in the soldiers' nets. When she saw that she and her children were in a helpless situation and explained to them the terrible things which were in store for them at the hands of humans – and the most unbearable of all terrors, the threat of prostitution – and she advised that it was not necessary for herself and her daughters to endure listening with attentive ears, but asserting that giving up their souls to the service of the demons was worse than every type of death and every destruction, she suggested that the flight to the Lord was the only escape from all these terrors. **4.** Then, when they had come to a common agreement, they wrapped their bodies neatly in their mantles, and having come to the middle point in their journey, asked the guards to be excused for a brief moment and hurled themselves into the river that was flowing nearby. **5.** Thus they disposed of themselves. Another pair of virgins in the same city of Antioch, godly in every way and truly sisters, renowned in their noble birth, but distinguished in their life, young in their age, ripe in their body, holy in their soul, pious in their disposition, and marvelous in their urgency, as if the earth could not bear to embrace such ones as these, the servants of demons gave the order that they be thrown into the sea. Thus these things happened with them. **6.** Others, in Pontus, suffered things terrible to hear:

some had sharp reeds driven under the tips of their fingernails on both hands, and others, when lead had been melted by fire, had the boiling and bubbling material poured upon their backs and the very most necessary parts of the body roasted thoroughly. **7.** Others endured throughout their private parts and inner organs shameful and unsympathetic sufferings which must not even be mentioned; these the noble and law-abiding judges contrived in a spirit of rivalry, displaying their shrewdness, as if it were some excellence of wisdom: they were vying to surpass one another in the discovery of ever newer tortures, as if those were included among the prizes of a contest. **8.** It was the height of these misfortunes when at last, after they had given up on the excess of evils, grown weary of killing, and taken their fill and surfeit of bloodshed, they turned to the goodness and humanity which was their custom, such that they no longer seemed to go to terrible extremes against us. **9.** For they said it was not right to stain the cities with the blood of their countrymen nor to slander the most supreme office of the rulers, which was beneficent and mild to all people, with charges of cruelty; rather it was necessary that the beneficence of the humane and imperial authority be extended to all people, and as such, they were no longer being punished with death; for this punishment directed against our own people had been abolished on account of the humanity of the rulers. **10.** At that time it was commanded rather that their eyes be gouged out and both their legs maimed. For these things were to them humane and the mildest of punishments against us; the result is that now, on account of this humanity of impious men, we are no longer able to express the large number of those who – beyond all description – first had their right eyes chopped out with the sword and then had them cauterized with fire; and again the large number of those who had their left feet disabled at the ankle with hot irons and after this were condemned to the copper mines in the province not for the sake of service so much as for ill-treatment and hard labor; and in addition to all these, the large number of others

who fell into different contests, which it is not even possible to describe, for their manly deeds are superior to every description. **11.** In these contests the magnificent martyrs of Christ distinguished themselves over the entire world and naturally struck with amazement the onlookers of their manliness everywhere and through themselves provided visible evidence of the true and unspeakable divine power of our savior. It would be tedious to recall each by name, if not truly impossible.

**XIII.** Of the ecclesiastical leaders who have been martyred in famous cities, let us first proclaim on monuments to the pious, as a witness to Christ's kingdom, Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, who was beheaded; **2.** and of the martyrs at Antioch, Lucian, most noble in his entire life and presbyter of the congregation there, who in Nicomedia, while the emperor was present, also himself proclaimed Christ's heavenly kingdom, first in word through an apology, then also in deeds. **3.** Of the martyrs in Phoenicia, the most famous would be the shepherds of Christ's logical flocks, God-loving in all respects: Tyrannion, bishop of the church in Tyre, Zenobius, presbyter of the church in Sidon, and finally, Sivanus, bishop of the churches in the area of Emesa. **4.** But this last one, along with others, became food for the wild beasts in the very city of Emesa and was received into the choirs of martyrs; the other two glorified the word of God at Antioch through their endurance until death: one of them, the bishop, was committed to the depths of the sea, while Zenobius, the best of doctors, died resolutely amid the tortures inflicted on his sides. **5.** Of the martyrs in Palestine, Silvanus, bishop of the churches in the vicinity of Gaza, was beheaded at the copper mines in Phaeno, along with thirty-nine others; the Egyptians there, bishops Peleus and Nilus, suffered death by fire, along with others. **6.** Furthermore, let us mention among these the great glory of the congregation at Caesarea, the presbyter Pamphilus, most marvelous of those in our era, the excellence of whose manly deeds we will record at the

fitting time. **7.** Of those who have met with distinguished perfection at Alexandria and throughout all Egypt and the Thebaid, let us first record Peter, bishop of Alexandria itself, a divine treasure among the teachers of God's piety in Christ, and among the presbyters with him, Faustus, Dios, and Ammonius, perfect martyrs of Christ, and Phileas, Hesychius, Pachymius, and Theodorus, bishops of the churches in the region of Egypt, and countless other famous men in addition to them who are remembered by congregations in their own countries and localities. It is not our task to commit to writing the contests of those who have contended throughout the entire world on behalf of piety toward the Divinity and to give an accurate account of everything that happened to them; rather, this would belong to those who have seen the affairs themselves. Those with whom I myself was present I will also make known to posterity through another composition. **8.** In the present account, I will attach to what has been said the recantation of the things which were done concerning us and the things which happened from the start of the persecution, as they are most profitable to my readers. **9.** What account would be sufficient to describe the affairs of the Roman government before the war against us, how long the friendliness and peacefulness of the rulers toward us lasted, what an abundance of wealth and prosperity it merited? When even those who held supreme power over the entire Empire completed their *decennalia* and *vicennalia* and passed their time in feasts, celebrations, and the most cheerful festivities and merriment with nothing but firmly established peace. **10.** But as their authority increased in this way without disturbance and daily advanced in magnitude, all of a sudden they changed their peaceful disposition toward us and stirred up a war without truce. And when a second year of such a change on their part had not yet passed, a quite unexpected turn of events impacted the entire principate and turned all of public affairs upside down. **11.** For when an inauspicious disease befell the first-in-rank of those mentioned above, on account of

which the state of his mind was reduced to delirium, he, along with the one who had been honored with second-in-command after him, took up the private life of a commoner. And these things had not yet been carried out in this way when the entire Empire was torn in two, an affair which, according to tradition, had never happened at any other time in the past. **12.** Not long after, Emperor Constantius, who had a very mild character throughout his whole life and was very kindly disposed toward his subjects and most friendly toward the divine word, died, in accordance with the common law of nature, leaving behind a legitimate son Constantine as Emperor and Augustus in his place. He was the first to be proclaimed a member of the gods by them and was deemed worthy of all honor after death that one could owe an emperor, indeed the kindest and gentlest of emperors. **13.** He alone among those in our time passed the entire period of his rule in a manner worthy of his imperial office and otherwise showed himself quite favorable and beneficent to all people; in no way did he take part in the war against us, but even guarded the pious of God under him so that they remained safe and free from injury; neither did he tear down the churches nor implement any other new measure against us; he has received in return a happy and thrice-blessed end to his life, for he alone experienced a gentle and glorious passing while he was still emperor, along with a lawful son, most temperate and pious in every way, as his successor. **14.** His son, Constantine, from the very beginning was proclaimed most perfect Emperor and Augustus by the armies and long before this by God himself, the absolute monarch, and established himself as emulator of his father's piety toward our word. Such was his character. And after this, Licinius was proclaimed Emperor and Augustus by a common vote of the rulers. **15.** These things caused Maximin terrible pain, since up to this point he was only styled a Caesar by all. As such, being a tyrant first and foremost, he pilfered the office for himself and became Augustus, having been made so only by himself. At this time, the one who

has been shown to have taken up his position after abdication was caught stitching together a plot to kill Constantine and suffered a most shameful death. He was the first to have his honorific inscriptions, statues, and all such monuments which have usually been set up, destroyed, on the ground that they belong to an unholy and impious individual.

**XIV.** His son Maxentius, who had obtained the tyranny at Rome, in the beginning impersonated our faith in order to flatter and cajole the Roman people; and thus he ordered his subjects to give up their persecution against the Christians, simulating piety, so that he would appear favorable and quite gentle compared to his predecessors. **2.** Nevertheless, by his deeds he has revealed himself not to be the kind of person we hoped he would be, but having steered his course into all sorts of wickedness, he did not neglect any act of defilement and licentiousness, instead carrying out adulteries and every kind of seduction. For example, he would separate lawfully married wives from their husbands, insult them most dishonorably, and send them back to their husbands; and it was his policy to direct these attempts not at undistinguished or unknown individuals, but indeed to offend the most prominent of those who had achieved the highest ranks in the Roman Senate. **3.** The entire population cowered before him, plebs and leaders, *honestiores* and *humiliores*, and was worn out by his awful tyranny; and even when they kept quiet and endured the bitter slavery, still there was no deliverance from the murderous cruelty of the tyrant. For instance, once, on some small pretense, he handed over the *populus* to his praetorians to be slaughtered, and a countless number of the Roman people were killed, in the middle of the city, by the spears and weapons not of Scythians or Barbarians, but of their own country-men. **4.** Indeed the number of murders which were carried out against Senators due to his designs on their wealth could not even be calculated, since countless multitudes were disposed of on fabricated charges which differed according to the situation. **5.** But the crooked

end of the tyrant's evils was when he was driven to witchcraft: at one point, ripping open pregnant women with the intention of performing magical rites, and at another, examining the entrails of newborn babies, slaughtering lions, and contriving unspeakable incantations to demons and sacrifices to avert war. For his entire hope of accomplishing victory rested in these rites. **6.** Thus while he was tyrant at Rome, one could not even describe the kinds of things he did to enslave his subjects, such that they were actually brought to the most extreme need and want of necessary provisions, on a scale which our contemporaries have never recalled happening at any other time. **7.** Maximin, the tyrant in the East, made a secret treaty with the one at Rome, as if with a brother in evil, and for the longest time thought that it went unnoticed. Indeed, when he was later discovered, he paid a worthy penalty. **8.** But one could marvel at how he won for himself a kinship and brotherhood, nay rather the victor's first prize of evil, with the wickedness of the tyrant at Rome. For the leading sorcerers and magi were deemed worthy of the highest honor by him, because he was extremely skittish and superstitious, valuing highly the error regarding idols and demons. For apart from prophecies and oracles he could not dare to move at all, even a nail's length, so to speak. **9.** For this reason, he applied himself to the persecution against us with more eagerness and constancy than his predecessors, he erected temples in every city, ordering that even the sacred precincts which had fallen into disrepair due to the passage of time be restored with all eagerness, and appointing priests of idols in every locale and city, and over these, as chief priest in each province, someone of decurial status who was quite distinguished through all his service, to be accompanied by a company of soldiers and bodyguard, recklessly bestowing upon all the sorcerers, as if they were pious and God-loving persons, positions in the government and the highest privileges. **10.** Taking this as his starting point, he distressed and repressed not one city or district, but whole provinces under his

dominion with exactions of gold, silver, and unspeakable amounts of property, and the heaviest assessments and various fines. Indeed he deprived the wealthy of the possessions which they had procured from their forefathers, and presented their riches and heaps of possessions all at once to the sycophants in his presence. **11.** In fact, he was carried to such an excess of drunkenness and intoxication that he became deranged and lost his senses amid his drinks and ordered such things while drunk that he regretted the next day when he was sober. He left to no one the chance to surpass him in drunkenness and prodigality, but established himself as teacher of wickedness to those in his presence, rulers and subjects alike. He urged the army to become enfeebled through every kind of luxury and licentiousness; he exhorted governors and *duces* to advance against their subjects with plundering and greed, as if they were all but fellow tyrants with him. **12.** Why is it necessary to recount the shameful lusts of the man or to count the multitude of those who have been defiled at his hands? Indeed it was impossible for him to pass by a city without continually seducing and abducting virgins. **13.** These things proved successful for him against all, with the exception of the Christians. By despising death, they rendered his tyranny, powerful though it was, of little account. For the men endured fire, iron, and nails; wild beasts and the depths of the sea; the amputation and burning of limbs, the gouging and digging out of eyes, and mutilation of the entire body; and furthermore, hunger, mines, and chains: in all they displayed endurance on behalf of piety rather than giving to the idols the honor due to God in exchange. **14.** But the women, in turn, no less than men, were made men by the teaching of the divine word. Some endured the same contests as the men and won for themselves equal prizes of virtue; others were dragged away to be raped and gave their soul up to death rather than their body to corruption. **15.** For example, a Christian lady, most well-known and illustrious among those at Alexandria, alone of those who had been debauched by the tyrant, conquered the

passionate and licentious soul of Maximin through a most manly courage; she was otherwise esteemed for her wealth, birth, and education, but still placed everything second to her chastity. While he importuned her many times, still he was not able to put her to death – though she was ready to die – since his desire proved to be stronger than his anger. Instead, he punished her with exile and deprived her of all her wealth. **16.** Countless other women, unable even to listen to the threat of prostitution, submitted patiently to every form of torture and racking and deadly punishment at the hands of the provincial rulers. As marvelous as these were, yet the most exceedingly wonderful was the woman at Rome, truly the most high-born and chaste of all whom the tyrant there, Maxentius, committing crimes similar to those of Maximin, attempted to treat offensively. **17.** For when she heard that those who provide these types of services to the tyrant were posted at her house (and she too was a Christian), and that her husband, who was the urban prefect of Rome, out of fear allowed them to seize her and lead her away, she asked to be excused for a short period, on the pretext of adorning her body, entered her bedroom, and when she was alone, stabbed herself with a dagger; and dying straightway, she left her dead body for the pimps, and by her very actions, louder than any word, she showed to all people, present and future, that the Christian's virtue is the only unconquerable and indestructible possession. **18.** So great was the power of the impulse toward evil that was assembled at one and the same time as it was wrought by the two tyrants who had divided east and west. Who in their search for the cause of events so momentous would doubt that it was the persecution against us, especially since there was no end to such a great state of confusion until the Christians recovered their freedom?

**XV.** Indeed during the entire ten year period of the persecution, there was no time when they were not scheming and at war with one another. The sea was unnavigable, and it was

impossible for people, no matter their port of origin, to avoid being subject to every kind of torture, such as being stretched on the rack and having their sides torn; and they were questioned with various methods of torture, for fear that they might come from enemies of the opposing side, and finally were subjected to crosses or punishment by fire. **2.** In addition to this, the readying of shields, armor, missiles, and spears, and preparations of other military operations, were undertaken everywhere, and it was not possible to expect anything other than the onset of wars every day. Famine and plague fell upon them after this, of which we will give the necessary account at the proper time.

**XVI.** Such a state of affairs continued throughout the entire persecution, which on the tenth year ceased entirely by the grace of God, although in truth it began to abate after the eighth year. For when the divine and heavenly grace began displaying its kind and propitious oversight toward us, then indeed our rulers, the very persons through whom the war against us was carried out from long ago, contrary to all expectation, changed their opinion and chanted a recantation, quenching the conflagration of persecution which had been kindled with vigor with beneficial proclamations and the most civilized ordinances regarding us. **2.** The cause of this was in no way human, nor was it due to the compassion, as one might say, or philanthropy of our leaders. Far from it! For daily, from the beginning up to this point in time, more and greater difficulties were being contrived by them against us, while they were inventing ever newer forms of torture with various devices. But there was a clear visitation of divine providence herself, reconciling herself to her people and attacking the author of the evils and growing angry toward the leader of the evil of persecution. **3.** For even if it were necessary for these things to happen in accordance with divine judgment, nevertheless “woe,” says the Logos, “through whomsoever the stumbling-block comes!” Therefore, the divinely-sent punishment pursued him, beginning with his very flesh and

proceeding to his soul. **4.** For all at once, an inflammation occurred in the middle of his body's unmentionable parts, then a deep fistula-like wound and an incurable mass which spread into the innermost organs. From this an unspeakable multitude of worms burst forth and a deadly odor was given off, for the entire mass of his body, even before his disease, had changed, from over-eating, into an extremely large heap of fat, which then rotted and furnished an unbearable and most awful sight to those who approached. **5.** And of the physicians, therefore, some were completely unable to endure the excessively foul nature of the odor and were slaughtered; others, being unable to provide further treatment when his entire tumor had swollen and deteriorated to a point where his salvation was hopeless, were mercilessly killed.

**XVII.** And wrestling with the magnitude of such evils, he came to an awareness of the atrocities which he had committed against the pious of God. Therefore, collecting his thoughts, he first confessed the God of the universe; then, after he had summoned those around him, he commanded that they cease the persecution against the Christians without delay, and with imperial law and ordinance, urge them to build their churches and perform their customary rites, offering prayers on behalf of the imperial government. **2.** Straightaway then, with action following upon the word, imperial ordinances were published in the cities containing the recantation of the things against us as follows:

**3.** "Emperor Caesar Galerius Valerius Maximianus Invictus Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, Germanicus Maximus, Aegyptiacus Maximus, Thebaicus Maximus, Sarmaticus Maximus five times, Persicus Maximus twice, Carpicus Maximus six times, Armeniacus Maximus, Medicus Maximus, Adiabenicus Maximus, possessing the Tribunican Power for the twentieth time, Emperor for the nineteenth time, Consul for the eight time, *Pater Patriae*, Proconsul. **4.** And Emperor Caesar Flavius Valerius

Constantinus Pius Felix Invictus Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, possessing Tribunician Power, Emperor for the fifth time, Consul, *Pater Patriae*, Proconsul. **5.** And Emperor Caesar Valerius Licinianus Licinius Pius Felix Invictus Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, possessing Tribunician Power for the fourth time, Emperor for the third time, Consul, *Pater Patriae*, Proconsul. To the people each in their own provinces, greetings. **6.**

Among the other arrangements which we make on behalf of the benefit and advantage of the state, we had earlier desired, in accordance with the ancient laws and the public discipline of the Romans, to set everything straight and to make provisions so that even the Christians, who had abandoned the sect of their own ancestors, might return to good disposition. **7.** Since for some reason they were possessed by so much presumption and overcome by so much folly that they did not follow the customs introduced by the ancients, which perhaps even their ancestors had established at an earlier period, but, in accordance with their own disposition, and as each one wished, in this way made laws for themselves, observed them, and brought together different crowds at different places. **8.** Wherefore, when this ordinance of ours followed suit, such that they should take themselves back to the customs established by the ancients, very many people were subjected to danger, while very many others were thrown into confusion and endured various forms of death. **9.** And since many people were persisting in the same folly, and we saw that they were neither furnishing the worship due to the heavenly gods nor paying heed to the god of the Christians, focusing on our clemency and enduring custom, through which we have been accustomed to grant pardon to all people, most eagerly too in this case have we thought it necessary to extend our indulgence, so that Christians may exist again and construct the buildings in which they used to gather, on the condition that

they do nothing contrary to public order. Through another letter I shall demonstrate to the judges what they should be on the lookout for. **10.** Hence, in accordance with our indulgence, they are obliged to supplicate their own God concerning our safety, that of the state, and their own, so that in every place the state may be rendered healthy, and they may be able to live free from concern at their own hearths.”

**11.** Such was the tenor of the Latin document, translated into the Greek tongue to the best of my ability. Thus it is time to examine what happened after this.

**App.** But the one responsible for the document, after such a confession, was immediately, but not for long, released from his sufferings and died. Indeed tradition holds that he was the first cause of the misfortune of the persecution, having compelled, still long before the action of the other emperors, the Christians in the armies – and truly, first of all, those in his own household – to turn aside, removing some from military rank, abusing others dishonorably, and even at this point hanging the threat of death over them, and finally having stirred up his colleagues in the imperial college to the persecution against all. It is not appropriate to commit the deaths of these same persons to silence. **2.** Of the four, then, who had achieved the supreme command, those who were preeminent in age and honor, after not even two whole years of persecution, abdicated from imperial rule, as we have also shown above, and indeed having spent the rest of their lives in the manner of commoners and civilians, obtained the following deaths: **3.** the one who was deemed worthy of the highest rank on account of honor and age was done in by a long and very painful infirmity of the body, and the one second in command to him ended his life by strangling, having suffered this in accordance with some demoniacal prediction due to the great many acts of wrong-doing dared by him. **4.** Of those who came after them, the last in rank, whom indeed we have said was also the instigator of the entire persecution, suffered such things

as we have shown above; but the one preceding him in rank, the kindest and gentlest emperor, Constantius, passed the entire period of his rule in a manner worthy of his imperial office and otherwise showed himself quite favorable and beneficent to all people; but he took no part in the war against us and guarded the pious of God under him so that they remained safe and free from injury; and neither did he tear down the churches nor instigate any other new measure against us; he has truly received in return a happy and thrice-blessed end to his life, for he alone experienced a gentle and glorious passing while he was still emperor, along with a lawful son, most temperate and pious in every way, as his successor to imperial rule. **5.** He, from the very beginning, was proclaimed most perfect emperor and Augustus by the armies and established himself as emulator of his father's piety toward our word. Such were the deaths of the four men recorded above, which occurred at different times. **6.** The one mentioned a little earlier by us, the only one of the emperors who still remained, along with those who came into imperial office afterwards, made the aforesaid confession through the document previously set forth.

## CHAPTER IV

### COMMENTARY

**Pref. Τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὴν:** This phrase occupies the same initial position at the beginning of Bk VIII as in the preface to the entire work (Τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὰς σὺν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διηγουμένοις χρόνοις 1.1.1) and marks the end of the episcopal lists for the sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (c.f. 7.32.31: Peter of Alexandria, the last bishop mentioned in the *HE*) that characterize Bks I-VII. E conceives of two types of succession: 1) the episcopal lists which, along with the reigns of emperors, form the chronological framework of the *HE* and 2) the academic successions at the Christian schools of Alexandria and Caesarea, which are modeled on the Hellenistic notion of philosophical succession (see Williams 2005: 222-226; also Grant 1980: 45-59). Since apostolic succession is the principal topic and unifying theme of the first seven books (1.1.1; described in 7.32.32 as ὑπόθεσις) we must conclude that the author indicates his intention to begin a new account (see Introduction VI; also Louth 1990: 115; Burgess 1999: 44). His model for such a method may have been Josephus. Before proceeding to his treatment of the Jewish war in a separate work (*AJ* 20.259), the historian concludes the final book of his *Antiquities* by pronouncing complete his account of the high priestly successions in the interval of two thousand years (*AJ* 20.261; see Grant 1980: 32). The termination of the episcopal lists may underscore the negative effect of the persecution on the church leaders who lapsed or behaved shamefully, and about whom E does not wish to speak at length (8.1.7-8; 8.2.2-3). These are replaced in the last

three books by the martyrs, who carry the true spirit of Christianity in their triumph over persecution (see *Tōn δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων* 13.1), and by the figure of Constantine, who is the culmination of the union of the Empire and Christianity (see Introduction VI).

**ἐν ὅλοις ἐπτὰ περιγράψαντες βιβλίοις:** E expands the phrase ἐν τούτοις...περιγράψαντες from 7.32.32. The compound verb and adjective (ὅλοις) emphasize completion, a theme expressed also in the number of books: E undoubtedly has in mind the seven days of creation (Burgess 1997: 499; see Introduction IV).

**ἐν ὀγδόῳ τούτῳ συγγράμματι:** σύγγραμμα occurs in the preface to the work, where the author speaks of those who served in each generation as ambassadors of the divine word ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων (1.1.1). It is a favorite term to introduce works of other authors in the *HE* (e.g., 1.11.7; 2.6.3; 3.10.6; 4.11.8; 5.11.2; 6.19.2; 7.24.1). Unlike συγγραφή, which often implies historical genre (Matthews 1994: 263-267), σύγγραμμα is a general term which E applies to different types of compositions. Its use here immediately preceding τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς suggests that E considers himself a literary ambassador of Christianity for his own generation.

**ὀγδόῳ:** This is the second of only three books in the *HE* to which E assigns a number, the others being 7 and 10 (see 7.pref.; 10.1.2). See Introduction IV for the significance of the number eight in E's numerology.

**τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς:** E means principally the persecution and related events, as becomes clear from two other introductory passages: 7.32.32 (τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀνδρισσαμένων ἀγῶνας) and 8.2.3 (τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων).

**οὐ τῆς τυχούσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς:** In 8.2.3, E defines Bk VIII's content as "the holy contests of the martyrs of the divine word in abridged form" (τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου

μαρτύρων ἐν ἐπιτομῇ), where ἐν ἐπιτομῇ probably refers to *MP(s)* (see Laqueur 1929: 34-39; also Grant 1968: 17), which formed the body of Bk VIII in the first edition. Yet this characterization is somewhat inconsistent with οὐ...τυχούσης γραφῆς here: why would E describe Bk VIII as “no trifling account” and “abridged” in the same introduction? The best explanation is that 8.pref. originated in the second edition, when *MP(s)* had been replaced by the rewritten and expanded Bk VIII, and E forgot to remove ἐν ἐπιτομῇ. Thus οὐ...τυχούσης γραφῆς would refer to the new, weightier account which replaced *MP(s)*, the latter having been deemed inadequate or “trifling” (note that τυχούσης could also mean “at hand”). E uses similar language in 1.1.6 to describe the relation between the *Canones* and the *HE*: his prior composition, the chronological tables, is an abridged form (ἐπιτομὴν) of the material of which he has set out to give the fullest narration (πληρεστάτην...ἀφήγησιν).

**ἐν τι τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων:** The redundancy of this phrase (note δεῖν below) led to its omission in MSS BD. E is comfortable speaking both of necessity and utility as motivations for writing history (Grant 1980: 23-25). Here necessity is associated with knowledge handed down to posterity (εἰς γυνῶσιν καὶ τῶν μεθ' ἡμᾶς, a repetition of 7.32.32); later in the introduction E speaks of relating only those things which are useful “both for ourselves and for those after us” (8.2.3). For an expanded discussion, see πρώτοις μὲν ἡμῖν...τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς...πρὸς ὠφελείας 8.2.3.

**καὶ ἄρξεται γε ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν ἐντεῦθεν:** Almost identical language introduces the first topic of the work in Bk I: the account of the preexistent Logos (1.1.7: Καὶ ἄρξεται γέ μοι ὁ λόγος; for the Logos-language which permeates Bk VIII, see Introduction IV and V). ἐντεῦθεν, which signals a starting point from the end of the last book in 303 (7.32.32), implies the narrative is about to begin, but this is postponed to 8.2.4, which is also introduced by ἐντεῦθεν at 8.2.3.

**I.1 Ὅσης μὲν καὶ ὁποίας:** Correlatives indicating quantity and type appear often in the E's introductions, prefaces, and summaries (e.g., 1.1.1-6; 2.pref.1; 3.5.4). For E's penchant to use quantitative language for the purpose of exaggeration, see Grant 1980: 37-38.

**πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ:** E digresses from the chronology of the narrative, which has advanced to the time of the Diocletianic Persecution. Though the author fails clearly to define this period, we may assume from 8.4.2, where he introduces the military persecution in the period following Decius and Valerian, that it extends from ca. 260-303. See Introduction IV for a discussion of the way in which this “prehistorical” digression relates to E's structural schema in the *HE*.

**ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τῷ βίῳ κατηγγελλένος...λόγος:** The Incarnation holds a central place in E's view of salvation history, which is essentially an historicized version of Origen's theology (see Chesnut 1986: 68). The climax of the *HE*, the persecution and triumph of Christianity, parallels another climax in human history, the Incarnation of the Logos through Christ (see Morgan 2005: 195). See Introduction IV.

**παρρησίας:** The concept of *παρρησία* appears three times in 8.1.1-3. Generally translated "freedom of speech," the word has a rich history in both secular and religious discourse (for its use in ancient Athens, see Saxonhouse 2006: 85-126; and in the New Testament, Fitzgerald 1996: 163-264). E's emphasis on *παρρησία* here sets up a contrast with *ἐλευθερίας* in 8.1.7 (see ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας 8.1.7); this is unusual, since the two terms are often linked in Greek and Christian thought (e.g., Pl. *Rep.* 557b; 2 Cor. 3.12-17). In the current context, however, freedom to practice Christianity openly and boldness of confession (*παρρησία*) stand in opposition to the license (*ἐλευθερία*, described in 8.10.10 as “accursed”) which leads to bickering and infighting. *παρρησία* can also refer to the uninhibited relationship between God and humanity before the

Fall (see Lampe, *παρρησία*, II.A.1), and thus here characterizes the freedom of the Church before its fall into persecution (as outlined in Introduction IV). See *εἰς πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ παρρησιαζόμενοις λόγῳ τε καὶ βίῳ* 8.1.3.

**παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις:** Similar expressions featuring the pairing of Ἕλληνας and βάρβαρος occur repeatedly in the Eusebian corpus. Generally, E's purpose is to demonstrate the universal reach of the Christian message. For a discussion of the Greek-Barbarian polarity, see Johnson 2006: 205-210. The phrase occurs a second time in connection with the account of Dorotheus and Gorgonius (8.6.1).

**I.2 τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐνεχειρίζον ἡγεμονίας:** These may be "positions of government in the provinces," rather than specifically governorships. E gives the examples of Dorotheus, head of the dye-works at Tyre (7.32.2-3), Philoromus, government official at Alexandria (8.9.7), and Adauctus, official in the finance ministry (8.11.2). Cyprian's complaint in *De Laps.* 6 about bishops who abandon their divine charge for secular positions seems to corroborate E's statements concerning Christians in the government.

**τῆς περὶ τὸ θύειν ἀγωνίας:** Government officials in the provinces were required to participate in official sacrifices. It was also the responsibility of the governor to take part and encourage participation in the various state and imperial cults (see Price 1985: 69-71).

**I.3 τῶν κατὰ τοὺς βασιλικοὺς...οἴκους:** E means members of the imperial service and royal family (see *γαμεταῖς καὶ παισὶ καὶ οἰκέταις* 8.1.3). Christians appear in the *familia Caesaris* as early as the first century (e.g., the οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας in *Phil.* 4.22; Flavia Domitilla in Cass. Dio 67.14; Suet. *Dom.* 15, 17; *HE* 3.18.4). Some of the earliest dateable Christian epitaphs belong to imperial slaves/freedmen in the period from Caracalla to Alexander Severus (see McKechnie 1999: 427-441). The Severans were particularly receptive to Christianity: Alexander

Severus included Christ among his household deities (SHA *Alex. Sev.* 29), and Julia Mamaea listened to the teaching of Origen in Antioch (*HE* 6.21.3-4). After successive purges during the third-century persecutions, Christians again formed a presence in the imperial service under Diocletian (see McKechnie 2001: 144-149 for a full discussion).

**εἰς πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ παρρησιαζόμενοις λόγῳ τε καὶ βίῳ:** In E's view, *παρρησία* relates both to speech and to conduct (λόγῳ τε καὶ βίῳ). It also carries a double meaning here in the context of the imperial court: it is the ability to have an audience with the emperor and to act openly in his presence (emphasized by *εἰς πρόσωπον*; see Millar 1977: 600; *DMP* 10.2, which describes members of the faithful who cross themselves in the presence of the emperor, may illustrate the freedom of worship enjoyed by Christians at Diocletian's court before the Persecution) and the boldness of speech associated with Christian confession. The emphasis on *παρρησία* as regards the imperial servants is not without irony. They will later exercise *παρρησία* under different circumstances (i.e., martyrdom; see 8.6.5) and as martyrs earn *παρρησία*, or the ability of intercessory prayer, before God (Rapp 2005: 268).

**γαμεταῖς καὶ παισὶ καὶ οἰκέταις:** *DMP* 15.2 implies that Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and wife of Galerius, and Prisca, the wife of Diocletian were among the Christians or Christian sympathizers at the imperial court. For *οἰκέταις*, see τούς δ' ἐν οἰκεταῖς 8.2.4.

**μόνον οὐχὶ καὶ ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ παρρησίᾳ τῆς πίστεως:** cf. 2 Thess. 1.4: ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν αἷς ἀνέχεσθε.

**I.4 ἐκεῖνος...Δωρόθεος...Γοργόνιος:** Despite the pleonastic description of their repute, Bk VIII gives our only notice of Gorgonius (see also 8.6.1, 5), and perhaps Dorotheus, though the latter may be identical to the learned presbyter mentioned in 7.32.2-3 – indeed ἐκεῖνος implies that he

has been discussed before – who is himself a eunuch and member of the imperial administration.

See τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον βασιλικοὺς παῖδας... γνησίων τε αὐτοῖς διαθέσει τέκνων οὐ

λειπόμενοι 8.6.1.

**I.5 οἴας...ἀξιουμένου:** The syntax is nearly identical to that of 8.1.1 and serves rhetorically to introduce the parallel account of church leaders of preeminence.

**τὰς μυριάδρους ἐκείνας ἐπισυναγωγὰς καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἄθροισμάτων**

**τὰς τε ἐπισήμους ἐν τοῖς προσευκτηρίοις συνδρομάς:** Note the pleonasm, which emphasizes large number and size. συνδρομάς (cf. Acts 21.20; Ju. 10.18) can imply an extemporaneous mob, but the terms for assemblies (ἐπισυναγωγή: cf. 2 Ma. 2.7; 2 Thess. 2.1; ἄθροισμα: cf. 1 Ma. 3.13) are otherwise synonymous. προσευκτήριον, though fairly rare in Christian literature, occurs fifteen times in the Eusebian corpus; Phil. De Vita Mosis 2.216 may be the proximate source. E states that these were full of people (μυριάδρους), many (or large, τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἄθροισμάτων is ambiguous), and in every city (κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν). This raises the question of the size and geographical compass of the Christian population before Constantine; for this enterprise the *HE* is one of our best literary sources. Recent scholarship prefers 5-10% of the empire's population (see Trombley 2006: 306-313). MacMullen argues for perhaps less than 5% in his archaeological analysis (MacMullen 2010: 111-112).

**εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας:** Note the alliteration: πλάτος...πάσας...πόλεις. E states that there were large structures (εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος) built specifically as churches (ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας) in many cities (ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις) before the Persecution. Literary evidence from this time supports E's statements: e.g., Lactantius notes the imposing size (*editissimum*) of the church in Nicomedia (*DMP* 12.2-5); Porphyry complains of church buildings so large as to resemble temples (Porph.

*Christ. frag. 76*). Archaeological evidence tells a somewhat different story: very few church structures survive or can be identified from the third century, and many were buildings only later used for Christian purposes; MacMullen 2010: 117-141, provides a comprehensive list. These include the mid-third-century house church with baptistery at Dura Europos. MacMullen's analysis of this and other sites suggests that third and fourth-century churches could accommodate only about five percent of the Christian population, which consisted primarily of social elites; popular worship centered on cemeteries and the martyr cult (MacMullen 2010: 95-114).

**Ι.6 ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις προϊόντα ὀσημέραι τε εἰς αὐξήν καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιδιδόντα:** Part of the author's apologetic aim, as demonstrated in his language and rhetoric, is to demonstrate the quantitative: the growth of the Church in size and numbers. This contrasts with his static view of the development of Christianity, which generally disregards changes, especially in theology and belief (see Morgan 2005: 193-208). E's account of secular affairs in 8.13 uses similar language (cf. οὕτω δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπαραποδίστως αὐξούσης καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ὀσημέραι προϊούσης τῆς ἐξουσίας 8.13.10).

**βασκαίνειν:** lit., "to bewitch with the evil eye." The notion of the evil eye pervades ancient Mediterranean culture and is associated with the vice of envy both in classical and biblical literature (e.g., Plut. *Quest. conv.* 681F-82; Dt. 28.56; Gal. 3.1). Here we have the explicit pairing with φθόνος common in Christian literature. Elliott 1994: 51-64, provides a good survey of the evil eye in ancient literature.

**οὐδέ τις δαίμων πονηρὸς...οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλαῖς:** While this implies both divine (δαίμων πονηρὸς) and human action (ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλαῖς), note that δαίμων is the grammatical subject of the action in the sentence. E tends to place the impetus for historical activity on the cosmic

level and attributes little motivation to human agents. On E's historiographical method, see Morgan 2005: 193-208. Cf. ὁ περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος 8.12.3.

**ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ ἔσκεπέν τε καὶ ἐφρούρει:** E likes to couple the adjectives θεία and οὐράνιος (e.g., 6.2.4; 3.5; 29.2; *MP(s)* 13.14; *PE* 1.3.7; 4.10.1; 13.16.3; *DE* 7.1.11; *VC* 3.20.1); the same language appears in a similar context at 7.30.21 regarding divine judgment at God's hand (see also εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις 8.16.1). This may indicate the influence of Roman bureaucratic language and imperial rhetoric (Grant 1980: 142-144; MacMullen 1962: 364-78).

**1.7 ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας:** For freedom that degenerates into license, E perhaps has in mind 1 Pt. 2.16 and Irenaeus' exegesis on the topic in *Adversus Haereses* (4.37.4). The latter connects ἐλευθερία with the sins attributed by E to the Church at this time: falsehood, jealousy, and strife.

**χαυνότητα:** Typically translated as “conceit,” we could also render χαυνότης as “slackness/weakness” (Lampe), which fits with the athletic and battle imagery of the following chapters. E picks up this theme again when he treats apostasies at the onset of persecution (see πρώτης ἐξησθένησαν προσβολῆς at 8.3.1).

**μετηλλάττετο:** In a book which features a great deal of change (i.e., the shift from toleration to persecution to toleration), it is not surprising that compounds of ἀλλάσσω appear frequently (e.g., 8.6.3; 6.5; 9.1; 9.3; 14.3 16.2; app.1). See ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι 8.13.10.

**ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθονομένων καὶ διαλοιδορουμένων:** This begins a long genitive absolute that consumes the greater part of the section. It describes the offences and abuses committed by Christians in the Church's time of peace. See τὰς πρόσθεν τοῦ διωγμοῦ διαστάσεις τε αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀτοπίας 8.2.2, for a discussion of the ecclesiastical controversies in the late third

and early fourth centuries. E has a tendency to place perpetrators of crimes (esp. against Christians) and immorality in absolute constructions, which has the (probably intended) syntactical effect of distancing such action from the focus of the account (e.g., τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος 8.4.2).

**ἐαυτοῖς προσπολεμούντων... ὄπλοις... καὶ δόρασιν τοῖς διὰ λόγων:** Battle imagery appears throughout Bk VIII (see προσρηγνύντων 8.1.7) and here foreshadows not only the attacks upon Christianity in 8.2.4 (E describes persecution as a war: see μάλιστα τῶν οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμου δὲ τρόπῳ πεπολιορκημένων 8.10.12), but also the persecution in the army, which is mentioned for the first time at the end of this section. E may have been inspired by Jas. 4.2, which links envy and infighting and uses πολεμέω to describe quarrels between Christians.

**εἰ οὕτω τύχοι:** lit., “if it happened to be so.” McGiffert’s translation, “as it were,” makes best sense with the simile (introduced by μόνον οὐχί). Oulton’s suggestion, “as occasion offered,” while plausible, may go too far, as E seems to use the phrase as an apology for strong language. cf. *DE* 4.13.7.

**ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι... λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοῦς:** Clergy and laity alike are implicated in the disputes, whereas E places most of the blame on the former in *MP(s)* 12 and in the section that follows (8.1.8). E may specifically have the bishops in mind (see ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνει 8.1.7). For E’s treatment of church leaders during the persecution, see Introduction V; also τῷ μὲν αὐτῆς καταλλαττομένης λαῷ 8.16.2.

**προσρηγνύντων:** This term (lit., “dashing against”) connotes sea battles and thus conforms to the war imagery of this section (see τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων 8.2.3; for more naval imagery, see εἰς πάσας δ’ ἀνοσιουργίας ὀκείλας 14.2; ἡ δὲ τῶν κακῶν τῷ τυράννῳ κορωνίς ἐπὶ γοητεῖαν ἤλαυνεν 14.5).

**καταστασιαζόντων:** καταστασιάζω occurs only four times in the Eusebian corpus (2.21.3; *Comm. in Ps.* PG 23.872.13; PG 23.368.26). Division and internal strife are characteristic of both Church and Empire during persecution (διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται, πρᾶγμα μηδ' ἄλλοτέ πω πάλαι γεγονὸς παραδεδομένον 8.13.11; see πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολήν καὶ δύσιν διειληφῶτων κατεργασθεῖσα 8.14.18;).

**τῆς τε ὑποκρίσεως ἀφάτου:** E probably intends this charge, which was often leveled against the Pharisees by Jesus (e.g., Mt. 23.28; Mk. 12.15; Lk.12.1), to have a particularly acute sting.

**ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ὅσον κακίας προϊούσης:** lit., “advancing to the furthest extent of wickedness;” E describes Maxentius and Maximin using similar language in 8.14.18: τοσαύτη δῆτα κακίας φορὰ... συνηνέχθη.

**θεία κρίσις:** 9.8.15 offers the interpretative key to the purpose and direction of divine judgment in Bks VIII and IX of the *HE*: chastisement. A close similarity in language links the these two passages (see εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω 8.1.8). E suggests here that divine judgment has a didactic quality and that Christians could have avoided full-fledged persecution at this point had they only recognized the warning signs, i.e. the persecution in the army. We may also inquire to what extent the phrase calls to mind imperial propaganda (for similar language concerning Maximian, *tuum...iudicium*, see *Pan. Lat.* 7.3.3), in which case it would serve as an ironic contrast between "true" divine judgment that works through, but ultimately against, the divine judgment of the emperors.

**ἐπισκοπήν ἀνεκίνει:** ἀνακινέω is an important verb for E, as it often occurs in contexts that assign responsibility for a course of events, especially persecution (e.g., 3.17.1; 3.32.1; 6.43.1; 7.30.20; 9.6.1). It appears a second time in Bk VIII, also in a description of persecution (see ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός 8.4.1). ἐπισκοπή can simply mean “oversight” (as in Oulton),

but it can also refer to the office of the episcopacy (as McGiffert recognizes). E may be suggesting that God has taken over the episcopacy of the Church – αὐτῆς (“over it”) could refer to the Church, if we construe it as an objective genitive rather than the customary subjective – which the bishops, to whom it properly belongs, have relinquished through lack of oversight (see 8.1.8).

**ἐκ τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἀδελφῶν καταρχομένου τοῦ διωγμοῦ:** E provides an account of the military persecution in 8.4.1-4. Lactantius’ account also implies that the persecution had its origin in the army (see *DMP* 10.4). The use of the genitive absolute here distances this event from the subject of the main clause (θεία κρίσις), even though context suggests that God’s judgment is ultimately responsible for the persecution.

**τῶν ἀθροισμάτων ἔτι συγκροτουμένων:** συγκροτέω has a wide semantic range in later Greek (see Lampe, συγκροτέω). In a military context it can mean "to collect, levy," and the mention of the persecution in the army (see ἐκ τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἀδελφῶν καταρχομένου τοῦ διωγμοῦ above) may occasion its use here. Like Origen's reply to Celsus (στρατευόμεθα δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἴδιον στρατόπεδον εὐσεβείας συγκροτοῦντες, *Contra Celsum* 8.73.35-37), E perhaps wishes to emphasize the "army of piety" both in the churches and the armies.

**I.8 ὡς δ' ἀνεπαισθήτως:** This introduces a section (8.1.8) that covers many of the same topics as the one which precedes (8.1.7); moreover, both sections begin with ὡς δ'. As such, Christensen sees parallel accounts in which 8.1.8 takes priority (Christensen 1989: 17-18). ὡς δ' ἀνεπαισθήτως begins a string of alpha privatives, culminating with the alliterative ἄθει ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα 8.1.8, that underscores the Church's utter lack of concern for the divine realm (τὸ θεῖον).

**ὅπως...καταστήσεται:** προθυμέομαι expects either an object clause of effort (with a future

indicative in primary and secondary sequence) introduced by ὅπως or an infinitive (Smyth 2209-2211). This is a rare case where the two constructions merge.

**εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω:** This pairing is fairly common in E's writings (e.g., 9.8.15; *MP(s)* 13.14; *PE* 4.13.1; *DE* 3.3.11; 4.10.16). Notably, it appears in the section of the *HE*'s preface (1.1.2) which outlines the content of Bks VIII-X: τὰ τ' ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦς μαρτύρια καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἴλεω καὶ εὐμενῆ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀντίληψιν γραφῆ παραδοῦναι. As the definitive instance of "merciful and kindly help" in Bk VIII, E has in mind Galerius' edict, which he introduces with the same adjectival pairing (see εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις 8.16.1). Such language may be connected to imperial propaganda: e.g., its appearance in connection with Constantine's defeat of the tyrants (9.8.15), in the emperor's letter to Shapur II (*VC* 4.13.1), and similar language in the so-called edict of Milan (εὐμενὲς, 10.5.4; *placatum ac propitium*, *DMP* 48.2; both, as here, connected with the ambiguous term "divinity"). See Grant 1980: 142-144.

**οἷα δὲ τινες ἄθεοι:** E employs the charge typically directed against Christians not to refute it, but to chastise the pre-persecution Church. The traditional notion of a *pax deorum* secured through the propitiation of the gods underlies its use here (see εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω above), though it is the Christian divinity that fails to be rendered "kindly and propitious," resulting in persecution for the Church after many years of peace. E is probably manipulating an anti-Christian rhetoric that had, from the 3rd century, increasingly featured the charge of Atheism (see Walsh 1991: 255-277).

**οἱ τε δοκοῦντες ἡμῶν ποιμένες:** See τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμένας 8.2.1.

**ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀνεφλέγοντο φιλονεικίαις:** Fire imagery in Bk VIII has negative associations: e.g., the burning of Scripture (8.2.1, 4), the roasting of Christians (8.6.3; 12.1), and

the fire in the palace attributed to Christians (8.6.6). E describes the persecution itself, which, in the context of Bk VIII, recalls the conflagrations visited upon early humanity (1.2.20), as a fire which is quenched by the Edict of Toleration (see τὴν ἐπὶ μέγα ἀφθεῖσαν τοῦ διωγμοῦ πυρκαϊᾶν σβεννόντες 8.16.1) and rekindled under Maximin (9.4.2). Thus the present figure of speech proves to be ironic: the church leaders who are enflamed with contention cause the Church to be scorched by persecution.

**τὰς ἔριδας...ἀπειλὰς...ζῆλον...ἔχθος...μῖσος:** These are quintessential vices in the Christian tradition. Grant 1968: 16-18 has made a compelling case that much of the language in this section and 8.1.1 – 8.2.3 more generally springs from 1 Clem. 3.1-3; 5. See ἱεροῦς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων 8.2.3.

**οἷά τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας:** lit., "claiming ardently the powers for which they lust, like they were tyrannies." Even Rufinus finds this phrase difficult to render and opts instead for an explanatory paraphrase: *ita ut tyrannidem potius quam sacerdotium tenere se crederent, Christianae humilitatis et sinceritatis obliti, sacra mysteria profanis mentibus celebrarent* (see Christensen 1989: 22). What E means is fairly clear: contemporary church leaders conduct themselves more like earthly despots (hence the recurrence of ἄρχοντες for church leaders in the introductory section: see 8.1.5; 1.7; 2.1; 3.1) than shepherds of the Church (8.1.8; 2.1; 13.3) in their lust for power. Such terminology calls to mind Paul of Samosata – a perfect figure to mark the change in ecclesiastical affairs between Bk VII and VIII – whose episcopal power is described as tyrannical in the bishops' letter of condemnation against him in 7.30.15 (οὕτω δὲ τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ δυναστείαν αὐτοῦ πεφόβηται). Like other Christian writers of the same period (e.g., Lactantius, *DI* 5.12.1), E characterizes persecuting emperors repeatedly as tyrants in Bks VIII, IX, and X. This includes the tyrannies of Maxentius and Maximin in 8.14, which sets

up a parallel between the behavior of the church leaders and that of the emperors in Bk VIII (see ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ'ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο 8.14.1). E probably adopted such language from Constantinian propaganda present in his western source (for which, see 8.14; also Barnes 1981: 45-47). Chesnut 1976: 76-78 provides a more general discussion of E's view of monarchy.

**ἐγνόφωσεν... φραγμοὺς αὐτοῦ:** This is a quotation from Lam. 2.1.2, which E replicates faithfully from LXX. Tradition assigns authorship of Lamentations to Jeremiah (thus κατὰ τὴν φάσκουσαν τοῦ Ἱερεμίου φωνὴν above). E probably interprets κατέρριψεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δόξασμα Ἰσραὴλ as the Church's fall from grace during the persecution; ὑποποδίου, "footstool," refers originally to the Ark of the Covenant, and underscores the strain (ἐμνήσθη) on God's relationship with the Church; κατεπόντισεν...πάντα τὰ ὥραῖα Ἰσραὴλ conjures those martyrs who faced death by drowning.

**I.9 κατέστρεψεν... αἰσχύνην:** E quotes Ps. 88.40-46 (in the numeration of LXX; 89.39-45 NRSV), the psalmist's address to God regarding his servant (Israel or the psalmist?). Besides the addition of conjunctions, E makes some changes to the text in view of the prophecy's application to the persecution: 1) all the second-person verbs which refer to God are rendered in the third person (insofar as the prophecy has been fulfilled); 2) the servant is interpreted as the Church; 3) E adds διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καθαρῆσεως to verse 42, changes the original αὐτὸν to τὰ πλήθη τοῦ λαοῦ in verse 43, and omits the last part of the same verse. For a detailed interpretation of this Psalm and its relationship to Bk VIII, see Somerville 1966: 91-97.

**II.1 Συντετέλεσται δῆτα καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα:** This statement obviously indicates that the scriptural passages which precede should be taken as a prophecy of the events recounted here. We should point out, however, that καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα stands without a qualifier to link the phrase

directly to the biblical quotations. As such, it should be translated more generically, “all things have been accomplished in our time.” This remarkable statement sums up the importance which E attributes to his own time: all of human history is fulfilled in the Great Persecution and triumph of Christianity (see Introduction IV).

**ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος αὐτοῖς θεμελίους καταρριπτούμενους:** Note the pleonasm for emphasis: αὐτοῖς θεμελίους – probably a comitative dative, denoting accompaniment (Smyth 1525) – is intended to recall 8.1.6, where spacious churches have been erected “from the foundations” (ἐκ θεμελίων). E views the Church’s physical edifices as a metaphor for its overall spiritual health (as he makes clear in 10.4.2-72). Here the Church has fallen from a lofty height (ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος... καταρριπτούμενους), undoing all the gains it has accrued in the period of peace. See ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν 8.2.4.

**τὰς δ' ἐνθέους καὶ ἱερὰς γραφὰς κατὰ μέσας ἀγορὰς πυρὶ παραδιδόμενας:** The targeted destruction of Christian books, usually by public burning, was an innovation of the Great Persecution. Although Roman officials had destroyed books on religious grounds before the fourth century CE (e.g., the burning of the “Books of Numa” in 181 BCE; see Livy 40.29, *DI* 1.22.5-8, et al.; and the burning of thousands of magical texts by Augustus in 12 BCE; see Suet. *Aug.* 30-32), never before had this ritual been employed in persecutions against the Christians. The importance of texts to Christianity had become evident to the Roman authorities by the fourth century, perhaps due to the institutionalization of the Church and the increased literary activity of Christian and anti-Christian writers in the third century. By targeting its sacred texts, Diocletian was making a calculated attack on Christianity’s lifeblood (see γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι 8.2.4). For a full discussion of book-burning in Roman tradition, including its appropriation by Christians in Late Antiquity, see Sarefield 2007: 159-173. *Traditio* (the

handing over of sacred texts), which would cause so much difficulty for western Christians in the debate over *lapsi*, was not regarded as a sin in the East (see De Ste. Croix 1954: 84-96). Thus E can speak unabashedly about being present at book-burnings (see αὐτοῖς ἐπέιδομεν ὀφθαλμοῖς below).

**αὐτοῖς ἐπέιδομεν ὀφθαλμοῖς:** This detail, as tantalizingly suggestive as it is – does it mean that the church at Caesarea was razed (as Carriker 2003: 30 suggests), or that E was involved in the handing over of Scripture (from the library or church?) – is ultimately inconclusive.

**τούς τε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμένας αἰσχρῶς ὧδε κάκεισε κρυπταζομένους:** E's point is that good shepherds lead their flocks (i.e., τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, the church body which lies in ruins), rather than hide, when danger occurs (see τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες 8.13.3 for the redemption of the Church's "shepherds"). For a discussion of flight from persecution, see Nicholson 1989: 48-65.

**ἐξεχύθη...ὁδῶ:** Ps. 106.40 (according to LXX numeration; Ps. 107.40 NRSV), reproduced verbatim from LXX. This is a post-exilic psalm that praises God's kindness, but also testifies to his retributive justice against the rebellious. Its nautical language in 106.23-32 may occasion the naval metaphor below (τῶν εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων 8.2.3).

**Π.2 οὐχ ἡμέτερον...οὐχ ἡμῖν οἰκειὸν μνήμη παραδιδόναι:** *MP(s)* 12 states, ταῦτα πάντα παρήσειν μοι δοκῶ, ἀνοίκειον ἐμαντῶ κρίνας παραιτουμένῳ τε καὶ ἀποφεύγοντι, ὡς δ' οὖν καὶ ἀρχομένῳ μοι εἴρηται, and thus appears, since no such referent occurs in *MP(s)*, to refer back to the section which begins here (8.2.2-3). For the accepted theory on the relationship between the *HE* and *MP(s)*, see Introduction III; also Laqueur 1929: 34-39 and the overview in Grant 1980: 12. This statement is a case of *paraleipsis*, for E discusses the topic further below, and in the first edition, recounts those very misfortunes which he claims to omit (*MP(s)* 12). See also Grant

1980: 24-25, which discusses what E decides to omit and its relationship to utility.

**τὰς ἐπὶ τέλει σκυθρωπὰς συμφορὰς:** ἐπὶ τέλει, which sets up a temporal contrast with πρόσθεν, could be translated either "in the event" or "in the end." The neutral language of "misfortune" (rather than, e.g., wickedness) matches the diplomatic tone of this sentence. E describes the persecution itself as a "misfortune" in 8.app.1 (τοῦ διωγμοῦ καταστῆναι συμφορᾶς). σκυθρωπὰς is probably occasioned by its alliterative and rhyming quality but also ensures that συμφορὰς is interpreted in its correct sense (i.e., not good fortunes; cf. Mt. 6.16; Lk. 24.17, which describes the gloomy countenances of the travelers on the road to Emmaus following Jesus' death).

**τὰς πρόσθεν τοῦ διωγμοῦ διαστάσεις τε αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀτοπίας:** E probably has in mind the ecclesiastical controversies following the Decian and Valerianic persecutions (e.g., the Novatianists 6.43, 45-46; 7.4, 7-8; Paul of Samosata 7.27-30), although he may also be retrojecting contemporary disputes over the Meletians (the target of *MP(s)* 12?) and Donatists (10.5.18 – 6.5; see Grant 1980: 123). Interestingly, Paul's schism follows roughly the same pattern which occurs at the beginning of Bk VIII: peace in the Church under Gallienus (cf. 8.1.1-6), ecclesiastical controversy involving a leader with despotic power (cf. οἷά τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες 8.1.8), and the threat of persecution under Aurelian.

**ἐπεὶ:** This should probably be interpreted in a causal sense.

**δι' ὧν ἂν τὴν θεῖαν δικαιώσαιμεν κρίσιν:** See ἡ μὲν δὴ θεῖα κρίσις 8.1.7.

**II.3 οὐδὲ τῶν πρὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ πεπειραμένων:** It is not entirely clear to whom this refers.

Christensen 1989: 25 argues that this passage "must refer to the group of Christians who did not abjure their faith despite the persecution to which they were subjected." The somber tone of the passage, however, suggests otherwise, perhaps that these were tried successfully. It may be that E's predecessor in the bishopric, whom he also passes over in silence, was implicated in such

behavior (the last-named bishop of Caesarea is Agapius in 7.32.24; see Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 263).

**τῶν εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων:** Nautical imagery occurs throughout Bk VIII, as this echo of 1 Tim. 1.19 here, usually to emphasize turmoil and vice (e.g., 8.1.7; 14.2, 5; 15.1-2). Note the similarity in language describing Galerius' disease (see καὶ εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος 8.16.5).

**αὐτῇ τε γνώμῃ:** lit., "by their opinion/judgment," recalling the verdict of a judge; E sets up a contrast between those who threw their "souls" into the depths *of their own accord*, thereby preserving their bodies, and those (i.e., the noble martyrs) who had their bodies thrown into the sea *by the verdict of a judge*, thereby preserving their souls (see τοῖς τοῦ κλύδωνος ἐναπορριφέντων βυθοῖς below).

**τοῖς τοῦ κλύδωνος ἐναπορριφέντων βυθοῖς:** The nautical imagery in the preceding lines certainly occasions this phrase, which is not without irony, as E describes later in Bk VIII martyrs who died by drowning or who had their bodies thrown into the depths of the sea (8.6.6-7; 12.5).

**μνήμην ποιήσασθαι προήχθημεν:** See the discussion of ecclesiastical leaders in Introduction VI.

**τῇ καθόλου...ἱστορία:** Should we interpret this phrase as referring to the *HE* as a whole, the revised form of Bk VIII in the second edition, the historical record in general, or something else? Its placement at the end of the introductory section appears significant. If E is making a statement about genre, the phrase could mean "universal history" (e.g., Polyb. *Hist.* 1.4.2: ἡ τῶν καθόλου πραγμάτων σύνταξις). For E's place in the genre of universal history, see Pelikan 1966: 48-57 and Mortley 1996: 151-199.

**πρώτοις μὲν ἡμῖν...τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς...πρὸς ὠφελείας:** πρὸς + genitive of ὠφέλεια = to the advantage of profitability, usefulness (Smyth 1695b). The utility of history is a recurring theme in the *HE* (e.g., 1.13.22, 3.24.1, 4.17.1; 5.2.8; 6.39.5) and, if we take E's programmatic statements at face value (e.g., 5.pref.1), one of his motivations for writing history. See Grant 1980 22-24. τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς and similar phrases recur throughout the *HE* (e.g. 7.18.1); πρώτοις μὲν ἡμῖν suggests that E expects his account to enjoy readership during his lifetime.

**τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων:** Grant 1968: 17-18 may be correct in arguing that E derives the athletic imagery in this section from 1 Clem. 5.1, but such language abounds in the martyr-acts (see Cobb 2008: 33-59). On E's view of the martyrs as contemporary manifestations of the divine Logos, see Introduction IV.

**ἐν ἐπιτομῇ:** lit., "in abbreviated form," presumably referring to the short recension of the Martyrs of Palestine, which originally comprised the body of Bk VIII. E probably forgot to remove this phrase when he rewrote the book for the second edition. (see οὐ τῆς τυχούσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς 8.pref.).

**Π.4 ἔτος τοῦτο ἦν ἐννεακαιδέκατον τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας:** This begins a section reproduced, with slight alterations, from the short recension of the *Martyrs of Palestine* (*MP(s)* pref. = *HE* 8.2.4-5). Diocletian's regnal year at the onset of persecution also appears in *Canones*, and *MP(s)* pref.1.1, which suggests that it was part of the original edict (see Burgess 1999: 37). Its appearance here is significant as marking the last regnal year in the *HE*, thereby ending the imperial successions (see Introduction VI). The reader is thrust abruptly into historical time after E's description of the nebulous period of peace and prosperity in 8.pref.1 – 8.2.3 (see Introduction IV). *MP(s)* tells us that Flavianus is governor of Palestine (*MP(s)* pref.1).

**Δύστρος μῆν:** The local calendar of Caesarea was based upon the Syro-Macedonian version that

appeared in different forms throughout the East. It was of the Tyrian variety, in which the year began October 3 and the month of Dystrus March 5. The placement of the first edict in Dystrus here (also in *Canones* and *MP(l)*) differs from *MP(s)* pref.1.2, where its publication occurs in Xanthicus (began April 4<sup>th</sup>). Since *MP(s)* holds chronological priority, we can surmise that E found more accurate information about the date of the edict's publication in Palestine between 313/14 and the publication of *MP(l)* and the second edition of *HE* in 315/16 (see Burgess 1999: 37 n.7). Lactantius tells us in *DMP* 13.1 that the edict was issued February 24, 303 in Nicomedia; thus it probably reached Palestine in March/April (it was being enforced in Africa from May/June, according to Optat. Append. 1). The correlation of Easter, which occurred April 18 in 303, and the onset of persecution fits more closely with the date in *MP(s)*. Burgess claims that E merely forgot to remove the reference to Easter in the *HE* and *MP(l)*. This seems implausible considering E's theological imperative to link Christ's suffering with that of the martyrs (see Introduction IV) and the fact that he changes the wording of the phrase to account for the change in month (see τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ἑορτῆς ἐπελαυνούσης 8.2.4).

**Μάρτιος κατὰ Ῥωμαίους:** Although E weakens the connection with Easter by placing the beginning of persecution before April, he may have seen symbolic importance in the martial connotations of *Martius* (just as, e.g., Lactantius and *Terminalia*), Galerius' association with Mars (see *DMP* 9.9), and the word's obvious similarity to the Greek μάρτυς.

**τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ἑορτῆς ἐπελαυνούσης:** A slippery genitive absolute: E perhaps intentionally fails to rule out a causal or concessive interpretation which, if explicit, could have shed light on Diocletian's timing or the working of Providence. Here the participle ἐπελαυνούσης replaces ἐπιλαμβανούσης of *MP(s)* pref.1. This is almost certainly intentional, as the former connotes rapid movement toward (i.e., the Easter season as seen from March),

whereas the latter carries the force of arrival (i.e., Easter as seen from April; see Δύστρος μήν above). E deliberately associates the feast of the Savior's Passion with the onset of the persecution (see Introduction IV), just as he does the feasting and partying of the emperors in 8.13.9.

**ἤπλωτο:** The verb here is particularly meaningful in the context of Easter, the destruction of churches, and the suffering of Christians. E generally prefers ἀπλόω for the publication of imperial constitutions (e.g., *HE* 8.17.2; 9.1.1; 10.9.8; *MP(s)* pref.1; *VC* 1.41.3; 2.20.1; 3.6.1; but also in reference to the demolition of buildings: *VC* 3.56.2 (Constantine's demolition of the temple of Asclepius) and *Comm. in Isa.* 2.40.82 (the destruction of Jerusalem, cf. εἰς ἔδαφος ἀπλωθεῖσα vs. εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν below). Christian authors have also applied ἀπλόω to the stretching of Christ's limbs on the cross (e.g., *Clem. Prot.* 11; *Orac. Sib.* 5.257; *Meth. Porph.* 1).

**πανταχόσε:** This denotes the legislation's universal application (cf. ἀθρόως πανταχοῦ in *MP(s)* pref. 1). Indeed, only the first edict seems to have been enforced in the West (see τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας 8.6.8), and there primarily in Maximian and Severus' territories. Constantius apparently limited his activity to destroying churches (*DMP* 15.7; cf. 8.13.13; *VC* 1.13.2).

**βασιλικὰ γράμματα:** Our main sources for the First Persecuting Edict are 8.2.4; 5.1; *DMP* 13.1; *MP* pref.1; and *Passio Felicis* 1. Unfortunately, βασιλικὰ γράμματα (simply γράμματα in *MP(s)* pref.1) is imprecise: γράμμα usually refers to an imperial letter or rescript but is sufficiently vague to cover any imperial constitution. E employs γραφή, which is used more distinctly of edicts (e.g., *VC* 2.21, 23), to characterize the same legislation below; it is also referred to in Galerius' Edict of Toleration as a πρόσταγμα (*iussio* in *DMP* 34.3). E uses various terms for other imperial constitutions that we know or assume to be edicts: e.g., βασιλικόν πρόσταγμα

(Decius' edict, *HE* 6.41.1), διάταγμα (Galerius' edict, *HE* 8.17.2), and διάταξις (Maximin's edict, 10.6.1). For the blurring of the distinction between *edicta* and *epistulae* in the period of the Tetrarchy, see Corcoran 1996: 198-203. The *communis opinio* takes E at face value and holds that there were four pieces of legislation, of which three follow here (the fourth, ordering general sacrifice, occurs in *MP(s)* 3.1); and that these were edicts, from Lactantius' account, which only mentions one legislation but terms it an *edictum* (*DMP* 13.1; *edictum* and *programma* in *Passio Felicis* 1). For an overview, see Löhr 2002: 75-95; also Corcoran 1996: 179-181.

**τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας...προαγορεύοντα:** While the text of the edict is no longer extant, the structure of the indirect statement (two μὲν/δὲ statements joined by καὶ and governed by different participles) and its content suggest an original legislation consisting, in part, of two broad categories divided into two subcategories: the destruction of church property (churches and Scripture) and legal punishments against Christians (high-ranking and imperial servants). The careful balance of the clauses and the *variatio* of the participles may indicate that E has preserved some of the original language and structure of the legislation (for the hypothesis, see Mason 1876: 344; MacMullen 1962: 364-378 treats Roman Bureaucratic language).

**ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν:** The first provision, already alluded to in 8.2.2, ordered the destruction of churches (and presumably any building in which Scripture was found; Optat. Append. 2). For the manner in which this was carried out in Nicomedia, see *DMP* 12.2-5. The original edict may have contained similar language (cf. Lactantius' account: *illud editissimum...solo adaequarunt*). See ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος αὐτοῖς θεμελίους καταρριπτομένους 8.2.2.

**γραφαὶς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι:** This is the second provision. The destruction of sacred writings had already appeared as a provision in Diocletian's legislation against the Manichees

(*Coll.* 15.3.6) and was likely intended to inhibit the practice and spread of the Christian message (Corcoran 1996: 181); on the burning of Scripture, see τὰς δ' ἐνθέους καὶ ἱερὰς γραφὰς κατὰ μέσας ἀγορὰς πυρὶ παραδιδόμενας 8.2.2. Lactantius mentions neither provision one nor two explicitly but implies their existence by the action in *DMP* 12.1-2, which features the destruction of churches and the burning of Scripture. Apparently, there were additional provisions of the first edict, including the confiscation of church plate (*Optat.* Append. 1) and prohibition of Christian assemblies (9.10.8; see De Ste. Croix 1954: 75; Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 270).

**τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους:** τιμή = *dignitas* and can be defined broadly as "official position and accompanying privileges;" ἀτιμία = *infamia* and is connected with loss of τιμή (or *dignitas*; i.e. loss of official position and privileges). From the third century such language is commonly associated with men of high rank, or *honestiores*, in which case *infamia* would entail degradation to the rank of *humiliores* (Garnsey 1976: 185; 221-233). A rescript from Diocletian and Maximian from this period shows that the emperors were concerned with upholding the *honestiores/humiliores* distinction (*CJ* 9.41.11). Lactantius explicates the legal ramifications more fully. In his account (*DMP* 13.1), τιμῆς = *ordo et gradus* ("order and rank") and ἀτίμους = *carere omni honore ac dignitate* (deprivation of "official position and status"). He also fleshes out the implications of ἀτιμία: 1) loss of position and status; 2) subjection to torture, despite order or rank; 3) the validation of actions brought against Christians in court, but loss of judicial recourse for wrongs done to Christians; 4) loss of freedom and right of speech (for the controversy on the latter, see Creed 1984: 94 n.3). These generally conform to the distinction in privileges between *honestiores* and *humiliores*, and we may conclude that this provision concerns the former.

**τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκεταίαις:** This phrase, perhaps the equivalent of *qui in familia sunt*, stands in contrast

to τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους above. These are probably not slaves, as ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι below implies free status. Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 270 follows Mason 1876: 344-345 in preferring "private citizens" (presumably those of low status), since the lack of the article seems to refer to something more general than *the* imperial household. Recent scholarship, however, has tended to view these as *Caesariani* (like those reduced to slavery in Valerian's edict; *Cyp. Ep.* 80.2), or freeborn/freedman members of the imperial civil service. On the *Caesariani*, see Jones 1949: 46-47; Corcoran 2007: 235-236.

**εἰ ἐπιμένοιν τῇ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ προθέσει:** The placement of the condition suggests that it applies only to the second provision (τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκεταίαις...ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι). προθέσει may be translated as "free profession" and probably refers to the παρρησία which the imperial household (the τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκεταίαις in question) enjoyed in the time leading up to the persecution. This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that προθέσει appears next to ἐλευθερίας, which E often contrasts with freedom of speech (see παρρησία 8.1.1).

**ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι:** cf. στερίσκεσθαι (*MP(s)* pref.1).

**Π.5 ἢ μὲν πρώτη καθ' ἡμῶν γραφή:** E indicates a first, single piece of legislation, whether an edict or letter. See βασιλικά γράμματα 8.2.4 (cf. γραφῆς...δύναμις *MP(s)* pref. 2).

**μετ' οὐ πολὺ:** The second edict likely dates to the Spring or early Summer of 303 (see De Ste. Croix 1954: 76); E links its issuance to the revolts in Melitene and Syria (*HE* 8.6.8). These disturbances, along with the fire in the palace at Nicomedia and hostile reactions of Christians there and elsewhere to the first legislation (*HE* 8.6.6; *DMP* 14.2; 13.2) seem to have precipitated the second edict (see Potter 2002: 338-339).

**ἐπιφοιτησάντων:** E emphasizes the frequency with which the imperial publications arrived in Palestine, probably roughly one every three months. See De Ste. Croix 75-77.

**τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προέδρους:** πρόεδρος is a generic term for church leadership, probably akin to προεστῶς and the Latin *antistes* (see ὁ τῆνικαῦτα προεστῶς Ἄνθιμος 8.6.6; also *MP(s)* 2.5; *VC* 2.2.2). This may reflect the original wording of the document, which would have implicated all church leadership, rather than just bishops (see ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν τε καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν 8.6.9).

**κατὰ πάντα τόπον:** i.e., in the East: this legislation seems not to have been published in the West (see Ste. Croix 1954: 76).

**εἰθ' ὕστερον:** Though normally interpreted as indicating a third legislation, this could be construed as the second provision of a singular piece of legislation (i.e., edict 2) that dictates actions to be taken *after* the institution of the first provision (i.e., the imprisonment of clergy). The description in *HE* 8.6.8-10, however, argues strongly for separate publications. This legislation should probably be seen in connection with the amnesty of Diocletian's *vicennalia* in November 303.

**πάση μηχανῇ:** We might translate this generally as "by every device/means," though the phrase may allude to devices of torture (cf. 8.6.10: ἐνισταμένους δὲ μυρίαὶς καταξάινειν προστέτακτο βασάνοις). See ἐξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκέναι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο 8.3.4 for how the local authorities in Palestine chose to interpret and implement this provision.

**III.1 Τότε δὴ οὖν, τότε πλεῖστοι μὲν ὅσοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες:** This begins a section that is duplicated, with omissions (notably the accounts of Alphaeus and Zacchaeus) and alterations, from *MP(s)* 1.3-5. Both the present context and that of the original passage make clear that the ordeals described in 8.3.1-4 apply only to the clergy (note the mention of the rural church leaders in *MP(s)* 1.3: μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως πλεῖστοι ὅσοι τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες δειναῖς αἰκίαις προθύμως διαθλήσαντες). This section may recount specifically the

results of the third edict, as its placement following the description of the legislation, as well as the double temporal adverbs at the beginning of the passage (Τότε δὴ οὖν, τότε), seems to indicate. Moreover, 8.3.4 clearly alludes to the third edict (see ἐξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκέναι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο 8.3.4). E's imprecise language, however, obscures the precise details and circumstances of the events.

**δειναῖς αἰκίαις...ἐναθλήσαντες:** ἀθλέω ἐν δειναῖς αἰκίαις, "to be an athlete in contests of terrible tortures" (cf. διαθλήσαντες in *MP(s)* 1.3). For the athletic language which pervades Bk VIII, see τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων 8.2.3.

**μεγάλων ἀγώνων ἱστορίας ἐπεδείξαντο:** Cf. *MP(s)* 1.3, which uses the singular ἱστορίαν and adds τοῖς ἐνορῶσιν (which would seem to confirm the eyewitness nature of 8.3.1-4). Since ἱστορία implies a written account, we may ask whether E has a specific one in mind. The switch from the singular ἱστορίαν in *MP(s)* to the plural ἱστορίας here suggests that both the *MP(s)* and *HE* are intended, for with the rewriting of Bk VIII, there are now two accounts of the martyrs' contests.

**μυριοὶ δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ δειλίας προναρκήσαντες προχείρως:** E introduces a second group: the clergy who have apostatized. Interestingly, the church leaders from the countryside are singled out for praise in *MP(s)* 1.3 (see Τότε δὴ οὖν, τότε πλεῖστοι μὲν ὅσοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες 8.3.1), with no mention of those from the city. Thus it may be that E's target here is the Caesarean clergy. In 8.2.1, he claims to have witnessed (undoubtedly in Caesarea) the shameful behavior of the "shepherds of the churches" during persecution. Among these was presumably his predecessor in the bishopric (see οὐδὲ τῶν πρὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ πεπειραμένων 8.2.3). προναρκήσαντες (lit., "having grown numb beforehand") seems to be a Eusebian coinage. This compound of ναρκάω, which occurs only here, in its original context in *MP(s)* 1.3,

and in a quotation of E in *Chron. Pasch.* p. 515, enhances the alliterative effect of προχείρως...πρώτης...προσβολῆς and emphasizes the failure of some clergy even before the start of the contest. ὑπὸ δειλίας = ὑπὸ + genitive expressing internal cause, in place of the more common dative for a personified emotion (Smyth 1698 b, n. 1; 1517).

**οὕτως ἀπὸ πρώτης ἐξησθένησαν προσβολῆς:** πρώτης... προσβολῆς may refer to the initial application of torture, or to πρώτη... γραφή in 8.2.5, in which case the allusion would be to clergy who faltered under the conditions of the first edict (e.g., actively surrendering Scripture, offering sacrifice in advance, etc.), even before they were directly targeted by legislation (an interpretation strengthened by προναρκήσαντες above).

**τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν:** It is not clear whether we should identify this group with the πλεῖστοι μὲν ὄσοι, or posit a third group.

**ἕκαστος εἶδη διάφορα βασάνων ἐνήλλαττεν:** E often dwells on the variety and novelty of torture to emphasize the cruelty of the persecutors and the endurance of the martyrs (e.g., 8.6.10; 8.1; 9.5; 14.6; 15.1; cf. *DMP* 16.8: *varia tormentorum genera*). The torture of Christians fell within Roman law: by the time of Diocletian, *humiliores*, which constituted the majority of Christians in the persecution, were liable to torture; but even Christian *honestiores* were not exempt, insofar as they belonged to an illegal organization (stipulated explicitly by the third provision of the first legislation: see τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους 8.2.4; also Robinson 2007: 108).

**ὁ μὲν μάστιξιν... ὁ δὲ στρεβλώσειν καὶ ξεσμοῖς:** “whippings, rackings, and scrapings,” a case of anaphora.

**τὸ σῶμα:** E contrasts those who die in the bodily contest (see οὐκ αἴσιον ἀπηνέγκαντο τοῦ βίου τέλος below) with those who die in the spiritual contest before they ever reach the bodily contest

(see μυρίοι δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ δειλίας προναρκήσαντες προχείρως 8.3.1; ναρκάω often connotes death). For a fuller discussion of bodily endurance in Christian literature, see Shaw 1996: 269-312.

**ἐφ' οἷς ἤδη τινὲς οὐκ αἴσιον ἀπηνέγκαντο τοῦ βίου τέλος:** *MP(s)* 1.3 differs here: δεσμοῖς τε ἀνυπομονήτοις, ὑφ' ὧν τισὶ καὶ παρεθῆναι συνέβη τὰς χεῖρας. The language calls to mind athletic competitions: ἀποφέρομαι can mean "to carry away as prize," and τέλος, normally translated here as "end," can mean prize (as in Pind. *Ol.* 10.67).

**III.2 ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πάλιν ἄλλως τὸν ἀγῶνα διεξήεσαν:** Note the paronomasia: ἄλλοι... ἄλλως. ἄλλως may refer to the trials which precede ("others went through the contest differently;" i.e., the current group neither suffered torture nor apostatized) or to those which follow ("some came through the contest one way, others another way"). I prefer the latter interpretation, because it is not completely clear that some in 8.3.2-3 did not suffer torture.

**ὡς τεθουκῶς... ἀπηλλάττετο, καὶ εἰ μὴ τεθουκῶς ἦν:** Since *libelli* (certificates of sacrifice) were not issued in the Diocletianic persecution, it was easier than it was in the Decian persecution to obtain release from sacrifice. In the absence of documentation, whether one had sacrificed depended on the simple assertion of officials. For Christians, this opened the door to various means of avoiding apostasy. For example, Peter of Alexandria's *Canonical Epistle* 5-7 records that some Christians sent pagans and slaves to sacrifice in their place, and the Council of Ancyra (*Conc. Ancyran.* 1, Can. 1) alludes to clergy who induced officials to arrange fake tortures, so that their sacrifice would be forgiven. While these forms were not officially countenanced (the first merited penance, and the second resulted in the loss of position), the purchase of exemptions, which was condemned in the West, was tolerated in the East.

**σιωπῇ φέρων τὴν συκοφαντίαν ἀπήει:** Such evasion, it would seem, was tolerated by the

Church in the East.

**ἡμιθνής αἰρόμενος ὡς ἂν ἤδη νεκρὸς ἐρρίπτετο:** ἡμιθνής = ἡμιθανής, "half-dead" (see Mt. 2.11; Lk. 10.30). *MP(s)* 1.4, in which ἀνιέτό γε τῶν δεσμῶν follows ἐρρίπτετο, suggests that we interpret this statement as referring to those who were weakened to the point of death either from the torture aimed at forcing them to sacrifice or from their time in prison, which often included torture. ἡμιθανής occurs famously in Luke's parable of the good Samaritan, though its more proximate source is a festal letter of Dionysius of Alexandria (7.22.10; note the similar language: κὰν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐρρίπτουν ἡμιθνήτας καὶ νεκροὺς ἀτάφους ἀπεσκυβαλίζοντο), which describes, in part, pagans who throw their loved ones "half-dead" into the street during times of pestilence. E also employs ἡμιθνής in 10.4.12 to describe humanity's miserable state before the Incarnation. Thus its use here underscores the persecutors' inhumanity.

**III.3 καὶ τις αὖ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμενος:** The clause within which this phrase occurs (καὶ τις...τοῖν ποδοῖν) does not appear in *MP(s)*. E encourages us to visualize this church leader as lying in ruins, like the church structure over which he presides (see ἐξ ὕψους εἰς ἔδαφος αὐτοῖς θεμελίους καταρριπτουμένου 8.2.1). It is unclear whether some act of violence or his own weak condition from imprisonment has rendered him supine. Perhaps he is passively resisting forced sacrifice.

**μακρὰν ἐσύρετο τοῖν ποδοῖν:** E may have in mind the dragging of Hector's body in *Il.* 395-404, since he has already quoted Homer in *MP(s)* 1.1 (the passage's original context).

**ἐν τεθυκόσιν αὐτοῖς λελογισμένος:** The phrase seems explanatory, but the force of the participle is elusive. Most translators (e.g. Oulton) avoid the issue altogether by a more literal translation. Williams notably chooses a concessive interpretation: "though included among the willing sacrificers." Note that the phrase modifies the action of the preceding clause

(ἄλλος...ἐρρίπτετο) in *MP(s)* 1.4.

**ὁ δέ τις ἐβόα καὶ μεγάλη διεμαρτύρετο φωνῇ:** Cf. Mk. 1.3 (and its prophecy from Is. 40.3)

which introduces the famous proto-martyr, John the Baptist. The prefix (δια-) intensifies the verb and thus denotes the individual's earnest desire to become a martyr (lit., "to testify thoroughly"), which stands in obvious contrast to the outcome.

**ἄλλος Χριστιανὸς εἶναι ἐκεκράγει:** *Christianus sum* was by this time a formulaic expression of would-be martyrs. See Χριστιανὸς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες 8.9.5.

**τῆ τοῦ σωτηρίου προσρήματος ὁμολογία λαμπρυνόμενος:** i.e., being distinguished as a confessor rather than a martyr.

**τὸ μὴ τεθυκέναι μηδὲ θύσειν ποτὲ διετείετο:** The articular infinitives render the verbal action more concrete, which contributes to the resoluteness of the expression. διατείνω = "to stretch to the uttermost," thus "to maintain earnestly" (LSJ).

**III.4 πολυχειρία... προσώπου καὶ παρειῶν τυπτόμενοι:** The vivid description of violence against confessors calls to mind violence against Jesus in the passion narratives of the Synoptics (Mt. 26.67-68; Mk. 14.65; Lk. 22.63-65).

**τεταγμένης στρατιωτικῆς παρατάξεως:** Evidently, the Roman officials in Palestine employed bands of soldiers to facilitate compliance with the third edict. We should note that στρατιωτικῆς does not appear in *MP(s)* 1.4. Since one of the many ways Bk VIII in its present form differs from *MP(s)* is its description of the persecution in the army, E may wish to portray the army's transformation into an agent of the persecution after the purge of its Christian members in 8.4.2-4. This may also explain the line of reasoning which E attributes to Galerius below: λοιποὺς ἀλῶναι ῥαδίως ᾤετο εἰ πρότερον ἐκείνων καταγωνισάμενος περιγένοιτο 8.4.2.

**ἐξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκέναι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο:** As E's

statement highlights, the enforcement of the persecuting edicts in any given locale depended upon the attitude of the governor and of the local magistrates: e.g., in Egypt, sacrifice was required in court (*P. Oxy.* 2601), and church property was confiscated (*P. Oxy.* 2673); see Corcoran 1996: 180 for the involvement of lower officials. The context here seems to be the implementation of the third edict by local authorities in Palestine, as the eyewitness tone and similarity in language – ἐξ ἅπαντος, lit., “by all means” (Smyth 1688c), probably corresponds to πάση μηχανῇ of the legislation in 8.2.5 – indicates (see De Ste. Croix 1954: 76-77). Thus E, in ironic fashion, contrasts the legislation with the way in which it was actually enforced: the true concern of the officials was to *appear* as if they were complying with imperial demands. πολλοὶ ἐτίθεντο is the genitive of value with περὶ: “considered it of great importance” (Smyth 1373; 1693b)

**τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῖς μαρτύρων:** Procopius, Alphaeus, Zacchaeus, and Romanus serve as our only evidence of martyrs prior to the issuance of the fourth edict (see ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός 8.4.1). E tells us in *MP(s)* 1.5 that Alphaeus, an exorcist and reader at Caesarea, and Zacchaeus, a deacon from Gadara, were the only martyrs “out of such a large number” (ἐκ δὴ οὖν τῶν τοσούτων, referring to all the clergy mentioned in *MP(s)* 1.3-5 and *HE* 8.3.1-4?). It is unlikely that these died as a result of the third legislation. Alphaeus, and Romanus on the same day at Antioch, were certainly quasi-volunteers. Procopius, however, whose martyrdom appears in *MP(s)* 1.1-2, may have been arrested in consequence of the second edict (see De Ste. Croix 1954: 81-82).

**ὧν εἰς ἀκριβῆ διήγησιν τίς ἂν ἡμῖν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος:** This is vaguely Thucydidean (see Thuc. 1.22.1-2). For E’s notion of accuracy, see ἀκριβέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμεῖς 8.10.1.

**IV.1 ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός:** E probably means the general persecution, which followed upon the release of clergy (= Third Persecuting Edict) described in 8.3.1-4 by only three months (i.e., in January or February, 304; although the earliest recorded deaths associated with the fourth edict were on April 1: see *Passio Agapae, Irenae, et Chionae* in Musurillo 22). For the Fourth Persecuting Edict, ordering all inhabitants of the Empire to sacrifice, see *MP(s)* 3.1; cf. *DMP* 15.4; see also De Ste. Croix 1954: 77; 84-100; Corcoran 1996: 182. Like the second and third edicts, the fourth seems only to have been enforced in the West. ἀνακινέω and διωγμός are a common pairing, especially in the *HE* (3.17.1; 3.32.1; 7.30.20; 8.1.7; 8.app.1; 9.6.1; 10.8.18; also *VC* 2.2.3). The passive ἀνεκινήθη here leaves the agent undetermined: is God or Galerius the instigator? (see τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος 8.4.2). E has already used ἀνακινέω, with θεία κρίσις as its subject, in connection with the beginning of the persecution in the military (8.1.7).

**πολὺ πρότερον:** This was probably three years prior (early 300) in E's reckoning, since the *Canones* assigns the beginning of the persecution in the army to year 16 of Diocletian (Helm 227d). See Burgess 1996: 157-158. The events in Antioch of *DMP* 10 likely occurred in 299. See Barnes 1981: 55.

**τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης συνεκροτεῖτο:** Just as E likens persecution to a war against the Christians (e.g., 8.4.2; 4.4; 10.12; 13.9, 10; 13.13; 16.1; app.4), he describes the absence of persecution as a state of peace (8.13.9, 10). These comparisons are especially prevalent in Bk VIII, because part of its theological-historical agenda is to demonstrate the merger of Church and Empire by establishing a correlation between the states of the two *politeiai*: when the Church is at peace, so is the Empire (e.g., 8.13.9), and when the former is at war (8.13.10), so is the latter (8.15.1-2) (see Introduction V). Thus, while E ostensibly means the period of Christian toleration between

Gallienus' edict (7.13.1) and the beginning of the persecution in the army (see μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ μεταξὺ χρόνον 8.4.2), he may also be alluding to circumstances in the East after Galerius' victory over the Persians, to which Lactantius assigns the beginning of the persecution in the army (*DMP* 9.5-12). συνεκροτεῖτο is also in keeping with the military language and metaphor of the section (see συγκροτουμένων 8.1.7).

**IV.2 ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι πρῶτον:** These adverbs, which are repeated to emphasize the synchronicity of the persecution in the army and the height of peace in the Church, modify the action of the main verb (παρῆν), from which they are separated by fifty-five words (an extreme case of hyperbaton). This is probably intentional on the part of E, to convey the length of time which has elapsed since the last persecution. Interestingly, we also see a correlation between the martyrdom of the soldier, Marinus, in 7.15.1 and the widespread peace of the Church following Gallienus' legislation (Κατὰ τούτους εἰρήνης ἀπανταχοῦ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν οὔσης, ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης Μαρῖνος...). As such, we might wonder whether E considers the origin of the military persecution as belonging to the mid third century (a more natural interpretation of πολὺ πρότερον above, although perhaps incongruous with what follows).

**ὥσπερ ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος ὑποκινουμένου:** Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 271 avers that ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος is the forty-years' peace, but this raises two problems: first, the phrase could not strictly apply to the perpetrator (ὑποκινουμένου; τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος below); and this contradicts E's depiction of the emperors' actively favorable policy towards the Christians in 8.1.1-6 (see Christensen 1989: 31 nn. 43-44). It may not refer to anything precisely, and if anything, it is E's attempt to assign causation to divine judgment (ὑποκινουμένου implies impetus from the outside), while blaming the perpetrator for his inherently (i.e., conscious) evil nature.

**τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος:** 8.app.1, which clearly refers to Galerius as the author of the persecution in the army, leaves little doubt that E means the junior emperor here. The phrase itself implies the subordinate authority of a Caesar – E uses a similar expression in *MP(s)* 9.1 (ὁ τοῦ διώκειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληγῶς ) when referring to Maximin Caesar. Still, others have argued for different identifications. Christensen sees Diocletian as the intended referent, since he is the only emperor named thus far in Bk VIII (ἔτος τοῦτο ἦν ἐννεακαιδέκατον τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας 8.2.4; see Christensen 1989: 31). While such a view does agree with Lactantius' account (*DMP* 10.4-5), which assigns blame to Diocletian for the military persecution, it is clearly at odds with E's statement in 8.app.1 (for an attempt at reconciling Lactantius and E's accounts, see Davies 1989: 89-92). We should note that E fails explicitly to name Galerius in the body of the text as we now have it (the name occurs only in the palinode reproduced in 8.17). This probably should be viewed in terms of his theological prerogative to assign blame for the persecution, at least in part, to the Church, and causation to the workings of the cosmic realm (see *θεία κρίσις* 8.1.7; also Morgan 2005: 204). Thus Valesius' suggestion of the devil seems less absurd than it appears at first glance (PG 20.2.750A). Based on evidence from the geographical distribution of martyr-acts and from eyewitness testimony, Davies 1989: 66-94 raises misgivings about Lactantius and E's portrayal of Galerius as the author and instigator of the persecution. See Leadbetter 2009: 130-134 for the revised view of Galerius' role.

**μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ μεταξὺ χρόνον:** This is an awkward and imprecise phrase (lit., "after the time in between the period beginning with Decius and Valerian"). ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ suggests a period which begins after the end of the Decian and Valerianic persecutions, but E assigns no definite end-point to μεταξὺ, and we must presume that he intends the ill-defined time of peace (καθ' ὃν ἔτι τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης συνεκροτεῖτο) long before

(πολὺ πρότερον) the expanded persecution in 303/304 (ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός). The emperor Decius (249-251 CE) instituted the first systematic persecution of Christians in 249/50 CE by decreeing that all inhabitants of the Empire should offer sacrifice to the gods and obtain certificates of compliance (i.e., *libelli*; see 6.39-7.4). Decius' death in 251 at the hands of the Goths ended persecution. His successor, Valerian, who was initially favorable to the Christians, initiated another empire-wide persecution in 257 (see 7.10-13; for the legislation, *Cyp. Epist.* 80.1). This persecution lasted until 260, when the Persians captured Valerian in battle, and his successor, Gallienus, granted toleration to Christianity (7.13), initiating the period of peace described at various places in 8.1-4. E's mention of the third-century persecuting emperors serves to place Galerius in the same class as those persecutors who have come before.

**ἐπαποδουμένου πολέμου:** ἐπαποδουμένου is middle: "stripping himself for war" (see, e.g., Philo *De Agri.* 159). Apropos of the context, E employs a military/wrestling metaphor (see *PE* 8.11.6 for its athletic connotation) to portray the stages leading up to the persecution as a stripping away of pretenses and revelation of Galerius' true intentions (cf. *MP(s)* 4.1, where similar language is used of Maximin: τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαπεδύετο διωγμῷ). When these are fully revealed, the same metaphor is rendered in the indicative with the comparative adjective γυμνότερον (γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο 8.4.5). In 8.17.1, the dying Galerius is described as "wrestling with the magnitude of such evils" (τοσούτοις παλαίων κακοῖς 8.17.1), an ironic reversal of fortunes characterized by similar athletic imagery.

**τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀλῶναι ῥαδίως ᾔετο:** It is difficult fully to grasp the line of reasoning attributed to Galerius. Perhaps it pertains to the army's role in enforcing the persecution (see, e.g., τεταγμένης στρατιωτικῆς παρατάξεως 8.3.4) or the divine favor that would accrue from the purge. Davies 1989: 92-94 argues that the recent military successes in 299 (i.e., Galerius' defeat

of the Persians in 298 and Diocletian's quashing of the Egyptian revolt in 297-298) reduced the need for military manpower and thus provided Diocletian an opportunity for carrying out a purge of the army (see τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης συνεκροτεῖτο 8.4.1).

**ἀσμενέστατα τὸν ιδιωτικὸν προασπαζομένους βίον:** This is the first appearance of προασπάζομαι (lit., “being the first to embrace,” according to Lampe) in Greek literature and a *hapax legomenon* in the Eusebian corpus. The pro- prefix stresses that it was the soldiers who first suffered persecution (for another unique occurrence of pro-, see μυρίοι δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ δειλίας προναρκήσαντες προχείρως 8.3.). An interesting juxtaposition exists between ἀσμενέστατα... προασπαζομένους and τὸν ιδιωτικὸν... βίον – “civilian life,” with the negative associations of the term ιδιώτης (common man, amateur, layman, etc.) – which must have been a terrifying prospect for career soldiers. Furthermore, this would have been a dishonorable discharge (*missio ignominiosa*, see *Dig.* 49.16.13.3), which carried serious penalties (see ἤς μετῆν... ἀπολαύειν τιμῆς 8.4.3 and τῆς δοκούσης δόξης καὶ εὐπραγίας 8.4.3). In 8.13.11 and 8.app.2, E portrays Diocletian and Maximian's abdication as a demotion to civilian life, undoubtedly to underscore the ironic workings of divine justice.

**δημιουργόν:** To be sure, this is a favorite descriptive title of E for the creative aspect of the divine *logos* (e.g., 1.2.3, 4, 14; 2.3.2; 3.37.3; 4.11.9; 7.11.8; 10.4.9, 25, 56, 69; *PE* 1.4.6; 2.5.3; 3.4.3; 4.4.1; 5.1.2; 6.6.30), but the choice of words seems strange in this context. Perhaps E has 1.2.3 (τὸν τῆς κατ' οὐρανὸν λογικῆς καὶ ἀθανάτου στρατιᾶς ἀρχιστράτηγον... τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων σὺν τῷ πατρὶ δημιουργόν) in mind, which connects the creative and militaristic aspects of the *logos*. If so, ἀρχιστράτηγον may contrast with στρατοπεδάρχης below.

**IV.3 ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος:** Jerome mentions a *magister militiae*, Veturius (*Chron.* 227d: *Veturius magister militiae Christianos milites persequitur paulatim ex illo iam*

*tempore persecutione adversum nos incipiente*; PLRE I 955), who should probably be identified with the στρατοπεδάρχης mentioned here. Scholars have noted the anachronism of *magister militiae* as applied to Veturius, for it was a title created only later by Constantine I. The proper designation for top generals in ca. 300 seems to have been *dux* (see 9.5.2, ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης, ὃν δοῦκα Ῥωμαῖοι προσαγορεύουσιν). The fact that E does not name him in the *HE* (ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος) but apparently does so in the *Chronici Canones* is indeed strange (Burgess 1996: 77 n.1 notes otherwise only the example of Basileus of Amasea in 10.8.15). Woods 2001: 587-91 offers a unique solution to the problem. He first suggests that E and Lactantius' accounts of the military persecution can only be reconciled if we assume E is describing its local manifestation (*DMP* 10.1-5; *HE* 8.4.2-4); he then conjectures that E in fact did not know who the commander was – in contrast to the *communis opinio* that E knew and is being contemptuous – but instead provided in the *Canones* the name of the camp where the persecution in the military began locally: *Betthorus* at modern day El-Lejjun (a place name Woods derives from *ND Or.* 37.22). The later continuators thus interpreted the place to be the corrupted form of the personal name, Veturius, but it was really the prefect of the *legio IV Martia*, to which *Betthorus* was home, who was the originator of the persecution. By contrast, Burgess 1996: 157-8 prefers Veturius as the local *dux*.

**φυλοκρινῶν καὶ διακαθαίρων:** φυλοκρινῶν (lit., “sorting by tribes”) is an interesting choice of words, considering E’s use of φύλον at 1.11.8 (see also 3.33.2; *DE* 3.5.106) to describe the Christian “race.” φυλοκρινέω appears four times in the Eusebian corpus, thrice in the context of purification (e.g., with διακαθαίρω again in *Comm. in Ps.*, PG 23.497.28). In 10.4.60-61, perhaps in contrast to the present passage, God is said to have purified the souls of the martyrs

(ψυχὰς... ἐξεκάθηρέν τε καὶ ἀπέσμηξεν), and Paulinus, in his building of the church at Tyre, to have sorted out “the understanding of the souls committed to him.”

**πειθαρχοῦσιν... αὐτοῖς:** This participle must be taken conditionally with εἰ ἀντιτάττοντο τῷ προστάγματι as an example of *variatio* within a protasis that is in a chiasmic relationship with its apodosis (ἤς μετῆν αὐτοῖς ἀπολαύειν τιμῆς ἢ τούναντίον στέρεσθαι ταύτης).

**ἤς μετῆν... ἀπολαύειν τιμῆς:** τιμῆς probably refers here to the privileges enjoyed by *honestiores* (τιμή = dignitas), to which soldiers, along with senators, equestrians, and decurions, naturally belonged. Deprivation of τιμή (στέρεσθαι ταύτης) would entail degradation to the rank of *humiliores*. Note the similarities to the First Persecuting Edict in language at τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους 8.2.4 ff.

**τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας:** This phrase, which stands in contrast to τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας in 8.2.4, defines the Christian soldier’s true allegiance. Considering the importance of the relationship between Church and Empire in Bk VIII, it is not surprising that E often contrasts the empire of Christ with that of the Romans. See βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος τὴν οὐράνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν 8.13.2.

**τῆς δοκούσης δόξης καὶ εὐπραγίας:** The benefits of completing a career in the army were manifold, including citizenship and high rank (i.e., δόξα), good pensions and tax exemptions (εὐπραγία). All of this would be compromised by *missio ignominiosa*. See Wesch-Klein 439-449 for a treatment of military benefits.

**IV.4 εἶς που καὶ δεύτερος... θάνατον τῆς εὐσεβοῦς ἐνστάσεως ἀντικατηλλάττοντο:** We have accounts in the *acta martyrum* of only three military martyrs from the period 260-303. These are Marinus (Musurillo 16; 7.15) between 260 and 268, Maximilian (Musurillo 17) on March 10,

295, and Marcellus (Musurillo 18) on October 30, 298. The one or two whom E assigns to the purge of the army between 299/300 and 303 remain obscure. See Barnes 2010: 106-10.

**τοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν ἐνεργοῦντος:** See τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος 8.4.2.

**μέχρις αἵματος ἐπ' ἐνίων φθάνειν ἐπιτολμῶντος:** If we are to believe Lactantius, this was due to Diocletian's constraint: *eam rem sine sanguine transigi iuberet* (DMP 11.8).

**τοῦ πλήθους, ὡς ἔοικεν, τῶν πιστῶν δεδιττομένου τε αὐτὸν ἔτι καὶ ἀποκναίοντος ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων ἀθρόως ἐφορμῆσαι πόλεμον:** Pretty clearly a conjecture on the part of E (ὡς ἔοικεν) put forth to stress the large Christian population and to underscore Galerius' cowardice, an offense punishable by death in a military context. The last point is effective rhetoric considering Galerius' recent military success (i.e., his defeat of Narseh in 298) and his association with Mars (DMP 9.5-9). Lactantius' account attributes Galerius' hesitation to Diocletian (see, e.g., DMP 10.3-8).

**IV.5 γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο:** See ἐπαποδυομένου πολέμῳ 8.4.2 and γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι 8.6.2.

**τοῖς ἀνὰ πάσας τάς τε πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας οἰκοῦσιν:** Christianity, primarily an urban phenomenon in the first two centuries, began to make significant inroads into the countryside in the mid-to-late third century. Barbarian invasions and systematic persecutions, among other factors, had forced a number of Christians to abandon city life and seek refuge in rural areas. For a discussion of this development, see Frend 1967: 334-346. It is part of E's apologetic mission to demonstrate the geographical spread of Christianity (hence his arrangement of material by geographical area in 8.7 – 13.8), and from his testimony, scholars are able to draw conclusions about Christian populations in certain locales (see, e.g., E's numbers for the Thebaid in 8.9.3).

**Ν.1 τῶν οὐκ ἀσήμων τις:** E employs litotes here for exaggeration. Lactantius is similarly indefinite as to the martyr's identity (*quidam*), but E's account provides information about his status and social standing which is missing in *DMP* 13.2-3 (see ἀλλὰ...ἐνδοξοτάτων 8.5.1). The Syrian martyrology identifies him as Euethius (*PO* 10.13).

**ἄγαν κατὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ βίῳ νενομισμένας ὑπεροχὰς ἐνδοξοτάτων:** ὑπεροχή is used of prominent officials (e.g., Polyb. 5.41.3) but carries the negative connotation of ὑπερβολή or “excess” which Paul eschews in Cor. 2.1; also 1 Ti. 2.2.

**ἅμα τῷ τὴν...προτεθῆναι γραφήν:** The martyrdom seems also to concur with the date of the edict's publication in *DMP* (i.e., February 24, 303; *DMP* 12.1; 13.1). ἅμα adds to the alliterative effect of the period (Αὐτικά, ἀσήμων, ἀλλὰ, ἄγαν, ἀνοσίαν, ἀσεβεστάτην, ἀνελὼν, αὐτήν, ἄλλων, ἀπὸ, ἀρχῆς) and may prompt the interesting use of the articular infinitive.

**ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινήθεις διαπύρω τε ἐφορμήσας τῇ πίστει:** Lactantius' account offers qualified criticism of the man's behavior: his action was *non recte*, but admittedly *magno animo* (*DMP* 13.2). Although E's language is more theological (ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν, διαπύρω... τῇ πίστει), it betrays little explicit approval. The martyr's zeal is toward God (τῷ κατὰ θεὸν) rather than from God (cf. θείους... διαπρεπεῖς μάρτυρας below 8.6.1) and his “fiery” faith is not necessarily positive. Moreover, ὑποκινήθεις, which implies outside impetus but lacks grammatical agent, suggests that E is unsure about the inspiration's provenance. The fire-imagery (διαπύρω) adds an ironic coloring to subsequent events (i.e., the martyr's death and the fire in the palace) and suggests that E, like Lactantius (*DMP* 13.3), knows of the martyr's death by fire, despite its omission from this passage.

**ἐν προφανεῖ καὶ δημοσίῳ κειμένῳ:** cf. κρύβδην τε ἔτι καὶ ἀφανῶς 8.4.2; see also γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο 8.4.4.

**ὡς ἀνοσίαν καὶ ἀσεβεστάτην ἀνελῶν:** Note the alliteration coupled with the language of raising which pervades the section (see γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι 8.6.2); the edict is lifted up and destroyed, just like the perpetrator (presumably burned at the stake: *DMP* 13).

**σπαράττει:** As Corcoran 1996: 179 notes, the edict must not have been published on durable material in Nicomedia, since it was torn down and ripped up. *σπαράσσω*, which sometimes means “convulse” in the New Testament (e.g., the evil spirits in Mk. 1.26, 9.26, and Lk. 9:39), associates this edict with the demonic.

**δυεῖν ἐπιπαρόντων κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν βασιλέων:** i.e., Nicomedia. This accords with *DMP*, where Diocletian and Galerius spend the winter of 302-3 in discussions at Nicomedia (*DMP* 10.6). Galerius remains until the burning of the palace (*DMP* 14.7).

**τοῦ τε πρεσβυτάτου τῶν ἄλλων:** i.e., Diocletian, the senior Augustus.

**τοῦ τὸν τέταρτον ἀπὸ τούτου τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπικρατοῦντος βαθμόν:** i.e., Galerius; for a complete scholarly treatment of the emperor, see Leadbetter 2009. In *DMP* 13.2, the martyr takes aim at Galerius’ Danubian background, by claiming that the legislation proclaimed victory for the Goths and Sarmatians (*cum irridens diceret victorias Gothorum et Sarmatarum propositas*).

**ἀλλ’ οὗτος μὲν τῶν τηνικάδε πρῶτος τοῦτον διαπρέψας τὸν τρόπον:** E seems to credit Euethius as being the first martyr of the general persecution.

**ἄμα τε τοιαῦτα οἶα καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν:** cf. *legitime coctus* in *DMP* 13.3, translated by Creed as “roasted by due process of law,” but also perhaps “cooked in a fitting manner;” see discussion in Creed 1984: 94 n.6.

**ὑπομείνας:** ὑπομονή had by E’s time become a lauded virtue with long history in Jewish, Stoic, and especially Christian thought. Shaw 1996: 269-312 traces its development and relationship in the three traditions. Cf. *cum admirabili patientia* in *DMP* 13.3.

**ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ τολμήματι:** Like ἅμα τε τοιαῦτα οἶα καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν above (8.5.1), this is an ambiguous pronouncement which may reflect E's uneasiness at the martyr's actions. Above all, it points to the fact that he was put to death not for being a Christian, but for treason (thus Lactantius could unabashedly describe his punishment as "lawful").

**εἰς αὐτὴν τελευταίαν... ἀναπνοήν:** E may intend to recall Jesus' last breath (c.f. Mk. 15.37 and Lk. 23.46).

**VI.1 Πάντων δὲ ὅσοι τῶν πρόποτε ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβημένοι:** E celebrates the deaths of the imperial servants with epic language (ἀνυμνοῦνται), while the chiasmic structure, which features *variatio* between the adjective (θαυμάσιοι) and the prepositional phrase (ἐπ' ἀνδρεία), and the finite verb form (ἀνυμνοῦνται) and the participle (βεβημένοι), heightens the tone of the new subject. Such language stands in contrast with E's cool and somewhat neutral description of the previous martyrdom (see ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινήθεις διαπύρω τε ἐφορμήσας τῇ πίστει 8.5.1). Peter's martyrdom fits this characterization well (Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο 8.6.4); for the incongruous deaths of Dorotheus and Gorgonius, see βρόχῳ τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάξαντες 8.6.5.

**εἴτε παρ' Ἑλλήσιν εἴτε παρὰ βαρβάρους:** See Ἑλλήσι τε καὶ βαρβάρους 8.1.1.

**τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον βασιλικὸς παῖδας... γνησίων τε αὐτοῖς διαθέσει τέκνων οὐ λειπόμενοι:** In 8.1.3, E states that the faithful in the imperial family consist of wives, children, and slaves (γαμεταῖς καὶ παισὶ καὶ οἰκέταις). Dorotheus and Gorgonius are servants of some kind (they are described as μᾶλλον τῶν συνθεραπόντων ἀποδεκτοῦς; probably freeborn *Caesariani*: see τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκεταίς 8.2.4), but an ambiguous relative pronoun (οὗς, which is closest in proximity to οἰκέταις) allows us only to imply that they belong to the οἰκέταις rather than the παισὶ. It is unclear whether E intends a distinction between παῖδες and οἰκέται here. E

uses the pairing of βασιλικός and παῖς only four times, and three of the four instances occur in 8.6. Interestingly, the other appears at *LC* 1.1, where he refers to the clergy who are present as οἱ βασιλικοὶ παῖδες. A very similar expression occurs in the Greek text of *MP(l)* (11.1.36-39), which describes Pamphilus' servant Porphyry: ὁ τε γὰρ ἡγεμονικῆς οἰκετίας θεράπων αὐτοῖς συγκατείλεκτο καὶ ὁ Πορφύριος, τὸ μὲν δοκεῖν τοῦ Παμφίλου γεγονῶς οἰκέτης, διαθέσει γε μὴν ἀδελφοῦ καὶ μᾶλλον γνησίου παιδὸς διενηνοχῶς οὐδὲν ἢ ἐλλείπων τῆς πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην κατὰ πάντα μιμήσεως. We might also ask what kind of relationship, if any, ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον expresses. E sometimes employs substantive phrases featuring ἀμφὶ with a proper noun to indicate students of a particular teacher/philosopher (e.g., οἱ ἀμφὶ Πυθαγόραν καὶ Δημόκριτον in *PE* 10.9.24; also 14.2.4, 5). If this is the case here, then it would be tempting to identify the present Dorotheus with the Hebrew scholar and imperial servant of the same name in 7.32.2 (see Δωρόθεος...Γοργόνιος 8.1.3). αὐτοῖς διαθέσει is somewhat ambiguous: διαθέσει could refer to the imperial masters and be rendered “in their (i.e., αὐτοῖς, the imperial masters’) disposition” (the most common meaning of διάθεσις in E’s writings); on the other hand, it may refer to the imperial servants, in which case αὐτοῖς would be taken with γνησίων... τέκνων, and translated, “in their (i.e., the imperial servants’) condition;” it is also possible, though perhaps unlikely, that διάθεσις means “will” (Latin *testamentum*), such that the βασιλικοὶ παῖδες would expect either to be manumitted (if slaves) or to receive an inheritance comparable to their legitimate brethren. For a discussion of manumission by will and legacies to slaves, see Buckland 1908: 460-478.

**μείζονα πλοῦτον...ἤγηνται...τοὺς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ὄνειδισμούς...πόνους...τοὺς κεκαιουργημένους...πολυτρόπους θανάτους:** Hb. 11.24-28, which describes Moses’ renunciation of Egyptian nobility in favor of Christ, inspires E’s portrayal of Dorotheus and Gorgonius here (cf. Hb. 11:26: μείζονα πλοῦτον ἠγησάμενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν τὸν

ὄνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ; also Mt. 5.10-11). The language of novelty and multiplicity in the final component of the tricolon (τοὺς κεκαιουργημένους...πολυτρόπους θανάτους; cf. 8.13.13), though employed here of modes of execution, echoes some of E's larger apologetic concerns. In the *Chronicon*, *HE* (1.4.2) and *PE*, much of E's scholarly effort centers on demonstrating that Christianity is more ancient than paganism – against pagan claims that it was recent – and that the worship of many gods was an inferior, later development of the original, monotheistic religion. Thus even the forms of execution used against the martyrs seem to mirror paganism in their novelty and multiplicity.

**σκοπεῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ... καταλείψομεν:** One of many instances in which E leaves the reader to generalize from a specific example (see Grant 1980: 25-27; also οὐ χείρονα δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὄντα... παραλείψομεν 8.6.5).

**τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμβεβηκότα:** Chesnut 1986: 41-45 provides a helpful discussion of E's conception of Fortune and preference for the term τὰ συμβεβηκότα.

**VI.2 κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν:** i.e., Nicomedia.

**θύειν δὴ οὖν προσταχθεῖς:** For a discussion of the so-called “sacrifice test” and the implications of its implementation before the fourth edict, see De Ste. Croix 1954: 79-83 and Robinson 2007: 103-5.

**γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι:** γυμνὸς recalls Galerius' epithet in 8.4.4 (γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο) and continues a series of comparisons (see also τοὺς κεκαιουργημένους ἐπ' αὐτοῖς πολυτρόπους θανάτους 8.6.1) between the martyr's death and Galerius' demise in 8.16.3-17.2 (see τῶν διασαπέντων 8.6.3). Language of hanging and lifting (ἀρθῆναι) occurs throughout Bk VIII, especially in reference to the execution of martyrs; interestingly, some of these martyrs are hung upside down – whether crucified (8.8.2) or hung by their feet (8.9.1; 12.1) – and recall not only

Christ's death, but Peter's upside down crucifixion, for which E provides the first datable reference (see Baldwin 2005: 313). For the connection between the apostle and the current martyr, also named Peter, see Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο. μετάρσιος (lit., "high in the air") is a term of exaltation for E and describes no other than Constantine in *LC* pr. 4); the term seems to be a favorite of the emperor (see *OC* 1.4; 9.3).

**εἰς ὅτε ἠττηθεὶς κἄν ἄκων τὸ προσταττόμενον ποιήσειεν:** εἰς ὅτε (= ἕως) + aorist optative after a secondary tense sometimes conveys purpose, expectation, or intent in Attic prose (Smyth 2420). κἄν (καὶ ἐάν) = "even if."

**VI. 3 ὄξος:** "cheap wine" or "vinegar" (Latin *posca*, or *acetum*, as in the Vulgate), as that offered to Jesus in the passion narratives (Mt. 27.48, Mk. 15.36, Lk. 23.36, Jn. 19.29). The account of Peter's execution is filled with culinary and sacrificial language which is perhaps intended to reinforce the barbaric nature of the persecutors and the religion they espouse. Cannibalism, a charge leveled at early Christians, runs under the surface of this passage.

**σὺν καὶ ἄλατι φύραντες:** Vinegar and salt were often mixed as a seasoning and pickling agent and used in the cooking of sacrificial meat (see Detienne-Vernant 1989: 11). Here E portrays the marinating of the martyr's mangled flesh before it is roasted.

**τῶν διασαπέντων:** The same verbal stem (σήπω) appears in connection with Galerius' disease at the close of Bk VIII (κατασαπεῖσαν 8.16.4) in a reversal of fortunes which E apparently savors. For the relationship between martyrdom, putrefaction, and resurrection, see Bynum 1995: 50-1.

**ἐπάτει τὰς ἀλγηδόνας:** Here there appears the imperfect form of πατέω, "to tread upon," thus "to despise" (as in Oulton). Yet one might remark on its similarity to πατέομαι, "to eat," which does occur in the active form (once, according to LSJ, in Orion 162.20). This *double entendre*, likely intentional, reinforces the sacrificial/cannibalistic nature of the passage.

**ἔσχάρα:** This was a portable hearth, made of bronze, iron, or sometimes silver, used for sacrifice or for the cooking of sacrificial meat (often contrasted with the *bomos*, a more permanent altar). In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the ἔσχάρα came to be associated with sacrifice to heroes and chthonic deities (see Ekroth 2002: 23-59).

**κρεῶν ἐδωδίων δίκην:** δίκην is an adverbial accusative (“in the way of” + genitive) whose use may be occasioned by the original connotation of the noun (i.e., punishment); ἐδωδίων (“edible”) is of a piece with the passage’s culinary language – here indeed E acknowledges the comparison explicitly – and anticipates ἀνηλίσκετο (8.6.3 below).

**τὰ λείψανα:** Probably connotes both the remains of a martyr (i.e., relics) and the edible remains of a sacrifice (see κρεῶν ἐδωδίων δίκην above).

**ὥς ἂν μὴ συντόμως ἀπαλλαγείη:** The length of the period, which stretches from ὥς δὲ to ἐπινεύσειεν, underscores the duration of the torture.

**κατὰ βραχὺ δὲ ἀνηλίσκετο:** After a marinade, the martyr is slow-roasted.

**VI. 4 νικηφόρος ἐν αὐταῖς βασάνοις:** cf. 1 Cor. 9:24; Phil. 3:14; see also τῆς ἐνθέου νίκης ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα 8.6.5.

**παρέδωκε τὴν ψυχὴν:** lit., “entrusted his spirit,” like the Latin *animam ago* (“give up the ghost”), likely an allusion to John’s Gospel (Jn. 19:30), where a similar idiom (παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα) describes Jesus’ expiration on the cross and occurs in the same verse as ὄξος (see ὄξος 8.6.3).

**Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο:** The simple statement following such a long period is rhetorically striking and offers a clue as to why E elaborates on this martyr: because his name is Peter (meaning “rock;” the martyr is particularly “petrine” in his endurance). E takes a particular interest in the

apostle and the form of his death (upside-down crucifixion, see 3.1.2; and γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι 8.6.2) in the *HE*. For further analysis, see Baldwin 2005: 312-13.

**VI. 5 φειδόμενοι συμμετρίας παραλείψομεν:** A rare, explicit statement of compositional reflection. According to Grant 1980: 30, this is the only comment in the *HE* concerning book-length and arises from E's awareness that *MP(s)* has been removed.

**ὁ τε Δωρόθεος καὶ ὁ Γοργόνιος:** See 8.4.1; 6.1. The Syrian Martyrology (*PO* 2-4) states that Gorgonius died on March 11 and Dorotheus on March 12, 303 (the same day as Peter; see Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο 8.6.4).

**ἐτέροις ἅμα πλείοσιν τῆς βασιλικῆς οἰκετίας:** cf. *DMP* 14; see also τούτῳ δὲ πλῆθος ἄθρων μαρτύρων προστίθεται 8.6.6.

**βρόχῳ τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάξαντες:** The deaths of Dorotheus and Gorgonius are strangely anti-climactic when compared to the heroic language that introduces their martyrdoms (see Πάντων δὲ ὅσοι τῶν πρόποτε ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβημένοι 6.1). Moreover, strangulation or hanging was a very unheroic form of death often associated with women in the Greek and Roman mindset (Loraux 1991: 7-30; cf. ἐπ' ἀνδρεία). Yet as an alternative to public execution, which tended to be bloodier, strangulation could be viewed as a milder form of death that spared humiliation. Like Peter's death mirrors Galerius' in certain details, the strangling of Dorotheus and Gorgonius recalls Maximian's (see ἀγχόνῃ τὴν ζωὴν ἀπορρήξας 8.app.1).

**VI. 6 Ἐν τούτῳ:** The demonstrative pronoun has no real referent and should probably be construed temporally, "at this time." According to the Syrian Martyrology (*PO* 10.15), Anthimus died on April 24 (either in 303 or in 312; see Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 272-3 and Frend 1967: 512 n.59 for the dates of the martyr).

**ὁ τηνικαῦτα προεστὼς Ἄνθιμος:** προεστὼς, an equivalent of the Latin *antistes* (“president”), was a term generally used to designate a member of the high clergy (i.e., presbyters and bishops; e.g., 5.24.9; 6.3.8; 7.5.1; Herm. *Vis.* 2.4.3; Just. *Apol.* 1.65; Cyp. *Epist.* 59.18.3) before the distinction between bishops and priests had become prevalent in the law codes and Christian literature of the fifth century (see Rapp 2005: 275-276). For *antistes* in fourth- and early fifth-century legislation, see *CTh* 16.2.11; 2.43, 45, 47; 4.6; 5.24, 28, 36, 54, 66; 6.1, 6. Anthimus appears again in 8.13.1.

**διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίαν:** Lawlor objects to this statement on the grounds that capital punishment was not authorized by the First Edict (Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 273) and suggests that Anthimus was executed for complicity in the burning of the palace. This is not necessarily the case, for Christians, even before the publication of the fourth edict, had suffered death for various acts of insubordination and treason, including refusal to sacrifice and failure to hand over Scripture (De Ste. Croix 1954: 77-81). We can only conjecture what led directly to Anthimus’ death, although it seems to have taken place during the intensified activity after the fire (see Ἐν τούτῳ 8.6.6).

**τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμνεται:** *Chron. Pasch.* p. 519 and *Passio Anthimi* 3-5 also state that Anthimus was decapitated. Beheading was a form of capital punishment usually reserved for *honestiores* (e.g., Philoromus and Phileas 8.9.8; *Dig.* 48.19.8.1; Mousourakis 2007: 134), which makes us wonder about Anthimus’ status.

**τούτῳ δὲ πλῆθος ἄθρων μαρτύρων προστίθεται:** Both E and Lactantius connect the fire in the palace to an increase in persecuting activity (*DMP* 14.2-16.2; see παγγενεῖ σωρηδὸν 8.6.6), but it seems that E has sacrificed chronology here in favor of presentation by placing the deaths of the imperial servants (Peter, Dorotheus, and Gorgonius) prior to the fire in the palace. Lactantius’

account offers a more convincing chronology (*DMP* 14.2-15.3; see ἦν καθ' ὑπόνοιαν ψευδῆ... λόγου διαδοθέντος 8.6.6).

**οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως:** Lactantius tells us his theory: Galerius engineered not one, but two fires in the palace to force Diocletian to expand persecution (*DMP* 14.2, 6). E's parenthesis is thus difficult to interpret: perhaps his source is reticent on the cause of the fire, and E expresses genuine ignorance; on the other hand, he may wish to offer a corrective to the tradition that holds Galerius responsible; it seems more likely, however, that E, in keeping with his propensity not to name persecutors explicitly (see, e.g., ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος), is aware of the tradition surrounding Galerius' involvement with the fire and intends the remark acerbically.

**πυρκαϊᾶς ἐν αὐταῖς δὴ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἀφθείσης:** Of the three contemporary sources that speak of the fire – *DMP* 14, *HE* 8.6.6, and *OC* 25 – only Lactantius blames Galerius and mentions a second fire. The plural ἐν αὐταῖς δὴ ταῖς ἡμέραις may suppose a fire, or fires, which lasted for several days. Of course, this recalls the circumstances under which the first imperially sponsored persecution began (i.e., the Great Fire of Rome in the reign of Nero; see Tac. *Ann.* 15.38-44; Leadbetter 2009: 133 argues that, in the case of Lactantius, the parallel must be intentional). Constantine, however, who was also in Nicomedia at the time, attributes the fire to lightning.

**ἦν καθ' ὑπόνοιαν ψευδῆ... λόγου διαδοθέντος:** The content of this rumor is perhaps reported by Lactantius (*DMP* 14.2): *illos consilio cum eunuchis habito de extinguendis principibus cogitasse, duos imperatores domi suae paene vivos esse combustos*. Based on the charges themselves, it is understandable why burning would have been a widely-used method of execution and torture.

**παγγενεῖ σωρηδόν:** cf. *DMP* 15.3: *omnis sexus et aetatis homines ad exustionem rapti, nec singuli, quoniam tanta erat multitudo, sed gregatim circumdato igni ambiebantur*.

**βασιλικῷ νεύματι:** According to Lactantius, this would have been Diocletian’s imperative (*DMP* 15.1). E may wish to contrast the “imperial will,” which orders the slaughter of Christians, with the will of the martyrs, which is fixedly resolved not to give in to the emperors’ will (cf. τοῖς προσταπτομένοις ἐπινεύσειεν 8.6.3).

**λόγος ἔχει:** This may indicate E’s dependence on a written document, perhaps a letter of Lucian of Antioch from Nicomedia to his home church, of which a fragment is preserved in *Chron. Pasch.* p. 519 (a hypothesis set forth in Lawlor 1912: 268-270). The text runs as follows: Ἀσπάξεται ὑμᾶς χορὸς ἅπας ὁμοῦ μαρτύρων. εὐαγγελίζομαι δὲ ὑμᾶς ὡς Ἄνθιμος ὁ πάπας τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου δρόμῳ ἐτελειώθη. See also Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 272-273; Carriker 2003: 224 conjectures that such a letter may lie behind much of 8.5.1 – 8.6.7.

**ἄνδρας ἅμα γυναῖξιν:** See παγγενεῖ σωρηδὸν 8.6.6.

**ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὰν καταλέσθαι:** The phraseology may not necessarily imply voluntary martyrdom, as De Ste. Croix has pointed out, but προθυμία θεῖα τινὶ καὶ ἀρρήτῳ, which explains motivation, is quite similar to language used of voluntary martyrs elsewhere (e.g., ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινήθεις διαπύρω τε ἐφορμήσας τῇ πίστει 8.5.1) and would seem to bolster such an interpretation. Among ecclesiastical writers, E is especially fond of voluntary martyrdom: in *MP* alone there are fourteen voluntary martyrs and seventeen “quasi-volunteers” out of the forty-seven martyrs about whose deaths we are informed (according to the reckoning and classification of De Ste. Croix 2006: 177).

**οἱ δῆμιοι:** “public executioners,” probably *servi publici*; Lenski 2006: 344-5 examines the topic in Late Antiquity.

**τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέριπτον βυθοῖς:** Kyle notes the multiple instances of drowning and of disposal of corpses in water (see ἐναπορρῖψαι θαλάττῃ 8.6.7) – here an example of two birds,

one stone – provided by the *HE* and *MP*. These may owe to Caesarea’s seaside location and, more generally, the desire of officials to limit the veneration of martyr-relics (see also γῆ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης κηδείας 8.6.7; ἐν μνήμασιν ἀποκειμένουσ προσκυνοῖέν τινες 8.6.7) and to exploit Christian fears about bodily resurrection (Kyle 2001: 251-53). The burial of Osama bin Laden at sea provides a contemporary parallel. On a rhetorical level, the water and fire-imagery that pervades Bk VIII, and especially this section, contrasts to underscore the cruel extremes taken against the martyrs. (See below ἐναπορρῖψαι θαλάττη 8.6.7; also 8.12.5; 13.4; 14.13; 10.9.7; *MP(s)* 4.13; 5.3; 6.7; 7.2; *DMP* 15.3).

**VI. 7 γῆ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης κηδείας παραδοθέντας:** Under Roman law, officials could not prevent the bodies of criminals who had been executed from being buried (*Dig.* 48.24.1). The procurement of a martyr’s remains, however, could be difficult and was often carried out in secret, either because those engaged in the task risked martyrdom themselves or because officials sometimes in fact denied burial, in order to limit the veneration of martyr-relics. See Rebillard 2001: 95-100.

**ἀνορύξαντες:** *Violatio sepulchri* had been a serious religious and civil offense from archaic times and carried a pecuniary penalty until Septimius Severus made it a capital offense in the third century. Prior to Late Antiquity, laws were concerned more with the tomb itself as *res religiosa* than the *reliquiae* therein. By the late 3<sup>rd</sup>/early 4<sup>th</sup> century, however, profanation of cadavers had become its own crime, punishable by exile for *honestiores*, and condemnation to the mines or death for *humiliores* (see the extensive treatment in Rebillard 2001: 57-88). The new legal basis and harsher punishments may partly explain E’s zeal to condemn the imperial overlords as “tomb-robbers” (see τυμβωρύχοις 8.6.9).

**ἐναπορρῖψαι θαλάττη:** See τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέρριπτον βυθοῖς 8.6.6. Nicomedia also enjoyed a seaside location – the Gulf of Astacus in the Propontis – and may be the provenance of the martyrs mentioned above.

**οἱ νενομισμένοι δεσπόται:** Even the tombs of slaves were considered *loci religiosi* (*Dig.* 11.7.2), and though no law exists which required the burial of a slave, the master’s obligation to incur the expenses of a slave’s funeral, if conducted by a third party, implies the existence of a religious obligation on the part of the master to provide a fitting burial (see ἀνορύξαντες below; also Westermann 1955: 84).

**ἐν μνήμασιν ἀποκειμένουσ προσκυνοῖέν τινες:** Preventing the worship of martyrs was apparently a serious concern during the Diocletianic persecution (see τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέρριπτον βυθοῖς 8.6.6; Lactantius *DI* 5.11.6 concerning Galerius) and before (see, e.g., 7.11.10 for Valerian’s prohibition on visiting cemeteries). See also Rebillard 2001: 97.

**VI.8 οὐκ εἰς μακρόν:** i.e., in the Spring or early Summer of 303 (see μετ' οὐ πολὺ 8.2.5).

**κατὰ τὴν Μελιτηνὴν οὕτω καλουμένην χώραν:** Melitene was the capital of remote Armenia Minor (formerly part of Cappadocia) near the border of Armenia. Two martyrdoms took place there on May 3, 303 (Helpidius and Hermogenes in the Syrian Martyrology). Leadbetter 2009: 133 argues that these may be indicative of a larger uprising of Christians in the area – indeed neighboring Armenia had a large population of Christians (e.g., 9.8.2) – perhaps in response to the First Persecuting Edict, which would have arrived around this time. Mason 1876: 126 ff. connects the incident with a revolt in Armenia and Cappadocia described by Simeon Metaphrastes.

**αὐτὸ πάλιν ἄλλων ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἐπιφυῆναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ:** E may allude to the same uprising described by Libanius (*Or.* 20.17; 19.45): a band of soldiers who were working in Seleucia

revolted, due to ill-treatment, proclaimed their tribune, Eugenius, emperor, and marched on Antioch. Although the Antiochenes successfully defeated and killed the soldiers, Diocletian, strangely, executed a number of *curiales* in both cities. It is unlikely that the revolt involved Christians. Whether E misinterprets the event or refers to another uprising is unclear. See Leadbetter 2009: 133; Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 274.

**ἐτέρων... πεπειραμένων:** The genitive absolute obscures the precise relationship between the uprisings in Melitene and Syria and the issuance of the second edict, but it is clear that some connection exists (μετ' οὐ πολὺ 8.2.5). E alone mentions the uprisings and their bearing on the course of the persecution.

**τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας:** πανταχόσε is applicable only for the East, whether E is aware of this or not, for the second edict does not seem to have been promulgated in the western provinces (De Ste. Croix 1954: 76). E probably understands προεστῶτας in its most general sense (i.e., “leaders,” rather than “presidents;” see ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν τε καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν 8.6.9). On προεστῶς, see ὁ τηνικαῦτα προεστῶς Ἄνθιμος 8.6.6.

**πρόσταγμα ἐφοίτα βασιλικόν:** This is the Second Persecuting Edict, ordering the imprisonment of clergy; see also εἴθ' ὕστερον 8.2.5, where it is termed γράμμα. ἐφοίτα implies that it followed rapidly upon the first edict (perhaps as early as late Spring; see De Ste. Croix 1954: 76; also ἐπιφοιτησάντων 8.2.5).

**VI. 9 καὶ ἦν ἡ θέα τῶν... γινομένων πᾶσαν διήγησιν ὑπεραίρουσα:** The periphrastic construction (ἦν... ὑπεραίρουσα) with the emphatic placement of ἦν (Smyth 1857; 1961) increases the vividness of the statement, which carries the conviction of one who had witnessed the imprisonment of church officials firsthand. Indeed, E would have seen the incarceration of

the Caesarean clergy (*MP(s)* 2.4), including his mentor, Pamphilus (arrested November 307; martyred February 16, 310; *MP(s)* 7.4-7; 11.1-31), whom he visited in prison. E himself may have been imprisoned, perhaps while he was in Egypt between 311 and 313 (see Barnes 1981: 149; Athanasius *Apol. Sec.* 8.3; Eriphanus *Pan.* 68.8.3).

**ἐπὶ τούτοις:** This prepositional phrase proves tricky. It is normally interpreted temporally (e.g., Oulton 1927; McGiffert 1890), with the events of 8.6.8 serving as the logical antecedent (“after these things;” though, according to LSJ, the usage is somewhat rare). The antecedent could also be προεστῶτας, in which case we might translate ἐπὶ τούτοις as “against/to them.” An additive translation is possible too (“in addition to these things”).

**μυρίου πλήθους ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καθειργνυμένου:** For overcrowding in prisons, see ὡς μηδὲ χώραν ἔτι τοῖς ἐπὶ κακουργίαις κατακρίτοις αὐτόθι λείπεσθαι 8.6.9. This may partly explain the Third Persecuting Edict, which ordered the release of clergy who sacrificed, and the extreme measures employed by local officials (e.g., compelling people to go through the motions of sacrifice and lying about their performance to secure release; see ἐξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκέναι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο 8.3.4.).

**τὰ πανταχῆ δεσμοτήρια... πάλαι πρότερον ἐπεσκευασμένα:** E depicts the use of prisons to house clergy as a novelty that violates Roman custom (which is generally true; see ὡς μηδὲ χώραν ἔτι τοῖς ἐπὶ κακουργίαις κατακρίτοις αὐτόθι λείπεσθαι 8.6.9). The circumstances vaguely recall the account of Barabbas in the gospel narratives (Mt. 27.16-21, 26; Mk. 16.7-15), in which Pilate, at the behest of the Jewish mob, pardons the murderer (see ἀνδροφόνοις καὶ τυμβωρύχοις below) but sentences Jesus to crucifixion. Prisons were a dangerous place in which people could languish for long periods awaiting trial (Harries 2001: 119-120 outlines particular examples), but

Christians had by this time developed a *modus operandi* for ministering to their imprisoned brethren (see Krause 1996: 122-131).

**ἀνδροφόνους καὶ τυμβωρύχους:** Galerius and Diocletian are obviously implied from their recent actions in 8.6.6 (the mass murder of Christians) and 8.6.7 (the violation of the imperial servants' tombs). E stresses that it is they, not the Christian clergy, who should be imprisoned. The latter offense was particularly ironic, for τυμβωρυχία was a charge leveled at Christians from the beginning (e.g., Mt. 28:12-15).

**τότ' ἐπληροῦντο:** cf. *DMP* 15.5: *pleni carceres erant*.

**ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν τε καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν:** E gives us an idea of the intended scope of τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας in 8.6.8, by emphasizing that all clergy, from highest to lowest orders, were imprisoned. The descending order also underscores the absurdity of imprisoning low-ranking church officials (i.e., ἀναγνωστῶν τε καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν) while real criminals (i.e., ἀνδροφόνους καὶ τυμβωρύχους) go free.

**ὡς μηδὲ χώραν ἔτι τοῖς ἐπὶ κακουργίαις κατακρίτοις αὐτόθι λείπεσθαι:** In the Roman penal system, prisons were not generally the place for convicted criminals (κατακρίτοις) – unless they were awaiting the execution of a sentence – but for those awaiting trial (e.g., *Dig.* 48.3.2; 3.3; see also Mousourakis: 2007: 176-8). Overcrowding was a constant problem, even under normal circumstances, as the workings of Roman justice were often slow and malpractice common (Mousourakis 2007: 255 n.64; for a discussion of the topic in Late Antiquity, see Harries 2001: 120-22).

**VI. 10 αὐθις δ' ἐτέρων τὰ πρῶτα γράμματα ἐπικατελιηφότων:** i.e., the Third Persecuting Edict, issued in November 303 (see εἴθ' ὕστερον 8.2.5).

**τοὺς κατακλείστους θύσαντας μὲν ἔαν βαδίζειν ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας:** θύσαντας should be taken

conditionally: “if they sacrificed.” On the negative implications of ἐλευθερία, see ἐπὶ πλεόν ἐλευθερίας 8.1.7 and παρρησίας 8.1.1. For E’s experience of how this was implemented in Palestine, see 8.3.1-4.

**ἐνισταμένους δὲ μυρίαὶς καταξαίνειν προστέτακτο βασάνοις:** See πάση μηχανῇ 8.2.5; for the ill-treatment of church leaders, see 8.3.1-4 and *MP(s)* 1.3-4.

**τῶν καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν μαρτύρων:** Up to this point, Bk VIII’s narrative has been characterized by a loose chronology (the period of peace, followed by the outbreak of persecution, first in the army, then against all inhabitants, etc.). In 8.7.1 – 13.8, E largely abandons this chronological approach (perhaps with the exception of 8.11-12) in favor of a geographical presentation of martyrs in the various provinces.

**τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν καὶ τὸ Μαύρων ἔθνος Θηβαΐδα τε καὶ κατ’ Αἴγυπτον:** The provinces, beginning with Africa Proconsularis, are listed in counterclockwise order (cf. *MP(s)* 13.11-12, where the list begins in Libya). τῶν κατὰ...Θηβαΐδα τε καὶ κατ’ Αἴγυπτον can be explained as introducing the material which E will cover in 8.7-10 (i.e., the Egyptian martyrs in Phoenicia, those in Egypt, those in the Thebaid, and the extract of Phileas); the inclusion of τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν καὶ τὸ Μαύρων ἔθνος is more difficult to account for, since E does not discuss martyrs from North Africa anywhere in Bk VIII. In fact, it is unclear just how much he knows about martyrdoms in this part of the West (see Barnes 1981: 142-143). As De Ste. Croix 2006: 82 notes, E omits Numidia (although 10.6.1 shows that he was aware of its existence), the province with perhaps the most martyrs in North Africa during this period. It may be that the designation “Africa and Mauretania” was simply the contemporary way of referring to the western provinces of North Africa (e.g., Optat. Append. 3.205-206; see De Ste. Croix 2006: 82). By including this area, E gives the account an appearance of universality which it lacks even after the rewriting of

*MP(s)*. Since E recognizes that the persecution in the West lasted only two years (*MP(s)* 13.12), μαρτύρων...τὸ πλῆθος would seem to describe only those martyrs between 303 and 305.

**VII.1 τοὺς...ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ:** τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν must refer to the Egyptians who were martyred in different cities and provinces in the previous statement (see ἐξ ἧς καὶ εἰς ἑτέρας ἤδη προελθόντες πόλεις τε καὶ ἐπαρχίας διέπρεψαν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις 8.6.10). Indeed E has much first-hand knowledge (ἴσμεν) of martyrs in Palestine, specifically Egyptians (e.g., *MP(s)* 3.3; 8.1, 13; 10.1; 11.5-13; 13.1; *MP(l)* 3.4; 13.3-6, 10), but seems to have included no examples in 8.7, for the statement which concludes the section limits itself to martyrs in Tyre (Καὶ τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ ἀγὼν τῶν κατὰ Τύρον τοὺς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἄθλους ἐνδειξαμένων Αἰγυπτίων 8.8.1). The likely reason for the exclusion is that *MP(s)*, which once comprised Bk VIII, had given an extensive catalogue from the region, and the author wished to give a more universal and geographically diverse account in the revised second edition (Grant 1980: 12 outlines the relationship between *MP(s)* and *HE* 8; for the accepted theory of composition, see Burgess 1997: 497-503). Palestine came into existence under Hadrian, who, as punishment against the Jews following the Bar Kochba revolt (132-5), renamed Judaea Syria Palaestina (Gr. Παλαιστίνη from Heb. *pelesheth*, “land of the Philistines,” Israel’s historical enemy). From the time of Diocletian, it belonged to the diocese of *Oriens* and included the southern part of Arabia, which was probably annexed to the province in the 290’s (see Millar 1993: 191-193; *MP* 13.1-3 assigns the mines at Phaeno to Palestine, and *Onom.* 36.13; 112.8; 144.7 ascribes Petra variously to Palestine and Arabia). E was bishop of Caesarea, the provincial capital of Syria Palaestina, and so was the metropolitan bishop of Palestine.

**τοὺς ἐν Τύρῳ τῆς Φοινίκης:** Elsewhere E mentions only the martyrdom of Ulpianus at Tyre, who is confined to an ox-hide with a dog and an asp and thrown into the sea (*MP(s)* 5.1). Since

the account only occurs in *MP(s)* (c. 313), E may have witnessed this martyrdom during the same visit to Phoenicia in which he saw the Egyptians (see οἷς γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν 8.7.2). What E calls Phoenicia was officially Syria Phoenice, which was created in the 190's when Septimius Severus divided Syria into two provinces: Syria Coele (to the North) and Syria Phoenice (to the South), both part of the diocese of *Oriens* beginning with Diocletian.

**οὗς τίς ἰδὼν:** The antecedent of οὗς could be inclusive (the martyrs of both provinces), or limited to τοὺς ἐν Τύρῳ τῆς Φοινίκης, as the following description suggests. For the eyewitness nature of the account, see οἷς γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν 8.7.2.

**οὐ κατεπλάγη τὰς ἀναρίθμους μάστιγας:** E manipulates the language in this section to demonstrate, ironically, that it was the spectators who were struck down at the sight of the martyrs (see also καταπλαγῆναι δ' ἦν 8.7.4), though the latter received real lashings yet remained “un-struck” (see ἀκαταπλήκτω δὲ καὶ ἀτρεμεῖ διανοίᾳ 8.7.4).

**ἐν τούτοις:** Possible antecedents for τούτοις are οὗς (the martyrs), μάστιγας, and Παλαιστίνη and Τύρῳ; context makes οὗς the least likely (ἐνστάσεις already stands in relationship with τῶν...ἀθλητῶν, synonymous with οὗς); thus, it is either temporal, "amid these (lashes)," or locative, "in these places." The proximity of μάστιγας favors the former interpretation, as does the fact that E only accounts for the martyrs in Tyre (see τοὺς...ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ 8.7.1).

**τὰς...ἐνστάσεις:** This is a plural with an abstract substantive (Smyth 1000): "the acts of resistance."

**τόν τε παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὰς μάστιγας...ἀγῶνα:** cf. 5.1.38 (ὑπέφερον πάλιν τὰς διεξόδους τῶν μαστίγων τὰς ἐκεῖσε εἰθισμένας καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων ἐλκηθμοὺς) and *Pass. Perp.* 18 (*ad hoc populus exasperatus flagellis eos vexari per ordinem venatorum postulavit*). Both suggest that scourging was part of the established order of punishment before contests with beasts and

that the crowd played a part in its implementation. See also Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 157.

**ἐν θηρσὶν ἀνθρωποβόροις:** E views the consumption of human flesh as a barbarous (e.g., associated with Scythians in *PE* 1.4.6; *DE* 5.proem.14; *LC* 16.9), post-Fall behavior, contrary to God's law (*HE* 8.2.19; *DE* 4.10.2), and characteristic of pagan religion (e.g., Satan as ἀνθρωποβόρος in *PE* 7.16.3; also *DE* 1.6.55; 5.proem.11). That the epithet follows so closely on the description of Peter's martyrdom, with its cannibalistic and sacrificial language (see ὄξος 8.6.3), is hardly coincidental: E wishes to portray the persecuting authorities as man-eating beasts (cf. *MP(s)* 4.10; 7.2, for beast-like Urbanus; *MP(s)* 8.8; 11.16, for Firmilianus or Maximin?).

**ἐν τούτῳ:** ἀγῶνα is most likely the antecedent.

**παρδάλεων καὶ διαφόρων ἄρκτων:** E claims that spectacles attended by the emperors at Caesarea often included exotic animals from India, Ethiopia, or other places (*MP(s)* 6.2).

Presumably, all the animals to which the martyrs were subjected at Tyre could be found in the region. As references in Scripture suggest (e.g., Song of Sol. 4.8; Is. 11.6; Jer. 13.23; Dan. 7.6; Hos. 13.7; Hab. 1.8), the leopard (Gr. πάρδαλις, Heb. *namer*) was native to the Levant (see Pinney 1964: 114). We also have references to bears (Gr. ἄρκτος, Heb. *dov*; 1 Sam. 17.34-6, 2 Kings 2.24; Prov. 17.12; Is. 59.11; see Pinney 1964: 116).

**σῶν τε ἀγρίων καὶ...βοῶν:** ὄς or σῶς (Heb. *chazir*) is the boar. Ps. 80.13 (LXX 79.14) is probably the only place in Scripture which refers to the wild variety, as opposed to the domesticated pig, which is generally χοῖρος in NT (e.g., Mk. 5.13; but σῶς in 2 Pt. 2.22). On βοῶν, see ἠγγιωμένῳ τάρῳ 8.7.5.

**πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ κεκαυτηριασμένων:** This is an example of hendiadys (lit., "burned by a hot iron"). E probably refers to a branding iron or similar instrument used to agitate the animals (as

the *cauteris* in the inventory of Pall. *Op. Agr.* 1.42.3).

**τὰς πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν θηρίων θαυμασίους τῶν γενναίων ὑπομονάς:** πρὸς ἕκαστον can be translated "in the face of each," and τὰς... ὑπομονάς "examples of endurance." E often uses the adjective γενναῖος for things and people, Christian and otherwise, whom he generally admires. Its appearance here, however, is particularly effective, for it provides a striking contrast between the "high-born" martyrs (τῶν γενναίων) and the lowly beasts (τῶν θηρίων).

**VII.2 οἷς γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν:** E probably visited Phoenicia between 311 and 313 when Maximin renewed persecution in the East (see Barnes 1981: 148-149 for the evidence); thus his presence at the martyrdoms of the Egyptians in Tyre appears to date to this period. E has transitioned abruptly from an account of the beginning of the persecution (8.5-6 deals with events of 303) to events near the end of the persecution in the East (311-313), and in the process, included material from outside the chronological scope of Bk VIII.

**τὴν θεῖαν δύναμιν ἐπιπαροῦσαν ἐναργῶς τε αὐτὴν τοῖς μάρτυσιν ἐπιδεικνῦσαν:** E emphasizes the reciprocity of action between the martyrs, who offer divine testimony (τοῦ μαρτυρουμένου σωτήρος ἡμῶν), and God, who provides divine power and inspiration (τὴν θεῖαν δύναμιν; cf. θαυμασιωτάτην ὄρμην θεῖαν τε ὡς ἀληθῶς δύναμιν καὶ προθυμίαν 8.9.5). The recurring language of presence – both the author (παρῆμεν) and the divine power (ἐπιπαροῦσαν) are present – reinforces the real, eyewitness (ἱστορήσαμεν), and unambiguous (ἐναργῶς) nature of the event.

**τῶν ἀνθρωποβόρων:** See ἐν θηρσὶν ἀνθρωποβόροις 8.7.1.

**ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον μὴ προσψαύειν μηδὲ πλησιάζειν...ἐπιτολμώντων:** This type of behavior must have been quite common, as Ignatius of Antioch could entreat God to make the beasts eager to attack (*Ep. ad Rom.* 5). Since wild animals generally do not molest people, those used

in the arena had to be specially trained and starved in preparation, goaded with hot irons, and sometimes chained to their victim (see Kyle 2001: 186). Still, there was no guarantee they would attack, and enthusiastic crowd reactions like what we find in *Pass. Perp.* 21.2, when Satorus is attacked viciously by a leopard, seem to hint at the relative infrequency of deadly assaults. Naturally, Christian authors tend to attribute such passive behavior during contests to God, and in many cases, this indicates a special holiness on the part of the martyrs (Gilhus 2006: 191-195 discusses the “pious interpretations” of animal behavior during the contests).

**ὅσοι δῆπουθεν ἔξωθεν ἐρεθισμοῖς παρώρμων αὐτά:** ὅσοι... ἔξωθεν, which clarifies τοὺς ἄλλους, itself in contrast to τῶν θεοφιλῶν, is difficult to interpret. Indeed the indefinite adverb δῆπουθεν (a variant of δῆπου before a vowel, creating the rhyming δῆπουθεν ἔξωθεν) may indicate some uncertainty as to the group’s identity. On the one hand, we might translate the phrase “those outside the Church” (i.e., the non-believers who were among those condemned to the beasts). This meaning of ἔξωθεν is attested in E and other authors (e.g., 2.4.2; Orig. *Princ.* 3.1.4). By this interpretation, the provocations (ἐρεθισμοῖς) on the part of those in the arena would accord with the order given by the authorities to attract the beasts (κατασειόντων ἐπὶ τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπισπωμένων, τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐκελεύετο πράττειν 8.7.2). Yet we might also translate ἔξωθεν more literally as “those on the outside” (i.e., those who tend to the beasts from outside the arena). This interpretation is also valid, for other *Acta* report animals attacking those who were involved in the games but not condemned (e.g., *Pass. Perp.* 19.5).

**κατασειόντων ἐπὶ τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπισπωμένων, τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐκελεύετο πράττειν:** See τὰς μὲν χειῖρας ἐφαπλοῦντος εἰς σταυροῦ τύπον 8.7.4.

**μόνων δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀθλητῶν... μηδ’ ὄλως ἐφαπτομένων:** See ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον μὴ προσψαύειν μηδὲ πλησιάζειν... ἐπιτολμώντων 8.7.2.

**ἔσθ' ὅπη... δὲ πρὸς τινος θειοτέρας δυνάμεως ἀνακρουομένων:** ἔσθ' ὅπη = “in a way;” E tends to soften claims of divine agency with language of uncertainty (e.g., προθυμία θεία τινὶ 8.6.6, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως 8.7.4, etc.). The dramatic behavior of the animals has transformed what was simply divine power (τὴν θείαν δύναμιν 8.7.2) into something greater (θειοτέρας δυνάμεως). Note the change in subject (from martyrs to animals) of the genitive absolute following the adversative.

**VII.4 καταπλαγήναι δ' ἦν:** See οὐ κατεπλάγη τὰς ἀναρίθμους μάστιγας 8.7.1 and τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἐφαπλοῦντος εἰς σταυροῦ τύπον 8.7.4.

**τὴν... καρτερίαν:** For a discussion of the bodily aspects of endurance in Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman literature, see Shaw 1996: 269-312.

**ἡλικίαν... νέου:** Note the emphatic pleonasm (“the young age of the youth”); ἡλικίαν appears to be a deliberate choice on the stylistic level to preserve the alliterative couplets at the start of the period (ἑώρας... ἡλικίαν οὐδ' ὅλων ἐτῶν εἴκοσι δίχα δεσμῶν). E may also have in mind the use of ἡλικία in Eph. 4.13, where it denotes spiritual maturity in the fullness of Christ. This could naturally serve as a contrast here to the youth’s physical immaturity (note its juxtaposition with οὐδ' ὅλων ἐτῶν εἴκοσι). For a discussion of young martyrs in early Christianity, see Horn and Martens 2009: 239-246.

**δίχα δεσμῶν:** E emphasizes that the young man stood firm of his own accord (μηδ' ὅλως τε μεθισταμένου μηδ' ἀποκλίνοντός), not because he was bound in place, as often happened in executions involving animals. The account of Blandina’s contest with the beasts in Bk V includes many of the same elements present here: her body makes the form of the cross, the beasts do not touch her, and she prays ardently (5.41.1). The only difference is that she’s bound. We may wonder if this is a case of E’s trying to one-up the martyr of Lyons.

**τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἐφαπλοῦντος εἰς σταυροῦ τύπον:** For the interesting ways in which E employs ἀπλόω, see 8.2.4. Under the particular circumstances, in which the martyrs were ordered to attract the animals by waving their arms (γυμνῶν ἐστώτων καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν κατασειόντων ἐπὶ τῆς σφᾶς αὐτοῦ ἐπισπωμένων, τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐκελεύετο πράττειν 8.7.2), the gesture may have been intended as an act of rebellion (though we should note that the cross was not a common symbol of Christ before the late 320's). τύπον (cf. σταυροῦ σχήματι 5.41.1) – “the result of a blow,” thus “stamp” or “impression” – contrasts markedly with ἀκαταπλήκτω δὲ καὶ ἀτρεμεῖ διανοίᾳ (“un-struck and calm purpose”) which follows. The cross, not the wild beasts, has left its mark on the martyr.

**ταῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον σχολαίτατα τεταμένου λιταῖς:** This is a carefully wrought oxymoron which features σχολαίτατα standing in ironic juxtaposition to τεταμένου (special middle of τείνω) and πρὸς τὸ θεῖον (the lofty, philosophical concept of divinity), while τεταμένου plays on the language of “stretching” (see τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἐφαπλοῦντος εἰς σταυροῦ τύπον above).

**ἄρκτων καὶ παρδάλεων:** The pairing, which recalls the leopard-bear hybrid in Rv. 13.2, may have been particularly common in executions and beast-hunts (cf. *Pass. Perp.* 19.3-4), due to the contrasting strengths of the animals: the agile speed of the leopard versus the hulking strength of the bear. See also παρδάλεων καὶ διαφόρων ἄρκτων 8.7.1.

**θυμοῦ καὶ θανάτου πνεόντων:** The expression seems natural enough in Greek (θυμός is literally breath), but the inspiration is probably biblical: Acts 9.1 describes Saul as ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου, language which may be based on Ps. 17.16 (ἀπὸ ἐμπνεύσεως πνεύματος ὀργῆς σου). E's propensity to alliterate may account for the specific choice of words (see also θεία καὶ ἀπορρήτω δυνάμει below).

**θεία καὶ ἀπορρήτω δυνάμει:** This happens to be a favorite expression of E (e.g., 8.74; *DE*

3.6.9; 3.6.38; 9.17.11), who, according to the tendency of the period, often uses two adjectives instead of one (for which see Grant 1980: 142-144; also MacMullen 1962: 364-378).

**VII.5 πέντε γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἐτύχωνον:** This is an interesting detail which contributes both to the credibility of the account and to the debate on persecution death totals (see Introduction VI; also πλειόνων ἢ δέκα... ὑπὲρ τοὺς εἴκοσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀναιρουμένων ἤττον καὶ τριάκοντα... ἐγγύς που ἐξήκοντα... ἑκατὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ 8.9.3).

**ἠγριωμένῳ ταύρῳ:** The βόες of 8.7.1 are bulls, as is customary. *Pass. Perp.* 20.1 implies that the use of cows in the arena was unusual: *puellis autem ferocissimam uaccam ideoque praeter consuetudinem comparatam diabolus praeparauit, sexui earum etiam de bestia aemulatus.*

**ἄλλους τῶν ἔξωθεν προσιόντων:** See ὅσοι δῆπουθεν ἔξωθεν ἐρεθισμοῖς παρώρων 8.7.2.

**τοῖς κέρασιν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ρίπτων διεσπάραττεν:** Though some Christian texts speak of the whole consumption of martyrs by wild animals (e.g., Galerius' bears in *DMP* 21.5-6), Kyle 2001: 185-7 contends that this common view is not borne out by ancient art and literature. Rather the goal of exposing people to beasts was primarily mutilation, not ingestion, as E illustrates here (διεσπάραττεν; cf. σπαράττει 8.5.1).

**ἠμιθνήτας αἴρεσθαι καταλιπών:** For the importance of ἠμιθνής, see ἠμιθνής αἰρόμενος ὡς ἂν ἤδη νεκρὸς ἐρρίπτετο 8.3.2.

**κυρίττων δὲ τοῖς ποσίν:** This is technically catachresis, since the participle κυρίττων (“to butt with horns”) would more naturally take κέρασιν (in the next clause) than ποσίν.

**διὰ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν καυτήρων ἐρεθισμοὺς:** See πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ κεκαυτηριασμένων 8.7.1.

**πρὸς τῆς ἱεραῆς... προνοίας:** See Chesnut 1986: 33-64, which examines E's historiographical concept of providence.

**μηδὲ τούτου μηδὲν μηδαμῶς αὐτοὺς ἀδικήσαντος:** The triple negative underscores E's

insistence that the martyrs remained unharmed by the animals and is congruous with other triplets in the passage, particularly τοῦ πρώτου δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον προσαφίεσθαι 8.7.3.

**VII.6 μετὰ τὰς δεινὰς καὶ ποικίλας τούτων προσβολὰς:** This implies that, eventually, the wild animals were successful in their attacks.

**ξίφει κατασφαγέντες:** cf. *Pass. Perp.* 6.4, which shows that authorities might resort to the sword if they and the spectators grew impatient with animals that were slow to finish off their victims. While the weight of evidence supports the argument of Kyle 2001: 185-7 that, in fact, most martyrs were not killed by beasts but had to be finished off by other means, such as the sword, Gilhus 2006: 195-200 contends that animals did actually kill and consume martyrs on a regular basis, and that evidence to the contrary in the *Acta Martyrum* and elsewhere is motivated by theological considerations, including the common view that martyrs were sacrificial animals themselves (and hence must have their throats cut) and athletes who could not properly claim victory if consumed *in toto* during their contests.

**οἱ πάντες ἀντὶ γῆς καὶ τάφων τοῖς θαλαττίοις παραδίδονται κύμασιν:** cf. τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέριπτον βυθοῖς 8.6.6.

**VIII.1 τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ ἀγὼν τῶν κατὰ Τύρον...Αἰγυπτίων:** See τοὺς...ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ 8.7.1 and τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας γῆς μαρτυρήσαντας below.

**τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας γῆς μαρτυρήσαντας:** This probably refers, as Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 276 avers, to “the northern districts of Egypt,” for the present statement seems to contrast with the close of the preceding section (τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ ἀγὼν τῶν κατὰ Τύρον...Αἰγυπτίων; i.e., rather than Egyptian martyrs in Tyre, we now have Egyptian martyrs in their own land), and the region of the Thebaid (i.e., southern Egypt), which E clearly distinguishes from Egypt (Θηβαΐδα τε καὶ κατ’ Αἴγυπτον 8.6.10), is described in 8.9.1-5. In this way, E gives his account of Egyptian

martyrs a geographical continuity from North to South. For the difficulty created by E's account of the Theban martyrs in this regard, see οἱ κατὰ Θηβαΐδα μάρτυρες 8.9.1.

**ἄνδρες ἅμα γυναιξίν καὶ παισίν:** E escalates the rhetoric of brutality by including women and children among the victims of persecution. Female martyrs appear in our sources quite frequently; for a treatment of child-martyrs, see Horn and Martens 2009: 239-246.

**ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας:** Jesus the “teacher” plays an important role in E's view of salvation history outlined in the introduction to the *HE* (1.2-4; indeed, διδασκαλία occurs more than 600 times in the Eusebian corpus). Teaching is intimately linked to the central event in this narrative, the Incarnation, and to the preexistent qualities of Jesus as the Logos of the Father, who teaches humanity to receive the knowledge of the Father through the lawgivers and philosophers. Jesus then comes to teach the Father's piety (διδάσκαλον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς εὐσεβείας), a teaching which is described as new (καινὴν διδασκαλίαν; 1.2.23). *PE* 1.4 outlines the transformative power of Christ's teaching.

**τοῦ προσκαιροῦ ζῆν καταφρονήσαντες:** The juxtaposition with τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας above suggests that E has a particular teaching of Jesus in mind, perhaps the Parable of the Sower in Mk. 4.17 and Mt. 13.21, which describes those who have no firm root in the faith as πρόσκαιροί (“temporary”), faltering when oppression and persecution come about (for similar language, see also 2 Cor. 4.18, Heb. 11.25).

**μετὰ ξεσμοὺς καὶ στρεβλώσεις μάστιγας τε χαλεπωτάτας:** Corporal punishments of these types preceded sentences of aggravated death. See τὸν τε παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὰς μάστιγας...ἀγῶνα 8.7.1.

**οἱ δὲ πελάγει καταβροχθισθέντες:** For drowning as a form of punishment, see τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέριπτον βυθοῖς 8.6.6.

**τοῖς ἀποτέμνουσιν τὰς ἑαυτῶν προτείναντες κεφαλὰς:** Decapitation may have been more frequently employed as a punishment against Christians than our sources, which tend to focus on the gruesome and fantastic, lead us to believe. E offers some impressionistic evidence in this section on its frequency during Maximin’s persecution (see ὡς ἀμβλύνεσθαι φονεύοντα τὸν σίδηρον ἀτονοῦντά τε διαθλάσθαι 8.9.4). Kyle 2001: 248 contends that by the third century governors had begun to downplay Christian executions by holding “quiet decapitations outside the arena” to limit martyrs’ opportunities for “self-display.”

**οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐναποθανόντες ταῖς βασάνοις:** E’s remark breaks the continuity of his list of punishments and is probably intended rhetorically to give the impression of greater variety. We can see why Rufinus would omit it from his translation (see Christensen 1989: 62). While persons often died under torture in earlier periods, though usually not by design (e.g., *Dig.* 48.19.8.3), it was not until the third century that torture as an aggravated form of death seems to have gained official sanction (Robinson 2007: 191).

**ἕτεροι δὲ λιμῷ διαφθαρέντες:** The context does not favor classifying these as voluntary martyrs (i.e., death via hunger strike). All of the martyrs in this section meet their end due to the different forms of punishment meted out by the authorities, and this case seems to be no different. We might imagine a situation in which the victims are bound or imprisoned and deprived of food and water, such as in ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἰκρίων λιμῷ διαφθαρεῖεν 8.8.1. Indeed Rufinus appears to consider the latter a repeat of the present statement, as evidenced by its omission in his translation (see Christensen 1989: 62).

**καὶ ἄλλοι πάλιν ἀνασκολοπισθέντες:** ἀνασκολοπίζω (“to fix on a stake”) is sometimes used interchangeably with other verbs, such as ἀνασταυρόω (“to fix on the cross”) and προσηλόω (“to nail up”), which are often translated as “to crucify.” Such imprecise and inconsistent

terminology in our ancient sources has led to a debate on the definition of crucifixion (Samuelsson 2011 discusses the topic from a philological point of view). This section of the *HE* provides rare testimony for this type of punishment as used against Christians. Barnes 2010: 340-342 notes the dearth of evidence for the crucifixion of martyrs before the Great Persecution, particularly that of Maximin. Noting Theodulus' singular death by crucifixion in the *MP* and the difficulty in dating martyrdoms in Bk VIII of the *HE*, he concludes, "Eusebius can therefore safely be used only as evidence that freeborn Christians may have been crucified during the last paroxysm of violence against the Christians in the territories ruled by Maximinus" (Barnes 2010: 342).

**οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ σὺνηθες τοῖς κακούργοις:** Of course, the Romans also crucified average criminals in this way, but E wishes to exaggerate the brutality of the punishment against the Christians, while highlighting, in ironic fashion, the criminal nature of the authorities who implement this "uncustomary" punishment (e.g., see ἀνορύξαντες 8.6.7, where E hints that the authorities are tomb-robbers for digging up graves of the martyrs).

**οἱ δὲ καὶ χειρόνως ἀνάπαλιν κάτω κάτω προσηλωθέντες:** For the significance of inverted crucifixion in the *HE*, see γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι 8.6.2.

**τηρούμενοί τε ζῶντες:** Guards were often stationed at the site of crucifixions to ensure that the bodies were not removed prematurely for burial – perhaps they were sometimes left on indefinitely, to rot and be consumed by animals – and to prolong suffering by allowing the victims food and drink. This is quite different from the practice in Judaea, with which most people are familiar through the Gospels, where death was often hastened by the breaking of the legs and burial granted soon thereafter (see Kyle 2001: 169).

**εἰς ὅτε καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἰκρίων λιμῶ διαφθαρεῖεν:** In the present context, ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἰκρίων

should be translated “on the poles/stakes themselves.” E posits λιμός as the *causa mortis*, by which he probably means, above all, dehydration. This type of death could last up to several days.

**IX.1 Πάντα δ' υπεραίρει λόγον:** Christensen 1989: 62-63 notes the grammatical difficulty that arises from this expression: we have a singular verb whose logical subject (ὅς υπέμειναν αἰκίας καὶ ἀλγηδόνας, where αἰκίας καὶ ἀλγηδόνας are attracted into the accusative by the relative pronoun) is plural. He argues that this and the general and repetitive tone of the sentence up to καταξαινόμενοι, points to a compositional seam (see οἱ κατὰ Θηβαΐδα μάρτυρες below).

**οἱ κατὰ Θηβαΐδα μάρτυρες:** Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 276 makes a convincing argument that 8.9.1-5 was a later insertion, for both ch. 8 apparently, and 8.9-10 certainly, deal with martyrs in Lower Egypt, and so this passage, which focuses on Upper Egypt, breaks the geographical continuity of the narrative. This accords with Christensen’s observation above (Πάντα δ' υπεραίρει λόγον).

**ὄστράκοις ἀντὶ ὀνόχων...καταξαινόμενοι:** The language is reminiscent of Job 2.8, in which Job scrapes himself with a potsherd (καὶ ἔλαβεν ὄστρακον, ἵνα τὸν ἰχῶρα ξύη) after being afflicted with boils. Perhaps E makes the allusion to equate the sufferings of the martyrs with the Old Testament paragon. Sometimes the floors of prison were strewn with potsherds to lacerate the martyrs’ naked bodies when they sat and lay down (e.g., Vincent in Prud. *Perist.* 5.553). ὀνόχων probably refers to the “iron claw” (Lat. *ungulae*), an instrument of torture used for mangling the sides (for a description and illustration, see Gallonio 1903: 104-106); it also reinforces the connection which E maintains between the persecuting authorities and wild beasts (see ἐν θηρσὶν ἀνθρωποβόροις 8.7.1).

**γυναῖά τε τοῖν ποδοῖν ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀποδεσμούμενα:** γυναῖά, “little women;” the diminutive of γυνή

adds a pathetic quality to the account. Martyrs were suspended from stakes and crosses in various ways, and suspension could be combined with other forms of torture, such as fire and mutilation. Gallonio 1903: 1-23 offers an extensive treatment.

**μετέωρά τε καὶ διαέρια κάτω κεφαλὴν μαγγάνοις τισὶν εἰς ὕψος ἀνελκόμενα:** μάγγανα were pulleys or cranes used for hoisting (see also μαγγάνοις τισὶ 8.10.5); the double meaning of the term (“means for charming or bewitching,” according to LSJ) is related to another word frequently used by E – μαγγανεία, “trickery” – and gives the devices a sinister quality.

**γυμνοῖς τε παντελῶς καὶ μηδ' ἐπικεκαλυμμένοις σώμασιν:** The stripping of women was a common form of sexual humiliation in public spectacles and figures prominently in the *Acta* (e.g., *Pass. Perp.* 20.3; *Martyrdom of Agape, Irene and Chione* 5.8-6; *Acts of Saints Paul and Thecla* 33; see Shaw 1993: 7-9).

**θεῶν ταύτην αἰσχίστην καὶ πάντων ὀμοτάτην καὶ ἀπανθρωποτάτην τοῖς**

**ὀρῶσιν ἅπασιν παρεσχημένα:** cf. θαῦμα παρεῖχεν οὐ μικρὸν τοῖς θεωμένοις 8.7.3 for similar language, but a very different judgment. Unlike the earlier passage, where E wishes to underscore the manifestation of divine power, here it is pathos on one hand, and inhumanity on the other, that motivates his description. For the inhuman (ἀπανθρωποτάτην) and beastly qualities of the persecuting authorities, see ἐν θηρσὶν ἀνθρωποβόροις 8.7.1.

**IX.2 ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πάλιν δένδρεσιν καὶ πρέμνοις ἐναπέθνησκον δεσμούμενοι:** Sometimes crucifixion could take on elaborate forms, as in *Apul. Metam.* 8.22, where a slave is tied to a fig tree, covered with honey, and consumed by ants. Christianity's critics were aware of the central position of the cross and the Jewish polemic against Jesus based on Dt. 21:22-23 (“cursed is anyone hung on a tree;” e.g., *Contra Celsum* 6.34), and this may account, in part, for the use of crucifixion during the persecution under Maximin, whom E describes as a distributor of anti-

Christian propaganda (e.g., 9.5.1; for the infrequency of crucifixion in Christian texts, see καὶ ἄλλοι πάλιν ἀνασκολοπισθέντες 8.8.1).

**εἰς ἐκάτερά τε τούτων τὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ἀποτείνοντες σκέλη:** ἀποτείνω connotes “stretching,” rather than “fastening” (*pace* Oulton), and although fastening was undoubtedly involved, E probably intended to describe the stretching of the legs along the length of the branch. Such language accords with the device’s effect.

**εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἠφίεσαν τοὺς κλάδους φέρεσθαι φύσιν:** The passive of φέρω can often mean “to be carried away involuntarily;” thus the idiom ἴημι φέρεσθαι is translated “to let fly.” Here τὴν φύσιν contrasts with ταῦτό and means the tree’s “natural position” (i.e., branches apart).

**καθ’ ὧν ταῦτ’ ἐνεχείρουν ἐπινοοῦντες:** ἐπινοοῦντες implies that this elaborate method of torture did not produce its intended effect (i.e., ἄθρουν τῶν μελῶν διασπασμόν). According to Soc. *HE* 4.5, Soz. *HE* 6.8, and Theoph. *AM* 5859, Valens imposed this form of execution on the usurper Procopius in 366 CE.

**IX.3 ἐπὶ μακρὸν ὄλων ἐτῶν διάστημα:** Due to the muddled chronology, we are left to wonder which period of persecution E has in mind (that under Diocletian and colleagues or that under Maximin). Even if we knew, however, this phrase would add little to our present knowledge, since it is clear that both periods of persecution lasted a period of whole years in the Thebaid.

**πλειόνων... ἀναιρουμένων:** a loosely constructed genitive absolute: what follows is a case of anacoluthon, either apparent or real, for E deviates from the genitive absolute by introducing a finite clause (ἄλλοτε δὲ οὐχ ἦττον καὶ τριάκοντα... ἄνδρες... ἐκτείνοντο) that uses the same subject (at least the same logical subject) as the absolute construction.

**πλειόνων ἢ δέκα... ὑπὲρ τοὺς εἴκοσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀναιρουμένων ἦττον καὶ τριάκοντα... ἐγγύς που ἐξήκοντα... ἑκατὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ:** There seems to be a rationale behind these

numbers: the series increases by increments of ten until it reaches thirty; then the sum of the first three numbers provides the fourth value ( $10 + 20 + 30 = 60$ ), which is also the double of the third value; the final number fits less neatly into this scheme but offers an even round number, itself a product of ten, to end the series. Concrete numbers for martyrs from any period of the persecution are lacking. The lone exception is *Passio Petri* 7, which records 660 martyrs in Alexandria from Feb. 303 – Nov. 311. Barnes accepts the validity of this figure and estimates that several thousand people perished in the East between 303 and 313 (Barnes 2010: 139; for estimates, see also De Ste. Croix 1954: 102-104), a telling number given that the persecution there was much more severe than in the West. As regards E's numbers, context suggests that they apply to the persecution under Maximin (Nov. 311 – summer of 313; see αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενόμενοι 8.9.4). At any rate, the language of imprecision (πλειόνων ἢ, ὑπὲρ, ἤττον, ἐγγύς που), rhetorical tidiness of the figures, and obviously hyperbolic totals (e.g., 100 martyrs in one day vs. 660 in Alexandria during seven years of persecution) require us to take his testimony with a grain of salt.

**ἄνδρες ἅμα κομιδῇ νηπίοις καὶ γυναῖξιν ἐκτείνοντο:** See ἄνδρες ἅμα γυναῖξιν καὶ παισὶν 8.8.1. E ratchets up the descriptive intensity by implying that the child-martyrs were quite young (νηπίοις).

**IX.4 αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενόμενοι:** The implications of this and συνεωρῶμεν below (8.9.5) prove significant in light of the dramatic testimony in this section. We must ask two questions: first, to which sections do these apply (8.9.4-5 only or 8.9.1-5); and second, can we trust that E describes accurately what he purports to have witnessed, or that he even witnessed what he describes? The date also proves significant – the middle of 312 according to Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 276 – for it technically falls outside the scope of Bk VIII's chronology (see οἷς

γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν 8.7.2) and describes a new phase in the persecution, that under Maximin in the East. This means that the events which E recounts as an eyewitness here cannot be used to generalize about the earlier persecution under Galerius and Diocletian, even if E conflates the two (something he clearly does).

**ὡς ἀμβλύνεσθαι φονεύοντα τὸν σίδηρον ἀτονοῦντά τε διαθλάσθαι:** The rhetorical aspirations of the result clause are signaled immediately by the chiasm (see αὐτούς τε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ἀποκάμνοντας ἀμοιβαδὸν ἀλλήλους διαδέχεσθαι below). σίδηρος could denote an axe or a sword, though the latter seems officially to have been preferred in the imperial period (*Dig.* 48.19.8.1). Elsewhere, E specifies that decapitation happened by the sword (i.e., ξίφος; *MP(s)* 8.12). It was undoubtedly the blade itself that grew dull (ἀμβλύνεσθαι) and probably the wooden handle that shattered (διαθλάσθαι).

**αὐτούς τε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ἀποκάμνοντας ἀμοιβαδὸν ἀλλήλους διαδέχεσθαι:** The alliterative effect is apparent and probably influences vocabulary and structure (e.g., ἀναιροῦντας for οἱ βασανισταί 8.10.5). While scholars tend to take these statements as indicative of the intensity of the persecution in Egypt and the East (e.g., Frend 1967: 388) – E, after all, claims to have been present – the literary craftsmanship and hyperbolic quality urge caution.

**IX.5 ὅτε καὶ θαυμασιωτάτην ὀρμὴν θεῖαν τε ὡς ἀληθῶς δύναμιν καὶ προθυμίαν τῶν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ πεπιστευκότων συνεωρῶμεν:** cf. θεῖαν δύναμιν ἐπιπαροῦσαν ἐναργῶς τε αὐτὴν τοῖς μάρτυσιν ἐπιδεικνῦσαν 8.7.2.

**Ἄμα γοῦν τῇ κατὰ τῶν προτέρων ἀποφάσει:** In the current context, ἀπόφασις (lit., “a denial”) is a translation of the Latin *sententia*, a technical term referring to the sentence given by a judge. See Mason 1974: 25.

**ἐπεπήδων...ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι:** Note the paronomasia. Some have assumed these to be voluntary

martyrs (e.g., Droge 1995: 163), but the state of the individuals before the action described here is uncertain: were they free onlookers who confessed of their own accord or did they belong to the group already imprisoned? If the latter is the case, then the martyrs' actions were legitimate in the eyes of the Church (see Tabbernee 2007: 211). We might have expected that E, who was presumably a witness to these events (αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γινόμενοι 9.9.4), would have given us more information about the martyrs. Still, E's description makes it difficult to avoid the impression that these were true volunteers (see ἀφροντίστως...διακείμενοι 8.9.5).

**τῷ πρὸ τοῦ δικαστοῦ βήματι:** βῆμα = *tribunal*, i.e., the elevated platform on which the provincial governor sat in his judgment seat (*sella curulis*): used of Pilate in the Gospels (Mt. 27.19; Jn. 19.13); Herod in Acts 12.21; Gallio (proconsul of Achaia) in Acts 18.12, 16, 17; Festus (procurator of Judaea) in Acts 25.6, 10, 17; eschatologically (God's judgment seat) in Rom. 14.10, 2 Cor. 5.10. The typical Roman tribunal was probably about 1 to 1.25 m in height (Bablitz 2007: 30), such that one effectively had to "leap" in order to mount it.

**Χριστιανὸς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες:** 1 Pt. 12-19 lays the foundation for a link between martyrdom and the designation Χριστιανός. For a discussion of the time-honored confession *Christianus sum*, see Bremmer 1991: 11-20; see also Vittinghoff 1984: 331-57 for its implications.

**ἀφροντίστως...διακείμενοι:** Could ἀφροντίστως betray misgivings on the part of E about the martyrs' actions? E pairs this very adjective with ἄθεοι earlier in Bk VIII to describe the bad behavior of church leaders in the time leading up to the persecution (οἷα δέ τινες ἄθεοι ἀφρόνιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγούμενοι 8.1.8). Cf. E's somewhat ambiguous description of Euethius' martyrdom (ἅμα τε τοιαῦτα οἷα καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν 8.5.1). Such an interpretation, however, seems less likely here due to the fact that the point of view which E establishes is that of the spectator, not the objective observer: the behavior of the martyrs, which

includes leaping, bold speech, and merriment, undoubtedly struck the observers as rash and heedless under the circumstances, and as such, made it a marvel to behold.

**ἀκαταπλήκτως δὲ παρρησιαζόμενοι:** For the language of striking which permeates this section, see οὐ κατεπλάγη τὰς ἀναριθμούς μάστιγας 8.7.1. On frank speech before officials, see παρρησιαζόμενοις 8.1.3.

**μετὰ τε χαρᾶς καὶ γέλωτος καὶ εὐφροσύνης:** Reports of laughter, merriment, and joke-telling among martyrs facing death are common: e.g., Sabina (*Mart. Pionii* 7.5-6); Pamphylus (*Mart. Carpi et al.* 4.3); Perpetua et al. (*Mart. Perp.* 6.6); Lawrence (*Prud. Peristeph.* 2.401-8). Such insouciant behavior (ἀφροντίστως... διακείμενοι 8.9.5) usually confounds the presiding authorities.

**τὴν ὑστάτην ἀπόφασιν τοῦ θανάτου καταδεχόμενοι:** See Ἄμα γοῶν τῇ κατὰ τῶν προτέρων ἀποφάσει 8.9.5.

**ψάλλειν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας...ἀναπέμπειν:** For a discussion of Christian music in the late third and early fourth centuries, see Smith 2011: 189-222.

**IX.6 θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ:** cf. Jerome's notice on Phileas: *nobili genere, et non parvis opibus* (*De vir. Illust.* 78). Like Origen, E desired to counter pagan claims, still current at the time, that Christianity was a religion only of the ignorant lower classes (e.g., *Contra Celsum* 3.44). He has already given the examples of the imperial slaves, Dorotheus and Gorgonius, whom he also describes as marvelous (see Πάντων δὲ ὅσοι τῶν πρόποτε ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβοημένοι 8.6.1; see also πάντα γε μὴν δεύτερα θέμενοι 8.9.6).

**λόγῳ τε καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ:** See ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις 8.9.7.

**πάντα γε μὴν δεύτερα θέμενοι:** cf. μείζονα πλοῦτον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἤγηται τῆς τοῦ βίου δόξης καὶ

τροφῆς τοὺς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ὀνειδισμούς 8.6.1, which describes the imperial slaves, Dorotheus and Gorgonius.

**IX.7 οἶος Φιλόρωμος ἦν:** Philoromus, *PLRE* 1.698; E’s play on the prefix *phil-* furthers the apologetic purpose of this section (see θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ 8.9.6). We have two prominent individuals who are nominally “lovers,” *Philo*-romus (“lover of Rome”) and *Phil*-eas (“one who loves”), and who are described in such terms: Phileas is a lover of knowledge (λόγῳ τε καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ 8.9.6; ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις 8.9.7); both martyrs choose against the “love of living” (οὐδαμῶς πρὸς τῶν τοσοῦτων ἐπὶ τὸ φιλοζῶῃσαι μὲν ἐλέσθαι 8.9.8) contrary to the entreaties of their “loved ones” (ὅσων πρὸς αἵματός τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων 8.9.8); finally, both are described as having souls that “love God” (φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8). We have additional accounts of Philoromus and Phileas, known collectively as the *Acts of Phileas*, which survive in two forms: a Greek recension (known also as the *Apology of Phileas*), preserved in P. Bodmer XX (*Musurillo* II 2000: 328-345); and a Latin recension (*Passio Phileae* or *Acta Phileae et Philoromi*; *Musurillo* II 2000: 344-353), which also provides information on Philoromus’ martyrdom. We will refer to these by their designations in *Musurillo*: A (Greek), B (Latin).

**ἀρχὴν τινα οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τῆς κατ’ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως ἐγκεχειρισμένος:**

We cannot be certain about Philoromus’ position. While διοίκησις may refer to the department of finance – and according to Valesius, he was the *rationalis, seu procurator summarum Aegypti* (general finance minister of Egypt) – the more generic “imperial administration” (lit. “imperial diocese”) for βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως is perhaps best, for as McGiffert 1890: 330 n.2 notes, the uncertainty of τινα suggests not a specific position but a high office more generally, and other sources provide contradictory evidence: *Passio Phileae* (B 7.1) dubs him *tribunus Romanorum*,

and Rufinus' translation *vir agens turmam militum Romanorum*. See Barnes 1982: 183.

**μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τιμῆς:** ἀξίωμα, τιμή = *dignitas*; for a discussion of the Latin vocabulary of privilege, see Garnsey 1970: 221-233; τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους 8.2.4 provides a more thorough explanation of such terminology.

**ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος:** clearly “guarded by a bodyguard of soldiers,” but its interpretation is less straight-forward. Does this mean, as has been commonly assumed, that Philoromus was given a bodyguard to aid in his official business (see ἐκάστης ἀνεκρίνετο ἡμέρας below)? Or was he assigned a bodyguard after his arrest to prevent him from fleeing (something akin to house-arrest)? Both could be interpreted as signs of status, which is precisely what E wants to demonstrate here. Schwartz 1905: 176 advocates for the latter interpretation: “wenn er verhört wurde... militärisch eskortirt: es war eine Ehre die seiner Stellung galt.”

**ἐκάστης ἀνεκρίνετο ἡμέρας:** ἐκάστης... ἡμέρας is genitive of time within which: “each day.” Most translators have interpreted ἀνεκρίνετο as referring to Philoromus' official duties – e.g., Oulton translates, “used to conduct judicial inquiries every day,” in which case ἀνεκρίνετο would be middle. Yet the passive translation (“was interrogated”) is possible, if somewhat less plausible, and still makes sufficient sense in the context: due to Philoromus' high rank, he is not subjected to prison (see ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος above) and only interrogated during the day.

**Φιλέας τε τῆς Θμουϊτῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος:** Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis (modern day Tell Timai), in the Nile Delta of Lower Egypt. Christensen 1989: 66 questions whether E confused the identity of two persons named Phileas – presumably, the martyr-philosopher in Alexandria, whose *Acta* survive, and the martyr-bishop in Thmuis, whose letter he quotes. This seems unlikely, as the Greek recension of the *Acta* (according to Musurillo II 2000: xlvi, datable to the

early 300's based on script) clearly identifies him as bishop of Thmuis.

**ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις:** E connects the socio-political status and religious character of Phileas in this phrase: πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις could be rendered “for the public *munera* in his country” (hendiadys) and interpreted as referring to Phileas’ curial status (Gilliard 1984: 155n.7, whose conclusion is based on the witness of Libanius); in a Christian context, πολιτεία and λειτουργία have a wide semantic range, but could mean “disciplined life” and “charitable work” respectively (e.g., Vettius Epagathus in 5.1.9).

**ἐν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις:** “in his philosophical works.” None of these has survived, although his reputation as a philosopher seems to have been known among contemporaries: e.g., Culcianus questions Phileas about Paul’s relationship to Plato in the *Acta* (A 8.11-17; B 3.2).

**IX.8 μυρίων...ἀντιβολουόντων:** a concessive genitive absolute; ἀντιβολουόντων should be rendered “entreating,” with the accusative αὐτούς understood (as παρακαλοῦντος below).

**ὄσων πρὸς αἵματός τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων:** The *Acta* tell us that the relatives of Phileas who were present included his wife (6.1), children (A 9.7-10; B 3.3), and brother (11.3-4; 5.4). Others were present too: when his relatives entreated him to regard his wife and children, Phileas responded that “the apostles and the martyrs were his kin” (B 6.4).

**τῶν ἐπ’ ἀξίας ἀρχόντων:** “those who held high positions.” These are probably the lawyers (δικαιολόγοι; *advocati*), clerk (*officium*), and curator (λογιστής) mentioned in the *Acta* who endeavor to persuade Phileas to sacrifice (A 12.2, 8-10, 15-16; 13.1; B 6.4).

**πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ δικαστοῦ παρακαλοῦντος:** πρὸς is adverbial (“in addition”). The *Acta* identify τοῦ δικαστοῦ as Clodius Culcianus, prefect of Egypt from 303-306/7 (*PLRE* 1.233ff; succeeded by Sossianus Hierocles), to whom E imputes the deaths of many Christians during the persecution (*HE* 9.11.4; *MP* 5.2). In both recensions, Culcianus pleads with Phileas to sacrifice

(see below).

**ὡς ἂν αὐτῶν οἶκτον λάβοιεν φειδώ τε παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν ποιήσονται:** Such pleas accord with descriptions in the *Acta* (cf. B 3.3); for martyrdom's impact on children, see Horn and Martens 2009: 246-249.

**τῶν περὶ ὁμολογίας καὶ ἀρνήσεως τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεσμῶν:** E probably alludes to Mt. 10.32 and Lk. 12.8.

**ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ:** E is fond of juxtaposing secular and religious distinctions (e.g., Apphianus in *MP(s)* 4.5: πνεύματι δ' ὥσπερ θεῖῳ κατεσχημένος καὶ κατὰ τινα φυσικὴν, μᾶλλον δ' ἔνθεον καὶ ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν). He reinforces his apologetic purpose here (see θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ 8.9.6) by highlighting Phileas' worldly excellence ("manly reason and philosophy") only to subordinate it to his spiritual qualities ("pious and god-loving soul").

**πρὸς ἀπάσας τοῦ δικαστοῦ τάς τε ἀπειλὰς καὶ τὰς ὕβρεις ἐνστάντες:** cf. *Acta Phileae* (A I.6-9): μετὰ πολλὰς ὕβρεις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος καὶ θορύβου[ς] πολλοῦσ καὶ ὀστοκό[που]ς ὑπὸ τῶν λε[γιω-] ναρίων ὑπ[ὲρ] τ[έ]σσαρα κέντ[ρα].

**ἄμφω τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀπετμήθησαν:** The Latin recension of the *Acta* confirms the punishment: *infatigabiles amborum spiritus, ferro caesis ceruicibus, effugarunt* (B 9.3). While decapitation was the ordinary form of death for *honestiores* – Phileas was probably a Decurion (see ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείας τε καὶ λειτουργίας 8.9.7) and Philoromus a member of the imperial administration (see ἀρχὴν τινα οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως ἐγκεχειρισμένος 8.9.7) – the first edict, which dictated that Christians holding high ranks lose their privileged status, allowed even these to be tortured and to suffer aggravated forms of death (see τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους 8.2.4; Robinson 2007: 106). The penalty here had

likely more to do with the governor's sympathy toward Phileas.

**X.1 τῶν ἔξωθεν μαθημάτων ἕνεκα:** See ἐν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις 8.9.7.

**αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ παρίτω μάρτυς:** ἑαυτοῦ is objective genitive, and παρίτω is 3<sup>rd</sup> present imperative of πάρειμι (παριέναι): “let him come forward as his own witness.” Of course, E employs μάρτυς ironically here, for as the *Acta* show, Phileas was a martyr known for his elegant witness to the faith before Roman authorities. The enargeia and apostrophic tone heighten the anticipation for Phileas' own words.

**ἑαυτὸν ὅστις ποτ' ἦν, ἐπιδείξων:** A strange statement when one considers that the extract which E quotes provides almost no personal information about its author other than what can be gleaned through his style of writing and the description of the martyrs. See Christensen 1989: 67.

**τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ συμβεβηκότα μαρτύρια:** κατ' αὐτὸν, “in his time” (inexplicably, Oulton fails to translate this); on the dating of Phileas' martyrdom, see Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 276-277. Basically, since the letter implies the existence of the fourth edict (see ἢ μὴ θύοντα τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δίκην ἐκδέχεσθαι 8.10.10), Phileas' martyrdom must have taken place between 304 and 311 (Edict of Toleration); Culcianus, who interrogates Phileas in the *Acta*, was prefect of Egypt between 303 and 306/7, and in this range, we can exclude the period between May 305 and March 306, when the domains of Maximin experienced a hiatus in persecuting activity; furthermore a letter of Athanasius (*Ad Episc. Aegypt.* 22) states that the Meletian schism – against which Phileas wrote (see διὰ τούτων τῶν λέξεων 8.10.1) – began in 306; finally, the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* assigns Phileas' death to Feb. 4, which must be 307, for no persecution was taking place in Feb. 306.

**ἀκριβέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμεῖς:** That E himself can provide only general information about the

persecution in Alexandria and Lower Egypt (see ch. 8) and uses Phileas' letter as representative of the activity there is telling. It suggests that he witnessed very little of the persecution in this region and must defer to "more accurate" testimony. Ironically, for as much as scholars have criticized E for his disregard of historical accuracy, the concept itself is important to the historian (ἀκριβής and related forms occur 32 times in the *HE* alone; many such statements are self-reflective: see ὧν εἰς ἀκριβῆ διήγησιν τίς ἂν ἡμῶν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος 8.3.4). For E, especially in Bk VIII, accuracy is intimately connected with eyewitness account (e.g., ἐπ' ἀκριβές... ἱστορεῖν, τῶν δ' ὄψει τὰ πράγματα παρεληφότων ἴδιον ἂν γένοιτο 8.13).

**διὰ τούτων τῶν λέξεων:** This refers to a letter which Phileas wrote to his home congregation at Thmuis while he was imprisoned at Alexandria during the persecution (see τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ συμβεβηκότα μαρτύρια 8.10.1). The *Letter of Phileas* is preserved only here (8.10.2-10) and in Rufinus' abridged Latin version (see Musurillo II 2000: 320-327 for both). What E preserves is undoubtedly an excerpt, for it lacks the customary greeting, closing, and background information; Rufinus, who may have possessed the entire letter, states this explicitly: *scribens igitur ad Thmuitas idem Phileas post aliquanta haec refert*. While Phileas was known for his secular learning (see τῶν ἕξωθεν μαθημάτων ἕνεκα 8.10.1) – and Rufinus appears to know of other works (*si aliqua ex opusculis eius...inseramus*) – this letter and the *Epistle of Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus, and Phileas to Meletius* (Migne 10.1565; see also *HE* 8.13.7) are his only works which survive.

**X.2 τούτων ἀπάντων ὑποδειγμάτων ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπογραμμῶν καὶ καλῶν γνωρισμάτων ἐν ταῖς θεαῖαις καὶ ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς κειμένων:** Such biblical examples were likely discussed in the preceding section of the letter not quoted by E, judging by Phileas' predilection for quoting Scripture (see below).

**οἱ μακάριοι σὺν ἡμῖν μάρτυρες:** These presumably include the Egyptian bishops Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus (8.13.7), and perhaps even Philoromus (8.9.7).

**τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα...καθαρῶς τείναντες:** We can trace the idea of the soul's eye back to Plato (*Symp.* 219 A; *Rep.* 533 D; *Theaetetus* 164 A; *Sophista* 354 A). Its currency in Middle Platonic works (it appears dozens of times in Philo's writings; and in the precise expression used here: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνωτέρω θεοῦ, πρὸς ὃν εἴ τις τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα τείνας, *De Abrahamo* 58.4) made it a natural expression for Christian intellectuals, including Clement of Alexandria and Origen. cf. Mt. 6.22; Lk. 11.34.

**ἀπρὶξ τῆς κλήσεως εἶχοντο:** ἅμα δὲ καὶ παρορμῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπρὶξ ἔχεσθαι 8.10.11.

**Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εὐρόντες ἐνανθρωπήσαντα δι' ἡμᾶς:** E employs ἐνανθρωπέω with frequency: e.g., *PE* 1.3.8; *DE* 4.13.2; 4.16.10; 5.5.4; 5.22.1; 6.11.3; 9.7.4.

**ἴνα πᾶσαν μὲν ἀμαρτίαν ἐκκόψη:** In this striking expression (cf. *Hermas* 61.4), Phileas relates the violence of torture applied to the martyrs (ἐκκόψη) to the abolition of sin through Christ.

**ἐφόδια δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν εἰσόδου ἡμῖν κατάθηται:** cf. 2 Pt. 1.11: οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; also Clem. Alex. *Ecl. Proph.* 12.1.

**οὐ γὰρ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ... θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ:** This is a quotation from Phil. 2.6-8, which omits part of verse 7 (i.e., ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος between λαβῶν and καὶ σχήματι) and of verse 8 (i.e., γενόμενος ὑπήκοος between ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν and ἕως – μέχρι in the original – and θανάτου).

**X.3 ζηλώσαντες τὰ μείζονα χαρίσματα:** cf. 1 Cor. 12.31 (ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα).

**οἱ χριστοφόροι μάρτυρες:** While the adjective χριστοφόρος does occur in earlier Christian literature, especially in the corpus of Ignatius (e.g., *Epist.* 1.9.2; *Mart. Ign.* 5.1), Phileas offers

the earliest pairing of χριστοφόρος and μάρτυς. E never uses the word χριστοφόρος. On χριστοφόρος as a mark of spiritual distinction in the early Church, see Rapp 2005: 57-60.

**τῶν δορυφόρων κατ' αὐτῶν φιλοτιμουμένων:** cf. φιλοτιμότερον ἐπενόουν, αἰεὶ ταῖς καινότερον ἐφευρισκομέναις αἰκίαις 8.12.7.

**τὸ τὴν τελείαν ἀγάπην ἔξω βάλλειν τὸν φόβον:** cf. Jn. 4.18 (ἀλλ' ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον).

**X.4 ἀνέσεως γὰρ οὐσης ἅπασιν τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐνυβρίζειν:** Mob violence was a common feature of early persecutions: e.g., in the first century, the first martyr, Stephen, was stoned by an angry Jewish mob (Acts 7.54 – 8.2); in the second century, Christians in Lyons were beaten, dragged, and stoned (5.1.7); in mid-third-century Alexandria, during the Decian persecution, confessors were beaten, stoned, immolated, and thrown from roofs (6.41.1-9).

**ξύλοις... ῥάβδοις... μάστιξιν... ἰμᾶσιν... σχοινίοις:** See τὸν τε παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὰς μάστιγας... ἀγῶνα 8.7.1. The *Acta* confirm that Phileas too experienced such treatment (A 2).

**X.5 περὶ τὸ ξύλον ἐξηρτῶντο:** Oulton 1932: 280 matches E's vagueness in his use of “gibbet” to translate ξύλον. Indeed the term has a variety of potential meanings when referring to an instrument of torture – it means anything wooden – including tree, stake, cross, stocks, executioner's table, and a very common, yet not-easily-reconstructed device called the wooden horse (Latin *equuleus*, sometimes rendered equally ambiguously as *robur*; see Prud. *Perist.* 5.109-112 for a vivid description; it is essentially a beam supported by four legs at the end of which pulleys were attached: see Gallonio 1903: 38-60). Based on the description here, we can be fairly certain that τὸ ξύλον is the *equuleus*, for the hands were commonly bound behind the back (ὀπίσω τῷ χεῖρι δεθέντες), which, along with the legs (πᾶν μέλος), were stretched by ropes attached to pulleys (μαγγάνοις τισὶ διετείνοντο) on each end of the stand, suspending the body

horizontally and thus exposing the front (τῶν πλευρῶν... τῆς γαστρὸς καὶ κνημῶν καὶ παρειῶν) to the torturers' instruments.

**πολλὴν τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ κακίαν ἔχουσα:** Phileas contrasts the κακία (the opposite of ἀρετή and ἀνδρεία) of the spectacle with the virtues exhibited by the martyrs under torture. See τὴν ἀρετὴν...ἀνδρείαν 8.10.4.

**ἕτεροι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς μιᾶς χειρὸς ἐξηρητημένοι αἰωροῦντο:** The account of the martyrs Shmona, Guria, and Habbib records examples of this type of punishment (see κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἐκ τοῖν ποδοῖν εἰς ὕψος ἀναρτωμένων 8.12.1); the martyr Antonia was hung by the arm for three days (see Gallonio 1903: 11-12).

**ἄλλοι δὲ πρὸς τοῖς κίοσιν ἀντιπρόσωποι ἐδοῦντο:** See Gallonio 1903: 21-22 for the mechanics of this form of torture.

**X.6 τοῦθ' ὑπέμενον, οὐκ ἐφ' ὅσον προσδιελέγετο οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἐσχόλαζεν:** If we may believe the *Acta*, Culcianus (see below) was quite chatty during his interrogation of confessors: e.g., he engaged in debates with Phileas about philosophy and religion.

**ὁ ἡγεμών:** i.e., Clodius Culcianus, prefect of Egypt; see πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ δικαστοῦ παρακαλοῦντος 8.9.8. The following description explains why he was regarded as such a fierce persecutor. See 9.11.4, where E relishes in his death.

**ἀφειδῶς δὲ κελεύων καὶ τοῖς δεσμοῖς προσιέναι:** Schwartz proposes the emendation προστιθέναι for προσιέναι, as the latter makes little sense in the context (Schwartz 1908 II: 762).

**κατατεθεμένους εἰς τὴν γῆν ἔλκεσθαι:** cf. καὶ τις αὖ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμενος... μακρὰν ἐσύρετο τοῖν ποδοῖν 8.3.3.

**X.8 ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου κείμενοι, διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων ὀπῶν διατεταμένοι ἄμφω τὸ πόδε:** Here ξύλον is clearly the stocks, a device of torture intended for confinement and stretching of the

legs. Ancient sources indicate that this was a long, heavy beam of wood set on the ground, with as many as five holes, into which the feet of victims were placed and stretched at great intervals (cf. 5.1.27; see also Acts 16:24; Origen stretched to four holes in 6.39). We are told in *Acta A 1* that Phileas endured this torture “beyond the fourth peg.”

**ὡς καὶ κατὰ ἀνάγκην αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου ὑπτίους εἶναι:** Normally, one would be able to sit upright in the stocks, as only the legs were bound. The martyrs’ injuries here prevented even this respite.

**ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν φέροντες τῶν βασάνων τὰς ἐπινοίας:** This may be an allusion to Gal. 6.17: ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω; cf. also *DE* 3.4.51.

**X.9 τῇ καρτερίᾳ καταισχύοντες τὸν ἀντίπαλον:** Note the wrestling imagery, which is common in Bk VIII (e.g., 8.4.2, 4; 8.17.1).

**οἱ δὲ ἡμιθνήτες ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ συγκλειόμενοι:** The use of ἡμιθνής here, in the context of torture and prison, may go a long way toward explaining E’s intended meaning of the adjective at ἡμιθνής αἰρόμενος ὡς ἂν ἤδη νεκρὸς ἐρρίπτετο 8.3.2.

**οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς θεραπείας ἀνακτήσεως τυχόντες τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ:** cf. the description of prison conditions in the account of the martyrs of Lyons (5.1.27-28). The care mentioned here probably came from those who visited the confessors. Krause 1996: 122-131 explains how Christians ministered to their brethren in prison.

**τῇ τῆς φυλακῆς διατριβῇ θαρσαλεώτεροι ἐγίνοντο:** hendiadys, “long duration of captivity;” for discussions of the Roman prison system, see τὰ πανταχῆ δεσμοτήρια... πάλαι πρότερον ἐπεσκευασμένα; ὡς μηδὲ χώραν ἔτι τοῖς ἐπὶ κακουργίαις κατακρίτοις αὐτόθι λείπεσθαι 8.6.9.

**X.10 ἐφαψάμενον τῆς ἐναγοῦς θυσίας ἀνενόχλητον εἶναι, τῆς ἐπαράτου ἐλευθερίας παρ’ αὐτῶν τυχόντα:** cf. τοὺς κατακλείστους θύσαντας μὲν ἔαν βαδίζειν ἐπ’ ἐλευθερίας 8.6.10, which

describes the third edict; for the negative connotations of ἐλευθερία, see ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας 8.1.7; for its contrast with παρρησία, see παρρησίας 1.1.1.

**ἢ μὴ θύοντα τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δίκην ἐκδέχεσθαι:** Scholars (Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 277 et al.) have taken this as indicative of the fourth edict, yet the letter does not specify whether the martyrs were all members of the clergy, which, if true, would not preclude the third edict. Note also the similarity of language above. This makes the dating of the letter to 303 possible, if unlikely (see τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ συμβεβηκότα μαρτύρια 8.10.1).

**ὁ γὰρ θυσιάζων... θεοῖς ἑτέροις ἐξολοθρευθήσεται:** Ex. 22.19 (LXX): ὁ θυσιάζων θεοῖς θανάτῳ ὀλεθρευθήσεται πλὴν κυρίῳ μόνῳ. Phileas quotes the same verse before Culcianus in *Acta B* 1.1.

**οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ:** Ex. 20.3, reproduced faithfully from LXX.

**X.11 φιλοσόφου τε ὁμοῦ καὶ φιλοθέου:** For the significance of the *phil-* prefix, see οἶος Φιλόρωμος ἦν 8.9.7; also ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8.

**πρὸ τελευταίας ἀποφάσεως:** Phileas was beheaded. The *Acta Phileae* presumably record the moment of Phileas' final sentence (see οἶος Φιλόρωμος ἦν 8.9.7).

**ὑπὸ τὴν δεσμοτικὴν ἔθ' ὑπάρχων τάξιν:** We cannot be sure whether Phileas experienced the same horrid prison scenes which he describes in his letter or instead suffered a lighter form of detention, perhaps like Philoromus (see ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος 8.9.7). The abstract expression δεσμοτικὴν... τάξιν (“prison arrangement”) in lieu of the more concrete δεσμοτήριον, suggests the latter; so too his curial status, the consideration which he receives from the governor during trial, and his literary activity while in prison (i.e., the *Epistle of Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus, and Phileas to Meletius*, PG 10.1565; see also *HE* 8.13.7).

**τοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ παροικίαν ἀδελφοῖς ἐπεστάλκει:** i.e., to his congregation at Thmuis; Phileas was detained at Alexandria (8.10.1).

**ἄμα μὲν τὰ ἐν οἷς ἦν, ἀνατίθημι:** E's choice of verbs, ἀνατίθημι, is not the most obvious for the intended meaning of "relate." It becomes more meaningful when we consider that E's aim in 8.13.1 is to proclaim ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις (on/among the monuments of the pious) the church leaders who bore witness in famous cities. E lists Phileas as one of these (8.13.2), and thus the Egyptian's letter here is a dedication of his own monument (a more natural meaning of ἀνατίθημι) of witness.

**ἄμα δὲ καὶ παρορμῶν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπρὶξ ἔχουσιν:** cf. ἀπρὶξ τῆς κλήσεως εἶχοντο 8.10.2; 3.36.4; 8.6.4; *DE* 3.5.63.

**X.12 ἀλλὰ τί χρὴ πολλὰ λέγειν...ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην:** A similar statement occurs only two sections later at the beginning of 8.12.1. It appears that we have a compositional seam here, for E breaks the account of individual martyrs of distinguished rank, which the section on Adautus continues in 8.11.2, to introduce the example of the Phrygian city whose inhabitants were massacred by soldiers.

**μάλιστα τῶν οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμου δὲ τρόπῳ πεπολιορημένων:** Although E seems to use *koinos nomos* in a general sense elsewhere (e.g., as "common custom" in *VC* 3.60, and "common law of nature" in *HE* 8.13.12), he probably means something akin to *ius gentium* here (*Inst.* 1.2.1 for the distinction between *ius civile* and *ius gentium*), the Roman conception of a universal law of peoples which developed from the Greek (e.g., Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 1.10.3) and specifically Stoic notion (e.g., Cicero *De Rep.* 3.33) of common law. The apparent meaning is that Christians were assailed both through laws (i.e., the four persecuting edicts) and through military attacks (e.g., the Phrygian city in 8.11.1; also 9.8.2, where Maximin makes war on the Armenia because of its large Christian population), but we should note that the martial language (πεπολιορημένων) here applies to both law and war. Indeed throughout Bk VIII, E describes

the persecution as a war against Christians which begins with the Church's war with itself (8.1.7) and Galerius' own warlike attitude toward the Church (8.4.2, 4) and results in the Empire's devolving into war (13.9, 13; 16.1; 8.app.4). In fact, E seems to be directing the narrative toward the account of the latter in 8.13.

**XI.1 ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὐτανδρον:** The sense of ὅλην is perhaps intentionally ambiguous: it can be taken with Χριστιανῶν (“composed *entirely* of Christians;” as Oulton), where the town's Christian population is emphasized, or with πολίχνην, its proper grammatical counterpart (“the whole city”), which underscores the size of the military undertaking. As the diminutive of πόλις, πολίχνη generally designates a small town, and E seems careful in the *Onomasticon* to distinguish between κῶμαι (villages), πολίχναι, and πόλεις (Hirschfeld 1997: 37; although there are only five πολίχναι mentioned in *Onom.*: Asdod, 20.19; Gabe 70.8; Iampeia 106.20; Gaza 130.8; Sebaste 154.22). Barnes has rejected Ramsay's conjecture of Eumeneia on the basis of the city's size (i.e., larger than a πολίχνη; Barnes 1981: 358 n.72; Mitchell 1993 II: 40-41 agrees with Ramsay) – Chastagnol's conjecture of Orcistus may be more plausible (Chastagnol 1981: 410-411; for the Orcistus inscription, see *CIL* III.7000, *MAMA* VII.305; see also λογιστής τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν καὶ ὅλῳ δήμῳ 8.11.1) – but we should note that E himself appears uncertain about the town's status (he refers to it as πόλιν below, which agrees with Rufinus' *urbem quandam*; furthermore, BDM reads πόλιν here rather than πολίχνη). Further complicating our picture is Lactantius, who apparently refers to the same incident – *unus in Phrygia, qui universum populum cum ipso partiter conventiculo concremavit* (*DI* 5.11) – but whose language does not necessitate the destruction of an entire town, only the Christian population therein (and its place of assembly?). According to Barnes 1982: 358 n. 72, the *unus* in Lactantius' account may have been the *praeses* of Phrygia et Caria (see below),

whose name has been removed from *IGRR* 4.814 and *AE* 1932.56. On the date, see τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν 8.11.1.

**ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν:** It was probably the early fourth century (301-305?) when Diocletian divided the province of Phrygia et Caria into Phrygia Prima (Pacatiana) and Phrygia Secunda (Salutaris). See Barnes's interpretation of the Verona List (Barnes 1982: 215). Phrygia was the target of early missionary activity (Acts 2.10; 13.14; 16.6; 18.23), and its large Jewish population from the Hellenistic period (Joseph. *Ant.* 12.3.4) seems to have facilitated the spread of the new religion. Christians may have comprised the majority of Phrygia's population by the end of the third century. See Mitchell 1993 II: 57-64 for an analysis of the sizeable epigraphic evidence and for population estimates. Rufinus (*HE* 9.6) quotes Lucian of Antioch as evidence for cities in Asia Minor which were entirely Christian.

**ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὀπλίται:** No special meaning attaches to ὀπλίται in the context. It simply means "heavily armed soliders."

**πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες κατέφλεξαν:** In *DMP* 12.4-5, Galerius and Diocletian debate whether the church in Nicomedia should be set on fire. Diocletian prevents this, arguing that it might also cause part of the city to burn. Might Diocletian's worry have been realized in this case? If the fire was initially limited to the church but spread to the rest of the city, it would give the impression that the military force intended to burn the entire city. See αὐτοῖς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἐπιβοωμένοις below. A policy of burning churches/cities may have resulted from the burning of the palace in Nicomedia (see τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν 8.11.1).

**αὐτοῖς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἐπιβοωμένοις:** This favorite expression of E, which he often uses to emphasize the entirety of a population, especially in descriptions of

brutality against Christians (e.g., 3.5.4; 8.6.6; 8.1; 9.3; 9.8.1), further clarifies αὐτανδρον above. The pleonasm in this passage (ὅλην... πολίχνην, αὐτανδρον, πανδημει πάντες, ὅλω δήμω) underscores E's two main points: 1) all the inhabitants of the town were Christian; 2) the entire population of the town was destroyed. Lactantius' account (*DI* 5.11), however, suggests a different interpretation of the event. It may have been that the entire Christian population of the town gathered in the local church (as in Gibbon's interpretation), which per the first edict (see τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν 8.11.1) was destroyed, but with the Christians inside. E's description of women and children "calling upon God" fits a place of worship, and the destruction of churches seems to have necessitated a military force (*DMP* 12.2 depicts praetorians in battle line attacking the church at Nicomedia; see ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὀπλίται 8.11.1). For the means of destruction, see πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες κατέφλεξαν above.

**λογιστής τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν καὶ ὅλω δήμω:** λογιστής = *curator civitatis*, the chief executive of the city who represented the imperial administration but was at this time chosen from the city's curial class; στρατηγοὶ = *duumviri* (Mason 1974: 11, 87, 161), i.e., the primary elective officials of the city; τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν = magistrates; δῆμος simply means "people/inhabitants." For the rise of Christians into the curial class in the third and fourth centuries, see Rapp 2005 183-188. The municipal structure proposed here corresponds with that described in *MP* 9.1-3 (Caesarea, a *colonia*) and may argue against an identification with Orcistus on the basis of size. On the other hand, E's uncertainty as to the town's designation (see ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὐτανδρον 8.11.1) may suggest a town whose status has changed, like Orcistus' transition from *civitas* to *vicus* (3<sup>rd</sup> century) and back to *civitas* in 325 (*vicus* = πολίχνη?).

**τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν:** Although the statement implies the fourth edict and thus a date after Jan. 304, we must remember that E has a penchant to use such language imprecisely. It is more convincing to situate this episode in the context of the uprisings in Syria and Melitene and the burning of the palace in Nicomedia following the issuance of the first edict (as Mason 1876: 129-130). Also possible, but less likely, is that the E preserves a proper (if only approximate) chronology from the death of Phileas (ca. 307) to the issue of Maximin's directive (ca. 307/8) in 8.12.8-10 (see *τινες τὴν πεῖραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἐλθεῖν* 8.12.2).

**XI.2 Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀξίας:** See μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τιμῆς 8.9.7.

**τοῦνομα Ἀδauκτος:** *PLRE* I: 12-13. Adauctus has a name befitting his position (*adauctor* = “an augments”).

**γένος τῶν παρ' Ἰταλοῖς ἐπισήμων:** In his Latin translation, Rufinus goes to some trouble to tie Adauctus directly to the city in Phrygia mentioned above, even describing him as the *auctor et dux* (interesting terminology in light of the martyr's name) and victim of the Christian witness there. Apparently, his aim is to make explicit the connection which E fails to make. But how did Adauctus, an Italian imperial finance minister, end up in a backwater of central Asia Minor? According to Rufinus, he was there performing his official duties as *rationalis* when he led the populace by his example in the confession of Christ. E, however, may not intend this connection: Christensen 1989: 58-59 argues convincingly that 8.11.2 was originally a continuation of 8.9.7 and thus of the account of individual martyrs of high distinction (hence the segue, *καὶ τις ἕτερος*, awkward in its present context).

**διὰ πάσης προελθὼν ἀνὴρ τῆς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι τιμῆς:** *παρὰ βασιλεῦσι* = “under the emperors,” marking his position as an imperial appointment. Given Diocletian's administrative

tendencies and E's emphasis here on upward mobility, Adactus was probably from the equestrian order and made his way to the rank of *perfectissimus* (Jones: 1986: 525-6; see τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις... μαγιστρότητος τε καὶ καθολικότητος below).

**τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης μαγιστρότητος τε καὶ καθολικότητος ἀμέμπτως διελθεῖν:** cf. 7.10.5: Macrianus is ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων... βασιλέως. Two offices are indicated: μαγιστρότης (or “office of magister;” Latin root *magistr* + Greek suffix -ότης) = *magister summarum rationum*; and καθολικότης = *rationalis summarum rationum* (see Hirschfeld 1905: 38 and Jones 1986: 50, 376, especially 71 for an explanation of the positions).

**διαπρέψας τοῖς ἐν θεοσεβείᾳ κατορθώμασιν:** Here is yet another example of the distinction which E maintains throughout Bk VIII between the worldly and spiritual successes of high-ranking martyrs (see ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8).

**τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου διαδήματι:** Although a person in Adactus' position would not have worn a diadem – the headgear, however, was coming into vogue among emperors, including Constantine and Licinius, at this time (see Canepa 2005: 198-199) – on a symbolic level, its use here further contrasts his earthly power with the newly acquired heavenly glory (cf. Rev. 12.3; 13.1; 19.2; also *DE* 4.17.19, where Jesus is said to be crowned with the diadem of his Father's Divinity: τῷ τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος στεφανοῦται διαδήματι).

**ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ καθολικοῦ πράξεως:** E likes to play on the various meanings of καθόλου, which occurs in three forms in this section (see τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις... μαγιστρότητος τε καὶ καθολικότητος 8.11.2): e.g., in 7.10.5, Macrianus is the general finance minister (ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων... βασιλέως) with no concern for the general well-being (οὐδὲν εὐλογον οὐδὲ καθολικὸν ἐφρόνησεν). By this statement, E clearly means that Adactus held the position of

*procurator summae rei* when he was martyred (see γένος τῶν παρ' Ἱταλοῖς ἐπισήμων 8.11.1 for Rufinus' interpretation) but we might also say that he, unlike Macrianus, died while engaged “in the very business of the common good,” another possible translation.

**XII.1 τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμεῖν ἢ τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας ἀναζωγραφεῖν:** cf.

διαφόρους ὑπέμειναν θανάτους 8.8.1, which introduces a similar list. Judging from the examples which we can extrapolate, the tortures which E ascribes to particular locales seem to be culled from specific, perhaps isolated, instances from the martyr-acts at his disposal rather than representative of the geographical prevalence of such forms. E is fond of alliterative couplets (see ἡλικίαν 8.7.4; also τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὴν μνήμην 8.12.2), and this may explain ἀναζωγραφεῖν, a rare verb in the Eusebian corpus (it occurs only four other times: *Epist. Ad Const. Aug.* PG 20.1548.21; *Comm. in Ps.* PG 23.620.56; *DE* 10.8.92; *Ant. Mart.* PG 20.1532.50).

**πέλυξιν ἀναιρουμένων, οἷα γέγονεν τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀραβίας:** Decapitation by the axe was a Republican form of punishment still used in the early Empire (*Sen. Ira* 2.5.5; *Rev.* 20.4); it recalls the *fascēs*, a bundle of wooden rods surrounding an axe which was carried by the lictors accompanying a magistrate (Josephus *JW* 2.365-66; *Livy* 2.5.8). Although the sword had come to be the official mode of death in the Empire (see Robinson 2007: 106; also ὡς ἀμβλύνοσθαι φονεύοντα τὸν σίδηρον ἀτονοῦντά τε διαθλάσθαι 8.9.4), the axe, as part of the *fascēs*, was traditionally a symbol of Roman power and domination. The old Severan province of Arabia had undergone considerable changes under Diocletian; for a discussion of the difficulties in delineating the province, see Barnes 1982: 213-215; Millar 1993: 192-3; also τοὺς...ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ 8.7.1).

**τὰ σκέλη κατεαγνυμένων, οἷα τοῖς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ συμβέβηκεν:** By the time of Diocletian, Cappadocia was much smaller than the old Severan province, which apparently had been divided into five parts: Pisidia, Cappadocia, Armenia Minor, Pontus Polemoniacus, and Pontus (or Diospontus), the last four in the diocese of Pontica (Barnes 1982: 216). Unfortunately, E does not name these martyrs, and we have no other notice of them.

**κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἐκ τοῖν ποδοῖν εἰς ὕψος ἀναρτωμένων:** For inverted crucifixion, see γυμνὸς μετάρσιος ἀρθῆναι 8.6.2. As Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 277-278 points out, E here alludes to the Edessan martyrs Shmona, Guria (Nov. 15, 309) and Habbib (Sept. 2, 310). For text and translation, see Burkitt 2007. It is Shmona who is hung by the foot and left hanging for three hours.

**μαλθακοῦ πυρὸς ὑποκαιομένου τῷ παραπεμπομένῳ καπνῷ τῆς φλεγομένης ὕλης ἀποπνιγομένων:** Habbib was to be burnt by a slow fire (Burkitt 2007).

**οἷα τοῖς ἐν Μέσῃ τῶν ποταμῶν ἐπήχθη:** The provinces of Mesopotamia and Osroene, which had resulted from Severan expeditions against Persia in the early third centuries, existed as separate entities under Roman rule in the early fourth century (Barnes 1982: 221).

**ρίνας καὶ ὄτα καὶ χεῖρας ἀκρωτηριαζομένων τὰ τε λοιπὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη τε καὶ μέρη κρεουργουμένων:** Such activity can probably be dated to c. 307/8 (Frend 1967: 379), as *MP(s)* 8 assigns to the sixth year of persecution the imperial directive of Maximin ordering the mutilation of martyrs in his domains. The language of butchering (e.g., κρεουργουμένων) and roasting (ἐσχάραις πυρὸς... κατοπτωμένων 8.12.2) is a common theme in Bk VIII (see ὄξος 8.6.3).

**οἷα τὰ ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἦν:** Christensen 1989: 90 regards the mention of mutilations in Alexandria as anticlimactic after the brutal tortures and killings attributed to the same city by Phileas' letter (8.10.2-10). Given E's propensities, however, there is likely a specific martyrdom

which underlies and explains his general depiction here. As Alexandria fell within Maximin's domain, it naturally felt the effects of the emperor's policy of mutilation begun in 307/8.

**XII.2 τῶν ἐπ' Αντιοχείας ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὴν μνήμην:** The verb contributes both to the fire imagery and to the alliterative coupling in the passage (see ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμεῖν...αἰκίας ἀναζωγραφεῖν 8.12.1). Antioch was the capital of the diocese of Oriens and the provincial capital of Syria Coele. From the third century, Antioch had been the most important city of the East militarily, and emperors often used it as a base from which to attack Persia and defend the eastern provinces. As such, Galerius had his imperial residence there (293-296), so too Diocletian (299-302) and Maximin Daia (305-306; 309-311; 312-313; see Barnes 1982: 49, 61, 65). Considering its importance to both, it is no surprise that Antioch was a center of conflict between Christians and government during the persecution. Eusebius also mentions Romanus, a deacon and exorcist in Caesarea, who was martyred at Antioch in 303 (*MP* 2.1). See Downey 1961 and Wallace-Hadrill 1985 for the definitive scholarly treatments of the city.

**ἐσχάραις πυρὸς... κατοπτωμένων:** See ἐσχάρα 8.6.3 for the type of hearth and its sacrificial connotations.

**οὐκ εἰς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μακροῦ τιμωρία:** This phrase draws attention to the blurring of the once separate categories of torture and punishment which began to take shape in the third century. For the extension of *summum supplicium* to death by torture, see Robinson 2007: 106, 191.

**τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ πυρὶ καθιέντων:** E probably means the early fourth-century martyr Barlaam (ca. 304), who takes Jesus' exhortation in Mt. 5.30 seriously when he is forced to hold a libation over the flames of the altar; though his hand is consumed, he does not betray his faith by letting the offering drop. Our principal sources on his life are Basil of Caesarea (*In Barl.* PG 2861;

31.483-90 although the attribution is considered spurious), Chrysostom (PG 50.675-682), and Severus of Antioch (*Hom. 73: PO 12.372-8*). E apparently sides with the tradition that his martyrdom took place in Antioch (*contra* Basil in PG 31.484). Delehayé 1903: 129-145 provides the standard treatment of the martyr and the identification with E's account. The plural *καθιέντων* draws attention to Rufinus' version, which speaks of two young men who were forced to sacrifice after they had been taken prisoner. When led to the altars, they placed their hands in the fire so as to indicate their failure to sacrifice. The dissimilarity between Rufinus' account and the *passio* of Barlaam casts doubt on the certainty of Delehayé's identification (see Christensen 1989: 90-91).

**τινες τὴν πείραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἐλθεῖν:** This statement may be helpful in providing a more precise date for the martyrdoms of Barlaam (τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτῷ πυρὶ καθιέντων above), Pelagia (ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὑψηλῶν δωμάτων ἑαυτοὺς κατεκρήμνισαν below), and Domnina, Berenice, and Prosdoce (τις ἱερὰ καὶ θαυμασία 8.12.3). The circumstances seem to match those described in *MP 4.8*, where Maximin is said to have ordered the enforcement of sacrifice among the urban population by use of census lists (which made possible the active pursuit of fugitives). Thus the date would be sometime in 306/7. There exists a general agreement, albeit impressionistic, between 8.12 and *MP 4-8* as regards the severity, focus, and trajectory of persecuting activities. This suggests that we might trust E's chronology here, even though he gives us little reason to do so in other sections of Bk VIII.

**ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὑψηλῶν δωμάτων ἑαυτοὺς κατεκρήμνισαν:** E may have in mind the example of Pelagia, an Antiochene virgin who Chrysostom states committed suicide by jumping from a roof to avoid prostitution (*Hom. in S. Pelag. I and II: PG 50.577-84*). Ambrose's statement in *De Virg. 3.7.34* may establish a link between Pelagia and Domnina, Berenice, and Prosdoce, the

martyrs described below. He states that Pelagia's mother and sisters drowned themselves in order to preserve their chastity. Van Hooff 1990: 73-77 treats jumping as a *modus moriendi*: he calculates that "there are 21 Roman historical examples of jumping" and attributes the embarrassment of late fourth-century Christianity toward this type of death to the Donatists, "of whom some were said to have thrown themselves from the rocks in order to reach the status of a saint."

**τὸν θάνατον ἄρπαγμα θέμενοι τῆς τῶν δυσσεβῶν μοχθηρίας:** cf. Phil. 2.6; also Chrysostom PG 50.639.54-6; See τις ἱερὰ καὶ θαυμασία below.

**XII.3 τις ἱερὰ καὶ θαυμασία:** We learn from Chrysostom that this is Domnina, who is martyred with her daughters during the early years of the persecution (see τινες τὴν πεῖραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἐλθεῖν 8.12.2). Chrysostom wrote two panegyrics devoted to the family: *Hom. in SS. Bernic. etc* (PG 50.629-40); *Hom. in Quatrid. Lazarum et SS. Domnina etc* (PG 50.641-4).

**τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν, τὸ δὲ σῶμα γυνή:** There exists a strong dichotomy in this passage between soul and body, male and female, where manly attributes, such as the Greek notion of excellence (ἀρετή), are associated with the soul, and female qualities, such as physical beauty (ὄρα καὶ ἀκμῆ), with the body. E considers Domnina and her daughters exceptional due to their masculine virtues, and the language he employs consistently brings these to light. For a discussion of women in E's writings, see Clark 1992: 256-269. cf. Chrysostom's account (PG 50.635.6-10): καὶ γὰρ ἐν γυναικείῳ σώματι ἀνδρῶν ἐπεδείξαντο φρόνημα, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἀνδρῶν ἐπεδείξαντο φρόνημα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴν ὑπερέβησαν τὴν φύσιν, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀσωμάτους δυνάμεις τὴν ἄμιλλαν ἔθεντο.

**πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ εὐδοξίᾳ παρὰ πᾶσι βεβοημένη:** E states that the women's wealth, birth, and reputation were celebrated by all, but the failure of Chrysostom to highlight these details in his account suggests rather that it is E's own apologetic concern to demonstrate worldly prominence in his martyrs (as we have noted previously; see ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8). For similar language, see also Πάντων δὲ ὅσοι τῶν πώποτε ἀνυμνοῦνται θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβοημένοι 8.6.1 and θαυμασιώτεροι οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ 8.9.6.

**παίδων ξυνωρίδα παρθένων:** i.e., Bernice and Prosdoce; see ἄλλην δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας ξυνωρίδα παρθένων 8.12.5. ξυνωρίς (= συνωρίς; lit., a pair of horses) is rarely used in the Eusebian corpus and only in reference to animals (e.g., quoted in *OC* 13.1; *Comm. in Isa.* 1.79.69, 91, 102). Perhaps E wishes to create a horse-racing metaphor (the pair of virgins would represent the two-horse chariot) to reinforce the competitive imagery of martyrdom.

**θεσμοῖς εὐσεβείας ἀναθρεψαμένη:** cf. Chrysostom (PG 50.635.41-3): Σὺ δὲ μὴ παραδράμῃς ἀπλῶς ἀκούων, ὅτι ἐξῆλθον γυναῖκες ἐλευθερίως ἀνατραφεῖσαι, μηδέποτε πείραν λαβοῦσαι τῶν δεινῶν τούτων.

**ὁ περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος:** The same evil trio – envy (φθόνος οὐδέ τις δαίμων πονηρὸς οἷός τε ἦν βασκαίνειν οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλαῖς 8.1.6), demons (τὸ προδοῦναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῇ τῶν δαιμόνων δουλείᾳ 8.12.3), and humans (τὰ μέλλοντα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δεινὰ 8.12.3) – appears at the beginning of Bk VIII as actors in the events which result in the Great Persecution. For the significance of κινέω, see ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνοι 8.1.7. What exactly φθόνος means in this context is unclear. Perhaps it refers to the ill-will directed against the daughters for their station and fame.

**πολὺς...πάντα τρόπον...περιειργάζετο:** The pleonasm highlights the extremes to which the authorities (the embodiment of φθόνος) went in pursuit of the women. We should note that the verb περιειργάζομαι apparently occurs in Maximin's directive of 307/8 (8.12.8) – which initiates his policy of punishing Christians by non-lethal means – to describe the period of intense persecution immediately preceding the order. This provides another link between the events described in this section and those of 306/7 (see *τινες τὴν πεῖραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἔλθεῖν* 8.12.2).

**ἀνιχνεύων λανθανούσας:** According to Chrysostom, Domnina's husband betrayed her location and accompanied the soldiers on their journey (PG 50.637.61).

**ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς αὐτὰς διατρίβειν:** This was Edessa (PG 50.636.30).

**δικτύων...στρατιωτικῶν εἴσω περιβέβληντο:** The recurrence of *περι* as preposition (ὁ *περὶ* αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος) and prefix (*περιειργάζετο*; *τά τε σώματα περιστείλασαι κοσμίως τοῖς περιβλήμασιν*) in this account is deliberate. It heightens the drama of the women's plight by emphasizing, on the one hand, that they are persistently surrounded by their enemies, and on the other, that they are lacking the customary surroundings by which their chastity is protected (i.e., the walls of the bedchamber, locks, servants, etc; Chrysostom explicates this point more fully and uses similar language in PG 50.636.9-17; see *τά τε σώματα περιστείλασαι κοσμίως τοῖς περιβλήμασιν* 8.12.4).

**ἐν ἀμηχάνοις:** cf. PG 50.636.22-23: *μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἐβάδιζον*

**τὰ μέλλοντα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δεινὰ:** It is clear that the threat is to the women's chastity (*τό τε πάντων δεινῶν καὶ ἀφορητότερον, πορνείας ἀπειλήν*). *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* has been taken, reasonably enough, to refer to the guards. There is nothing explicit, however, in E's or Chrysostom's account to mark the guards as a credible threat. Rather, E must mean condemnation to public

prostitution (as πορνεία below probably indicates; Chrysostom perhaps alludes to this in PG 50.639.56-62), which appears to have been a common punishment during persecution (Prud. *Peristeph.* 14.21-60, esp. 21-30; according to Soc. *HE* 5.18.1-14, Theodosius put an end to forced public prostitution in 391 CE; see Lenski 2011: 235-260 for condemnation to slavery during the Great Persecution).

**τῷ λόγῳ παραθεῖσα:** Although both E and Chrysostom portray Domnina as a philosopher, the latter does so on the basis of her actions and endurance (i.e., suffering the death of her daughters; PG 50.640.6) rather than her philosophic wisdom and speech (see ὁμοῦ τῇ γνώμῃ συνθέμεναι 8.12.4).

**τὸ προδοῦναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῇ τῶν δαιμόνων δουλείᾳ:** cf. Chrysostom (PG 50.637, 28, 34, 39).

**μίαν τούτων ἀπάντων εἶναι λύσιν...τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγήν:** cf. Chrysostom (PG 50.636.20-21): εἶχον γὰρ τὴν ἀληθινὴν ὁδὸν τὴν πρὸς οὐρανὸν αὐτὰς ἄγουσαν; Chrysostom defends the women's decision to flee to Edessa by quoting the standard biblical proof (i.e., Mt. 10.23; PG 636.36-42). He also praises their intelligence in knowing when to flee and when to stand firm in contest (by which he means their suicide; PG 50.638.6-16). By contrast, E portrays even their suicide as a form of flight.

**XII.4 ὁμοῦ τῇ γνώμῃ συνθέμεναι:** Chrysostom downplays any definitive assent on the part of the daughters, instead emphasizing the mother's role in dragging them into the river (PG 50.638.30-42; 639.14-39).

**τά τε σώματα περιστείλασαι κοσμίως τοῖς περιβλήμασιν:** Naturally, the ancients would remove their clothing before swimming or bathing, not put on their heaviest garments (περιβλήμα could refer specifically to the *palla*). The counterintuitive behavior of the women underscores their exemplary modesty. On the recurrence of the περι- prefix in this section, see ὁ

περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος 8.12.3. Chrysostom claims that the women, in their selfless care for others, left their shoes on the bank to show that no one was complicit in their escape and thereby to ensure that the guards would not be punished (PG 50.640.34-36).

**ἐπ' αὐτῆς μέσης γεινόμεναι τῆς ὁδοῦ:** This was at Hierapolis (modern-day Membij in Syria), a city in the province of Syria approximately midway on the journey between Edessa and Antioch. Chrysostom considers this a fitting place of departure for the martyrs on their journey to the true “holy city” (i.e. the heavenly Jerusalem), a contrast he probably felt needed to be made, since Hierapolis was so called due to its being the cultic center of the Syrian Goddess, Atargatis (PG 50.638.17-19; see Lightfoot 2003). No river runs through the city proper, so the reference below must be to the Euphrates (approximately 10 miles to the East).

**φύλακας εἰς ἀναχώρησιν ὑποπαραιτησάμεναι:** Perhaps a common tactic for women, based on the evidence of E (cf. Apollonia in 6.41.7: ὑποπαραιτησαμένη βραχὺ καὶ ἀνεθεῖσα; Sophronia in 8.14.17: ἐς βραχὺ ὑποπαραιτησαμένη). According to Chrysostom, the women, possibly aided by the father and husband who betrayed them, slipped away from the soldiers while the latter were eating and drinking (PG 50.638.19-23).

**ἐπὶ παραρρέοντα ποταμὸν ἑαυτὰς ἠκόντισαν:** The verb ἠκοντίζω, which means literally “to hurl a javelin,” is of a piece with the masculine form of death attributed to Domnina and her daughters and adds a Lucretian quality to their suicide. For a discussion of the paradigm of Lucretia and its place in Christianity, see van Hooff: 1990: 50. Chrysostom portrays their drowning as a second baptism (PG 50.638.42-639.14).

**XII.5 Αἶδε μὲν οὖν ἑαυτάς:** While E seems to approve of the women’s suicide, the omission of the verb is an obvious euphemism designed to avoid stating explicitly that the martyrs killed themselves. It thus betrays the same uneasiness and ambivalence about the issue which other

Christian authors echo (e.g., Augustine is otherwise decisive, but the present example, which he considers in *De civ. Dei* 1.26, causes him doubt).

**ἄλλην δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας ξυνωρίδα παρθένων:** These martyrs are otherwise unattested.

For the language, see παίδων ξυνωρίδα παρθένων 8.12.3.

**τὰ πάντα θεοπρεπῶν...θαυμαστῶν τὴν σπουδῆν:** E's description of these martyrs is similar to that of Berenice and Prosdoce above. The asyndeton and pleonasm are more exaggerated here, which may make up for the lack of information.

**ὡς ἂν μὴ φερούσης τῆς γῆς τὰ τοιαῦτα βαστάζειν, θαλάττῃ ρίπτειν ἐκέλευον οἱ τῶν**

**δαιμόνων θεραπευταί:** See τοῖς θαλαττίοις ἐναπέριπτον βυθοῖς 8.6.6. Rufinus' account parallels that of Domnina and daughters even more closely. He states, *contra* E, that the girls cast themselves into the sea to preserve their chastity (*non ferentes violari publicis edictis ac legibus castitatem, marinis se fluctibus demersere*).

**XII.6 καλάμοις ὀξέσιν τοῖν χεροῖν ἐξ ἄκρων ὀνύχων τοὺς δακτύλους διαπειρόμενοι:** lit., “being pierced with sharp reeds as to the fingers from the tips of the nails on both their hands,” a passive participle (διαπειρόμενοι) with accusative of respect (τοὺς δακτύλους) and dative of instrument (καλάμοις ὀξέσιν), a construction that is repeated in the following clause. This was perhaps a common form of torture in Asia Minor: similar tortures are recorded for Boniface in Tarsus during the persecution under Diocletian and Maximian (c. 307; Ruinart 1859: 325-332); also the deacon Benjamin in Persia (Theod. *HE* 5.38).

**πυρὶ μολίβδου διατακέντος, βρασσοῦση καὶ πεπυρακτωμένη τῇ ὕλῃ τὰ νῶτα καταχεόμενοι:**

The use of hot liquid as a form of torture or execution is attested in our sources: *Passio*

*Potamiaenae et Basilidis* 4; *Prop.* 4.7.38; *Prud. Peri.* 229-230; pouring molten lead down the

throat is Constantine's punishment for nurses complicit in the abduction of a girl for marriage (CTh 9.24.1.1).

**XII.7 διά τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων...μελῶν τε καὶ σπλάγγνων...ἀσυμπαθεῖς καὶ οὐδὲ λόγῳ ῥητὰς...πάθας:** Note the emphatic pleonasm (ἀπορρήτων, οὐδὲ λόγῳ ῥητὰς) and oxymoronic quality of ἀσυμπαθεῖς...πάθας (lit., “sufferings without feeling”).

**οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ νόμιμοι δικασταὶ:** In an ironic reversal of roles, E now shows the judges to be members of a contest. This he does by applying to them the vocabulary previously associated with martyrs in Bk VIII to make a contrast between the two forms of competition. Thus the judges here are γενναῖοι (just as the martyrs who fought the beasts in 8.7.1) and νόμιμοι (as the θεσμός-abiding martyrs Phileas and Philoromus in 8.9.8 and Berenice and Prosdoce in 8.12.3).

**τὴν σφῶν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δεινότητα, ὥσπερ τινὰ σοφίας ἀρετὴν:** Whereas God demonstrates his divine power to the martyrs during the contest in 8.7.2 (τὴν θεῖαν δύναμιν ἐπιπαροῦσαν ἐναργῶς τε αὐτὴν τοῖς μάρτυσιν ἐπιδεικνῦσαν), and the martyrs themselves provide clear proof of divine power in 8.12.11 (θείας ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀπορρήτου δυνάμεως ἐμφανῆ δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰ τεκμήρια παρεστήσαντο), the judges show their “cleverness” or rather “terribleness” – E probably intends the *double entendre* – “like some virtue/manliness of wisdom” (cf. Domnina's manliness of soul τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν 8.12.3; also Phileas' manly philosophy ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ 8.9.8).

**φιλοτιμότερον ἐπενόουν, αἰεὶ ταῖς καινότερον ἐφευρισκομέναις αἰκίαις:** The competition is undertaken quite ambitiously (φιλοτιμότερον), but E surely intends some wordplay on the idea of the love of punishment (φιλο-τιμῆ). E defines the contest as the discovery of ever newer tortures. This contrasts with the repeatedly new examples of contests offered by the godly martyrs (καινοτέρας ἐπὶ καινοτέραις τῶν ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην θεοπρεπῶν μαρτύρων ἀθλήσεις

8.10.12) but is also characteristic of the behavior of persecutors (e.g., τοὺς κεκαινουρημένους ἐπ' αὐτοῖς πολυτρόπους θανάτους 8.6.1).

**ὥσπερ ἐν ἀγῶνος βραβείοις:** cf. Dorotheus and Gorgonius' prizes of divinely inspired victory (τῆς ἐνθέου νίκης ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα) in 8.6.5.

**ΧΠ.8 τὰ δ' οὖν τῶν συμφορῶν ἔσχατα:** It is difficult to interpret ἔσχατα, which has a broad semantic range, including “farthest extent” (spatial), “greatest extreme” (degree), “last” (sequential), “end” (temporal), etc. (LSJ s.v. ἔσχατ). We can naturally exclude the sequential and temporal translations, since this point in the narrative (ca. 307/8) clearly does not mark the end of the persecution. In light of the intense punishments which precede (8.12.6-7) and the mitigation of persecution which follows, it seems most plausible that ἔσχατα is backward-looking (i.e., to the culmination of past events in the present) and carries the sense of degree (perhaps the sense is spatial too, considering the topic of the section: ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης 8.12.11); thus “it was at the height of these misfortunes.”

**λοιπὸν ἀπειρηκότες ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν κακῶν ὑπερβολῇ:** The perfect participle of ἀπολέγω is used absolutely here and means “to give up” or “to lose heart” (LSJ s.v. ἀπολέγω). E gives a sense of what he means by τῇ τῶν κακῶν ὑπερβολῇ in the atrocities described in 8.12.6-7 (see also ὡς μηδὲν μὲν ἔτι δοκεῖν δεινὸν καθ' ἡμῶν περιεργάζεσθαι 8.12.8 for the idea as expressed in official language).

**πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν ἀποκαμόντες:** cf. αὐτούς τε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ἀποκάμνοντας ἀμοιβαδὸν ἀλλήλους διαδέχεσθαι 8.9.4. cf. *MP(s)* 11.14, where the judge becomes weary from torture.

**πλησμονήν τε καὶ κόρον τῆς τῶν αἱμάτων ἐκχύσεως ἐσχηκότες:** E charges the persecutors not only with cannibalism (ὄξος 8.6.3), but also with gluttony (Galerius' πολυτροφία in 8.16.4).

**ἐπὶ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτοῖς χρηστὸν καὶ φιλόνηρον ἐτρέποντο:** For E, Jesus was the embodiment of φιλόνηρος insofar as the Logos appeared throughout history in human form (1.2.21), especially in the Incarnation. By extension, this quality was attributed to Constantine (10.9.2, 3, 8). We should assume that E reproduces some of the original language of Maximin's pronouncement (e.g., φασὶν 8.12.9; προσετίθετο 8.12.10). Moreover, the repetition of φιλόνηρος would take on a deliciously parodic tone if there existed an original in which the term was used in earnest. A standard translation of φιλόνηρος is well-nigh impossible due to its complex history. For the development of the term in pagan and Christian traditions and its special importance in the rhetoric of the fourth century, see Downey 1955: 199-208; see also Rapp 2005: 84-87. Thanks to Lactantius, however, whose preservation of Galerius' Edict of Toleration in Latin allows us to compare vocabulary with E's Greek version, it would seem that φιλόνηρος here might translate *clementia* (cf. also *DMP* 36.6), though E plays on the term's various connotations.

**ὥς μηδὲν μὲν ἔτι δοκεῖν δεινὸν καθ' ἡμῶν περιεργάζεσθαι:** The ironic distinction between the appearance (δοκεῖν) of imperial policy and its reality is a common theme for both E and Lactantius, although the occurrence of a similar idea (*specie tenus*) in *DMP* 36.6 regarding the same imperial pronouncement suggests the preservation of original phraseology here.

Maximin's unique enforcement of the fourth edict through the use of census rosters (*MP* 4.8; see below) may be the intended referent of δεινὸν καθ' ἡμῶν περιεργάζεσθαι. For a possible example of this policy of "terrible extremes," see πολλὸς...πάντα τρόπον...περιεργάζετο 8.12.3.

**XII.9 μὴ γὰρ καθήκειν φασὶν αἵμασιν ἐμφυλίοις μιαίνειν τὰς πόλεις:** The concern expressed here for bloodshed in the cities probably pertains to the care of maintaining the religious sanctity of the *pomerium*. Since only provincial governors had the power to issue capital sentences, most

executions took place in or around the cities of the ancient world. The number of executions likely increased when Maximin used the new census lists, which for the first time included city-dwellers, to attack the urban Christians in 306 (*MP* 4.8). As the most enthusiastic restorer of pagan rites before Julian, Maximin would have been aware of the implications of such profane behavior for the *pax deorum* (e.g., in *MP* 9.9, E describes the large quantity of human entrails which remained scattered throughout Caesarea until washed away by a rainstorm). His new policy of persecution remedied the situation not only by limiting executions, but also by relocating the objects of profanation (i.e., Christians) from the cities to rural labor camps.

**εὐμενῇ τοῖς πᾶσιν ὑπάρχουσιν καὶ πραεῖαν:** A similar adjectival pairing appears in 8.1.8 (εὐμενῆς καὶ ἴλεω), where the failing of Christians "to render the deity kindly and propitious" resulted in the persecution, and in 8.16.1 (εὐμενῇ καὶ ἴλεω), where the "divine and heavenly hand displayed its kindly and propitious oversight" and thus ended the persecution. Moreover, Constantine employs the exact pairing (πρᾶός τε καὶ εὐμενῆς) in speaking of God both in the Edict to the Eastern Provincials VC 2.55.1 and in the Letter to Sapor 4.13.1.

**τῆς φιλανθρώπου καὶ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς πάντας ἐκτείνεσθαι τὴν εὐεργεσίαν:** While the pairing φιλανθρώπου καὶ βασιλικῆς occurs sporadically in the first three centuries of the Empire, it is the fourth century which sees the genesis of the inextricable connection of philanthropy and emperor that will characterize Byzantine imperial propaganda. See Downey 1955: 199-208

**μηκέτι θανάτῳ κολαζομένους... καθ' ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν τιμωρίαν:** The referent here is likely the fourth persecuting edict, which ordered universal sacrifice (*MP* 3.1; De Ste. Croix 1954: 77) and entailed, for those who refused, the penalty of death (certainly in practice, probably *de iure* – this is implied by the proconsul Anullinus in *Passio Sanctae Crispinae* 1.5,7, who associates capital punishment with the enforcement of the fourth edict). Perhaps the decree was considered

especially philanthropic because Maximin's enforcement of the fourth edict through the use of census lists increased the likelihood of death for the average Christian.

#### **ΧΠ.10 τηνικαῦτα ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύττεσθαι καὶ τοῖν σκελοῖν πηροῦσθαι θάτερον**

**προσετάττετο:** Those condemned to the mines were not usually maimed in this way before their dispatch; tattooing (e.g., *CTh* 9.40.2), disfiguring with the branding-iron (e.g., *Suet. Cal.* 27.3), and forms of corporal punishment, such as beating with rods (e.g., *Dig.* 47.18.2; *Cyp. Ep.* 77.3), were common. Mattingly 2010: 188-189 hypothesizes that Maximin's practice of mutilation helped to maintain security in the mines amid the increase in their population during the persecution. That this was in fact an imperial order (*προσετάττετο*; also *φασὶν* 8.12.9) is confirmed by *MP(s)* 8.1 (ἐκ βασιλικοῦ νεύματος προστάττει), *VC* 1.57.2 (ἐνομοθέτει), and *DMP* 36.6 (*debilitari iussit*). For the date and language of the document, see ἐπὶ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτοῖς χρηστὸν καὶ φιλόνηρον ἐτρέποντο 8.12.8.

**ταῦτα γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς τὰ φιλόνηρα καὶ τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν τιμωριῶν τὰ κουφότατα:** cf. the apparent allusion to Maximin's policy of sentencing Christians to the mines in *DMP* 22.2: *Nulla poena penes eum levis, non insulae, non carceres, non metalla, sed ignis, crux, ferae in illo erant cotidiana et facilia*; cf. also the mention of Maximin's policy of mutilation in *DMP* 36.6: *Nam cum clementiam specie tenus profiteretur, occidi servos dei vetuit, debilitari iussit*. Like E here, Lactantius states in *DMP* 22.2 that condemnation to the mines was a mild form of punishment (*poena...levis* = τιμωριῶν τὰ κουφότατα) compared to Galerius' unrestrained use of aggravated death sentences, and in *DMP* 36.6, that Maximin's policy of mutilation was intended to give the impression of clemency (τὰ φιλόνηρα = *clementiae*; see ἐπὶ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτοῖς χρηστὸν καὶ φιλόνηρον ἐτρέποντο 8.12.8).

**ταύτης ἔνεκα τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν φιλανθρωπίας:** The reference to martyrs in 8.13.1 whose names are to be included on monuments of the pious (ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις) makes the ironic juxtaposition of ἀσεβής and φιλανθρωπία here even more effective, for presumably the language of φιλανθρωπία in the imperial decree which E reproduces was similarly recorded on *stelai*.

**τοὺς μὲν δεξιοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ξίφει πρότερον ἐκκοπτομένων κάπειτα τούτους πυρὶ**

**καυτηριαζομένων:** E informs us in *VC* 1.58, 59 that Maximin himself invented this form of punishment. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the mutilation described here (see also κάπειτα τούτους πυρὶ καυτηριαζομένων below ff.) somehow pertains to the admonition of Jesus in Mt. 5.29 (εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ · συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν). Perhaps the logic is as follows: one can lose his right eye, still stumble (due to the branding of the left ankle), and yet still has body thrown into the place of punishment (the mines). Such an interpretation would be congruous with E's description of Maximin as an anti-Christian polemicist and propagandist. Indeed E paints Maximin's demise, which included the loss of eyesight, as a divine form of poetic justice (*VC* 1.59).

**τοὺς δὲ λαιοὺς πόδας κατὰ τῶν ἀγκυλῶν αὐθις καυτῆρσιν ἀχραιομένων:** κατὰ τῶν ἀγκυλῶν = "at the ankles," as πόδας restricts the otherwise unspecific ἀγκάλῃ (cf. *pedes detruncabantur* in *DMP* 36.7). E probably means the severing of the Achilles tendon (as in 4 Ma. 15.22; Hipp. *De Haem.* 6).

**μετὰ τε ταῦτα τοῖς κατ' ἐπαρχίαν χαλκοῦ μετάλλοις...καταδικαζομένων:** While legal sources specify that custodial punishment, such as *opus publicum* and *damnatio in metallum/opus metalli*, was confined to slaves and *humiliores* from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century (see Millar 1984), the first edict of persecution effectively stripped high-ranking Christians of their status and permitted

them to be punished with hard labor. The rescript of Diocletian and Maximian to the proconsul of Africa concerning the Manichees makes this explicit (*Coll.* 15.3). Based on the previous geographical reference (κατὰ τὸν Πόντον 8.12.6), scholars have assumed the μέταλλα here to be those in the province of Pontus (κατ' ἐπαρχίαν; e.g., Gustafson 1994: 422). The passage, however, has a very nonspecific tone, which suggests that the provincial μέταλλα to which E refers are either those in general or, given the similarity in language with *MP(s)* 8.1, where E also records the imperial order of Maximin, those in Palestine (see οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας τοσοῦτον ὅσον κακώσεως καὶ ταλαιπωρίας ἔνεκεν below). For the mines at Phaeno in Palestine, see κατὰ τὰ ἐν Φαινοῖ χαλκοῦ μέταλλα 8.13.5; *MP* 7.1-2; 8.1; 13.1, 4-10; for the quarries in the Thebaid, see *MP* 8.1; 9.1; also Hirt 2010: 223-225.

**οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας τοσοῦτον ὅσον κακώσεως καὶ ταλαιπωρίας ἔνεκεν:** cf. *MP(s)* 8.1: μόχθου καὶ κακοπαθείας ἔνεκεν ταλαιπωρεῖσθαι. Generally, E's point is that one does not maim prisoners who are expected to be productive in their work at the mines. This underscores the punitive rather than economic purpose of *damnatio in metallum* (see Millar 1984: 147). Given the vocabulary (οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας...ἔνεκεν), however, E may also have in mind the punitive legal category *ministerium metallicorum*. There were three degrees of sentences to the mines: *damnatio in metallum*, *damnatio in opus metalli*, and *ministerium metallicorum*. The most severe, *damnatio in metallum*, was usually a life-sentence (*CTH* 2.14.1; 16.5.40) and entailed loss of citizenship/status (*Dig.* 48.19.2.pr.) and binding with heavy fetters; *damnatio in opus metalli* was a mitigated form of temporary duration and lighter fetters (*Dig.* 48.19.8.6). The third degree, *ministerium metallicorum*, pertained primarily to women (though *Dig.* 48.19.36 attests to the inclusion of men) and carried with it a less physically demanding form of service (*Dig.*

48.19.8.8), probably to the *metallici* themselves. If E alludes to this distinction, then he means that the martyrs suffered the worst form of service in the mines.

**XII.11 ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης:** This phrase neatly sums up the topic – the martyrs throughout the provinces of the Roman world – whose treatment marks 8.7.1 – 13.9 as a distinct literary unit. See τὸ πλῆθος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν καὶ τὸ Μαύρων ἔθνος Θηβαῖδα τε καὶ κατ' Αἴγυπτον 8.6.10. As the summarizing tone and repetition make clear, this section serves as the proper conclusion to the account which begins in 8.7.1. As such, it would appear that the list of church leaders throughout the provinces which E includes in 8.13.1-8 is a later addition included for variety and/or is intended to conclude the account of martyrdoms which begins with those in Nicomedia as early as 8.5.

**τοὺς μὲν ἀπανταχοῦ τῆς ἀνδρείας αὐτῶν ἐπόπτας εἰκότως κατεπλήξαντο:** By reproducing the language of 8.7 (see οὐ κατεπλάγη τὰς ἀναρίθμους μάστιγας 8.7.1), which begins the theme of persecution in the provinces (see ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης above), E clearly ties the end of the account with the beginning and marks 8.12.11 as the conclusion to the section.

**τῆς δὲ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θείας ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀπορρήτου δυνάμεως ἐφανῆ δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰ τεκμήρια παρεστήσαντο:** Note once again the striking similarity in language to the beginning of the account in 8.7 (e.g., τὴν θείαν δύναμιν ἐπιπαροῦσαν ἐναργῶς τε αὐτὴν τοῖς μάρτυσιν ἐπιδεικνῦσαν 8.7.2).

**ἐκάστου μὲν οὖν ἐπ' ὀνόματος μνημονεύειν μακρὸν ἂν εἴη, μὴ τί γε τῶν ἀδυνάτων:** This statement both concludes ch. 12 (note its similarity to Τί με χρὴ νῦν ἐπ' ὀνόματος τῶν λοιπῶν μνημονεύειν in 8.12.1) and in view of the list which follows, provides the introduction to 8.13.1-8 through a figure which verges on *paraleipsis*. Although alliteration may partly account for μακρὸν ἂν εἴη (paired with μνημονεύειν), a phrase not all that common in the Eusebian corpus,

the language of omission is prevalent throughout the *HE* (see Grant 1980: 25-26 for reasons why E omits topics), especially in ch. 12 of Bk VIII (cf. 8.12.1, 2). E's *modus operandi* of using omission to generalize about numbers (in this case geographical distribution also) is likely in play here, but real compositional concerns over length seem to be at the forefront as well (see φειδόμενοι συμμετρίας παραλείγομεν 8.6.5), since Bk VIII lies at the precipice of a major shift in topic at 8.13.9.

**XIII.1 Τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων:** As noted in ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης 8.12.11, this passage, which chronicles the famous church leaders during the persecution, seems to be a later addition. Yet its function in the economy of Bk VIII turns out to be quite important, and this perhaps explains its inclusion. In the present context, the mention of church leaders naturally calls to mind their negative role in the introduction to Bk VIII. Not only did they occasion divine punishment through their pre-persecution behavior (8.1.7-8; 2.2), but when persecution began, failed to meet the challenge (8.2.3; 8.3.1-4). E vows not to dwell on their shameful behavior and apostasy, but to recount “only those things which might be to the advantage of utility” (8.2.2-3). As such, his description here makes good on his promise to provide edifying details of the church leaders' behavior. More importantly, however, at a point when the ecclesiastical portion of the persecution narrative ends, it serves to redeem the church leaders from their behavior in the introduction (note the parallel in 8.16.2, where the laity – or more generally, God's people – are reconciled to God). In a way, it also resumes the bishop-lists, which cease at the beginning of Bk VIII, quite intentionally, we have argued (see Introduction VI, as a statement concerning the church leaders' behavior (note also the lack of ecclesiastical martyrs in 8.5.1-8.12.11: only Anthimus and Phileas). We should also keep in mind E's own situation in 315/16 (the date of the present

book), for at this time he has presumably settled into his episcopacy at Caesarea (ca. 313). Thus it is not unreasonable to suppose that he has begun to identify himself more with the ecclesiastical elites than before – a contrast which we can discern in comparing the present section with the negative view of clerics presented in 8.2.3, 8.3.1-4, and *MP(s)* 12 (all belonging to the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of 313).

**ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας:** E marks the contrast between the imperial ordinances which surround this section (Maximin's proclamation in 8.12.8-10; Edict of Toleration 8.17.3-10), and which E undoubtedly copied from public *stelai* (e.g., the rescript of Maximin at 9.7.3: ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΤΥΡΩΙ ΣΤΗΛΗΣ ΜΕΤΑΛΛΗΦΘΕΙΣΗΣ ), and the funerary *stelai* erected to the martyrs. The latter are monuments belonging to a different political entity, the kingdom of Christ (τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας vs. τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας 1.2.23), and thereby serve as a new form of political proclamation based on piety (εὐσεβῶν; note the concurrence of Christian *politeia* and piety at *PE* 15.61.12: μόνης δὲ τῆς ἀμφὶ τὸν πάντων δημιουργὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείας ἔχεσθαι καὶ διὰ σώφρονος βίου τῆς τε ἄλλης κατ' ἀρετὴν θεοφιλοῦς πολιτείας ἀρεσκόντως ζῆν σπουδάζειν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ; see also Johnson 2006: 220-227). See βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος τὴν οὐράνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν below; also ἅμα μὲν τὰ ἐν οἷς ἦν, ἀνατιθέμενος 8.10.11; τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας 8.2.4.

**XIII. 2 πρῶτος...μάρτυς ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Νικομηδέων πόλεως...Ἄνθιμος:** Indeed, Anthimus is the first ecclesiastical leader mentioned by name in Bk VIII (8.6.6).

**ἡμῖν...ἀνηγορεύσθω:** Here we have the dative of agent which often accompanies the perfect tense (Smyth 1488).

**Λουκιανός:** Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch and famous biblical scholar, was martyred on January 7, 311 or 312. He later became a favorite saint of Constantine's mother Helena, who

built a church in his honor at Helenopolis (Phil. *HE* 2.12-13). See also 9.6.3; Chrysostom PG 50.519-526. For the date of Lucian's martyrdom, see Slusser 2003: 329-337; Barnes 2004: 350-353. For an overview of his contributions to the biblical text, see Metzger 1962: 189-203.

**βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος τὴν οὐράνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν:** E makes a striking distinction in this section between imperial rule (βασιλέως, presumably Maximin) and the heavenly kingdom of Christ (οὐράνιον...βασιλείαν; also τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας above). Such a contrast proves effective in light of the recent allusion to the imperial pronouncement of Maximin (8.12.8-10) and the description of the secular affairs in the Empire (8.13.9-17.2) and recantation of Galerius which follow (8.17.3-11). See also τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας 8.4.3.

**λόγῳ πρότερον δι' ἀπολογίας, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἔργοις ἀνακηρύξας:** Rufinus' version of the *HE* preserves this apology at 9.6.3. According to Carriker, it is unlikely that E knew this text, and Rufinus either excerpted it from an unnamed source or invented it himself for inclusion in his translation (see Carriker 2003: 223 for an overview of the scholarship). The subordination of words (λόγοι) to works/deeds (ἔργα) is an important underlying current in E's historical thought (e.g., *PE* 1.3.6; see also Pelikan 1965: 50). As such, Lucian joins the ranks of intellectuals, such as Phileas (see ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8), whose best work is martyrdom, not philosophical argument.

**XIII.3 τῶν δ' ἐπὶ Φοινίκης μαρτύρων:** E appears to list the ecclesiastical martyrs in the same order in which he treats the geographical regions in 8.5-12. Thus, we have Anthimus and Lucian, both tied to Nicomedia (the geographical topic of 8.5-6); Tyrannion, Zenobius, and Silvanus of Tyre (Phoenicia is one of the geographical topics in 8.7); Silvanus, Peleus, Nilus, and Pamphilus in Palestine (purported geographical topic of 8.7, though no examples are given there;

see τοὺς...ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ 8.7.1); Peter, Faustus, Dios, Ammonius, Phileas, Hesychius, Pachymius, and Theodorus in Egypt (topic of 8.8-10).

**τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρεμμάτων ποιμένες:** This interesting phrase derives from *MP(s)* 12.1, where E ironically contrasts the ecclesiastical leaders' proper duty (i.e., to be shepherds of the rational flocks of Christ) with the divine punishment with which they meet during the persecution (i.e., becoming keepers of camels and imperial horses). According to the introduction to Bk VIII, the shepherds of Christ are deserving of punishment because they act more like tyrants than pastors (οἱ τε δοκοῦντες ἡμῶν ποιμένες τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας... οἷά τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες 8.1.8). In keeping with the reconciliatory tone of this section (see *Τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων* above), we see that E has reversed his earlier judgment of God's shepherds, such that the phrase now occurs in praise of the ecclesiastical martyrs in Phoenicia (the provenance of the activity in *MP(s)* 12.1?).

**Τυραννίων ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Τύρον ἐκκλησίας:** E provides our only notice of Tyrannion and Zenobius.

**πρεσβύτερός τε τῆς κατὰ Σιδῶνα Ζηνόβιος:** See ὁ δὲ ἱατρῶν ἄριστος Ζηνόβιος 8.13.4.

**Σιλβανὸς τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Ἔμισαν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος:** In 9.6.1, E informs us that Silvanus was one of three martyrs condemned to the wild beasts in Emesa after they confessed themselves Christian. Silvanus was exceedingly old at the time, having served in the church for forty years. He was martyred under Maximin in 312.

**XIII.4 χοροῖς ἀνελήφθη μαρτύρων:** cf. *MP* 11.26; *Comm. in Psalm.* PG 23.1145.16, 25; 23.1148.42; 23.1157.22. E is one of the first to use what would become a common expression in Byzantine ecclesiastical writers.

**ὁ μὲν θαλαττίους παραδοθεὶς βυθοῖς:** This is a strange punishment, considering that Antioch lies some 15 miles from the Mediterranean (cf. the two sisters' punishment in 8.12.5). Perhaps E means the Orontes River, which runs through city. θαλαττίους...βυθοῖς is sufficiently vague to allow this interpretation.

**ὁ δὲ ἱατρῶν ἄριστος Ζηνόβιος:** Zenobius is said to be a doctor. What occasions this new information may be the type of torture he endures – presumably the opening of his sides with iron hooks (ταῖς κατὰ τῶν πλευρῶν ἐπιτεθείσαις αὐτῷ καρτερῶς ἐναποθανῶν βασάνοις; see Gallonio 1903: 104-114) – which could be likened to a surgery performed by a doctor.

Ironically, E views Zenobius as “the best of physicians,” due to his endurance of this surgical-type torture. This is of a piece with E's habit of subordinating martyrs' earthly talents and occupations to their spiritual fortitude during martyrdom (see ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8)

**XIII.5 Σιλβανός, ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Γάζαν ἐκκλησιῶν:** See *MP(s)* 7.3; 13.4.

**κατὰ τὰ ἐν Φαινοῖ χαλκοῦ μέταλλα:** See *MP(s)* 7.1-2; 8.1; 13.1, 4-10. Modern-day Feinan, and biblical Pinon/Punon (Gen. 36.41; Num. 33.42; Chron. 1.52), Phaeno was located in Idumaea between Petra and Zoar. For fuller discussions of the site, see Millar 1984: 124; Kind 1965: 56. See also μετὰ τε ταῦτα τοῖς κατ' ἐπαρχίαν χαλκοῦ μετάλλοις...καταδικαζομένων 8.12.10.

**σὺν ἑτέροις ἑνὸς δέουσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τεσσαράκοντα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμενται:** See *MP(s)* 13.12.

**Αἰγύπτιοί τε αὐτόθι Πηλεὺς καὶ Νεῖλος...τὴν διὰ πυρὸς ὑπέμειναν τελευτήν:** See *MP* 13.3. Besides the obvious geographical link, there may be a further connection between the martyrs listed in 13.5 and the two who follow (Pamphilus and Peter): the *Defense of Origen and His Opinions*, written by Pamphilus, was addressed to the confessors in the mines at Phaeno,

probably as an attempt to refute the polemical attacks on Origen by Peter (see Πέτρος, αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος 8.13.7; also Barnes 1981: 199-200).

**XIII.6 τὸ μέγα δὲ κλέος τῆς Καισαρέων παροικίας...Πάμφιλος πρεσβύτερος:** Since E's biography of Pamphilus is no longer extant, most of our knowledge of the famous presbyter comes from the *Martyrs of Palestine*. For an overview of Pamphilus' life with relevant sources, see Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 1-2, 331 ff. and Carriker 2003: 10-23. See also Introduction I.

**ἐν τούτοις ἡμῖν μνημονεύεσθω:** We can interpret ἐν τούτοις as referring to the martyrs previously mentioned (most probable) or to the monuments on which E purports to inscribe the names of the prominent ecclesiastical martyrs (ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας 8.13.1).

**οὗ τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων τὴν ἀρετὴν κατὰ τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν ἀναγράφομεν:** Apparently, this is a reference to the now lost *Life of Pamphilus* (alluded to in 6.32.3, 7.32.25, and *MP(s)* 11.3 as already published and consisting of 3 books; some of its content can be surmised from *MP* 11). A date of 310 seems reasonable (Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 333), but the future ἀναγράφομεν is puzzling (the manuscript tradition is messy here, and we should note that AT<sup>1</sup> preserves the aorist).

**XIII.7 Πέτρος, αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος:** Peter was seized and beheaded on November 26, 311 by agents of Maximin (*HE* 9.6.2). See Vivian 1988 for the standard scholarly treatment of Peter. It is somewhat strange that E praises Peter so warmly (see below), since the Alexandrian bishop was decidedly anti-Origen, and therefore, anti-Caesarean. Indeed the *Defense of Origen and His Opinions* (PG 17.541-616; Phot. *Bibl.* 118, 117) written jointly by E and his mentor Pamphilus (*HE* 6.33; ca. 307-9; with a sixth book added by E in 310) was in large part a rebuttal of Peter's anti-Origenist polemic. Thus the juxtaposition of Pamphilus and Peter

in the present narrative may indicate an underlying historical reality. Considering his universalizing historiographical tendencies, however, it is likely that E has subordinated his personal views about Peter to preserve what Barnes 1981: 201 calls “his selective picture of a brave Church heroically withstanding persecution.”

**θεῖόν τι χρῆμα διδασκάλων τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας:** While the colloquial nature of the expression θεῖόν τι χρῆμα (= “a divine thing...he is!”) may at first suggest sarcasm, other passages in which it appears suggest genuineness: such as *PE* 1.1.1 (the bishop Theodotus); *DE* 1.pref.1 (Theodotus); *HE* 1.3.3; *DE* 3.6.27 (Christ himself); E further explains his admiration of Peter in 9.6.2, using similar vocabulary: θεῖον ἐπισκόπων χρῆμα βίου τε ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων συνασκήσεως.

**ἀναγεγράφω:** Although a rather common verb in the Eusebian corpus, here it fits the language of physical monuments (according to LSJ, ἀναγράφω = “to engrave and set up publicly,” and is often paired with στήλη; see ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας 8.13.1).

**Φαῦστος καὶ Δίος καὶ Ἀμμώνιος:** The identification made by earlier scholars (e.g., McGiffert 1890: 354 n. 11; Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 279) of Faustus here and the deacon of the same name who appears as a confessor with Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, during the Decian Persecution (6.40.9 and 7.11) seems correct. In 7.11.26, E tells us that the deacon Faustus lived to a very old age and was beheaded during the Great Persecution. Little can be said about Dios and Ammonius.

**Φιλέας τε καὶ Ἡσύχιος καὶ Παχύμιος καὶ Θεόδωρος:** It would appear that E knew of and perhaps possessed the *Epistle of Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus, and Phileas to Meletius* (Migne 10.1565), even if he does not name it explicitly, since here he lists the names ascribed to it.

**ὧν ἀνὰ τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην:** See ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης 8.12.11.

**τῶν δ' ὄψει τὰ πράγματα παρεληφότεων ἴδιον ἂν γένοιτο:** See ἀκριβέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμεῖς 8.10.1.

**τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς γνωρίμους δι' ἐτέρας ποιήσομαι γραφῆς:** This must be the *Martyrs of Palestine* in general, not specifically the account of Pamphilus in *MP* (*pace* Oulton 1932: 297).

**XIII.8 τὴν παλινοδίαν τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰργασμένων τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπισυνάψω:** See 8.17.3-10.

**τά τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ συμβεβηκότα:** A dramatic shift in perspective occurs in the following chapters of Bk VIII, in which the story of persecution comes full circle and is retold with a focus on the imperial government (8.13.9-10 mirrors 8.1.1-6; see below). In this regard, ἐξ ἀρχῆς takes on a new meaning (“from the perspective of the imperial government” or “because of the imperial government”).

**χρησιμώτατα τυγχάνοντα τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις:** The theme of utility runs throughout the *HE* (see Grant 23-24; e.g., 1.1.5; 5.2.8; 8.2.3), but the superlative form of χρήσιμος is unusual in the Eusebian corpus (it appears only four times).

**XIII.9 Τὰ μὲν οὖν πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας...τίς ἂν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος διηγῆσασθαι:** In its description of the golden age of Roman rule in the late third/early fourth century, 8.13.9-10 mirrors very precisely 8.1.1-6, the first chapters of Bk VIII, which speak of the success and good-standing of the Church during the same period. The similarity in language between 8.13.9 and 8.1.1 is striking and unmistakable: πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου = πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ; ὀπόσης ἀγαθῶν εὐφορίας καὶ εὐετηρίας ἠξίωτο = Ὀσης μὲν καὶ ὀποίας...δόξης ὁμοῦ καὶ παρρησίας... ἠξίωτο; τίς ἂν ἐξαρκέσειεν λόγος διηγῆσασθαι = μεῖζον ἢ

καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως διηγῆσασθαι. This section picks up on a motif which is central to E's view of history: the relationship between Church and Empire.

**οἱ μάλιστα τῆς καθόλου κρατοῦντες ἀρχῆς:** E wants to emphasize the contrast between this united state of affairs and the division of empire which will occur when the persecution begins (see διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται, πρᾶγμα μηδ' ἄλλοτέ ποῦ πάλαι γεγονὸς 8.13.10).

**δεκαετηρίδας καὶ εἰκοσαετηρίδας ἐκπλήσαντες ἐν ἑορταῖς καὶ πανηγύρεσιν φαιδροτάταις τε θαλίαις καὶ εὐφροσύναις:** It is strange that E should include Diocletian's *vicennalia* (November 303 in Rome), as the persecution had already begun by this time, and it was by no means a pleasant experience for the emperor (he was disturbed by the outspokenness of the Roman people and left before the assumption of his ninth consulship; see *DMP* 17.2).

**XIII.10 οὕτω δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπαραποδίστως αὐξούσης καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ὀσημέραι προϊούσης τῆς ἔξουσίας:** This provides a striking parallel to Bk VIII's introduction (cf. ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις προϊόντα ὀσημέραι τε εἰς αὐξὴν καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιδιδόντα 8.1.6): just as the Church's success resulted in infighting and persecution, the progressive increase in the emperors' authority resulted in a policy of persecution and civil war. Such a clear articulation of the idea that progress results in decline flies in the face of scholarship which has advocated a simple "theory of progress" in E's historical writings (e.g., Grant 1976: 62-70; Chesnut 1986: 66, 93). See Johnson 2006: 237-239 for a more measured approach.

**ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι:** cf. Ὡς δ' ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαυνότητα καὶ νωθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο 8.1.7: the peaceful disposition of the emperors toward the Church has changed to one of war, just as (or in E's view, because) the affairs of the church leaders changed to a state of greater license, boastfulness, and pride. Later

in the narrative, the emperors will change their opinion about persecution, described using a similar μετα- compound (παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην 8.16.1).

**πόλεμον ἄσπονδον ἐγείρουσιν:** Note the active ἐγείρουσιν, whereby E attributes direct causation of the persecution to the persecutors (cf. ὁ κατὰ πάντων ἀνεκινήθη διωγμός 8.4.1)

**τῆς τοιαύδε κινήσεως δεύτερον ἔτος:** i.e., 305.

**τι περὶ τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν νεώτερον γεγονός τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει:** “Revolution,” although a possible translation for νεώτερον, is a bit too strong (*pace* Oulton 1932: 298). The sense of νεώτερον here is “quite an unprecedented event,” referring to Diocletian and Maximian’s abdication, which probably shocked the inhabitants of the Empire, E included. He leaves the interpretation here to be implied, but E undoubtedly views this unexpected occurrence as a result of the persecution and thus part and parcel of the “new” era in history which he narrates.

**XIII.11 νόσου γὰρ οὐκ αἰσίας τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισκηψάσης, ὑφ’ ἧς ἤδη καὶ τὰ τῆς διανοίας εἰς ἔκστασιν αὐτῷ παρήγετο:** Diocletian was the chief Augustus (τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ) among the four Tetrarchs (τῶν εἰρημένων = οἱ μάλιστα τῆς καθόλου κρατοῦντες ἀρχῆς). E’s description of Diocletian’s illness generally agrees with the much fuller account in Lactantius (*DMP* 17:3-9), who informs us that Diocletian fell ill on his winter journey back to Nicomedia from Rome, was bed-ridden for almost a year and presumed dead from December 304, only to appear in public again on March 1, 305, though suffering from mental defects.

**σὺν τῷ μετ’ αὐτὸν δευτερείοις τετιμημένῳ:** i.e., Maximian.

**τὸν δημόδη καὶ ιδιωτικὸν ἀπολαμβάνει βίον:** While E clearly links Diocletian’s abdication to his illness, *DMP* 18 states it was Galerius who forced the senior Augustus to step down; later sources, however, represent it as a voluntary abdication (*Vict. Caes.* 39.47-8; *Epit.* 39.5; *Eutr.*

9.27). E's language here resembles that in his description of the military persecution, when soldiers gladly embraced civilian life to avoid apostasy (ἀσμενέστατα τὸν ἰδιωτικὸν προασπαζομένους βίον 8.4.2). Thus E may view Diocletian as receiving a fitting recompense (perhaps a better translation of ἀπολαμβάνει) for his persecuting activities.

**διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται, πρᾶγμα μὴδ' ἄλλοτέ ποῦ πάλαι γεγονὸς παραδεδομένον:** *MP(s)* 13.13, from which this expression seems to originate, provides the interpretive key: the persecution in the West ended after less than two years, while that in the East endured for a lengthier period, thus producing a divided empire – one in which there was tolerance, the other persecution. In the current context, E may also have in mind the divided loyalties of the emperors: the anti-Christian Galerius and Maximian, and the pro-Christian Constantine and Licinius; and later Maxentius/Maximin vs. Constantine/Licinius (as made explicit in 9.9.1).

Note the remarkable similarity in language to Lactantius' account of Diocletian's death in *DMP* 42.2: *cum videret vivus quod nulli umquam nulli imperatorum acciderat.*

**XIII.12 χρόνου δ' οὐ πλείστου μεταξὺ γενομένου:** Constantius died on July 25, 306 at Eboracum (York), roughly a year after Diocletian and Maximian abdicated (May 1, 305).

**πραότατα καὶ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις εὐνοϊκώτατα τῷ τε θεῷ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα διαθέμενος:** E contrasts Constantius' mildness with the feigned mildness of Maximian (8.12.9) and Maxentius (8.14.1); cf. *DMP* 20.1, where Maximian despises Constantius for his mildness of character (*natura mitis*). Constantius' friendliness to the divine word underscores one of E's theological aims in this section: to portray the relationship between Constantius and Constantine as similar to that between the Father and Son/Logos (see below).

**παῖδα γνήσιον Κωνσταντῖνον:** There was some uncertainty about Constantine's legitimacy hinging on Helena's relationship to Constantius (for concubinage: Jerome *Chron.* 228g; Oros.

*Hist. Adv. Pag.* 7.25.16; *Chronica Gallica a. DXI* 445 (*Chr. Min.* 1.643); *Zos.* 2.8.2; *Chr. Pasch.* 516/17; for marriage: *ILS* 708: Salernum; *CIL* 10.1483: Naples; *Origo* 1; *Vict. Caes.* 39.25; *Eut. Brev.* 10.2.2; *Jerome Chron.* 225g; *Epit.* 39.2; *Barnes* 1982: 34 is pro marriage; *Drijvers* 1992: 17-19 is pro concubinage). E probably wishes to contrast Constantine not only with Maxentius, whom some sources (*Origo* 12; *Epit.* 40.13) accuse of being illegitimate, but also Galerius' illegitimate son, Candidianus, and Diocletian's lack of male heirs.

**Κωνσταντῖνον αὐτοκράτορα καὶ Σεβαστὸν ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπών:** Constantine was initially proclaimed Augustus by the army upon Constantius' death (July 25, 306), but suffered a demotion by Galerius to the rank of Caesar (*DMP* 25.1-5; *Pan. Lat.* 6(7).8.2; *ILS* 657; 682), which he accepted; he was elevated to Augustus again in 307 by Maximian (*Pan. Lat.* 7(6).1.1; 2.1; 5.3; 8.1), but demoted to Caesar at Carnuntum (see ὑπὸ κοινῆς ψήφου τῶν κρατούντων 8.13.14; although he continued to style himself Augustus), and was finally officially promoted by Galerius to the rank of Augustus in 310 (*Barnes* 1981: 33).

**κοινῷ φύσεως νόμῳ τελευτᾷ τὸν βίον:** For a discussion of the ancient conception of common law, see μάλιστα τῶν οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμου δὲ τρόπῳ πεπολιορκημένων 8.10.12.

**πρῶτός τε ἐν θεοῖς ἀνηγορεύετο παρ' αὐτοῖς:** E could have easily passed over Constantius' deification on the grounds that it was unfitting for a (proto-) Christian emperor (cf. E's view of human deification in *DE* 8.pref.). Indeed E appears somewhat uncomfortable with the detail, in light of the qualification which follows (ἀπάσης μετὰ θάνατον, ὅση βασιλεῖ τις ἂν ὠφείλετο, τιμῆς ἠξιωμένος). Yet based on the Christological language which pervades this section, it seems to be a deliberate attempt on the part of E to establish a divine figurehead for Constantine, whom E views as a manifestation of the Logos at a pivotal moment in history.

**XIII.13 ὃς δὴ καὶ μόνος τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως τῆς ἡγεμονίας τὸν πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς**

**διατελέσας χρόνον:** cf. *DMP* 8.7: *Constantium praetereo, quoniam dissimilis ceterorum fuit*

*dignusque qui solus orbem teneret.* Language of singularity (μόνος τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς) and primacy (πρῶτός τε ἐν θεοῖς see above) surrounding Constantius further contribute to his association with the first person of the Trinity.

**τοῦ τε καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνήσας:** cf. *MP(s)* 13.12, which is incongruous

with this statement; moreover, *DMP* 15.7 states clearly that Constantius destroyed churches

(*contra* E here: μήτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοὺς οἴκους καθελὼν; also *VC* 1.13.1-3; 16.1 – 17.3; 20.3;

2.49; *Optat.* 1.22; *Soz.* 1.6.1-4), but agrees with E's account that he did not harm Christians (τοὺς

ὕπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους φυλάξας).

**τέλος εὐδαιμον καὶ τρισμακάριον ἀπέλιφεν τοῦ βίου:** Ostensibly, the clause which follows

explains why Constantius is “thrice-blessed,” although its non-tripartite structure is less explicit

than we would like. We are told that the emperor died during his office (unlike Diocletian and

Maximian), it was a good end (unlike the other Tetrarchs), and he had a lawful son, Constantine,

as his successor (unlike the other Tetrarchs). Yet we also cannot help but perceive the

Trinitarian connotations of τρισμακάριον, which fits with the other divine and monarchical

language surrounding Constantius in this section (e.g., εὐδαιμον).

**ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ γνησίῳ παιδὶ πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ:** ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ recalls the succession of bishops which has been broken in Bk VIII (see Introduction VI). E may view

Constantine's succession, on the model of apostolic succession, as restoring a link to the Logos

which has been broken through the persecuting emperors (in Constantinian propaganda, this link

goes back to Claudius Gothicus, who is also Christian; see *Pan. Lat.* 6.2.2). Constantine's

prudence and piety also sets him apart from the descriptions of Maxentius and Maximian which follow in 8.14.

**XIII.14 Κωνσταντῖνος εὐθὺς ἀρχόμενος βασιλεὺς τελεώτατος καὶ Σεβαστὸς πρὸς τῶν στρατοπέδων:** *DMP* 24.8 states that Constantius commended Constantine to the troops and conferred the imperial authority on Constantine himself; according to *Origo* 4, he was appointed Caesar (not Augustus) unanimously by the troops (see also *Vict. Caes.* 40.4; *Epit.* 41.3; *Zos.* 2.9.1; Barnes 1982: 5). For Constantine's complicated journey to Augustus, see Κωνσταντῖνον αὐτοκράτορα καὶ Σεβαστὸν ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπὼν 8.13.12.

**ἔτι πολὺ τούτων πρότερον πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ ἀναγορευθεὶς:** We see the beginning of a theological rhetoric which will be developed further in E's later works (e.g., *VC* 1.3.4; 6.1): Constantine's relationship with the absolute monarch of the universe which justifies the emperor's own absolute monarchy on earth.

**ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο:** For E's portrayal of Constantius as the first person of the Trinity and of Constantine as the Logos, see Introduction VI.

**Λικίνιος...αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ Σεβαστὸς ἀναπέφηνεν:** Galerius promoted his trusted military companion, Licinius, directly to Augustus at Carnuntum (see *DMP* 29.1 ff.; *Jer. Chron.* 229c; *Chr. Min.* 1.231; *Zos.* 2.10.3 ff.), which upset the Caesars Maximian and Constantine (see ταῦτα Μαξιμίον δεινῶς ἐλύπει, μόνον Καίσαρα παρὰ πάντας εἰς ἔτι τότε χρηματίζοντα 8.13.15).

**ὑπὸ κοινῆς ψήφου τῶν κρατούντων:** After Severus' death Galerius summoned Diocletian out of retirement to confer with Maximian at the Conference of Carnuntum (Nov. 11, 308) regarding the composition of the new Tetrarchy.

**XIII.15 ταῦτα Μαξιμῖνον δεινῶς ἐλύπει, μόνον Καίσαρα παρὰ πάντας εἰς ἔτι τότε**

**χρηματίζοντα:** E's language here is ironic in attributing to Maximin the same terrible pain which the martyrs experienced under his rule (e.g., τὴν σφῶν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δεινότητα 8.12.7; cf. *DMP* 32.4 *dolet bestia et mugit*); Lactantius' narrative (*DMP* 32.1-5) also records Maximin's distress following the Council of Carnuntum: when Galerius' attempt to secure compliance from the young emperor through envoys is rebuffed by Maximin's argument of temporal precedence (he was emperor first!), Galerius first offered the title "sons of the Augusti" (evidence on coinage dates to 309-310, *RIC* 6.514; 6.630 ff.), then, after the army proclaimed Maximin Augustus in the spring of 310, ordered that all four tetrarchs were to be called "emperors." See also *DMP* 44.11-12 and 9.10.1 for Maximin's arrogance and penchant for complaining.

**ἐν τούτῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ μηχανὴν θανάτου συρράπτων ἀλοῦς... αἰσχίστῳ καταστρέφει**

**θανάτῳ:** In 310, Maximian reassumed the purple behind the support of soldiers from Augustodunum, holed up in Massilia, and was promptly handed over by the same soldiers to Constantine upon his arrival. After being placed under house arrest, Maximian plotted to kill Constantine – according to Lactantius, Maximian convinced his daughter, Fausta, to leave Constantine's bedroom poorly guarded, but she betrayed her father to her husband (Constantine), and Maximian instead killed a eunuch who had been substituted in the emperor's bed– after which he was forced to commit suicide. For Maximian's revolt and downfall, see *Pan. Lat.* 6(7).14.1-20; *DMP* 29.3-30.6; *VC* 1.47.1; *Vict. Caes.* 40.21-2; *Epit.* 40.5; *Eutr.* 10.3.2; *Zos.* 2.11.1; *Zon.* 12.33. The "most shameful form of death" is hanging/strangulation (see also ἀγχόνῃ τὴν ζωὴν ἀπορρήξας 8.app.1; as a form of execution, see βρόχῳ τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάξαντες 8.6.5).

**ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόθεσιν ἐπανηρῆσθαι δεδηλωμένος:** Maximian's re-elevation to the imperial throne has not yet been mentioned by E (nor is it ever). It may be that E has confused the

narrative in his source material with that of his own; or perhaps he is alluding, albeit clumsily, to the mention of Maximian's abdication in 8.13.11 (σὺν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν δευτερείοις τετιμημένῳ). **πρώτου δὲ τούτου τὰς ἐπὶ τιμῇ γραφὰς ἀνδριάντας...καθήρουν:** Maximian suffered *damnatio memoriae* in late 311 during the war between Constantine and Maxentius after the latter had deified his father and was seeking to avenge his death against Constantine (*DMP* 43.4-6; *Zos.* 2.14.1; *RIC* 6.382, Roma 243-4, 250-1; 404, Ostia 24-6). His memory was restored only after Eutropia swore under oath that Maxentius was not Maximian's biological son (*Pan. Lat.* 12(9).3.4, 4.3; *Origo* 12; see Barnes 1982: 34). By πρώτου δὲ τούτου, E undoubtedly means first among the Tetrarchs: Maxentius, Maximin, and Licinius also had their memories condemned (see Lenski 2005: 68-77).

**XIV.1 Τούτου παῖς Μαξέντιος:** E introduces Maxentius the same way he does Constantine (see Τούτου παῖς Κωνσταντῖνος 8.13.14), probably in a deliberate attempt to signal an immediate contrast not only between the two emperors, but also between their fathers.

**ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννίδα συστησάμενος:** Maxentius was declared *princeps* (see *RIC* 6:338-9, 367-70) on Oct. 28, 306 by the disgruntled remnants of the Praetorian Guard in Rome (see *DMP* 26.1-3, 6-7; *Zos.* 2.9.3; *Origo* 6; *Eut.* 10.2.3; *Vict. Caes.* 40.5; *Epit.* 40.2, 10-12; *Jer. Chron.* s.a. 307; *Soc.* 1.2.1).

**ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ' ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο:** cf. *MP(s)* 12.13; *Optat.* 1.18; (*HE* 9.9.2; *VC* 1.33-7). E's testimony here is unique, and very important, for Lactantius has surprisingly little to say about Maxentius' religious policy; for a good scholarly treatment, see de Decker 1968: 472-562; Curran 2000: 63-65. Considering the Romans' zeal for traditional religion, the motive ascribed to Maxentius for toleration (ἐπ' ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων) is unconvincing, as Laqueur 1929:

159 notes. Drake 2000: 172 argues that the evidence for Maxentius' favorable action in Rome must have been strong to allow E, the fiercest literary critic of the tyrant, to recognize him even as a false Christian. Van Dam 2011: 89-91 conjectures that E's source material for Maxentius in 8.14 (perhaps the same used for the events of 312 in Bk IX) was anti-Christian and attributed Maxentius' shameful behavior to the usurper's own adherence to Christianity. Thus E wished to recount the shameful acts of Maxentius, while separating them from any connection with Christianity. Perhaps most convincing is Christensen 1989: 135-6, who postulates that E's source was pagan and made mention only of Maxentius' εὐσέβεια (see εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων below; the pagan concept of *pietas*) which E interpreted in a Christian way (and thus added τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν) because of the emperor's policy of toleration. On another level, we can also discern in this statement a connection with, and indeed an aversion to, the shameful behavior of Christian leaders who, prior to the persecution, “pretend” to be atheists (οἷα δέ τινες ἄθεοι ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγούμενοι 8.1.8) and secular rulers (οἷα τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες 8.1.8). This is one of the ways in which E situates Maxentius firmly in the universal pattern of peace, fall, persecution/punishment, and restoration, established in the introduction to Bk VIII (8.1.1-8.2.3).

**ταύτη τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνεῖναι προστάττει διωγμὸν:** Barnes 1981: 38-39, 303 n. 98 emphasizes that Maxentius' policy was one of toleration, not restitution (see also Potter 2004: 665-6 n. 87), although there is evidence that he restored churches at Rome (Aug. *Brev. Coll.* 3.18.34; *Don. Post Gesta* 13.17).

**εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων καὶ ὡς ἂν δεξιὸς καὶ πολὺ πρῶος παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανείη:** While Christensen 1989: 134 emphasizes the difference in meaning between τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν (above) and εὐσέβειαν – one is unmistakably Christian, and the other pertains to the pagan

concept of *pietas* which emperors were supposed to possess – overall, the vocabulary suggests that Maxentius intended his religious policy to mimic that of Constantius and Constantine, but only superficially: E portrays Constantine as an emulator of his father's piety (ζηλωτὴν...εὐσεβείας 8.13.14), Maxentius as a simulator of piety (εὐσεβείαν ἐπιμορφάζων; τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν...καθυπεκρίνατο 8.14.1); Constantius is most mildly disposed to his subjects (πραότατα καὶ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις 8.13.12) and most favorable toward all (τοῖς πᾶσι δεξιότατον 8.13.13), while Maxentius only wishes to appear favorable and mild compared to his predecessors (ὡς ἂν δεξιὸς καὶ πολὺ πρᾶος παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανείη 8.14.1). E means Constantius and Constantine by τοὺς προτέρους, but Maxentius probably desired to set himself apart from Galerius as well (Potter 2004: 351, which posits a formal edict, based on Optat. 1.18: *Maxentio...iubente christianis libertas est restituta*; also προστάττει above).

**XIV.2 οὐ μὴν οἶος ἔσεσθαι ἠλπίσθη, τοιοῦτος ἔργοις ἀναπέφηνεν:** According to Christensen 1989: 136, E's introductory sentence in 8.14.1, which emphasizes the emperor's feigned Christianity, coupled with the present statement, would lead us to expect an account of Maxentius' change to an anti-Christian policy. That we never meet with such an account – instead hearing of adulteries, rapes, and killings – is evidence that E has reinterpreted the original idea of 8.14.1 (see Christensen's theory at ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ'ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία 8.14.1) but proceeds to follow closely the narrative of his source in the rest of the section.

**εἰς πάσας δ' ἀνοσιουργίας ὀκείλας:** lit., “run aground,” or “steer one's course.” This naval metaphor provides another link between 8.14 and the introductory section of Bk VIII. There it is Christians whose salvation has been shipwrecked (τῶν εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων 8.2.3, an echo of 1 Tim. 1.19). See ἡ δὲ τῶν κακῶν τῷ τυράννῳ κορωνίς ἐπὶ γοητείαν ἤλαυνεν

8.14.5. Such language also provides a fitting build-up to the description of the naval blockade in 8.15.1.

**μιαρίας ἔργον καὶ ἀκολασίας:** This expression provides a good summary of Maxentius' crimes: defilement (i.e., the murders and religious offenses recounted in 8.14.3-5) and licentiousness/intemperance (the adulteries and greed of 8.14.2-4).

**διαζευγνύς γέ τοι τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς κατὰ νόμον γαμετάς:** Maxentius himself was married to Galerius' daughter (his only legitimate child), Valeria Maximilla (*ILS* 666, 671), sometime before 305, and they had two sons together (*ILS* 667; *Pan. Lat.* 12(9).16.5). The description of Maxentius' lustful activity here matches that of Maximin, not only in E's account, but even more so in Lactantius' (*DMP* 38-41; especially 38.2). Much of this section on Maxentius's crimes (8.14.2-6) is repeated in *VC* 1.33-36.

**ἐμπαροινῶν τοῖς ἐξοχωτάτοις:** E will also characterize Maximin as a drunkard (see παροιμία γέ μὴν καὶ μέθης ἐς τοσαύτην ἠνέχθη φοράν 8.14.11 for a discussion of the topic).

**XIV.3 οἱ πάντες δ' αὐτὸν ὑποπεπτηχότες, δῆμοι καὶ ἄρχοντες, ἔνδοξοί τε καὶ ἄδοξοι:** We should probably assume, as Christensen 1989: 137 n.86 avers, that δῆμοι καὶ ἄρχοντες = *senatus populusque Romanus*; ἔνδοξοί τε καὶ ἄδοξοι may also be equivalent to *honestiores* and *humiliores*. Typically ὑποπεπτηχότες is translated as "cowered before him" (as in Oulton 1932: 303), but it can also connote "bowing down." It had become customary in this period even for aristocrats to bow down and kiss the hem of the emperor's garment (see Matthews 1989: 244-249).

**δουλείαν ἀπαλλαγὴ τις ὅμως ἦν τῆς τοῦ τυράννου φονώσης ὠμότητος:** Much like post-312 Constantinian propaganda, E's source material characterizes Maxentius' rule in traditionally Roman terms: the slavery of cruel tyranny has replaced the traditional Roman *libertas*, which can

only be restored through some form of deliverance (*Pan. Lat.* 9.4.2-4; 10.3.2; 6.2; 8.2; 31.3; ἀπαλλαγὴ τις sets up Constantine's action in 9.9.2).

**τὸν δῆμον εἰς φόνον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν δορυφόροις ἐκδίδωσιν, καὶ ἐκτείνεται μυρία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων πλήθη, ἐπὶ μέσης τῆς πόλεως:** *Chron.* 354, 148 states that 6000 people were killed; Zosimus apparently records the same incident: during a fire at the temple of Fortuna, a soldier who uttered a blasphemy against the goddess (perhaps the ἐπὶ σμικρᾷ γούν ἤδη ποτὲ προφάσει of which E speaks) was killed by a Roman mob. This ignited a mutiny among the soldiers, which would have resulted in the entire city's being destroyed had not Maxentius appeased them (*Zos.* 2.13.1). *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 40.24 speaks of the bodyguards' involvement; See also *Pan. Lat.* 4 (10).8.3; *Lib. Pont.* 31.

**οὐ Σκυθῶν οὐδὲ βαρβάρων ἀλλ' αὐτῶν τῶν οἰκείων δόρασι καὶ πανοπλίαις:** Maxentius is portrayed not only as a tyrant, but also as worse than a barbarian. – a standard theme of invective during this period (cf. *DMP* 9.2), which happily aligns with E's own theological and historical preoccupations. According to E's "ethnography of conversion" (as in Johnson 2006: 23), the various tribes which converted to Christianity have experienced a dramatic civilizing of their naturally barbaric *mores* (e.g., *PE* 1.4.6, in which the Scythians are mentioned). Here is another instance of the retrogressive aspect of persecution at operation in the emperors.

**XIV.4 δι' ἐπιβουλήν ἐνηργεῖτο τῆς οὐσίας:** Maxentius is accused repeatedly of despoiling his people: *Pan. Lat.* 12 (9).3.5; *Pan. Lat.* 4 (10).31.2 (possessions in Rome); *Pan. Lat.* 4 (10).8.3 (inheritances); *Vict. Caes.* 40.24 (forced munificence); *Zos.* 2.14.3 (Africa).

**ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις πεπλασμέναις αἰτίαις μυρίων ἀναιρουμένων:** *Pan. Lat.* 4 (10).31.1-2 vaguely refers to the imprisonment of Senators; *Prud. C. Symm.* 1.467-71 states that one hundred Senators were freed from prison by Constantine; *Zos.* 2.14.3 speaks of charges brought against

the elites in Africa who were associated with Alexander; but *Pan. Lat.* 12 (9).3.6 and Zon.

13.1.172.27-30 speak also of senatorial plots on Maxentius and the punishments which followed.

cf. ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθονουμένων καὶ διαλοιδορουμένων 8.1.7.

**XIV.5 ἡ δὲ τῶν κακῶν τῷ τυράνῳ κορωνὶς ἐπὶ γοητείαν ἤλαυνεν:** Unlike E, who lists all sorts of crimes engineered by Maxentius, including the the following hyperbolic list of religious atrocities, Lactantius can only fault the emperor for his superstitious form of paganism, which amounts to an overzealous interest in oracles (*DMP* 18.9, 26; 44.1, 8). In fact, he seems not even to count him among the persecutors (*DMP* 43.1; see Curran 2000: 65). Constantine too was fascinated by oracles, especially the Sibylline variety, as evidenced by passages in his *Oratio ad Coetum Sanctorum* (OC 18-20). The interest in oracles, which Constantine and Maxentius share, is a feature of early fourth century propaganda and polemic (see Digeser 2004), and in the case of Constantine, may owe partly to the conflict between the two emperors. κορωνὶς ἐπὶ γοητείαν ἤλαυνεν is yet another naval metaphor (“the curve of the tyrant’s ship of evils rammed into witchcraft;” e.g., the curved ships in Homer *Il.* 18.388; see also εἰς πάσας δ’ ἀνοσιουργίας ὀκείλας 8.14.2).

**μαγικαῖς ἐπινοίαις... συνισταμένον:** E gives our only notice of these (obviously exaggerated) religious atrocities. According to Grant 1992: 663, the description of Macrianus and Valerian’s activity in 7.10.4-9 (e.g., cutting the throats of children and exposing the entrails of new-borns) provides the model for E here.

**διὰ τούτων γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς νίκης κατορθωθήσεσθαι ἢ πᾶσα ἐτύγχανεν ἐλπίς:** This statement is borne out by the report of Maxentius’ actions before the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (9.9.3; also *DMP* 44, especially 44.8-9, when a reply from the Sibylline books led him to hope for victory: *quo response in spem victoriae inductus*). Thus E sets up the contrast between

Maxentius, who puts his hope in magic, and Constantine, who places his trust in the God of the Christians (cf. 9.9.2). For further discussion, see Lenski 2008: 209-211.

**XIV.6 τοὺς ὑπηκόους κατεδουλοῦτο:** See δουλείαν ἀπαλλαγὴ τις ὅμως ἦν τῆς τοῦ τυράννου φονώσης ὠμότητος 8.14.3

**ὡς ἤδη καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων τροφῶν ἐν ἐσχάτῃ σπάνει καὶ ἀπορία καταστῆναι:** The rebellion of L. Domitius Alexander, *vicarius* of Africa, which probably began in the summer of 308, caused a disruption of the grain supply to Rome and resulted in famine for the city's inhabitants (*Chron. Min.* 1.148; *Zos.* 2.12-14; *Vict. Caes.* 40.17-19; *Epit.* 40.2, 6) until it was crushed by Rufius Volusianus in 309.

**ὅσῃν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς οὐδ' ἄλλοτε οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι μνημονεύουσιν:** This exaggeration is certainly Eusebian (rather than belonging to his source material), meant to underscore his persistent claim that the period of persecution should be seen as unique in human history (see *τι περὶ τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν νεώτερον γεγονός τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει* 8.13.10).

**XIV.7 ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς τύραννος Μαξιμίνος:** Maximin's introduction as tyrant of the East shows immediately that E wants to establish a parallel account with that of Maxentius (ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς τυραννίδα συστησάμενος 8.14.1). E's intention is to demonstrate that both halves of the Empire are subject to tyranny: Maxentius in the West (see *πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν διειληφότων κατεργασθεῖσα* 8.14.18) and Maximin in the East (as Christensen 1989: 114 points out). It is also apparent that E has devoted considerably more space to the treatment of Maximin than to Maxentius. This is probably both necessary and deliberate. In the first place, E undoubtedly had access to more material on Maximin. While the account of Maxentius and Maximin in 8.14 probably owes largely to a single source (perhaps, as Grant 1992: 673 argues, one which Lactantius also used), E does seem to add material (e.g., his description of Maximin's

religious program in 8.14.9). At the same time, E is writing with the purpose of one that has experienced Maximin's persecution, which would likely skew the weight of presentation in favor of Maximin. Still, E may have wished to correct this imbalance (see τὰ ὅμοια Μαξιμίνῳ δρῶν 8.14.16).

**ὡς ἂν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν, πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης φιλίαν κρύβδην σπενδόμενος:** Imperial propaganda portrayed the Tetrarchy as a fraternity (*Pan. Lat.* 11.7.5-7; *ILS* 646; also *DMP* 8.1; 20.3). E, like other Christian polemicists, could expand the similarity in traits associated with brotherhood to including vice (e.g., Lactantius' comparison of Diocletian and Galerius in *DMP* 8.1-2; see ἦν δὲ θαυμάσαι ὅπως below). For a discussion of "collegiate unity" in the Tetrarchy, see Rees 2004: 72-76.

**πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης φιλίαν κρύβδην σπενδόμενος:** In 310, Maxentius made a secret treaty with Maximin (*DMP* 44.10). For E (or his source material), this information likely provided the basis for the comparisons between the two tyrants which follow, and indeed may have supplied the basis for the Maxentius' portrayal as persecutor in Constantinian propaganda.

**φοραθεῖς γέ τοι ὕστερον δίκην τίννυσι τὴν ἀξίαν:** According to *DMP* 44.10, Constantine found the correspondence among Maxentius' letters when he entered Rome in 312. The "worthy punishment" presumably refers to Maximin's defeat by Licinius, death, and *damnatio memoriae* in 313 (9.10-11).

**XIV.8 ἦν δὲ θαυμάσαι ὅπως καὶ οὗτος τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά, μᾶλλον δὲ κακίας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ νικητήρια τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου κακοτροπίας ἀπηνηγμένους:** This statement contains no finite verb in the subordinate clause. Christensen 1989: 145 attributes this to the fact that E clumsily expanded the original sentence, which connected τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά directly to κακίας (ἦν δὲ θαυμάσαι τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά κακίας?) and stressed the

tyrants' equality, to emphasize Maximin's superiority in evil. By this statement, E clearly indicates that he considers Maximin the worse tyrant (even though Maximin's evils are somewhat anti-climactic compared to Maxentius'), and this perhaps explains his greater treatment of the eastern tyrant.

**γοήτων τε γὰρ καὶ μάγων οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρ' αὐτῷ τιμῆς ἤξιωντο:** E probably has Theotecnus in mind (e.g., 9.11.6: ἡγεμονίας ἤξιωτο παρὰ Μαξιμίνου; see also 9.2.1-4.1; put to death by Licinius in 9.11.5-6, along with his partners in witchcraft). Note too the link with Maxentius regarding witchcraft (8.14.5; 9.9.3). After his initial defeat by Licinius, Maximin would put to death many of the same priests and prophets whom he had appointed, on the grounds that they had been sorcerers, cheats, and traitors (9.10.6). Here we have a reversal of the situation which characterized the period of peace before the persecution at the beginning of Bk VIII: under Maximin, it is the sorcerers, not the Christians, who hold the highest positions (note the similarity of language, especially the verb ἀξιόω in 8.1.1-5). This is yet another way in which E can link the behavior of the emperors to the universal pattern of peace, fall, punishment established in the introduction.

**ψοφοδεοῦς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ δεισιδαιμονεστάτου καθεστῶτος:** ψοφοδεής, a *hapax legomenon* in the Eusebian corpus, may come from E's source (though Clement of Alexandria uses the term: Clem. *Strom.* 1.1.18; 7.16.100). For Lactantius, timidity is one of Diocletian's defining traits (*DMP* 7.2; 8.2).

**τὴν τε περὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας περὶ πολλοῦ τιθεμένου πλάνην:** cf. παρ' οὐθὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα 8.14.13.

**μαντειῶν γοῦν δίχα καὶ χρησμῶν οὐδὲ μέχρις ὄνυχος ὡς εἰπεῖν τολμᾶν τι κινεῖν οἷός τε ἦν:**

Devotion to oracles is a commonplace in the late third/early fourth centuries. See Digeser 2004: 57-77.

**XIV.9 οὗ χάριν καὶ τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν σφοδρότερον ἢ οἱ πρόσθεν καὶ πυκνότερον ἐπετίθετο**

**διωγμῷ:** E attributes Maximin's zeal for persecution to his overly superstitious personality.

This begins a long period (78 words) of difficult syntax, which perhaps underscores the extensive and complex measures taken by Maximin to revive paganism. Note especially how the hyperbaton here (τῷ... διωγμῷ) reflects the scope and duration of his persecuting activities.

**νεὸς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐγείρειν καὶ τὰ χρόνου μήκει καθηρημένα τεμένη διὰ σπουδῆς**

**ἀνανεοῦσθαι:** Maximin appears to have initiated a preliminary phase of pagan revivalism in 308, which, according to *MP(s)* 9.2, featured the rebuilding of pagan altars, a forceful renewal of universal sacrifice, and a pollution of the marketplace and baths with sacrificial libations. This first attempt foreshadowed the second phase of 311/12 described here (Millar 1993: 202-203), which included a full-scale restoration of temples and sacred precincts.

**ἱερέας τε εἰδώλων κατὰ πάντα τόπον καὶ πόλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων ἐκάστης ἐπαρχίας ἀρχιερέα:**

cf. *DMP* 36.4-5. It may be that Maximin intends to imitate church hierarchy by appointing priests in each city and high priests in each province. Nicholson 1994: 1-10 provides a more detailed discussion of Maximin's pagan revivalism; Belayche 2011: 235-255 questions the innovative aspect Maximin's reforms.

**μετὰ στρατιωτικοῦ στίφους καὶ δορυφορίας:** E finds this worthy of note, because a bodyguard was usually reserved for high-ranking civil magistrates, such as governors and emperors (see ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος 8.9.7).

**XIV.10 πόλιν μὲν οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ χώραν:** The distinction here between city and country might pertain to Galerius' policy of taxing the landless urban populations (see below).

**χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χρημάτων ἀμυθήτων εἰσπράξεις ἐπισκήψεις τε βαρυτάταις καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις καταδίκαις:** E also likens Maximin to Maxentius in his greed, plundering, and profligacy (cf. δι' ἐπιβουλὴν ἐνηργεῖτο τῆς οὐσίας 8.14.4). εἰσπράξεις ἐπισκήψεις τε...καὶ...καταδίκαις = levies, injunctions, and condemnations; χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χρημάτων may be gold, silver, and bronze coins. E thus gives the impression that most of Maximin's revenue was procured through fines and condemnations. *DMP* 37.3.4-6 gives a similar description of Maximin's rapacity: he took possession of private granaries and storehouses, exacted future debt – this led to famine (cf. *HE* 9.8.1, which attributes the famine to drought) and a rise in prices – and seized herds for sacrifices; he was also wasteful in his use of resources: he gave his sizeable entourage fine clothes and golden coins, bestowed silver on common soldiers, and was generous in his giving to barbarians; he would steal people's goods while they were still living (cf. τῶν γε μὴν εὐπόρων τὰς ἐκ προγόνων περιποιηθείσας οὐσίας ἀφαιρούμενος) or give them to those of his attendants that sought others' goods (cf. πλούτους ἀθρόως καὶ σωροὺς χρημάτων τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν κόλαξιν ἔδωρεῖτο). Maximin's reputation for excessive taxation may originate in part from his enforcement of Galerius' policy of taxing the urban population in 306 (*MP(s)* 4.8) – indeed this policy helped provoke the usurpation of Maxentius in Rome – despite his restoration of exemption to Rome in 311 (see *DMP* 36.1; *CTh* 13.10.2).

**XIV.11 παροιρίας γε μὴν καὶ μέθης ἐς τοσαύτην ἠνέχθη φορὰν:** Drunkenness is a charge leveled repeatedly against the Tetrarchs in our sources, both pagan and Christian: cf. *Epit.* 40.19 (Maximin); *Origo* 4.9, *DMP* 18.12 (Severus); *Origo* 4.11 (Galerius). See Humphries 2002: 75-

88 for a full discussion. E also describes post-fall humanity as being in a drunken state (οἷα μέθης δεινῆς 1.2.21).

**τοιαῦτά τε μεθύοντα προστάττειν, οἷα ἀνανήψαντα αὐτὸν τῇ ὑστεραία εἰς μετάμελον ἄγειν:**

*Origo* 4 offers a strikingly similar description of Galerius: *Igitur Galerius sic ebriosus fuit, urbs, cum iuberet temulentus ea quae facienda non essent, a praefecto admonitus, constituerit ne iussa eius aliquis post prandium faceret.*

**κακίας διδάσκαλον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσί τε καὶ ἀρχομένοις ἑαυτὸν καθίστη:** E sets up a contrast here between Maximin, who plays a role typical among profligate characters in Greco-Roman literature (i.e., teacher of vice), and the female martyrs in 8.14.14, who resist threats of fornication “on behalf of the teaching of the divine word.” While the content of Maximin’s evil teaching – luxury and licentiousness which enfeeble the army (θρύπτεσθαι μὲν τὸ στρατιωτικὸν διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας ἐνάγων) – is described in feminine terms (luxury, licentiousness, and weakness all being female attributes in Antiquity), the female martyrs actually become men through the divine word’s teaching and their endurance of “the same contests as men” (αἱ δ' αὖ γυναῖκες... ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλίας ἠρρενωμέναι... τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀγῶνας ὑποστᾶσαι).

**θρύπτεσθαι μὲν τὸ στρατιωτικὸν διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας ἐνάγων:** The corruption of the army through luxury is a recurring theme in sources on the Tetrarchs. For example, Lactantius tells us that Maximian’s army longed for the pleasures of the Roman city (*DMP* 26.5). According to Zosimus, Maxentius corrupted his soldiers with money (χρήμασι τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ στρατιωτῶν διαφθείρας Μαξέντιος; *Zos.* 2.10.1), and Constantine rendered his soldiers effeminate through public shows and pleasures (καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐκδόντας ἑαυτοὺς θεάτροις καὶ τρυφαῖς ἐμαλάκισε; *Zos.* 3.34.2).

**ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ στρατοπεδάρχας δι' ἀρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας χωρεῖν κατὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων:**

The military metaphor (χωρεῖν κατὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων) fits the context nicely: while Maximin is enfeebling the army through luxury, he is encouraging governors and military commanders to attack and plunder their subjects. στρατοπεδάρχης = *dux* (see ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος 8.4.3).

**μόνον οὐχὶ συντυραννοῦντας αὐτῷ:** On the concept of tyranny in Late Antiquity, see Neri 1997: 71-86.

**XIV.13 κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προухώρει, μὴ ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν:** cf. οὐ καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῖς μαρτύρων ταῦτα προухώρει 8.3.4.

**οἱ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες παρ' οὐθέν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα:** cf.

Dorothea in 8.14.15, who conquers Maximin through her passive resistance (τὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου ψυχὴν δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν).

**οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρες ἀνατλάντες...:** The following list should be seen as a Eusebian addition (i.e., not part of his source material) which serves as a segue between the general account of Maxentius and Maximin and the stories of Dorothea and Sophronia in 8.15-17. It also allows E to compare the contests of male and female martyrs. His conclusion, that men and women participate in equally “manly” contests, demonstrates a martyrological gender theory of equality, which nevertheless centers on the role of manliness. For a discussion of masculinizing language in accounts of Christian martyrs, see Cobb 2008: 60-91.

**XIV.14 αἱ δ' αὖ γυναῖκες οὐχ ἦττον τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου διδασκαλίας**

**ἡρρενωμένα:** ἡρρενόομαι occurs only twice in E's works. Its second appearance is in *LC* 7.7, a passage which shares language with the current account: θηλειῶν τε ὡσαύτως νεανικαὶ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐχ ἦττον ἡρρενωμένα, αἱ μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀγῶνας ὑποστᾶσαι ἴσα

τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα (note the identical language of the lemma below). In E's thought, the transformational power of the Logos' teaching extends not only to race, but also to gender categories (e.g., *PE* 1.1.6; 12.32.7; see Johnson 2006: 210-213).

**αἱ μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀγῶνας ὑποστᾶσαι ἴσα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα:**

Here we have a similar agonistic metaphor as 8.14.8 (τὰ νικητήρια τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου κακοτροπίας ἀπενηνεγμένος, which speaks of Maximin's triumph in contests of evil). E thus emphasizes that the female martyrs have not only made themselves equal to men in their contests of virtue, but have also overcome Maximin's superiority in contests of wickedness.

**XIV.15 μόνῃ... Χριστιανῆ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισημοτάτη τε καὶ λαμπροτάτη:**

According to Rufinus' translation of the *HE*, the lady's name is Dorothea. We have no further information about her or any explanation for Rufinus' source for the name, but the story seems at least plausible based on Lactantius' more exaggerated portrait of Maximin's lust (*DMP* 38-41). Christensen may be correct in his speculation that E's source material was pagan, and so the author's insistence on the woman's Christianity would be an attempt to Christianize her. The following description of Dorothea's wealth, standing, and education suggests that we interpret λαμπροτάτη as *clarissima*, (see Christensen 1989: 151 n.134).

**ἐτόίμως θνήσκειν ἔχουσιν:** E seems almost apologetic about Dorothea's survival, probably because it serves as an anti-climax to the description of female martyrs in 8.14.14 which introduces her story.

**τὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου ψυχὴν δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν:**

Once again we see the juxtaposition of traditionally female (ἐμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον... ψυχὴν) and male qualities (δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν) residing in bodies of opposite gender.

**ἔνδοξος μὲν τὰ ἄλλα πλούτῳ τε καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ, πάντα γε μὴν δεύτερα σωφροσύνης τεθειμένη:** See ἀνδρείῳ δὲ λογισμῷ καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, μᾶλλον δὲ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ φιλοθέῳ ψυχῇ 8.9.8.

**τῆς ἐπιθυμίας μᾶλλον τοῦ θυμοῦ κατακρατούσης αὐτοῦ, φυγῇ δὲ ζημιώσας πάσης ἀφείλετο τῆς οὐσίας:** In a masterful piece of rhetoric, E ascribes to Maximin three different vices – lust, anger, and greed – in the description of a singular action. It is not surprising that lust wins out, since, according to Lactantius, this is Maximin’s principle vice (*DMP* 38.1). The punishment of exile was also used on Valeria, daughter of Diocletian, when she refused Maximin’s advances (*DMP* 39.5).

**XIV.16 πορνείας ἀπειλὴν μὴδ’ ἀκοῦσαι δεδυνημένοι:** Again, this is probably a reference to public prostitution (cf. πορνείας ἀπειλὴν, μὴδὲ ἄκροισι ὡσὶν ὑπομεῖναι δεῖν ἀκοῦσαι 8.12.3).

**θαυμασταὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὐταὶ:** Christensen 1989: 165-166 is probably correct in viewing this entire section (i.e., 8.14.16-18) as a later insertion, since the discussion of Maxentius’ misbehavior, including his notorious *libido*, ended at 14.6. He contends that this is not only E’s way of correcting the imbalance between the accounts of Maxentius and Maximin (which place greater emphasis on Maximin), but also of paralleling Maximin’s behavior in 8.14.15, offering a concrete example of Maxentius’ lustfulness described vaguely in 8.14.2, and demonstrating the consistency of virtue between Christian women in the East and West.

**θαυμασιωτάτη ἢ ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς εὐγενεστάτη τῷ ὄντι καὶ σωφρονεστάτη γυνή:** Rufinus informs us that the woman's name is Sophronia, a fitting name, considering her noble behavior in the face of Maxentius' lust, and an interesting coincidence, considering E's adjective (σωφρονεστάτη). Whether E knew her name and paid homage through the adjective, or Rufinus derived the name from the same adjective, or neither, is difficult to say. Sophronia, however, is a decidedly Greek name (in a Latin-speaking milieu), and one which corresponds very neatly with her noble

attributes; these considerations lend credence to the view that Rufinus (mistakenly or intentionally?) identified her with the adjective. See Groag 1930 (*RE*): 2467.

**ἐμπαρουνεῖν**: lit., “to behave as though drunk” (Lampe 2); thus with the dative, “to behave offensively toward.” cf. ἐμπαρουνῶν in 8.14.2; for the polemical aspect of drunken behavior, see παροιρίας γε μὴν καὶ μέθης ἐς τοσαύτην ἠνέχθη φορὰν 8.14.11.

**τὰ ὅμοια Μαξιμίνῳ δρῶν**: This expression, which belabors the major contention of 8.14 – the similarity in vice between Maxentius and Maximin – should be seen as an attempt to link this section (8.14.16-18), which is probably a later addition, to the preceding one.

**XIV.17 Χριστιανὴ δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ ἦν**: Once again, E’s insistence on the woman’s Christianity should cause some suspicion, especially since the story occurs in the traditionally Roman milieu of the ancient capital (see μόνη... Χριστιανὴ 8.14.15).

**καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίων ὄντα ἔπαρχον**: Rufinus clarifies the post as that of urban prefect, who should probably be identified here as Junius Flavianus, based on the evidence of *Chron. Min.* 1.67: Flavianus left office on Feb. 9, 312, even though it was customary for new prefectures to begin on the anniversary of Maxentius’ succession (i.e., Oct. 28). Thus it seems that he resigned his post (on account of his wife’s suicide?). See Barnes 1981: 42; Chastagnol 1962: 59.

**ἐς βραχὺ ὑποπαραιτησαμένη, ὡς ἂν δὴ κατακοσμηθεῖ τὸ σῶμα**: A common detail in such narratives. See βραχὺ τι τοὺς φύλακας εἰς ἀναχώρησιν ὑποπαραιτησάμεναι 8.12.4.

**ξίφος καθ’ ἑαυτῆς πήγνυσιν**: The parallels to the story of Lucretia are manifest: the chaste wife, the threat of sexual violation by a tyrant, and the suicide (Livy 1.57.60; Dion. Hal. 4.64-7; cf. *VC* 1.34, where she stabs herself in the chest). E may have known the story of Lucretia from Dionysius, as we have evidence of his using at least the first two books of the *Antiquitates Romanae* (see Carriker 2003: 147). More likely, however, the Lucretian quality comes from the

Latin milieu of E's source material. Interestingly, at *DMP* 28.4, Lactantius likens Maximian to Tarquin the Proud, which would make Maxentius comparable to Tarquinius Sextus, who raped Lucretia and brought about the downfall of the Etruscan kings. The existence of such a strain of propaganda would explain the story of Sophronia and its Lucretian quality.

**ἔργοις δ' αὐτοῖς ἀπάσης φωνῆς γεγωνότεροις:** The distinction between words and deeds is a common theme not only in E (e.g., *PE* 1.3.6), but also in ancient Greek authors more generally (cf. Thuc. 1.20-22); for a fuller discussion of the word/deed distinction in the literature of Late Antiquity, see Lim 1996: 257-69. See also *λόγω πρότερον δι' ἀπολογίας, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἔργοις ἀνακηρύξας* 8.13.2.

**ἢ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ἀρετὴ πέφυκεν:** Christensen 1989: 166 notes the awkwardness of this construction, and he may be right in conjecturing that *μόνον χρημάτων ἀήττητόν τε καὶ ἀνώλεθρον... ἢ... ἀρετὴ πέφυκεν* originally belonged to E's pagan source, and that the clumsy *παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς* was added by E to distinguish Sophronia's virtue as Christian. E himself seems to find the construction unsuitable, as he changes *χρημάτων* to *χρῆμα* and *ἀρετὴ* to *βοωμένη... σωφροσύνη* when he reproduces the passage in *VC* 1.34.

**πάντας ἀνθρώπους τοὺς τε νῦν ὄντας καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα γενησομένους:** (e.g., 8.pref., 8.2.3)

**XIV.18 τοσαύτη δῆτα κακίας φορὰ:** A similar situation of “evil-gone-wild” prevails in the Church at the beginning of Bk VIII (*τῆς εἰρωνείας ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ὅσον κακίας προϊούσης* 8.1.7; *ἄλλας ἐπ' ἄλλαις προσετίθεμεν κακίας* 8.1.8), and this state of affairs occasions the persecution. Here the persecution will begin to abate at the height of evil in secular affairs (E has already described Maxentius and Maximin as brothers and competitors in evil at 8.14.7-8) by the appearance of God's mercy, just as the behavior of humanity was civilized by the appearance of the Logos after evil had overwhelmed the primeval world (1.2.21).

**πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν διεληφότεων κατεργασθεῖσα:** The divided Empire mirrors the divided state of Christendom before the persecution (καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων 8.1.7; τὰς πρόσθεν τοῦ διωγμοῦ διαστάσεις 8.2.2), when church leaders contributed to division by acting as tyrants (οἷά τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες 8.1.8). Christensen 1989: 167 n.184 notes that διαλαμβάνω could also mean “lay hold of” here (as in illegal seizure).

**τὴν τῶν τοσοῦτων διερευνώμενος αἰτίαν...τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν διωγμὸν ἀποφίνασθαι:** Morgan 2005: 193-208 has shown that, of the two types of historical causation present in the *HE*, the human and divine, E gives clear precedence to the latter. This is true in Bk VIII as well (e.g., 8.1.7, where E attributes persecution to God’s judgment; and 8.16.1-2 is clear that the abatement of persecution owes to God’s “divine and heavenly hand,” not to any human cause). Yet Morgan also notes that Bk VIII is the exception for attributing provocation for the persecution to the Christians, in which scheme the emperors are implicated as God’s instruments and yet punished according to Biblical precedent. E says here that “the cause of events so momentous” is the persecution.

**ὄτε γε μάλιστα οὐ πρότερον τὰ τῆς τοσῆσδε πέπαντο συγχύσεως ἢ Χριστιανοὺς τὰ τῆς παρρησίας ἀπολαβεῖν:** i.e., until Christianity enjoys the freedom of practice described in 8.1.1-5 (see παρρησίας 8.1.1; εἰς πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ παρρησιαζομένοις λόγῳ τε καὶ βίῳ 8.1.3).

**XV.1 Διὰ παντός γέ τοι τοῦ κατὰ τὸν διωγμὸν δεκαέτους χρόνου:** E’s reference here to the entire ten-year period of persecution, and his mention of the famine in 8.15.2, are clear evidence that the events of this section (8.15.1-2) belong more properly to the second bout of persecution under Maximin (312-313) narrated in Bk IX. See ἀσπίδων ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θωρήκων παρασκευαῖ...κατὰ πάντα συνεκροτοῦντο τόπον 8.15.2.

**ἄπλωτα μὲν τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν:** The unsettled state of affairs which E narrates here – wars, storms, famines, and plagues – recalls the punishment meted out to primeval humanity in their uncivilized state before the appearance of the Logos (1.2.19-20).

**XV.2 ἀσπίδων ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θωρήκων παρασκευαῖ...κατὰ πάντα συνεκροτοῦντο τόπον:**

Christensen 1989: 173-174 offers a plausible explanation for the vivid intensity of this passage. He argues that it has a specific context: E's perception of the frantic military mobilization following Maximin's defeat by Licinius at *campus Ergenus* (the events are recounted in *DMP* 46-48.1; 49 and *HE* 9.10.3-4). Up until this time, the Levant had been little affected by the wars waged between the emperors. When Maximin was forced to retreat to Tarsus in May of 313, Caesarea, the main naval base in the eastern Mediterranean, would have experienced a great deal of military activity (ἐτοιμασίαι τριήρων τε καὶ τῶν κατὰ ναυμαχίαν ὀπλων) and would have been on the lookout both for spies (τῶν δι' ἐναντίας ἐχθρῶν 8.15.1) and for an attack by sea (οὐδ' ἦν ἄλλο τι παντὶ τῷ προσδοκᾶν ἢ πολέμων κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔφοδον ἡμέραν; according to *DMP* 49.2, Licinius did have a naval force in the region). E may have originally intended this account for inclusion at 9.8 but instead chose to generalize it so that it would be parallel with 1.2.19-20

**ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα λιμός τε καὶ λοιμὸς:** The account of the famine under Maximin occurs in *HE* 9.8.

The pairing of λιμός and λοιμὸς, especially in the context of divine punishment, was a commonplace in Greek literature since the time of Hesiod (*Hes. Op.* 243; also *Thuc.* 2.54).

**XVI.1 δεκάτῳ μὲν ἔτει σὺν θεοῦ χάριτι παντελῶς πεπαυμένου, λωφᾶν γε μὴν μετ' ὄγδοον**

**ἔτος ἐναρξαμένου:** Before modern scholarship had sorted out the difficulties regarding the date and composition of Bk VIII, E's statement, contextually awkward on a chronological level, that the persecution ended completely in the tenth year, was taken to be a later modification (i.e., after the persecution ended in 313; Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 283-4 conjectures that the original

read, “which came completely to an end...in the eighth year”). However, since it has been established that 313 was the date of the first edition (and 315/16 of the one which included the present Bk VIII), this solution is no longer valid. A better answer lies in the structure and economy of the *HE* as they relate to Bk VIII. We have established in the Introduction that Bks VIII, IX, and X represent the three days of the passion narrative (see Introduction IV). Thus Bk VIII mirrors the incarnation of the Logos in its account of the passions of the martyrs and the manifestation of the Word through their testimony. After the account in 8.13.9 – 15.2, which parallels the description of the Fall and of the uncivilized state of humanity before the Logos enters history (1.2.18-19), E sets the stage for the Logos to enter history again on a more concrete level through the recantation of persecution under Galerius. Thus we have language which touches on themes associated with the gospel narratives: historical uniqueness (ἀρχῆθεν καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ), divine visitation (ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς θείας προνοίας ἐμφανῆς ἐπίσκεψις) and reconciliation (τῷ μὲν αὐτῆς καταλλαττομένης λαῷ), repentance (μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην) the juxtaposition of human and divine (εὐμενῆ καὶ ἕλω ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις vs. οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἶκτος) and body and soul (σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς προελθοῦσα), and salvation (καὶ εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος). E's concern, then, is to clarify that Bk VIII mirrors the event of the Incarnation, which brought divine grace and relief from evils (a temporary abatement of persecution) but not ultimate victory. The latter would come only in the Resurrection (i.e. the end of persecution in Bk X, which represents the day of Resurrection).

**εὐμενῆ καὶ ἕλω ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις:** The Christians had lost this divine and heavenly favor (ἐς ὅσον ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ ἔσκεπέν τε καὶ ἐφρούρει 8.1.6) when they fell from grace at the beginning of Bk VIII due to their failure to make the Deity kind and propitious toward

them (οὐχ ὅπως εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προθυμούμεθα 8.1.8). See εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω 8.1.6 for a discussion of the vocabulary.

**οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄρχοντες:** We must wait until *παλινοδῖαν* to know with certainty that E intends the ambiguous phrase “our leaders” to refer to the persecuting emperors and not the leaders of the Church. This is perhaps intentional, for according to 8.1.7-2.3, the persecution arises due to the shameful behavior of the ecclesiastical leaders (whom E terms ἄρχοντες, e.g., 8.1.5), a connection that is reinforced here by the preceding εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις and the following explanatory clause (δι' ὧν πάλαι τὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐνηργεῖτο πολέμων).

**παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην:** cf. ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι 8.13.10, where the change to persecution happens quite unexpectedly.

**παλινοδῖαν ἦδον χρηστοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν προγράμμασιν καὶ διατάγμασιν ἡμερωτάτοις:** The “useful proclamations and most civilized ordinances” mentioned here form a parallel with “the civilized and most humane laws” (τοῖς ἡμέροις αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλανθρωποτάτοις...νόμοις 10.4.18) by which the Logos tames the barbaric ways of uncivilized tribes and indeed early humanity (as in 1.2.18-23). Grant 1979: 62-70 discusses civilization as a preparation for Christianity in E’s view of History. The singing imagery (*παλινοδῖαν ἦδον χρηστοῖς*) likens the palinode to an oracular or prophetic pronouncement made through the persecuting emperors. This makes us wonder whether E had heard, at this early date, of the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, which is said to have initiated the persecution (cf. *VC* 2.50; *DMP* 11.7-8).

**τὴν ἐπὶ μέγα ἀφθεῖσαν τοῦ διωγμοῦ πυρκαϊᾶν σβεννύντες:** The vocabulary here calls to mind the conflagrations which God sent upon post-lapsarian humanity as punishment for their wicked behavior (*πυρπολήσεσιν* 1.2.20); moreover, since the context is the end of persecution and demise of Galerius, E probably intends us to recall the fire in the palace, (*βασιλείους πυρκαϊᾶς*

ἐν αὐταῖς δὴ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἀφθείσης 8.6.6), which was a determining event at the beginning of the persecution, and in which Galerius is vaguely implicated.

**XVI.2 οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἶκτος, ὡς ἂν φαίη τις, ἢ**

**φιλανθρωπία τῶν ἀρχόντων:** The contrast is between the φιλανθρωπία of emperors (τῶν ἀρχόντων), as expressed in imperial proclamations (ὡς ἂν φαίη τις; see ἐπὶ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτοῖς χρηστὸν καὶ φιλόφρονον ἐτρέποντο 8.12.8; also the Edict of Toleration at 8.17.9), and the divine Logos, as evidenced by its visits in human form throughout history (αὐτὸς ὁ προὖν λόγος φιλανθρωπίας ὑπερβολῇ τοτὲ μὲν δι' ὀπτασίας ἀγγέλων τοῖς ὑποβεβηκόσι 1.2.21)

**ποικιλωτέραις μηχαναῖς ἄλλοτε ἄλλως τὰς καθ' ἡμῶν αἰκίας ἐπικαινουργούντων:** A *topos* in Bk VIII is the novelty and variety of torture (e.g., 8.3.1; 10.5; 12.1, 7; 8.1; 9.5; 14.16). For its relation to E's theological/apologetic agenda, see κεκαινουργημένους ...πολυτρόπους θανάτους 8.6.1.

**ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς θείας προνοίας ἐμφανῆς ἐπίσκεψις:** One cannot help but think of the appearance of the Logos among early humans described in 1.2.21. cf. Lk. 1.78

**τῷ μὲν αὐτῆς καταλλαττομένης λαῷ:** cf. Eph. 2.16; Rom. 5.10; 2 Cor. 5.18; Col. 1.20, 22. In the introduction to Bk VIII, E describes the laity as having formed factions (λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων 8.1.7). E perhaps also conceives of this reconciliation as marking a contrast with the divided state of affairs described in 8.14.18 (τυράνων ἀνατολήν καὶ δύσιν διεληφόντων). We should also note the significance of λαός, especially in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, as distinguishing the people of a specific religious community (e.g., Mt. 2.6; Lk. 2.10; Acts 15.14; Ex. 18.1, 14, etc.).

**τῷ δ' αὐθέντη τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης:** i.e., Galerius.

**καὶ πρωτοστάτη τῆς τοῦ παντὸς διωγμοῦ κακίας ἐπιχολουμένης:** Only ATER preserve καὶ πρωτοστάτη... ἔρχεται from earlier versions of the *HE*. One wonders why E decided to remove this section. In the first place, we detect some hesitancy on the part of E to attribute the punishment of the emperors explicitly to divine judgment (καὶ γὰρ εἴ τι ταῦτ' ἔχρην κατὰ θείαν γενέσθαι κρίσιν). Secondly, E may have originally intended πρωτοστάτη to refer to Diocletian (indeed this designation is used of the senior emperor at 8.13.11, in the context of his disease, and with vocabulary which is echoed in this section: νόσου γὰρ οὐκ αἰσίας τῷ πρωτοστάτη τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισκηψάσης). Perhaps E later desired to make Galerius' sole responsibility for the persecution explicit. In the present context, E may have chosen the verb ἐπιχολουμένης for its medical meaning (lit., “to turn into bile;” as in Gal. 15.599), since in ancient humoristic medicine, an excess of bile was thought to cause deterioration in the internal organs (Nutton 2004: 79-80).

**XVI.3 “οὐαί,” φησὶν ὁ λόγος, “δι' οὗ δ' ἂν τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται”:** E views Galerius' disease as the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy (as he does the persecution at Συντετέλεσται δῆτα καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα 8.2.1), and thus we see a connection to the oracular language at 8.16.1. This is a loose quotation from Mt. 18.7/Lk. 17.1. Though usually translated “Scripture” (as in Oulton 1932: 314), ὁ λόγος can be taken quite literally as the Logos, who itself forms the content of the biblical judgment quoted here. It is fitting that the Logos should speak at a point in the narrative when E portrays a divine visitation (τῆς θείας προνοίας ἐμφανῆς ἐπίσκεψις; θεήλατος κόλασις 8.16.2), as earthly sojourns constitute the primary occupation of the Logos in E's view of history (e.g., 1.2.21). Morgan 2005: 204-205 considers the historiographical implications of this quotation, which, she argues, clarifies that the main persecutor (whom she misidentifies as

Diocletian), despite being a simple instrument of God without his own motivations, is deserving of punishment based on the biblical paradigm.

**μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θεήλατος κόλασις:** cf. 1.2.20, where E uses the same verb (μέτειμι) describing God's punishment (κολαστηρίσις) of post-Fall humanity.

**ἐξ αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ καταρξαμένη σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς προελθοῦσα:** Like Galerius' sickness, which goes as deep as his soul, the condition of early humanity in 1.2.20 is described as "a disease of souls" (νόσον ψυχῶν).

**XVI.4 περὶ τὰ μέσα τῶν ἀπορρήτων τοῦ σώματος ἀπόστασις:** While Africa 1982: 14 cautions against reading too much historical reality into E and Lactantius' description of Galerius' illness, it is probably the case that he had a degenerative bowel disease, such as colon cancer (Lenski 2006: 68).

**εἶθ' ἔλκος ἐν βάθει συριγγῶδες ἀνίατος νομὴ κατὰ τῶν ἐνδοτάτω σπλάγχνων:** cf. *DMP* 33.2: *sed inducta iam cicatrice scinditur vulnus et rupta vena fluit sanguis usque ad periculum mortis, vix tamen cruor sistitur.* Lactantius describes this as a wound which repeatedly reopens.

Doctors are only able to treat it with difficulty, but by this time, the cancer has spread to the adjoining areas (*DMP* 33.2-4).

**ἀφ' ὧν ἄλεκτόν τι πλῆθος σκολήκων βρύειν:** Lactantius provides a fuller (and indeed more gruesome) account of Galerius' illness in *DMP* 33.1-11 (= see Creed xxxviii-xxxix for its parallel with the description of Antiochus Euphianes' death in 2 Macabees 9). Among later sources, cf. *Oros.* 7.28; *Origo* 3.8; *Vict. Caes.* 40; *Epit.* 40. Africa 1982: 12-15 argues that Galerius died from an infection, but that the phthiriasis was a literary invention common among ancient authors. Indeed E mentions Herod the Great's death by phthiriasis (1.8.6-9), and Herod Antipas'

(2.10.1-9), and probably would have read 2 Macabees 9 and Papias' account of Judas' wormy death (Papias Fr. 3).

**θανατώδη τε ὀσμὴν ἀποπνεῖν:** cf. *DMP* 33.7, where Lactantius takes hyperbole to a new level, claiming that the smell “pervaded not just the palace but the whole city” (Creed 1984: 51).

**τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου τῶν σωμάτων ἐκ πολυτροφίας αὐτῷ...εἰς ὑπερβολὴν πλήθους πιμελῆς μεταβεβληκός:** While Lactantius mentions Galerius' large stature (e.g., *DMP* 9.4; described as bear-like in 21.5), it is E who explicitly ties it to gluttony and attributes to it the emperor's demise. E's charge of gluttony is of a piece with the cannibalistic language in Bk VIII, particularly surrounding the martyrdom of Peter (ἐπάτει τὰς ἀλγηδόνας 8.6.3).

**ἦν τότε κατασαπεῖσαν ἀφόρητον καὶ φρικτοτάτην τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν παρέχειν τὴν θέαν:** In what E must consider poetic justice, it is Galerius, not the martyrs, who now furnishes the hideous spectacle (cf. θέαν ταύτην αἰσχίστην... ὀρῶσιν ἅπασιν παρεσχημένα 8.9.1). Moreover, E describes the nature of his suffering (i.e., his putrefied body) in terms that recall the martyrdom of the imperial servant Peter, in which Galerius apparently was involved (see τῶν διασαπέντων 8.6.3).

**XVI.5 ἰατρῶν δ' οὖν οἱ μὲν...κατεσφάπτοντο...οἱ δὲ...ἀνηλεῶς ἐκτείνοντο:** Lactantius' account of the physicians' behavior is somewhat different. According to *DMP* 33.2-6, famous doctors were brought in to treat Galerius and, though they tried many different procedures to no avail, did not stop their treatment (cf. οὐδ' ὄλωσ ὑπομεῖναι τὴν τοῦ δυσώδους ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀτοπίαν οἳ τε), “even with no hope of curing the disease” (*DMP* 33.6). Lactantius fails to mention the fate of the doctors, but they are described as *infelices*; it is unclear whether this is due to punishment for their failure or their misfortune in witnessing the hideous sight. In his translation of the *HE*, Rufinus records the testimony of one of the doctors, who, facing death and

inspired by God, informs Galerius that his treatment has failed because of divinely sent punishment. The provenance of this information is uncertain and may be an invention by Rufinus. The adverb ἀνηλεῶς reinforces E's assertion above that human (i.e., the emperors') mercy was not the cause of the recantation. See οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἶκτος 8.16.1.

**καὶ εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος:** cf. *DMP* 33.6: *vel sine spe vincendi mali*; 35.3: *nec...veniam sceleris accepit a deo*; E probably intends σωτηρία in its spiritual sense as well (the disease, after all, goes as deep as his soul 8.16.3; cf. εἰς ἅπαν τῆς σωτηρίας νεναυαγηκότων 8.2.3, which speaks of the church leaders' compromised salvation), all the more since Galerius requests that the Christians pray for his salvation in the Edict of Toleration (περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας 8.17.10)

**XVII.1 τοσοῦτοις παλαίων κακοῖς:** In 8.4.2, 5, E portrays Galerius as a wrestler stripping to do battle with the Christians (Ὡς δὲ καὶ γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο 8.4.5). Now he must wrestle instead with his own misfortunes/evil deeds (indeed the ambiguous κακά can be subjective or objective; cf. *DMP* 33.11: *malis domitus*).

**συναίσθησιν τῶν κατὰ τῶν θεοσεβῶν αὐτῷ τετολημμένων ἰσχει:** In both E and Lactantius' narrative, Galerius comes to the realization himself, apparently from reflecting on his illness/evil deeds (cf. *DMP* 33.11). Rufinus, however, less confident in Galerius' reasoning skills, states that a doctor had to inform him of the cause of his disease.

**συναγαγὼν δ' οὖν εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὴν διάνοιαν:** The implication is that Galerius was out of his mind when he was persecuting the Christians. Likewise, E describes Diocletian as having a mental illness (τὰ τῆς διανοίας εἰς ἔκστασιν αὐτῷ παρήγετο 8.13.11; cf. *DMP* 17.9; *DMP* 31.5). This stands in contrast to Galerius' contention in the Edict of Toleration that it is the Christians

who are seized by ἀπόνοια and must return εἰς ἀγαθὴν πρόθεσιν (*ad bonas mentes*).

**πρῶτα μὲν ἀνθομολογεῖται τῷ τῶν ὄλων θεῷ:** Both E and Lactantius claim that Galerius confessed God (even if less than willingly, according to *DMP* 33.11: *deum coactus est confiteri*), but there is no evidence in the edict itself of such a confession/conversion (see Rees 2004: 67-8).

**εἶτα τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἀνακαλέσας:** Lawlor-Oulton 1928 II: 284 speculates that this was his council of assessors (i.e. his *consistorium*), and likewise Christensen 1989: 187 n. 231 suggests the highest officials, including the praetorian prefect. E's point may be that Galerius, in his helpless state, must call upon those same imperial servants whom he persecuted in 8.5-6.

**μηδὲν ὑπερθεμένους τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποπαῦσαι διωγμὸν...προστάττει:** The hastiness of the proclamation was expressed in the edict itself (see προθυμότητα 8.17.9). For the specific provisions, see ἵνα αὐθις ὅσιν Χριστιανοὶ 8.17.9.

**νόμῳ τε καὶ δόγματι βασιλικῷ:** See βασιλικά γράμματα 8.2.4.

**τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπισπέρχειν καὶ τὰ συνήθη διαπράττεσθαι:** The edict states that the Christians are allowed (not urged) to build gathering places (see τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο συνθῶσιν 8.17.9), but “ought to” offer prayers for the safety of the emperor and the state (εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου ποιουμένων).

**XVII.2 ἔργου τῷ λόγῳ παρηκολουθηκότος:** The verb probably originates from the edict itself (see τοιούτου ὑφ' ἡμῶν προστάγματος παρακολουθήσαντος 8.17.8)

**ἤπλωτο κατὰ πόλεις βασιλικά διατάγματα τὴν παλινωδίαν:** See ἤπλωτο 8.2.4. The Edict of Toleration, posted at Nicomedia on April 30, 311, survives in two copies (here, as a Greek translation, and in *DMP* 34). Lactantius, who reproduces the Latin text, records that the legislation was an edict (although E's version is presumably a letter; see δι' ἐτέρας δὲ ἐπιστολῆς 8.17.9). E's translation uniquely preserves the titlature listing the names and imperial titles of

three of the four emperors (Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius) in which the legislation was issued. Rufinus' version simply retranslates E's Greek translation into Latin. The edict was probably only published in Galerius' provinces, (9.1.1 claims it was not published in Maximian's provinces). For further discussion of the legislation, including its context, see Bihlmeyer 1912: 411-427, 527-589; Knipfing 1922: 693-705; Keresztes 1983: 390-393; Corcoran 1996: 186-187; Corcoran 2006: 231-240.

**XVII.3 Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ:** = *imperator Caesar*, the standard epithet of an Augustus which occurs invariably before the proper name. 8.17.3-5 is of great importance, since Lactantius fails to preserve the imperial titulature of the Latin original (although *DMP* tells us the edict was issued in the names of all four emperors. For fuller discussions of tetrarchic titulature, see especially Barnes 1982: 17-29; Corcoran 2006: 231-240. Barnes 1982 reproduces and comments on the eight most important (i.e., official) documents for our knowledge of the emperors' names and titles: Currency Edict of 301 (*AE* 1973.526a), Price Edict of 301 (*CIL* 3.802-803; *AE* 1956.113), Military Diploma of January 7, 305 (*AE* 1958.190), Military Diploma of January 7, 306 (*AE* 1961.240), fragment of imperial edict/letter of 310 (Sinope; *CIL* 3.6979; *ILS* 660), fragment of imperial edict/letter of 310 (Lycia; *CIL* 3.12133), *HE* 8.17.3-5, and Letter of Constantine to the Senate of Rome of 337 (*AE* 1934.158). Corcoran 2006: 231-240 offers treatment of the newly discovered letter from Galerius to Heraclea Sintica in Macedonia.

**Γαλέριος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμιανός:** Galerius' official name became Gaius Galerius Valerius Maximianus – "Valerius" from Diocletian (C. Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus, whose daughter, Valeria, Galerius married) and "Maximianus" from Maximian (M. Aurelius Valerius Maximianus) – upon his elevation to Caesar (March 1, 293).

**ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος:** = *invictus Augustus, pontifex maximus*, standard

epithets of an Augustus following the proper name, but conspicuously lacking the customary *pius felix* (which normally precedes *invictus Augustus*). Barnes 1982: 22 has emended the text to include εὐσεβῆς εὐτυχῆς (just as it occurs with Constantine in 8.17.4); it is more likely the case that E intentionally omitted it (Galerius was neither *pius* nor *felix*), or the phrase fell out due to scribal error.

**Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος:** Thus begins the victory titles. The praetorian diploma of Jan. 7, 306 (*AE* 1961.240) records the fifth iteration of *Germanicus Maximus*, and the new inscription of Heraclea Sintica in Macedonia (*AE* 2002.1293) attests to the sixth. E's version of the edict lacks the iteration.

**δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ εἰκοστόν:** *tribunicia potestas* was bestowed on the *dies imperii* and renewed each following December 10; thus Galerius received his twentieth on Dec. 10, 310. As Corcoran 2006: 232 points out, this is one more iteration than we should expect, considering Galerius was elevated on March 1, 293. We must therefore assume that he received an additional year upon his elevation to Augustus in 305 (see also Barnes 1982: 26).

**αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἔννεακαιδέκατον:** The first *imperator*, which always precedes *Caesar* at the beginning of the titlature, is invariable, while the second *imperator* always follows the proper name and is attributive (renewed annually on the *dies imperii*; Barnes 1982: 25). Since in the Tetrarchy Caesars did not officially carry the title *imperator*, we should expect Galerius to be *Imp.* VII (from his elevation to Augustus on May 1, 305). *Imp.* XIX is probably the result of his reckoning from his initial appointment to Caesar (March 1, 293; see Corcoran 2006: 232).

**πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος:** = *pater patriae, proconsul*, the final standard epithet for an Augustus (lacking for Caesars), which occurs at the end of the titlature.

**XVII.4 Φλαύιος Οὐαλέριος Κωνσταντῖνος:** As the translation of Oulton 1932 indicates,

Maximin's name would have appeared between Galerius' titulature and that of Constantine here (for *DMP* 36.3 states that the edict was issued in the name of all four emperors). Maximin's name is excluded for obvious reasons. For Constantine's titulature, see Barnes 1982: 21-29.

**XVII.5 καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Οὐαλέριος Λικιννιανὸς Λικίννιος... ἐπαρχιώταις ἰδίοις χαίρειν:** Section 8.17.5 appears only in manuscripts ATER, omitted in the post-315/16 editions due to Licinius' defeat by Constantine and subsequent *damnatio memoriae*. The greeting provides a clear indication that the edict was originally published as a letter (see δι' ἐτέρας δὲ ἐπιστολῆς 8.17.9).

**XVII.6 Μεταξὺ τῶν λοιπῶν:** An unnecessarily literal translation of *inter cetera*.

**βεβουλήμεθα πρότερον:** See τοιούτου ὑφ' ἡμῶν προστάγματος παρακολουθήσαντος 8.17.8.

**κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους νόμους:** Such ancient laws are to be contrasted with the “made-up” laws of the Christians (οὕτως ἑαυτοῖς καὶ νόμους ποιῆσαι 8.17.7).

**τὴν δημοσίαν ἐπιστήμην τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων:** cf. *DMP* 34.1: *publicam disciplinam*

*Romanorum*. ἐπιστήμη is the typical (and probably accurate) translation of *disciplina* in the *HE* (e.g., 3.33.3). See Knipfing 1922: 696.

**πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι:** E likely uses this periphrasis for its alliterative value (cf. *id providere*; Fisher 1982: 203).

**τῶν γονέων τῶν ἑαυτῶν καταλελοίπασιν τὴν αἵρεσιν:** cf. *DMP* 34.1: *qui parentum suorum reliquerant sectam*.

**εἰς ἀγαθὴν πρόθεσιν ἐπανάλθοιεν:** Lactantius' Latin version helps to clear up E's imprecise Greek: *ad bonas mentes redirent* (*DMP* 34.1).

**XVII.7 τοσαύτη αὐτοῦς πλεονεξία:** *tanta...voluntas* (“so much self-will”).

**κατεσχῆκει καὶ ἄνοια:** Only ATER preserves this reading, which, according to Schwartz,

belongs to an earlier edition of the *HE* (*GCS* 2.2: 794). E must have deliberately omitted this phrase – which nevertheless appears in the Latin original (*invasisset et tanta stultitia*) – from later editions due to its negative pronouncement on Christianity. But see τῶν πολλῶν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπονοία διαμενόντων 8.17.9.

**τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι καταδειχθεῖσιν:** cf. *DMP* 34.2: *illa veterum instituta*

**ἄπερ ἴσως πρότερον καὶ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἦσαν καταστήσαντες:** Creed 1984: 112 n.114 argues that the “perhaps” qualifies “ancestors,” meaning that only some of the Christians’ ancestors were the Romans who would have established the traditional forms of worship. πρότερον is a somewhat imprecise translation of the original *primum*. Fisher 1982: 202-3 conjectures that the periphrastic ἦσαν καταστήσαντες results not from a misreading or mistranslation, but from E’s desire to play on the sound of ἦσαν.

**ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν πρόθεσιν καὶ ὡς ἕκαστος ἐβούλετο:** E’s translation deviates somewhat from the Latin here (*sed pro arbitrio suo atque ut isdem erat libitum*). While κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν πρόθεσιν (“according to their purpose”) does differ substantially in meaning from *pro arbitrio* (“according to their own judgment”), ὡς ἕκαστος ἐβούλετο only renders an idiomatic Latin expression (*ut isdem erat libitum*) into readable Greek (Fisher 1982: 203).

**ἐν διαφόροις διάφορα πλήθη συνάγειν:** cf. *et per diversa varios populos congregarent* *DMP* 34.2. As Creed 1984: 112 points out, large gatherings always concerned the Roman imperial government.

**XVII.8 τοιγαροῦν:** This word (= *denique* in *DMP* 34.3) signals that the dispositive part of an imperial constitution is about to start: the law is broken into the heading (titulature), the opening (in this instance the greeting of the letter), the preamble (which usually gives the background to a law), and then the disposition (which is always introduced by *denique* or *itaque*). See ἵνα αὐθις

ὡσιν Χριστιανοὶ 8.17.9.

**τοιούτου ὑφ' ἡμῶν προστάγματος παρακολουθήσαντος:** This evidently refers to the persecuting edicts of 303/304, although these are characterized as a single piece of legislation here. See βασιλικὰ γράμματα 2.2.4. cf. *cum eiusmodi nostra iussio extitisset DMP 34.3.*

**παντοίους θανάτους ὑπέφερον:** The phrase is missing in Lactantius' version (see Creed 1980: 112 n.6), and we should probably assume, based on the vocabulary (similar expressions abound in Bk VIII), that this is a Eusebian addition, perhaps to compensate for the stronger sense of *deturbati* in the Latin.

**XVII.9 τῶν πολλῶν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπονοίᾳ διαμενόντων:** Note the different vocabulary in Lactantius' version: *cum plurimi in proposito perseverarent (in proposito = “in their determination”)*. If E's copy is the same as Lactantius' here, it is strange that he should translate the mundane *in proposito* with the scandalous τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπονοίᾳ, especially since in later manuscripts he had removed this very expression when it occurred earlier in the document (see 8.17.7).

**μήτε τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις τὴν ὀφειλομένην θρησκείαν προσάγειν αὐτοὺς μήτε τῶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν προσέχειν:** cf. *nec diis eosdem cultum ac religionem debitam exhibere nec Christianorum deum observare*, where the difference in E's translation is noticeable. Above all, the truncated reference to the Christian god (lacking *deum*), when juxtaposed to the more elaborate τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (simply *diis* in Lactantius) τὴν ὀφειλομένην θρησκείαν προσάγειν, may indicate that E's copy may have been somewhat more hostile to the Christians (e.g., rescript of Maximin at 9.7.5).

**προθυμότατα:** E's translation here may be more wishful thinking than fact: the original Latin (*promptissimam in his quoque indulgentiam*) speaks more of “readiness” or “visibility” than

eager intention.

**ἵνα ἀθέτως ὦσιν Χριστιανοί:** While the disposition began at τοιγαροῦν 8.17.8, only here do the substantive provisions of the legislation begin: 1) Christianity is now legal and 2) Christians are allowed to build churches. Some scholars emphasize the significance of this provision as granting the first formal recognition of Christianity as a *religio licita* (see Knipfing 1922: 704-5; Creed 190: 113 n.8) – it indeed surpasses Gallienus’ legislation – but others downplay its importance (as Barnes 1981: 39). Keresztes 1983: 391 argues that the spirit of the document is one of toleration, emphasized by the language of pardoning and indulgence, not of equality for Christianity with the official pagan religion. This is brought into focus by Lenski 2011: 243, who contrasts the language of the so-called Edict of Milan with that of the Edict of Toleration and finds that, while *libertas* is mentioned six times in the former, the term never occurs in the latter.

**τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο συνθῶσιν:** = *conventicula sua component* (DMP 34.4). In terms of the letter’s internal logic, this would seem to be a necessary prerequisite to encourage prayers on behalf of the emperor and the state. This provision seems to permit only the building of new churches and the rebuilding of ones that had been destroyed (Keresztes 1983: 391). As such, it does not even go as far as the legislation of Gallienus (*HE* 7.13; ) in allowing the restoration of church property.

**οὕτως ὥστε μηδὲν ὑπεναντίον τῆς ἐπιστήμης αὐτοῦς πράττειν:** Keresztes 1983: 391 is probably correct in arguing that this proviso clause, at the very least, “does not show a spirit of goodwill.” It may in fact be intended (as it seems to have become for Maximin) to be an escape clause for future emperors who would desire to circumnavigate the legislation and engage in persecuting activities.

**δι' ἑτέρας δὲ ἐπιστολῆς:** Of course, this implies that the present legislation takes the form of a letter, as the greeting at the beginning of the document suggests (see ἐπαρχιώταις ἰδίους χαίρειν 8.17.5; and as Barnes 1981: 39 avers).

**τοῖς δικασταῖς δηλώσομεν τί αὐτοὺς παραφυλάξασθαι δεήσει:** By τοῖς δικασταῖς, E and Lactantius (*iudicibus*) probably mean the provincial governors. The strong language of “guarding” seems to suggest that the letter would further specify the content of the proviso clause (ὥστε μηδὲν ὑπεναντίον τῆς ἐπιστήμης αὐτοὺς πράττειν), which would agree generally with the restrictive measures alluded to in the so-called Edict of Milan (10.5.3; *DMP* 48.4); some scholars, however, have seen in this promised letter an attempt to grant more concessions to Christians, including the recovery of church property. Other scholars doubt whether any such letter ever existed (for the evidence, see Knipfing 1922: 702-703; also Keresztes 1983: 391). Any connection with the “conditions” of previous rescripts mentioned in the so-called Edict of Milan is thus problematic.

**XVII.10 κατὰ ταύτην τὴν συγχώρησιν τὴν ἡμετέραν:** τὴν συγχώρησιν = *indulgentiam* (“indulgence/forgiveness”). This amounts to an imperial pardon for Christianity’s past and future malfeasances (see Knipfing 1922: 701), which carries with it an obligation on the part of the Christians to pray for the safety of the emperor and the state, and otherwise to keep from trouble. **ὀφείλουσιν τὸν ἑαυτῶν θεὸν ἱκετεύειν:** *DMP* 46 states that Licinius required his soldiers to pray a generic, monotheistic prayer before his battle with Maximin, and *VC* 2.30 describes Constantine’s enforcement of prayer on Sunday, whether pagan or Christian, among his soldiers. Both suggest an increasing willingness on the part of emperors during this period to require forms of “non-denominational” prayer.

**περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας:** This phrase in the edict may have prompted E’s biting remark in 8.16.5

about Galerius' illness (εις ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπτωκότος).

**τὰ δημόσια παρασχεθῆ ὑγιῆ:** “the state may be rendered healthy;” ὑγιῆ serves as a predicate (as in the Latin *res publica praestetur incolumis* DMP 34.5).

**ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἐστία:** It is strange that E should use the decidedly pagan ἐστία (cf. *MP(l)* 4.1; to translate the more neutral *sedibus*).

**XVII.11 Ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων φωνήν... τοῦτον εἶχεν τὸν τρόπον:** E wants to emphasize that he preserves the “gist” of the Latin document (τοῦτον εἶχεν τὸν τρόπον), which is only represented in a translation.

**ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλωτταν κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν μεταληφθέντα:** Based on the self-deprecating remark (κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν), and the fact that he has translated a document from Latin to Greek elsewhere in the *HE* (the epistle of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus; see 4.8.8) there can be little doubt that E himself translated the edict. See Fisher 1982: 201 n.71 for the evidence.

**App.1 ὁ μὲν τῆς γραφῆς αἴτιος:** E attributes the cause of the persecution to Galerius (αἴτιον τῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ καταστῆναι συμφορᾶς 8.app.1) but not its cessation (οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἶκτος 8.16.2). God is responsible for the end of the persecution (εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος 8.16.1), and Galerius only for its official proclamation.

**αὐτίκα καὶ οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν:** One could interpret this phrase in two ways. εἰς μακρὸν usually denotes length of time, and as such, would normally be translated “not for long” – the sense being that Galerius would also suffer in the hereafter (as in Oulton 1932: 323 and Bardy 1958 III: 41). Yet we should expect an adversative (such as ἀλλά) rather than the simple connective (καὶ), a fact which probably leads McGiffert 1890 to interpret οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν as intensifying αὐτίκα. While E's focus on temporal affairs means that he does not dwell on punishment in the

hereafter, there are places where he ascribes such punishment to persecutors (*VC* 2.27; *MP* 7.8; see Trompf 2000: 129). Indeed, this would be fitting for the instigator of the persecution.

**μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον:** Galerius presumably died during the first days of May 311.

**λόγος ἔχει:** Carriker 2003: 68 suggests that the phrase here may indicate a source which is simply “current tradition,” but I would argue that it probably refers to the same written source which E uses for the events in the West (8.13.9 – 14.18) and Galerius’ illness (8.16.4 – 17.2), insofar as the information which it contributes (that Galerius was the cause of the persecution) is of a piece with Lactantius’ account, which, in turn, shares much of its content with 8.13.9 – 14.18 and 8.16.4 – 17.2. While E and Lactantius may have shared source material for these sections, they seem to have had different copies of the Edict of Toleration. Lactantius presumably reproduces the original Latin version posted in Nicomedia on April 30, 311 (without the heading; see Knipfing 1922: 695); E, in all likelihood, procured a copy from a neighboring province after persecution ended.

**ἔτι πάλαι πρὸ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν βασιλέων κινήσεως:** For the date of the persecution in the armies, see *πολὸν πρότερον* 8.4.1.

**τοὺς ἐν στρατείαις Χριστιανούς:** This passage is the precursor to the expanded treatment of the military persecution in 8.4.1-4, and so the source to which E alludes here (see *λόγος ἔχει* 8.app.1) would seem to supply the information for that section.

**καὶ πρώτους γε ἀπάντων τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου:** Lactantius’ report in *DMP* 10.4 that Diocletian ordered those in his household to sacrifice on the pain of whipping after a failed reading by the *haruspices* was blamed on the Christians who were present, and this before letters ordering sacrifice were sent to the commanders of the army, corroborates this parenthetical statement.

**τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῆς στρατιωτικῆς ἀξίας ἀποκινουῦντα... ἤδη δὲ καὶ θάνατον ἐτέροις ἐπαρτῶντα:**  
cf. 8.4.3; *DMP* 10.4.3.

**τοῦσχατόν γε τοὺς τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων ἀνακεκινηκότα διωγμόν:**

E fails to reproduce this piece of information in his account of the events leading up to the general persecution in 8.4.1-4 – which assigns all persecuting activity solely to Galerius – though he probably found it in his source (note the similarity to *DMP* 10.6).

**App.2 τεττάρων οὖν τὴν κατὰ πάντων διειληχότων ἀρχήν:** i.e., the first Tetrarchy: Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius, and Galerius. E chooses an ambiguous verb (*διαλαγχάνω* = “obtain,” but also “divide”) to emphasize the divided state of the Empire under the Tetrarchy (cf. πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολήν καὶ δύσιν διειληφότων κατεργασθεῖσα 8.14.18). For E’s dislike of polyarchy, which he equates with civil strife, see Chesnut 1986: 76-78.

**οἱ μὲν χρόνῳ καὶ τιμῇ προηγούμενοι... μεθίστανται τῆς βασιλείας:** i.e., Diocletian and Maximian, who abdicated on May 1, 305, simultaneously, in Nicomedia (Diocletian) and Milan (Maximian); see Barnes 1982: 4; cf. 8.13.10.

**ἧ καὶ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δεδήλωται:** This apparently refers back to *MP(s)* 3.5-6.

**δημῳδῆ καὶ ἰδιωτικῷ τρόπῳ διαγενόμενοι:** See τὸν δημῳδῆ καὶ ἰδιωτικὸν ἀπολαμβάνει βίον 8.13.11. When asked by Maximian and Galerius to resume power, Diocletian famously replied that he preferred to cultivate cabbage at his residence in Split (*Aur. Epit.* 39.6).

**App.3 ὁ μὲν τιμῇ τε καὶ χρόνῳ τῶν πρωτείων ἠξιομένος:** i.e., Diocletian.

**μακρᾷ καὶ ἐπιλυποτάτῃ τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενείᾳ διεργασθείς:** It is unclear whether E connects this disease with the one which caused his abdication. According to *DMP* 42.2-3, Diocletian died from “hunger and anguish,” heartbroken over the state of the Empire after his abdication. He is the only emperor of the original Tetrarchy whose death is not mentioned in the

reworked Bk VIII (perhaps because E linked it with his initial disease?). On the date of his death, see τούτων δὴ μόνος ἔτι λείπων 8.app.6.

**ὁ δὲ τὰ δευτέρα αὐτοῦ φέρων ἀγχόνη τὴν ζωὴν ἀπορρήξας:** The nature of Maximian's death, which is described in 8.13.15 as “most shameful,” is not mentioned in the reworked Bk VIII, perhaps because Constantine played such a heavy role in it. See *DMP* 30.1-6; *Pan. Lat.* 6(7).14.5.

**κατὰ τινὰ δαιμονίαν προσημείωσιν:** This may allude to a quotation, like the one of Virgil preserved in Lactantius' account – *dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes...ac nondum informis leti trabe nectit ab alta* (*DMP* 30.5) – which perhaps was attached to Maximian's death in western source material.

**App.4 τῶν δὲ μετὰ τούτους:** i.e., the Caesars Galerius and Constantius Chlorus.

**ὁ μὲν ὕστατος:** i.e., Galerius.

**τοιαῦτα οἷα καὶ προδεδηλώκαμεν πέπονθεν:** This is a clear reference to Galerius' sufferings in 8.16.2 – 17.2, which proves that these sections too were included in the first edition. See Introduction III.

**ὁ δὲ τοῦτον προάγων:** i.e., Constantius, who was senior to Galerius, as indicated by the order of names on official imperial documents (e.g., Maximum Prices Edict; *PLondon* 974) and attested by our two best sources for the period (*DMP* 18.6; 20.1; *HE* 8.5.1). For a discussion of hierarchy in Tetrarchic titulature, see Nixon-Rodgers 1994: 50-51. E omits this information when he reworks this material in 8.13.12-13, probably because the new context does not require it. Yet one can see how it might cause embarrassment: if Constantius was the senior Caesar, then Augustus, why could he not put an end to persecution?

**χρηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος... εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο:** E

reproduces much of this material on Constantius and Constantine in 8.13.13-14 with minor alterations. For a discussion of the changes, see the notes on 8.13.13-14.

**App.5 τῶν προαναγεγραμμένων τεττάρων:** i.e., Galerius, Diocletian, Maximian, and Constantius.

**κατὰ παρηλλαγμένους χρόνους:** Deaths of the original Tetrarchs: Constantius (July 25, 306), Maximian (310), Galerius (May 311), Diocletian (311 or 312? See Barnes 1982: 31-32).

**App.6 τούτων δὴ μόνος ἔτι λείπων:** The manuscript tradition is complicated at this point: while E preserves λείπων, A λιπών, and R omits τούτων – κατεστήσαντο altogether, no reading gives the form (presumably λειπομένων) required for the proper sense (“of those still remaining”).

Although not normally adduced in the debate over the date of Diocletian’s death, this statement does seem to imply, based on context, that Diocletian was dead before Galerius (against scholarly consensus; see Barnes 1973: 32-35; Barnes 1982: 31-32). Still, it’s inconclusive, since E might refer here to those left in office rather than to those still living.

**ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν εἰρημένος:** i.e., Galerius.

**σὺν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσποιηθεῖσι:** i.e., Constantine, Licinius, and Maximin.

**τὴν προδεδηλωμένην ἔξομολόγησιν... τοῖς πᾶσι φανερὰν κατεστήσαντο:** A reference to 8.17.1 and 8.app.1, ostensibly this statement means simply that the so-called confession was published, but we can also translate the statement as “they made the aforesaid confession *apparent* to all.” In this case, it is an argument that the document itself serves as evidence of such a confession.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Africa, T. "Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History." *CA* 1 (1982): 1-17.
- Bablitz, L. *Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Baldwin, M. C. *Whose Acts of Peter?: Text and Historical Context of the Actus Vercellenses*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Bardy, G., trans. *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclésiastique. Texte grec, traduction et annotation*. 4 vols. SC 31, 41, 55, 73. Paris: Cerf, 1952-1960.
- Barnes, T. D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Eusebius of Caesarea." *Expository Times* 121.1 (2009): 1-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Lactantius and Constantine." *JRS* 63 (1973): 29-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Some Inconsistencies in Eusebius." *JTS* 35 (1984): 470-475.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Date of the Martyrdom of Lucian of Antioch." *ZAC* 8.2 (2004): 350-353.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Editions of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*." *GRBS* 21.1 (1980): 191-201.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Belayche, N. "La politique religieuse 'païenne' de Maximin Daïa. De l'historiographie à l'histoire." In *Politiche religiose nel mondo antico e tardo antico*, edited by Giovanni A. Cecconi and Chantal Gabrielli. Bari: Edipuglia, 2011.
- Bihlmeyer, K. "Das Toleranzedikt des Galerius vom 311." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 94 (1912): 411-27, 527-89.
- Bremmer, J. N. "'Christianus sum': The Early Christian Martyrs and Christ." In *Eulogia*:

*mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire*, edited by G. J. M Bartelink, A. Hilhorst and C. H. Kneepkens, 11-20. Steenbrugge: Nijhoff, 1991.

Buckland, W. *The Roman Law of Slavery: the Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian*. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.

Burgess, R. W. *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*." *JTS* 48 (1997): 471-504.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Date of the Persecution of Christians in the Army." *JTS* 47 (1996): 157-58.

Burkitt, F. *Shmona, Guria and Habib Edessan Martyrs: Texts and Translations With Notes and Commentary*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007.

Bynum, C. W. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Cameron, A. "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History." In *Tria Corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, edited by E. Gabba, 71-88. Como, 1983.

Cameron, A., S. Hall, eds. *Eusebius' Life of Constantine: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Canepa, M. *The Two Eyes of the Earth: Art and Ritual of Kingship between Rome and Sasanian Iran*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Carriker, A. J. *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Chastagnol, A. "L'inscription constantinienne d'Orcistus." *Antiquité Tardive* 93.1 (1981): 381-416.

Chesnut, G. F. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Christensen, T. *Rufinus of Aquileia and the Historia Ecclesiastica, Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius*. Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The So-called Appendix to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII." *C&M* 34 (1983): 177-209.

- Clark, E. "Eusebius on Women in Early Church History." In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, 256-269. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Cobb, S. *Dying to Be Men: Gender and Language in Early Christian Martyr Texts*. New York: Columbia Press, 2008.
- Corcoran, S. "Galerius' Jigsaw Puzzle: the Caesariani Dossier." *Antiquité Tardive* 15 (2007): 221-250.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Galerius, Maximinus and the Titulature of the Third Tetrarchy." *BICS* 49 (2006): 231-240.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284-324*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Creed, J. L., trans. and ed. *Lactantius. De Mortibus Persecutorum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Curran, J. *Pagan City and Christian Capital*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Davies, P. S. "The Origin and Purpose of the Persecution of 303 AD." *JTS* 40 (1989): 66-94.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. "Aspects of the 'Great Persecution.'" *HTR* 47 (1954): 75-109.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*. New York: Oxford, 2006.
- DeDecker, D. "La politique religieuse de Maxence." *Byzantion* 38 (1968): 472-562.
- Delehaye, H. "S. Barlaam Martyr at Antioch." *AB* 22 (1903): 129-145.
- Detienne, M. and J. P. Vernant. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Digeser, E. D. "An Oracle of Apollo at Daphne and the Great Persecution." *CP* 99.1 (2004): 57-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lactantius and Constantine's Letter to Arles: Dating the Divine Institutes." *JECS* 2.1 (1994): 33-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Religion, Law and the Roman Polity: The Era of the Great Persecution." In *Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome*, edited by Clifford Ando and Jorg Rupke, 68-84. Stuttgart: Verlag, 2006.
- Downey, G. *A History of Antioch in Syria: from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ." *Historia* 4 (1955): 199-208.
- Drake, H. A. *Constantine and the Bishops. The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Eusebius Knew: The Genesis of the 'Vita Constantini.'" *CP* 83.1 (1988): 20-38.
- Drijvers, J. W. *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the True Cross*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Droge, A. J. *Homer or Moses?: Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Crown of Immortality: Toward a Redescription of Christian Martyrdom." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, edited by John J. Collins and Michael A. Fishbane, 153-168. Albany: SUNY Press, 1995.
- Edwards, M. "The Constantinian Circle and the *Oration to the Saints*." In *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, 251-275. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ekroth, G. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, 2002.
- Elliott, J. H. "The Evil Eye and the Sermon on the Mount." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 2.1 (1994): 51-84.
- Elliott, T. G. *The Christianity of Constantine the Great*. Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1996.
- Ferguson, T. "The Past is Prologue: Origenism in Book X of the *Ecclesiastical History*." *ZAC* 7 (2003): 99-112.
- Festy, M. "Puissances tribunicienes et salutations impériales dans la titulature des empereurs romains de Dioclétien à Gratien." *RIDA* 29 (1982): 193-234.
- Fisher, E. "Greek Translations of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century A.D." *YCS* 27 (1982): 173-215.

- Fitzgerald, J. T. *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*. Leiden: Brill 1996.
- Frend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.
- Fritze, E. *Beiträge zur sprachlich-stilischen Würdigung des Eusebios*. Borna-Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1910.
- Gallonio, A. *Tortures and Torments of the Christian Martyrs*. Translated by A.R. Allinson. Paris, 1903.
- Garnsey, P. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Geerard, M. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. 5 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974-1987.
- Gero, S. "The True Image of Christ: Eusebius's Letter to Constantia Reconsidered." *JThS* 32 (1981): 460-470.
- Gilhus, I. S. *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Gilliard, F. D. "Senatorial Bishops in the Fourth Century." *HTR* 77.2 (1984): 153-175.
- Grant, R. M. "Civilization as a Preparation for Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius." In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams at the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, edited by F. Forrester Church and Timothy George, 62-70. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Early Christians and Animals*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Eusebius and Imperial Propaganda." In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, 658-683. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Eusebius as Church Historian*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "H. E. VIII: Another Suggestion." *VC* 22.1 (1968): 16-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Transmission of Eusebius, H.E. VIII, 17, 3-5." *Texte & Textkritik* (1987): 179-185.
- Groag, E. *Maxentius*. *RE* 14 (1930): 2417-2484.
- Gustafson, M. "Condemnation to the Mines in the Later Roman Empire." *HTR* 87.4 (1994): 421-433.

- Hägg, T. "Hierocles the Lover of Truth and Eusebius the Sophist." *SO* 67 (1992): 138-150.
- Harries, J. *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Helgeland, J. "Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine." *ANRW* 2.23.1 (1979): 724-834.
- Helm, R., ed. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.
- Hengel, M. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Hirschfeld, O. *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905.
- Hirschfeld, Y. "Farms and Villages in Byzantine Palestine." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 51 (1997): 33-71.
- Hirt, A. M. *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World: Organizational Aspects, 27 BC-AD 235*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Horn, C. B., and J. W. Martens. *"Let the Little Children Come to Me": Childhood and Children in Early Christianity*. Washington, D.C: The Catholic University Press, 2009.
- Horrocks, G. C. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Humphries, M. "The Lexicon of Abuse: Drunkenness and Political Illegitimacy in the Late Roman World." In *Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Guy Halsall, 75-88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Johnson, A. *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Philonic Allusions in Eusebius, *PE* 7.7-8." *CQ* 56.1 (2006): 239-248.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602 : A Social Economic and Administrative Survey*. 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Roman Civil Service." *JRS* 39 (1949): 38-55.
- Kind, H. D. "Antike Kupfergewinnung zwischen Rotem und Totem Meer." *ZDPV* 81 (1965): 56-73.
- Keresztes, P. "From the Great Persecution to the Peace of Galerius." *VC* 37.4 (1983): 379-399.

- Knipfing, J. R. "The Edict of Galerius (311 A. D.) Re-considered." *RBPH* 1.4 (1922): 693-705.
- Kofsky, A. *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Krause, J. U. *Gefängnisse im Römischen Reich*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996.
- Kyle, D. G. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Lake, Kirsopp and J. E. L. Oulton, trans. *The Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1932.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961-1968.
- Laqueur, R. *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1929.
- Lawlor, H. J. *Eusebiana: Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- Lawlor, H. J. and J. E. L. Oulton, ed. and trans. *Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. London: SPCK, 1927-1928.
- Leadbetter, B. *Galerius and the Will of Diocletian*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Lenski, N. "Constantine and Slavery: *Libertas* and the Fusion of Roman and Christian Values." In *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana XVIII*, edited by G. Crifò, 235-260. Perugia: Aracne Editrice, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evoking the Pagan Past: *Instinctu Divinitatis* and Constantine's Capture of Rome." *JLA* 1.2 (2008): 204-257.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Servii Publici in Late Antiquity." In *Die Stadt in der Spätantike Niedergang oder Wandel*, edited by J.-U. Krause and C. Witschel, 335-57. Stuttgart, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reign of Constantine." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski, 59-90. New York: Cambridge, 2006.
- Levine, L. *Caesarea under Roman Rule*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Lightfoot, J. L. *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Lim, R. "'By Word or By Deed,' Two Modes of Religious Persuasion in Late Antiquity." In *Religion in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Dillon, 257-269. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1996.
- Löhr, W. A. "Observations on Karl-Heinz Schwarte's 'Diokletian's Christengesetz.'" *VC* 56.1 (2002): 75-95.

- Loraux, N. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. Translated by Anthony Forster. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Louth, A. "The Date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*." *JTS* 40.1 (1990): 111-123.
- MacMullen, R. "Roman Bureaucrats." *Traditio* 16 (1962): 364-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Second Church: Popular Christianity, A.D. 200-400*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Mason, A. J. *The Persecution of Diocletian: A Historical Essay*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1876.
- Mason, H. J. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*. Toronto: Hakkert, 1974.
- Matthews, J. F. "The Origins of Ammianus." *CQ* 45 (1994): 252-269.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Mattingly, D. J. *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- McGiffert, A. C., trans. *The Church History of Eusebius*. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Henry Wace and Philip Schaff. Oxford: Parker and Company, 1890.
- McKechnie, P. "Christian Grave Inscriptions from the *Familia Caesaris*." *JEH* 50 (1999): 427-441.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The First Christian Centuries*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2001.
- Metzger, B. "Lucian and the Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible." *NTS* 8 (1962): 189-203.
- Millar, F. "Condemnation to Hard Labour in the Roman Empire, from the Julio-Claudians to Constantine." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 52 (1984): 124-147.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC-AD 337*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Roman Near East: 31 BC - AD 337*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Mitchell, S. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Maximinus and the Christians in AD 312: A New Latin Inscription." *JRS* 78 (1988): 105–24.
- Morgan, T. J. "Eusebius of Caesarea and Christian Historiography." *Athenaeum* 93 (2005): 193–208.
- Mortley, R. *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.
- Mousourakis, G. *A Legal History of Rome*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Musurillo, H. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Neri, V. "L'usurpatore come tiranno nel lessico politico della tarda antichità." In *Usurpationen in der Spätantike*, edited by Francois Paschoud et al., 71–86. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.
- Nicholson, O. "Flight from Persecution as Imitation of Christ." *JTS* 40 (1989): 48–65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Pagan Churches' of Maximinus Daia and Julian the Apostate." *JThS* 45 (1994): 1–10.
- Nixon, C. E. V. and B. S. Rodgers, eds. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Nutton, V. *Ancient Medicine*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Patrich, Y. "The Martyrs of Caesarea: the Urban Context." *Liber Annuus* 52 (2002): 321–346.
- Pelikan, J. *The Finality of Jesus Christ in an Age of Universal History: A Dilemma of the Third Century*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Pinney, R. *The Animals in the Bible: The Identity and Natural History of All the Animals Mentioned in the Bible*. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1964.
- Potter, D. S. *The Roman Empire at Bay: AD 180–395*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Quasten, J. *Patrology 3: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature: From the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon*. Westminster: Christian Classics, 1992.
- Rapp, C. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005.

- Rebillard, É. *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*. Translated by Elizabeth Trapnell Rawlings and Jeanine Routier-Pucci. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Rees, R. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Robinson, O. F. *Penal Practice and Penal Policy in Ancient Rome*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.
- Ruinart, T. *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta*. Ratisbon, 1859.
- Samuelsson, G. *Crucifixion in Antiquity: An Inquiry into the Background & Significance of the New Testament Terminology of Crucifixion*. Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Sarefield, D. "The Symbolics of Book Burning: The Establishment of a Christian Ritual of Persecution." In *The Early Christian Book*, edited by William E. Klingshirn and Linda Safran, 159-176. Washington: Catholic University Press, 2007.
- Sato, Y. "Martyrdom and Apostasy." In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, 619-634. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Saxonhouse, A. W. *Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Schott, J. "Founding Platonopolis: The Platonic in Eusebius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus." *JECS* 11.4 (2003): 501-531.
- Schwartz, E and T. Mommsen, eds. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. 3 vols. GCS. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903-1909.
- Shaw, B. "Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs." *JECS* 4.3 (1997): 269-312.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Passion of Perpetua." *Past & Present* 139 (1993): 3-45.
- Slusser, M. "The Martyrdom of Lucian of Antioch." *ZAC* 7.2 (2003): 329-337.
- Smith, J. A. *Music in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Somerville, R. E. "An Ordering Principle for Book VIII of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History: A Suggestion Author(s)." *VC* 20.2 (1966): 91-97.
- Stathakopoulos, D. *Famine and Pestilence in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Empire: a Systematic Survey of Subsistence Crises and Epidemics*. Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
- Tabbernee, W. "Eusebius' 'Theology of Persecution:' As Seen in the Various Editions of his Church History." *JECS* 5.3 (1997): 319-334.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Tougher, S. *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Trombley, F. "Overview: The Geographical Spread of Christianity." In *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Origins to Constantine*, edited by Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, 302-313. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Trompf, G. W. *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice*. London: Continuum, 2000.
- Van Dam, R. *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Van Hoof, A. J. L. *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-killing in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Vergote, J. "Les principaux modes de supplice chez les Anciens et dans les textes chretiens." *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 20 (1939): 141-63.
- Vittinghoff, F. "'Christianus sum': Das 'Verbrechen' von Aussenseitern der romischen Gesellschaft." *Historia* 33 (1984): 331-57.
- Vivian, T. *St. Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr*. In *Studies in Antiquity and Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Wallace-Hadrill, D. S. *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Walsh, J. J. "On Christian Atheism." *VC* 45.3 (1991): 255-77.
- Wesch-Klein, G. "Recruits and Veterans." In *A Companion to the Roman Army*, edited by Paul Erdkamp, 436-450. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Westermann, W. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1955.
- Williams, R. L. *Bishop Lists: Formation of Apostolic Succession in Ecclesiastical Crises*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005.
- Williamson, G. A., trans. *Eusebius: The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*. New York: Penguin, 1965.
- Winkelmann, F. *Euseb von Kaisareia: Der Vater der Kirchengeschichte*. Berlin: Verlags-Anstalt Union, 1991.

Woods, D. "Veturius and the Beginning of the Diocletianic Persecution." *Mnemosyne* 4.54 (2001): 587-91.