

Rufinus of Aquileia and the
Historia Ecclesiastica,
Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius

By TORBEN CHRISTENSEN

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser **58**

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters



Commissioner: Munksgaard · Copenhagen 1989

The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

publishes four monograph series, an Annual Report and, occasionally, special publications. The format is governed by the requirements of the illustrations, which should comply with the following measures.

	<i>Authorized Abbreviations</i>
<i>Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser</i> , 8°	Hist. Fil. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. (printed area 175×104 mm, 2700 units)
<i>Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter</i> , 4° (History, Philosophy, Philology, Archaeology, Art History)	Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk. (printed area 2 columns, each 199×177 mm, 2100 units)
<i>Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser</i> , 8° (Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology)	Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. (printed area 180×126 mm, 3360 units)
<i>Biologiske Skrifter</i> , 4° (Botany, Zoology, Palaeontology, General Biology)	Biol. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk. (printed area 2 columns, each 199×77 mm, 2100 units)
<i>Oversigt, Annual Report</i> , 8°	Overs. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

The Academy invites original papers that contribute significantly to research carried on in Denmark. Foreign contributions are accepted from temporary residents in Denmark, participants in a joint project involving Danish researchers, or partakers in discussion with Danish contributors.

Instructions to Authors

Manuscripts from contributors who are not members of the Academy will be refereed by two members of the Academy. Authors of accepted papers receive galley proof and page proof which should be returned promptly to the editor. Minidisks etc. may be accepted; contact the editor in advance, giving technical specifications.

Alterations causing more than 15% proof charges will be charged to the author(s). 50 free copies are supplied. Order form, quoting a special price for additional copies, accompanies the page proof. Authors are urged to provide addresses for up to 20 journals which may receive review copies.

Manuscripts not returned during the production of the book are not returned after printing. Original photos and art work are returned when requested.

Manuscript

General. – Manuscripts and illustrations must comply with the details given above. The original ms. and illustrations plus one clear copy of both should be sent to the undersigned editor.

NB: A ms. should not contain less than 32 *printed* pages. This applies also to the Mat. Fys. Medd., where contributions to the history of science are welcome.

Language. – English is the preferred language. Danish, German and French mss. are accepted and in special cases other languages. Where necessary, language revision must be carried out before final acceptance.

Rufinus of Aquileia and the
Historia Ecclesiastica,
Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius

By TORBEN CHRISTENSEN

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser **58**

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters



Commissioner: Munksgaard · Copenhagen 1989

© Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab 1989
Printed in Denmark by Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri A/S
ISSN 0106-0481. ISBN 87-7304-178-5

Contents

Prefaces	5
An Introduction and an Apology	7
LIBER VIII	13
The Proem (736,1-5)	13
1,1-2,1 (736,6-740,24): The Church before the outbreak of the persecution	15
2,2-4,5 (740,24-746,20): The beginning of the persecution	24
5,1-6,7 (746,20-750,21): The persecution in Nicomedia	37
6,8-10 (750,21-752,10): The persecution gathered speed when the second and third edicts were issued	47
7,1-10,11 (752,11-764,15): On the deaths of the martyrs in Palestine and Egypt	55
10,12-13,8 (764,15-774,10): Examples of martyrs' sufferings in individual provinces	79
13,9-15,2 (774,11-788,7): Christianity and politics in the Ro- man Empire	113
14,7-16a (780,22-786,2): Maximin as the tyrant of the East	144
14,16b-17 (786,2-15): Maxentius and the Roman noblewoman	164
14,18 (786,15-21): Anarchy in the Roman Empire	167
15,1-2 (786,21-788,5): Civil war during the persecution of the Christians	172
16,1-17,11 (788,8-794,25): The persecution is called off	177
LIBER IX	201
1,1-11 (802,1-806,18): Maximin's reluctant recantation of the persecution of the Christians	201
EXCURSUS: The origins of <i>cap.</i> 1	222
2-6,4 (806,19-812,18): Maximin's resumption of the persecu- tion of the Christians	228
7,1-9a,12 (812,19-838,16): Maximin is forced to discontinue the persecution of the Christians	254

10,1-15 (838,16-848,8): Maximin is forced to give the Christians complete freedom of religion	314
11,1-8 (848,9-852,6): The restoration of the churches and the removal of Maximin's officials and family.	324
CONCLUSION	333
Bibliography	337

Prefaces

Publishing unfinished posthumous manuscripts is always a difficult task. Torben Christensen was, of course, well aware of this, and he laid down the essential directions for the work on the manuscript for this book. As is evident from his own introduction, he primarily wanted a critical reading to determine if the manuscript could be and should be published.

The unfinished analyses of the texts presented the greatest problem to the editors. Torben Christensen had taken the analysis of Eusebius's text through to the end of Liber IX, but he had not supplied a discussion of the parallel text in Rufinus from IX, 10 ff. (839,9-853,5).

We saw three possible solutions to the problem. We could complete the analysis of Rufinus along the lines of the method which Torben Christensen had himself adopted. We could exclude the final section which lacked an analysis of Rufinus's text. Or we could leave the incomplete analysis as it was. We chose the last solution, essentially because Torben Christensen knew that, in any case, his book would appear as a torso. No attempts to complete the textual analysis could have fulfilled the intentions which Torben Christensen had for his project.

Professor Christensen himself emphasized the point that he had had no time to synthesize his analysis of the textual material. But before he died, he published an article which reported on his preliminary results; it was originally given as a "mastertheme" at The Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford, 1979: "Rufinus of Aquileia and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius," *Studia Theologica*, 34 (1980), 129-152. We decided to use the summary from this article as a conclusion for his posthumous manuscript.

Moreover, we have carried out the critical reading that Torben Christensen wanted. We have supplied, wherever possible, information missing from the notes, and we have checked the often lengthy and numerous Greek and Latin quotations.

Torben Christensen never finished his work, but even as it stands it represents a comprehensive analysis of a complex of problems which is essential to the history of the early church. His material, therefore, must be made available to other scholars. Under the circumstances we feel convinced that readers will appreciate the work in its unfinished state.

Øyvind Norderval

Niels Hyldeahl

My husband, Torben Christensen, discussed, shortly before he died, on Sept. 8, 1983, his unfinished manuscript with his two close friends Niels Hyldahl, Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Copenhagen, and cand.theol. Øyvind Norderval, Research Fellow in the History of the Early Church at the University of Oslo. They promised Torben Christensen to prepare his work for publication. I am very grateful to them because they have kept their promise with such a great sense of duty and loyalty. Originally, another of my husband's friends, Povl Johannes Jensen, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Odense, was to have revised the English translation, which had been kindly provided by Mrs Ann Caie. But tragically, Povl Johannes Jensen died in 1985. Therefore, Dr Karsten Klejs Engelberg, together with a fourth of Torben Christensen's close friends, Professor Johnny Christensen, undertook to revise the English text and supply necessary corrections. I am very grateful to them both for their extensive contributions. Erik Petersen, Librarian of the Royal Library, Copenhagen, gave us much valuable bibliographical assistance, for which I am also very grateful. Finally, I would like to thank Maria Rasmussen, Torben Christensen's secretary, the Faculty of Theology at the University of Copenhagen, and the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts for their help in handling numerous practical tasks.

Copenhagen, April 25th, 1987

Else Marie Bukdahl

An Introduction and an Apology

Eduard Schwartz's critical studies on Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* proved that *lib.* VIII-IX in their present form, dating from immediately after the year 324, are the products of various adaptations. He even demonstrated that this section of the Church History existed in four different "Ausgaben".¹

Richard Laqueur continued Schwartz's critical studies in his *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit*.² He subjected considerable sections of *lib.* VIII-IX to close analysis with such perspicacity and ingenuity that he was able to uncover difficulties and problems which previous research had never noticed, far less attempted to solve.³ On the basis of his critical analysis, he offered a new exposition of the origins of *lib.* VIII-IX from the time immediately after the appearance of the Galerian Edict in the spring of 311 to Constantine's victory over Licinius in 324. As the various "Ausgaben" or, as R. Laqueur prefers to say, "Schichtungen"⁴ reflect political changes, it follows that Laqueur's interpretation is of decisive importance in the evaluation of Eusebius as a source of knowledge about political developments in that period.

Henri Janne, to name but one scholar, considered "Schwartz et Laqueur comme les Dioscures de la critique eusébiennne".⁵ In fact, nearly all reviewers, who discussed Laqueur's book on its publication, agreed that it was indispensable for any future work on Eusebius's account in *lib.* VIII-IX in general, and on church history and political developments from 311 to 324 in particular. Laqueur was considered indispensable not only because of many of his results, but also because his book highlighted the need for new critical research – for it cannot be denied that some of his analyses and conclusions carry little conviction. Last but not least, Laqueur was considered indispensable because of his actual methods, since his work demonstrated that thorough internal criticism of Eusebius's text was urgently needed.

¹ See "II. Die antiken Ausgaben der KG" in *Eusebius Werke* II, 3, p. XLVII-LXI (Leipzig 1909).

² *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* II (Berlin and Leipzig 1929).

³ Henri Janne has accurately characterized E. Schwartz and R. Laqueur's methods in their discussion of the Church History. *Byzantion* VIII (1933), p. 742.

⁴ Cf. p. 1 note 1.

⁵ *Byzantion* VIII (1933), p. 749.

But all the recognition accorded to Laqueur, his analyses, and his results produced little intensive research. He was greatly praised but apparently not on the basis of a detailed examination of his results – one gets the impression that later scholars have accepted uncritically the predominantly positive evaluation of the first researchers. Laqueur was venerated as an authority, but he had little importance to critical accounts of the course of events in the period which we are discussing.

This was, at any rate, my conclusion when I decided many years ago to make the Emperor C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus the subject of a book, on the realization that he had been sadly neglected by students of church history and general history alike. It then became clear that many scholars had made uncritical use of Lactantius's *De mortibus persecutorum* and Eusebius – mostly, of course, his *h. e.* VIII-IX. They could perhaps be excused in the case of Lactantius's work as it had not been the subject of any thorough critical examination, but Laqueur's work offered excellent discussions of Eusebius.

It became evident, however, that Laqueur's results must be closely scrutinized. One major shortcoming was his failure to analyze thoroughly *lib.* VIII-IX, the two books which are of primary interest here. Therefore his conclusions often rested on a very limited selection of material. And we have already intimated that a number of his specific analyses present problems. Some of them are actually incorrect, and Eusebius's text frequently suggests possibilities of interpretation different from those discussed by Laqueur. And finally Eusebius's account in *lib.* VIII-IX contains even more difficulties and problems than all those which Laqueur had the astuteness to identify.

The amount of detail included in Laqueur's analyses of individual sections in *lib.* VIII-IX varies considerably. He often discusses the same material in several different connections, so it was meaningless to base a critical examination of Laqueur on his own arrangement of the material. Initially, *lib.* VIII-IX must be thoroughly analyzed. The analysis should employ Laqueur's method to draw attention to the existence of possible uncertainties, contradictory repetitions and interruptions of the continuity in Eusebius's text. In other words, we must discover the close connections which exist between individual sections, whether long or short. Once these sections had been analyzed, and their tendency and entire scope had been determined, we then had to establish if the sections displayed features which suggested that they belonged together originally. And finally, we must discover if the sections represented specific tradi-

tions – either written or oral sources – and if so, how they were related to each other. By reconstructing in this way the various traditions which form constituent parts of Eusebius's Church History, we might throw light on the origins of the separate sections.

An examination based on these principles of method shows very clearly, in my opinion, that Eusebius's account in *lib.* VIII-IX – to restrict ourselves to the most important books in this context – is the product of his own constant adaptation of the material. In fact, his revisions were much more extensive than assumed by E. Schwartz and, particularly, R. Laqueur. A number of the revisions can be traced to one of the later "vier Ausgaben" of the Church History, correctly identified by E. Schwartz.⁶ But many of the additions and alterations which Eusebius included subsequently, cannot be dated with any certainty. Often, we can only establish relative chronological connections between the various groups of material which make up his Church History. Consequently, the results are much more uncertain than Laqueur, for example, allowed in his discussion of the origins of *lib.* VIII-IX. But of course, there is some value in pointing out problems for which no satisfactory explanation seems to exist.

The purpose of the investigation was, therefore, first of all, to subject *lib.* VIII-IX to a thorough analysis using the principles of the method described and only secondly to consider Laqueur's interpretation of and explanation for the creation of these books. It soon became evident that the critical debate with Laqueur could not be conducted as consistently as one would have liked, quite simply because he often draws far-reaching conclusions from material which is in itself tenuous and problematic. In such cases, it served no purpose to enter into further discussion with him.

Eusebius really worked according to "a scissors and paste method".⁷ Particularly in the case of *lib.* VIII-IX, his method produced an untidy account full of repetitions, contradictions, and material of widely different kinds. It is a mess, both from a compositional and a literary point of view.

As we know, Rufinus completed a Latin *interpretatio* of Eusebius's Church History about 401-402. It has been severely criticized by scholars

⁶ Cf. my *C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus* (Copenhagen 1974), p. 13 f.

⁷ For a short description of this, see my article "The so-called *Appendix* to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII." *Classica et Mediaevalia*. XXXIV (1983), p. 177-209, especially p. 202 f.

who regard it as a paraphrase of Eusebius rather than an exact translation.⁸ A cursory comparison between Eusebius's Greek text and the Latin version soon reveals that Rufinus took many liberties as a translator. He removed and added material, and he diverged from the original whenever he felt it necessary. Interest in Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's Church History seemed to disappear when this fact had become generally accepted. That is reasonable in discussions of Rufinus's contributions to our understanding of Eusebius's original text; they are obviously minimal because his translation is so very free.

But we must remember that in the Middle Ages Rufinus's Latin *historia ecclesiastica* – not Eusebius – was the most prominent source to scholars in the Latin West of the history of the Church up to the Emperor Constantine's victory over Licinius in 324. Because of this, Rufinus's *h. e.* deserves more than passing attention. How did Rufinus present the development of the Church to his Latin readers? This question becomes even more important when we realize that Rufinus in fact diverged from his original quite often and made it simply the starting point for an independent description which expressed ideas quite different from those put forward by Eusebius.

This complexity of problems has never been subjected to detailed investigation, but the more we realized, through E. Schwartz and R. Laqueur, the difficulties in Eusebius, the more pressing it became. Quite basically, one is curious to know how Rufinus handled all the problems – apart from the purely stylistic ones – involved in translating Eusebius.

For those reasons, I began a thorough analysis of Rufinus's version of *lib.* VIII-IX. I restricted my investigation to these two books because they are the most difficult and the most untidy in Eusebius's Church History, so they illustrate very clearly his abilities as an *interpretator* and reveal the principles, if any, behind his *ars interpretandi*. I proceeded in the following way: first I subjected Eusebius's original text to a detailed examination, using mainly the principles of internal criticism discussed above. Then, I analyzed Rufinus's version of the appropriate section of Eusebius, indicating which passages were simple reproductions and which diverged from the original. The essential points of this analysis were: to discover motives which had inspired Rufinus to go his own way and to indicate ideas in the new version which differed from Eusebius.

This comparative investigation of Rufinus's relationship to Eusebius (as regards his version of *h. e.* VIII-IX) began to take shape in 1977. But numerous unexpected tasks fell to my lot and prevented me from com-

pleting it as quickly as I had planned. But eventually, the work had progressed to a point which made it feasible to complete the book before the end of 1983 and submit it for publication to the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

At the beginning of August 1983, however, it was ascertained that I was suffering from an incurable disease which would quickly sap my strength and which would certainly not allow me to finish the investigation in question as planned. At that point, the book was a torso, in more than one sense. The manuscript containing my discussion of Eusebius's account in IX, 10-11 and Rufinus's version of those chapters had not been prepared for the printers. Moreover, several sections offering an interpretation of the origins of certain parts of *lib. VIII-IX* which differed from Laqueur's had been drafted, but they were not in a form that allowed them to be easily integrated into the work. A general discussion of the characteristics in Rufinus's translation of *lib. VIII-IX* and his *ars interpretandi* had yet to be written. Those two points are, of course, two aspects of the same matter, and they are intimately related to his theological thought. The present study may also be regarded as a contribution to a discussion of his theological profile, a subject which scholars have sadly neglected. Finally, it was, of course, not possible to subject the sections already finished to a much needed critical inspection. I was unable to draw on colleagues and friends among classical scholars who had very kindly offered to read my manuscript and help in removing some of the worst blunders which I, as an ordinary church historian, was bound to commit.

I must admit that, considering my condition, I was tempted to leave matters as they were. But I do feel that the work, as it is, includes observations and identifies problems which deserve much more critical attention than they have received so far. For example, no satisfactory detailed critical analysis of Eusebius's VIII-IX has been written, despite Laqueur's contribution. Similarly, no one has yet examined Rufinus's version of these books in order to provide a clear characterization.

Should anyone therefore, after my death, and after the requisite critical inspection, find it reasonable to publish my *torso* of a monograph, I shall make no objections. I know that mistakes and shortcomings can be found in the present work, but in spite of those, I will ask possible future readers to regard it as an incentive to independent research on both Eu-

8 Cf. my article, "Rufinus of Aquileia and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *lib. VIII-IX*, of Eusebius," *Studia Theologica* 34 (1980), p. 129-152.

sebius and Rufinus, along the lines given here. I do not for a moment doubt that much work still remains to be done.

Hørsholm, 17th August, 1983

Torben Christensen

Liber VIII

The Proem (736,1-5)

As an introduction to his Church History,¹ Eusebius listed the subjects he intended to discuss.

He wished to describe the Apostolic Succession right up to his own time, the various events which were of historical importance to the Church, the eminent Church leaders, the men who had preached the divine word with voice and pen in each generation, and the heretics. Furthermore, he wanted to describe the many different types of struggle which the heathens had inflicted on Christianity, the many bloody martyrdoms throughout the history of the Church up to his own day and Christ's merciful help in all circumstances.²

In his conclusion to *liber VII*, Eusebius stated that, having analyzed, in the previous books, the theme of succession from the birth of Christ up to the outbreak of the "great persecution" – a period of 305 years – he would now describe the extent and character of the Christians' struggle for their belief in his own time, so that posterity would have a clear picture of the events.³

With an account of the so-called Diocletian persecution, the history of the martyrs of the Church would, in other words, be brought up to date.

Eusebius begins *liber VIII* by saying that, after his account of the Apostolic Succession, one of the most important tasks would be to inform present and future readers about the extraordinary events⁴ in his own time.⁵ His *prooimium* seems to be a repetition of the conclusion to *liber*

1 I,1-2 (6,1-18).

2 Eusebius ended his subject catalogue by saying that he would describe τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἴλεω καὶ εὐμενῇ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ἀντίληψιν (6,14-15); ἐπὶ πᾶσιν is best understood as referring to the tribulations and persecutions to which the Church had been subjected.

3 VII, 32, 32 (730.16-20).

4 τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, οὐ τῆς τυχοῦσης ἄξια ὄντα γραφῆς (736,2-3).

5 736,2-4.

VII.⁶ We may also understand τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς (736,2) to refer not just to the martyrs' struggle but, in a more general sense, to the circumstances in Eusebius's time. In that case, his account of contemporary history must include more than the history of the martyrs as proposed in the conclusion to *liber* VII.

If this was Eusebius's idea, then we must remember that it meant an expansion of the original plan, which he had outlined at the end of *liber* VII.

⁶ Closer consideration shows, however, that there are differences. Eusebius talked of τὴν τῶν διαδοχῶν ... ὑπόθεσιν, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενέσεως ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν προσευκτηρίων καθάρσεων εἰς ἔτη συντείνουσιν πέντε καὶ τριακόσια in VII, 32, 32 (730,16-17), but in 736,1 it simply says τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. Eusebius stated in 730,19-20 that he would describe τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀνδρῶν ἀγωνάσων ἀγωνάσων, ὅσοι τε καὶ ὀπηλίκοι γεγόνασιν, whereas in 736,2-3 he wrote τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, οὐ τῆς τυχοῦσης ἄξια ὄντα γράφῃς.

Cap. 1,1-2,1 (736,6-740,24): The Church before the outbreak of the persecution

Eusebius concludes his *prooimium* with the words: καὶ ἄρξεται γε ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθεν (736,4-5). There is nothing in the previous discussion suggesting a definite date, but in VII, 32,32 (730,16ff), he says that the first seven books follow developments from the birth of Christ up to the year 305 when the persecution begins. If Eusebius had this period in mind when he used the expression ἐντεῦθεν, we must note that the following account does not begin with that year; it gives an outline of the Church's position in the Roman Empire before the actual outbreak of the persecution. Not until VIII, 2,4 does an account beginning at the year 305 appear. The next question, then, would be whether this is not in fact the original continuation of the proem, in which case *cap.* 1,1-2,3 must be considered as a later insertion.

Whatever the case may be, Eusebius writes, *cap.* 1,1-4 (736,6-22) in the present version of the text, that everybody – Greeks and barbarians – had shown greater honour and given more freedom to Christianity⁷ in the period before the persecution than he could recount. There is proof of this in the fact that the Emperors – because of their sympathy for the Christian teaching⁸ – had entrusted its adherents with governorships without requiring their participation in sacrifices. Moreover, all members of their *familiae* – spouses, children and slaves – were allowed to profess Christianity in word and deed and the Emperors preferred Christians in the Imperial service, as in the case of Dorotheos and Gorgonios.

In *cap.* 1,5-6 (736,22-738,10), Eusebius further relates that everywhere the leaders of the Church enjoyed the favour of provincial governors. He also notes the difficulties involved in describing the full congregation meetings and services, which made it necessary to build new, spacious churches.

This expansive development continued unhindered by jealousy, and by the devil and his human assistants – because God was protecting His people.

⁷ This is Eusebius's florid expression ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τῷ βίῳ κατηγορημένος τῆς εἰς τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεῶν εὐσεβείας λόγος (736,7-8).

⁸ κατὰ πολλὴν ἦν ἀπέσφον περιὶ τὸ δόγμα φιλῶν (736,12).

Even though the two sections referred to here both discuss the Church's position before the persecution, they each have their own distinct style.

In the first section, attention is mostly focussed on the relationship of the Emperors to the Church: the Emperors gave the Christians complete freedom and considered them their best employees – far from being the object of discrimination, they were regarded with the highest respect. The account also gives the impression that the situation had been created entirely by the Emperors and their positive attitude to Christianity. In the second case, the thriving life of the Church's great expansion are of particular interest, the reason being that God has protected His people against all designs on them either by the devil or by human beings.

The fact that the two sections are quite different in perspective must, of course, raise the question whether they were originally meant to be read in sequence.⁹ The logical continuation of the first section would have been remarks to the effect that the altered situation which the persecution heralded was due to the Emperors giving up their positive attitude towards the Christians. The second section, on the other hand, implies that the persecution was begun when God withdrew his protection from the Christians, since they no longer showed themselves worthy of it. Here, we merely record the difference; close analysis is required to decide whether *cap.* 1,1-6 was originally one unit or not.

In *cap.* 1,7-9 (738,11-740,16) Eusebius continues his account by mentioning how the Christians fell into moral laxity¹⁰ because of the great freedom they enjoyed, and this resulted in slander, disputes and contradictions between the bishops, dissension among the lay people and unlimited hypocrisy. God then intervened gently with His judgement and let the persecution be limited, initially, to the army. But the Christians paid no attention; on the contrary, they continued to sin and their Church leaders lived in strife and enmity with each other, setting the law of God aside. Then God in his anger punished the Church, in accordance with the Scriptures.¹¹ He destroyed it and allowed its adversaries to triumph over it, and the Christians were made objects of derision.

In the section referred to here, it is clear that Eusebius intended to show that God punished the Christians for their increasingly sinful behaviour with a persecution which devastated the Church. Even so, the account is obviously inconsistent. After describing the Christians' terrible sins (738,12-17), he takes note of the somewhat surprising fact that Christians in the army were the first to be subjected to persecution – it

would have been much more likely for the persecution to have affected all Christians, its aim being to bring them back to a pious way of life. Furthermore, ἡ θεία κοίσις (738,17) which Eusebius speaks of here, is meant didactically, since it was intended to make the Christians recognize and turn away from their sins. His line of thought must, therefore, have been this: the persecution of the Christian soldiers should be a warning of what would happen to those who persisted in sinning.

Eusebius obviously intended his account to culminate in the description of God's crushing anger and of how it affected the Christians when instead of heeding His mild judgement, they simply continued to sin. But the description in 738,22-27 does not provide the *crescendo* which he had prepared.

Not only does it concentrate mainly on the leaders of the Church, but it is also to a great extent a repetition of the account of the sins of the Christians already given in 738,12-17. In fact, 738,20ff appears to be a parallel account to 738,11ff, an impression further confirmed by the fact that they both begin with ὡς δέ. They lack, therefore, any actual connection.

The matter looks quite different, however, if 738,20ff is taken together with 738,9-10 (ἐς ὅσον κτλ). Then his argument might be summed up thus: the Christians in their blindness disregarded God's providence and consequently did not attempt to lead holy lives and be worthy of Him; they remained sinful.¹²

9 The link between the two sections in this passage is, of course, *cap.* 1,5 *init.* (736,22-738,1) where we are told that the Church leaders were honoured by the authorities.

10 ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαυνότητα καὶ νοθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο (738,11-12). The freedom which the Christians enjoyed because of the Emperors' lenient attitude to their faith must be the subject intended here. This freedom resulted in the Christians' decline into worldliness.

11 Eusebius quoted *Thren.* 2,1-2 and *Psalms* 88,40-46, which he regarded as a prophecy of God's punishment of the Church. The first quotation coincides with LXX, although it does not contain εἰς γῆν after ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (740,1-2), mentions Ἰσραὴλ (740,4) instead of Ἰακώβ and has καθέλειν πάντας τοὺς φραγμοὺς αὐτοῦ (740,4-5) instead of καθέλειν ἐν θυμῷ αὐτοῦ τὰ ὄχυράματα τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰουδα. In the second quotation, Eusebius used the third person singular where LXX has the second person singular, just as he talked of τὰ πλήθη τοῦ λαοῦ (740,9) instead of αὐτοῦ. He did not include εὐφρανας πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ (v. 43), but added διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καθαιρέσεως (740,7) to explain the intentions of the phrase ἐβεβήλωσεν εἰς γῆν ... τὸ ἄγλασμα αὐτοῦ (740,6-7).

12 *Cap.* 1,8 is also linked to *cap.* 1,6 in terms of language. οἶα δέ τινες ἄθεοι ἀφρόντιστα καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγούμενοι (738,21-22) thus clearly refers to ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χεὶρ ἔσκαπέν τε καὶ ἐφρούρει (738,9), just as οὐχ ὀπως εὐμενεὶς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προθυμούμεθα (738,20-21) plays on οἶα δὲ ἄξιον ὄντα (738,9-10).

On the basis of these observations, it is possible to reconstruct the writing of this section. The original account included *cap.* 1,6 and 1,8-9, but its consistency was broken by the introduction of *cap.* 1,7. The insertion may be explained by the fact that Eusebius later found it necessary to mention the purge of the Christians from the army. As he regarded the persecution as an expression of the divine *κρίσις*, it must naturally also include the removal of the Christian soldiers from the army. Eusebius realized that this was a mild form of persecution and of very limited dimensions – the Christian congregations escaped completely; therefore, bearing in mind his view of the connection between the persecution and God’s punishment, we should consider it solely as a warning to other sinful Christians. By regarding *cap.* 1,7 as a later insertion, it is possible to account for the break in logical thought in this section. It explains the two parallel accounts of the Christians’ sins in 738,11-17 and 738,20-27 respectively. In the same way, it becomes clear why the divine *κρίσις* in the original passage appears as a vindictive judgement whereas in the insertion, it is a didactic judgement.

In *cap.* 2,1 (740,16-24), Eusebius says that the Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled, when with his own eyes, he saw the churches razed to the ground and the Holy Scriptures burned, the leaders of the Church hide themselves or be caught and ridiculed – the last being a fulfilment of *Ps.* 106,40.¹³

After this analysis, we turn to Rufinus’s version of *cap.* 1-2,4. His translation of the proem does not give rise to any comment, as he followed his source, with only a few unimportant alterations,¹⁴ but by adding *etenim* (737,5), he linked *cap.* 1 more closely to the proem than did Eusebius.

In the ensuing translation, we can see how Rufinus avoided Eusebius’s hyperbolic expressions and created a clear, consistent account which, nevertheless, remained historically reliable. For instance, he obviously omitted *παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάρους, ἠξίωτο* (736,8-9), because such a universal acceptance of Christianity was inconsistent with the actual state of affairs – and in addition, the expression itself was, of course, completely foreign to Latin readers. Rufinus also broke up *ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τῷ βίῳ καταγγελλόμενος τῆς εἰς τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεὸν εὐσεβείας λόγος* (736,7-8), so the result is this: *per universum mundum sermo Christi et pietatis doctrina profecerit et in quantum sublimitatis ascenderit* (737,6-7). Rufinus deemed it necessary to add the last words as a background for the later reference to *Thren.* 2,1.

Rufinus was unable to accept the whole account as it is in Eusebius in 736,10-18. He thought that a natural connection was lacking between *cap.*1,1, which discussed the universal recognition of Christianity, and *cap.*1,2, which only described the Emperors' relationship to the Church. He provided the connection himself by writing: *nosci tamen et ex hoc possibile est* (737,8), which only refers to the great advances made by Christianity, instead of *τεκμήρια δ' ἂν γένοιτο* (736,10). Eusebius also created the impression that all the Emperors were kindly disposed towards the Christian faith and the Christians, but Rufinus did not find this to be in agreement with the facts, so he limited himself to saying *aliquanti ex principibus Romanis* (737,8-9). Rufinus obviously considered Eusebius's phraseology insufficient when he wrote *οἷς καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐνεχείριζον ἡγεμονίας* (736,11), since he put *et facultatem regendi provincias iurisque dicendi nostris praebebant* (737,9-10). What is more, when he did not translate *τῆς περὶ τὸ θύειν ἀγωνίας, κατὰ πολλὴν ἦν ἀπέσφωζον περὶ τὸ δόγμα φιλίαν αὐτοῦς ἀπαλλάττοντες* (736,11-13), the explanation could be that the lines implied that the Emperors were idolaters, an idea that was incompatible for Rufinus with the love of Christianity. Nor did he translate *οὓς ἐξόχως καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν συνθεραπόντων ἀποδεκτοῦς ἡγοῦντο* (736,17-18), probably influenced by the consideration that the assertion is too categorical and, in addition, says exactly the same as the subsequent mention of Dorotheos. Rufinus was also aware that Dorotheos had not been mentioned before, so he felt the need to explain his identity by adding *in cubiculo regum* (737,15). He obviously felt that *οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως τοῦτοις ἡξίωοντο διὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον τιμῆς* (736,21-22) also required further explanation, so he wrote *ceterique cum ipsis in domino fideles, vel qui intra palatium in summis honoribus erant, vel qui ad provincias gubernandas praeferri ceteris fidei contemplatione merebantur* (737,17-19).

13 As the Old Testament prophecies mentioned previously could only be applied to the Church itself, Eusebius found that he had to cite another Old Testament passage which could be applied to the Church leaders.

14 Thus Rufinus translated *ἐν ὄλοις ἑπτὰ περιγράψαντες βιβλίοις* (736,1-2) by *intra septem libros a nobis conclusis* (737,1) and omitted *ἐν τι τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων* (736,3). Far more important, however, is his reworking of VII, 32, 32. Here he translated *ἐν τοῦτοις τὴν τῶν διαδοχῶν περιγράψαντες ὑπόθεσιν* (730,16) by *hucusque successiones episcoporum gestaue diversa* (731,16), by which he created a meaningful text which, at the same time, is coordinated with the proem to *liber VIII*. He left out *εἰς ἔτη συντείνουσαν πέντε καὶ τριακόσια* (730,18), probably because he realized that Eusebius did not in fact take his account up to the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution in the year 305.

Rufinus has completely omitted 736,22-738,1. Perhaps in his piety as a monk, he thought there was no reason to stress that the leaders of the Church had found favour with the temporal powers – experience from 4th Century Church history had shown that this led all too often to the secularization of the church. He also regarded the passage in 738,1-4 as too ornate and too imprecise. At any rate, he replaced it with this sentence: *iam vero multitudines coeuntium intra ecclesias populorum et praecipue in diebus festis innumerabiles catervas per loca singula confluentes quis digne poterit explicare?*¹⁵ (737,19-739,3). Nor did Rufinus find εὐθείας κτλ. (738,5-6) very satisfactory, and instead he wrote: *sed cottidie orationum domus dilatarentur, ita ut amplitudo earum concludere instar urbium videretur* (739,3-5). Eusebius continued ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις προϊόντα ὁσημέραι τε εἰς αὐξήν καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιδιδόντα (738,6-7), but Rufinus must have felt that this was far too indefinite and added nothing new to the work. Therefore, he composed a sentence which both rounded off the previous account and, by his very choice of words, prepared his readers for what was to follow: *sic per tempus plurimum ecclesiarum status incrementis prosperioribus augebatur et gloria earum terris excedens et cuncta supereminens festinare videbatur ad caelum* (739,5-7).¹⁶ Rufinus could not accept 738,7-10 as it stood. οὐδέ τις δαίμων πονηρὸς οἶός τε ἦν βασκαίνειν οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλαῖς κωλύειν (738,7-8) became *nullus livor nequissimi daemonis obviabat* (739,8) – the reason for this abbreviation of the text is probably to be found in the fact that for him, the evil spirit need only be involved at this point in the context.

Rufinus's translation of ἐξ ὅσον κτλ. (738,9-10) is even more remarkable. He obviously felt that Eusebius did not emphasize the dependence of God's protection on His people and their living according to His will. Rufinus wanted to remedy this and felt himself bound to write: *quoniam quidem caelestis dexterae fulciebatur auxilio populus etiam tum bene de deo pro pietatis cultu et iustitiae observatione promeritus* (739,8-10).

The source has ὡς δ' ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλεον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαυνότητα καὶ νοθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο (738,11-12), but Rufinus has chosen to say *verum ubi ex multa libertate multaue indulgentia vitiatum sunt mores et disciplina corrupta est* (739,11-12). This independent version no doubt reflects his desire to emphasize the point that the sin of the Christians was not just a misuse of the freedom granted them by the Emperors but also contempt for the divine *indulgentia*.¹⁷ In the same way, he did not think that χαυνότης καὶ νοθρία sufficed to describe the moral decline depicted in the next passage.

In his translation of 738,12-17, describing the Christians' sins, Rufinus also diverged from his original on several points. First of all, he rephrased passages to make a number of coordinate *dum* clauses creating a stylistically consistent composition. He also thought it necessary to insert *dumque nos invicem mordemus et incusamus* (739,13)¹⁸ as a prerequisite for the understanding of καὶ μόνον οὐχὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἑαυτοῖς προσπολεμούντων ὄπλοις, εἰ οὕτω τύχοι, καὶ δόρασιν τοῖς διὰ λόγων (738,13-14). His translation makes it clear that he referred to the Christians' own contentions: *et adversum nosmet ipsos intestina proelia commovemus, dum verborum iaculis proximorum corda terebramus* (739,13-15). For ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι προσρηγνύντων καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων (738,14-15) Rufinus constructed the sentence *dum princeps cum principibus, populi cum populis seditiones et certamina concitamus* (739,15-16). Finally, he has converted τῆς τε ὑποκρίσεως κτλ. (738,16-17) to this effective conclusion to the list of the Christians' sins – *dum simulatio in vultu, dolus in corde, fallacia profertur in verbis et malorum per singula cumulus intumescit* (739,16-17).

Rufinus introduced some changes into the conclusion 738,17-20 which were obviously intended to make the meaning clear. He found it necessary to explain in some detail what was implied in the phrase ἡ θεία κρῖσις, οἷα φίλον αὐτῇ ... τὴν αὐτῆς ἐπισκοπὴν ἀνεκίνει (738,17-19). This gave rise to the sentence *divina providentia iacturam disciplinae populo suo inlatam ex plurima pace et nimia sui lenitate perspiciens* (739,18-19). Rufinus has made it clear that this is not God's destructive judgment; in fact, He wishes to lead the sinner away from his sin – and, as previously mentioned, this interpretation of Eusebius is entirely correct. He also wanted to clarify the passage πεφεισμένως, τῶν ἀθροισμάτων ἔτι συγκροτουμένων, ἡρέμα καὶ μετρίως κτλ. (738,17-20), so he made this revision: *adgreditur primo sensim refrenare lapsantes et integro adhuc ecclesiae statu congregationibusque manentibus indulget interim eos qui erant in militia tantum gentilium persecutione pulsari* (739,19-22). In his

¹⁵ The last words represent Rufinus's elegant translation of πῶς δ' ἄν τις διαγράψειεν (738,1).

¹⁶ Rufinus has here used a phrase leading up to *Thren.* 2,1-2 and *Psalms* 88,40-46, which he subsequently quoted.

¹⁷ This point of view was so important to Rufinus that he repeated it in 739,18-19.

¹⁸ By this Rufinus was probably referring, generally, to the insurrections and civil wars which ravaged the Roman Empire as opposed to the internal quarrels which disturbed the Church. He identified the Christians as those responsible, probably because he regarded the rulers of the Roman Empire and the whole of its population as Christian.

translation, Rufinus stated, with much greater emphasis than Eusebius, that the persecution of the Christians in the army should serve as a warning, showing them the possible consequences of their persistent sinning.

Rufinus apparently felt that he must improve the connection between *cap.* 1,7 and 1,8, so he replaced ὡς δ' ἀνεπαισθήτως ἔχοντες οὐχ ὅπως εὐμενῆς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσασθαι τὸ θεῖον προουθυμούμεθα (738,20-21) in his source with this passage: *sed cum nullus ex hoc clementiae eius intellectus populis redderetur* (739,22-23). When he translated ἄλλαις ἐπ' ἄλλαις προσετίθεμεν κακίας (738,22-23) by *et per hoc eo magis persistere in malis suis* (739,24-25), he emphasized the consistency in the account even more strongly. He must also have read Eusebius's account in 738,23-24 as a repetition of the description of the Christians' sins found in 738,12-17. In his translation of 738,23-26, Rufinus therefore tried to condense the account and, by varying his expressions, remove the impression of repetition: *atque ipsi, qui duces populi videbantur et principes,¹⁹ divini mandati inmemores effecti adversum se invicem contentionibus, zelo, livore,²⁰ superbia, inimicitiiis atque odiis inflammarentur* (739,25-27).

Rufinus was quite obviously surprised at the phrase οἱά τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες (738,27) – it seemed so cryptic to him in the context, that further explanation was necessary. This led to *ita ut tyrannidem potius quam sacerdotium tenere se crederent, Christianae humilitatis et sinceritatis obliti, sacra mysteria profanis mentibus celebrarent* (739,27-29). Here Rufinus's statement that the sins of the Church leaders caused the secularization of the Church, also suggests that God's judgement merely ratified the destruction of the Church which the Christians, guided by their leaders, had occasioned.

In his version of the Old Testament quotations, Rufinus diverged little from his source. The small differences to be found resulted partly from his use of a Latin translation of the Bible,²¹ partly from consideration for his readers.²² A definite divergence is, however, to be found when, for συντετέλεσται δῆτα καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα, ὀπηνίκα τῶν μὲν προσευκτηρίων τοὺς οἴκους (740,16-17), Rufinus wrote *summa namque malorum nobis adfuit omnium tunc cum domus orationis et ecclesiae dei vivi etc.* (741,14-16). Instead of regarding the original text as a depiction of the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, he has understood it to be a new phase in the description of the destruction which overcame the Church. Perhaps he wished to avoid giving his readers the false impression that God Himself was behind the demolition of the churches and the burning of the Holy Scriptures – on the contrary, the Emperors were responsible, as he

demonstrated in the whole of the following account. For Rufinus, it was here solely a question of the shameful treatment to which the Church and its leaders were subjected, and therefore he found it difficult to translate τούς τε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ποιμένας αἰσχροῶς ὧδε κἀκεῖσε κρυπταζομένους, τοὺς δὲ ἀσχημόνως ἀλισκομένους (740,20-21). Instead he composed this sentence: *sacerdotes domini et pastores ecclesiarum publice denudatos inverecunde et inhoneste huc atque illuc ab impiis trahi* (741,18-19). It should be noted that this alteration of the source produced obscurity in Rufinus: who is the subject of *et seduxit eos in invio et non in via* (741,21)? Eusebius, on the other hand, obviously intended God as the subject.

19 *duces populi et principes* takes the place of ἡμῶν ποιμένες (738,23).

20 When Rufinus used the words *zelum* and *livor*, he probably wanted to emphasize the point that now the Church was afflicted by just those sins from which, according to 739,7-10, it had until then been free.

21 The reference cannot be identified more precisely. Examples of the characteristic deviations include δειλία (740,9) translated by *timor* (741,7) and αἰσχύνη (740,16) translated by *confusio*.

22 This is the case when Rufinus writes *nostrorum* (741,10) for αὐτοῦ (740,12) and *nos* (741,11) for αὐτοῦ (740,13) and *super nos* (741,13) for αὐτοῦ (740,16).

Cap. 2,2-4,5 (740,24-746,20): The beginning of the persecution

In *cap.* 2,2 (740,24-742,20), Eusebius stated that he would not describe the sad fate which overcame the leaders of the Church, just as he considered it improper to report on their disharmony and mutual wickedness during the period before the persecution. He wished to include only those facts which could justify the Divine judgement. Nor would he mention those who had endured persecution²³ or lost their faith, but simply add to the ordinary account²⁴ descriptions which, above all, could benefit his contemporaries but also posterity.

Here, Eusebius stated quite clearly how he planned to arrange his account from this point on – his readers are fully informed on his intentions. Even so, this section contains a few passages which call for comment.

It seems strange for Eusebius to announce that he would discuss the Church leaders' sinful behaviour before the persecution, since this was exactly what he had done in *cap.* 1,7-8.²⁵ Furthermore, it is not clear what he meant when he spoke of ἡ καθόλου ἱστορία (742,5) or what he had in mind when he said that he would only add what might be useful to his contemporaries.²⁶ And the exact implications of πρὸς ὠφελείας (742,6-7) cannot be deduced from the information in this section.

The details are open to various interpretations, but it is obvious that the outline included in this section is different from the one he gave in the proem, where he said, without reservation, that the planned account was intended for posterity. The difference is marked, and we are forced to conclude that the proem and *cap.* 2,2-3 were not originally part of one and the same account. On the other hand, the last section evidently presupposes the description in *cap.* 1,1-2,1 of the Church's situation before the outbreak of the persecution. The section must have originated along with the description and have been intended as its conclusion leading on to the ensuing description of martyrs, which Eusebius planned as the subject of *liber* VIII.

But the fact that *cap.* 1,1-2,1 is a later insertion, in which the scope was expanded to include the relationship between the Emperors and the Church, also explains why the outline which Eusebius gave in *cap.* 2,2-3 is different from the one included in the proem. In spite of the vague details, however, it appears that Eusebius changed and expanded his objective as compared to the original plan described in the proem. In other words, the

change in Eusebius's plan of work was related to his expansion of the original account to include the material in *cap.* 1,1-2,1. The actual nature of this new expanded version is not revealed, however, till later in the account.

When Eusebius continued Ἰωμεν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μαρτύρων ἐν ἐπιτομῇ διαγράφοντες (742,8-9), it must mean, in the present context, that he wanted to give a brief description of the Church leaders' struggle for their faith. The description does not, in fact deal exclusively with them, so it would be natural to understand the passage as referring to Christian champions of the faith in general, an interpretation which seems to be confirmed by the corresponding τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀνδρισαμένων ἀγῶνας (730,18-19). The uncertainty regarding the exact identity of the people whom Eusebius had in mind is not quite accidental, however. It is the result of Eusebius's realization that he needed a sentence to act as a link between the insertion in *cap.* 1,1-2,3 discussing the Church leaders, and the original account having the Christian martyrs in general as its theme.

After this discussion of *cap.* 2,2-3, we may examine Rufinus's rendering of the section, and it then becomes obvious that he attempted to integrate his rendition into the work in a manner quite different from Eusebius's. As a logical consequence of *cap.* 2,1, Rufinus regarded τὰς ἐπὶ τέλει σκυθροπὰς συμφορὰς (740,25) as applying to the misfortunes which befell the Church leaders. Consequently, he translated 740,24-25 thus: *sed non est nostrum describere, quanta in sacerdotes dei iniuriarum genera conlata sint* (741,21-22). He then continued, *sicut ne illud quidem nostrum duximus exponere singillatim, quanta prius inter nostros rabies dissensionis exarserit* (741,22-24), and thereby, in fact, removed the contradiction found in his source between 740,25-27 and *cap.* 1,7-8. In the same way, he adapted 740,27-742,2 and made it a link carrying forward the account: *hoc solum historiae tradere licuit, quod iusto dei iudicio et necessaria correptione divinam sensimus manum* (741,24-743,2). Rufinus

23 τῶν πρὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ πεπειραμένων (742,2) must refer to the group of Christians who did not abjure their faith despite the persecution to which they were subjected.

24 μόνα δ' ἐκεῖνα τῇ καθόλου προσθήσομεν ἱστορίᾳ (742,5).

25 It almost seems as if Eusebius himself realized this, since immediately afterwards, he wrote, almost as a footnote, that he would only include those things about the Church leaders δι' ὧν ἂν τὴν θεῖαν δικαιοσύμην κρῖσιν (742,1-2).

26 We must also ask whether Eusebius intended πρώτοις ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς (742,5-6) to refer only to the Christians or, more generally, to his own time.

must also have felt that Eusebius's text in 742,1-7 contained details that made it impossible to reproduce this passage as it stood. He obviously found Eusebius guilty of contradicting himself here too; he said that he would not report on those who had been persecuted or had lost their faith, and then, in fact, went on to do so. At any rate, Rufinus avoided any hint of contradiction when he said that his version did not constitute a comprehensive account: *neque enim refert in medium proferre pro quibus vel turbo persecutionis invecus est,*²⁷ *vel quos quantosque infidelitatis procella submerserit* (743,2-4). Nor did he find μόνα δ' ἐκεῖνα κτλ. (742,5-7) exactly satisfactory – this applies to the interpretation of ἡ καθόλου ἱστορία, and to the fact that the aim of the account as described here is contradictory to what Eusebius wrote in the proem. In any case, he omitted these problematic statements and created a short, lucid text which in addition, appears as a new element in the work so that any repetition is avoided: *sed illa sola commemorabo, quae vel nos ipsos dicentes vel alios aedificent audientes* (743,4-5). Finally, it must be pointed out that, in his next literal translation of Ἴωμεν κτλ. (742,8-9), Rufinus rendered οὖν (742,8) as *propter quod* (743,5). It serves as an introduction to the sentence, which he thus managed to link to the previous account to a quite different degree than his source so that it constitutes a fitting conclusion to the section.²⁸

In *cap.* 2,4-5 (742,9-20), Eusebius reported on the outbreak of the actual persecution. In the 19th year of Diocletian's reign, in the month of March, Imperial letters²⁹ were posted up everywhere, ordaining that the churches should be razed to the ground, that the Holy Scriptures should be burned, that Christians of rank should be divested of the privileges of their position³⁰ and that slaves who remained Christian should be deprived of the possibility of being freed.³¹ Shortly afterwards, new letters were sent out, the first of which ordained that Church leaders everywhere should be imprisoned and that they should be forced in every possible way to offer up sacrifices.³²

In *cap.* 3,1-4 (742,20-744,14), Eusebius depicted the effects of the Imperial laws on the leaders of the Church. Many held out under the atrocities to which they were subjected³³ but innumerable others succumbed. Some lost their lives as a result of various forms of torture. Others were helped to create the impression that they had sacrificed, after which they were set free.³⁴

The whole of 742,8-744,14 constitutes one unit which, apart from a few details, presents no problems of interpretation. Even so, Eusebius's text

did not satisfy Rufinus completely; he found it necessary to adapt several points.

Rufinus did not translate Δύστρος μήν (742,10), the Macedonian name for the month of March, and κατὰ Ῥωμαίους (742,11), but simply wrote *mensis Martius*, but this is understandable, since it was the only feature of interest to his Latin readers. He wished to leave them in no doubt as to the meaning when he translated ἐν ᾧ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ἑορτῆς ἐπελαυνούσης (742,11-12) by *et dies sollemnis paschae imminebat* (743,8)

27 These words translate τῶν πρὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ πεπειραμένων (742,2).

28 The other divergence from the source arose when Rufinus rephrased τῶν τοῦ θείου λόγου μαρτύρων (742,8-9) and wrote *beatissimorum martyrum* (743,5-6).

29 The precise date – March 303 – in 742,9-10 implies that Diocletian had instigated the persecution.

30 Eusebius's expression καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους (742,14) has been precisely interpreted by H.J. Lawlor – J.E.L. Oulton: "men of rank – senatores (illustres, spectabiles, clarissimi), perfectissimi, egregii – should be made *infames*" (*Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine* (henceforth cited as *Eusebius*) II, p. 270).

31 The crucial point here is the interpretation of οἱ ἐν οἰκεταίς. The most natural translation would be "those in servitude", i.e. slaves. This interpretation seems incorrect, on the other hand, because of ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι, which presupposes that the group in question is free. Another possibility would be to take ἐν οἰκεταίς as meaning "in households", but the real significance of this is not clear. The variety of suggestions substantiates the view that no satisfactory solution can be given to this *crux interpretationis*. In the light of the later description of Diocletian's purge, however, Eusebius may have had the members of the Imperial household in mind when he used the expression *caesariani*.

32 On the face of it, 742,17-20 states that a new letter was sent out ordaining that the Church leaders should first (πρῶτα) be imprisoned and then (εἰθ' ὕστερον) forced to sacrifice. It appears, however, from *cap.* 6,8-10 that there were two separate letters commanding imprisonment and sacrifice respectively.

33 τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἕκαστος κτλ. (742,24f.) must refer back to πλεῖστοι μὲν κτλ., since Eusebius went on to describe the various forms of torment to which the Church leaders had been subjected. Even though the passage is not specific on this point, the tortures were intended to make the leaders abjure their faith, and hence the use of the expression μέγλων ἀγώνων ἰστορίας ἐπεδείξαντο (742,22).

34 Of the six cases which Eusebius listed, only the first two are actually said to have ended in releases after feigned sacrifices. In the last two, the words μετὰ βίας ἐξωθοῦντο (744,13) suggest the same. Eusebius concluded the account with the following passage: οὕτως ἕξ ἅπαντος οἱ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθροὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἠνυκνεῖν περὶ πολλοῦ ἐτίθεντο (744,14-15); this statement implied that the intention had been to force everybody to sacrifice, after which they would be released. In the account up to now, however, no decree of this nature has been discussed, but only an order that the Church leaders should be forced to sacrifice, with no specification of the result following their compliance or their refusal. This was reserved for *cap.* 6,10 (752,3-6).

which was more familiar to them. In the same way, he clarified βασιλικὰ γράμματα (742,12) by rewriting it as *edicta principis* (743,8)

καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους (742,14) was too compact for Rufinus to be easily understood, since he created this text: *si qui inter nostros alicuius honoris praerogativa muniretur, sublata hac maneret infamis* (743,10-12). He was in no doubt that οἱ ἐν οἰκεταίς (742,14-15) meant slaves who, as Christians, were to be precluded from the possibility of being freed. He therefore wrote *si qui servorum permansisset Christianus, libertatem consequi non posset* (743,12-13).

In his translation of 742,16-20, Rufinus only diverged from his source by replacing πάση μηχανῇ θύειν ἔξαναγκάζεσθαι (742,20) with *omnibus suppliciis simulacris immolare cogantur* (743,16-17). In that way, he provided a more direct link than Eusebius to what follows immediately – a description of the *supplicia* – tortures – to which the Church leaders were subjected. He did not find the account in 742,20-27 sufficiently well thought out. So, from τότε δὴ οὖν κτλ. (742,20-22), which here refers to those who did not succumb during the persecution, he created this much more detailed sentence of a purely general nature: *hic vero ingens spectaculum sacerdotes dei effecti sunt huic mundo et angelis et hominibus, cum persecutorum crudelitate ad supplicia raperentur et agones mirandos omnibus desudarent* (743,17-19). Rufinus no doubt wished to create agreement with what Eusebius had said in 742,2-4 when he changed μυρῶι δ' ἄλλοι (742,22-23) into this sentence: *illos autem, qui et multo plures fuerunt, quos metus oppressit et ante congressionem solus terror elisit, praeterire melius puto* (743,19-21). He thought it necessary to break up τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν κτλ. (742,24-27) into two finite sentences, which at the same time described the fate of the steadfast more directly and in more detail than in Eusebius: *ceteri vero, quorum mens promptior et fides validior fuit³⁵, tormenta patiebantur. flagris alii discerpebantur, alii unguibus fodiebantur, alii ignitis lamminis urebantur³⁶, ex quibus nonnulli quidem fatigati cedebant, alii usque ad finem patientiam conservabant* (743,21-25).

In 742,26-27, Eusebius must, on the face of it, be understood to mean a group different from those who held out under torture, but for Rufinus, this is wrong – it must be one and the same group. Therefore he left out ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πάλιν ἄλλως τὸν ἀγῶνα διεξήρισαν (742,27-28) and instead wrote *ex ipsis autem persecutoribus quidam tamquam miseratione usi* (743,25-26). Rufinus used this expression to indicate that a new phase in the treatment of the faithful Christian leaders had begun; some of their persecutors, out of pity for them, no longer wanted to force them by

torture to offer sacrifices, but were only interested in creating the impression that they had sacrificed. Rufinus succeeded, with this alteration of the source, in bringing to the account a sense of continuity which cannot be found in Eusebius.

In 742,27-744,14 Eusebius confined himself to examples of individual experiences, but Rufinus spoke of groups: *nonnulli, alii*. In mentioning the first group, he omitted βίᾳ συνωθούντων (742,28-744,1) – perhaps he felt that the phrase was inconsistent with his interpretation: that the new course was motivated by *miseratio persecutorum*. On the other hand, it seems somewhat difficult to explain why he did not translate ἀπηλλάττετο (744,2). His translation of ταῖς παμμυρίοις καὶ ἀνάγνοις (744,1) by *ad incesta sacrificia* (743,26) is one small detail – perhaps he found Eusebius's expression too diffuse. In the second example in Eusebius, Rufinus probably felt that σωπῆ φέρων τὴν συκοφαντίαν (744,4) was too brief and therefore gave an expanded version, so that his readers would immediately understand the point: *in eo tantum culpabiles, quod crimen sibi obiectum cum silentio paterentur* (745,3-4). The same motive induced him to replace τινος ἐναγοῦς (744,3) with *immundis hostiis* (745,2).

The two examples which Eusebius quoted in 744,7-9 refer, according to Rufinus, to the same incident, his view resulted in this translation: *aliqui sane exclamabant ingenti voce et testabantur se non sacrificasse, sed esse Christianos, tali gaudentes confessione decorari*³⁷ (745,6-8). He must have thought that ἔτερος κτλ. (744,9-10) sounded a little too much like a repetition and, wishing to avoid this, he wrote *nonnulli etiam maiore fiducia neque immolasse se neque umquam immolaturos esse testabantur* (745,8-9). He must also have found that κατὰ στόματος παιόμενοι καὶ κατασιγαζόμενοι κατὰ τε προσώπου καὶ παρειῶν τυπτόμενοι (744,11-13) was repetitive in its ornate style, since he translated it as *ora continuo atque oculi contundebantur*,³⁸ *ut tacerent* (745,10). He probably intended to emphasize the point of this incident more strongly than his source, and

35 The description given in *cap.* 2,4-5 of the outbreak of the persecution in fact repeats Eusebius's report in *cap.* 2,1, but this passage is more precise, since it mentions the edicts issued by the Imperial government which resulted in the persecution. As *cap.* 2,1 clearly presupposes these edicts, we are justified in regarding this as an indication that it is later – as it had already been mentioned in *cap.* 2,4-5, it was unnecessary to repeat it.

36 Eusebius referred, strictly speaking, to only two groups: 742,25-26.

37 The last words represent a free translation of τῆ τοῦ σωτηρίου προσορήματος ὁμολογία λαμπρυνόμενος (744,8-9).

38 By this independent feature, Rufinus wanted to indicate that their resistance had its price; their eyes were destroyed.

therefore he added *tamquam adquevissent* (745,11). Finally, Rufinus must have considered οὕτως κτλ. (744,13-14) rather unintelligible, because he composed this concluding passage *tanti erat impiis studii, ut propositum suum viderentur implese* (745,11-12).

Following immediately upon his account of the bishops' struggle for their faith, Eusebius wrote ἀλλ' οὐ καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῖς μαρτύρων ταῦτα προυχώρει (744,15-16). On the face of it, the passage should be understood to mean that the persecutors were not successful in creating the impression that the martyrs had offered sacrifices, as they had been in the case of the Church leaders. It is evident, however, that the description of their struggle is such that there can be no question of a discrepancy. There is, in fact, no connection between this sentence and the previous account. Here, Eusebius discussed martyrs in general – not the Church leaders in particular.³⁹

From 744,15-16 we would expect a full description of the failure of the persecutors' policy towards the martyrs. Instead, Eusebius related in 744,16-20 that it had proved impossible to give an exact account of their struggle, on the grounds that (γὰρ, 744,17) the martyrs were so many in number⁴⁰ – and that among these, victims from “the time of peace” before the general persecution⁴¹ were also included. In other words, 744,16-20 begin a new theme completely unrelated to the contents of 744,15-16. On the other hand, the subject of the section is so clearly connected to 742,8-9, that it can be regarded as a direct continuation of that passage, since it justifies Eusebius's description of the martyrs' struggle ἐν ἐπιτομῇ. The original continuity has been broken by the insertion of 742,9-744,12. The motive for this expansion should undoubtedly be sought in the fact that, after completing the first account, Eusebius realized that the struggle of the Church leaders had been unfairly treated and he wanted to correct this. In order to establish a connection between the new insertion and the following account, whose theme is indeed the struggle of the martyrs, he added 744,15-16, but somewhat carelessly without considering the new context.

In *cap.* 4,2 (744,20-746,6), Eusebius described the purge in the army. The section is introduced by ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι πρῶτον (744,20). The phrase signals his intention quite clearly: he was going to depict the martyrdoms of the “period of peace”, but the expression is peculiar because it refers to no point in time specified in the immediately preceding passage.

Eusebius identified the originator of the persecution as ὁ τὴν ἕξουσίαν

εἰληφώς (744,21). The expression must refer to “the Emperor”⁴² and as the preceding account mentioned only Diocletian, he must be the one intended.⁴³ When saying that he woke up “from a deep torpor”, Eusebius meant that instead of remaining passive towards the Church, Diocletian now began to act against it.⁴⁴

The change manifested itself, as stated in 744,21-23, in his secret attacks on the Church after the Decian and Valerian persecutions.⁴⁵ What it really implies is not at all clear. On the contrary, Eusebius continued in 744,23-25 by relating that the Emperor was slowly preparing himself for

39 Therefore, the specific reference of ταῦτα is also unclear. Lawlor-Oulton translate the word by “such methods” (*Eusebius* I, p. 258), but that interpretation obscures the absence of a link between this passage and the previous account.

40 Eusebius’s use of the expression θαυμαστὴν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων ἐνδειγμένους προθυμίαν (744,17-18) is in fact equivalent to his description of the Church leaders: δειναῖς αἰκίαις προθύμως ἐναθλήσαντες (742,21-22). In both places, then, the reports are of exactly the same type, the only difference being that the first discusses the Church leaders, the second martyrs in general.

41 In 744,18-20, Eusebius made a clear distinction between ὁ κατὰ πάντων διωγμός and τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης. According to VII,13, this “time of peace” began with Emperor Gallienus’s edicts in 260 and lasted until the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution in 303. The “time of peace”, which is practically a recurrent theme in Eusebius, was really complete, and this is apparent not only from the fact that he was only able to report a single martyrdom in VII,15, but also from the description in VIII,1,1-6 of Church relations with the Roman Empire before the persecution. The fact that Eusebius here described all the martyrizations which took place in “the time of peace”, does, however, make this concept illusory.

42 *De mart. Pal.* 9,1, in which Eusebius described Maximin (or Galerius) as ὁ τοῦ διώκειν τὴν ἔξουσίαν εἰληφώς (928,5) provides an analogy.

43 Referring to *De mart. Pal.* 9,1, Lawlor-Oulton thought that Galerius might be intended (*Eusebius* II, p. 271) but this argument collapses when we consider that only Diocletian has been mentioned up to now. If, with Lawlor-Oulton, we take ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος (744,20-21) as referring to “the forty years’ peace” (*ibid.*), it is of course difficult to think of any Emperor at all. The immediately subsequent passage implies, on the other hand, an activity which extended over more than 40 years and this makes it impossible to talk of one particular Emperor. On this basis, we can understand why Henri Valois took the expression as referring to *diabolus* (PG XX,2, 750A – cf. also n. 4); he is followed in this by A. J. Mason: *The Persecution of Diocletian* (Cambridge 1876), 41, and P. Allard: *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle* (2. édition Paris 1898), I, p. 107.

44 We must admit that it is by no means apparent what Eusebius meant when he wrote ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος (744,20-21). But if the above interpretation is correct, we must accept, at any rate, that Eusebius here expressed ideas contrary to *cap.* 1,2-4, which describes the active goodwill shown by the Imperial government towards the Christians.

45 μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ μεταξὺ χρόνον ταῖς ἐκκλησιαίς ἐπιχειροῦντος (744,22-23).

war against the Christians⁴⁶ by first of all attacking only the Christian soldiers – getting them to renounce their faith might mean that the other Christians would be more easily overcome when their time came. Finally, Eusebius said, in 746,1-4, that the majority of the Christian soldiers opted for civilian life rather than the renunciation of their faith.

This presupposed, implicitly, that they had been faced with the demand that they either abjure their faith or leave the army.

Cap. 4,1-2 in its present form obviously lacks consistency. As mentioned above, the point of the emphatic ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι πρῶτον (744,20) is rather obscure in this connection. Quite apart from the fact that it has no natural link with the preceding passage, it builds up to a description of a new decisive phase in the persecution of the Christians. But we do not find this in the continuation. Furthermore, 744,23-25 appears to be parallel to 744,21-23, so a distinct shift in thought must have taken place; the discussion no longer concerns a secret as opposed to an open war, but a limited war as opposed to a total war against the Christians. What is more, the secret war is said to have been waged throughout the entire period following the Decian and Valerian persecutions, whereas the purge of the Christians from the army began at a definite time. Finally, it must be noted that Eusebius's description of the purge as the first phase in the persecution of the Christians is misleading, since in actual fact, it was an instance of social discrimination rather than of persecution. These inconsistencies probably arose because the passage constitutes an original account.

In 744,16-18, Eusebius said that he couldn't possibly depict all the countless martyrs who had shown a marvellous zeal for their faith. ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι πρῶτον makes little sense if seen in relation to οὐκ ἔξ ὄτουπερ κτλ. in 744,18-20; but it does make sense if connected to 744,16-18. The idea, then, is that a new decisive situation had arisen which caused the many martyrdoms. Consequently, 744,18-20 must be regarded as a later insertion. μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ Δεκίου καὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ μεταξὺ χρόνον ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπιχειροῦντος (744,22-23) in this context also makes such bad sense that it is natural to suppose that this, too, constitutes a later insertion. Therefore, the original may have read: ἄρτι γὰρ ἄρτι πρῶτον ὥσπερ ἀπὸ κάρου βαθέος ὑποκινουμένου τοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἰληφότος κρύβδην τε ἔτι καὶ ἀφανῶς οὐκ ἀθρόως τε τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαποδυομένου πολέμῳ.

This information that the Emperor had prepared in secret for war against the Christians would have had, as its logical continuation, an ac-

count of the outbreak of total persecution, which then generated countless martyrdoms. But this does not occur. Instead, he described the purge of the Christians from the army, and that description must be the result of a later insertion. After completing the original account, Eusebius learnt about the purge and understood it to be the herald, or rather the first phase, of the persecution of the Christians. He felt that this new knowledge was so important that he had to include it in his account. This necessitated considerable alterations to the original account; he inserted οὐκ ἔξ ὄτουπερ κτλ. (744,18-20) and μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ κτλ. (744,22-23), after which he added the actual passage on the purge (744,24-746,4). The insertions produced the inconsistencies mentioned above, but they also rendered illusory the original clear division between “a time of peace”, which began in 260, and the persecution of, or war against, the Christians, which started with Diocletian’s edict in the year 303 because, according to the new account, the persecution began in peacetime.

In *cap.* 4,3-4 (746,4-17), Eusebius wrote that, at a troop inspection, the military commander⁴⁸ gave the Christian soldiers the choice between

46 οὐκ ἀθρόως τε τῷ καθ’ ἡμῶν ἐπαποδουμένου πολέμῳ (744,23-24). The verb can mean both “prepare for battle” and “attack”, but the context here requires the first reading.

47 φυλοκρινῶν καὶ διακαθαίρων τοὺς ἐν τοῖς στρατοπέδοις ἀναφερομένους (746,6-7) must refer to a specific event and can therefore best be understood as a troop review, which would be much more natural at this point than sacrificing to the gods.

48 In his commentary on ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, even Henri Valois (PG XX,2,749, n. 5) interpreted the word as *magister militiae* with reference to Hieronymus’s translation of Eusebius’s *Chronicon*: *Ueturius magister militiae christianos milites persequitur, paulatim ex illo iam tempore persecutione aduersum nos incipiente* (*Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Eusebius* 7. Band, I. Teil, p. 227,9-11). Lawlor-Oulton interpreted this designation as “the supreme commander” of the army (*Eusebius* II, p. 271). The word can, however, also mean *praefectus castrorum* (CIL 3. 13648, 14187^o). The fact that Eusebius described an actual event here, makes it natural to assume that the event was the purge of the Praetorian Guard, carried out by its leader in accordance with the Imperial edict. Eusebius only wrote ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος (746,4-5) instead of giving his name, and the phrase should probably be understood as “contemptuous – he was not worth mentioning”, as Lawlor-Oulton suggested (LCL *Eusebius* II, 262 note). This in itself should make it difficult to identify him as Veturius. 746,8-9 mentions τὸ πρόσταγμα, which probably translates *edictum*. Neither its author nor its contents are described, however, but it must be assumed that the edict was issued by the Imperial government and from the account up to now, that must mean Diocletian. From ὅσοι τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας κτλ. (746,9-11), we are justified in concluding that the edict must have contained the demand either to sacrifice or to leave the army. We are not in a position to determine whether this was valid for all soldiers or whether the edict referred specifically to the Christians.

obeying the order to sacrifice or being deprived of their rank. The majority chose the second possibility without hesitation.

The passage quite clearly serves as an elaboration on the suggestions in the immediately preceding section.⁴⁹ Here the military commander appears as the person who implemented the persecution,⁵⁰ whereas the Emperor remains in the background, in contrast to the preceding section. It should be noticed that he is introduced as someone already known. When seen in relation to the fact that it is also presumed known that an order had been issued with very definite contents, this seems to suggest that the section was taken from a fuller account describing the issue of an edict by the Imperial powers. The edict must have decreed that everyone should offer sacrifices or leave the army with subsequent loss of rank and all privileges, and it must have contained specific instructions to the military commander on its enforcement. Eusebius drew on this account with the intention of explaining the purge of Christians from the army. But he did not include the information necessary to understand his explanation and made both ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης and τὸ πρόσταγμα appear quite unmotivated in the context.

Only a few soldiers suffered martyrdom, we are informed later on in *cap.* 4,4 (746,11-20). The numbers remained fairly insignificant because the Emperor⁵¹ – apparently out of fear for the many believers – held back from suddenly beginning a comprehensive war against the Christians.⁵² Eventually, when he did make a more open attack,⁵³ the many various martyrdoms, which were in evidence everywhere in the towns and in the country, defied description.

On the basis of the account this far we might have expected Eusebius, when describing the intensification of the persecution, to be referring to Diocletian's edicts, to which the Church leaders fell victim. This interpretation breaks down, however, because 746,18-20 must be assumed to include all martyrs in general and not just the Church leaders. And it also proves that the passage is in fact a repetition of Eusebius's discussion in 744,16-18. A probable explanation for this is that, having inserted the report on the purge of Christian soldiers from the army, Eusebius wanted to pick up the thread from 744,16-18 in 746,18-20, so that he could continue the interrupted account. Originally, he may at this point have described the escalation of the persecution resulting from an order to sacrifice issued to all Christians. The order followed Diocletian's edicts which had, primarily, affected the Church leaders, and it produced all the various martyrs, whom Eusebius now wanted to discuss. The insertion of the description of the removal of the Christians from the army disturbed

not only the original account, in which Eusebius had the persecution begin with Diocletian's edicts in 303, but it also dislocated the description of the separate phases in the persecution. The escalation of the persecution originally consisted of a sacrifice edict being expanded to include all Christians, but now Eusebius had partial persecution begin with the purge in the army and let Diocletian's edicts herald the total persecution of the Christians. This is, of course, incorrect, but it also meant that Eusebius simply failed to mention the issue of an edict demanding that all Christians should make sacrifices.

However the creation of 744,15-746,20 might be explained, it must be incontestable that in this section, there is a distinct lack of consistency. Even Rufinus had this opinion. In addition, he must have felt that, in its existing form, the section was so unsatisfactory that he could see no solution except to omit large parts of it.

Rufinus thought that the statement in 744,15-16 was misleading, since it actually said that, in contrast to the martyrs, the Church leaders deserted. Instead, he composed this sentence: *sed non adversum beatos martyres inpune haec facere licebat* (745,13). This general statement indicated that the persecutors' treatment of the martyrs – which also included the leaders mentioned previously – did not go unpunished.

In 744,15-20, Rufinus found that ὧν εἰς ἀκριβῆ κτλ. (744,16) was a hyperbolic rhetorical expression whose ideas, moreover, were repeated in the immediately following ἰστορήσαι ἄν τις (744,17). Furthermore, he considered the source misleading in its announcement that many martyrdoms occurred in “peace time” – this is contradicted even in 746,11-13. His considerations led Rufinus to compose this passage: *quorum patientiae et magnanimitatis virtutem, ⁵⁴ quamvis nullus digne proferat sermo, ta-*

49 ἄρτι πρῶτον (746,5) is linked to ἄρτι ἄρτι πρῶτον (744,20) emphasizing the continuity of the passage.

50 ἐνεχείρει τῷ κατὰ τῶν στρατευμάτων διωγμῷ (746,5-6) is similar to ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς ἐπιχειροῦντος (744,22-23), in which, however, the Emperor is the subject. The two sections may not be contradictory, since the military commander acted on the basis of the edict issued by the Imperial government.

51 τοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν ἐνεργοῦντος (746,14), from the account up to now, must mean Diocletian, who is thus once more seen as the instigator of the persecution.

52 καὶ ἀποκναίοντος ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων ἀθρώως ἐφορμῆσαι πόλεμον (746,16-17).

53 ὡς δὲ καὶ γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο (746,18) must mean “attack” here, the idea being that the Emperor now attacked the Christians more openly and directly than had been the case when the Christian soldiers were excluded from the army.

54 Rufinus used these words to translate θαυμασιήν ... προθυμίαν (744,17-18).

men pro mediocritate virium nostrarum, quae possumus enarrabimus (745,14-16).

Rufinus also noticed that Eusebius described the persecution of the Christian soldiers as if he had entirely forgotten that it had already been mentioned in *cap.* 1,7. He must also have felt that the whole of 744,20-746,4 constituted a digression in an account ostensibly dealing with the history of the martyrs. A number of details in this section have seemed so problematic to him that they could best be left out. Therefore, he limited himself in his version to a brief mention of the purge of the Christians from the army: *igitur primo omnium quoniam, sicut diximus, ignis huius exordium inter solos militares parva scintilla conflaverat, cum deligerentur, si qui essent inter milites Christiani, ut aut immolandum⁵⁵ sibi scirent aut militiam pariter vitamque⁵⁶ ponendam, plurimi, ex ipsis militiam pro fide Christi, pauci etiam animas posuere* (745,16-747,3). Apart from these words, which refer to 746,11-13, Rufinus translated no part of 746,4-17.

The reason for this is undoubtedly to be found in the fact that this section simply repeated previous statements. He did not find it necessary to mention the military commander's implementation of the Imperial edict. The omission resulted from his feeling that the source ascribed too much importance to the commander in the removal of the Christian soldiers; this was at odds with the previous account in which the Imperial power was held to be responsible for the persecution.

Rufinus probably felt that ὡς δὲ καὶ γυμνότερον ἐπαπεδύετο (746,18) was too vague as an indication that the persecution included not only the priesthood, but also lay people. He obviously also noticed that οὐδ' ἔστιν λόγῳ κτλ. (746,18-20) appears to be a repetition of 744,16-18 – and this was unsatisfactory to him both in content and style. Finally he must have felt that Eusebius had not succeeded in 746,18-20 in creating a satisfactory link to the ensuing account of the events in Nicomedia. To correct these shortcomings, he wrote the following: *cum vero inde flamma sumens initium tota per populos et sacerdotes exaggerasset incendia, possibile non est numero comprehendi, quanti cottidie paene per singulas quasque urbes et provincias martyres efficiebantur* (747,4-7).

⁵⁵ In contrast to Eusebius, Rufinus states quite clearly that the soldiers were confronted with a demand to sacrifice.

⁵⁶ This addition was caused by Rufinus not finding any explanation in his source for the death of some of the Christian soldiers. He therefore suggested here that Christian soldiers were aware that death could be the consequence of their refusal to sacrifice.

Cap. 5,1-6,7 (746,20-750,21): The persecution in Nicomedia

In *cap.* 5 (746,20-748,2), Eusebius gave an account of a high-ranking Christian in Nicomedia who tore up the first edict⁵⁷ to be posted up in the Forum, while Diocletian and Galerius were staying in the town,⁵⁸ and fearlessly suffered death as punishment for this daring act.

The section begins with *αὐτίκα γοῦν* (746,20-21). The meaning of this expression is not very clear, however. It is possible to understand it as “for example”, meaning that the subsequent passage will give an example of all the glorious martyrs in town and country whom Eusebius had just mentioned. But the fact that the martyr in question was not sentenced to death because of his faith but because of an illegal action⁵⁹ speaks against this assumption. Therefore *αὐτίκα* should rather be understood as meaning “to begin with”⁶⁰, since this indicates that the distinguished Christian is considered as the first of many Christians who suffered death in Nicomedia during the persecution.⁶¹ At any rate, with this section, Eusebius began an account of the events which took place in Nicomedia after the issue of Diocletian’s first edict.

The report itself is clear and consistent. It should be noted, however, that Eusebius obviously drew on an existing account. His remarks on the two Emperors, who were first and fourth respectively in the Imperial hierarchy, suggest as much. No mention has been made of the tetrarchy up to now, but only of Diocletian, and the explanation for this must be

⁵⁷ When talking of *τὴν κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν τῇ Νικομηδείᾳ ... γραφὴν* (746,22-24) here, Eusebius must be referring to the first edict mentioned in *cap.* 2,4.

⁵⁸ *δυσὲν ἐπιπαρόντων κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν βασιλείων, τοῦ τε πρεσβυτάτου τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦ τὸν τέταρτον ἀπὸ ταύτου τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπικρατοῦντος βαθμόν* (746,26-28). The precise statement of the position of the two Emperors in the Imperial hierarchy leaves no doubt that Diocletian (as *maximus augustus*) and Galerius (as his *caesar*) are referred to.

⁵⁹ Even though Eusebius did emphasize the fact that the Christian was motivated by his faith: *ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινηθεὶς διαπύρω τε ἐφορμῆσας τῇ πίστει* (746,23-24), he also stated that he was punished because of his bold conduct (*ἐπὶ τοιοῦτῳ τολμήματι*, 748,1). In other words, his action had the seditious and subversive character of a *crimen laesae majestatis* and was punished as such. It was also necessary, therefore, to mention that the *augustus* and *caesar* of the East were in Nicomedia at exactly that time.

⁶⁰ As in Lawlor-Oulton, *Eusebius I*, p. 259.

⁶¹ The words *ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν τῶν τῆνικάδε πρῶτος τοῦτον διατρέψας τὸν τρόπον* (746,28-29) must be interpreted in this way, since *τῆνικάδε* alludes to the time of persecution.

found in the fact that the account Eusebius used mentioned Diocletian's tetrarchy and gave the names of each Emperor and his place in the Imperial hierarchy.

In his version of *cap.* 5, Rufinus evidently made a point of integrating the entire account to an extent quite different from what Eusebius, in his estimation, had done. Therefore, as already pointed out, he rewrote 746,17-20, to serve as the introduction to the ensuing account. When at the same time, he wrote *etenim* (747,7) for ἀντίκα γούν, he pointed out that the report which followed should be considered as an example of the many martyrdoms which had occurred, according to the previous section, in both town and country.

When translating the actual account of the martyrs Rufinus tried to create a readily understandable rendition. This is true of the details,⁶² but it is also evident in his description of the circumstances surrounding the high-ranking Christian's death. He thus considered it a mistake that his source gave no indication of the part which the two Emperors played in the distinguished Christian's death – and that must surely be the reason for mentioning them. He amended this by adding, in his report, that the destruction of the edict had taken place *publice populo inspectante* (747,9-10). Witnesses thus attended the action and this explains how the Emperors came to hear about it. In their anger, they reacted by trying to break the Christian with all kinds of cruelties, but the joyous courage of his faith prevailed.⁶³ With these expansions, Rufinus created an account which was intended further to demonstrate the *crudelitas* of the Imperial power towards the Christians, a theme which he had already touched upon with the words *adversum cultores dei -- crudelia edicta* (747,8-9). Similarly, the Christian appears as an unyielding upholder of the faith standing up to the Emperor's cruelty.⁶⁴

In *cap.* 6,1-5 (748,3-750,5), Eusebius pronounced the *caesariani*, with Dorotheos at their head, some of the finest martyrs. He gave a detailed description of Peter's cruel sufferings and death and left his readers to imagine, from that, the destiny of the other martyrs – though he did mention that Dorotheos and Gorgonios were two of a large group who suffered death by hanging.

In Eusebius's account, the report on the *caesariani*'s martyrdoms is part of the history of the martyrs from the congregation in Nicomedia. The introduction to the section, πάντων δὲ ὅσοι κτλ. (748,3-4), does not,

however, form a natural link to the previous description of the first martyr in Nicomedia. It is much more closely connected to 744,15-18 and 746,18-20 and must be regarded as a direct continuation of these passages. The Christian *caesariani* were depicted, then, in order to provide an example of the sufferings which the great host of martyrs had to endure.⁶⁵ Eusebius probably chose to call particular attention to this group of martyrs because of their high social standing⁶⁶ – the fact that they suffered martyrdom in Nicomedia is incidental.

When Eusebius stated immediately that this section was intended as a discussion of τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον βασιλικοὺς παῖδας (748,5-6), readers would naturally expect him to proceed with a description of Dorotheos's martyrdom, since he was the leader of the Christian *caesariani*. It is therefore surprising that, as an example of the type of cruel sufferings and death which they had to endure, Eusebius does not mention Doro-

62 Thus Rufinus chose to translate τῶν οὐκ ἀσήμων τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγαν κατὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ βίῳ νενομισμένας ὑπεροχὰς ἐνδοξοτάτων (746,21-22) by *vir quidam de nobilibus honore et dignitate saeculi inlustris* (747,7-8). Where Eusebius had τὴν κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ... γραφὴν (746,22-23), he wrote *adversum cultores dei ... crudelia edicta* (747,8-9), thereby taking into account the fact that Eusebius had previously mentioned the issue of several edicts. In connection with ὡς ἀνοοῖαν καὶ ἀσεβεστάτην (746,25), he did however mention *librum iniquae legis* (747,10). The phrase ζήλω τῷ κατὰ θεὸν ὑποκινήθεις διαπύρῳ τε ἐφορησας τῇ πίστει, he felt, could be abbreviated with advantage to *calore nimio fidei ignitus* (747,9). He also replaced δνεῖν κτλ. (746,26-28) with the concise *Augusto in eadem urbe simul cum Caesare constituto* (747,11). Finally, he omitted ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν τῶν τηνικάδε πρῶτος τοῦτον διαπρέψας τὸν τρόπον (746,28-29), probably because he found the passage quite misleading, since the previous account had already reported the sufferings of the Church leaders which, indeed, in certain cases had led to death.

63 *ad quos cum relatum esset religiosi et inlustris viri factum, continuo omni in eum crudelitatis genere desaevientes, ne hoc quidem solum efficere quiverunt, ut eum maestum aliquis videret in poenis, sed laeto atque hilari vultu, cum iam viscera in supplicii defecissent, spiritus tamen laetabatur in vultu. ex quo tortores sui gravius cruciabantur, quod omnia suppliciorum genera consumebant in eum, quem ne tristem quidem ex his reddere poterant* (747,12-749,2).

64 This interpretation meant that Rufinus found no use for τοιαῦτα οἷα καὶ εἰκόδ ἦν, ὑπομείνας ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ τοιοῦτῳ τολμήματι (746,29-748,1), since this might imply that the Christian was justly condemned for a subversive action.

65 This is quite clear from the universal perspective in the introductory words for this section – he is discussing θαυμάσιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρεία βεβοημένοι εἴτε παρ' Ἑλλήσιν εἴτε παρὰ βαρβάροις (748,3-4). Incidentally, this is also proof that *cap.* 5 is a later insertion interrupting the original continuity.

66 This explains why 748,6-10 emphasized a description of them as the Emperors' highly appreciated and esteemed people, who chose suffering and death rather than τῆς τοῦ βίου δόξης καὶ τρυφῆς.

theos but some unknown person: this is even more remarkable when later in *cap.* 6,5 he says that he suffered martyrdom by strangulation.

All this can only be explained as a result of Eusebius's revision of an original account. There, only the *caesariani* were mentioned and one of them was given closer attention, so that, by the example of his martyrdom, readers could conclude what the others had suffered.⁶⁷ Later, Eusebius learned that Dorotheos and Gorgonios were the most well-known of the Christian slaves at the Imperial court. He used this knowledge when rewriting *cap.* 1,1-6 and also felt that they should be mentioned here, since their absence from *cap.* 6,1-5 would be very conspicuous when he had discussed the otherwise unknown Peter in that passage. Eusebius therefore inserted ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον (748,5) and all of 750,1-5, which makes direct mention of the martyrdom of Dorotheos and Gorgonios.⁶⁸ As a motive for this last insertion, Eusebius stated plainly that these were even more cruel than Peter's, but he ignored the fact that he thus contradicted 748,10-12, where the argument implies that the martyrdom mentioned was the most cruel one imaginable. After the description of this appalling martyrdom, Dorotheos and Gorgonios's deaths are clearly something of an anticlimax!

When Eusebius wrote θεῖους ἤνεγκεν ὁ καιρὸς καὶ διαπρεπεῖς μάρτυρας (748,4-5), his intentions were rather obscure. If ὁ καιρὸς is taken to mean "a critically dangerous time",⁶⁹ he might have referred to the persecution as such. Another possibility is that the word signifies a definite event, in which case we would assume it, most naturally, to refer to the first edict, as it included a provision on the *caesariani*. We may add, in support of this second interpretation, that, according to the chronology in the previous account, their martyrdoms occurred before the 2nd and 3rd edicts were issued. Conversely, and in support of the first argument, in the first edict, the death penalty was not decreed for those who chose to adhere to their faith. Therefore the question arises whether ὁ καιρὸς did not originally indicate the issue of a general edict on sacrifice which would then also have included the Christian *caesariani*. The obscurity resulted from Eusebius's alteration of the original account which simply mentioned the Christian *caesariani* as an example of the many martyrs created by this edict on sacrifice. Eusebius then revised the original to form a chronological account which began in Nicomedia.

The description of Peter's martyrdom in *cap.* 6,2-4 began with the words ἡγέτο τις εἰς μέσον κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν ἐφ' ᾧν δεδηλώκαμεν ἀρχόντων (748,12-14). The most obvious interpretation would

be this: the martyr was brought in front of the *augustus* and his *caesar*, who commanded him to sacrifice, and then, because of his continued refusal, attempted to force him to obey orders by cruel treatment.⁷⁰ Are we really to believe, however, that the two Emperors were actively involved in the cruelties against the recalcitrant Christian? Eusebius's words κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν and ἐφ' ὧν δεδηλώκαμεν ἀρχόντων also appear strange, following, as they do, his mention of Nicomedia and the Emperors. It would be natural, therefore, to ask if the passage was based on an account which originally spoke only of a Christian *caesarianus* being brought in front of the provincial governor in Nicomedia. Eusebius then inserted the above-mentioned words in order to bring his account into harmony with the description of the first martyr in the Imperial city of residence. The addition placed the report on this martyr as part of the history of the martyrs from the congregation in Nicomedia.

Rufinus seems to have been dissatisfied with Eusebius's account in *cap.* 6,1-5. This is true even of the introductory πάντων δὲ ὅσοι κτλ. (748,3-6), indicating that new material will be introduced, but providing no connection to the directly preceding report. The passage also interrupts the continuity, so Rufinus decided that it could be omitted altogether. Nor did he find occasion to reproduce μείζονα πλοῦτον κτλ. (748,7-10), but his reason for this is impossible to gauge. It is easier to explain why he did not translate 748,10-13 – this must have struck him as superfluous since Eusebius later discussed the martyrdoms of Dorotheos and Gorgonios and many other *caesariani*. Rufinus, however, chose to replace the whole of 748,3-12 by the following passage: *post hunc ad unum ex Dorothei sodalibus, qui in cubiculo regis erant*⁷¹ *quique semper in affectu habiti fuerant*

67 When Eusebius wrote ὃν ἐνός τινος οἴω κέχρηται μνησθέντες τῷ τοῦ βίου τέλει (748,10-11) and, still mentioning no names, continued ἤγετό τις κτλ. (748,12-13), this demonstrates that originally only an anonymous figure was mentioned as in the case of the other *caesariani*. Only later did Eusebius find occasion to give his name: ἄξιον ὡς ὄντως καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας: Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο (748,27-750,1). The position of this passage at the end of Peter's sufferings is proof, in itself, that the passage is an addition.

68 The insertion of these words created a stylistically unsatisfactory text. This is not clear from Lawlor-Oulton's translation: "Dorotheus and the imperial servants that were with him" (*Eusebius* I, p. 259).

69 Cf. Liddell-Scott, pp. 859-60.

70 Cf. θύειν δὴ οὖν προσταχθεῖς, ... κελεύεται κτλ. (748,14-16).

71 Rufinus used these words to translate τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον βασιλικοὺς παῖδας (748,5-6), as he had already spoken of *ille Dorotheus in cubiculo regum* in 737,14-15.

liberorum, intentionis transfertur insania (749,3-5). With this version, Rufinus also created a natural link to the preceding account by describing Peter's martyrdom as a new example of Imperial *insania*, an effect which was further emphasized when he continued with this free composition: *etenim cum de immensis supra memorati martyris supplicii liberius causaretur ...* (749,5-6).

In his report on Peter's suffering and death, Rufinus diverged on several points from the source at 748,13-26. He paraphrased ἡγετό τις εἰς μέσον (748,12-13) by *duci ipse iubetur in medium* (749,6-7), specifically identifying an interrogation as the subject under discussion. He omitted to translate κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν ἐφ' ᾧν δεδηλώκαμεν ἀρχόντων (748,13-14), probably because the martyrization took place in Nicomedia and because the Emperors were responsible. θύειν δὴ οὖν προσταχθεῖς, ὡς ἐνίστατο (748,14) was abbreviated by Rufinus to *atque immolare compellitur* (749,6-7) – undoubtedly in order to emphasize the parallel to the Church leaders who were also forced to sacrifice.⁷² The most obvious difference results from Rufinus's replacement of οὐ πρότερον κτλ. (748,23-26) with the following impressive composition: *cumque ministri scelerum⁷³ hinc modo corpus, modo inde versantes, per membra singula poenas inciperent et supplicia renovarent, sperantes ab eo elicere se posse consensum, ille firmus in fide et ovens in spe consumptis iam et igne resolutis carnibus suis ultimum spiritum in fide laetus exhalat* (749,14-18). Furthermore, Rufinus thought it necessary to expand ἄξιον ὡς ὄντως καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας· Πέτρος γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο (748,27-750,1), if his readers were to understand the point: *tali Petrus, hoc enim ei nomen est, martyrio decoratus, vere Petri extitit et fidei heres et nominis* (749,18-19).⁷⁴

Rufinus obviously thought that Eusebius's 750,2-5, in comparison with Peter's sufferings, did not give the martyrdoms of Dorotheos and Gorgonios the attention which they deserved. He also wished to point out their importance as spiritual leaders for the other Christian *caesariani*: *huius institutor in disciplina et magister in officiis, quae intra palatium exhibebantur, Dorotheus erat, cubiculi regii praepositus, habens secum officio, fide et magnanimitate parem Gorgonium. quorum institutionibus optimis omnes paene cubiculi ministri in fide dei vigilanter et libere persistebant* (749,19-24).⁷⁵ Rufinus also missed in Eusebius a detailed description of the events surrounding their martyrdom. He wanted to rectify this in a way which would also describe their prominence as witnesses to their Christian faith. He composed an account, therefore, which described Dorotheos and Gorgonios as incessantly protesting to the Emperor, at the sight of Peter's horrible sufferings, because only he was being punish-

ed, although they shared the same beliefs as he did.⁷⁶ This then resulted in their being hanged,⁷⁷ on the command of the Emperor, once they had been subjected to almost the same tortures.

Eusebius went on in *cap.* 6,6-7 (750,5-20) to discuss the accusations against the Christians of having set fire to the Imperial palace. As a result, many were beheaded, others burned or drowned, and eventually, on the Emperor's orders, the bodies of the *caesariani* who had suffered martyrdom were dug up and thrown into the sea. In this description Eusebius wished to illustrate the increase, both in scope and inhumanity, of the fight against the Christians in Nicomedia under the leadership of the Emperors.⁷⁸ Even though he listed all the Christians who lost their lives as

72 Rufinus's version of the account of Peter's torments includes some minor differences: for instance, he considered it superfluous to translate ταῦτα πάσχω (748,17). On the other hand, he thought that τῶν ὁστέων ὑποφαινομένων (748,17-18) ought to be replaced by *visceribus iam pelle nudatis* (749,9), so that he could omit κατὰ τῶν διασπαέντων τοῦ σώματος μερῶν (748,18-19).

73 In contrast to Eusebius, Rufinus stated very clearly that subordinates – and not the central government – were responsible for the torture.

74 Rufinus did not translate τοιοῦτον τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐνὸς τὸ μαρτύριον παίδων (748,26-27), probably because he regarded it as superfluous, in view of the fact that, immediately afterwards, Dorotheos' and Gorgonios's deaths are reported.

75 Rufinus had given an independent, detailed account of these two prominent *caesariani*, so there was, of course, no reason for him to translate οὐ χεῖρονα δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὄντα λόγου φειδόμενοι συμμετρίας παραλείψομεν (750,1-2).

76 *Dorotheus igitur et Gorgonius, cum Petrum tam crudelibus viderent atque inmanibus supplicii cruciari, constanter et libere: "Cur", aiunt, "imperator, punis in Petro mentis sententiam, quae in nobis omnibus viget? ut quid in lillo crimen ducitur, quod a nobis omnibus confitetur? haec nobis fides, hic cultus et unanimes eademque sententia"* (749,24-751,3). With this account, Rufinus succeeded in linking the report on Dorotheos and Gorgonios closely to Peter's martyrdom. The reason could be that he knew that Dorotheos was martyred at the same time as Peter, cf. *Martyrologium Syriacum*. Incidentally, it is worth noting that here Rufinus regarded the torments to which Peter was subjected as a punishment for his Christian faith, whereas, in the account itself, he stated that the torture was a means to force him to sacrifice.

77 *quos ille cum in medium nihilominus venire iussisset, similibus paene ut priores supplicii adfectos, ad ultimum laqueo adpensos necari iussit* (751,3-5). Rufinus omitted τῆς ἐνθίου νίκης ἀπηνέγκαντο βραβεῖα (750,5) probably because he thought that there was no need to mention, in particular reference to them, something which was true for all Christians.

78 This can be seen when οἱ νενομισμένοι δεσπότες (750,18-19) desecrated the graves of the Christian martyrs, about whom it is specifically said γῆ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης κηδείας παραδοθέντας (750,16-17).

martyrs,⁷⁹ it really only applied to Anthimos.⁸⁰ Eusebius also made it quite clear that the other Christians suffered death as punishment for alleged arson.

With the passage καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομηδείας κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀποτελεσθέντα τοῦ διωγμοῦ τοιαῦτα (750,20-21), Eusebius closed the section *cap.* 5-6,7. The chronology of the account, as it now exists, suggests that the events listed took place in the fairly short period which passed between the publication of the first edict in Nicomedia and the appearance of the second and third edicts, commanding the imprisonment of the Church leaders and demanding that they should offer sacrifices. This is, however, historically inaccurate. Bishop Anthimos's martyrdom must be seen in the context of the third edict or perhaps even of a general order to sacrifice, and the issue of such a decree seems, at any rate, to be the basis for the martyrdoms of the Christian *caesariani*. In other words, Eusebius included, in this section, material from different phases of the history of the persecution of the congregation in Nicomedia to create a chronological account of the persecution giving Nicomedia, the seat of the Emperor Diocletian, as the starting point. This explains why, in fact, there is no continuity between the report of the death of the first Christian, the martyrdoms of the Christian *caesariani*, and the many death penalties resulting from the accusation of arson. Finally, we should note that Eusebius's new principle of organizing his material produced alterations in his original plan, causing *cap.* 5-6,7 to diverge from the previous account.

Rufinus quite obviously thought that Eusebius had not made it clear that *cap.* 6,6-7 applied to Christians who had died for their faith. He also found Eusebius's rather short note on Anthimos insufficient – the note was repeated in *cap.* 13.1. Rufinus composed this version: *tunc et Anthimus ipsius urbis episcopus in domini Iesu Christi confessione perdurans martyrii gloriam capitis obruncatione suscepit. hunc autem tamquam vere bonum pastorem viam martyrii praeuntem universa paene gregis sui multitudo prosequitur* (751,5-8).

Rufinus diverged on several points from the report in his source on the Christians' being accused of and sentenced for arson. He saw no reason, therefore, to repeat οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως (750,8) and probably considered Eusebius guilty of exaggeration in: ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Νικομήδειαν βασιλείοις πυρκαϊᾶς ... ἀφθείσης (750,8-10); he himself wrote: *partem aliquam palatii incendio conflagrare* (751,9). He went beyond Eusebius when

mentioning that the Emperor – and in the context he must be Diocletian – was seized with *inaestimabili furore* and commanded the death of the Christians whom suspicion had identified as guilty.⁸¹

Rufinus quite obviously felt that Eusebius had left his readers in the dark when, without detailed explanation, he wrote λόγος ἔχει προθυμία θεία τινὶ καὶ ἀρρήτῳ ἄνδρα ἅμα γυναιξὶν ἐπὶ τὴν πυρὰν καταλέσθαι (750,13-14). It is not very clear if this applies to a group different from those who were condemned to die at the stake, just as it is questionable whether these and the others who were condemned to death can be called Christian martyrs at all. At any rate, Rufinus created an account which removed these uncertainties by explaining that the condemned Christians were offered freedom if they abjured their faith: *sed in illis per divinam gratiam maior fidei ignis ardebat. denique cum adsistentes ministri interrogarent singulos, si forte sacrificaturi vellent dimitti, tam viri quam mulieres ne interrogari quidem se patiebantur, sed ultro vel flammis intruere vel caedentibus gladiis certatim obiectare cervices* (751,12-16).⁸² For the passage 750,14-16, Rufinus must have felt the lack of clarity on these points: who suffered death by drowning, and why were they in particular sentenced to this punishment? He himself was in no doubt that those intended must be the Christians already mentioned. He therefore felt the need for an account which would also emphasize the *crudelitas* which characterized the treatment of the Christians. His version is: *cumque iam illis ipsis spectatoribus nimietas crudelitatis horresceret, ministri scelerum partem populi naviculis iniectam in medium pelagus abducunt ibique in sententia fidei persistentes praecipitant in profundum* (751,17-19).

The Imperial order to desecrate the graves of the Christian *caesariani* was regarded by Rufinus as a fresh example of the *crudelitas* and *inhuma-*

79 Eusebius thus wrote: τούτῳ [Anthimos] δὲ πλῆθος ἄθροον μαρτύρων προστίθεται (750,7-8).

80 He died διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίαν (750,6-7), but we are not told the details of his martyrdom. According to the chronology of the existing account of the martyrs in the Nicomedia congregation, his refusal to sacrifice cannot be seen as the reason, because the issue of the second and third edicts is only reported later in *cap.* 6,8.

81 Rufinus's text is *hoc imperator a nostris factum falsa suspicione praesumpsit, ex quo inaestimabili furore succensus iubet omnes nostros acervatim collectos alios quidem gladio obtruncari, alios ignibus conflagrare* (751,10-12).

82 With this expansion, he also succeeded in creating a complete parallel between those who were condemned to be beheaded and those who were condemned to be burned at the stake. But this meant that the Emperors' command to have the Christians killed as arsonists became meaningless in the context.

nitas which always characterized the Emperors' treatment of the Christians. By emphasizing this in his version, he managed to integrate the desecration of the graves into the context more fully than Eusebius. From οἱ νενομισμένοι δεσπότες κτλ. (750,18-20), Rufinus created this short ironic passage: *hoc dicentes: "ne forte dii efficiantur Christianorum et illi, qui deos adorare nolunt, servos nostros incipient adorare"* (751,23-24). In order to remove any possibilities of misunderstanding, he did add, however, that the Emperors were speaking from false assumptions: *putant enim, quod divinus apud nos honor martyribus deferatur* (751,24-25). Finally, Rufinus shaped 750,20-21, which rounded off Eusebius's description in *cap. 5-6,7*, into a natural transition to the following account.

Cap. 6,8-10 (750,21-752,10):
The persecution gathered speed when
the second and third edicts were issued

According to this section, the Imperial government commanded that Church leaders everywhere should be imprisoned, following Christian disturbances in the Melitene area and around Syria. The prisons were filled, leaving no room for criminals. A new edict decreed that those who agreed to sacrifice should be set free, and those who refused should be tortured. This resulted in a great number of martyrs in all the provinces, but mostly from Africa proconsularis, Mauretania, Thebes and Egypt. The reason given by Eusebius for the ordinance on the imprisonment of the Church leaders is ἐτέρων κατὰ τὴν Μελιτηνὴν οὕτω καλουμένην χώραν καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἄλλων ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἐπιφυῆναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ πεπειραμένων (750,22-24). The previous account of the persecution referred to the Christians in Nicomedia, so ἔτεροι must be interpreted as the Christians who lived in the provinces of Armenia Minor⁸³ and Syria.⁸⁴ But why are they said to have tried ἐπιφυῆναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ?

If the verb is taken to have its usual meaning of “adhere, cling closely to something”,⁸⁵ the natural interpretation would be that the Christians attempted to cling closely to the kingdom of God – and, from the description of the persecution up to now, this must mean that they chose to defy the Imperial edict mentioned in *cap.* 2,4. If this was Eusebius’s intention, why did he not state quite clearly that he was referring to “the kingdom of God”? The expression πεπειραμένων (750,23-24) also seems strange if it was supposed to indicate that the Christians had chosen to follow God instead of the Emperor.

These are the problems which have led scholars to believe that the expression refers to an attempted attack by the Christians on the Roman Empire.⁸⁶ Even though it is possible from a purely linguistic viewpoint to

⁸³ Paul Allard is quite right: *La Persécution de Dioclétien* I, p. 221. Lawlor-Oulton gives the same interpretation, II, p. 274.

⁸⁴ The expression ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν (750,23) implies that he must have thought of several places throughout the province of Syria.

⁸⁵ Cf. Liddell-Scott, 672.

⁸⁶ As in Henri Valois: *imperium arripere conati essent* (PG XX,2, 745C), and Lawlor-Oulton I, 261: “had attempted to take possession of the Empire”. Strangely enough, no translator or commentator has seen reason to point out, let alone discuss, the problems occasioned by this expression.

translate ἐπιφυῆναι as “attack”,⁸⁷ this concept is in direct contrast to the Christians’ relationships, as we know them, with the Imperial powers. If the Christians had risen up in order to take control of the Roman Empire themselves, the Emperors would, as in other instances, have ordered their prompt execution.⁸⁸ Had an attempted Christian revolution taken place, the Emperors were most unlikely to have limited themselves to simply imprisoning the Church hierarchy as punishment. What is more, the very thought of rising up and resisting the political leaders was completely foreign to the Christians. For them, it was an indisputable fact that the authorities were installed by God and could therefore command obedience. This attitude can also be found in Eusebius.⁸⁹ Finally, we have absolutely no evidence of Christian rebellion in Armenia Minor or Syria.⁹⁰

It is not possible, therefore, to say what Eusebius meant when he phrased ἐπιφυῆναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ, but he wanted, at any rate, to explain the appearance of the second edict.⁹¹ The edict is remarkable because it decreed the imprisonment of the Church hierarchy exclusively. But they were not to be accused or sentenced because of their Christian belief, nor were they to be forced to abjure. Further, Eusebius explained that the internment included *ordines maiores*: bishops, presbyters and deacons as well as *ordines minores*: readers and exorcists. This apparently indicated that the edict was designed to cripple the Church by preventing its leaders from carrying out their pastoral and charitable duties. It therefore followed exactly the same lines as the first edict, which attempted to eliminate the Church by stopping its divine services. Having issued this first edict, however, the Emperors must soon have realized that it would not have the desired effect as long as no steps were taken against the Church leaders. The Emperors must have assumed that by ordering the internment of all members of the Church hierarchy, they could still prevent the Church from functioning and therefore, without using brute force, bring about its destruction. The two edicts were therefore so closely connected that the second must be regarded as necessary for the implementation of the first. This is the reason for its appearance.⁹²

Christians in Armenia Minor and Syria may have resisted the implementation of the first edict under the leadership of the priests and this would then have led to the unrest. Eusebius might have learned of such incidents and seen in them the reason for the appearance of the second edict. But he probably did not know the circumstances in detail, and therefore expressed himself rather ambiguously. Whatever the case may

be, his interpretation must be rejected as improbable. It seems utterly unlikely, as already mentioned, that possible Christian unrest in some places in the Eastern provinces should have resulted simply in the imprisonment of the hierarchy, and the appearance of the second edict is much better explained as a practical necessity designed to further the intentions of the first edict.

According to Eusebius, the third edict commanded that the imprisoned members of the hierarchy should be released if they made sacrifices, but if they refused to do so, they should be tortured.⁹³ It is not clear here whether the torture should force them to sacrifice or be regarded as a punishment. If we compare this passage with *cap.* 2,5-3,4 which discusses the edict and describes its implementation, we are left in no doubt, however, that the torture was intended to weaken the resistance of the prisoners and thus make them sacrifice.⁹⁴

When Eusebius said that all the prisons were filled with Church leaders, leaving no room for real criminals, he obviously wished to state the

⁸⁷ The word has this meaning in Plutarch, *Pomp.* 51 (cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 672).

⁸⁸ The Imperial government punished by death, severely and relentlessly, all those who attempted an uprising. This is illustrated, for example, by Libanius's depiction of Diocletian's reaction to a slight uprising of soldiers in Antioch (*Oratio* 11.158-62; 19.45-46; 20.18-20).

⁸⁹ When Eusebius emphasized in VIII, 1,1-6 and 6,1 the Christians' position as the most trusted servants of the Imperial government this alone presupposes his incontrovertible acceptance of the existing political system. Furthermore, since Eusebius was at pains to show in his Church History how the Imperial government and the Church should work harmoniously together, according to God's will, it is difficult to imagine that he was thinking of a Christian uprising when he rephrased this vague expression.

⁹⁰ See my *C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus* (1974), p. 73, note 223.

⁹¹ Even though Eusebius did not use this designation, it is legitimate to speak of both the second and third edicts, as they follow on the edict, mentioned in *cap.* 2,1, which heralded the persecution. Numbering them like this is even more acceptable because the three edicts were very closely connected. For the sake of completeness, it should be noticed that Eusebius used the designation τὰ γράμματα (752,3-4) only for the second and third edicts, just as he used βασιλικὰ γράμματα (742,12) for the first edict.

⁹² This close relationship between the first and the second edict makes it impossible to regard the latter as an amnesty, issued on the occasion of Diocletian's *vicennalia*, as interpreted by J. Mason, *op. cit.* p. 206. For further justification, see Hedwig Fritzen: *Methoden der diokletianischen Christenverfolgung. Nach der Schrift des Eusebius über die Märtyrer in Palästina* (München 1962), pp. 31-32.

⁹³ αὐθις δ' ἐτέρων τὰ πρῶτα γράμματα ἐπικατελιφθῶτων (752,3-4).

⁹⁴ Eusebius was therefore correct when he gave its contents in *cap.* 2,5 as πάση μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι (742,20).

reason for the appearance of the third edict: it was to solve the problem of the overfilled prisons which the second edict had created. This explanation cannot, however, be accepted at face value, since the entire account is a piece of rhetoric which, with its striking exaggerations, attempts to bring out the monstrosity of the imprisonment of the Church leaders: the innocent occupied the place of the real criminals, a situation dangerous to the law and order of the whole of society.

But Eusebius's explanation is based on the correct observation that the third edict was published in response to the situation created by the second edict, which the Imperial powers had not foreseen, let alone taken into account. The hopes that the imprisonment of the Church hierarchy would mean the dissolution of the Church were not realized at all: instead, it created a crowd of prisoners and nobody knew what to do with them. If they could be made to sacrifice – voluntarily or under constraint was a minor consideration in this connection – and then be released, the lay people would follow their example and worship the official gods of the Roman Empire, it was thought. The strain on the prisons could also be relieved in this way – a thought which may possibly also have entered into the considerations leading to the edict.

The third edict must therefore be regarded as a necessary continuation of the first two edicts, because, like them, it was designed to eliminate the Church. But with this edict, the struggle against the Church was intensified to such an extent that it was beginning to develop into an extensive and bloody persecution. It was no longer simply a question of eliminating the Church as an organization and preventing the practice of its religious and social life. The development entailed that the Church leaders should be forced, by bloody, even fatal violence, if necessary, to sacrifice to the gods. From there, the next step, extending the demand to include all Christians, was a short one. But Eusebius mentions no edict containing a general command to sacrifice.

The third edict created innumerable martyrs in all the provinces.⁹⁵ Up to this point, the account has mentioned only the leaders of the Church, so this large number seems striking. At any rate, it presupposes that continued refusal to sacrifice was punished by death, but Eusebius did not discuss this. The assertion can only be true if referring to martyrs in general, not only to the leaders of the Church, who could hardly account for the high numbers given here. We must conclude that the account was interrupted at this point. Previously, Eusebius had mentioned the imprisoned Church hierarchy, but from *πῶς κτλ.* (752,6), and providing no further link, he talked of martyrs in general.⁹⁶

These martyrs, he continues in 752,7-10, were mostly to be found in Africa proconsularis, Mauretania, Thebes and Egypt – and from here, Christians were deported to other cities and provinces where they were martyred. This recital has such a fortuitous character, both in point of style⁹⁷ and content,⁹⁸ that it can only be explained as a later insertion. Eusebius's reasons for adding the passage cannot, on the other hand, be satisfactorily explained.⁹⁹

If we disregard the later addition of *καὶ μάλιστα κτλ.* (752,7-10), *cap.* 6,9-10 discusses the persecution of the Church leaders resulting from the second and third edicts. The section is so closely linked to the previous account of the persecution of the Christians in Nicomedia (*cap.* 5,1-6,7), that together they make up a chronologically arranged description of the persecution from its earliest beginning.¹⁰⁰ In many respects this now resembles a parallel to the depiction of the persecution which Eusebius gave in *cap.* 2,1-3,4.

Despite the common theme, however, the second passage constitutes no simple repetition. Close analysis reveals not only differences in the

95 πῶς ἂν πάλιν ἐνταῦθα τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν μάρτυρων ἀριθμῆσειέν τις τὸ πλῆθος; (752,6-7). This rhetorical question forms the main clause after αὐθις δ' ἑτέρων κτλ. (752,3-6).

96 As further confirmation that this interpretation is correct, we could mention the fact that Eusebius's statement in 752,6-7 is quite similar to 746,18-20, which obviously discusses a question of the Christian martyrs in general.

97 In the list, τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν (752,7-8) is followed for no apparent reason by τὸ Μαύρων ἔθνος (752,8), where κατὰ Μαυρετανίαν (752,8) might have been expected. In the same way, ἐξ ἧς κτλ. (752,9-10) interrupts the close continuity, because it describes deported Egyptian Christians who had suffered martyrdom outside their homeland.

98 It is remarkable that Thebes is specially mentioned here, since the city belonged to Egypt. It is also surprising that, in this list, Eusebius did not include Syria nor Palestine, which saw many more martyrs than Mauretania, where Christians were few and far between.

99 Eusebius may have wanted to insert this list to describe the contents of his subsequent account, but he certainly did not follow any such plan. He did mention the martyrs in Thebes and the rest of Egypt and the Christian Egyptians who suffered martyrdom when banished from their country, but he never mentioned a single martyrdom in Latin North Africa. On the contrary, he gave accounts of martyrs from other regions than those listed here. The insertion stands quite isolated in the account.

100 Eusebius's precise dating proves his wish to provide his readers with a chronologically arranged account. The sentence καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομηδείας κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀποτελεσθέντα τοῦ διωγμοῦ τοιαῦτα (750,20-21) refers to *cap.* 6,1-7. It is said of the second edict that it was issued οὐκ εἰς μακρόν (750,21-22), and immediately afterwards (αὐθις, 752,3) the third followed.

actual treatment of the material,¹⁰¹ but also different perspectives in the two accounts. In *cap.* 2,1-3,4, the persecution is described in the light of God's punishment of the Church for its religious and moral decline. In *cap.* 5,1-6,10, the persecution is regarded as an attempt by the Imperial government to annihilate the Church. Eusebius, therefore, had good reasons for starting the second account with the events in Nicomedia, the Imperial seat, and then continue with the description of the persecution, its intensification by new edicts and its increasingly gruesome and bloody character.

By now, the perspectives appear to differ in the two accounts to such an extent that we find it difficult to imagine them to have been written at the same time as part of one and the same description. *Cap.* 5,1-6,7 contains no suggestion of being the later of the two versions,¹⁰² so we must assume that, having completed the first version of the persecution in *cap.* 2,1-3,4, Eusebius chose to pause in order to demonstrate, by a new chronological account, that the Imperial government must bear the responsibility for the persecution of the Christians. His desire to give a fuller description of the separate phases in the persecution may have been a contributory cause.

Turning, with these remarks, to Rufinus's version of *cap.* 6,8-10, we find that he recast his source drastically. He was clearly inspired by a desire to create a continuous account which would form a natural part of his narrative up to this point, and he felt that Eusebius's original was inadequate on several points.

Rufinus must have found that much of *cap.* 6,8-10 repeated Eusebius's previous comments, rather than being part of a progressive course of events. Furthermore, ἐπιφύησαι τῇ βασιλείᾳ πεπειραμένων (750,23-24) must have caused him problems. He possibly felt that, taken at face value, the words might create a false impression, suggesting that the Christians were the real cause of the second and third edicts being issued. At any rate, he chose to exclude the phrase from his version leaving Melitene and Syria as the places which experienced horrible persecutions: and they only differed from those in Nicomedia in one respect: all Christians, both lay people and the priesthood, were imprisoned: *cum haec apud Nicomediam gererentur, ubi cruentus et ferox auctor ipse crudelitatis piorum carnibus inhiabat, haud segnus etiam apud Melitenen¹⁰³ provinciam Syriamque¹⁰⁴ omnes ecclesiarum principes carceribus retrudi et in vincula conici edictis principalibus¹⁰⁵ urgebantur, simulque cum his ex plebe viri ac muli-*

eres nobilesque et ignobiles rapiebantur et fiebat ubique spectaculum miserabile ac foedum (751,25-31).

Instead of the general statement in 750,25-752,3 (καὶ ἦν ἡ θέα κτλ.), Rufinus chose to give a lively description of the conditions in Melitene – and here he was not afraid to give the reins to his imagination: *subito namque inveniebatur in urbe silentium, in carceribus constipatio, in urbe per plateas homo nullus, in carceribus vacuus locus nullus, ut non tam rei ad ergastulum duci quam civitas tota migrasse videretur ad carcerem*¹⁰⁶ (751,31-34). Rufinus also expanded Eusebius's observation that there was no longer room for the criminals, with this well formed account: *catenae, quae homicidis, adulteris, venenariis et sepulcrorum violatoribus*¹⁰⁷ *fuerant fabricatae, nunc episcoporum et presbyterorum diaconorumque et lectorum atque omnium religiosorum hominum*¹⁰⁸ *colla constringunt, ita*

101 The account in *cap.* 5.1-6.7 does not mention the first edict since it obviously presupposes the statement of its contents in *cap.* 2.4. In contrast, we are given a more detailed treatment of the 2nd and 3rd edicts in *cap.* 6.9-10 together with the background for their appearance, than is the case in the short note in *cap.* 2.5. We learn, therefore, that all members of the Church hierarchy were to be imprisoned, not just the bishops, as suggested by the phrase τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προέδρους in *cap.* 2.5. *Cap.* 6.10 reports that the Church leaders were to be released once they had sacrificed, and that is much more correct than *cap.* 2.5, which has πάση μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι. On the other hand, in *cap.* 3.1-4, there is a detailed description of the attempted implementation of the third edict, a description which is completely missing from the later account.

102 This is evident from Eusebius's description of the first Christian martyr in Nicomedia: here he limited himself to saying that the martyr tore down τὴν κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ... γραφὴν (746,22-23). As this presupposes the statement of the contents of the edict in *cap.* 2.4, this statement and the whole of the following account must have been written at a later stage, but the exact date cannot be determined.

103 Eusebius wrote κατὰ τὴν Μελιτηνὴν οὕτω καλουμένην χώραν (750,22), but Rufinus simply mentioned the city's name.

104 Instead of ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν, it is just called *provincia Syria*.

105 This replaces τοὺς πανταχόσε κτλ. (750,24-25). Rufinus's omission of any reference to the issue of an edict was undoubtedly intentional, because this had been spoken of earlier. His mention of the imprisonment of the lay people rendered his version obscure, since it is not clear if the Imperial edicts demanded their imprisonment too. Furthermore, he omitted ἐπιφυῖνα τῇ βασιλείᾳ πεπειραμένων (750,23-24), as already mentioned, and thus provided no reason for their appearance in his version.

106 Rufinus presumed that Melitene was a thoroughly Christian city, which was probably the case in his time.

107 Rufinus found Eusebius's listing of ἀνδροφόνοις καὶ τυμβωρύχοις (750,28) so arbitrary, that he felt it necessary to expand the list of the various criminals.

108 Rufinus omitted "exorcists", but he added *atque omnium religiosorum hominum*, and that must, from the context, refer to all the other Christians.

ut criminosis nec vincula superessent nec locus ergastuli resideret(751,34-753,3).

Rufinus specified, much more directly than Eusebius, the point that the Emperor issued the third edict to make room in the prisons for criminals. He even went beyond his source by stating that the Christians would be sentenced to death if they refused to sacrifice.¹⁰⁹ There is little doubt that Rufinus used these alterations to improve on Eusebius's account, which had one serious defect: it mentioned no issue of an edict which demanded that all Christians should sacrifice and, if they refused, should be sentenced to death. This was the reason for the subsequent appearance of innumerable martyrs in the individual provinces.¹¹⁰

109 *verum cum pervenisset ad principem aestuare carceres et per innocentium poenas locum deesse criminosis, nova rursus decreta mittuntur, ut ex his, qui conclusi erant, si qui immolare vellet, liber abscederet, qui vero abnueret, diversis poenarum generibus interiret* (753,3-7). Previously, Rufinus had simply mentioned that the population of the Christian city of Melitene had been imprisoned, so, strictly speaking, the edict should apply only to this situation. The word *carceres* makes it clear, however, that the scope of the edict was a general one. This break in the continuity is due, of course, to Rufinus's free revision of his source.

110 *tum iam quantae per singulas provincias multitudines martyrum et praecipue in Africae ac Mauritaniae, Thebaidis quoque atque Aegypti regionibus extiterint, numero comprehendere quis valeat?* (753,7-10). This passage differs from its parallel in Eusebius in that *martyres* includes both the clergy and lay people. It should further be noted that Rufinus found the list in *καὶ μάλιστα κτλ.* (752,7-9) with its mixture of geographical and ethnic names inconsistent, and a change of style was therefore required. He completely omitted *ἐξ ἧς κτλ.* (752,9-10), probably because he regarded this note as quite superfluous in the context.

Cap. 7,1-10,11 (752,11-764,15): On the deaths of the martyrs in Palestine and Egypt

Cap. 7,1-8,1 init. (752,11-754,24) has, as its theme, the martyrs and the wild animals of the arena. The section opens in 752,11-12 with a note to the effect that Eusebius knew of the deported Egyptians¹¹¹ who were martyred in Palestine and the Phoenician city of Tyre. He then explained that, following their flogging, the champions of the faith were thrown to the wild animals, who attacked and killed them.¹¹² The most important point here is the emphasis on the martyrs' steadfastness (ἐνστάσεις, 752,14) and endurance (ὑπομονάς, 752,18) in the face of torture and attacks from wild animals. It is worth noting that in this instance the torture appeared not to have been intended to make the Christians sacrifice, which had been implied in the third edict. It was regarded rather as part of the punishment which befell the Christians who refused to sacrifice to the gods. Here then, their refusal is taken for granted.

In this context, the section discusses the deported Egyptians who were martyred in Palestine and Tyre. The account is of a highly universal character, however,¹¹³ so it appears to describe martyrs in general, without special reference to the deported Egyptian martyrs. It would be natural to consider the report as the immediate continuation of πῶς ἂν πάλιν κτλ. (752,6-7). The original continuity has been disturbed by the insertion of first 752,7-9 and then of 752,6-12, which refers openly to the deported Egyptian martyrs.

In *cap. 7,2* (752,18-29), Eusebius describes how he himself had seen fierce man-eating beasts that did not attack the martyrs at all, even though they had been ordered to attract attention to themselves, but instead the animals turned on those who had set them on the Christians.

111 τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν (752,11) refers to the deported Egyptians mentioned in 752,9-10.

112 Though not explicitly stated, the intention is clear from the expressions used: τόν τε παραχοῆμα μετὰ τὰς μάστιγας ἐν θεροῖν ἀνθρωποβόροις ἀγῶνα (752,14-15) and τὰς ἐν τούτῳ παρδάλειον καὶ διαφόρων ἄρχτων συὼν τε ἀγρίων καὶ πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ κεκατηρη-
ιασμένων βοῶν προσβολάς (752,15-17).

113 This is evident from the detailed list in 752,16-17 of the wild animals which were let loose on the Christians.

The reason was that Christ's divine power had been at work in the martyrs and made them untouchable. *Cap.* 7,3 (752,29-754,1) continues by saying that when this situation had lasted for a long time, to the astonishment of the spectators, a second and then a third wild animal was let loose on the same martyr. The implied suggestion must be that none of them was able to attack the martyrs.¹¹⁴ The section belongs, in point of content, with *cap.* 7,2 and must be regarded as its direct continuation. It is remarkable, however, that whereas *cap.* 7,2 talks of both wild animals and martyrs in the plural, *cap.* 7,3 reports on only one martyr and one wild animal being let loose at a time.

In *cap.* 7,4 (754,1-11), Eusebius comments on these martyrs' astoundingly undaunted perseverance and on the unbendable steadfastness of the young persons.¹¹⁵ As an example, he describes a young man, barely twenty years old, who prayed unceasingly to God, even though he was surrounded by angry leopards and bears, eager to kill, yet prevented by God from devouring him.¹¹⁶ When Eusebius writes of τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ἀπτόητον τῶν ἰερῶν ἐκείνων καρτερίαν (754,1-2), he is referring to the martyrs mentioned in *cap.* 7,2-3. On the other hand, with τὴν ἐν σώμασι νέοις βεβηκυῖαν καὶ ἀδιάρρηπτον ἔνστασιν (754,2-3) he seems to be thinking of another group of martyrs. But apart from this, the account is controlled by the same concepts as applied in *cap.* 7,2-3, so that in fact, it is a parallel account.¹¹⁷

Eusebius describes in *cap.* 7,5 (754,11-20) how four other young men had been thrown to a wild bull.¹¹⁸ It turned on the spectators and tore them apart,¹¹⁹ but it did not accost the martyrs who were protected by Divine Providence. New wild animals were again let loose on them, but they too were unable to effect the execution.¹²⁰ The section thus resumes the theme from *cap.* 7,2 and, what is more, in such a way that the passage seems like a duplicate.¹²¹

Finally, *cap.* 7,6 (754,20-22) states that the martyrs were killed with swords and thrown into the sea, once the attack from the wild animals had proved unsuccessful. In *cap.* 8,1 *init.* (754,23-24), Eusebius concludes by saying that he has now recounted the struggle of the Egyptian martyrs in Tyre, and his remarks are most readily understood as referring to the immediately preceding account in *cap.* 7,4-6 on the martyrdom of the five young men. But it must be noted that Eusebius did not place the martyrdoms of *cap.* 7,1-3 geographically. This could be due to forgetfulness, or perhaps his remarks in 752,11 referred to the martyrs' fights which took place in Palestine. We must leave this question undecided.

The analysis of *cap.* 7,1-8,1 *init.* (752,11-754,24) has shown, we think, that we are discussing an account which is lacking in continuity and consistency. The inconsistencies which it contains indicate, on the other hand, that they must be the results of Eusebius's efforts to organize his large amount of material in a clear and easily accessible fashion. We pointed out that 752,7-12 interrupts the continuity originally existing between 752,6-7 and 752,12-18. Having stated that he could not possibly list all the martyrs, Eusebius tried to identify features which characterize their general attitude. Thus they manifested steadfastness during torture and endurance when they were thrown to the wild animals in the arena. The description in *cap.* 7,1 (752,11-18) implies, as already pointed out, that the wild animals attacked and killed them.

114 διὰ τὸ ἄπρακτον τοῦ πρώτου δευτέρου καὶ τρίτου προσαφείσθαι ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ μάρτυρι θηρίον (752,30-754,1).

115 In ἐν σώμασι νέοις (754,2) σῶμα must, on the basis of the subsequent description, mean a human being, having a body and a soul.

116 ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως θεία καὶ ἀπορρήτῳ δυνάμει μόνον οὐχὶ φραττομένων τὸ στομά καὶ αὐθις παλινδρομούντων εἰς τοῦπίσω (754,9-11).

117 Both accounts are therefore introduced in the same way: οὓς τίς ἰδὼν οὐ κατεπλάγη (752,12) and καταπλάγηται δ' ἦν (754,1). We also find in both places ἐνοστάσεις (752,14) and ἔνοστασις (754,3), and ὑπομονάς (752,18) and τὴν ἀπτόητον ... καρτερίαν (754,1-2). The statement in 754,9-11 that the wild animals were prevented from attacking the martyrs and drew back from them, is a repetition of 752,28-29.

118 πάλιν δ' ἂν ἐτέρους εἶδες (πέντε γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἐτύγχανον) (754,11-12) must, from the previous account, be understood to refer to a group of, in all, five young men. Having recounted the fate of one member, Eusebius proceeded to describe what befell the other four.

119 ὃς τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους τῶν ἔξωθεν προσιόντων τοῖς κέρασιν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ῥίπτων διεσπάραττεν (754,13-14). The passage probably refers to *those*, who let the bull loose on the Christians.

120 ἔτερα ἅπαντα αὐτοῖς ἐπαφείσθαι θηρία (754,20). The passage which follows immediately after this makes it clear that they were not able to kill the Christian martyrs either. When Eusebius here wrote μετὰ τὰς δεινὰς καὶ ποικίλας τούτων προσβολάς (754,20-21), it must be taken quite literally to mean that the wild animals did in fact attack the holy martyrs. If this is the meaning, the passage is in direct contrast to the previous account in *cap.* 7,2-5, but not, on the other hand, to *cap.* 7,1, where the report implies that the wild animals did attack the Christians.

121 Both accounts thus report that the wild animals attacked those who had let them loose instead of the Christians (752,23-24 and 754,13-14), that they had been goaded into throwing themselves at the Christians (ἐρεθισμοῖς παρώρων αὐτά, 752,24, and διὰ τοῦς ἀπὸ τῶν καυτήρων ἐρεθισμοῦς, 754,17-18), that Divine power held them back (752,28-29 and 754,18-19) and that new wild animals were let loose on the Christians (752,31-754,1 and 754,20).

The principle of the association of ideas probably suggested to Eusebius that an explanation was required of how he had himself experienced that the wild animals did not attack the martyrs, a fact which could only be ascribed to the power of Christ present in them. The point is that the martyrs remained unhurt, and therefore this expansion of the account in *cap.* 7,2-3 (752,18-754,1) contrasts with the report in *cap.* 7,1 (752,11-18). The contrast is in part obscured by the fact that the passage under discussion here includes no direct statement to the effect that the Christians were killed in attacks by wild animals.

Eusebius must also have wanted to document in greater detail and with specific examples the general description in *cap.* 7,2-3 and therefore he added the report on the five young men in *cap.* 7,4-6 (754,2-24). Its repetition of much of the material included in *cap.* 7,1-3 is presumably the product of Eusebius's general description in *cap.* 7,4-6 being based on his own observations at the martyrization of the five young men. When he decided later to recount this specifically, repetitions were unavoidable. In connection with this expansion Eusebius probably also felt that he must insert 752,7-12 to emphasize the point that the subsequent report was based on his own personal experiences. The insertion corresponds to his remark in *cap.* 13,7, stating that he would only discuss the martyrdoms he himself had witnessed.

In his version of this section, Rufinus diverged from his source in several places and also added new material. He clearly intended to create an account in which the separate parts were joined together to form a progressive course of events.

Eusebius had just mentioned the impossibility of listing the numerous martyrs, and therefore Rufinus obviously felt that his subsequent remark, that he knew the martyrs in Palestine and Tyre, was illogical. He amended this by phrasing the following sentence which also serves to link the previous account to the next one: *sed ne illorum quidem, quorum agones apud Palaestinam vel Tyrum, quae est urbs maxima Foenices, praesentes inspeximus,*¹²² *ut dignum est, memorare sufficimus* (753,11-13). Rufinus must also have felt that his source could produce the false assumption that the steadfastness and endurance of the martyrs on the one hand and the divine power of Christ on the other were unrelated, since they appeared to be described quite independently of each other. He was anxious to unite these two concepts and show that Christ alone had preserved the martyrs from succumbing: *tanta etenim ab eis virtute perseverantiae*

*adversum inlata supplicia pro pietate*¹²³ *certatum est, ut nisi quis prius domino et salvatori nostro credat dicenti, quia ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi, et eius virtutem martyri-bus sciat esse praesentem, rebus gestis deroget fidem* (753,13-18).

Furthermore, Rufinus used the material in *cap.* 7,1-2 independently to create a continuous account. He supplied some new details to give it a lively, specific character.¹²⁴ Finally, we should note that in his version, he emphasized the *crudelitas* to which the martyrs were subjected and linked the section closely to the previous account which was also to serve as evidence of the *crudelitas* of the persecution.¹²⁵ The whole account has been composed by Rufinus in such a way that it describes the escalation of *crudelitas*. At the same time, he has succeeded in emphasizing how, in contrast to the wild animals, the persecutors were unaware that the martyrs were under God's protection which meant that they were themselves, quite properly, killed by the animals.¹²⁶

122 Rufinus used *praesentes inspeximus* to clarify the implication of the original Ἰομεν (752,11).

123 *Supplicium* can mean both torture and punishment, so that *supplicia pro pietate* could mean the punishment to which the Christians were sentenced because they refused to sacrifice to the gods. When immediately afterwards Rufinus speaks of *diversa tormentorum genera* (753,19), the expression should probably be taken to mean tortures for the sake of the faith.

124 Details of particular interest in Rufinus's version 753,20-755,4 are these: in relation to the source, Rufinus included a more detailed list of the wild animals: *adhibebantur leones, ursi, pardi atque omne ferarum genus, apri quoque, sed et tauri* (753,21-22). He also felt that a more detailed description of these events was justified: *ad haec dei cultores nudati statuuntur in medio harenae loco, additur adhuc arte intra caveas bestiis furor, et ita saeviores semet ipsi effectae proruant claustris, replent subito stadium, circumdant ecclesiam martyrum in medio sitam . . .* (753,25-28). It should also be noted that, from Eusebius's remark in 752,25-27 (καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν κτλ.), Rufinus created a new section which functions independently in the account: *et cum iam nullus ex huiusmodi artificibus auderet accedere iubentur ipsi sancti martyres commotis manibus et velut provocantibus incitare adversum se beluas* (753,36-755,2). Finally, we see that Rufinus was surprised to find that in *cap.* 7,3 his source only mentioned one wild animal which was set upon one and the same martyr, in contrast to the previous account. He avoids a clash of styles in this elegant way: *sed ne sic quidem pati aliquid poterant, verum et si forte aliqua fuisset ex beluis concitata, cum venisset ad proximum, protinus in semet ipsam conversa repedabat* (755,2-4).

125 753,23-25 includes a passage which is almost like a table of contents: *praeparabantur haec omnia adversum cultores dei et omnis contra eos hominum bestiarumque et elementorum crudelitas armabatur*.

126 Rufinus expanded Eusebius's short remark in 752,23-24 (ἀλλ' κτλ.) in this way: *sed ilico furor, qui reprimebatur in beluis, transit in homines. nemo praesentem dei virtutem, nemo divinum piis adesse sentit auxilium, sed mittuntur, quibus hoc artis est, instigare bestias*

Rufinus obviously thought that *cap.* 7,4-5 in Eusebius repeated much of the report in *cap.* 7,1-2, and that the section was really not at all integrated into the context. Nor did he see any reason to describe first the twenty-year-old's and then the four other young men's torments as, according to Eusebius's note in *cap.* 7,5 (754,12), they constituted one and the same incident. He chose therefore to describe the martyrdoms of the five young men as one. Furthermore, instead of regarding the young men as a new group, as his source did, he included them with the martyrs already mentioned. The characteristics of the struggle of these five were therefore also relevant for all of them. Finally, he wrote his version in such a way that it avoided all repetition and was a progressive part of the account.

His version reads: *tum vero stupor ingens et pavor omnes, qui in spectaculis considerabant, invaserat, videntes homines nudos, in quibus plurimi primae adhuc aetatis, in medio tot ac tantarum positos ferarum intrepidus omnes et impavidus extentis ad caelum palmis et oculis ac mente totos cum deo non solum nihil curare terrena, verum ne carnem quidem suam magni pendere et ipsis iudicibus pavore trementibus reos laeto et hilari vultu in medio persistere bestiarum* (755,5-11). In his report on the martyrdom of the four young men in 754,13-14, Eusebius mentioned the bull that had turned on those who had set it against the Christians. Rufinus quite clearly considered this to be a repetition of the contents of 752,23-24. He wanted to avoid this and, at the same time, to contrast the persecutors with the wild animals by highlighting their *furor* against the Christians.¹²⁷ He also thought it important to underline the point that the new attempts to make the animals attack the Christians only rebounded on their oppressors, since Christ protected His people according to his promise.¹²⁸ In order to create a progressive account of events, Rufinus had reserved, for this particular point in his report, the information that the first wild animals were removed because they would not attack the Christians; others were then let loose but the result was exactly the same.¹²⁹ Rufinus followed his source when he let the martyrs perish by the sword, but he included this in an independent passage which he finished by underlining the view that the persecutors were worse than angry wild animals: *gladiis*

adversum eos, quos divina dextera defendebat. verum illae, ut ostenderetur omnibus non feritatem deesse bestiis, sed divinam dei cultoribus adesse custodiam, illos ipsos, qui ad instigandum mittuntur, incredibili velocitate discerpunt (753,30-36). This version emphasizes much more strongly and directly than the source the fact that the persecutors fell a prey to their own treatment of the Christians.

igitur peragunt, quod bestiis nequiverunt, et ut in omnibus se ostenderent beluis esse nequiores, prohibebant etiam cadavera mandari terrae, sed iubebant fluctibus dari (755,25-27). Finally, in 755,27-29, Rufinus thought the time had come to reveal that the martyrs who suffered the torments in Tyre were Egyptian Christians.

In *cap.* 8 (754,25-756,6), Eusebius wrote of the Egyptian martyrs who suffered all kinds of torture¹³⁰ and death¹³¹ in their homeland too. The section displays great similarities with *cap.* 7,1 (752,12-18),¹³² which can only be explained if we assume that, originally, the two sections belonged together. Instead of embarking on the impossible task of listing the many martyrs, as stated in 752,6-7, Eusebius wanted to convey an impression of their conduct during the different forms of torture and death to which they were subjected – in other words to make a general statement.¹³³ Afterwards, however, he felt the need to expand his account with specific examples. This occasioned the expansions in 752,9-12 and 752,18-754,24. Here, he described the martyrdoms which exiled Egyptian Christians suffered in Palestine and Tyre, and he found it appropriate also to recount the martyrdoms which Christian Egyptians suffered in their own homeland. This led to the addition of αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας γῆς μαρτυρήσαντας, ἔνθα (754,25-26).¹³⁴ But this alteration changed the general description into a history of Egyptian martyrs.

127 *sed ilico furor, qui reprimebatur in beluis, transit in homines. nemo praesentem dei virtutem, nemo divinum piis adesse sentit auxilium, etc.* (753,30-32).

128 See 755,16-20.

129 *cum nec igitur sic quidem aliquid egisset humana saevitia, iubentur mutari ferae et ablatis prioribus aliae rursus dimitti. quae cum et ipsae similiter ut priores nihil triste dei cultoribus intulissent, amotis etiam his saeviores feras martyribus homines mittunt, qui soli possunt inmanitate beluas, crudelitate feras, atrocitate bestias superare* (755,20-25).

130 Here Eusebius speaks of ξεσμούς καὶ στρεβλώσεις μάστιγας τε χαλεπωτάτας καὶ μυριάς ἄλλας ποικίλας καὶ φρικτὰς ἀκούσαι βιασάνους (754,29-30).

131 The διαφόρους θανάτους (754,28) were specified by Eusebius in 754,30-756,6 as burning, drowning, beheading, torture itself, starvation, crucifixion with the head either up or down – in all 7 types of execution.

132 Both passages describe the martyrs' endurance during torture and death. We may further note that both sections began with a rhetorical question: οὐς τίς ἰδὼν οὐ κατεπλάγη κτλ. (752,12) and θαυμάσειε δ' ἄν τις κτλ. (754,25).

133 Whereas *cap.* 7,1 describes flogging and wild animals killing in the arena, the account in *cap.* 8 presents an extensive catalogue of ways of torture and death.

134 The possibility must remain that μυρίοι τῶν ἀριθμῶν (754,26) could also belong to the later expansion. At any rate, αὐτῶν seems so objectionable in point of style that it must represent a revision. If the word is left out, a clear and satisfactory text remains.

In his version of the section, Rufinus did not think it necessary to translate $\theta\alpha\nu\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \delta'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\iota\varsigma$ (754,25) – he possibly considered it to be a superfluous repetition. Nor did he find 754,25-28 satisfactory in point of style and content and so he created this version: *In sua vero provincia apud Aegyptum innumerabiles alii non inferiori gloria tam viri quam feminae, sed et pueri ac senes pro fide domini nostri Iesu Christi praesentem vitam parvi pendentes futurae gloriae beatitudinem quaesiere* (755,30-34). The addition of the last words – *futurae* etc. – probably resulted from his desire to avoid $\delta\iota\alpha\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (754,28): it seemed quite superfluous since Eusebius had just described the various methods of execution.¹³⁵

In his translation of the rest of the section too, (754,28-756,6) we observe Rufinus making alterations for the sake of clarity. He replaced Eusebius's participial clauses with an independent sentence. He omitted $\omicron\iota\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (756,2-3), obviously feeling that the words broke the logical continuity of the account describing the various ways in which death had been inflicted on the Christians.¹³⁶ Rufinus saw no reason to translate $\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omicron\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (756,4) either. Criminals were also crucified, heads down, and he probably attempted to avoid any suggestion that the Christians were criminals. At the the end he completely omitted $\tau\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \tau\epsilon\ \zeta\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma,\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omega\nu\ \iota\kappa\rho\iota\omega\nu\ \lambda\iota\mu\omega\ \delta\iota\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ (756,5-6), so he probably thought that this merely repeated the expression *nonnulli inedia consumpti* (757,2). He probably also thought that this form of crucifixion worked so fast that it excluded any possibility of death by starvation. But whatever his motives, Rufinus provided this clear description: *alii patibulis adfixi, in quibus quidam more perverso capite deorsum presso et pedibus in sublime sublatis* (757,2-4).

In *cap.* 9,1-2 (756,7-19), Eusebius describes the sufferings of the martyrs in Thebes: men were slashed to death with potsherds. Women were hoisted naked into the air by one foot¹³⁷ and others were stretched out on trees which were tied together so that the victims were torn apart when the bindings were cut.

The section in the form given here appears to be the culmination of the previous account.¹³⁸ This corresponds badly, however, with the fact that $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ (756,8-9) is really a repetition of $\omicron\iota\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (756,2-3). Furthermore, the general nature of the description of the various methods of execution marks it as belonging much

more suitably with the general description in *cap.* 7,1 and 8.¹³⁹ Finally, we should note that the introductory remark πάντα δ' ὑπεραίρει κτλ. (756,7-8) is grammatically unsatisfactory.¹⁴⁰

These observations clearly suggest that the section as it stands is the product of a revision. We would also be justified in saying that καὶ ἄς ὑπέμειναν κτλ. (756,7-9) is a later insertion.¹⁴¹ The original text probably included the following: πάντα δ' ὑπεραίρει λόγον γύναιά κτλ. The description was of a general nature and represented the direct continuation of *cap.* 7,1 and 8. The original continuity was interrupted, however, by the insertion of 756,7-9, with which Eusebius changed the general account into a history of the local martyrs.

In *cap.* 9,3 (756,19-25), we learn that all these events took place over a period of years and that sometimes a small number, sometimes a large number of people were killed. When Eusebius wrote καὶ ταῦτά γε πάντα ἐνηγοεῖτο (756,19), he was referring to the martyrs in Thebes, judging from the context as it stands. It is, however, extremely difficult to imagine that Thebes was the scene of all the group martyrdoms subsequently described in the account. It does, on the other hand, make excellent sense if the phrase is taken as referring to the entire previous report on the various forms of torture and death to which the martyrs were subjected.¹⁴² The

135 When, in contrast to his original, Rufinus inserted *non inferiori gloria* (755,30-31), he must be understood to mean "of a not inferior fame", even though he did use *gloria* immediately afterwards in the divergent meaning of "the bliss of future glory". Smaller divergences from the original include his translation of ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας (754,27) by *pro fide domini nostri Iesu Christi* (755,31-32) and his addition of *ac senes* as a necessary counterpart to *et pueri*.

136 Smaller changes include his rewriting of μετὰ ξησομῶν καὶ στρεβλώσεως μάστιγας τε χαλεπωτάτας (754,29) as *post verbera, post unguis, post flagella* (755,33-34) and his replacing of τοῖς ἀποτέμνουσιν (756,1-2) with *securibus* (757,2).

137 The intention, though not explicitly stated, must be that this treatment led to their death.

138 πάντα δ' ὑπεραίρει λόγον κτλ. (756,7ff.).

139 The – somewhat pedantic – question arises whether the martyrs from Thebes died in these ways only.

140 The logical subject for πάντα ὑπεραίρει λόγον is ἄς ὑπέμειναν αἰκίας καὶ ἀληθόνας.

141 Reasons for regarding ὁστροάχοις κτλ. as part of the later insertion include the facts that, as already mentioned, the passage repeats 756,2-3, and that it breaks the tight composition which distinguished the original account by letting the mention of the women's deaths follow the description of the various ways of crucifixion.

142 The logical subject for ἐνηγοεῖτο (756,19) is therefore the persecutors, who inflicted the various tortures and modes of death (ταῦτά πάντα) upon the Christians.

remark that these occurrences took place over a number of years was made on a general basis, and therefore we may be justified in assuming that it was the conclusion of the original account which did have a clearly general character.

The list in 756,20-25 giving the number of different groups of Christians is remarkable in several respects. It seems strange in itself that Eusebius would suddenly compute the number of group martyrdoms after the apparently concluding remarks in 756,19-20. Moreover, the numbers given seem quite random.¹⁴³ Finally, the composition is grammatically very loose.¹⁴⁴ These peculiarities can be explained, however, as a product of Eusebius's continued reworking of his material.

It seems evident that the passage includes two independent parts: 756,20-22 (ὅτε μὲν κτλ.) and 756,22-24 (ἄλλοτε κτλ.). Eusebius probably added the first one to the original general description of the tortures and deaths of the martyrs in order to state that they suffered martyrdom not just singly but also in groups. Then he must have felt that the numbers given were too small, but instead of altering them, he chose to correct them by a new addition in 756,22-24.¹⁴⁵ This then provides the link with the subsequent specific report on the group martyrdoms.

In *cap.* 9,4-5 (756,25-758,8), Eusebius explains that he himself had seen many beheaded and others burned on the same day in Thebes¹⁴⁶ and that another group, without giving torture a thought, had rushed forward to the judge and confessed that they were Christians so that, rejoicing, they could receive the sentence of death. Eusebius intended this section as a detailed illustration of the general statement that he had just given – and for this purpose he described his own experiences. But even here, traces of revision can be discovered. The graphic description of the executioner's axe, which became blunted and broken, and of the executioners, who were exhausted and had to relieve one another, serves to demonstrate clearly the magnitude of the executions. τοὺς δὲ τὴν διὰ πυρὸς τιμωρίαν (756,27) breaks this continuity, and it is made the subject of no detailed discussion, so therefore it must be regarded as a later insertion. Eusebius probably intended it to provide a better connection between this section and the previous one which said of the Christians: ποικίλαις καὶ ἐναλλαπτούσαις τιμωρίαις καταδικαζόμενοι (756,24-25).¹⁴⁷

The original account only mentioned a series of Christian executions by decapitation. Not till later do we learn that a judge had, in fact, condemned the Christians to death. We must assume, although the information is not actually given, that they had been both imprisoned and

sentenced because of their confession of the Christian faith. The passage does not discuss the question whether the verdict was based on their refusal to sacrifice. Nor is it clear whether the second group was also imprisoned or whether they remained free until they were arrested and executed after confessing themselves Christian on their own initiative. From the context, however, the latter explanation appears to be the most natural. This lack of clarity must be the result of Eusebius having adapted parts of an existing account on martyrs which had described in detail their arrest, sentence and execution. Eusebius, however, had not taken care to give the information necessary for a full understanding of the situation. Perhaps the description of the voluntary martyrs was also part of this account. In that case, a report describing the martyrdoms which took place in Thebes may have been the basis for Eusebius's account.¹⁴⁸ At any rate, his mention of the voluntary martyrs had the effect of introducing a change in the point of his account. It became less of a report on the horrible torture and death meted out by the persecutors and more of a description of the joy and exultation with which the martyrs met death.

Admirable as these voluntary martyrs were, they were surpassed, however, according to *cap.* 9,6-8 (758,8-27), by those who prized their Christian faith more than riches, ancestry, honour and learning,¹⁴⁹ such as Philo-

143 The list is in itself astonishing: *ὅτε μὲν πλείονων ἢ δέκα, ὅτε δὲ ὑπὲρ τοῦς εἴκοσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀναιρουμένων* (756,20-22). It also seems totally superfluous seeing that Eusebius added *ἄλλοτε δὲ οὐχ ἦπτον καὶ τριάκοντα, ἥδη δ' ἐγγύς που ἐξήκοντα* (756,22-23).

144 In 756,20-22 we find a list in the form of a genitive absolute with an adverb of time: *ὅτε μὲν, ὅτε δέ*. Other numbers follow in a finite clause with a second adverb of time: *ἄλλοτε δὲ ... καὶ πάλιν ἄλλοτε*, although, logically, they are closely connected to the preceding phrase.

145 The phrase *ποικίλαις καὶ ἐναλλαττούσαις τιμωρίαις καταδιχαζόμενοι* (756,24-25) applied to these groups of Christians is, strictly speaking, superfluous, since the whole of the previous account in *cap.* 7,1-9,2 had this very theme. The repetition must be the result of Eusebius having the subsequent account in mind when he completed the remark. This small feature further confirms the fact that the passage belongs to the later account.

146 On the basis of 756,8, *ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων* (756,25-26) must refer to Thebes.

147 The insertion of this has, however, created a rather unsatisfactory construction: *πλείους κτλ.* (756,26-27), since Eusebius had to add *τοὺς μὲν* (756,26) to the original *πλείους τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀποτομῆν ὑπομείναντας*. As a result, *πλείους* lost its original place and meaning in the context.

148 Eusebius's *ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενόμενοι* (756,25-26) and *συνεωρῶμεν* (758,1) only make sense if he himself had been a witness to the martyrdoms described here. In view of the fact that, here, he made use of a martyrology, this implication is not quite correct.

149 *λόγω τε καὶ φιλοσοφία διατρέψαντες* (758,10-11). This passage discusses secular philosophical thinking, not Christian philosophy.

romus,¹⁵⁰ a high ranking imperial official in Alexandria, and Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis. In this account, Philoromus appears as the most important figure. Not only is he named first but he was also the most distinguished, because his position entitled him to an escort.¹⁵¹ Phileas, on the other hand, is described simply as someone trained in philosophy who had achieved distinction in public service.¹⁵² The description includes no hint of his being a bishop. The same applies to the following description, illustrating these two men's resistance to all exhortations to abjure their faith, which resulted in their being beheaded. Although Phileas is introduced as Bishop of Thmuis, we are here faced with an account of two distinguished members of the upper aristocracy who suffered martyrdom. This undoubtedly raises the question of whether Eusebius did not mistake the identity of the Phileas mentioned here with that of his namesake, the Bishop of Thmuis. But apart from all this, Eusebius definitely wanted his description to show that the martyrs also counted men from the highest ranks in society, skilled philosophers and distinguished public servants. He hoped to refute the opinion, widespread also in his own time, that Christianity could gain a footing only amongst the unprivileged and uneducated.

We learn little of the details of Philoromus and Phileas's martyrdoms. We hear nothing of the background to their arrest, nothing of when and where it took place. The report only includes scanty details from the interrogation, which was intended to make them sacrifice to the gods, so that they could be released – but this is not stated specifically and must be concluded from the context. Eusebius also leaves it up to the readers themselves to discover the implications of the expression *πρὸς ἀπάσας τοῦ δικαστοῦ τὰς τε ἀπειλὰς καὶ τὰς ὕβρεις ἐνστάντες* (758,25-26). This all reveals that Eusebius must have had much more information on these two martyrs than is included in his account. The fact that he gave a detailed description of Philoromus's official position might suggest that he had access to an existing account on martyrs. The description is so imprecise, however, that no conclusion may be drawn from it. Moreover, no martyrology of this particular kind has been preserved. These features and the fact that Eusebius perhaps mistook the Phileas mentioned here for the Bishop of Thmuis, suggest, as a much more likely explanation, that Eusebius relied on oral traditions, with which he had become familiar during his stay in Egypt.

In *cap.* 10,1 (758,28-32), Eusebius said that he would let Phileas himself bear witness to his secular learning,¹⁵³ his own situation and the martyr-

doms in Alexandria. This he did by reproducing Phileas's letter to the congregation in Thmuis (*cap.* 10,2-10.760,2-764,9). By way of a conclusion, Eusebius stated, in *cap.* 10,11 (764,10-15), that Phileas sent the letter to the congregation in Thmuis before the sentence of death had been passed, urging them to maintain their faith. Even the excerpts from this letter¹⁵⁴ are remarkably void of information on Phileas's παιδεία and on his own situation. On the other hand, he did describe the imprisoned Christians, who were subjected to various horrible forms of torture until the order came that they would be released if they sacrificed – and if not, they were to be punished by death.¹⁵⁵ As noted above, Phileas himself remains in the background in this account – his description resembles one given by a detached spectator.¹⁵⁶ Only one single expression indicates that

150 Eusebius's description of Philoromus: ἀρχὴν τινα οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως ἐγχεχειρισμένος (758,13-14), identifies him as “*procurator oder rationalis ad diocesim Alexandriae*” (Eduard Schwartz in *Gesammelte Schriften* III (1959), p. 102 note 2).

151 Here, the interpretation of ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος, ἐκάστης ἀνεκρίνετο ἡμέρας (758,15-16) presents problems. We must follow Ed. Schwartz in understanding the text, as it stands, to mean that Philoromus “wenn er verhört wurde. . . , militärisch eskortiert [wurde]. . .” (*ibid.*). In that case, we must assume that he was under some kind of house arrest. On the other hand, we would have expected him to be brought before the judge immediately upon his imprisonment. The mention of his escort is obviously also meant to show his high rank, so everything points to the phrase meaning, rather, that he was accompanied by an escort when he sat in court every day. Even H. Valois interpreted the case in this way, as can be seen from this – in fact incorrect – translation: *et pro dignitate ac prerogativa honoris Romani, stipatus militibus quotidie jus dicebat* (PG XX,2 762A). We meet the same interpretation in, for example, Lawlor-Oulton: “who, in connection with the dignity and rank that he had from the Romans, used to conduct judicial enquiries every day, attended by a body-guard of soldiers” (*Eusebius* I, p. 264) and in Gustave Bardy: “qui, conformément à sa dignité et à son rang chez les Romains, était entouré de soldats, lorsque chaque jours il rendait la justice” (*Histoire Ecclésiastique* III, p. 19).

152 διαπρέψας ἀνὴρ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις (758,17-18).

153 τῶν ἔξωθεν μαθημάτων (758,28).

154 Even though the heading Ἐπὶ τῶν Φιλέου πρὸς Θμουῖτας γραμμάτων (760,1) may not come from Eusebius himself, it is correct, because the passage is a mere extract. This can be seen from the fact that the γράμματα given here contains no plea to maintain the faith, as should have been the case according to 764,13-15.

155 προσετέτακτο αἰρέσεως κειμένης ἢ ἐφαψάμενον τῆς ἐναγοῦς θυσίας ἀνενόχλητον εἶναι, τῆς ἐπαράτου ἐλευθερίας παρ' αὐτῶν τυχόντα, ἢ μὴ θύοντα τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δίκην ἐκδέχασθαι (764,3-5). This refers to an Imperial command.

156 Phileas can, for example, write καὶ ἦν ἡ θέα τῶν αἰκισμῶν ἐνηλλαγμένη καὶ πολλὴν τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ κακίαν ἔχουσα (760,21-23).

he belonged to the imprisoned.¹⁵⁷ We are not told to which of the various methods of torture he was himself subjected. Only one fact is clear: that he belonged to the group who recovered from the tortures, but awaited punishment by death because of their refusal to sacrifice.

Eusebius saw an eyewitness account of the Alexandrian martyrs in the letter from Phileas, and from its position in the entire context we must assume it to refer to Christians in general. In consequence, the Imperial edict mentioned here would have to be the fourth edict.¹⁵⁸ Such an identification is, however, impossible. Since the fourth edict demanded that all Christians should sacrifice to the gods and otherwise be punished,¹⁵⁹ it fits in very badly with the situation unfolded in Phileas's letter. It corresponds, however, to the description of the persecution of the Church leaders which Eusebius gave in *cap.* 2,5-3,4 and *cap.* 6,9-10. Both passages mention imprisonment and torture of the prisoners, before an Imperial decree ordered that they could be released if they sacrificed. The similarities are very striking, so we are forced to the conclusion that the Phileas letter refers to the leaders of the Church, not to martyrs in general. In other words, this is a new description of the fate which befell the imprisoned members of the Church hierarchy. The previous account had not made it clear if the torture was to be regarded as a means of forcing the Church leaders to renunciation, but Phileas's account showed that this was indeed the point. Phileas also refrained from commenting on the apostates' possible release. His interest centered exclusively on the champions of the faith who resisted during all torture until the third edict brought the necessary clarity: release following a prisoner's sacrifice to the gods, or death.¹⁶⁰ If we accept, with Eusebius, that Phileas was describing the martyrdoms which occurred in Alexandria, the ἡγεμῶν (762,9) mentioned by him must be Culcianus. This is obvious from *Papyrus Bodmer XX*.¹⁶¹ But the description in this essentially authentic martyrology shows him as a man who tried in every way to persuade Phileas to sacrifice – and Eusebius's report of the interrogation in *cap.* 9,8 is in complete agreement with this view. The Phileas letter, however, describes a ἡγεμῶν who treated the Christians so mercilessly¹⁶² that we find it difficult to imagine that the two sources refer to one and the same person. In addition, the letter contains much information suggesting that the man in question was the governor of Thmuis.¹⁶³ In that case, Phileas described the torture in Thmuis to which he and other imprisoned Church leaders were subjected before he was transferred to Alexandria, and there the interrogation under Culcianus was of quite a different humane nature.

This interpretation suggests that the letter must be a description of the persecution which befell the Church leaders in connection with the issue of the second and third edicts. The discrepancies arising between this account and the corresponding ones in *cap.* 2,5-3,4 and 6,9-10 result, first and foremost, from the fact that the situation had developed differently in different places. The otherwise unknown governor in Thmuis did not limit himself to imprisoning the Church leaders, as the second edict required, but he also demanded that they should abjure their faith. And if he did not succeed by persuasion,¹⁶⁴ he used torture. The third edict may be said to have ratified this practice with the one difference that it decreed specifically that those who sacrificed should be released and those who did not, should be executed. Some authorities were satisfied if they managed simply to create the impression that the Church leaders had sacrificed, as the description in *cap.* 2,5-3,4 attests, and this practice probably reflects local attempts to mitigate the effects of the decree. A comparison of the three accounts serves to emphasize the necessity of realizing that the situation developed differently in different provinces; local authorities sometimes went further than the Imperial ordinances decreed, sometimes stopped at an extremely lenient implementation.

157 This comes out in 762.14-15: οὐ γὰρ εἶναι κἄν μέρος φροντίδος αὐτοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν.

158 Oulton also understands the matter in this way, see *Eusebius* II, p. 277.

159 Cf. *De mart. Pal.* 3.1.

160 The Phileas letter also specifies the contents of the third edict, which was not the case in earlier similar accounts. *Cap.* 2.5 simply says that an order was issued stating that the Church leaders should be coerced by any means to sacrifice, whereas *cap.* 6.10 describes the torture which was to be inflicted upon those who refused to sacrifice to the gods.

161 See *col.* III, 1.4 (Herbert Musurillo: *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, p. 330).

162 *Papyrus Bodmer XX*, *col.* I, 1.5-15 (= *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 328) states that Phileas was tortured in Thmuis by the governor (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος). He recovered, however, and was taken to Alexandria, where he was interrogated again by Culcianus, who is also described as ὁ ἡγεμών (*col.* II, 15-16). The statement that, in Thmuis, he was subjected to ὀστοκόπους ὑπὸ τῶν λεγιωναρίων ὑπὲρ τέσσαρα κέντρα (*col.* I, 8-9), corresponds exactly to the description in *cap.* 10.8 which says of those who were tortured: ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου κείμενοι, διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων ὀπῶν διατεταμένοι ἄμφω τῷ πόδε (762.18-19). This similarity is so striking that we are justified in assuming that the passages discuss one and the same event.

163 Phileas says that the governor gave his servants orders to torture the Christians unremittingly, without pity and οὕτω καὶ διανοεῖσθαι καὶ πράττειν, ὡς μηκέτ' ὄντων (762.15-16).

164 προσδιελέγετο ... ὁ ἡγεμών (762.8-9) surely suggests that the provincial governor entered into a debate with the prisoners in order to convince them to give up their faith.

In his version of *cap.* 9,1-10,11, Rufinus again treated his original freely whenever he felt the need. Sometimes he rearranged the information, sometimes he included abbreviated versions of the original and sometimes he introduced additional material, all with the obvious intention of composing a continuous and comprehensible text. Rufinus apparently found little fault with Eusebius's account of the martyrs in Thebes in *cap.* 9,1-2 and therefore reproduced it with relatively few alterations. He wanted to emphasize much more strongly than Eusebius the *crudelitas* manifested by the *tortores*.¹⁶⁵ In this context, Rufinus felt that he should name the various forms of torment, so he judged that *καὶ μέχρως ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ βίου* (756,9) should be replaced by *donec totam carnis traherent cutem* (757,7). He intensified the vividness of his description of the atrocities committed by adding that the women hung suspended *per diem continuum* (757,10). For the same reason τῶν μελῶν διασπασμόν (756,18) became *discerptis despiciasque visceribus avulsa secum membra rapiabant* in his version (757,14-15). Conversely, he refrained from translating passages in his source which he considered superfluous.¹⁶⁶

In *cap.* 9,3, Rufinus obviously found the numbers given for the various groups of martyrs confusing. Therefore, he reshaped the entire section composing this short, lucid passage: *et hoc non paucis aliquibus diebus aut parvo tempore, sed per annos aliquot cotidie, quando minimum, decem, interdum autem et centum in una die viri vel mulieres, sed et parvuli supra dictis poenarum generibus trucidabantur* (757,15-18). Rufinus clearly thought that the account of the martyrs in *cap.* 9,4-5 was inconsistent. His new version represented an improvement in this respect while at the same time removing the obscure points contained in the source. The source began rather abruptly, but Rufinus composed an introduction which made it clear that a judgement scene was to follow.¹⁶⁷ He further wrote of a *saevissimus praeses*, thereby signalling that in the report we shall see a new example of the *crudelitas* typical of the persecutors' treatment of the martyrs. Here Eusebius wrote of τοὺς δὲ τὴν διὰ πυρὸς τιμωρίαν (756,27), but Rufinus found this completely unmotivated and alien to the entire passage, so he quite simply left it out. He felt that there was insufficient information explaining why the executioners were exhausted and their axes blunted, so he supplied it in 757,22-30 by giving a lively description of the terrible judge who sentenced the Christians to be beheaded in one large group, because he was annoyed by their joy on learning that they were to be executed.¹⁶⁸ A detailed account follows describing how they were then led out to the place of execution. Only at this

point does it make sense to explain that the executioners were put to an overwhelming task: *defecerunt carnificum manus et succedentes sibi invicem fatigati sunt, hebetata est acies gladii. videbam fessos residere carnifices, vires resumere, animos reparare, mutare gladios, diem quoque ipsum non sufficere ad poenam* (757,29-32).

Rufinus quite clearly saw no reason to give particular prominence to the martyrs mentioned in *cap.* 9,5 as Eusebius did – the joy and zeal at attaining martyrdom despite their sufferings was, after all, characteristic of all martyrs. He did not, therefore, describe them as a new group, but regarded them as belonging to the martyrs already sentenced. The reason why they deserved special mention even so, was, from Rufinus's interpretation of the events at the place of execution, that they were eager to achieve martyrdom with their fellow believers before sunset, just as, instead of collapsing at the sight of the first executions, they approached death with joy and exuberance.¹⁶⁹

Rufinus also disliked Eusebius's description of the aristocratic and philosophically trained Christian martyrs as the most outstanding. He accepted no classifications of martyrs and so omitted 758,8-12. Instead, he wrote this passage to close the report on the death of all the martyrs: *o vere mirabilis et omni veneratione dignus grex ille beatorum, turma viro- rum fortium, corona splendoris gloriae Christi* (759,3-5). As *primus inter*

165 Thus πάντα δ' ὑπεράρει λόγον καὶ ἄς ὑπέμειναν αἰκίας καὶ ἀληθδνας οἱ κατὰ Θεβαῖδα μάρτυρες (756,7-8) is changed to *Apud Thebaida vero omnem narrationem superat agitata crudelitas* (757,5). Correspondingly, in 756,9-13, he altered the passive form of the verbs to the active form, all having *tortores* as their subject.

166 He found it quite sufficient to translate θεάν ταύτην αἰσχίστην καὶ πάντων ὀμοτάτην καὶ ἀπανθρωποτάτην τοῖς ὀρώσιν ἄπασιν παρεσχημένα (756,12-13) by the simple *indignissimo spectaculo expositas* (757,10). καθ' ὄν ταῦτ' ἐνεχείρουν ἐπινοοῦντες (756,18-19) seemed to him a rather superfluous remark which he felt quite happy to omit.

167 Rufinus added this to emphasize the fact that the various *poenarum genera* had been fully described in the previous section.

168 *cumque hi certatim se et sponte gladio subicerent confessione praemissa, ille inhumano et crudus nec multitudinis contemplatione nec virtutis eorum magnanimitate per-motus duci nihilominus omnes et caedi capite iubet* (757,22-25).

169 *nullus tamen ex omnibus, ne parvulus quidem infans deterreri potuit a morte, sed hoc solum singuli pavescebant, ne forte dum properum sol vergens clauderet diem, separatus a consortio martyrum remaneret. sic confidentia fidei constanter et fortiter cum laetitia et exultatione mortem praesentem velut aeternae vitae principia rapiebant. denique cum priores quique iugularentur, reliqui non desidia aut torpori animos indulgebant, sed psallentes et hymnos deo canentes locum quisque sui martyrii expectabat, ut haec agentes etiam extremos spiritus in dei laudibus exhalarent* (757,32-759,3).

pares, Phileas belongs to this group: *hanc sane coronam pretiosior omnium lapis et gemma nobilior adornabat, hanc turman praeibat ductor inlustrior, hunc gregem pastor nobilior decorabat* (759,5-7).

A much more important feature, however, is Rufinus's replacement of Eusebius's account of Philoromus and Phileas's martyrdoms in *cap.* 9,6-8 by a completely new account, in which Phileas is the dominant figure. His "public service" and "secular learning" are certainly mentioned but his Christian qualities receive special attention.¹⁷⁰ Only after details have been given of his steadfast rejection of his relatives' repeated prayers to show consideration for his wife and children¹⁷¹ does Philoromus appear on the scene. He is correctly introduced as an officer: *vir agens turmam militum Romanorum* (759,22). He upbraids those present for attempting to force Phileas to renounce his faith.¹⁷² Everone is so angry at this interference¹⁷³ that they demand that he should suffer the same punishment as Phileas. The judge complies with their wishes by commanding that they both be beheaded.¹⁷⁴

Several points in this account would benefit from further clarification. Rufinus included no information on the details of Phileas's martyrdom. Only the phrase *frequenter ad praesidem ducebatur* (759,15-16) suggests that he must have been imprisoned and repeatedly brought to interrogation before the *praeses*. The entire context makes it clear that Thmuis was the scene of these events, although the name does not actually appear. The description of the progress of the various interrogations is also extremely short: the reader must guess that they were supposed to make Phileas sacrifice so that he could be released. The provincial governor's role is equally unclear. From 759,16-17, he appears to have restricted himself to exhorting Phileas to spare his wife and children by abandoning his *praesumptio*. But when Rufinus then wrote of *lacrimis propinquorum et praesidis calliditate* (759,23-24), a line of conduct which was distinguished by *calliditas* was obviously attributed to him. But the effects of this shrewdness remain obscure.

Considering that Rufinus is otherwise very careful to give all the information required for full understanding, his negligence at this point is remarkable. The explanation can, however, be found in the fact that here Rufinus dipped into a much more detailed martyrology which contained the information missing in his description. Moreover, we are in a position to prove that this account shares a considerable amount of material with *Passio beati Phileae episcopi de civitate Thmui*.¹⁷⁵ The report describes the same course of events. Phileas is the dominant figure and Philoromus

only appears at a later stage when he is sentenced along with Phileas because of his “speech of defence”. It is even more remarkable that the whole of 759,19-32 in Rufinus is identical, even to the wording, to *Passio*, 6,4-7 (350,23-352,5).¹⁷⁶ We may therefore reasonably suggest that the martyrology which he used also included, in all essentials, *cap.* 1-6 of the Latin *Passio*. Rufinus did not, indeed, report the theological debate between Culcianus and Phileas which dominates these chapters but, even

170 *hic nobilitatem primi generis secundum animi virtutem de caelestibus trahebat, de terrenis vero, quantum ad saeculum pertinet, primis in Romana re publica fuerat honoribus functus, eruditione quoque liberalium litterarum et omnibus quae ad animi virtutem pertinent exercitiis adprime eruditus, novissimam hanc, quae prior est omnium, secundum deum philosophiam ita suscepit, ut omnes, qui praecesserant, anteiret* (759,8-14).

171 *cumque plurimos propinquos et consanguineos nobiles viros in eadem urbe haberet, frequenter ad praesidem ducebatur eiusque monitis adquiescere tot et tantis propinquis exorantibus, respectum habere uxoris et contemplationem suadebatur suscipere liberorum neque coepita praesumptione persistere* (759,14-19).

172 [Philoromus] *qui cum videret Phileam circumdatum lacrimis propinquorum et praesidis calliditate fatigari nec tamen flecti aut infringi ulla tenus posse, exclamat: »quid inaniter et superfluo constantiam viri temptatis? quid eum, qui fidem deo servat, infidelem vultis efficere? quid eum cogitis negare deum, ut hominibus adquiescat? non videtis, quod aures eius vestra verba non audiunt? quod oculi eius vestras lacrimas non vident? quomodo potest terrenis lacrimis flecti, cuius oculi caelestem gloriam contuentur?«* (759,23-30).

173 Rufinus's *cunctorum ira* (759,30) presumably refers to the judge as well as to Phileas's family and friends.

174 See 759,30-32. We should note that Philoromus was sentenced, strictly speaking, because he attempted to stop all efforts to persuade Phileas to give up his resistance. On the other hand, this, of course, happened because he was a Christian, his support of Phileas being clear evidence of his convictions.

175 F. Halkin provided a critical edition of this *Passio* in *Analecta Bollandiana* 81 (1963), 1-27. It is reprinted in H. Musurillo: *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, pp. 344-52.

176 A few, admittedly unimportant, differences do arise. They include *animo ad caelum tendere* (759,20), *et praesidis calliditate fatigari nec tamen flecti aut infringi ulla tenus posse* (759,23-24), for which the *Passio* simply has *frangi posse* (350,29), *superfluo* (759,25) instead of *frustra* (350,29), *fidem deo servat* (759,26) rather than *Deo fidelis est* (350,30) and *utrumque plecti capite* (759,32) instead of *ambos ferire gladio* (352,4). For this text in Rufinus: *quid eum cogitis negare deum, ut hominibus adquiescat? non videtis, quod aures eius vestra verba non audiunt? quod oculi eius vestras lacrimas non vident? quomodo potest terrenis lacrimis flecti, cuius oculi caelestem gloriam contuentur?* (759,26-30), the *Passio* simply has *num videtis quod oculi eius vestras lacrimas non vident, quod aures eius vestra verba non audiunt, quia oculi eius caelestem gloriam contuentur?* (350,31-352,2). All these differences can, however, be quite easily explained as Rufinus's alterations and additions. The same is true of his description of Philoromus as *vir agens turmam militum Romanorum* (759,22), where the *Passio* writes *tribunus Romanorum* (350,27). Rufinus probably chose his expression as a word play on *turma virorum fortium* (759,4).

so, his account contains several indications that he knew of it. For example, the sentence *respectum habere uxoris et contemplationem suadebatur suscipere liberorum neque coepta praesumptione persistere* (759,17-19) only makes sense on the basis of the description in *Passio*, suggesting that the point was to make Phileas meet the demand to sacrifice, so that he could be released. Exactly the same is true of Philoromus's defence of Phileas. When Rufinus continued by writing of *praesidis calliditas*, he must have been thinking of Culcianus's cunning attempts to show the unreasonableness of Phileas's attitude, in order to make him sacrifice. Finally, the *Passio*'s description of his explanation of the relationship between Paul and Plato and the other Greek philosophers (*cap.* 3,2) and his reference to Sorates (*cap.* 4,2) formed the basis of Rufinus's discussion of his philosophical and theological abilities in 759,11-14. Rufinus's remark about Phileas – *frequenter ad praesidem ducebatur* (759,15-16) – is only intelligible on the basis of the information contained in *Papyrus Bodmer XX*, in which *col. II*, 2-10¹⁷⁷ reports that Phileas, when a prisoner, was interrogated before the *praeses* for a third, fourth and fifth time. Since the Latin *Passio* only mentions one interrogation, this provides evidence that Rufinus's source must also, at any rate, have included material from *col. II*.

But there are considerable differences as well as similarities between Rufinus's account and the Latin *Passio* and the parts which are preserved in *Papyrus Bodmer XX*. Rufinus's omission of the debate between Culcianus and Phileas constitutes, of course, the greatest difference. He described the events as taking place in Thmuis and not in Alexandria and the *praeses* is anonymous. In his account the relatives beg Phileas to show concern for his family, whereas the *praeses* simply supports them. In the *Passio*, Culcianus dominates the scene: he exhorts Phileas to show concern for his family by sacrificing, and the relatives only appear after this.¹⁷⁸

The differences can, however, be explained by the fact that Rufinus only wanted to include from the martyrology material which could illuminate Phileas's *fides* and *constantia*. The same motive must have prompted him to arrange the information in a different way from his source. He preferred to base his own version on this martyrology rather than on Eusebius's account, because he thought he had found a far superior, authentic account.

In his version of Eusebius's introduction to the Phileas letter, Rufinus diverged from the original on several points. He omitted αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ παρῴτω μάρτυς, ἅμα μὲν ἑαυτὸν ὅστις ποτ' ἦν, ἐπιδείξων (758,29-30),

obviously in recognition of the fact that the letter throws no light on these points. Conversely, he stated, quite precisely, that the excerpts from the letter represent a discussion *de martyrum passionibus* (759,35).¹⁷⁹ He also omitted 758,30-32 (ἄμα δὲ καὶ κτλ.) so, in his opinion, these *passiones* could only have taken place in Thmuis. When Rufinus wrote *aliqua ex opusculis eius* (759,34-35), he must have intended to state that he knew of a *corpus Phileae*, which, among other things, also included the letter to the congregation in Thmuis.¹⁸⁰ Furthermore, he specifically stated that the Phileas letter was only given in extract.¹⁸¹ But however tempting it might be to assume, because of this, that Rufinus knew of the entire Phileas letter, everything points to the fact that Eusebius's account alone is the basis of his version.¹⁸²

Probably for the sake of clarity, Rufinus chose to rearrange the material in *cap.* 10,2. Leaving aside the Biblical references, he immediately began a description of the martyrs, producing this version of 760,2-6: *Horum vero nobis bonorum exempla praebuerunt beati martyres, qui una nobiscum in agonibus perdurantes, secundum quod ex divinis scripturis fuerant instituti, oculum mentis suae in deo habentes defixum mortem pro pietate absque trepidatione capiebant* (761,1-4). He omitted ἀπὸ τῆς κλήσεως εἶχοντο (760,6) but continued with this final passage: *indesinenter etenim considerabant dominum nostrum Iesum Christum propter nos hominem factum hoc nos docuisse, ut usque ad mortem obluemur adversum peccatum, siquidem ipse non rapinam arbitratus sit* etc. (761,4-10). But this version introduces a shift in the line of thought. According to Phileas, salvation depends on belief in Christ. Through His incarnation

177 *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, p. 328-30.

178 Cf. *cap.* 6,4 (350,21-23): *Aduocati et officium una cum curatore et cum omnibus propinquis eius pedes ipsius complectebantur rogantes eum ut respectum haberet uxoris et curam susciperet liberorum*. We are further told that *frater Phileae qui erat unus ex aduocatis* (*cap.* 8,1, p. 352,6 f.) stated, after the sentence and on the way to the place of execution, that Phileas had appealed the sentence, an assertion which he energetically denied on Culcianus's inquiry.

179 We must assume from 759,33-34, however, that Rufinus also saw the extract from the letter as a demonstration of *ingenii atque eruditionis eius studium*.

180 Perhaps this *corpus* also contained the account of Phileas's martyrdom which Rufinus used as the basis for his own account in *cap.* 9,7-8.

181 *scribens igitur ad Thmuitas idem Phileas post aliquanta haec refert* (759,36-37).

182 When Rufinus gave the impression, albeit indirectly, that these *passiones* took place in Thmuis and not in Alexandria, as stated by Eusebius, it might be because the full Phileas letter contained precisely this information.

and death on the cross. He had destroyed sin and won eternal life for mankind. Rufinus, however, emphasized the conviction that Christ, by His incarnation, taught us that we must fight sin to our dying day as He Himself did.¹⁸³

Cap. 10,3 also had to be rewritten by Rufinus, so that he could emphasize specifically the view that Christ's suffering and death were the example which the martyrs were following. He found 760,12-15 unnecessarily lengthy and therefore produced this version: *cuius exemplum secuti beati martyres¹⁸⁴ omnes cruciatus et poenas susceperunt, ne fidei suae conscientiam macularent, quoniam quidem perfecta in eis caritas foras eiciebat timorem* (761,10-13).

Here he abbreviated, but he expanded 760,18-19 (ὧν καταλέγειν κτλ.) to underline its status as an eyewitness account: *quorum si velim nunc tolerantiae enumerare virtutes et exponere robur constantiae, nec mihi copia tanta sermonis est nec puto aliis nisi his solis, qui oculis suis intuebantur, quae gesta sunt, videri credibilia* (761,13-16).

Rufinus reproduced, in all essentials, Phileas's description in 760,19-762,3 of the various torments to which the martyrs were subjected. He chose, however, to do this in a number of independent sentences, and he also added some new details, apparently from the desire to create a varied account.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, Rufinus felt that καὶ ἦν ἡ θεία κτλ. (760,21-23) should appear after the list of the various forms of torture. He had to reach this point, at any rate, before he thought the time had come to use the passage as the basis for this sentence, which served to illustrate the cruelty with which the martyrs had been treated: *sed ne facies quidem ac vultus et frons a tormentis remanebat immunis. addebatur et hoc super omnia, ut posteaquam fuissent humana corpora absque omni humanitate laniata, exposita in publico et nudata non solum veste, sed etiam cute, crudele cunctis praetereuntibus spectaculum fierent* (763,3-7).

762,3-8 (ἔτεροι κτλ.) was undoubtedly considered by Rufinus to be a superfluous repetition of the contents of *quosdam columnis districtos et post tergum distortis brachiis victos relinquebant* (763,7-8). In Rufinus's opinion, the subsequent account in *cap. 10,6-8* (762,8-24) could also be shortened to advantage, so that repetition was avoided. In an independently phrased version, he described only the use of *equuleus*:¹⁸⁶ *iam vero hi, qui ante praesidem suspendebantur, non id solum temporis, quo ab eo vel discutiebantur vel cruciabantur, sed totum paene diem, cum alii actus agerentur, in eculeis exigebant, si forte aliquis ex his iugis poenae continuatione a proposito firmitate decideret* (763,8-12). It is also interesting that, in

Rufinus's version, the *praeses* plays a much less prominent role than in the original. He completely omitted 762,14-16 which in the original emphasized the man's inhuman behaviour towards the martyrs. In Rufinus's opinion, all tormentors were like this.¹⁸⁷ He included this view when he rewrote *cap.* 10.8 (762,17-24) to form this independent report: *tanta vero in his crudelitas erat et in tantum ab eis omnis penitus humanitatis sensus aufugerat, ut posteaquam omne corpus vel tormentis vel verberibus fuisset absumptum, trahi nudum pedibus rursus iuberetur ad carcerem atque ibi nervo pedibus conclusis recentibus adhuc terga vulneribus reicerentur in solum testarum fragmentis subter stratum* (763,12-17).

Rufinus followed his source, up to a point, in *cap.* 10,9 (762,24-764,2) by saying that many of the martyrs died during torture.¹⁸⁸ He also stated that others recovered but added on his own account, that this simply gave rise to new agonies.¹⁸⁹ On the other hand, he completely omitted *cap.* 10,10 (764,2-9). He probably thought that the Imperial edict mentioned here was identical with the third edict and therefore had no place in this context, which describes martyrs in general and not only the Church lead-

183 This was also Phileas's line of thought, which Rufinus could have deduced from τούτων ἀπάντων ὑποδειγμάτων κτλ. (760,2-3). He wanted to make it specific, however, by mentioning *exemplum Christi*.

184 Here, the original has οἱ χριστοφόροι μάρτυρες (760,13).

185 Rufinus translated ἕτεροι δὲ πάλιν ἰμάσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ σχοινίῳς (760,21) by *nonnullis loris districti vel funibus adpensi* (761,19-20). The source has just καθάπερ τοῖς φονεῦσιν (762,2), but he expanded it to *ut latronibus et homicidis solet* (763,1). For περὶ τὸ ξύλον ἐξηγοῦντο (760,23-24), Rufinus felt that *adpendebantur* (761,21) was sufficient. He thought the link to εἶθ' οὕτως κτλ. (760,24 ff.) too abrupt and therefore inserted *iam vero unguis exarari vetus et leve ducebatur* (761,22-23). Furthermore, instead of τοῖς ἀμυντηρίοις ἐκόλαζον (762,3), Rufinus wrote *et usque ad unguis ungula perveniebat* (763,2). Since Rufinus had translated ἀνέσεως γὰρ οὐσης ἅπασιν τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐνυβοῦζειν (760,19-20) in this free manner: *et erat studium per singulos paene novum genus invenire supplicii* (761,20-21), he obviously saw no point in translating ἐκ κελεύσεως οἱ βασιανισταί (762,1).

186 Rufinus understood ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου κείμενοι to mean *eculeus/lequuleus*.

187 The reason is perhaps that, on the basis of the *Passio Phileae*, Rufinus did not find the *praeses* as inhuman as in Phileas's description.

188 *interea quam plurimi usque ad mortem constanter et fortiter perdurantes inventoriibus scelerum inaniter intentatae crudelitatis pudorem non minimum conferebant* (763,17-19). In 762,24-27, the source mentions those who died immediately and those who died after a few days, but Rufinus put them together. We should also note that for Phileas's τῇ κατ'εὐρίᾳ κατασχύναντες (762,25-26), he stated the direct opposite, in order to expose their inhumanity.

189 *alii vero recepta corporis sanitate ad reparandos denuo agones dispensatores poenarum sponte provocabant* (763,19-765,2).

ers. Since Rufinus clearly presumed a general demand to sacrifice, specifying death as the punishment for refusing, this conclusion appeared to him quite sufficient: *quos illi erubescences rursus ad tormenta revocare, ipsa eorum audacia perterriti, capite eos caedi iubebant* (765,2-3).

In translating the concluding remarks to the description of the Phileas martyrdom in *cap.* 10,11 (764,10-15), Rufinus completely omitted ἅμα μὲν κτλ. (764,13-15). He probably realized that the statement made no sense in the context and that there was no support for it in the extract from the letter itself. Instead he composed this passage which rounded off the account quite concisely: *istae sunt veri in deo philosophi beati martyris Phileae voces, quas in vinculis positus et in carcerem retrusus commissae sibi ecclesiae scribebat, quibus una secum socios eos martyrum et consortes faceret caelestium coronarum* (765,4-7).

Cap. 10,12-13,8 (764,15-774,10): Examples of martyrs' sufferings in individual provinces

In *cap.* 10,12 (764,15-18), Eusebius posed a question stating, in effect, that more examples of the martyrs' struggles would be superfluous, particularly of those who were assailed as if in war.¹ We may read this rhetorical passage as Eusebius's indication that he did not intend to write an exhaustive account of the many martyr struggles which took place throughout the world, however horrible they were. He probably recognized that he could not go on listing individual martyrs' struggles, as the account in *cap.* 7,1-10,10 had tended to do. When understood in this way, the passage forms a natural conclusion to the previous account. So apparently Eusebius was saying here that he would not fill his account with more martyrologies but we must admit that, in what follows, he did not carry out his intentions; in fact, he did continue to recount fresh martyrdoms.² In the present context, *cap.* 10,12 appears, therefore, to be completely superfluous, not to say meaningless.

In *cap.* 11,1 (764,19-25), Eusebius explained that soldiers surrounded a little town in Phrygia and burned it down and its entire Christian population with it, because they refused to sacrifice to the gods. In this context, the account serves as an example of Christians being treated according to martial law;³ the massacre was carried out as a military operation, such as would have been mounted in a war against the enemies of the Empire. Nor was this purely arbitrary. Eusebius expressly states that the massacre took place because the entire population of the town⁴ had re-

1 This is a paraphrase of *μάλιστα τῶν οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμου δὲ τρόπῳ πεπολιορκημένων* (764,17-18). Eusebius was stating that war-like methods, without normal judicial procedures, were used against the Christians. He probably composed this sentence with the next episode in *cap.* 11,1 in mind, in which the army was brought in to destroy a Christian town.

2 This does not, however, apply to *μάλιστα κτλ.* As just mentioned, the words refer to the account in *cap.* 11,1; we shall return to this question.

3 This is clear from the introductory words *ἤδη γούν* (764,19).

4 It is quite evident that Eusebius was at pains to demonstrate that the entire population was Christian. He did not simply write *κατέφλεξαν αὐτοῖς ἅμα νηπίους καὶ γυναῖξιν τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἐπιβοωμένους* (764,20-22); he went on immediately to offer an explanation which resembles a repetition: *ὅτι δὴ πανδημεὶ πάντες οἱ τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες*

fused to sacrifice to the gods. In other words, it had been faced with a demand to sacrifice in which refusal to obey was punishable by death. There can scarcely be any doubt that the demand was an Imperial decree and this is the first direct mention in Eusebius of an Imperial law which required all Christians, under pain of death, to sacrifice to the gods.

Cap. 11,2 (764,25-766,6) tells the story of Adautus. He belonged to an aristocratic Italian family and had advanced in the Imperial administration to the position of *magister summarum rationum*.⁵ As the admirable Christian he was, he suffered martyrdom while still engaged in his official duties. In Eusebius's account, it would be natural to see Adautus as one of the public officers from the Christian town in Phrygia. But, on closer inspection, it is impossible to substantiate this interpretation. We are told that he occupied a prominent place in the central Imperial administration and, what is more, suffered death while still in office, so there is nothing here to connect him to the Christian population in Phrygia. The weight placed on the description of Adautus's rank and worldly career makes this passage completely parallel to the description of Philoromus and Phileas in *cap.* 9,7 in which Eusebius deliberately emphasized their high political and administrative positions. This is scarcely accidental but, in fact, quite natural if the story of Adautus originally comprised the direct continuation of *cap.* 9,8. In other words, he is cited beside Philoromus and Phileas as a new example from the group of high-ranking aristocratic Christians who were martyred, as Eusebius stated in *cap.* 9,6.⁶ The continuity was broken, however, when Eusebius decided to supplement this completed account by reproducing an extract from Phileas's letter to his congregation in Thmuis. This necessitated the insertion of the introductory and concluding remarks which appear in *cap.* 10,1 and 10,11 respectively.⁷ But, as we mentioned above, the expansion threatened to turn the martyrology into an account of individual martyrdoms. This threat led to the note in *cap.* 10,12 – we can imagine that this was what happened – in which Eusebius wished to emphasize the point that he wanted no such change. The account of the massacre of the Christian town in Phrygia may have been added from a desire to illustrate more fully what was meant by the Christians being treated *πολέμου τρόπῳ* (764,18). Eusebius may have wished to retain the account of Adautus's martyrdom, even though it had been isolated from its original context by the insertion of

λογιστῆς τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν καὶ ἄλλῳ δήμῳ Χριστιανοῦς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες (764,22-24).

cap. 10,1-11,1, because it would serve to emphasize the unreasonable treatment of the Christians.

Whatever the explanation may be for this reconstruction, it is at any rate certain that Rufinus was dissatisfied with Eusebius's account in *cap.* 10,12-11,2. He clearly interpreted *cap.* 10,12 as Eusebius's explanation to his readers that he did not intend to give more examples of martyrdoms. Therefore, he found his source contradictory, when Eusebius continued, even so, to tell of the massacre of the Phrygian Christians and of Adaucus's martyrdom. In the context, this section seemed quite meaningless to him, so he chose simply to omit it in his version. At the same time, he was at pains to link the new martyrology with the previous account. He created this passage in order to underline his view that this was an even more horrible manifestation of the persecution of the Christians: *Iam vero quod apud Frygiam gestum est, quis audeat praeterire? in quo et communia humanitatis et propria Romani regni iura violata sunt* (765,8-10).

In this translation of *cap.* 11,1, Rufinus felt it necessary to rearrange the material in order to create a clearly constructed account, avoiding all repetitions. Therefore, he stated at the very beginning that the inhabitants of the town were Christians who refused to sacrifice to the gods, so that they were burned to death as a punishment.⁸ Similarly, he wanted to

⁵ Here, Eusebius gives the precise designation of occupation: ὡς καὶ τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης μαγιστρούτητός τε καὶ καθολικότητος ἀμέμπτως διελθεῖν (766.1-3). For a more detailed description of *magister summarum rationum*, see O. Hirschfeld: *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 38.

⁶ καὶ τις ἕτερος (764,25) can also be said to support the correctness of this interpretation. The words make little sense in the present context, but they work very well as the continuation of *cap.* 9,8, since Adaucus is introduced as a new representative of the socially high-ranking Christian aristocrats after Philoromus and Phileas.

⁷ This expansion produced, as mentioned previously, a discrepancy between *cap.* 9,6-8 and *cap.* 10,1-11. In the first passage, Philoromus and Phileas – in that particular order – appear as examples of distinguished Christians, who were skilled also in practical administration. In the second, Phileas appears alone and only as one of the steadfast Christian martyrs.

⁸ *ubi urbem quandam Christianorum civium, in qua cum et populos omnis et honorati viri et curator ac magistratus Christianos se esse nec adquiescere ad sacrificandum faterentur, circumdari militibus iubent cunctosque simul cum mulieribus viros, cum parvulis senes, cum civibus civitatem iniecto igni concremari, ita ut nullus penitus ex illa urbe, etiam cum optio volentibus daretur, abscederet* (765,10-15). This must be understood to mean that one aspect of the law on general sacrifice was completely disregarded: it decreed that those who chose to sacrifice should go free – and this in itself would make a massacre *en bloc* impossible. In

explain much more directly than Eusebius why the Christians there were treated *κοινῶ νόμῳ* (764,17-18): *et hoc in cives perpetratum est, quod in hostes egisse notam crudelitatis habuisset* (765,15-16). In other words, the idea is that against the Christians as *cives* the authorities – *tormentores* – used means which would be regarded as cruel even if used against the enemies of the Empire.

Eusebius reported Adautus's martyrdom immediately afterwards; Rufinus thought that Adautus was one of the Christians in the town. Apart from the fact that it was a mistake not to have indicated this, he also felt that his source owed an explanation on what a high-ranking Imperial financial officer, who came from Italy, was doing in the little Phrygian town. If the account was to be intelligible, then it was necessary to fill in the gaps. In his version, Rufinus accomplished this by making Adautus a leader and an example for the Phrygian Christians,⁹ because, in his function as an Imperial officer, he happened to be in the town temporarily to inspect its accounts.¹⁰

In *cap.* 12,1 (766,7-16), Eusebius included a rhetorical question stating that it would be impossible to mention the other martyrs by name, to list their numbers and describe in detail the many different forms of torment which they suffered;¹¹ they were sometimes killed by axes as in Arabia, sometimes had their legs broken as in Cappadocia, sometimes they were hung upside down and suffocated by a smoking fire as in Mesopotamia, and sometimes had their limbs cut off as in Alexandria. This passage is clear and intelligible as it is. Seen in a wider context, however, it is striking in several respects. When Eusebius stated here that he did not intend to give an exhaustive martyrology, he was in fact repeating what he had said, in almost identical wording, in *cap.* 6,10 and *cap.* 10,12.¹² The list of the various forms of torture which were used in different areas was furthermore introduced as if they were mentioned here for the first time. Eusebius had in fact treated this theme in detail in the whole of *cap.* 7,1-9,6, so that several points are mere repetitions.¹³ Finally, on the face of it, the passage is best interpreted as a statement from Eusebius that he no longer

this passage, it should also be noted that Rufinus omitted τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων κτλ. (764,21-22) and simply reproduced, in a slightly altered form, Χριστιανοὺς κτλ. (764,24-25). He obviously wished to avoid repetition. In the list of the individual officials, it is also worth noticing that Rufinus translated οὖν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσιν (764,23) by *honorati viri*, by which he introduced a new group and thus avoided the repetition which actually appears in his source.

intended to go into detail in his martyrology, neither on the number of martyrs nor on how they died. None the less, the fact remains that, in what followed, he included descriptions of several individual martyrdoms.

9 This is stated twice, first in the introductory passage: *verum beati huius numerosique martyrii pariter ab universa urbe suscepti auctor et dux extitit vir pietate et religione etc.* (765,17-18). So, in contrast to Eusebius, Rufinus regarded him firstly in his capacity as a Christian. Secondly, in the concluding passage, it is emphasized again *cuius in confessione Christi constantiam omnis populus secutus, boni ducis exemplo summarum vere partium per martyrrium consecutus est palmam* (767,4-6). Rufinus's interpretation gives, at the same time, clear reasons why Aadauctus deserved special mention as opposed to the rest of the Christian population in the town.

10 The passage in Rufinus must be understood in this way: ... *honoribus palatii per gradus singulos usque ad officiorum magisterium perfunctus, rationes quoque per illud tempus summarum partium administrans in supra dicta urbe degebat* (767,1-4).

11 The expression τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας ... τῶν θανασιῶν μαρτύρων (766,8-9) must be understood, as is shown in the subsequent passage, to mean both the ways in which the martyrs died and the sufferings which the various forms of torture inflicted on them.

12 Thus, *cap.* 6,10 says: τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν μαρτύρων ἀριθμησείεν τις τὸ πλῆθος (752,6-7) and *cap.* 10,12: ἀλλὰ τί χρὴ πολλὰ λέγειν κτλ. (764,15).

13 Eusebius here wrote τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας (766,8); this is equivalent to the expression διαφόρους ὑπέμειναν θανάτους (754,28), which introduced a list similar to this one. In *cap.* 9,4, for example, he discussed in detail how the martyrs were executed in Egypt with axes, and this short note – πέλυξιν ἀναιρουμένων οἷα γέγονεν τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀραβίας (766,9-10) – seems strange. Considering that, in *cap.* 9,1-10,11, Eusebius had given a detailed account of the martyrdoms which had taken place in Alexandria, it also seems somewhat of an anti-climax when the town is described here as the place where noses, ears, hands and other parts of the body were cut off.

14 ἑτέρων τε θάπτον τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτῷ πυρὶ καθιέντων ἢ τῆς ἐναγοῦς θυσίας ἐφαπτομένων (766,18-20). This must mean that the martyrs were dragged to the sacrificial altar, where, instead of bringing the necessary sacrifice, they put their right hands into the fire until they were completely burnt. In John Chrysostom, a *panegyricus* on Barlaam (Montfaucon, *S. Ioannis Chrysotomi Opera*, vol. II, pp. 681-96) has been preserved in which the provincial governor in Antioch lets Barlaam hold his fist with incense over the sacrificial fire. The governor expected the heat to force his hand open so that it looked as if he had sacrificed. The plan failed, though, and Barlaam's hand was consumed by the fire. This is a clear, continuous account. From the fact that a sacrificial fire and a burnt hand are mentioned both here and in Eusebius, H. Delehaye concluded that the passage referred to Barlaam's martyrdom, see *Analecta Bollandiana* XXII (1903), pp. 134-135 ("S. Barlaam. Martyr à Antioche"). Even if, with Delehaye, we attempt to explain the plural forms καθιέντων and ἐφαπτομένων on the grounds of Eusebius's rhetorical use of language, see p. 135, the differences are so marked that it would be difficult to deduce any direct dependence. A more likely explanation of the fact that Eusebius's note is difficult to understand can be found in his own experience of martyrs in Antioch who had allowed their right hands to burn in the sacrificial fire rather than sacrifice, but he had no knowledge of the details.

In *cap.* 12,1, Eusebius said, first, that he would not mention how some martyrs in Antioch survived being placed on red hot gridirons, and how others let their right hand burn rather than sacrifice (766,16-20).¹⁴ Next, he reported that some escaped the demand to sacrifice¹⁵ by throwing themselves off roofs, thus taking their own lives (766,20-23). The introductory words τί δεῖ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας ἀνάζωπυρεῖν τὴν μνήμην (766,16-17) link this section ostensibly to *cap.* 12,1 with the almost identical introduction τί με χροῖ νῦν ἐπ' ὀνόματος τῶν λοιπῶν μνημονεύειν (766,7). In other words, Eusebius wanted this section to be understood as a continuation of the theme in *cap.* 12,1. The line of thought in *cap.* 12,2 displays an emphasis different from that in *cap.* 12,1, where the various forms of death and torture were the main theme. The section here shows the authorities attempting to make the Christians sacrifice¹⁶ and their failure.¹⁷ The subsequent account shows very clearly that a new theme had now been broached.

In *cap.* 12,3-4 (766,23-768,12), Eusebius went on to report on a distinguished woman from Antioch and her two daughters who chose to die by drowning rather than submit to fornication or abjure their faith. Eusebius introduced this passage by describing how a virtuous woman from the highest aristocracy in Antioch¹⁸ gave her two young, beautiful, unmarried daughters a pious upbringing.¹⁹ He continued ἐπειδὴ πολὺς ὁ περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος πάντα τρόπον ἀνιχνεύων λανθανούσας περιειογάζετο (766,27-28), but this seems rather cryptic. It makes no sense to give φθόνος its usual meaning of “envy”²⁰ nor does it explain why such great efforts were made to find the young girls. It does make sense, however, if the word is understood to mean “ill-will” or “resentment”.²¹ The emphasis in this passage on the beauty of the two girls²² probably served as an indication that advances had been made to them. They had avoided these by fleeing, and those who had been rejected concentrated all their efforts, in their resentment, on finding them and bringing them back to Antioch. We are not told who was responsible. On the face of it, we would think of suitors who could force through their wish to marry these desirable, beautiful girls. The point of this interpretation is that the girls refused to marry so that they could live as virgins.

Nor is the continuation εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς κτλ. (766,28-768,1) very clear. The words μαθῶν ... ἐκάλει must be understood to signify that here Eusebius had a particular person²³ in mind – the passage was inserted without further explanation as a new subject. The verb ἐκάλει appears here as a law term on the summons of the judge before the court. It must

mean that the provincial governor had issued orders for the arrest of the women²⁴ and after having learned of their hiding place, he sent out soldiers to capture them.²⁵ The strong military force appears to suggest that the charge was serious, but no information on its contents is revealed.

The sentence δικτύων τε ἤδη στρατιωτικῶν εἴσω περιβέβληντο, ἐν ἀμηγάνοις ἑαυτὴν καὶ τὰς παῖδας θεασαμένη καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἕξ ἀνθρώπων δεινά (768,2-3) also presents problems. The words ἕξ ἀνθρώπων introduce a group which has not been mentioned previously. It would be most natural to assume that the words refer to the soldiers, in which case the passage indicates that the mother was afraid that the soldiers who had surrounded them and placed them in a helpless situation, wanted to behave immorally towards them. This interpretation seems, moreover, to be supported by the next lines, 768,3-6, in which she points out that fornication is terrible and that they must therefore not even hear of it. Against this, however, it can be argued that the soldiers in 768,10-12 seem to be a guard with the sole task of bringing the three women back to Antioch and whose cooperativeness, in fact, gave the women the chance

15 ὧν τινες τὴν πείραν φεύγοντες, πρὶν ἀλῶναι καὶ εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἐλθεῖν (766,20-21). The situation here must obviously be this: the authorities pursued the Christians who had not sacrificed, so that, having taken them prisoner, they could force them to comply with the demand to sacrifice.

16 The expression ἐσχάταις πυρὸς οὐκ εἰς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μακρᾷ τιμωρίᾳ κατοποιούμενων (766,17-18) must also be understood in this way.

17 In this respect a change in thought has also taken place, since attention is no longer focussed on the behaviour of the authorities but rather on the martyrs' struggle to avoid complying with the demand to sacrifice.

18 Eusebius's zeal to emphasize her high social position is noticeable here: τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ εὐδοξίᾳ παρὰ πᾶσι βεβοημένη (766,24-25).

19 θεσμοῖς εὐσεβείας ἀναθρεψαμένη (766,26-27).

20 See Lawlor-Oulton: "Much envy was stirred up on their account" (*Eusebius* I, p. 267).

21 G. Bardy agrees with this – free – translation: "Pleins de mauvais sentiments à leur égard" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 25).

22 τῇ τοῦ σώματος ὥρᾳ καὶ ἀκμῇ διαπρεπουσῶν (766,25-26).

23 On a purely grammatical basis, πολὺς ὁ ... φθόνος (766,27) must be seen as the subject, but this makes no sense in the context.

24 περὶ αὐτᾶς (766,27) refers to the young girls, but αὐτὰς διατρέβειν μαθῶν (768,1) also applies to the mother. This change is added proof that there is no connection between 766,23-28 and 766,28 f.

25 πεφροντισμένως (768,1) is not easily classed with other words in the passage. If taken in its usual meaning of "carefully" (cf. Liddell-Scott, 1398), it would be most naturally linked to ἐκάλει, emphasizing that this was a carefully planned action.

to take their own lives. If ἐξ ἀνθρώπων is taken to refer to those who pursued the two young women because of their beauty, and that seems to be the meaning of 766,25-27, then the problem presents itself that the mother's admonitory speech applies not only to her two daughters but also to herself.

To the warning against fornication, the mother added an earnest request to the young girls not to give up their souls to the slavery of demons, which was worse than any death or destruction.²⁶ This could be understood as a warning against sacrificing to the gods, since that would mean entering their service.²⁷ This interpretation would throw light on ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκάλει (768,1): the provincial governor summoned the three women so that they could fulfil the demand to sacrifice, which they had avoided by fleeing. However natural such an interpretation might seem, it still presents difficulties. In the first place, there has been no previous mention of a command to sacrifice. Secondly, it is surprising that the warning against idolatry comes after the warning against fornication. It seems more reasonable, therefore, to consider the warning against submitting to the slavery of demons as emphasizing the conviction that those who fornicated would become slaves of the demons – perhaps there is a reference here to 1. *Cor.* 6,18-20. It should also be noted that this warning appears to have been superimposed and is, in fact, more serious than the stern warning against fornication.²⁸

But this much at least is clear: The mother in this account felt that she and her daughters were threatened with both fornication and idolatry and in this situation she considered suicide the only possibility for salvation.²⁹ Her daughters assented and during the journey to Antioch, they took their own lives by throwing themselves into a nearby river.³⁰

All the obscurities in this account could have arisen because it is a resumé of a longer account giving all the details necessary for complete clarity. There is no extant account, however, which could be regarded as a source supplementing Eusebius's account.³¹ And there is considerable doubt whether one ever existed. The problems of interpretation are probably much better explained as the results of the revision of an account which was not originally related to the persecution of the Christians. It probably described the persecution of the two young women because of their beauty, and the preservation of their chastity when they committed suicide with their mother at her behest. Even though this account may be purely heathen³² Eusebius – or the source he used – regarded it as Christian, and, moreover, as a martyrology. A probable explanation for this

could be that the threat of fornication was seen as synonymous with the threat of being sentenced to the brothels and thus being forced into immorality, a punishment to which Christian women were sentenced if they refused to sacrifice to the gods. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ προδοῦναι κτλ. (768,6-8) has been inserted³³ to emphasize the point that this was, in fact, the heart of the matter. This interpretation, however, is contrary to the original aim of the account, which explains the inconsistency of the account as revealed by its many obscure points.

Eusebius's *cap.* 12,5 (768,12-18) is closely connected to *cap.* 12,3-4 and contains a short and concise account of another two sisters in Antioch itself. They were unsurpassed in every respect³⁴ but, because of their faith, they were thrown into the sea.³⁵ Even though the account is parallel

26 ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ προδοῦναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῆ τῶν δαιμόνων δουλεῖα πάντων ὑπάρχει θανάτων καὶ πάσης χειρόν ἀπωλείας φήσασα (768,6-8).

27 This might then be an allusion to I. *Cor.* 10,19-20.

28 The warning against fornication in τὸ πάντων δεινῶν καὶ ἀφορητότερον (768,4) is sufficiently strong in itself and therefore the warning against becoming slaves of the demons appears to be in competition to it.

29 μίαν τούτων ἀπάντων εἶναι λύσιν ὑπετίθετο τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγὴν (768,8-9).

30 They were successful in spite of being under guard, a fact which Eusebius explained in this way: βραχὺ τι τοὺς φύλακας εἰς ἀναχώρησιν ὑποπαραιτησάμεναι (768,11-12).

31 For more detailed reasons, see Lawlor-Oulton, *Eusebius* II, p. 278.

32 The exclusive emphasis on the young girls' beauty could point in this direction. The mother brought them up θεσμοῖς εὐσεβείας (766,26), but this fact does not actually imply that it was a Christian upbringing. A Christian would consider it so, but that is, of course, quite another matter.

33 This passage clearly appears to be an addition, as pointed out above. The same can be said of ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκάλει (768,1), which is best understood to mean that the women were summoned before the court in Antioch in order to sacrifice to the gods. The correctness of this assumption is further supported by the fact that the omission of these words produce a more continuous text.

34 When Eusebius here speaks of ἄλλην δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας ξυνωρίδα παρθένων (768,13), he reveals that the previous report also emphasized the fate of the two young girls. Only their physical beauty was mentioned in that passage, but the description of the qualities of the two young sisters includes some quite different details and evinces a clear bias towards their moral and religious qualities.

35 θαλάττῃ ῥίπτειν ἐκέλευον οἱ τῶν δαιμόνων θεραπευταί (768,17-18) must be understood to mean that the young girls were condemned to death by drowning, because they refused to comply with the demand to sacrifice to the gods. The reference to οἱ τῶν δαιμόνων θεραπευταί is not clear. But the phrase must, at any rate, include the provincial governor, since he was the one responsible for the implementation of the demand to sacrifice.

to *cap.* 12,3-4, there is no doubt at all that here two Christian martyrs are involved.

In *cap.* 12,6-7 (768,19-28), Eusebius continued with a description of some Christians in Pontus who had sharp reeds driven up under their fingernails, of others who had liquid lead poured down their backs, and yet others whose genitals and bowels were tortured. The judges³⁶ were responsible for these sufferings, vying with each other in devising yet more new methods of torture.

This description of the sufferings of the Christians in Pontus resembles quite closely the one in *cap.* 12,1 (766,7-16) in which the various forms of torture suffered by the martyrs were also enumerated. The ironical mention of the judges – the provincial governors³⁷ – was obviously intended by Eusebius as an explanation of not only how the various methods of torture were arrived at, but also who was responsible for the persecution of the Christians in the provinces. Eusebius probably gave this information as the conclusion to the section beginning with *cap.* 12,1, the purpose of which was to describe τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας τῶν θαυμασίων μαρτύρων (766,8-9) in various regions of the Empire. But it must be added that the theme does not dominate the account in *cap.* 12,1-7. *Cap.* 12,2 emphasizes the Christians' reactions to the attempts of the authorities in Antioch to implement the command to sacrifice: while some Christians were tortured over red hot gridirons, others chose to commit suicide by throwing themselves off roofs.

In view of the fact that Eusebius had declared in *cap.* 10,12 and later repeated in *cap.* 12,1 *init.* that he did not intend to describe new individual martyrdoms, it seems odd that, even so, he gave a comparatively detailed martyrology in *cap.* 12,3-4 – from the context, it must be regarded as a martyrology – which did not even take place in Antioch itself. The explanation is probably that Eusebius wanted this dramatic description to show that Christianity had among its followers distinguished members of the aristocracy, who were forced to seek death as the only protection against attacks on their faith and conduct. In *cap.* 12,5, Eusebius gave yet another account of the martyrdom of two aristocratic sisters, probably because he wished to demonstrate that the case was not exceptional.

The description of the Christians' torments in Pontus in *cap.* 12,6 (768,19 ff.) closely resembles the report in *cap.* 12,1. This is hardly a coincidence and is also best explained by the fact that these two sections originally belonged together. The continuity was broken when Eusebius wanted to supplement the original account by giving a more detailed descrip-

tion of the martyrs in Antioch. The latter had, as its theme, the Christians' own attitude during the persecution, rather than their sufferings, and this explains the lack of continuity which characterizes *cap.* 12,1-7 in its present form.

When we turn our attention to Rufinus's version of this section, we find confirmation of the view that he was far from satisfied with Eusebius's account, beginning right from the introductory remark *τί με χορή κτλ.* (766,7-9). As Rufinus probably regarded this as a repetition of previous statements in *cap.* 6,10 and 10,12, he confined himself to writing simply *sed unde sufficimus propria uniuscuiusque martyris per singulos enumerare supplicia?* (767,7-8). This created an excellent link between the previous account and the one to follow, and allowed him to state precisely the theme for the subsequent description. Moreover, Rufinus chose to turn the account in *cap.* 12,1-2 into a series of short questions which should all make it clear that no report could possibly be given on the torments suffered by the Christians in the various places.³⁸ Finally, he introduced a number of different alterations to make a lively, varied account which avoided repeating previous statements as far as possible.³⁹ Note that he translated *τὰ σκέλη κατεαγνυμένων* (766,10) by *crura frangi dei cultoribus iubebantur* (767,10-11) to create variation in the list. Similarly, he replaced the more detailed description of the torments in Mesopotamia with a description emphasizing the inhumanity to which the Christians were subjected: *quis Mesopotamiae referat cruciatus, ubi Christianos sui ni tergoris more singulis manibus pedibusque suspensos amarissimo fumo*

³⁶ ἄς οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ νόμμοι δικασταὶ κτλ. (768,25-28) refers, strictly speaking, only to αἰσχρὰς καὶ ἀσυμπαθεῖς καὶ οὐδὲ λόγῳ ῥητὰς ... πάθας (768,24-25) in the preceding passage. It must, however, refer to all the sufferings which Eusebius listed in *cap.* 12,1-7 as having been inflicted on the Christians. Thus, the phrase αἰεὶ ταῖς καινότερον ἐφευρισκομέναις αἰκίαις (768,27) undoubtedly alludes to τὰς πολυτρόπους αἰκίας (766,8) at the beginning of *cap.* 12,1.

³⁷ οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ νόμμοι δικασταὶ τὴν σφῶν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δεινότητα, ὥσπερ τινὰ σοφίας ἀρετὴν, φιλοτιμότερον ἐπενόουν (768,25-27). In other words, the provincial governors devised yet more horrible methods of torture with complete disregard for law and virtue.

³⁸ See 767,18-19.

³⁹ Lawlor-Oulton surmises that Rufinus knew the source which Eusebius used here and on the basis of this source he corrected Eusebius's account, see *Eusebius II*, pp. 277-278. Rufinus may have been better informed on this subject than Eusebius. His short note does seem to indicate that he relied on "Hörensagen".

subter ingesto indignis cruciatibus enecabant (767,11-13). When he went on to say *alios vero lento igni prope adhibito tormentis longioribus absumebant* (767,13-14), in contrast to his source, he introduced a new group, who were subjected to a new type of torture.

Eusebius's description of the Christians in Alexandria who had various parts of their bodies cut off must have been regarded by Rufinus as something of an anti-climax after the previous list of torments, not to mention his description in *cap.* 10,1-11 of the sufferings which the Christians had endured in Alexandria. Rufinus wanted a point to round off with, and he created this text: *illa autem quomodo replicem quae apud Alexandriam gesta etiam veterum poetarum fabulas vincunt? ubi obruncatis auribus atque inhonesto vulnere naribus, manuum quoque ceterorumque membrorum summitatibus amputatis truncum sinebant abire derisum* (767,14-18). He wanted this last independent move to emphasize the degree to which the maimed Christians became an object of derision and ridicule for the population when they were set free.

The report in his source of the events in Antioch, *cap.* 12,2, also required revision, in Rufinus's opinion. In 766,16-18, he omitted οὐκ εἰς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μακροῦ τιμωρία κατοπτωμένων (766,17-18), which he obviously felt was quite superfluous and even meaningless. Instead, he composed this version, parallel to the previous questions: *apud Antiochiam vero quomodo recordabor craticulas prunis inpositas, quibus Christiani superpositi torrebantur?* (767,18-19).

In all probability, Rufinus found Eusebius's mention of those who let their right hands be consumed by fire rather than sacrifice, far too short, since he replaced it with a separate martyrology. Previously, he had said that he would no longer list the individual martyrs' *supplicia*, and therefore he felt it necessary to explain why he was doing so now: *sed inter haec nobilium duorum iuvenum factum memorabile silere aequum non puto* (767,20-21). Rufinus states quite directly, unlike Eusebius, that these martyrs had been taken prisoner so that they could be forced to sacrifice to the idols.⁴⁰ They asked to be taken to the sacrificial altars where they put their hands in the fire and kept them there so that the persecutors would not think that they had sacrificed, as would have been the case had they withdrawn their hands.⁴¹ With this version, Rufinus probably wanted to show that these young martyrs chose to brave all suffering rather than be guilty of idolatry.⁴²

Rufinus could have written this independent account because he knew of better sources than Eusebius. The mention of *duo iuvenes* could in-

dicate this. Here, as in Eusebius, it would be natural to think of the martyrdom of Barlaam. If Rufinus had known it in the form in which it survived in the writings of his contemporary John Chrysostom, however, it would be difficult to imagine that he had omitted the decisive point in order to give a rather incomprehensible report instead. Apart from this, the differences between Rufinus's version and Barlaam's *passio* are, in any case, so great that any form of dependence must be excluded. We must therefore assume that Rufinus either used an unknown martyrology or perhaps elaborated on Eusebius's original on his own initiative.

Rufinus also chose to translate ὧν τινες κτλ. (766,20-23) independently. Much more concisely than Eusebius, he points out that suicide was a way of escaping the authorities' command to sacrifice: *alii cum ad sacrificandum quaerentur, sacrilegam pollutionem vitantes vitam praecipitio finierunt* (767,25-26).⁴³ However, Rufinus omitted τὸν θάνατον ἄρπαγμα θέμενοι τῆς τῶν δυσσεβῶν μοχθηρίας (766,22-23). He probably felt that it could be regarded as unqualified approval of these suicides, which he could not really accept. When writing *minore quidem tolerantiae fiducia, sed conservandae fidei maiore cautela* (767,26-27) instead, he doubtlessly wanted to state that it would have been better for these Christians to have shown the same endurance during the trial of their faith as the two young men, rather than avoiding it by taking their own lives.

Rufinus clearly felt that Eusebius's account of the suicide of the mother and her two daughters was not properly integrated into the context. Therefore, he began the description with *in quibus etc.* (767,27). This is a clear statement that the passage which follows will include an example of those who took their own lives in order to avoid sacrificing to the idols.⁴⁴ It should also be noted that, for the sake of clarity, he changed the long ponderous sentence which spans *cap.* 12,3-4 into a number of short sentences.

⁴⁰ *qui cum comprehensi simulacris immolare cogerentur* (767,21).

⁴¹ The continuation is *aiunt*: "ducite nos ad aras". *et cum fuissent adducti, manus suas ardentis igni superponentes, "si subtraxerimus", inquam, "sacrificasse nos credite"* (767,22-23).

⁴² The martyrology has this conclusion: *et quoadusque caro omnis in ignem deflueret, immobiliter perdurarunt* (767,24).

⁴³ The last words replace Eusebius's more elaborate expression: ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὑψηλῶν δωμάτων ἑαυτοὺς κατεκρήμνισαν (766,21-22).

⁴⁴ *in quibus* refers to *sacrilegam pollutionem vitantes vitam praecipitio finierunt* (767,25-26).

Rufinus felt that Eusebius had failed to emphasize the fact that the mother was both beautiful and chaste – this was necessary for a full understanding of the continuation of the account. On the other hand, Rufinus thought that his source gave information of secondary interest when it stated that the mother was superior to everyone in Antioch both socially and economically. Therefore, his translation of 766,23-25 reads like this: *in quibus admirabilis quaedam et veneranda femina, pulchritudine pariter et pudicitia formosa, genere nobilis et copiosa facultatibus* (767,27-29). Rufinus probably also felt that Eusebius's account had emphasized the physical beauty of the two daughters to the exclusion of their Christian virtues. To correct this bias, unacceptable in a Christian context, he replaced 766,25-27 (παίδων ξυνωρίδα κτλ.) with the following passage: *cui erant duae filiae virgines, honestae satis et ad maternae pudicitiae regulam nutritae, specie simul et moribus aemula sibi probitate certantes, quas religiosa mater secundum praeceptum divinum in timore domini educaverat* (767,29-32).

ὁ περὶ αὐτὰς κινούμενος φθόνος (766,27) required closer reading to be comprehensible to Rufinus. He himself understood the words to mean that the young girls were pursued because of their beauty and religious and moral virtues: *sed pro his quae supra diximus vel naturae vel institutionum bonis pravorum hominum multa erga virgines⁴⁵ earumque matrem contentio exagitabatur, et summo studio summaque vi perquirebantur* (767,32-35). These additional details were still insufficient to clarify the purpose of the attentions, in Rufinus's view. The question is whether *pravi homines* should be taken to mean the godless heathens who pursued the women in order to marry them. The words used undoubtedly lead to such a conclusion which seems to be supported in the sentence that follows immediately: *cumque declinandi turbinis gratia sui absentiam procurassent, agitur omni intentione, ut earum praesentia fieret* (767,35-36). On the other hand, the fact that soldiers were sent after them to bring them back to Antioch by force⁴⁶ indicates that the authorities made the greatest efforts to catch them and force them to sacrifice. If this was the intention, it must be stated that Rufinus, who otherwise always made an effort to be comprehensible and precise, did not make this clear to his readers.

To all appearances, Rufinus felt that Eusebius's mode of expression in 768,2-3 (δικτύων τε κτλ.) could mean that the mother was afraid that the soldiers wanted to behave immorally towards her and her daughters. For him, however, the assumption was erroneous, since the soldiers through-

out the whole episode appeared only as an escort. Therefore, he omitted the lines in question and instead wrote: *sed cum perurgentibus militibus vehiculo impositae iter agerent* – (767,37-769,1).⁴⁷

Rufinus follows the events of his source by letting the mother consult with her daughters after they have been captured. Direct speech is used here, and the contents also diverge considerably from the original. Whereas Eusebius regarded the warning against fornication as being of the greatest importance, Rufinus described the mother's worry as being directed equally towards both the Christian faith and *pudicitia et castitas* – in that order.⁴⁸ This gave rise to the question *quid igitur nunc agimus? videtis, quod ista omnis vis aut a deo nos studet aut a pudicitia separare* (769,7-8), which must be understood to mean that an attempt would be made to make all three women abjure their faith by forcing them to sacrifice to the gods and if this failed, they would be sentenced to the brothels, in punishment for their refusal to obey, thereby losing their *pudicitia*. The latter possibility is, of course, the only relevant one, so the mother continues immediately *prostituentur ergo publicis lupanaribus membra, quae aer paene ipse publicus habuit incognita?* (769,8-10).

Eusebius had simply stated rather briefly in 768,8-9 that the mother suggested suicide as the only salvation for them all. Rufinus felt this to be insufficient and thought that detailed reasons were required to explain why these three women were justified in taking their own lives – clearly, suicide was not for him a question to be taken lightly. Therefore he had the mother say *ne, quaeso, filiae, quia nec tam parva nobis in deo fides est,*

⁴⁵ Eusebius II.2 has *virginis*, which must be a printer's error.

⁴⁶ *missi in hoc ipsum milites repertas eas venire Antiochiam cogunt* (767,37). This sentence replaces εἶτ' ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς κτλ. (766,28-768,1); Rufinus was probably unable to explain why Eusebius wrote, for no apparent reason, as if one specific person was responsible for the action.

⁴⁷ Rufinus probably added that the women were put in a carriage for the return journey, because he wanted to explain very simply, why the mother was able to have her conversation on suicide with her daughters without the soldiers suspecting anything.

⁴⁸ ... *talibus religiosa et pudica mater ad filias utitur verbis: "scitis, dulcissimae mihi filiae, quomodo vos in disciplina dei educaverim, scitis, quod a parvulis vobis deus pater, deus nutritor, deus institutor extiterit, et quod pudicitiae et castitatis bonum ita mecum pariter dilexistis, ut ne oculos quidem vester unquam, sicut vobis conscia sum, lasciviore fuerit maculatus aspectu"* (769,1-7). This section of the mother's speech replaces 768,4-8 in Eusebius. Rufinus had no problems omitting ... πορνείας ἀπειλήν, μηδὲ ἀκροῖς ὠσίν ὑπομείναι δεῖν ἀκοῦσαι (768,4-5), probably because it implied that such a thing could be possible – a revolting thought in the context of the whole account.

ut mortem pertimescamus, nec tam despecta pudicitia, ut vivere etiam cum turpitudine cupiamus. quin potius, si placet, quod in omnibus tenetis, etiam in hoc sequimini matris exemplum. praeveniamus impuras carnificum manus et impudicorum praecripiamus incursus mundumque hunc, qui nos ad impuram et impudicam compellit ac pertrahit vitam, pura et pudica morte damnemus (769,10-16). Although Rufinus expressed himself elegantly and in much detail here, we must note that it remains obscure whether the mother's plea to choose death was motivated by a wish to avoid the persecutors of Christianity or to avoid contracting a marriage, as many proposed.⁴⁹ Rufinus followed his source, Eusebius, when he made the daughters acquiesce to the mother's suggestion that they commit suicide. He wanted to explain more directly than Eusebius, how this was possible, however, since the women were heavily guarded. He did this by writing that they succeeded in throwing themselves into the river, after they pretended that they had to relieve themselves, a request respectfully met by the soldiers.⁵⁰

Our analysis has shown that Rufinus's description of the suicide of the three women differs in so many respects from Eusebius that the question arises whether he based his account on a different martyr tradition. The tradition preserved in Eusebius of Emesa and John Chrysostom comes naturally to mind. But the very fact that they concentrate on the *virginitas* of the two young girls, whereas Rufinus attaches great importance to the mother's *pudicitia*, makes it difficult to assume that any dependence exists. In addition, Rufinus emphasizes strongly the women's wish to retain their Christian faith and he has woven this into his account. There is no indication, therefore, that he used any particular martyrology.

The reason why he diverged from his original on so many points must be, rather, that he wanted to improve the account and create a clear intelligible text. He was not entirely successful in this, however. He did not succeed in removing the obscurities which characterize Eusebius's report, as we have pointed out.

In his version of Eusebius's depiction of the martyrdom of the two sisters, *cap.* 12,5 (768,12-18), Rufinus took care to produce a close parallel to the previous description in *cap.* 12,3-4. Eusebius made the authorities condemn the sisters to death by drowning, but Rufinus claimed that they chose their own death by throwing themselves into the sea rather than lose their *castitas*.⁵¹ He did mention the girls' beauty – this was obvious since it explained why their *castitas* was threatened – but here too, he took pains to emphasize their spiritual qualities as the most important.⁵² Finally, instead of ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παρὰ τοῦδε (768,18), he chose to write *haec*

apud Antiochiam (769,25), in order to conclude the martyrdoms in Antioch.

Eusebius's account in *cap.* 12,6-7 (768, 19-28) also presented problems for Rufinus. He replaced τὰ φρικτὰ δὲ ἀκοαῖς κατὰ τὸν Πόντον ἔπασχον ἕτεροι (768,19) with this factual statement: *in regionibus vero Ponti crudeliora gerebantur* (769,25-26). He possibly found Eusebius's remark superfluous – it could be applied to all the sufferings meted out to the martyrs and not just the martyrs at Pontus. It should also be noted that in 768,21-25 (καὶ ἄλλοι κτλ.) the source lists two groups of male martyrs, but Rufinus thought that the second group must consist of women.⁵³ Furthermore, he wanted to make his description of the torments suffered by the martyrs more precise, just as he was anxious to emphasize the inhumanity which came to light: *alii plumbum igni liquefactum*⁵⁴ *et dorso*

49 Whereas *impurae carnificum manus* (769,13-14) could refer to the persecutors of Christianity, expressions such as *[impurae manus] impudicorum* (769,14) and *[mundus hic] qui nos ad impuram et impudicam compellit ac pertrahit vitam* (769,15) seem rather to refer to those who wished to avoid marriage with the women, because it would result in the loss of their *pudicitia* and in a need to conform to this world. The second case involves the contrast between a life in this world, with marriage, and the monastic *virginitas*-ideal.

50 *cumque talibus exhortationibus filias ad simile propositum videret accensas, ad fluvium quendam in itinere positum venerunt, ubi cum se humanae necessitatis causa descendisse simulassent et paululum custodes cogente naturali reverentia secessissent, adductis diligentius hinc inde vestibibus minacis se fluvii rapidis iniecerunt fluentis* (769,16-21). Rufinus avoided everything suggesting worldliness; one example is *adductis diligentius ... vestibibus* which replaces Eusebius's sweeping statement: τὰ τε σώματα περιστελασαι κοσμίως τοῖς περιβλήμασιν (768,10).

51 *... non ferentes violari publicis edictis ac legibus castitatem, marinis se fluctibus demersere* (769,24-25). It is not apparent from Rufinus that the young girls would be sentenced to the brothels in punishment for their continued refusal to sacrifice to the idols. But two pieces of evidence allow us to conclude that this is, in fact, the meaning: the reference to *publica edicta et leges* and the fact that the passage is a complete parallel to the previous account which makes it quite clear that women who adhered to their faith could expect to be sentenced to the brothels. Rufinus's choice of words in these lines could suggest that there was an Imperial law which decreed that women who did not comply with the demand to sacrifice should be sentenced to prostitution. We have, however, no evidence of such a general provision. Rufinus probably generalized on the basis of the actual fact that, during the persecution, women were sentenced to the brothels if they did not sacrifice to the gods.

52 *sed et aliae duae virgines per omnia insignes sorores, genere nobiles, vita mirabiles, primae adhuc aetatis, specie pulchrae satis, sed anima pulchriores, ornatae moribus magis quam monilibus, studiis adprime probabiles etc.* (769,21 ff).

53 He probably felt that διὰ τῶν ἀπορρητῶν μελῶν τε καὶ σπλάγχνων (768,23-24) only made sense if it was taken to refer to women.

54 These words replace Eusebius's lengthy expression: πυρὶ μολίβδου διατακέντος, βρασσοῦσῃ καὶ πεπυρακτωμένῃ τῇ ὕλῃ (768,21-22).

defusum usque ad loca pudenda, quibus naturalis egestio procurari solet, infundebatur. feminis quoque veri candentes et reusti ardentes absque ullo humanitatis miserationisque respectu ingerebantur per pudenda viscerum et naturalium secreta membrorum (769,27-31).

Rufinus must have felt that Eusebius lacked a conclusion to the report on the torments of the martyrs in *cap.* 12,1-7. At any rate, he composed one himself by emphasizing, in connection with the introductory remark to *cap.* 12,1, that it was impossible even to find names for all the various *supplicia* to which the martyrs were subjected: *sed quid faciam, quod appellationes ipsae mihi in admissis facinoribus desunt et gestorum scele-rum nec vocabula, quibus enumerari queant, inveniri possunt?* (769,31-34). These words make it possible for Rufinus to bring in the judges in a much more definite way than Eusebius and to let their inventiveness, in regard to new *supplicia*, refer to the whole of the preceding description: *sustinebant tamen omnia fortissimi et piissimi martyres, cum optimi et praeclari iudices in eo solo sapientiam suam omnibus futuram in admira-tione censerent, si aliquod novae crudelitatis supplicium novique generis invenissent* (769,34-771,2).⁵⁵ With this elegant contrast between the mar-tyrs and the provincial governors, Rufinus provided an effective conclu-sion to the entire account in *cap.* 12,1-7.

In *cap.* 12,8-10 (768,28-770,23), Eusebius stated that the authorities stop-ped killing the Christians, but instead, for so-called philanthropic rea-sons, they gouged out one eye, burned out the knee joint, and con-demned them to the copper mines where they suffered innumerable new hardships.

The section is introduced by the words τὰ δ' οὐχ τῶν συμφορῶν ἔσ-χατα (768,28-770,1). On the face of it, this phrase means “the worst of these calamities”⁵⁶ and we would expect the account to describe tribu-lations which were even worse than those Eusebius had previously men-tioned. But, in actual fact, the continuation describes a reduction in the torments suffered by the Christians, so this interpretation cannot be maintained. Instead, we might interpret the expression as meaning “the end of the calamities”.⁵⁷ This, too, is unsatisfactory, however, since the text does not continue to describe a cessation of the Christians’ suffer-ings; it simply says that the sufferings took a different form. The final possibility would be to translate the phrase as “the last of the calamities” listed previously. But we must also object to this suggestion, because Eusebius goes on to describe new types of calamities as the expression of

a change of policy; therefore, they cannot be considered on an equal footing with the calamities mentioned above, as the third interpretation would indicate. Eusebius's intentions remain obscure, whatever the correct meaning of this expression.

He continued, at any rate, in *cap.* 12,8 (770,1-5) by saying that the judges, who were exhausted from killing the Christians,⁵⁸ adopted a so-called philanthropic policy towards them. The section is closely connected to the preceding lines (768,25-28) which described the provincial governors also as the instigators. The point is that, just as they were responsible for the bloody treatment of the Christians, they also had it in their power to bring it to a halt.

In *cap.* 12,9 (770,5-11), Eusebius made the provincial governors say that killing the Christians was wrong, since it created a state of affairs resembling civil war⁵⁹ and led to unfair accusations of cruelty against the Imperial government. The Imperial government is philanthropic towards everyone, so no one can be punished by death.⁶⁰ When he went on to say, in *cap.* 12,10 (770,11-13), that the order was given for their eyes to be gouged out and one of their legs maimed, he must also be understood as referring to provisions in the Imperial edict.⁶¹

In this context, the reference to the Imperial decree and its provisions must be understood as an attempt to justify the provincial governors' new

55 In his description of the judges, Rufinus translated the essential points in Eusebius's account in 768,25-28. He found it far too ornate, however, and felt that some simplification was necessary.

56 ἔσχατος often occurs in connection with misfortunes, sufferings etc., meaning utmost, last, worst, cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 699.

57 Lawlor-Oulton: "But the end of these calamities came ..." (*Eusebius* I, p. 268) and Gustave Barty: "Le terme de ces calamités arriva donc ..." (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, 26). But H. Valois chose this translation: "Cæterum hæ calamitates non prius finem acceperunt, quam iudices etc." (PG XX,2, 771 C). His note: "Hunc locum non infeliciter vertisse mihi videor" (*ibid.* n. 50) reveals that Eusebius's expression presented problems to him.

58 To emphasize the provincial governors' immense evil and cruelty, Eusebius chose these words: ὅτε δὴ λοιπὸν ἀπειρηγότες ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν κακῶν ὑπερβολῇ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν ἀποκαμόντες πλησμονῇ τε καὶ κόρον τῆς τῶν αἱμάτων ἐκχύσεως ἐσχηγότες (770,1-3).

59 This is the meaning of the phrase: αἵμασιν ἐμφυλίοις μιαίνειν τὰς πόλεις (770,6).

60 λελύσθαι γὰρ αὐτῶν καθ' ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν τιμωρίαν διὰ τὴν τῶν κρατούντων φιλανθρωπίαν (770,10-11). This accusative with an infinitive is governed by φρασίν (770,5).

61 The logical subject of προσετάττετο must be the rulers (οἱ κρατοῦντες) mentioned immediately before. It is strange, though, that these provisions are mentioned in an independent sentence rather than in the form of a new accusative with infinitive, linking it with 770,10-11.

policy towards the Christians. The Imperial rule had inspired a more lenient treatment with a reference to “philanthropy” which included all inhabitants of the Empire, also the Christians.⁶² But this view is in contrast to the immediately preceding account, which stated that the change of policy was introduced by the provincial governors, on the grounds that they no longer wanted to kill the Christians. Previously, they had issued a law demanding that the Christians be punished by death⁶³ and therefore they also had it in their power to repeal the law and replace it with other punitive measures.

Eusebius went on to report, in *cap.* 12,10 (770,13-23), that this philanthropy and mitigation in punishment meant that innumerable Christians had one eye cut out and the joint in their left knee burned out, and afterwards they were sent to the copper mines in the various provinces. The introduction to this long passage reads: ταῦτα γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς τὰ φιλόανθρωπα καὶ τῶν καθ’ ἡμῶν τιμωριῶν τὰ κουφότατα κτλ. (770,13-14). It states that this should be regarded as a further reason for the edict issued by the Emperors. It is, however, evident that the passage repeats previous statements – and as such, it is really quite superfluous. On the other hand, the passage changes meaning if placed beside *cap.* 12,8 as its direct continuation. In that case, αὐτοῖς must have referred originally to the provincial governors. In view of their behaviour towards the Christians as described in *cap.* 12,7-8, the term “godless” makes excellent sense when applied to them, whereas *cap.* 12,9 seems to be no logical introduction.

The description given here of the mutilations suffered by the Christians resembles, as already mentioned, a paraphrase of 770,11-13. Yet there are differences. The latter mentions briefly that both eyes should be gouged out, but here is a detailed description of how the right eye was cut out and the socket cauterized.⁶⁴ We are also given a much more precise statement of the method used to paralyze the left foot: the ligaments were burned through.⁶⁵ Finally, a new element was added to this passage stating that not only the mutilations but also the sentence to the copper mines, were part of the milder punishment to which the Christians were condemned instead of the death penalty. The same phenomena were described in different ways in the two sections, which only makes sense if they did not originally belong together. In other words, this is a new indication that 770,11 ff. was the original continuation of *cap.* 12,8 and served to explain in detail the provincial governors’ intentions when they adopted a more philanthropic policy in their treatment of the Christians.⁶⁶

πρὸς ἄπασί κτλ. (770,20-23) states that those who were sentenced to the copper mines were exposed to many other trials which were quite impossible to list. This emphasizes the fact that the Christians' sufferings continued – in other words, that despite all talk of philanthropy, cruelty still dominated the attitude towards the Christians. Even so, the statement seems surprising in a context which, though couched in ironic phrases, was essentially designed to explain that the Christians were now subjected to a milder form of persecution, since they were no longer sentenced to death. Therefore, the statement could be an insertion.⁶⁷ Perhaps Eusebius wanted to point out in this way that all the talk of a philanthropic treatment of the Christians had produced no improvement in their lot.

But *cap.* 12,8-10 lacks continuity in any case. The reason, as our analysis should have shown, is that *cap.* 12,9 is a later addition. Originally, Eusebius only described the provincial governors' adoption of a milder policy towards the Christians which meant that they were no longer sentenced to death. Later, he became acquainted with an Imperial decree

62 The expressions used make it abundantly clear that this is the dominant point of view: ... τῶν κρατούντων ἀρχήν, εὐμενῇ τοῖς πᾶσιν ὑπάρχουσαν καὶ πραεῖαν, δεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς φιλανθρωπῶπου καὶ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς πάντας ἐκτείνεσθαι τὴν εὐεργεσίαν (770,7-9) and διὰ τὴν τῶν κρατούντων φιλανθρωπίαν (770,11). These phrases correspond so closely to the official Imperial language that they must have been copied from the Imperial decree. To all appearances, then, Eusebius quoted from and paraphrased the decree, and this, ultimately, explains the neutral tone which prevails in the whole of *cap.* 12,9.

63 The phrase μηκέτι θανάτῳ κολαζομένους (770,9-10) presupposes the issue of an Imperial law which decreed the death penalty. Eusebius has not, however, mentioned such a law. But it did exist and did decree that all Christians should sacrifice to the gods or, on refusal, be sentenced to death. This conclusion follows, as previously mentioned, from the fact that Eusebius's martyrology can be explained only on the basis of this assumption.

64 τοὺς μὲν δεξιούς ὀφθαλμοὺς ξίφει πρότερον ἐκκοπτομένων κάπειτα τούτους πυρὶ καυτηριαζομένων (770,16-17).

65 τοὺς δὲ λαιοὺς πόδας κατὰ τῶν ἀγκυλῶν ἀῖθις καυτηρῶσιν ἀχρειομένων (770,17-18).

66 In this way, γὰρ (770,13) also assumes its proper function. Eusebius wrote that the Christians were sentenced to the copper mines οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας τοσοῦτον ὅσον κακώσεως καὶ ταλαιπωρίας ἔνεγκεν (770,19-20), and this is also fully comprehensible only on the basis of the previous statement describing the cruelty of the provincial governors towards the Christians.

67 Both the contents and the style suggest that this passage constitutes an addition. The verbs in the genitive absolute construction appeared in the passive with the authorities – the Emperors or the provincial governors – as their grammatical object, but περιπεπτωκότων (770,22-23) takes the Christians as its subject.

which had commanded that the Christians should be punished with mutilation instead of death. From this it was also apparent that the Imperial rule – not the provincial governors as he thought initially – had produced the new, more humane policy towards the Christians. This new information made it necessary to correct the account up to this point, and for that reason he paraphrased the Imperial law and inserted it as *cap.* 12,9. The continuity which marked the original account was thus interrupted. Instead, we have a description which sometimes identifies the provincial governors, sometimes the Imperial government, as the inspiration for this change in policy towards the Christians.

In *cap.* 12,11, we are told, 770,23-28, that the martyrs throughout the whole world amazed those who saw their courage and that they were living proof of the divine power of Christ.

In *cap.* 12,1 (766,7 ff.), Eusebius said that it would be impossible to give an exhaustive martyrology – including the martyrs' names, their numbers and the description of their various torments. Instead, he limited himself to giving examples of martyrs' sufferings in different regions. On this background, the passage mentioned above can be said to form an effective conclusion to the entire account in *cap.* 12,1-10 by telling of non-Christian reactions to the torments, examples of which had been given here.⁶⁸ Eusebius went on to note, in 770,27-28, that it was impossible to mention every martyr by name. This seems most surprising. Quite apart from the fact that his remark appears as a superfluous repetition of previous lines,⁶⁹ it hardly constitutes a suitable new conclusion. On the other hand, the passage makes slightly better sense if seen as connected to the following, *cap.* 13, which includes a list of some martyrs' names. We must assume, then, that Eusebius was explaining why only a few martyrs could be mentioned by name. Therefore, the passage must be read as the introduction to *cap.* 13.

In his version of *cap.* 12,8-10, Rufinus completely omitted τὰ δ' οὖν τῶν συμφορῶν ἔσχατα (768,28-770,1). The reason probably was that he could not force any useful meaning out of the phrase in this context. Nor did he feel that it was sufficient to say, as Eusebius did, that the provincial governors initiated a more lenient treatment of the Christians, simply because they were tired of shedding their blood. The change must have had a much more realistic reason – the destructive economic and social consequences of the policy towards the Christians up to that time: *sed cum aliquando iam non ratione aut humanitate, crudelitatis tamen nimietate*

*satiati*⁷⁰ *respicere ad immanitatem sceleris sui coepissent, desolatas urbes civibus et optimis civibus, rura nudata cultoribus, orbatos filiiis patres et parentes liberis, ad clementiam se humanitatemque convertunt* – (771,2-6).⁷¹

Rufinus must have noticed a discrepancy between *cap.* 12,8, in which the provincial governors are said to have initiated the new policy, and *cap.* 12,9, which clearly attributes it to the Emperors. He would not let this pass and therefore attempted to coordinate the two sections so that all contradictions were removed. This he achieved by omitting ὡς μηδὲν μὲν ἔτι δοκεῖν δεινὸν καθ' ἡμῶν περιεργάζεσθαι (770,4-5) and replacing it with *edictumque principale proponunt* (771,6). The fact that the provincial governors' more lenient treatment of the Christians was based on an Imperial edict is more formally expressed in 771,6-12, which appears as a direct translation of the contents of the edict.⁷²

Rufinus must have found it confusing that Eusebius gave two different versions of the contents in both 770,5-12 and 770,13-20. At any rate, he treated the passages as one unit by extracting from them the information which he considered important. He also added supplementary information where he deemed it necessary and gave the edict this clear, well-arranged form: *quoniam fas non esset tot cives, in quibus fidei suae esset obstinata persuasio, morti tradere*,⁷³ *placere de reliquo, ut hoc genus hominum nequaquam quidem subiret interitum, omnes tamen, qui hanc speciem confessionis tenerent, dextris oculis ferro effossis eisdemque cautere adustis, sinistro etiam poplite*⁷⁴ *nihilominus cautere debilitato, per singulas*

68 ἐν δὴ τούτοις (770,23) must refer to the sufferings, described in *cap.* 12,1-10, which the martyrs had to bear.

69 Both the introductory remark itself and the whole of the previous account make it evident that mentioning all the martyrs by name is out of the question.

70 With these few words, Rufinus greatly reduced Eusebius's florid expression ἀπειρηκότες κτλ. (770,1-3).

71 It should be noted that in this version Rufinus takes much greater pains than Eusebius to emphasize directly the view that the change in policy was purely selfish. He therefore notes immediately that it did not arise from *ratio* or *humanitas*.

72 Rufinus did not translate φασίν (770,5). Mommsen inserts a semicolon (;) before *quoniam* etc. (771,6). but the context naturally requires a colon (:).

73 The source has αἵμασιν ἐμφυλίους μιαινέιν τὰς πόλεις (770,6), but Rufinus chose quite simply to translate it as *tot cives ... morti tradere*. On the other hand, he found it necessary, in contrast to Eusebius, to state that the passage referred to the Christians: *in quibus fidei suae esset obstinata persuasio* and *qui hanc speciem confessionis tenerent*.

74 Here, Rufinus states more precisely than Eusebius that the knee tendons were burnt through and rendered useless.

quasque provincias in aeris ferrique metalla vel operis⁷⁵ vel poenae gratia⁷⁶ deportandos (771,6-12).⁷⁷

Rufinus omitted to include 770,6-9 (μηδ' ἐπ' ὁμότητι κτλ.). He must have considered the passage superfluous, not to say misleading; the edict's provisions, far from acquitting the Imperial powers of cruelty, in fact confirmed the justification of this accusation. Correspondingly, he saw no reason to emphasize, as thoroughly as his source, the fact that the edict stemmed from the all-embracing *humanitas* of Imperial rule. For him, this ironic remark was quite sufficient: *haec fuit clementia principalis, qua optimis civibus consultum est* (771,13).

Rufinus did not need to repeat the detailed description in 770,13-20 of the implementation of the new procedure against the Christians, since he had already given it in his version of the provisions of the Imperial edict. Nor did he see fit to include πρὸς ἅπασί κτλ. (770,20-23). Perhaps he considered that the description of the deported Christians' new sufferings did not fit too well into a context whose clear aim was to depict the more lenient treatment which was now to be their lot. But Rufinus also found that he could omit 770,23-27 (ἐν δὴ τοῦτοις κτλ.) to advantage. He probably thought that a summary like this was out of place, since Eusebius also gave a list of martyrs in a subsequent passage. Instead, he created this independent conclusion: *sed illi quidem suis, ut videbatur, vel moribus vel vitiis agebant, iustis vero et sanctis viris coronae virtutis et patientiae parabantur, domino et salvatore nostro per haec vel explorante fidem credentium sibi vel merita remunerante* (771,13-17). With this translation, Rufinus probably referred not only to the provincial governors'⁷⁸ implementation of the provisions of the Imperial edict, but to their treatment of the Christians in general, as depicted in the previous *cap.* 12,1-7. For him it is just as important in this concluding passage to point out that those who persecuted the Christians also had to serve God's will and purpose. In other words, Rufinus was at pains to show that, whatever sufferings and calamities befell the faithful, they were always surrounded by God's Providence. The detailed description of the martyrs' torments was of interest to Rufinus first and foremost because it demonstrated the truth of this conviction and therefore served to confirm and strengthen the Christians' faith.

Rufinus interpreted ἐκάστου κτλ. (770,27-28) as meaning that Eusebius wanted to create a link to his next passage, in which he listed a number of martyrs by name. But he obviously also felt that the link was not sufficiently clear, and that the passage seemed strangely unmotivated in the

context. At any rate, he found it necessary to give much clearer reasons for including a list of martyrs' names at this point. He created a much more detailed version which, as further improvement on Eusebius, serves as an excellent and very elegant link of the previous account to the following martyrology: *sed sicut omnes per singulos enumerare non solum difficile, sed et impossibile est, qui tunc in passionibus carnis suae deo gloriam dederunt,⁷⁹ ita omnes penitus omittere et ne paucorum quidem nominatim facere mentionem satis videtur ingratum. paucos ergo memorabimus et maxime ecclesiarum principes per loca sua singulos martyrii gloria coronatos* (771,17-22).

In *cap.* 13,1-7 (770,29-774,2), Eusebius mentions by name 17 Church leaders who suffered martyrdom – eleven bishops and six presbyters.

He stated, as an almost automatic introduction, that he intended to give the names of the Church leaders who had achieved martyrdom⁸⁰ in well known cities. It is no simple list, however, since he added more or less detailed information to most of the names.

75 Rufinus found Eusebius's isolated mention of deportation to the copper mines to be incorrect.

76 Eusebius wrote οὐχ ὑπηρεσίας τοσοῦτον ὅσον κακῶσεως καὶ ταλαιπωρίας ἔνεκεν (770,19-20), but Rufinus stated on the contrary that the deportations to the mines resulted from a desire to use the Christians as labour.

77 When Rufinus gives the impression here of reproducing the contents of the Imperial edict, the question arises whether his independent version was the product of his personal knowledge of the authentic text. On the face of it, *fidei obstinata persuasio* could indicate this. The structure of his version does not, however, in any way display dependance on an Imperial edict any more than the terminology which he used. Nor does his version go beyond his source. All evidence suggests that, here as in other places, Rufinus cleverly utilized the material which he found in Eusebius to create a clearer and more easily accessible account.

78 As *illi ... agebant* continues *proponunt* (771,6), the passage still refers to the provincial governors. Note here too that Rufinus's *suis, ut videbatur, vel moribus vel vitibus agebant* replaces Eusebius's ironic phrase: ἔνεκα τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν φιλανθρωπίας (770,14-15).

79 This definition of a martyr expresses a view which was characteristic of Rufinus: God is with the faithful in everything that happens, and therefore they must also give him all the praise.

80 τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων πρότος ἡμῖν ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἀνηγορεύσθω μάρτυς ... (770,29-772,1). From the subsequent passage, it is clear that ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ἀρχοντες includes both bishops and presbyters and therefore the expression describes the Church hierarchy just as in *cap.* 3,1 (742,21).

The first on the list, 772,1-2, is Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, about whom we are briefly told that he was beheaded.⁸¹ Then in *cap.* 13,2 (772,2-6) the presbyter Lucian is named as the most outstanding amongst the martyrs in Antioch.⁸² Eusebius says that he proclaimed Christ's kingdom in word and deed in the presence of the Emperors in Nicomedia – of his death, however, we are told nothing at all. Next, in *cap.* 13,3-4 (772,6-16), Tyrannion, bishop of Tyre, Zenobius, presbyter in Sidon, and Silvanus, bishop of Emesa,⁸³ are mentioned as the most famous of the Phoenician martyrs.⁸⁴ To this list the information is added that Silvanus suffered martyrdom along with many others;⁸⁵ he was killed and consumed by wild animals in Emesa, whereas Tyrannion was drowned in Antioch⁸⁶ and Zenobius died while he was being tortured in the same place. It is a striking fact that the first list gives the names in this order: Tyrannion, Zenobius, Silvanus, but their deaths are described in a different sequence: Silvanus, Tyrannion, Zenobius. Moreover, it is worth noting that Zenobius is termed first a presbyter and then ὁ ἱατροῶν ἀριστος (772,14). The second phrase can only be understood to mean the very best of physicians.

Next on the list, in *cap.* 13,5 (772,16-23), Eusebius mentions, among the martyrs in Palestine, bishop Silvanus of Gaza,⁸⁷ who was one of 40 beheaded in the copper mines in Phaeno.⁸⁸ At the same place, the bishops Pileus and Nilus were burned at the stake with other Egyptian Christians.⁸⁹ He then notes that the Palestinian martyrs⁹⁰ also numbered Pamphilus of Caesarea, the most outstanding of Eusebius's contemporaries. Eusebius refers to a later work about him, and therefore includes just this simple notice here.⁹¹ Finally, Eusebius mentions in *cap.* 13,7 (772,24-774,1), bishop Peter of Alexandria as the most outstanding among the martyrs in the whole of Egypt.⁹² In addition, the presbyters Faustus, Dius and Ammonius and the bishops Phileas, Hesychius, Pachymius and Theodore⁹³ all suffered martyrdom. Eusebius simply gives their names. He does not even explain how they died, which is the case also with bishop Peter.⁹⁴ Eusebius goes on to explain in 774,1-2 that, besides all these, innumerable other illustrious people were commemorated by the congregations in each place.⁹⁵

Ostensibly, this last statement is a part of the list of martyrs in Egypt, but he phrasing itself indicates rather that it is a comment on martyrs in general throughout the whole world with no special reference to Egypt.⁹⁶ In that case, the statement should be regarded as the conclusion to the previous account in *cap.* 13,1-7.⁹⁷ But as Eusebius probably only wanted to include clerical martyrs in the list, and martyrs in this passage means all

Christian martyrs, a lack of continuity is again apparent in the account. This is best explained by assuming that the passage constitutes Eusebius's incomplete revision.

As we have mentioned already, Eusebius introduced this section by saying that he would give the names of Church leaders in the most important cities. Our analysis of *cap.* 13,1-7 showed that he really did not follow

81 This short note is in complete agreement with the mention of Anthimus in *cap.* 6.5 (750,5-7).

82 Here, Eusebius wrote τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτύρων τὸν πάντα βίον ἄριστος προεβύτερος κτλ. (772.2-3); οἱ μάρτυρες must mean martyrs in general and not the clerical martyrs in particular, although we would have expected this from the introductory phrase. In other words, Lucian appears here, first and foremost, as the most outstanding representative of the martyrs in Antioch.

83 When Silvanus is described as τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Ἐμισαν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος (772.9-10), it is not clear whether the words refer to the church in Emesa itself or in the neighbourhood. If the second reading is correct, Silvanus cannot be considered as a bishop from a renowned city.

84 Again τῶν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης μαρτύρων (772.6) describes martyrs in general. If the words had referred to clerical martyrs the continuation would, of course, have been quite superfluous: γένοιτο ἂν ἐπισημότατοι τὰ πάντα θεοφιλεῖς τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρημμάτων ποιμένες (772,6-8).

85 μαθ' ἐτέρων (772.11) refer to martyrs in general with no special reference to clerics.

86 θαλαττίους παραδοθεῖς βυθοῖς (772,13-14). Cf. G. Bardy's correct observation: "Il est étrange qu' Eusèbe représente Tyrannion comme ayant été jeté à la mer à Antioche, qui n'était pas une ville maritime" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, 28, note 3).

87 As was the case in 772.9-10, the description ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Γάζαν ἐκκλησιῶν (772,16-17) does not make it clear whether Silvanus was bishop in Gaza or of the churches in the neighbourhood.

88 σὺν ἐτέροις ἑνὸς δέουσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τεσσαράκοντα (772,18) must refer to martyrs in general.

89 μαθ' ἐτέρων (772,20) here means ordinary Christians.

90 ἐν τούτοις (772,21) refers to τῶν ἐπὶ Παλαιστίνης μαρτύρων (772,16).

91 ... τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς θαυμασιώτατος, οὗ τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων τὴν ἀρετὴν κατὰ τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν ἀναγράφομεν (772,22-23).

92 Here we have the word ἀναγεγράφθω (772,26-27).

93 Of these Eusebius uses the expression τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοποι (772,29-774.1).

94 Eusebius simply says of him: θεῖόν τι χοῦμα διδασκάλων τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας (772,26).

95 μυριοὶ τε ἐπὶ τούτοις ἄλλοι διαφανεῖς, οἱ πρὸς τῶν κατὰ χώραν καὶ τόπον παροικιῶν μνημονεύονται (774,1-2).

96 The most natural interpretation of πρὸς τῶν κατὰ χώραν καὶ τόπον παροικιῶν would be "by the congregations in every country and place", i.e. all over the world.

97 ἐπὶ τούτοις (774,1) refers therefore to the martyrs mentioned in *cap.* 13,1-7.

this programme. The people named by him are seen first of all as representatives of the martyrs in the individual areas – no particular emphasis is placed on the towns as such. The towns mentioned merely represent a selection of the famous cities in the Roman Empire – several of them were in fact rather small provincial towns. Nor did Eusebius restrict himself to a simple listing of the martyrs' names; he added notes to quite a few of them, sometimes explaining how they had died, sometimes describing their personalities.

Although the account is quite uneven, it does contain some constants. Almost identical expressions are used to introduce the various groups:

τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισημοὺς πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων (770,29)

τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτύρων (772,2)

τῶν δ' ἐπὶ φοινίκης μαρτύρων (772,6)

τῶν δ' ἐπὶ Παλαιστίνης μαρτύρων (772,16)

τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας καθ' ὅλης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος διασπρεπῶς τελειωθέντων (772,24-25).

This is hardly accidental. In all probability, Eusebius used lists from various towns and regions which recorded the names of the martyrs who were commemorated in local churches.⁹⁸ The Church leaders occupied a prominent place, but the commemorative lists included all the martyrs from a given area. This seems the only possible explanation for Eusebius's general discussion of martyrs in the body of the text – quite in contradiction with the intentions stated in his introduction. Furthermore, all evidence suggests that Eusebius added supplementary information to several of the names listed, rendering the account disconnected and, at several points, incongruous. The case of Lucian is an example in point. Lucian appears in Eusebius's list of the martyrs in Antioch. Immediately afterwards, Eusebius says that Lucian suffered martyrdom in Antioch. This is surprising, because, strictly speaking, Lucian should have been with those who, like Anthimus, suffered martyrdom in Nicomedia. The fact that Tyrannion, Zenobius and Silvanus are listed in a different order in *cap.* 13,3 and *cap.* 13,4 respectively, is also best explained by assuming that the second occurrence is a later addition – Zenobius and Silvanus rightly belong with those who suffered martyrdom in Antioch. The same explanation accounts for Zenobius's being termed, first, a presbyter and, later, a doctor.

The position of *cap.* 13,1-7 in the context suggests that the martyrs named here must have suffered death before the "palinode", Galerius's edict of April 311. From IX,6,1-3 (810,28-812,15) however, it appears that

Silvanus, Peter and Lucian – listed in that order – became martyrs during the persecution which Maximin initiated in November 311. Since there is no reason to believe that the mention of these martyrs is a later insertion in *cap.* 13,1-7, this entire section must have been written no earlier than the description of Maximin's persecution, which Eusebius completed after the martyrs' death in August 313 – probably in 314. At the time of this expansion of the Church History, he inserted the section and the passage 770,27-28, which explains why some, but not all, martyrs names were given. The later insertion interrupted the original continuity, and it corresponds with neither the previous account nor the ensuing description.

The aim of the account in *cap.* 13,1-7 was, as mentioned above, to list prominent ecclesiastical leaders who had suffered martyrdom. If we compare this aim with the fact that the account actually concludes Eusebius's martyrology, we should be able to discover the reason why Eusebius judged that it must be inserted. He must have reached the conclusion that the account of the martyrs' struggles up to this point could leave the impression that the ecclesiastical rulers had failed in comparison with the ordinary martyrs – *cap.* 3,4-4,1 could certainly point to this reading. But for him, this was a misunderstanding which had to be countered. He therefore named bishops and presbyters as the most outstanding among the martyrs. Moreover, Eusebius had given examples, in the previous martyrology, of the various tortures and ways of death which the martyrs had experienced. He may also have given this type of information regarding the individual bishops and presbyters, in order to balance the two sections in this respect.

In *cap.* 13,7 (774,2-6), Eusebius states that detailed descriptions of the struggles which had involved Christians throughout the whole world were tasks to be undertaken only by eye-witnesses of these events. He would himself publish his experiences in a separate work.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ This also renders the expression οἱ πρὸς τῶν κατὰ χώραν καὶ τόπον παροικιῶν μνημονεύονται (774,1-2) completely intelligible.

⁹⁹ Scholars such as Henri Valois (PG XX, 2, 775, note 57), H.J. Lawlor, J.E.L. Oulton (*Eusebius* II, 279) and Gustave Bardy (*Histoire Ecclésiastique* III, 29, note 11) thought that Eusebius was referring here to *De martyribus Palaestinae*. But this cannot really be regarded as an eye-witness account. The work in question is much more likely to be *De martyribus Caesareae*, which forms the basis of *De martyribus Palaestinae*, see R. Laqueur, *op cit.*, 26 ff. This account was written later than the section of the Church History where this reference occurs.

Eusebius is here thinking of Christian martyrs in general with no special reference to the ecclesiastical rulers. This in itself makes it difficult to regard the passage as a direct continuation of the list of martyrs in *cap.* 13,1-7. On the other hand, continuity is very naturally introduced, if the passage is seen as following directly after the account in *cap.* 12,1-11 (766,7-770,27). Eusebius then gave his reasons for having restricted himself to examples of the kind of struggle for the faith which involved the martyrs in the individual regions – a detailed description could only be given by eye-witnesses. Here, then, we have additional evidence that 770,27-774,2 is a later insertion interrupting the original account which had 774,2 ff. as the continuation of 766,7-770,27.¹⁰⁰

In *cap.* 13,8 (774,7-10), Eusebius goes on to say that he will add to the account as it stands a report on the complete change of the policy against the Christians¹⁰¹ and a report on events from the beginning of the persecution, both being extremely profitable to his readers. The first half of this passage (774,7-9) is closely linked to the previous account: as it is not Eusebius's task to give a detailed description of the struggles of all martyrs, he will conclude his description by adding the "palinode". Taken at face value, this can really only mean that he will conclude his account of the persecution by publishing Galerius's edict containing the "palinode". But in the second half of the passage (774,9-10) Eusebius goes on to say that he will also add τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ συμβεβηκότα, and this seems very surprising, since the account up to now has done exactly that – it has described events since the beginning of the persecution. The reason which he gives, i.e. that the description will be profitable for his readers,¹⁰² resembles a repetition of the reason which he gave in *cap.* 2,3 for including a description of the persecution.¹⁰³ τὰ τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτλ. may seem confusing in the light of the account up to this point, but the words become more intelligible if seen as an introduction to Eusebius's subsequent description of conditions in the Roman Empire since the outbreak of the persecution.¹⁰⁴ This also suggests that the words constitute a later insertion, and that is the reason why 774,7-9 is not followed by the publication of the Galerian edict, as we would expect – it appears much later in *cap.* 16,1.

As shown above, Rufinus did not think that Eusebius had succeeded in creating a satisfactory link between *cap.* 12 and *cap.* 13. He tried to supply a link by giving a free translation which would, at the same time, state and justify the theme for the ensuing account in *cap.* 13: *paucos ergo me-*

*morabimus et maxime ecclesiarum principes per loca sua*¹⁰⁵ *singulos martyrii gloria coronatos* (771,20-22). Since Rufinus had here used τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων (770,29-30), which introduced the passage on Anthimus, he could omit the words completely from his translation of the passage referred to at 770,29-772,2. Besides, Rufinus preferred to rewrite ἐν εὐσεβῶν στήλαις τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας (770,30-772,1), giving us this clear passage: *Primus nobis in memoriis piorum fulgens in regno Christi martyr scribatur Anthimus Nicomediae episcopus, capite caesus* (771,23-773,1).

Eusebius's remarks on Lucian in *cap.* 13,2 (772,2-6) were reproduced by Rufinus in a much altered form. τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτύρων τὸν πάντα βίον ἄριστος προεβύτερος τῆς αὐτόθι παροικίας, Λουκιανός (772,2-4) were shortened to *Lucianus presbyter Antiochenus* (773,2). Rufinus presumably wished to make it absolutely clear that Lucian appeared as a *clericus* and not as a representative of the martyrs in Antioch. In

100 Here, we can add that the perspective is the same in both places: ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης (770,23) ≠ ἀνὰ τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην (774,2-3). It is hardly a matter of pure coincidence that τῶν δ' ὄψει τὰ πράγματα παρειληφότεων ἴδιον ἂν γένοιτο (774,5-6) seems to play on τοὺς μὲν ἀπανταχοῦ τῆς ἀνδρείας αὐτῶν ἐπόπτας (770,24-25).

101 The expression τὴν παλινοδίαν τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰργασμένων (774,8), of course, refers to the cessation of the anti-Christian legislation of the Imperial rule.

102 κρησιμώτατα κτλ. (774,10) explains why Eusebius wanted to report on events from the beginning of the persecution.

103 Here, Eusebius said that he would only add ἃ πρόωτοις μὲν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς γένοιτ' ἂν πρὸς ὠφελείας (742,5-7) to the general history. The continuation shows that he had martyrologies in mind which clearly implies a Christian readership. There is no evidence to indicate that this is not also the case with τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις in 774,10. R. Laqueur makes out another case, however: "in 774,10 zielt er [Euseb] auf die Kaiser- und Reichsgeschichte; wenn deren Lektüre aber von Nutzen sein soll, dann ist bei den ἐντευξόμενοι an die hierfür verantwortlichen Personen, d.h. in erster Linie an die Kaiser gedacht, die er dann auch im folgenden darauf hinweist, dass der Kampf gegen die Christen zum Unheil des Reiches ausschlägt" (*op. cit.*, p. 49). Whether this interpretation is correct depends, ultimately, on the intentions behind "die Kaiser- und Reichsgeschichte", which Eusebius gave in the passage that follows. We shall simply point out that nothing in the existing context justifies the assumption that Eusebius was here thinking of a new readership: the Roman authorities headed by the Emperors.

104 Cf. R. Laqueur, who was the first to make this perceptive observation: "In der Tat folgt eine *erneute* Darstellung der Verfolgungszeit nur mit dem Unterschied, das nunmehr diese Periode in ihrer Auswirkung auf Kaiser und Reich geschildert wird, während sie vorher vom Standpunkt der Märtyrer aus betrachtet wird" (*op. cit.*, p. 48).

105 Rufinus translated κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους πόλεις (770,29) by *per loca sua*, probably because he felt that the next passage did not deal exclusively with martyrs from the conspicuous cities.

addition, he noted that Lucian was martyred in Nicomedia, so that he belongs, in fact, with the martyrs in Nicomedia. Therefore Rufinus introduced his note about him with *post hunc* [sc. Anthimus] (773.1). He must also have been surprised to find Eusebius stating that Lucian gave testimony at his martyrdom – all martyrs did. At any rate, he created a passage which lists, clearly and concisely, the reasons for mentioning him: *post hunc vita et studiis semper martyr Lucianus presbyter Antiochenus, sed tunc apud Nicomediam Christi regnum verbis gestisque praedicans* (773.1-3). Rufinus completely omitted βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος (772.4). The reason probably was that he knew from his more detailed knowledge of the circumstances surrounding Lucian's martyrdom that his apology had been made to the provincial governor and not to the Emperor, as stated later in his translation of IX,6,3.

Eusebius's account in *cap.* 13,3-4 (772.6-16) was subjected to drastic abbreviation by Rufinus. He omitted ἐπὶ Φοινίκης (772.6), perhaps because he regarded it as a place name which was hardly necessary in the context; to Latin readers it would, in any case, mean nothing. On the other hand, he must have omitted τῶν λογικῶν Χριστοῦ θρημμάτων ποιμένες (772.7-8) because he considered the phrase completely superfluous, since a statement had already made it clear that the essence of the matter was *ecclesiarum principes* (771,21). Rufinus perhaps felt that τὰ πάντα θεοφιλεῖς (772.7) was too general because in his reference to Tyrannion he replaced it by *a prima aetate in Christi institutionibus enutritus* (773.4-5). This phrase only applies to Tyrannion, however. Unlike Eusebius, Rufinus mentioned neither Tyrannion nor Zenobius's martyrdom in his version, only Silvanus's death by wild animals. The reason for these alterations is not clear.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps Rufinus thought that they would help him preserve the character of the account as a list of names. At any rate, his version reads: *apud Tyrum vero nobilissimus in martyribus et a prima aetate in Christi institutionibus enutritus Tyrannio eiusdem episcopus, Zenobius a Sidona presbyter et Silvanus Emisenorum ecclesiae episcopus,¹⁰⁷ qui in sua civitate bestiarum morsibus absumptus¹⁰⁸ martyrum sociatus est choris¹⁰⁹* (773,3-7).

In *cap.* 13,5 (772.16-20), Eusebius claims that all the representatives of the martyrs suffered death in the copper mines in Phaeno, but in Rufinus Silvanus's death takes place in Gaza, where he was bishop. Rufinus added, on his own account, that several clerics were beheaded along with him. The cause of this deviation is difficult to discover, but Rufinus rejoined his source when he mentioned the martyrs in Phaeno with only one difference, that he gave the number of people executed as 40, instead of

39 in Eusebius. The passage also refers to *clerici*, although it is not stated explicitly. Further proof that Rufinus saw the passage as a list of clerical martyrs can also be found in his mention of Peleus and Nilus's martyrdoms at the stake. Here he translated μεθ' ἑτέρων (772,19-20) by *cum plurimis clericis* (773,10). His entire version reads: *in Palaestina¹⁰⁰ vero primus Silvanus episcopus apud Gazam¹⁰¹ cum plerisque clericorum, in metallo autem Fanensi quadraginta simul capite caesi, Peleus vero et Nilus episcopi¹⁰² cum plurimis clericis igni consumpti* (773,7-10).

Rufinus found no reason to reproduce Eusebius's remark in 772,22-23 that he would report on Pamphilus's life and death in another work. It was of no interest to his readers, because the Pamphilus biography had not been translated into Latin. He therefore created a version which connects, in point of style, the mention of Pamphilus much more closely than in Eusebius to the previous account: *in eorum numero habeatur etiam Caesariensis ecclesiae flos nobilissimus et fructus doni caelestis¹⁰³ Pamphilus* (773,10-12).

In his translation of Eusebius's note on the Egyptian martyrs in *cap.* 13,7 (772,24-774,1), Rufinus diverged at several points from his source. τῶν τελειωθέντων (772,24-25) was omitted as superfluous. He obviously felt that it was necessary, however, to clarify the meaning of θεῖόν τι χρῆμα διδασκάλων τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας (772,26). He supplied an explanation in his translation: *apud Alexandriam vero et per omnem Aegyptium vel Thebaida primus velut lucifer quidam inter astra consurgens Petrus eiusdem urbis episcopus, doctrina, moribus et vita praecipuus* (773,12-15). As he continued to work with Eusebius's text, Rufinus apparently came to understand σὺν αὐτῷ προεσβυτέρων κτλ. (772,27-28) to

106 Rufinus thus completely omitted τῶ δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας κτλ. (772,12-16).

107 This is a translation of τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Εἰμυσαν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος (772,9-10).

108 Eusebius limited himself to writing θηρίων βορά (772,10-11). Rufinus omitted μαρτύρων (772,11), probably because he found it superfluous in this context, which only discusses ecclesiastical rulers.

109 Rufinus mentioned only Silvanus's martyrdom, perhaps for the simple reason that the source reports it immediately after mentioning his name.

110 Here, too, Rufinus omitted τῶν μαρτύρων (772,16), probably again because he regarded it as superfluous in this case.

111 This is a translation of ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Γάζαν ἐκκλησιῶν (772,16-17).

112 Rufinus did not translate Αἰγύπτιοί τε αὐτόθι (772,19). He surely found the words unnecessary in this context, which mentioned the martyrdoms that took place in Palestine.

113 τὸ μέγα κλέος (772,20-21) and τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς θανασιώτατος (772,22) both form the basis of *flos nobilissimus*. He used *fructus doni caelestis*, perhaps because he wished to suggest this as a basic tenet in the description of Pamphilus in his biography.

mean that many other presbyters from Alexandria had suffered martyrdom. The question then is: why are these three presbyters in particular listed by name? His translation gives us the answer: *et cum eo* [sc. Petrus] *presbyter Faustus et Dius et Ammonius, nec merito nec institutionibus nec martyrio dispares* (773,15-16).

We should also note that Rufinus completely omitted οἱ πρὸς τῶν κατὰ χώραν καὶ τόπον παροικιῶν μνημονεύονται (774,1-2). He may have felt that the words referred to martyrs in general, so the statement had no place in a section discussing clerical martyrs. Instead, he composed this version: *Phileas quoque et Hesychius et Pachomius ac Theodorus episcopi ex urbibus Aegypti ceterique cum ipsis innumerabiles nobilissima pertulere martyria* (773,16-775,1).

Rufinus's translation of 774,2-7 is a much abbreviated form of the original: *quorum per singula agones describere, ne nos opus nostrum iusto longius dilatemus, suis civibus, qui ad dicendum probe pollent et praesentes tunc aderant, derelinquo* (775,1-4). He omitted to translate ἀνὰ τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην (774,2-3), probably because he felt that the phrase introduced a new concept where it should, in fact, have established a natural link to the previous lines. The remark saying that Eusebius would describe events, which he himself had witnessed, in another work was probably omitted by Rufinus because the work in question was not available in a Latin translation. We might note, by the way, that Rufinus went further than Eusebius; he demanded not only that those who described the struggles of the martyrs should be eye-witnesses, but also that they should have a talent for this kind of work.

Rufinus omitted the whole of *cap.* 13,8 (774,7-10) in his version, no doubt because he felt that the passage was completely out of place in the context; the account does not go on, as is suggested here, to give a "palinode", just as τὰ τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ διωγμοῦ κτλ. (774,9-10) is puzzling in the light of the account up to this point.

If we compare the divergences from the source which characterize Rufinus's version of *cap.* 13,1-8, we see that they are all motivated by the desire to create a clear, continuous text corresponding with the previous account. Or, in other words, Rufinus wished to remove the jarring elements which he had noted in his source. And in this, we might add, he was largely successful.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ His reliance on the original has, however, in some cases left ambiguities in Rufinus's version. Thus *in metallo autem Fanensi quadraginta simul capite caesi* (773,9) and *cum ipsis innumerabiles nobilissima pertulere martyria* (773,17-775,1) seem, on the face of it, to refer to martyrs generally rather than clerical martyrs.

Cap. 13,9-15,2 (774,11-788,7): Christianity and politics in the Roman Empire

In *cap.* 13,9 (774,11-17), Eusebius describes the conditions in the Roman Empire before the persecutions.¹ The friendly attitude of the rulers towards the Christians gave rise to extraordinary prosperity. The Emperors could celebrate their *decennalia* and *vicennalia* at spectacular festivals in joy and peace.

Eusebius here claims that the success and prosperity of the Roman Empire and its rulers depended on the Emperors' friendly and peaceful attitude towards the Church and therefore also towards the Christian God.² Eusebius does not name the Emperors, but he mentions their *decennalia* and *vicennalia*, so he must have been thinking of Diocletian and Maximian. The question is whether he referred to the tenth and twentieth anniversaries, respectively, of their rule or whether the events were in fact simply one, at which Diocletian and Maximian, as *augusti*, celebrated their *vicennalia* and Galerius and Constantius, as their *caesares*, celebrated their *decennalia*.³ The second is the most probable interpretation; the Roman Empire really only achieved peace and prosperity⁴ at the twentieth year of Diocletian's rule, not after his first ten years. Naturally, Eusebius used the term rulers⁵ to refer to the four members of the tetrarchy. In his version, therefore, all the Emperors display a friendly attitude towards the Church. It is also worth noting that he speaks very highly of their rule as being characterized by progress, prosperity and peace for the Roman Empire.

1 τὰ μὲν οὖν πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας (774,11-12).

2 There is no direct statement to this effect, but the expression ὀπίσθη ἀγαθῶν εὐφορίας καὶ εὐετηρίας ἡξίωτο (774,13) implies that God had given the Roman Empire peace and good years because the Emperors had recognized Him.

3 Cf. W. Seston: *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie I, Guerres et réformes 284-300* (1946), p. 361-62, who presumes with good reason "la célébration collective des *vincennalia* des Augustes et des *decennalia* des Césars le 17 ou le 19 septembre 303" (p. 361).

4 We receive further proof that this is a correct impression from the tetrarchic monument which was erected for the celebration of Diocletian's *vicennalia* in the *Forum Romanum*. It emphasized the cooperation and unity between the two *augusti* and the two *caesares*.

5 In this section, Eusebius used these expressions of the Emperors: οἱ ἄρχοντες (774,12), οἱ μάλιστα τῆς καθόλου κρατοῦντες ἄρχῆς (774,14-15).

While the Imperial rule was still enjoying continual progress, according to *cap.* 13,10 (774,17-22), the rulers suddenly began a relentless war against the Christians.⁶ The persecution had not lasted fully two years when quite unexpected events in the government produced radical changes.⁷ He did not say so directly, but Eusebius undoubtedly believed that “the revolution” was a result of the persecution of the Christians. If this view is seen in connection with previous statements, it must mean that God punished the Empire with misfortunes because the Emperors had changed their minds and had adopted a hostile policy towards the Christians.

Eusebius gives no further details on the actual nature of the revolution. He simply explains that it occurred less than two years after the outbreak of the persecution which had taken place after the conclusion of the *vicennalia*. In *cap.* 2,4, he had already stated that the persecution began in March 303. The “revolution” must therefore have happened no later than early 305.⁸ We have no evidence, however, that any event with consequences as far-reaching as those indicated by Eusebius took place at this time. On the other hand, we do know from Lactantius that Diocletian and Maximian abdicated on 1st May 305.⁹ It is therefore natural to suppose that Eusebius had this event in mind, but in that case, his dating is imprecise.¹⁰

The phrase τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει (774,21-22) must mean that, instead of the peace and prosperity which reigned in the Roman Empire according to Eusebius’s previous comments, strife and affliction now set in – that is, political and economic chaos. We know that the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian was not the direct cause of any such conditions. But Maxentius’s election as Emperor in Rome in October 306 did provoke a civil war and caused the whole of the West to withdraw from Galerius’s authority as *maximus augustus*.¹¹ Not until then, in other words, do we find a situation which fits Eusebius’s description. This seems to indicate that no absolute precision must be expected from his account,¹² despite its chronological dates. He has simply tried to give a brief summary without details of the results of the events which followed the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian and which, in time, led to political and economic chaos in the Roman Empire. This is the point of the statement.

In *cap.* 13,11 (774,22-776,3), Eusebius reports that the first Emperor was stricken with a fateful disease which made him insane. He abdicated along with the one next to him in the hierarchy. But before this happened,

the entire government had been deeply divided, which was a completely new situation.

The section begins with a γάρ: Eusebius obviously intended to provide a further explanation of καί τι περι τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν κτλ. (774,21-22). This means that the “revolution” must consist of the Emperors’ abdication which seems a definite anti-climax. It is also strange that, whereas Eusebius talked of the Emperors as one single group in *cap.* 13,9-10, here he mentions Emperors who occupied first and second place respectively in the Imperial hierarchy. There can be no doubt that he was referring to Diocletian and Maximian here. The striking fact is, however, that he discussed the “tetrarchy” with its hierarchical structure as if it were known to his readers – although he had made no previous reference to this institution.

οὕτω δὲ ταῦθ’ οὕτω πέπρακτο (776,1) can only mean that the abdication had not taken place before internal strife caused the Imperial

6 Eusebius used the phrase ἀθρόως τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰρήνης μεταθέμενοι (774,19) to state that the persecutions of the Christians began very suddenly and unexpectedly. This excludes the idea that the persecutions began when Christian soldiers were expelled from the army, as described in *cap.* 2.2. This could indicate that the description was added later than *cap.* 13,9-10.

7 τι περι τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν νεώτερον γεγονός τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει (774,21-22). The interpretation of this passage is made difficult by the ambiguity of ἀρχή. The word can be taken to mean “empire”, as G. Bardy, for example, does in this translation: “... une sorte de révolution se produisait pour l’empire entier” (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 30). Since Eusebius has just used the expression οἱ μάλιστα τῆς καθόλου κρατοῦντες ἀρχῆς (774,14-15), it would be natural to assume that ἀρχή stands for “government” here too. The new and unexpected event thus concerned the leaders of the Imperial government.

8 This of course only applies if he also had that date in mind.

9 *De mortibus persecutorum*, XIX, 1-3.

10 “The revolution” had therefore taken place not, as Eusebius stated, almost two years after the outbreak of the persecution, but more than two years after.

11 *De mort. pers.* XXVI - XXVII. Cf. also my book *Maximinus*, pp. 103 ff.

12 This is true even though Eusebius made the persecutions begin after the *vicennalia* festivities had finished. Since we know that these took place on 20th November 303, the date for the beginning of the persecutions must be incorrect, as R. Laqueur has pointed out, *op.cit.*, p. 53. But no great importance need be attached to precise dating here. When Eusebius explained that the Emperors celebrated their *decennalia* and *vicennalia* in complete peace, he probably wished simply to emphasize the point that the Roman Empire experienced a happy and stable period of peace during the Diocletian tetrarchy, until the persecution of the Christians began. The chronological inaccuracies can be ascribed to Eusebius’s rhetoric.

government to disintegrate.¹³ Eusebius undoubtedly saw a connection between the abdication and the disruption within the Imperial rule even though he never made any direct statement to that effect. Perhaps he was thinking of the conflict which arose, according to Lactantius, between Diocletian and Galerius and which manifested itself in their differing opinions as to the composition of the new tetrarchy.¹⁴ The eventual decision was at the root of the discord between the Emperors, and this led, as a further consequence, to the schism of the Empire which took place in the autumn of 307. This interpretation also renders meaningful Eusebius's remark on the schism: *πράγμα μὴδ' ἄλλοτὲ πω πάλαι γεγονὸς μνήμη παραδεδομένον* (776,2-3): the tetrarchy of Emperors had indeed functioned as a single unit under the leadership of Diocletian but this was not true of the Roman Empire in general.

No interpretation of 776,1-3 will, however, alter the fact that this passage is obviously a repetition of Eusebius's statement in 774,21-23 (*καί τι περὶ κτλ.*). But even though they are parallel accounts, they display a different bias. *Cap.* 13,10 argues on the basis of the concept that the political and economic dissolution in the Roman Empire was punishment for the Emperors' persecution of the Christians. The split in the government described in *cap.* 13,11 is, on the other hand, a consequence of Diocletian's decision to abdicate while deranged by illness. When seen in isolation, the second passage contains no indication of divine justice.¹⁵ On the contrary, it is a factual account of the reason for Diocletian's abdication and its consequences.

We have shown that no natural link exists between *cap.* 13,9-10 and *cap.* 13,11. If we compare the second section with *cap.* 13,10, it seems quite clear that originally they were not designed to be read together. In 774,21-22, Eusebius probably only wished to suggest in rather general terms that an alteration in the government had resulted in chaos throughout the Empire. Later, he felt he should be more specific – possibly because he had obtained material which gave detailed information on this point. At any rate, on the basis of the full explanation which Eusebius gave in *cap.* 13,11, we can conclude that he must have found his information in an account describing the Diocletian tetrarchy, the background for Diocletian's abdication and its consequences – and that this account must have been “political”, not “religious”. This is the only possible explanation for the divergence of *cap.* 13,11 from *cap.* 13,9-10. But not only that! Eusebius only wanted to use his insertion to give further information on the revolution in the government at which he had hinted in 774,21, but in fact, it

caused the emphasis of the account to shift towards purely political developments.

Cap. 13,12 (776,3-9) explains that Constantius, who had been a lenient ruler, well disposed towards Christianity, died a natural death and left his son, Constantine, as *imperator* and *augustus*.¹⁶ Constantius was declared divine and received every honour due to an Emperor – and he was the best and most lenient of Emperors.¹⁷

When seen in relation to the account up to this point, this section seems surprising. Previously, Eusebius had talked of the Emperors without mentioning their names, but he now abandoned this principle. In *cap.* 13,9-10, he had stated that the Emperors had given up their friendly attitude towards the Christians and started a relentless war against them, but now he is saying that Constantius was well disposed towards them throughout his whole life.¹⁸ If we consider the fact that Eusebius had viewed the political and economic chaos as a result of the persecution of the Christians, his description of Constantius's lenient rule also comes as a complete surprise. But the account is puzzling in yet another respect. Eusebius had just spoken of the split in the Imperial government which took place in connection with the abdication of Diocletian and Maxi-

13 καὶ διχῆ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀρχῆς διαιρεῖται (776,1-2). When seen out of context, this passage can be interpreted in various ways. διχῆ can either be taken literally or regarded as reinforcing διαιρεῖται, giving the meaning of “divided or rent in two” and “rent asunder” respectively. ἀρχή can mean “empire”, which then suggests the concept that the Roman Empire was divided into two parts or just rent asunder. If, however, the word is taken to mean “government”, then the college of Emperors was in fact split apart. We have shown that ἀρχή stood for “government” in the passage just before this, and therefore we may reasonably assume that the word should be understood in the same way here.

14 R. Laqueur rightly pointed this out: “Unmittelbar hintereinander folgen sich also in 774,20-21 und 776,1-3 die zwei identischen Gedankengänge: “noch kaum war das geschehen, als das und das eintrat, ein unerhörtes Ereignis.” Offenkundig ist der eine die Kopie des anderen” (*op. cit.*, p. 53). We must add, though, that the two are not as completely parallel as he seems to suggest. 776,1-3, for example, in contrast to 774,20-21, mentions only the split in the government, but not the consequences.

15 This is not contradicted by Eusebius's use of the expression νόσου ... ἐπισχηψάσης (774,22-23).

16 παῖδα γνήσιον Κωνσταντῖνον αὐτοκράτορα καὶ Σεβαστὸν ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπών (776,5-6).

17 χορηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλέων (776,9).

18 Whereas Eusebius spoke of τὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων φίλιά τε ἦν ἡμῖν καὶ εἰρηναῖα (774,12-13) before the outbreak of the persecution, he wrote of Constantius τῷ ... θεῖῳ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα (776,4-5). He probably used this expression because he wanted to indicate that Constantius should really be regarded as a Christian.

mian, so his readers must have been in doubt as to the exact nature of Constantius's relationship to the tetrarchy. Constantius is mentioned here for the first time, and the passage states quite clearly that he died a short time after the abdication.¹⁹

Even though this section appears completely unmotivated in the context, it was probably intended to contrast Constantius with Diocletian and Maximian. They abdicated because of Diocletian's insanity, but Constantius died with his Imperial honour untarnished. They left a disunited Imperial government, whereas Constantius's good rule was continued by Constantine, his legitimate heir to the Imperial power. The emphasis of the account is placed on Constantius's death, which became a happy one because he had accepted Christianity. In other words, the important fact is that Eusebius does not regard the tetrarchy here as a unit in which the individual members are collectively responsible for the persecution of the Christians; he discusses each Emperor's individual attitude to Christianity. The difference is so marked that it is difficult to believe that *cap.* 13,12 originally belonged with *cap.* 13,9-11. It must be a later expansion of the text, written because Eusebius realized that the members of the tetrarchy could not be discussed collectively in an account of their attitudes to Christianity. *Cap.* 13,12 must have been intended as a correction to the account in *cap.* 13,9-11.

Eusebius adds that Constantius was made divine, as the first Emperor of the tetrarchy,²⁰ and celebrated as *divus*.²¹ This information must also serve, in the context, to show that he was greatly appreciated by the entire population – including the heathens. But Eusebius was a Christian and regarded the apotheosizing of an Emperor as anathema,²² so it seems strange that he mentioned this in detail, even more so because the text could lead to the assumption that Constantius was a heathen. The explanation must lie in the fact that Eusebius followed a heathen source here.²³ He mentions Constantine *en passant* as Constantius's legitimate heir although, strictly speaking, this goes beyond the scope of the section on Constantius. This fact suggests very strongly that he was depending on his source, which must have contained an account of Constantius as the best of the rulers in the tetrarchy;²⁴ he was celebrated for his good rule and the dynasty founded by him. Constantine appears here as the legitimate heir to the title of Emperor,²⁵ so the source must have been intended as a rejection of the tetrarchical form of government established by Diocletian.²⁶

The remark about Constantius τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα (διαθέ-

μενος) (776,4-5) diverges markedly from the description of his apotheosizing and celebration as *divus*. The contradiction is best explained if we regard the remark as a later addition. Originally, the source simply described Constantius's wise rule for which he deserved apotheosizing. Since Eusebius was convinced that there was an inextricable connection between the fate of an Emperor and his attitude to Christianity, he could draw no other conclusion from the account on Constantius's wise rule and happy death than that he had accepted Christianity. Eusebius wanted to emphasize this clearly and therefore inserted τῷ τε θείῳ λόγῳ προσφιλέστατα. But his Christianizing of the source was not enough to erase its original heathen character.

Cap. 13,13 (776,9-18) also discusses Constantius. The readers are informed that he was the only Emperor to rule worthily, had been well disposed towards everyone and, because of this, had a happy and blessed death, since he died as Emperor, leaving a very clever and pious son as his heir.

The structure, thought and words of this section show such great similarities with cap. 13,12 that the passage appears, on the face of it, to be a repetition.²⁷ Closer inspection reveals, however, that significant differ-

19 The introductory words in the section – χρόνου δ' οὐ πλείστου μεταξύ γενομένου (776,3) – must refer to the time of Diocletian and Maximian's abdication.

20 πρῶτός τε ἐν θεοῖς ἀνιγορεύετο παρ' αὐτοῖς (776,7). By παρ' αὐτοῖς, Eusebius must have meant the tetrarch Emperors and not Roman Emperors in general.

21 When, immediately after the mention of the apotheosizing, we read that ἀπάσης μετὰ θάνατον, ὅση βασιλεῖ τις ἂν ὠφειλέτο, τιμῆς ἡξιωμένος (776,8-9), we are to understand that Constantius was worshipped as a *divus*. This probably took place through the *sodalitates* which existed for this purpose.

22 This refers to the mention of Herodes Agrippa, who appeared as divine, as described by Eusebius, in agreement with Josephus, in *lib.* II,10.

23 R. Laqueur pointed this out, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

24 The expression πρῶτός ... παρ' αὐτοῖς shows that the source must also have mentioned the tetrarch Emperors.

25 When Eusebius described Constantine as παῖς γνήσιος (776,5), he emphasized the fact that the rank of Emperor was Constantine's right because he was Constantius's legitimate son.

26 The procedure in *Dispositio Diocletiani* for the choice of new rulers broke with the dynastic principle – see my book *Maximinus*, pp. 33-34. Constantius's attitude to the Diocletian tetrarchy and Constantius's dynasty are rather obscure, probably because Eusebius only took from his source material which would serve his immediate purpose: to show that Constantius died a happy death because he was a Christian or at least, was well disposed towards the Christians.

27 This is Eduard Schwartz's characterization of the section in *Eusebius* II, 2, 776.

ences exist between the two parts of the text. In this section, Eusebius describes Constantius's excellent rule more vividly than in *cap.* 13,12. He also reports in detail on the facts that Constantius did not participate in the persecution of the Christians, and that he protected them and ensured that Diocletian's anti-Christian legislation was not implemented.²⁸ Constantius's happy death is also described in more detail than previously and the suggestion is made that, in this way, he was rewarded for his good, pro-Christian government.²⁹ We hear nothing of his deification nor of the cult of which, as *divus*, he should have been the object. Instead, we are told that his death was remarkable because he was the only one to die with honour as Emperor, and that his heir was in every respect extremely clever and pious.³⁰

It is evident, therefore, that, despite the obvious similarities with the account in *cap.* 13,12, *cap.* 13,13 has a much more pronounced Christian slant. This conclusion provides an explanation for the origin of the section. After writing *cap.* 13,12, Eusebius must have thought that he had failed to offer convincing proof that Constantius had taken no part whatsoever in the persecution of the Christians. He probably also felt that the reference to Constantius's deification and to his being worshipped as *divus* could throw doubt on his Christian attitude. Finally, the short remark on Constantine probably seemed quite coincidental in the context, and the fact that his qualities were not mentioned at all might appear strange. At any rate, he felt the need to write a new description of Constantius to improve on these shortcomings. He did not introduce it to replace the first account, however; he added it as an explanatory note³¹ and did not worry about the fact that *cap.* 13,13 then seemed to be a repetition of *cap.* 13,12.

Cap. 13,14 *init.* (776,18-778,2) states that Constantine was proclaimed the highest *imperator* and *augustus*,³² by the army at the very beginning, and indeed much earlier by the Almighty God himself, and that he eagerly adopted his father's attitude to Christianity.³³

This section begins with the words τοῦτου παῖς (776,18). They seem quite superfluous in the existing text, when we consider the fact that Eusebius had just mentioned him as Constantius's γνήσιος παῖς (776,5). But they make better sense if we see them as referring to *cap.* 13,12: having described Constantius's death, Eusebius continued his account by mentioning his son Constantine.³⁴ This provides further evidence in support of the assumption that *cap.* 13,13 constitutes a later insertion which interrupts the original continuity between *cap.* 13,12 and 13,14.

It seems surprising that Eusebius stated, first, that the army proclaimed Constantine Emperor, only to continue to say that God had bestowed the same honour upon him at a much earlier point in time. When he used the expression *παμβασιλεύς* (776,20) to indicate that Constantine's ruling power had been derived from and assigned to him by God himself, we would expect this statement, as the more important one, to have appeared first. Moreover, Eusebius's use of the verb *ἀναγορευθεῖς* (776,20) seems strange in this connection since, strictly speaking, it only applies to the proclamation of an Emperor by the army. This instance of grammatical and linguistic inappropriateness is easily explained, however, since *καὶ ἔτι πολὺ τούτων πρότερον πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ* (776,19-20) must be regarded as a later addition.³⁵ Eusebius inserted

28 The short note *τὸν πάντα βίον κτλ.* (776,4-5) was thus spelt out in 776,9-15.

29 *τέλος εὐδαιμον καὶ τρισμακάριον ἀπέλιψεν τοῦ βίου* (776,15-16).

30 *μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας εὐμενῶς καὶ ἐπιδόξως ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ γνησίῳ παιδί πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ τελευτήσας* (776,16-18). The expression describes Constantine not only as honourable but also as very pious – and this must be taken in the Christian meaning in this context.

31 This passage constitutes an addition, which is evident also from the stylistic fact that the section forms a relative clause to *χρηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλέων* (776,9). The expression really seems quite superfluous as a conclusion to the account in *cap.* 13,12, and therefore it should perhaps also be considered an addition – inserted at the same time as *cap.* 13,12 in order to provide a natural link to the original description in *cap.* 13,12.

32 *βασιλεὺς τελεώτατος καὶ Σεβαστός* (776,18-19). The Latin equivalent would be *imperator maximus et augustus*, which implies that he was invested with the supreme power in the Empire.

33 *ζηλωτὴν ἑαυτὸν τῆς πατρικῆς περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσεβείας κατεστήσατο* (778,1-2). It is difficult to decide whether *ζηλωτής* should be understood to mean that Constantine was “an emulator of his father's piety”, as in Lawlor-Oulton's translation (*Eusebius* I, 271), or to state, simply, that he followed it. The best rendering would probably be that he zealously followed etc. Nor is it clear whether the expression *ἢ περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον εὐσέβεια* means a Christian attitude or simply suggests sympathy for Christianity. The first interpretation seems the most natural, but perhaps Eusebius used a vague expression on purpose. At any rate, it is important to maintain that Eusebius did not distinguish here between Constantius's and Constantine's religious attitudes.

34 Eusebius did indeed, in *cap.* 13,12, speak of *παῖς γνήσιος Κωνσταντῖνος* (776,5), but this is no repetition, if *Κωνσταντῖνος* in 776,18 is regarded as a later insertion linking *cap.* 13,14 to *cap.* 13,13, which does not list Constantine's name.

35 This interpretation which is based on an analysis of the present text, is further confirmed in the *Appendix* in 797, 6-7, where we find the original version, word for word, which provided the basis for this reconstruction. For a more detailed discussion of this question, see my article “The so-called *Appendix* to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII”, *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XXXIV, 1983, p. 185 f.

it into the original text to avert the impression that Constantine owed his Imperial rank to the army, an impression which Eusebius regarded as false.

When the army elected an Emperor they assigned *imperium* to him.³⁶ Therefore, Eusebius's mention of the soldiers' proclamation of Constantine to the title of *augustus* runs counter, strictly speaking, not only to the heavenly proclamation but also to the dynastic principle of inheritance, which we met in *cap.* 13,12. But Eusebius probably did not think of the proclamation by the army in its original and proper meaning. He probably wanted to say that the army approved of Constantine as the legitimate heir to the Imperial throne because of his sonship.³⁷

In *cap.* 13,14 *fin.* – 15 *init.* (778,2-7), Eusebius reports that Licinius³⁸ was then made *imperator et augustus*³⁹ by decision of the rulers. This distressed Maximin who was only recognized as *caesar*⁴⁰ at the time. As the great tyrant that he was, he made himself *augustus*.⁴¹

This section constitutes a unit dominated by the contrast between Licinius and Maximin. It was designed to show that Licinius was the only legitimate *augustus*, whereas Maximin's title was of his own making and therefore the manifestation of a usurper's act. Even though Eusebius stopped at these laconic statements, there can be no doubt that he was referring to the congress of Emperors held in Carnuntum in the autumn of 308 and chaired by the Emperor Diocletian. Licinius was appointed *augustus* at this congress, a decision against which Maximin, Galerius's *caesar*, protested by making himself *augustus*.⁴² The interesting fact is that Eusebius's account implies recognition of the tetrarchy re-established by Diocletian in Carnuntum. In other words, Licinius is depicted here, in contrast to Maximin, as Diocletian's legitimate heir.

This section refers to no total declaration of enmity against Maximin. He was the legitimate *caesar*, recognized by all, and his one offence was this: instead of accepting the Emperors' choice of Licinius as *augustus*, he protested against it and arrogated to himself the title of *augustus*. On this basis, Eusebius's characterization of Maximin as τὰ μάλιστα τυραννικὸς ὄν (778,5-6) seems out of all proportion – particularly because he had never mentioned him before. The discrepancy between the description of Maximin as an absolute tyrant and his offence must, however, have arisen because Eusebius added the characterization at a later stage. He must have felt that it was needed to provide a link between this section and the comprehensive description of Maximin as a tyrant *par excellence*, which appears in *cap.* 14,7-16 (780,22-786,2). And the insertion is most certainly

appropriate; without it, readers would be surprised by the account in *cap.* 14, because then they would have heard of him simply as a legitimate *caesar* whose only crime had been to proclaim himself *augustus* in order to counter Licinius's appointment.

In all other respects, this section is a purely political account discussing the question whether Licinius or Maximin had the right to call himself *augustus*. It has no connection, however, to the account up to this point. If we compare the section with the fact that Eusebius stated, without further explanation, that Licinius became *augustus* ὑπὸ κοινῆς ψήφου τῶν κρατούντων (778,2-3), the comparison indicates that he drew on a fuller account giving a detailed description of the events to which he merely alludes here. We are also justified in saying that the source from which he drew his information contained a description of Licinius as the legitimate *augustus*, who had denounced Maximin's title of *augustus* as an instance of usurpation. From other sources we know that the question of who was the legitimate *augustus* and the rightful heir to the Diocletian tetrarchy only became important after the Conference of Milan early in the year 313.⁴³ Eusebius's source can be no older than this and, therefore, the section cannot have found its way into the account before this time.

If we enquire into the place and function of this section in its present context, we must first state for a fact that it contradicts the previous de-

36 Cf. Johannes Straub: "Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike" (*Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte* 18), Stuttgart 1939, p. 19 ff.

37 This interpretation means that Eusebius was expressing exactly the same opinion which Constantine had launched in 310 and which he had made known in the panegyric held in his honour at Trier the same year. See *Paneg.* VII (310), *cap.* 2,1; 2,3; 3,1,3-4; 4,1-2; 7,3-4; 8,2-3. Cf. my book *Maximinus*, p. 129 ff.

38 ἐπὶ τούτοις (778,2) probably refers to the time when the army proclaimed Constantine as Emperor.

39 ὑπὸ κοινῆς ψήφου τῶν κρατούντων αυτοκράτωρ καὶ Σεβαστὸς ἀναπέφηνεν (778,3-4). According to this account, the Emperors' choice of Licinius was unanimous.

40 The words μόνον Καίσαρα παρὰ πάντας εἰς ἔτι τότε χρηματίζοντα (778,4-5) state that he was recognized by all – the Emperors as well as the population of the Roman Empire – as the legitimate *caesar*.

41 ὃς δὴ ὄν τὰ μάλιστα τυραννικὸς ὄν, παραρπάσας ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀξίαν, Σεβαστὸς ἦν, αὐτὸς ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ γεγονώς (778,5-7).

42 For a more detailed report on the Congress of Carnuntum, its background, progress and consequences, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 116 ff. Eusebius's description is correct, as far as Licinius and Maximin are concerned, but he omits to mention that Constantine also rejected Licinius's appointment as *augustus*.

43 For more detailed reasons, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 243 ff.

scription of Constantine. The assertion of Licinius's appointment as *augustus* implies the right of the Diocletian tetrarchy to appoint new *augusti*, whereas Constantine's claim to the title of *augustus* derived from the dynastic principle of inheritance. Eusebius no doubt chose to include both, despite their contradictory character, in order to indicate that Licinius was a legitimate Emperor, but definitely inferior to Constantine. Maximin could not be considered in this comparison at all. Thus only Constantine was *imperator maximus et augustus*. This honour was based on the heavenly nomination and the principle of dynastic succession, but Licinius was appointed *augustus* simply by a human decision – and, what is more, only after Constantine had become Emperor. Of Constantine it was only said that he was elected by the army and distinguished by his *pietas*, so Eusebius obviously wanted to emphasize that he was also superior to Licinius in these other respects. From every point of view, Constantine was *imperator maximus et augustus*.

In *cap. 13,15 fin.* (778,7-11), Eusebius reports that the man who was caught plotting to kill Constantine suffered a shameful death and was subjected to *damnatio memoriae*.

This section – probably the most difficult in the entire Church History – begins ἐν τούτῳ (778,7). The date must refer to Maximin's election of himself as *augustus* – from other sources we know that this took place in 310. Eusebius mentions no name, but he must have had Maximian in mind.

But apart from this, the section presents a number of much more difficult problems, such as the expression ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόθῃσιν ἐπανηροῖσθαι δεδηλωμένος (778,8).⁴⁴ Eduard Schwartz, who found the whole passage in 778,7-10 “bis zum Unverständlichkeit verstümmelt”,⁴⁵ felt that ἐπανηροῖσθαι demanded an object: “Aus der Geschichte muss man τὴν ἀρχὴν oder τὴν βασιλείαν ergänzen”.⁴⁶ He also felt that δεδηλωμένος must mean that a report had already been given to the effect that Maximian had again resumed the office of Emperor.⁴⁷

R. Laqueur rejected Schwartz's interpretation completely and stated that “ἐπαναιρέομαι im Medium nicht nur “auf sich nehmen”, sondern vielfach “töten” und zwar besonders in heimtückischem Sinne [bedeutet] (Polyp. II, 19,9; VIII, 12,2). Damit fällt zunächst die Notwendigkeit einer Ergänzung von τὴν ἀρχὴν oder dergl. fort. Was aber das δεδηλωμένος betrifft, so bezeichnet es auch den Mann, von dem es offenbar wurde, dass er etwas tat. Danach scheint mir folgende Interpretation notwendig: “Der Mann, von dem es offenbar wurde, dass er nach seiner Abdankung getötet hat“.⁴⁸

Lacqueur identified apparent weaknesses in Schwartz's interpretation, but his own reading is hardly tenable. If we accept his explanation of ἐπανηροῦσθαι, an object is still necessary. In his opinion Κωνσταντῖνῳ μηχανὴν θανάτου συρράπτων ἄλοῦς (778,7-8) is a later addition,⁴⁹ and Constantine, therefore, cannot be the object. Moreover, ἐπαναίρεομαι usually means "to take upon one, enter into",⁵⁰ and as ἡ ἀπόθεσις must mean that the Imperial purple was relinquished, the verb can only mean that Maximian had again taken upon himself *potestas imperii*⁵¹ as *augustus*. Since Eusebius had just spoken of the title of *augustus* when mentioning Licinius and Maximin, it would be natural to accept τὴν ἀξίαν (778,6) as the object of ἐπανηροῦσθαι. In the wide context, this reading is also required. Eusebius's words τούτου παῖς Μαξέντιος (778,11) immediately after his mention of Maximian, constitute a complete parallel to τούτου παῖς Κωνσταντῖνος (776,18). This was no accident, but a conscious plan to contrast a pious with a godless dynasty. The just and pious Constantius was succeeded by his equally just and pious son Constantine, but the godless Maximian had as his successor his son, the tyrant Maxentius. This comparison implies, however, that, as *augustus*, Maximian also controlled an empire which he could hand over to his son.

From this interpretation, it follows that δεδηλωμένος (778,8) must be taken to mean "make known", which produces the following translation: "he, of whom it was said that, after his abdication, he again assumed the Imperial purple". This could be understood, as in Schwartz, to mean that

44 This participial clause has caused considerable problems which is evident from the greatly differing translations offered, see *Eusebius Werke* II, 2, 778.

45 *Eusebius Werke* II, 3, p. LIII.

46 *ibid.* This interpretation can be found not just in Rufinus, but even in an early version in Henri Valois: *Sub id tempus Maximianus quem post depositum imperium iterum purpuram sumpsisse retulimus* (PG XX, 2, p. 782).

47 Eduard Schwartz drew the following conclusion: "Dann wird auf eine Erzählung vom Tode von den Abenteuern Maximians nach seiner Abdankung 305 verwiesen: sie ist jetzt spurlos verschwunden. Also hat Euseb aus officiösen Rücksichten diese Erzählung gestrichen und an der Erzählung vom Tode Maximians corrigiert, aber so unklar und undeutlich, dass die Abschreiber keinen verständlichen Text zuwege brachten" (*Eusebius* II, 3, p. LIII).

48 Laqueur (*op. cit.*, p. 60) specifically criticized "die von Schwartz empfohlene Interpretation", because "sie doch anerkanntermassen mit dem überlieferten Text nicht zu vereinigen [ist], und der Hinweis auf eine nachträglich gestrichene Stelle ist deshalb wenig plausibel, weil schwer zu sagen wäre, wo sich diese Stelle befunden haben sollte".

49 See p. 61.

50 See Liddell-Scott, p. 607.

51 Cf. *Paneg.* VII (310), 15.1.

at an earlier stage Eusebius had reported that Maximian had resumed the title of *augustus*, but that later he had omitted this section. As we have pointed out, however, with Laqueur, that this cannot be proved, the phrase is more naturally explained as Eusebius's reproduction of a source which had previously given detailed information on Maximian's resumption of the Imperial purple.

It seems strange that Eusebius says, first, that Maximian was taken prisoner during an attempt on Constantine's life and then reports that, having abdicated, Maximian resumed the rank of *augustus* – the reverse order would have been natural.⁵² Furthermore, the accumulation of participles *συρράπτων ἄλοῦς ... δεδηλωμένος* (778,8) is stylistically clumsy, so the question arises whether this is a revision. In that case, it would be natural to see *Κωνσταντίνῳ μηχανὴν θανάτου συρράπτων ἄλοῦς* (778,7-8) as a later addition. The original text would then have read like this: *ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόθεσιν ἐπανηροῦσθαι δεδηλωμένος αἰσχίστῳ καταστρέφει θανάτῳ* (778,7-9).⁵³ Later, Eusebius felt that this note was too laconic and added that it was caused by Maximian's abortive attempt on Constantine's life. This addition also enabled him to establish a connection between this and the previous section in which Constantine was mentioned.

We find no explanation to account for the shameful nature of Maximian's death. Eusebius might have been thinking of the actual way in which he died, but he could also be referring to the fact that Maximian was the object of *damnatio memoriae*. Most importantly, at any rate, we must make it quite clear that the unsuccessful attempt on Constantine's life led to his death. In other words, it was caused by political, not religious, matters.

When Eusebius says of Maximian that he was the first (*πρώτου τούτου*, 778,9) to become the object of *damnatio memoriae*, he must mean that he was the first of the rulers in the tetrarchy to be disgraced in this way.⁵⁴ The expression is thus parallel to *πρωτός ἐν θεοῖς ἀνηγορεύετο παρ' αὐτοῖς* (776,7): Constantius was apotheosized, but Maximian was condemned to eternal oblivion.

Our analysis of *cap.* 13,9-15 has proved that the account in no way constitutes an entity; it contains material which is dominated by varying points of view. This leads to the question of the composition of this section, but we do not need to discuss that problem in this connection.⁵⁵ On the other hand, it would be useful, for the sake of clarity, to examine Rufinus's

version of this difficult section at this point, but we must, of course, bear in mind that it is inextricably bound up with the following description in *cap.* 14,1-14 of Maxentius, Maximin and their tyrannical rule.

Rufinus was not at all happy with *cap.* 13,9-15. He wanted a connection between the description of the Roman Empire and its Emperors and the previous account which discussed the Christian martyrs. He must also have felt that a comparatively detailed report of conditions in the Roman Empire would be out of place in a work which was intended to be an account of the history of the Church. He probably also felt that this section presented a new and different view of the persecution: previously, it had been regarded as God's punishment of his people because of their sins, but here the Imperial powers are said to be the cause. Finally, Rufinus must have noticed that the section contained repetitions, contradictions and far too many points for which insufficient information was given. These critical observations left Rufinus no choice but to recast radically Eusebius's original.

As previously mentioned, Rufinus completely omitted *cap.* 13,8, because Eusebius did not fulfil his promise to give the "palinode" and relate what had happened from the beginning. Similarly, Rufinus found that he only needed a few incidents from the account in *cap.* 13,9-11 for his own translation. But most of all, he wanted to emphasize his view that the persecution was God's punishment of the Christians for their sins. This did not mean that the anti-Christian Emperors were blameless. Rufinus had a very clear interpretation of the situation: God used the Emperors as his tools to chastise the Christians. But he did not cease to keep watch over the Emperors for this reason. When they overstepped their mandate by proceeding in a bloody fashion against the Christians, he intervened against them and punished them. Rufinus expressed these opinions in the introduction which also linked the new account closely to the previous

52 This occasioned J.E.L. Oulton to give this translation of the passage under discussion "At this time he who had resumed office again after his abdication, as we have shown, was discovered devising a plot to secure the death of Constantine etc." (*Eusebius I*, p. 271).

53 R. Laqueur reached the same result – albeit for other reasons, see *op. cit.*, p. 60-61.

54 Eusebius's phrase implies that others, apart from Maximian, were subjected to *damnatio memoriae* and this can only mean Maximin. Consequently, the description of Maximian was written after August 313 when Maximin died.

55 The question of the origins of *cap.* 13, 9-25 can in fact only be discussed in connection with the so-called *Appendix* (796,3-797,12). See my article "The so-called *Appendix* to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica VIII*", *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XXXIV, 1983, pp. 177-209.

martyrology: *Interea perturbari statum nostrum et crudeli ubique animadversione vastari aeternum pervigilemque illum non latuit oculum. et quoniam dominus quidem tradiderat familiam suam castigari paucis, cruenti vero immanitatis ministri desaevierunt in multis,*⁵⁶ *adest continuo ultrix dei dextera et illos, qui primo, dum pacem servarent ecclesiae, cum omni prosperitate imperium gubernaverant,*⁵⁷ *in tantam rerum permutationem deducit ...* (775,5-11).

Rerum permutatio appears in Rufinus's version in place of *καὶ τι περὶ τὴν ὅλην ἀρχὴν νεώτερον γεγονὸς τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει* (774,21-22). He probably preferred this short rendering because he found Eusebius's statement problematic; it is followed by a passage mentioning only the individual Emperors without describing the revolution which should have taken place in the Roman Empire. At any rate, he sees *rerum permutatio* simply as Diocletian's mad abdication together with Maximian. The point here was to show that *ultrix dei dextera* made a stand against the Christians' persecutors, and therefore Rufinus felt that Eusebius should have mentioned Galerius in this connection; in his Church History, Eusebius had pointed to him as the real instigator of the persecution – he too received severe punishment. Consequently Rufinus chose this continuation for the account, instead of *cap. 13,11: in tantam rerum permutationem deducit, ut Augustus ipse in id vanitatis atque amentiae perveniret, quo depositis cum collega pariter Augusto regni insignibus privati et plebei post imperium viverent,*⁵⁸ *ille vero, qui ei secundus in honore, postmodum etiam in primis successor fuit,*⁵⁹ *qui et incentor ac signifer nostrae persecutionis extiterat, tam multis variisque morbis et corporis tabo atque insania mentis adficeretur, ut post longos atque inextricabiles languores scelerum suorum furiis agitatus sponte vitam nefariam proderet. sed haec postmodum* (775,10-777,1).⁶⁰

Rufinus quite clearly felt that in his source the description of the consequences of Diocletian and Maximian's abdications contradicted the report on Constantius's rule. 776,1-2 (*καὶ διχῆ κτλ.*) said that the abdications had caused unheard-of conditions resembling civil war, but the statement was in fact belied by the subsequent discussion of Constantius's peaceful rule. He also felt that Eusebius confused his readers because he did not explain which parts of the Roman Empire were ruled by the Emperors in question. Rufinus thought he could avoid these shortcomings by simply omitting the whole of 776,1-3 (*οὐπω δὲ κτλ.*) and by changing *καὶ διχῆ κτλ.* to a piece of factual information that the Roman Empire was divided into an Eastern and a Western *procuratio*. Previous-

ly, Rufinus had explained that Galerius succeeded Diocletian as *augustus* in the East, and here he informs his readers that Constantius took over the *imperium* in the West from Maximian: *tunc vero in occiduis partibus, quod Maximianus, qui et Herculius,⁶¹ deposuerat, Constantius regebat imperium. in duas namque procurationes Romanum regnum fuerat divisum* (777.1-3).

Rufinus saw the detailed description of Constantius in *cap.* 13,12-13 as an unnecessary repetition which could be excluded from his translation. Moreover, he must have felt that Eusebius had paid too much attention to Constantius's rule itself – his piety should dominate the account. Therefore, he felt that it would be correct of him to omit all of *cap.* 13,12 and

56 The persecution was thus supposed to have had only a limited range.

57 Eusebius's description of the flourishing state of the Roman Empire and the Emperors' happy and peaceful rule before the persecution in 774, 13-19 was felt by Rufinus to be superfluous. It was of no interest to him in an account of God's care for His Church and so it was sufficient just to write *cum omni prosperitate imperium gubernaverant*. Rufinus saw no reason to translate the remark in 774,19-20 that the Emperors changed their minds and persecuted the Christians, and this is understandable from his point of view – it could easily give the wrong impression that the Emperors were responsible for the persecution.

58 A few details may be mentioned, e.g. that instead of τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ τῶν εἰρημίων (774,22-23) Rufinus simply wrote *Augustus ipse*, and that he translated οὐν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν δευτεροεῖς τετιμημένῳ (774,24-25) by *cum collega pariter Augusto*. He must have considered these alterations necessary, since he could not expect his readers to have any knowledge of the hierarchical order of the Diocletian tetrarchy. He also wanted to help them to understand that the abdication of the two *augusti* was the subject when he wrote, specifically, *depositis ... regni insignibus ... post imperium*. It should be noted here, too, that Rufinus did not give the names of the two *augusti*. Nor did he mention that Diocletian's *vanitas atque amentia* were the result of illness.

59 The expression *ei secundus in honore* is used to indicate that Galerius, who is not mentioned by name either, was Diocletian's *caesar*. *postmodum etiam in primis successor fuit* indicates, on the other hand, that he replaced Diocletian as *augustus* in the East. Rufinus was only thinking of affairs in the East which is evident from the very next passage, where he describes conditions *in occiduis partibus* (777.1). These alterations to the contents of his source clearly show that his knowledge of the tetrarchy and its history surpassed the information found in Eusebius.

60 Rufinus used these last words to refer to the detailed description of Galerius's illness and death in *cap.* 16,2-17,1. The two passages differ, however, in that here Rufinus mentioned Galerius's *insania mentis* and claimed that he took his own life – these features cannot be found in the later account.

61 When Rufinus added *qui et Herculius* here, although it was not in his source, he probably wished to differentiate between Maximian and Galerius – Rufinus is alone in referring to the latter also as Maximian. Nor did Eusebius ever refer to Maximian as *Herculius*, but this information we find in Lactantius's *De mortibus persecutorum*, *cap.* LII.

simply write instead *sed is multa clementia erga homines, erga deum vero religione maxima utebatur* (777,3-4).⁶² He was quite happy to use Eusebius's description of Constantius's attitude to the Church, however, as further illustration of his piety,⁶³ but he felt that it must be supplemented with an account of Maximian's persecution of the Church – Eusebius did not mention this at all. This information would serve to throw Constantius's attitude to the Church into relief. His version is as follows: *neque vero ex consortii rabie regnum suum piorum sanguine maculaverat*⁶⁴ *neque orationum domos et conventicula nostrorum*⁶⁵ *imitatus Maximiani vesaniam hostili vastatione destruxerat, quin potius cultores dei venerationi habuit et honori* (777,4-8).⁶⁶

Rufinus completely omitted any mention of Constantius's happy death in his version of the Constantius section. He simply gave this short piece of information: *unde et merito religiosus pater religiosiorem filium Constantinum regni bene parti reliquit heredem* (777,8-9). Rufinus chose to use only the last part of the expression πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ (776,17), in order to emphasize the point that the *pietas* displayed by father and son was the most important aspect of the description. In fact, he points out more explicitly than his source that Constantine surpassed his father in this.⁶⁷

Rufinus considered Eusebius's discussion of Constantine in *cap.* 13,14 *init.* (776,18-778,2) contradictory because it stated, first, that Constantine inherited the title of *augustus* from Constantius, and then that he was elected *maximus augustus* by the army and by God Himself. On the other hand, the information available to him about Constantine's rule was insufficient for writing a parallel to the description of his father's rule.⁶⁸ Rufinus therefore found it necessary to replace the account in his source with this: *at vero Constantinus, statim ut Romani regni apicem*⁶⁹ *ex paterna hereditate suscepit, mira quadam dei gratia civibus carus, exercitui acceptus, viris fortibus imitandus, facinorosis vero et ignavis terribilis fuit* (777,9-12). An interesting point here is that Rufinus mentions Constantine's good relations with the population before he talks of his popularity with the army.⁷⁰ His source⁷¹ does not include the description of Constantine as a model to the brave and courageous and as a source of terror for the cowardly and vicious. Rufinus obviously wanted to characterize him as a truly Christian Emperor who encouraged virtue and discouraged sin.⁷² But here again he is at pains to bring out piety as his most important quality: *in observantia quoque religionis longe etiam patrem vincere studuit* (777,12-779,1).⁷³

When translating Eusebius's short note on Licinius and Maximin, Rufinus followed his source quite closely: *sed et Licinius ... adsumit* (779,1-5). He omitted ὅς δὴ οὖν τὰ μάλιστα τυραννικὸς ὢν (778,5-6), probably because this remark would only confuse his readers, who had heard nothing yet about Maximin—this only happens in *cap.* 14. Perhaps he also had a feeling that the description of Maximin was not concordant

62 It is worth noting that Rufinus completely omitted any mention of Constantius's being apotheosized and celebrated as *divus*. He undoubtedly found it *mal à propos* to reproduce this piece of pagan cultic Imperial ideology – particularly as it had no place in the picture of a pious Christian Emperor – which was in fact the description that Rufinus gave.

63 χρηστότατος καὶ ἠπιώτατος βασιλέων (776,9-12) was probably omitted by Rufinus since it constituted a repetition and, moreover, placed excessive emphasis on Constantius's secular rule.

64 Rufinus used these words to rewrite καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνήσας (776,12), apparently in order to render the meaning clear.

65 With this double expression, Rufinus translated τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοὺς οἴκους (776,14). He mentioned both *orationum domi* and *conventicula*, probably because, in the Galerius edict, he translated τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο (794,16) by *conventicula, in quibus orare consueverunt* (795,12-13). Rufinus's expression must therefore be taken to mean both chapels and actual church buildings where congregations met for divine worship.

66 These last words replaced τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους φυλάξας (776,13-14). Rufinus probably felt that he must describe Constantius's motives for his treatment of the Christians.

67 He was probably guided here by 778,1-2.

68 He did not regard πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ (776,17) as sufficient in this respect.

69 Since Rufinus chose to translate βασιλεὺς τελεώτατος καὶ Σεβαστός (776,18-19) by *Romani regni apex*, the expression must mean the control of the entire Roman Empire. But from the immediately preceding passage his readers must conclude that Constantine only inherited the West from his father. The discrepancy arose when, in the first case, Rufinus simply followed Eusebius but in the second case provided information which supplemented his source and was, in fact, correct.

70 *exercitui acceptus*, if seen in isolation, could mean that the army hailed Constantine as the lawful successor to the rank of *augustus*. But in context, it probably suggested that the army supported him. Therefore, the expression is parallel to *civibus carus*.

71 *mira quadam dei gratia* was, on the other hand, inspired by πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ ἀναγορευθεῖς (776,20).

72 There is every indication that Rufinus was influenced by *Rom.* 13, 4. In that case, he was saying that, according to the Scriptures, Constantine's rule was inspired, to some extent, by Christian thinking.

73 Rufinus followed the contents of his source quite closely here and his translation of ἡ περὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον εὐσέβεια (778,1) into *observantia religionis* proves that he understood *religio* and *religiosus* in their Christian sense. Incidentally, he thereby demonstrated that paganism in his time had been superseded to such an extent that the Christians automatically used *religio* to describe their faith.

with the fact that he did actually rule as a legitimate *caesar*. Finally, he probably saw no reason to emphasize the fact that Maximin was a tyrant, as opposed to Licinius, since later in Eusebius, Licinius is described in just this condemnatory fashion. Rufinus gives the correct information in his version that Maximin was *Caesar in Orientis partibus*, again out of consideration for his readers. A desire to create a simple and easily accessible text must also have made him rewrite παραρπάσας ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀξίαν, Σεβαστὸς ἦν, αὐτὸς ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ γεγονώς (778,6-7) to read *vi raptum sibimet Augusti nomen adsumit* (779,5). It is not very obvious, however, why he replaced τῶν κρατούντων (778,3) with the more imprecise *omnium*. Perhaps he felt that the context was unclear as to which rulers were being discussed.

In *cap.* 13,15, Rufinus must have found the first passage (778,7-9) almost cryptic in its brevity, and felt that his readers would be unable to discover its meaning. Rufinus himself possessed sufficient knowledge to understand the references included in the passage, and he passed on this information in a completely independent account: *Maximianus vero, qui et Hercules,*⁷⁴ *quem paulo ante collegam fuisse Diocletiani et cum eo imperii insignia deposuisse memoravimus,*⁷⁵ *cum a filio Maxentio in urbe Roma tyrannidem tenente fuisset expulsus, ad Constantinum tamquam ad generum miserationis causa confugiens insidias ipsi, a quo religiose susceptus fuerat, molitur* (779,5-10). The lines include the information necessary to understand the course of events, and they also offered Rufinus a chance to give a specific example of Constantine as *religiosus*. Whereas the tyrannical usurper Maxentius disregarded his filial duty to his father, Constantine accepted his repudiated father-in-law out of compassion. Maximian met this magnanimity with *insidiae*, thereby proving himself to be an *irreligiosus* just like his son.

Rufinus follows his source in not specifying Maximian's *insidiae* towards Constantine. He is as reticent on this subject as on the shameful nature of Maximian's death: *in quibus [insidiis] turpiter deprehensus turpius perit* (779,10-11) and then he added immediately that this resulted in *damnatio memoriae*: *ita ut post interitum statuae eius atque imagines auferrentur et in aedibus publicis vocabula eius nominis mutarentur* (779,11-12). Even though Rufinus followed his source here, he diverged from it at a few points in order to create a clear, precise text. The most striking difference is his omission of ὡς ἀνοσίτου καὶ δυσσεβεστάτου (778,10-11), a common characteristic of a tyrant.⁷⁶ He probably introduced this change so that he could claim that Maximian's criminal behaviour towards his son-in-law led to his *damnatio memoriae*.⁷⁷

This analysis of Rufinus's translation of *cap.* 13,9-15 shows that he treated his source quite freely. His version is considerably shorter, first of all because he removed everything which seemed repetitive or irrelevant in Eusebius. But he expanded his account in several places where he felt that Eusebius's text was inadequate and insufficient. In particular, he took great care to integrate this section into the previous discussion of the persecution of the Church – in Rufinus's opinion, Eusebius had failed in this respect, both stylistically and theologically. He introduced his version, therefore, by stating that God punished the Emperors because they had, as His instruments of punishment, overstepped their mandate in their persecution of the Christians. Not only did this create a link to the previous description of the persecution, but Rufinus adapted the following account to correspond with the basic viewpoint expressed by Eusebius at the beginning of *liber VIII*: the persecution was God's punishment of a secularized Church. Furthermore, Rufinus suggested in his version that the ensuing account would describe God's punishment of the individual Emperors for their bloody treatment of the Christians. Therefore, he also had to mention Galerius as the real instigator of the persecution of the Christians and to report on Maximian's *vesania* against the Christians. Conversely, he could discard much of the political material in Eusebius, as this did not illustrate his theme.

Rufinus was not entirely successful in creating a continuous account because, despite all his alterations, he failed to eradicate completely the heterogeneous character of his source. Eusebius had wanted to demonstrate that the continuance of the Roman Empire and the Imperial power was entirely dependent on the Emperors' attitudes to the Christians and to show, at the same time, how the lives and fates of the individual

74 Contrary to Eusebius, Rufinus listed the Emperors under discussion by name.

75 In his version, Rufinus completely omitted ἐπαρηγοῦσθαι (778,8). Perhaps he felt that although Maximian's abdication had indeed been described previously, no mention had been made of his resumption of *insignia imperii* – the proof that this was Rufinus's interpretation of the word can be found in the next passage, in which he reported on Maximian's *insidiae* against Constantine. He may also have considered the information irrelevant to the account.

76 Cf. IX, 11,2 (848,16-17): δυσσεβέστατος ... καὶ θεομισέστατος τύραννος (Maximianus) ≠ *tyrannus et impius* (849,11-12).

77 Rufinus did not want to translate πρώτου ... τούτου (778,9), probably because he thought that the information, which was not very precise in itself, was completely irrelevant in the context. Eusebius's somewhat lengthy expression τὰς ἐπὶ τιμῇ κτλ. (778,9-11) deserved this rendering, however: *statuae eius atque imagines ... et in aedibus publicis vocabula eius nominis*.

Emperors depended on their having persecuted the Christians or not. Even though Rufinus had found the second aspect more relevant in a Christian context, his dependence on his source led him to describe Constantius's and Constantine's rule and to report on the disagreement between Licinius and Maximin on the question of the title of *augustus*. This last subject is particularly irrelevant as it does not involve their relationship to the Christians – strictly speaking, at this point, we do not know if they were Christian or not.

The revision to which Rufinus subjected *cap.* 13,9-15 shows that his knowledge of the Diocletian tetrarchy and its history exceeded the information given in Eusebius. The precise facts which allowed him to correct and supplement the account in his source agree entirely with Lactantius's report in *De mortibus persecutorum*.⁷⁸ It is therefore a justifiable conclusion that, if Rufinus did not know and use this work, he must have known "eine Kaisergeschichte" which coincided with Lactantius's account.

Cap. 14,1-6 (778,11-780,22) describes Maxentius's tyrannical rule in Rome. When, by way of introduction, Eusebius stated that he was Maximian's son (τούτου παῖς, 778,11), he was linking this section to the preceding account of his father. Eusebius obviously intended to show that the son took after his father in depravity.

In *cap.* 14,1 (778,11-16), Eusebius further states that, having established his tyrannical rule in Rome,⁷⁹ Maxentius pretended to be a Christian⁸⁰ in order to please the Romans and commanded his subjects to stop persecuting the Christians. By feigning piety, he wished to appear milder than his predecessors.

The passage lacks conciseness in both style and content. Eusebius repeated himself, for example, when he wrote τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ... καθυπεκρίνατο (778,12-14) and then immediately afterwards used the expression εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων (778,15). It is evident, too, that while καθυποκρίνειν and ἐπιμορφάζειν are synonyms, πίστις and εὐσέβεια are not. By πίστις he means the Christian faith. The connection with the next phrase καὶ ὡς ἂν δεξιὸς καὶ πολὺ πρῶος παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανεῖη (778,15-16) shows, on the other hand, that εὐσέβεια means the *pietas* which, together with *clementia*, distinguished a true Emperor – so it is therefore a heathen concept.

We may further note that the line of thought in εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων κτλ. (778,15-16) is clear, but that ἀρχόμενος κτλ. (778,12-15) is,

from a historical point of view, rather suspect. In view of the fact that all other sources present Maxentius as an unmistakable heathen, who was zealous in the cause of the national Roman religion,⁸¹ it is surprising to learn here that he pretended to be a Christian. If we also bear in mind the fact that Rome, with its predominantly heathen population, took pride in its pagan traditions, we find it difficult to place any faith in the statement that, in order to please his subjects, Maxentius commanded the *populus Romanus* to stop their persecution of the Christians⁸² – and it appears even more unreasonable when the account actually implies that his Roman subjects were in fact responsible for the persecution.

The inconsistencies are so striking that they must have been caused by Eusebius's reworking of an original text. The process can be described quite easily. We mentioned that the line of thought in εὐσέβειαν κτλ. (778,15-16) is clear. The very next words οὐ μὴν οἶος ἔσσεσθαι ἠλπίσθη κτλ. (778,16-20) obviously refer to ἀρχόμενος (778,12), so they must have belonged with εὐσέβειαν κτλ. ἐπ' ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων (778,13) provide no reasonable explanation for Maxentius's command to stop persecuting the Christians, but they become meaningful if linked to εὐσέβειαν κτλ. The original text must have read: ἀρχόμενος μὲν ἐπ' ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων καὶ ὡς ἂν δεξιὸς καὶ πολὺν προῶος παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανείη.⁸³ It includes no reference to Maxentius's feigned Christian faith nor to his relationship with the Christians. It simply says that, to win over the Roman people at the beginning of his rule, he pretended to be pious and

⁷⁸ Rufinus's description of Maximian corresponds closely to Lactantius's account in *cap.* XXVIII – XXX.

⁷⁹ ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννίδα συστησάμενος (778,11-12). Eusebius does not mention when and how this happened.

⁸⁰ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ... καθυπεκρίνατο (778,12-14).

⁸¹ Coins and inscriptions show that Maxentius relied on and promoted the national Roman religion right from the start. Since the 3rd century, this religion had experienced a renaissance in Rome. For Maxentius's religious attitude, cf. H. von Schoenebeck, *Beiträge*, pp. 4-27.

⁸² Cf. R. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, p. 159, who as the first and only scholar pointed out: "wie es ... sachlich unzutreffend ist, zu behaupten, dass Maxentius aus Schmeichelei gegen die römische Bevölkerung befohlen habe, die Christen zu schonen."

⁸³ R. Laqueur had already hinted at a similar interpretation of the passage in question: "[es] scheint mir evident, dass die Quelle berichtet hat, dass Maxentius anfangs das römische Volk umschmeichelt hat, in der Absicht, gegenüber seinen Vorgängern als milde zu erscheinen" (*op. cit.*, p. 159). I only mention this, however, as a supposition without further evidence.

wanted to appear much milder than his predecessors. But εὐσέβεια here stands for the old Roman virtue of *pietas*, so this proves that Eusebius used a heathen source.

Eusebius, however, understood εὐσέβεια not in the heathen but in the Christian sense. As he probably knew that Maxentius had caused the persecution of the Christians to cease,⁸⁴ it was natural to assume that he had done so because he wanted to pretend to be Christian. Eusebius wished to underline this and inserted τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς (778,12-13) and καθυπεκρίνατο (778,13-14) into the original text.⁸⁵ This train of thought explains why Eusebius excluded from the rest of his account any reference to the fact that Maxentius had changed his policy and adopted an anti-Christian attitude – and *cap.* 14,1 in its present form was leading up to just this. On the other hand, Eusebius continued quite correctly on the basis of the contents of the original text.

Cap. 14,2 (778,16-780,3) states, clearly and unequivocally, that the expectations which Maxentius's behaviour had awakened at first, were not fulfilled at all. Far from being a mild and pious ruler, he abandoned himself to all kinds of wickedness, adulteries and rape. He assaulted married women in the most dishonourable way – and, quite by design, he chose the women from amongst the aristocracy of the Senate as his victims.

The continuation in *cap.* 14,3-4 (780,3-12) is just as clear. Eusebius reports that the Roman people and the Senate,⁸⁶ high and low, suffered under Maxentius's terrible tyranny. Even though they endured their slavery quietly and patiently,⁸⁷ they were not safe from his bloody savagery.⁸⁸ For example, he gave the Pretorian guard⁸⁹ permission, on the slightest pretext, to carry out a barbaric massacre on the people of Rome. In the same way, he had countless senators killed in order to lay his hands on their riches by using false accusations.⁹⁰ In other words, Maxentius showed himself to be a tyrant who suppressed the *libertas* of Rome and, in every respect, behaved like a barbarian violating *Romanitas*.

According to *cap.* 14,5 (780,12-18), the tyrant resorted, as his crowning deed of wickedness, to witchcraft. He took auguries, sometimes by cutting up pregnant women to examine the foetus, sometimes by killing newborn babies to explore their entrails and, for the same reason, he killed lions.⁹¹

At the end of this list of Maxentius's magic arts, the text says καὶ τινὰς ἀρρητοποιίας ἐπὶ δαιμόνων προκλήσεις καὶ ἀποτροπιασμὸν τοῦ πολέμου συνισταμένου (780,16-17). Eusebius had spoken quite generally up to this point, but now he states that Maxentius had established new

bloody rites of sacrifice involving invocation of the gods and propitiatory sacrifices; in that way, he wished to avert a war, but this had not otherwise been mentioned.⁹² When the text goes on to say that only in this fashion could Maxentius hope for victory,⁹³ it presupposes that, if not actually at war, he was threatened by war.⁹⁴ The text refers to this state of affairs as a well-known fact, but the account includes not even the merest hint up to this point, of any such situation, far less an indication of whom Maxentius's adversary might be.

In *cap.* 14,6a (780,18-20), Eusebius wrote that no exhaustive list could possibly be given of all the tyrant's repressive measures directed against his subjects.⁹⁵ This statement on its own would naturally be taken as the concluding summary of the description of Maxentius's tyrannical rule. But Eusebius continued in 780,20-22 to say that a scarcity of food arose,

84 For information on Maxentius's relationship to the Christians, see H. von Schoenebeck, *op.cit.*, pp. 4, 27.

85 We must admit that ἐπ' ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων (778,13) is out of place in the new context. But Eusebius probably thought that, with the new insertions, he had made it clear that the Christians were being discussed here too: Maxentius pretended to be a Christian and brought the persecutions to a close in order to please the Christian populace in Rome.

86 δῆμοι καὶ ἄρχοντες undoubtedly alludes to *senatus populusque Romanus*.

87 τὴν πικρὰν φερόντων δουλείαν (780,5) states that Maxentius had deprived Rome of its *libertas*.

88 The phrase τις ὁμῶς ἦν τῆς τοῦ τυράννου φονώσης ὁμότητος (780,5-6) emphasizes the fact that Maxentius was, to an extraordinary extent, devoid of *humanitas*.

89 τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν δορυφόροις (780,7-8).

90 ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις πεπλασμέναις αἰτίαις μυρίων ἀναρουμένων (780,12). Maxentius tried, at least, to give the murders of the senators and the confiscation of their wealth an air of legality.

91 Here, Eusebius expressed himself briefly and concisely: μαγικαῖς ἐπινοίαις τοτὲ μὲν γυναικᾶς ἐγκύμονας ἀνασχίζοντος, τοτὲ δὲ νεογνῶν σπλάγχνα βρεφῶν διερευνωμένου λέοντάς τε κατασφάττοντος (780,13-15).

92 The use of the definite article – τοῦ πολέμου – indicates that a specific war, not war in general, is being discussed. In terms of content as well as style, this passage differs from the previous one, since the parts mentioned here are introduced by καὶ, whereas the previous passage had τοτὲ μὲν ... τοτὲ δὲ.

93 διὰ τούτων γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς νίκης κατορθωθήσεσθαι ἢ πᾶσα ἐτύγχανεν ἐλπίς (780,17-18).

94 οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννῶν οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα δρῶν τοὺς ὑπηκόους κατεδουλοῦτο (780,18-20).

95 It is worth noting that Henri Valois understood Eusebius's text correctly here and therefore found this free translation necessary: *et nefanda quaedam peragens sacra ad daemones evocandos, et ad bellum quod jam imminebat depellendum* (PG XX, 2, 782 D-783 A).

on a scale unknown to his contemporaries. This is given as the result (ὡς ἤδη, 780,20) of Maxentius's enslavement of the Roman people, so it seems necessary to take *κατεδουλοῦτο* (780,19-20) in the weak sense of economic pressure on the population.

This interpretation may well be correct, but it is evident that no natural connection exists between this section and the previous description of Maxentius's witchcraft. It seems much more likely to assume that the section continues the description in *cap.* 14,4: Maxentius not only seized the senators' riches, but made demands on the entire population to such an extent that a scarcity of food arose. Whether *cap.* 14,5 is regarded as a later addition or not, the break in continuity remains. Maxentius's witchcraft is described in *cap.* 14,5 as the culmination of his tyrannical rule, and *cap.* 14,6 seems to be a superimposed appendix.

This analysis of *cap.* 14,1-6 has shown that the account lacks coherence. The reason, no doubt, is that Eusebius used material which he had found in a text containing a description of Maxentius's rule. Eusebius's asyndetic description of this regime and the fact that he mentioned events which required more details, prove that he used his source eclectically. The details surrounding Maxentius's assumption of power and the war which was either impending or had broken out, are cases in point. The only possible explanation is this: Eusebius took facts and phrases from a wider context which contained all the information necessary for comprehension.⁹⁶

Even though Eusebius only made limited use of this information, enough remains to indicate the fundamental character of his source. It must have described Maxentius's effort to appear, at first, as a good and pious ruler after his assumption of power in Rome, but soon he showed himself to be a tyrant who, in his personal lifestyle and in his entire rule, acted as a horrible barbarian violating the traditions of Rome and depriving her of her *libertas*. Eusebius does not criticize the assumption of power as such, but only the way in which Maxentius ruled, and in this he probably also simply followed his source.⁹⁷ It may not have been openly critical of the tetrarchy, but at least it accepted the coup d'état which made Maxentius Emperor in Rome. On the other hand, the whole point of the Maxentius account was to show that he had forfeited any right to rule Rome. It provided reasons why he, as a tyrant, had to be removed.

Eusebius undoubtedly also followed his source when he linked the description of Maxentius and his tyrannical rule to the discussion of Maximian as the one overtaken by *damnatio memoriae*. Both father and son

were branded here, probably in order to prove the falsity of the claim that Maximian, as the legitimate Emperor, had founded a dynasty with his son Maxentius as his lawful successor. This interpretation seems correct also because the account of Maximian and his son appears as the negative counterpart to the description in *cap.* 13,12-14 of Constantius and his son Constantine as forming the true Imperial dynasty.

Eusebius also depended on his source for his description of Maxentius's brutal and bloody conduct towards the aristocracy of the Senate and the population in general. It is interesting that this conduct and the accusation that Maxentius, as the tyrant of Rome, had deprived the Romans of their *libertas*, agree entirely with the reason given by the Latin panegyrists for Constantine's invasion of Italy in 312, when he defeated Maxentius and took over his territories as the lawful Emperor.⁹⁸ This similarity is hardly accidental and therefore justifies the assumption that Eusebius's source was an official piece of propaganda which had been written to substantiate Constantine's right and duty to remove Maxentius and, for

⁹⁶ R. Laqueur was the first to state that *cap.* 14,1-6 does not form a unified whole. He claimed that οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννῶν (780,18-19) was the first mention of a reason for Maxentius's tyrannical rule: "jetzt sieht dieses Stück nach einer Rekapitulation des vorangehenden aus; aber in Wahrheit teilte Euseb durch diese Worte erst dem Leser die *Tatsache* der Tyrannis des Maxentius mit, welche er 778,11 als bekannt voraussetzt. Also besagte der Text ursprünglich τοῦτου παῖς Μαξιέντιος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννῶν usw. 780,18. Euseb erweiterte diesen Text durch die Einlage 778,11-780,18, wobei er zu Anfang in Interesse des Lesers bereits auf die *Tatsache* des Tyrannis hinwies" (*op.cit.*, p. 151) This interpretation is unnecessary. Because the whole section is much less homogeneous than Laqueur presumed, his reconstruction of the original text is arbitrary, based as it is on a single inconsistency in the account – again, it is unfortunate that Laqueur founded his interpretation on no thorough analysis of the section in question. Moreover, *cap.* 14,6 in itself is insufficient as proof that Maxentius was the tyrant of Rome. Therefore, as stated above, the complex character of this section must be explained as a result of the fact that Eusebius was eclectic in his use of material from an account on Maxentius and paid no attention to the consistency of his own account.

⁹⁷ When Eusebius wrote, at the start of his description of Maxentius: ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννίδα συστησάμενος (778,11-12), he actually criticized the very assumption of power, since it resulted in a tyrannical regime. This disagrees with the next description, in which Eusebius followed his source, probably because Eusebius wanted to describe Maxentius as the tyrant of Rome by beginning the section ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κτλ.

⁹⁸ See *Paneg.* IX (313), 4,2,4 and X (321), 3,2; 6,2; 8,2; 31,3. It is also worth noting that Maxentius is not criticized here because he was a usurper, but because, with his sinful disposition, he neglected and misused his Imperial position. Cf. my book *C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus*, p. 204 f. and 223.

that purpose, utilized the criticism of Maxentius's rule which had gradually grown amongst the leading senators in Rome.⁹⁹

Rufinus also found Eusebius's account in *cap.* 14,1-6 unsatisfactory in many respects; he had to treat it freely at several points if he was to create a clear and comprehensible translation.

This was the case even in *cap.* 14,1. Rufinus must have been astonished to learn that, according to Eusebius, Maxentius had pretended to be a Christian ἐπ' ἀρεσκεία καὶ κολακεία τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων (778,13). This could only make sense if the expression referred to the Christian people. He therefore rewrote from ἀρχόμενος κτλ. up to καθυπεκρίνατο (778,12-14) like this: *primo velut invitandae erga se plebis gratia fidei nostrae veneratorem se esse simulabat* (779,13-15). He thought that Eusebius's continuation from ταύτη τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις κτλ. up to διωγμόν (778,14-15) was misleading, suggesting that the population of Rome were responsible for the persecution of the Christians. He wanted to remove any such misunderstanding in his version: *et ob hoc persecutiones reprimi omnesque iniurias a Christianis arceri iubet* (779,15-16). The first part clearly identifies the Imperial power as the agent responsible for the persecution – and therefore equally responsible for its cessation – and the second part refers to the population who must not molest the Christians.

Rufinus completely omitted εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων up to φανείη (778,15-16). Perhaps he felt that εὐσέβειαν ἐπιμορφάζων could be omitted without difficulty as a duplicate quite superfluous in the context. But it seems more likely that he wished to compress the account and change it into a description only of Maxentius's relationship to Christianity, not of his rule – here, as always, Rufinus demonstrated his interest in religious attitudes, rather than in the political conditions as such. For the same reason, he also transformed οὐ μὴν οἶος ἔσεσθαι ἡλίπισθη, τοιοῦτος ἔργοις ἀναπέφηνεν (778,16-17) into a question of Maxentius's Christianity: *sed nihil in reliquis actibus suis, nihil in vita vel moribus, quod Christianis proximum videretur, ostendit* (779,16-17).

Rufinus changed εἰς πάσας δ' ἀνοσιουργίας κτλ. up to φθοράς (778,17-19) into an independent sentence with a complete characterization of Maxentius's behaviour, and he also used various expressions¹⁰⁰ to create a veritable crescendo: *in tanta etenim flagitiorum et scelerum faece, in tanto impuritatis caeno versabatur, ut nihil prorsus facinorum pessimorum ab eius, non dicam vita, sed unius saltim diei actibus esset alienum* (779,17-20).

Rufinus interrupted Eusebius's description, in 778,19-780,3, of Maxentius's disgraceful treatment of women by pointing out immediately that Maxentius was driven by his immense *libido* for distinguished women: *denique senatorum et maxime nobilium matronas publice¹⁰¹ abstrahi atque ad suam libidinem deduci imperabat et post contaminationem viris suis reddi iubebat, non tam expleta adulterii libidine quam inmutata* (779,20-781,1).

In his translation of οἱ πάντες κτλ. up to ὁμότητος (780,3-6) Rufinus omitted οἱ πάντες δ' αὐτὸν ὑποπεπτηχότες (780,3). Perhaps he felt that the words implied the concept of voluntary submissiveness, which was foreign to the tone of the entire account. He saw no reason to translate δεινῇ κατετρύχοντο τυραννίδι (780,4), possibly because the preceding passage had given too little information on the true nature of Maxentius's rule for the implication of this phrase to be comprehensible. On the other hand, he found no reasons in his source to explain why the population of Rome tolerated the bondage into which Maxentius had led them. In Rufinus's opinion, fear was the only possible reason, so he created this independent account from the passage in 780,3-6: *tantus vero metus patres plebemque¹⁰² oppresserat, uti ne hoc ipsum quidem, quod in metu erant, palam ostendere auderent, sed ferebant insuetam servitutem gementes et aliquid pro libertate cogitare metu inhibebantur, cum ille non iam ira, sed libidine caedis agitaretur* (781,1-5). The final expression also provides an elegant link to the previous section. There, the theme was *adulterii libido*.

99 The above account identifies Eusebius's source as a piece of propaganda for Constantine, and it also provides further proof of R. Laqueur's perceptive observation: "Die Hinrichtung von Senatoren und Schändung ihrer Frauen, die Ausplünderung der Reichen – alles dies sind Vorwürfe, welche für ein national-römisches Lesepublikum berechnet waren, welche aber einem in Cäsarea lebenden Christen ganz ferne liegen mussten. Also hat Euseb ... hier eine literarisch geformte heidnische Quelle benutzt" (*op. cit.*, p. 156). The same is true of Laqueur's mention of Maxentius's witchcraft: "Dieser Angriff gegen die Hinneigung zur Zauberei wird ... keineswegs von christlicher, sondern von heidnischer Basis aus eröffnet. Die vom Orient nach Rom vorgedrungene Magie steht in einem absoluten Gegensatz zu der römisch-etruskischen Haruspizin" (p. 158).

100 He probably felt that the source was rather selective in its choice of expressions and that it concentrated too highly on his fornication, which was the subject of the next passage.

101 Rufinus translated τὰς κατὰ νόμον γαμετάς (778,20) correctly by *matronae publice*. Instead of the lengthy account in καὶ ταῦτ' οὐκ ἀσήμοις κτλ. (778,21-780,3), he chose to write briefly *senatores et maxime nobiles*, which rendered his translation clear and intelligible.

102 His source had δῆμοι καὶ ἄρχοντες, ἔνδοξοί τε καὶ ἄδοξοι (780,3-4), but Rufinus considered *patres plebsque* sufficient.

here it is *libido caedis*, the other important feature of Maxentius's wicked character.

The whole passage, 780,6-12, was greatly shortened in Rufinus's version. He omitted ἐπὶ συμφορᾷ προφάσει (780,6-7), since he probably felt that, after all, it gave a tinge of justification to Maxentius's bloody conduct towards the population of Rome. The wish to illustrate the extent of his *libido caedis* more clearly probably also made Rufinus supply new details in his version. On the other hand, he compressed his source at several points and gave the following text: *denique quadam die imperat militibus suis*¹⁰³ *exire per plateas totius urbis et omnes, qui occurrissent cuiuscumque aetatis et cuiuslibet sexus, gladiis caedere, innumeraeque multitudines populi Romani non hostium, sed civium telis*¹⁰⁴ *deiectae sunt* (781,5-8). Rufinus here replaced οὐ Σκυθῶν οὐδὲ βαρβάρων (780,9) by *hostium*, presumably because he regarded the contrasting pair, robbers – barbarians, as illegitimate in a Christian context. Here as elsewhere, Rufinus tried to tone down, and if possible remove, the national Roman feeling found in the original. He could accept, however, from a Christian point of view, the fact that those who had occasioned civil wars were denounced.

In his version of 780,10-12, Rufinus must have felt it was meaningless to say with Eusebius that no list of all the senators killed by Maxentius could possibly be given – their numbers were limited, after all. On the other hand, he considered συγκλητικοί (780,10) in his source insufficient. Instead he wrote *senarores vero et hi maxime, qui vel honoribus vel opibus clariores in curia videbantur* (781,8-9). Correspondingly, he must have felt that Eusebius's expression ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις πεπλασμέναις αἰτίαις μυρίων ἀναιρουμένων (780,12) was summary to the point of being misleading. He corrected this by giving the following version: *confictis criminibus tamquam rei puniti proscriptique sunt* (781,9-10). Rufinus also omitted δι' ἐπιβουλήν ἐνηργεῖτο τῆς οὐσίας (780,11), so, unlike his source, he was able to link this section closely to the passage immediately before. Maxentius's behaviour towards the senators and other persons of rank thus becomes new evidence of his *libido caedis*.

Rufinus's version of *cap.* 14,5 illustrates his efforts to create a better, clearer account than the one he found in his source. He created the following passage from ἡ δὲ τῶν κακῶν κτλ. up to ἀνασχίζοντος (780,12-14): *addit vero etiam hoc fastigium sceleribus suis et artis magicae industriam summis studiis*¹⁰⁵ *excolit, ad quae ministeria*¹⁰⁶ *explenda perquirebantur mulieres nobiles gravidae et adhibitae funestis sacris mediae scindebantur*

(781,10-13). Here, contrary to Eusebius, Rufinus states that pregnant women from the aristocracy were involved, and therefore the passage is linked to the previous one describing the treatment to which Maxentius subjected the *honestiores*.

Rufinus's desire for intelligibility also made him render τοτὲ δὲ νεογνῶν σπλάγγνα βροφῶν διερευνημένου (780,14-15) by this independent sentence: *rapiebantur et parvuli infantes eorumque exta visceribus revulsa perscrutabantur* (781,13-14). The position of λέοντάς τε κατασφάττοντος (780,15) he found awkward, however, and he moved the words to the following passage. Eusebius's continuation, καὶ τινὰς κτλ. up to ἐλπίζ (780,16-18), did not exactly satisfy Rufinus. He obviously found the reference to a particular war here rather strange; a war which Maxentius wanted either to avert or to win by using his magic – such a war had never been mentioned before. At any rate, he completely omitted ἀποτροπιασμὸν τοῦ πολέμου (780,16-17) and διὰ τούτων κτλ. (780,17-18) and instead gave this general account: *iugulabantur et leones et nefandis quibusdam commentis ac precationibus daemonica arte conpositis*¹⁰⁷ *bella per haec dicebantur arceri et credebatur ius fasque regni per nefas posse servari* (781,15-17). This is characteristic of Rufinus: not only did he state that Maxentius thought he could ensure his victory and consolidate his rule by magic, but he is also at pains to emphasize the point that this was impossible; hence his use of *ius fasque regni per nefas*.

Eusebius's account in cap. 14,6 caused problems for Rufinus. He found it difficult to see the connection between οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς κτλ. (780,18-20), which is of a general nature, and the continuation in ὡς ἤδη κτλ. (780,20-22), which mentions the shortage of food for the very first

103 Rufinus's translation of τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν δορυφόροις (780,7-8) by *milites* rather than the more correct *praetoriani* is an example of his efforts to avoid any expression which would make the text difficult for his readers to understand. The Praetorian Guard no longer existed since it had been abolished by Constantine immediately after the victory over Maxentius on 28th October 312.

104 *telis* here replaces δόρασι καὶ πανοπλίαις (780,10).

105 The source has ἐπὶ γοητείαν ἤλανθεν, μαγικαῖς ἐπινοαῖς (780,13-14), which is difficult to translate, and Rufinus replaced it with this clear phrase: *artis magicae industriam summis studiis excolit*.

106 Rufinus inserted a link here which was essential if the text was to be properly understood.

107 With these words, Rufinus rewrote τινὰς ἀρρητοποιίας ἐπὶ δαιμόνων προκλήσεις καὶ ἀποτροπιασμὸν (780,16). He apparently wanted to emphasize the point that various instances of the magic arts were being discussed, for which the demons were responsible.

time. He therefore felt that he must provide a link himself and at the same time explain to his readers how Maxentius's rule had caused a food shortage which resulted in starvation. So he wrote this version: *his vero malis omnibus etiam illud additur,¹⁰⁸ quod omnes, qui per ceteras urbes vel agros fuerant tyrannica crudelitate deterriti, dum nihil sibi ad vitam tutum putant et relictis agris per loca abdita et latebras eunt, omni studio arandi serendique cessante tanta fames urbem atque omnia loca invaserat, ut nihil reliqui ad vitae subsidium fieret¹⁰⁹* (781,17-22).

Cap. 14,7-16a (780,22-786,2): Maximin as the tyrant of the East

In cap. 14,7 (780,22-25), Eusebius reports that Maximin concluded a secret treaty of friendship with Maxentius. Later he was found out and punished.

Eusebius began by describing Maximin as the tyrant of the East (ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς τύραννος, 780,22), and this corresponds exactly with the introductory description of Maxentius as the tyrant of Rome. The parallel is scarcely accidental. He undoubtedly wanted to indicate that the subsequent description of the tyrant Maximin followed the same lines as the report on Maxentius. The latter tyrannized the West,¹¹⁰ and Maximin tyrannized the East. They were brethren in wickedness,¹¹¹ so it was also natural that they should form a treaty of friendship to secure their tyrannical rule throughout the whole Roman Empire. This is obviously what Eusebius was telling his readers.

Eusebius's only direct statement, however, concerned Maximin; he took the first step towards a treaty of friendship. The date and the details of the treaty are not given at all. Eusebius leads us to believe that a criminal act was committed – he says that Maximin wanted to keep the treaty secret, but that later it was discovered and Maximin justly punished. No information is given on the crime and the readers are left in ignorance as to the date and nature of Maximin's punishment.¹¹² Eusebius is very laconic here, probably because he used a fuller account which described the details of the treaty of friendship between the two tyrants.¹¹³

Cap. 14,8-9 (780,25-782,14) analyses Maximin's personal religious attitudes and his religious policies.

The section begins with a passage (780,25-782,1) describing Maximin as not only resembling Maxentius but actually surpassing him in evil. But

in several places the passage clearly repeats *cap.* 14,7. τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά (780,26) is a repetition of πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν (780,23), just as τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου (780,27) duplicates πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, sc. τύραννον (780,23). These quite superfluous repetitions leave no doubt that originally the passage in question did not belong with *cap.* 14,7. In this way, the description of Maximin ceases to be completely parallel to that of Maxentius and therefore ὡς ἂν κτλ. (780,22-25) must be regarded as a later addition. Eusebius probably inserted it into the original account in order to show, by reporting on their treaty of friendship, that they were also close allies in a political sense. But the passage in itself also calls for comment. τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά (780,26), for example, lacks a controlling verb and a direct object. This stylistic anomaly¹¹⁴ undoubtedly arose because originally Eusebius wrote that Maximin, the tyrant of the East, to an amazing extent displayed τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφὰ τῆς κακίας with Maxentius. This argument is further supported by the fact that the description of Maximin was meant to be a parallel to that of Maxentius. On closer consideration, however, Eusebius thought it more correct to depict Maximin as surpassing him – he probably decided this from his opinion of Maximin as the worst of the Christian persecu-

108 This wording enabled Rufinus to connect the passage closely to the account immediately before. He omitted οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τυραννῶν οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οἷα δρῶν τοὺς ὑπηκόους κατεδουλοῦτο (780,18-20), probably because he felt that it simply repeated previous statements – moreover, it provided no explanation for the food shortage.

109 In this version, Rufinus omitted ὄσσην ἐπὶ Ῥώμης οὐδ' ἄλλοτε οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι μνημονεύουσιν (780,21-22). He probably felt that it was another of Eusebius's baseless hyperbolic statements.

110 Eusebius's later remark: πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολῆν καὶ δύσιν διειληφότων (786,16-17) shows that he used Ῥώμη to refer not just to the town itself, but to all the West. He wanted to indicate that the whole Roman Empire was at the mercy of the two tyrants. This has no basis in history, but that is quite another matter.

111 ὡς ἂν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν (780,22-23).

112 Eusebius never returned to this question, not even later in his account.

113 An account of this kind did exist. This conclusion can be reached from the fact that Lactantius also reported in *De mort. pers.* XLIII, 2-4 and XLIV, 10 on the treaty of friendship between Maximin and Maxentius. He gave many more details, however, and supplied the information about the contract which is missing in Eusebius. His account can almost be said to be an extract from Lactantius's report.

114 This is obscure in the various translations which treat this passage very freely. This is true of Henri Valois, PG XX, 2, p. 783A, and G. Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, pp. 33-34, and also of Lawlor-Oulton: "It was marvellous how he acquired a family likeness and kinship with the villainy of the tyrant at Rome, nay rather, carried off the first prize for wickedness and the reward of victory over him" (*Eusebius* I, p. 272).

tors. Therefore he expanded the original sentence structure, by which *κακίας* became separated from *τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά* and inserted into a new context: *μᾶλλον δὲ κακίας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ νικητήρια τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου κακοτροπίας ἀπηνεγεγμένος* (780.26-782,1).

Maximin was far more evil than Maxentius because, we are told in 782,1-5, he considered the foremost among sorcerers and magicians worthy of the highest honour. The reason for this was that he was extremely nervous and superstitious and believed implicitly in false gods and demons. Without divinations and oracles, he dared not take the slightest action.

If we compare this account with the description of Maxentius's horrible acts which he committed by using his magic, it is actually difficult to see how Maximin can be said to have surpassed him on this point. This may not be a definite anticlimax, but we must at any rate say that no real connection exists between this section and the previous passage. Another surprising point is that the description of the tyrant Maximin's *κακοτροπία* begins with his preference for witchcraft and magic. A discussion of the other aspects of his tyrannical rule would have created the parallel with Maxentius which Eusebius had suggested.

In this section, *τὴν τε περὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας περὶ πολλοῦ τιθεμένου πλάνην* (782,3-4) implies a clear condemnation of the heathen gods as false. It clashes with the rest of the account which could otherwise quite possibly have been written by a heathen. Maximin's excessive superstition, which made him completely dependent on divinations and oracles, is the most important point of criticism – and this did not necessarily come from the Christians.¹¹⁵

In the next passage, *μαντειῶν γοῦν δίχα καὶ χρησμῶν οὐδὲ μέχρις ὄνυχος ὡς εἰπεῖν τολμᾶν τι κινεῖν οἷός τε ἦν* (782-5) is not linked at all to *τὴν τε περὶ κτλ.* (782,3) but to *ψοφοδεοῦς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ δεισιδαιμονεστάτου καθεστῶτος* (782,2-3) in order to explain why Maximin did nothing without divinations and oracles. This supports the assumption that *τὴν τε περὶ κτλ.* is a later addition inserted by Eusebius to emphasize his point that Maximin's superstition resulted from his worship of false gods. Eusebius would probably have been particularly anxious to introduce this explanatory gloss into the text if he used an account, which, to judge from the language, was of heathen provenance.

782,5-14 states that Maximin persecuted the Christians much more intensely than his predecessors, that he commanded the building and restoration of temples,¹¹⁶ appointed priests everywhere and high priests in all

the provinces, and gave magicians the highest positions¹¹⁷ and greatest privileges, as if they were men of piety.

This description of Maximin's religious policies begins with οὗ χάριν (782,5). If this refers to μαντειῶν (782,4) immediately before, Eusebius must have wished to state that it occurred because Maximin allowed himself to be directed in everything by portents and oracles. It makes much better sense, however, to assume that οὗ χάριν refers back to τὴν τε περὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα κτλ. (782,3-4). Then the line of thought is that Maximin's worship of false gods occasioned the religious policies which are described in the next lines.

The passage is noticeable because it discusses Maximin's work to re-establish paganism in terms quite different from the strongly critical description of him as the worst of all the persecutors of Christianity (καὶ τῶ καθ' ἡμῶν κτλ., 782,6). If εἰδῶλων (782,9) is disregarded, the report becomes purely factual. It is also worth noting that Eusebius normally never uses νεῶς (782,7) and τεμένη (782,8) for pagan temples and places of worship, nor ἱερεῖς (782,9) for pagan priests.¹¹⁸ If we think of these words together with his rather appreciative description of the good qualifications demanded of the high priests in each of the provinces, we may ask whether Eusebius has not in fact used an account of heathen provenance here too.

Taken at face value, ὡς ἂν εὐσεβέσιν καὶ θεῶν προσφιλέσιν (782,12-13) means that Maximin presented the sorcerers with the highest offices and privileges because of their piety and dedication to the gods. This could have been found in a pagan source. But the point surely is that Eusebius understood these words ironically and wanted his readers to understand them so; he would never call anyone pious who worshipped idols.

All this apart, the account in 782,1-14 appears composite and disparate. Some sentences and words express direct criticism of Maximin, such as τὴν τε περὶ κτλ. (782,3-4), οὗ χάριν καὶ τῶ καθ' ἡμῶν κτλ. (782,5-6) and

115 Of course, it was a standard indictment against tyrants in pagan polemics that they were controlled by *superstitio*. On this point, the Christians adopted pagan polemics as their own.

116 *De mart. Palest.* 9,2.

117 τὰς ἡγεμονίας (782,13) could refer to the office of a provincial governor. It should probably be taken here to mean the highest offices.

118 In *h.e.*, Eusebius only used the word to describe Christian priests, 862,16 and 882,2.

εἰδῶλων (782,9). The rest of the passage does contain criticism of Maximin's superstition and his preferential treatment of sorcerers and magicians, but it is essentially a factual account of his religious policy. These features justify the assertion that Eusebius made use of a pagan source which he transformed by expansion into a critical account of Maximin's religious attitude and his entire religious policy.

Maximin's dissolute rule is the main topic of *cap.* 14,10-12 (782, 14-784,5).

782,14-18 states that Maximin used an entire range of different methods to subject his provinces to economic exploitation.¹¹⁹ In this context, the first words ἐκ δὴ τούτων ὀρμώμενος (782,14) would naturally be thought to mean that the sorcerers had prompted this economic pressure. But that reading does not agree with the fact that the entire passage attempts to stamp Maximin as the instigator of all the evils which befell the inhabitants of his provinces. No elements can be found in the previous account to which these words could naturally refer, so we can only say that they refer to an entirely new and independent idea.¹²⁰ It is impossible to discover exactly how Eusebius regarded this expression, probably because he used material from a fuller account which described in detail Maximin's ruthless policy of economic spoliation.¹²¹ Eusebius's very laconic information on this point suggests a similar conclusion.

In a new sentence (782,17-20), Eusebius says that Maximin stripped the rich of their inherited wealth¹²² and gave it to his flatterers. As this probably constituted illegal confiscation of inheritance, the sentence, strictly speaking, adds nothing to the account.¹²³ From a critical point of view, we can also affirm that this was Eusebius's first reference to the fact that Maximin surrounded himself with courtiers merely because they were his flatterers.¹²⁴ Again, the scanty information in this passage can be explained as the natural result of Eusebius's extraction of material from a fuller account which included many more details on subjects which are simply hinted at here.

Cap. 14,11 (782,20-784,2) describes Maximin's drunkenness and the damaging effects of his depraved life on both the army and the administration.

As an example of Maximin's excessive drinking,¹²⁵ Eusebius mentions that in his drunkenness at the nightly orgies, he would issue orders which he cancelled the next day when he was sober.¹²⁶ It is debatable whether this is really the best example with which to illustrate Maximin's drunkenness – it rather serves to show that, despite his drinking, Maximin had

so much control over himself that, like a responsible ruler, he was able to prevent it from influencing his government. This is not Eusebius's idea, however. He goes on in 782,23-25 to say that Maximin allowed no one to surpass him in drunkenness and prodigality,¹²⁷ and that he was a teacher of evil for those around him, rulers and subjects alike.¹²⁸ In this way, he

119 When speaking here of *χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χρημάτων ἀμυθήτων εἰσπραξέσιν ἐπισκήψεσιν τε βαρυτάταις* (782,15-17), Eusebius was probably thinking of taxes, compulsory levies and confiscations.

120 Linguistically, it is possible to read *ἐκ τούτων* as an indication of time. Henri Valois translated it as such: *post hæc* (PG XX, 2, 783 C), as did G. Bardy: “Partant de là” (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 34) and Lawlor-Oulton: “henceforward” (*Eusebius* I, p. 272). The previous passage, however, contains no point of reference for this phrase.

121 Later, *cap.* 14,11 states that Maximin encouraged the civil and military leaders to exploit the population δι’ ἀρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας ... μόνον οὐχὶ συντυραννοῦντας αὐτῷ (782,27-784,1), and we are justified in concluding that, for Eusebius, *πλεονεξία* was the motive for his policy of economic repression.

122 As τὰς ἐκ προγόνων περιποιηθείσας οὐσίας (782,18), we should probably reckon first of all the landed property owned by the aristocracy, which had been passed down to them through generations as their inheritance.

123 The text says that Maximin robbed (*ἀφαιρούμενος*, 782,18-19) the rich of their fortunes; he probably did so by such illegal confiscations which are included in the expression used immediately before: *ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις καταδίκαις* (782,17).

124 τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν κόλαξιν (782,19-20). This probably refers to the same group as τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσι; it was mentioned in 782,24-25.

125 παροιρίας γε μὴν καὶ μέθης ἐς τοσαύτην ἠνέχθη φορὰν ... (782,20-21).

126 Strictly speaking, Eusebius only said that Maximin repented the commands which he had issued the night before (*εἰς μετᾶμελον ἄγειν*, 882,23). But the implication must be that he rescinded them.

127 *κραιπάλης δὲ καὶ ἀσωτίας μηδενὶ καταλιπὼν ὑπερβολήν* ... (782,23-25). Where-as *κραιπάλης* must be translated by “drunkenness”, the meaning of *ἀσωτία* is not clear at all. διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας (782,26) in the very next passage naturally suggests that the word means “prodigality” in the sense of “luxurious living” – H. Valois rendered it in this way in his translation: *Quod autem ad luxum ac delicias atinet* ... (PG XX, 2, p. 783 D). But the expression *κακίας διδάσκαλον* (782,24) could indicate that the word means “profligate living”, an interpretation which formed the basis of Lawlor-Oulton’s translation: “riotous living” (*Eusebius* I, p. 272). Eusebius probably used the word to signify both; the very next passage, on Maximin, supports this assumption: διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας ἐνάγων (782,26).

128 τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσι τε καὶ ἀρχομένοις (782,24-25). Eusebius apparently wanted to give a more detailed description of this group of flatterers (τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν κόλαξιν, 782,19-20). He divided them into *ἀρχοντες* and *ἀρχόμενοι*: the first group must refer to the ἡγεμόνες and στρατοπεδάρχαι, which are mentioned soon after in 782,26-27. So Eusebius included Maximin’s subjects in his circle of flatterers. Or in other words, he enjoyed the support of large sections of the population.

rendered the army weak since, after his example, it led a luxurious and licentious life.¹²⁹ His behaviour also encouraged his provincial governors and army leaders to plunder their subjects without restraint, so that they almost equalled him in tyranny.¹³⁰ Eusebius continued in *cap.* 14,12 (784,2-5) to describe Maximin's innumerable sexual outrages in all the cities he visited; there he seduced both married women and virgins.

Only the Christians, *cap.* 14,13-14 (784,5-18) continues, took no account of his tyranny. The men chose to suffer punishments and mutilations for their faith rather than worship idols. Many women were subjected to exactly the same tribulations as the men, whereas others took their own lives to escape adultery.

This description of the Christians' resistance begins with the words *κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προουχῶρει, μὴ ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν* (784,5-6). Readers' first reaction would be to link the words to the passage immediately before and so receive the impression that Maximin was successful in committing fornication with all women except the Christians. The continuation *οἱ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες παρ' οὐθὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα* (784,6-8) does not, however, support this interpretation. The passage must in fact mean that no Christians – men or women – submitted to Maximin's tyrannical rule.¹³¹ It then refers to the whole of the preceding account in *cap.* 14,8-12, not just to Maximin's outrageous conduct towards women. We should also note that the ensuing clear and well-written description discusses only the Christians' attitude to Maximin's violent persecution, a theme which appeared briefly in 782,5-7 in connection with his religious policy.

Here it is quite clear that Maximin persecuted the Christians to make them worship the pagan gods.¹³² If they refused, they were punished with mutilations, imprisonment, deportation to the mines and subjection to various forms of execution.¹³³ The women are described as *αἱ δὲ ἐπὶ φθορὰν ἐλκόμεναι θᾶπτον τὴν ψυχὴν θανάτῳ ἢ τὸ σῶμα τῆ φθορᾷ παραδεδώκασιν* (784,16-18), and in this connection Eusebius must have been thinking of those who were condemned to the brothels in punishment for their refusal to obey and who chose to commit suicide rather than be forced into fornication.

In *cap.* 14,15 (784,18-25), we are told that one of the most outstanding women in Alexandria¹³⁴ – a Christian – rejected Maximin's repeated passionate advances. Her punishment was exile and confiscation of her wealth.

Eusebius begins his account of this incident with *γοῦν* (784,18), obvi-

ously because he wanted to indicate that it was an example of how Christian women resisted Maximin. It makes little sense, however, to relate this episode to the text immediately before. That was a discussion of women who were condemned to the brothels because they refused to comply with Maximin's orders to sacrifice to the gods, but the Alexandrian woman was punished because she repelled Maximin's advances. If there is no natural connection between this incident and the account in *cap.* 14,14, such a connection exists with the description of Maximin's immoral behaviour towards women in 784,2-6. This is one and the same context, clearly indicated by the fact that the expressions τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων (784,18) and τὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου ψυχὴν (784,20) actually repeat τῶν πρὸς αὐτοῦ μεμοιχευμένων (784,3) and τὰς ἐμπαθεῖς τάνδρως αἰσχρουργίας (784,2) respectively.

Eusebius informs his readers that the aristocratic Alexandrian lady was a Christian (Χριστιανή, 784,19). It is striking, however, that this state-

129 θρύπτεσθαι μὲν τὸ στρατιωτικὸν διὰ πάσης τρυφῆς τε καὶ ἀκολασίας ἐνάγων (782,25-26). This expression indicates that, by his example, Maximin inveigled the army into a life of luxury and licentiousness which resulted in a weakening of discipline and morale.

130 ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ στρατοπεδάρχας δι' ἀρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας χωρεῖν κατὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων μόνον οὐχὶ συντυραννοῦντας αὐτῷ προκαλούμενος (782,26-784,2).

131 In this sentence, we must decide how to interpret the words παρ' οὐθὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα (784,7-8). Lawlor-Oulton understood them to mean: "They ... set at naught this his fierce tyranny" (*Eusebius I*, p. 273). This translation is linguistically possible, but we must reject it as suggesting an actual struggle against Maximin's tyrannical rule. The context offers no support for this idea, so the words must be interpreted thus: "they regarded his tyranny as nothing", meaning that they did not behave according to his will and wishes. In other words, the Christians offered passive, rather than active, resistance.

132 ἐπὶ πάντων μᾶλλον ὑπομονὴν τὴν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἐνεδειξάντο ἢ τὸ σέβας τὸ εἰς θεὸν εἰδώλοισι ἀντικατηλλάξαντο (784,12-13).

133 οἱ μὲν γὰρ συνδρες ἀνατλάντες πῦρ καὶ σίδηρον καὶ προσηλώσεις θηρᾶς τε ἀγρίου καὶ θαλάττης βυθοὺς ἀποτομάς τε μελῶν καὶ καντήρας καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν κεντήσεις τε καὶ ἔξορύξεις καὶ τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἀκρωτηριασμοὺς λιμόν τε ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ μέταλλα καὶ δεσμά (784,8-12). In fact, Eusebius used this list to summarize all the sufferings and punishments which he had previously mentioned in the account of the martyrs' fight for their faith, *cap.* 7-12. It should be noted, though, that crucifixion (προσηλώσεις, 784,8-9) and hunger (λιμός, 784,11) are mentioned here for the first time.

134 She is described as ἐπισημοτάτη τε καὶ λαμπροτάτη ..., ἐνδοξος μὲν τὰ ἄλλα πλούτῳ τε καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ (784,19-22). The word λαμπροτάτη could mean *clarissima*, thus emphasizing her social station. But it should perhaps be taken to mean brilliant, describing her beauty. It then provides a specific explanation for Maximin's lust for her.

ment constitutes the only specifically Christian reference in the report. The lady is extolled because she placed σωφροσύνη above all,¹³⁵ just as her courage enabled her to withstand Maximin.¹³⁶ In other words, the point of the story is that Maximin's *libido* reached a barrier in the person who possessed σωφροσύνη. All evidence, therefore, points to the fact that this story is of pagan origin, and that Eusebius christianized it, so to speak, by inserting Χριστιανή.

The introductory words of this section prove the interpretation to be correct: μόνη γοῦν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων Χριστιανῆ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ... (784,18-19). If taken at face value, they mean that only the Alexandrian woman refused to commit adultery with Maximin. This does not agree, however, with Eusebius's previous statement in 784,5-6, where he said that Maximin was successful in committing fornication with all women except the Christians. This striking contradiction can only be explained as the result of a rather unsuccessful revision by Eusebius. The expression μόνη ... τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων (784,18) states, strictly speaking, that the Alexandrian woman was amongst those with whom Maximin had committed fornication, and this also suggests a revision.¹³⁷ The assumption that the text constitutes a revision could also explain why the introductory words include two genitives: τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων and τῶν ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας, separated by Χριστιανῆ.

If μὴ ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν (784,6) belonged in the original version, it is difficult to imagine that Eusebius could write at this point that the Alexandrian woman alone (μόνη, 784,18) had withstood Maximin's advances. It must therefore have appeared in the text later. Consequently, μόνη must originally have been the direct continuation of κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προυχώρει (784,5-6). The basis of the text as we know it must have been an account stating that Maximin assaulted all the women he met in every city and that he had his way with them all except the distinguished lady in Alexandria. The point is to show that Maximin's uninhibited *libido* was rendered powerless when faced with her σωφροσύνη.¹³⁸ This is clearly pagan and therefore cannot represent Eusebius's own line of thought. He probably took it from the same account of Maximin and his rule which he had used previously.

Since Eusebius regarded σωφροσύνη as a Christian virtue, he was in no doubt that the distinguished Alexandrian must have been a Christian. He wanted to state this specifically by inserting Χριστιανῆ into the original text. The new text – μόνη Χριστιανῆ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας κτλ. –

could, however, lead to the false assumption that only this Christian woman had withstood Maximin's advances. To avoid a misunderstanding of this kind, Eusebius added *μη ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν* (784,6) to *κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προουχώρει* (784,5-6) – only in this way did it seem possible to explain the contradiction in the account to *μόνη κτλ.* At this point, Eusebius wanted to show unequivocally that not just the Christian women, but all Christians had refused to give in to Maximin – otherwise, the account would have been distorted. This must have been Eusebius's motive for inserting the long section 784,6-18. He connected it to the original text by writing *οἱ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες παρ' οὐθὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην ἔθεντο τυραννίδα* (784,6-8) – which explains the ambiguous character of the passage. *γοῦν* (784,18) was also introduced to link the insertion to the subsequent account. But he was dealing with disparate material, and the existing text clearly shows that he was unable to establish a satisfactory connection.

When he inserted the passage on the Christians' resistance to Maximin during the persecution, he separated the story of the Alexandrian woman from its original context, so that it appeared quite isolated. He felt that he must counter this and added *τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων* (784,18). But in doing so, he produced a stylistically clumsy text.

In *cap.* 14,16 (784,25-786,2), Eusebius reports that the provincial governors punished many other women with all kinds of torture and execution,¹³⁹ because they refused even to consider any suggestion of fornication.

The context makes it clear, although indirectly, that these women were Christian. In its present form, the short section is connected to the pre-

135 πάντα γε μὴν δεύτερα σωφροσύνης τεθειμένη (784,22).

136 δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν (784,20-21).

137 Henri Valois appears to be the only recent translator to have noticed this. He rewrote it thus: *Certe unica mulier ... , cum cæteræ a tyranno violatæ fuissent ...* (PG XX, 2, p. 786 B).

138 Quite apart from this, however, we may wonder whether originally the report was intended only to illustrate Maximin's *libido*. Some of its features rather suggest the possibility that at first, it was a description of unrequited love. The expressions *τὴν ἔμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου* (784,20) and *πολλὰ λιπαρήσας* (784,22-23) could easily refer to his repeated, but unsuccessful courtship of her. Because of his love, he could not bring himself to kill her, but merely punished her with exile and confiscation of her wealth.

139 πᾶν εἶδος βασάνων καὶ στρεβλώσεων καὶ θανατηφόρου κολάσεως ὑπέστησαν (786,1-2).

vious passage and must therefore be understood to mean that the women who refused Maximin's demands to prostitute themselves were punished by the provincial governors.

But the passage only mentions the provincial governors. If we consider it in isolation, *πρὸς τῶν κατ' ἔθνος ἀρχόντων, πορνείας ἀπειλὴν μηδ' ἀκοῦσαι δεδυνημέναι* (784,25-26) must mean that the provincial governors punished those who refused to commit fornication with them. When interpreted thus, the section in fact makes excellent sense in the context. Earlier in the account, Eusebius had described Maximin as *κακίας διδάσκαλον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσί τε καὶ ἀρχομένοις* (782,24-25). And Eusebius then illustrated this state of affairs when, having described Maximin's immoral behaviour, he went on to show that the provincial governors imitated him in this also, as their teacher and example, and therefore almost behaved like fellow-tyrants.

Eusebius made no direct reference to the provincial governors' treatment of women, probably because he gave just a short summary here of the detailed contents in the fuller account of Maximin's tyrannical rule which, again, he must have used when working on his own text. In his source, the women were probably heathens. His description of the punishment they suffered reveals that he regarded them as Christians, as he did the Alexandrian woman. He used exactly the same expressions here as he had done previously when describing the sufferings of the martyrs.

We will pause here to examine Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's *cap.* 14,7-16 (780,22-786,2), a section which, as this analysis has shown, is much more complex and inharmonious than research to date has revealed.

Rufinus retained only very little of *cap.* 14,7 in his translation. He excluded the entire report on Maximin's treaty of friendship in 780,23-25. In Eusebius, the report is important, showing that the two tyrants became allies, so Rufinus must have had weighty reasons for omitting it. Stylistically, it certainly interrupts the continuity, but this consideration can hardly have been decisive for Rufinus. He is much more likely to have regarded the account as fiction and, for that reason, refrained from including it in his version. We have no means of discovering how he reached this decision. He must have felt that his source wanted to depict Maxentius and Maximin as equals. Consequently, he thought that a contradiction arose when, immediately, Eusebius named Maximin as the more wicked. So he had to deviate from his source at this point, too, and write an independent account, which was as follows: *in Orientis vero atque Aegypti*

*partibus*¹⁴⁰ *Maximinus simili per omnia crudelitate et vesania tyrranidem gerebat*,¹⁴¹ *ita ut alter alterum, utpote in tyrranide socius, etiam in sceleribus videretur imitari*¹⁴² *et nescires, cui potissimum dare flagitiorum palmam*¹⁴³ *deberes* (781,22-26).

Rufinus deemed it correct to link τὰ νικητήρια κτλ. (780,27-782,1)¹⁴⁴ to γοήτων τε γὰρ καὶ μάγων οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρ' αὐτῷ τιμῆς ἤξι-
ώντο (782,1-2) and composed on this basis the following passage: *eo sane Maximinus praeire socium sceleris videbatur, quod etiam publicos honores et maximos magistratus magorum et malarum artium*¹⁴⁵ *doctoribus decernebat* (781,26-783,2). The version is characteristic in that it emphasizes much more strongly than its source the fact that Maximin surpassed Maxentius. The latter's predilection for magic naturally presupposed his high esteem for the sorcerers, so Rufinus chose to translate οἱ πρῶτοι by *doctoribus*, and to link τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρ' αὐτῷ τιμῆς (782,1-2) to πᾶσιν γόησιν ... ἡγεμονίας καὶ τὰς μεγίστας προνομίας δωρούμενος (782,12-14) as connected in point of content. In other words, Maximin surpassed Maxentius by consciously preferring the teachers of magic and black arts.

Nor was Rufinus entirely satisfied with the continuation ψοφοδεοῦς κτλ. (782,2-5). He must have regarded ψοφοδεοῦς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ δεισιδαιμονεστάτου καθεστῶτος (782,2-3) as irrelevant information which could be completely omitted in this context. On the other hand, Maximin's idolatry must appear as the real reason for his inability to act without omens and divinations. This resulted in the following version which differs from its source by displaying consistency: *simulacrorum quoque cultui satis superstitiose deditus erat*,¹⁴⁶ *ita ut ne ad parvum quidem*

140 Rufinus's phrase corrects his source, which simply said ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς τύραννος Μαξιμίνοϋ (780,22). The expression was misleading, since it gave the impression that he ruled over all the East.

141 This translation must be a paraphrase of ὡς ἂν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν (780,22-23).

142 *ut alter alterum etc.* represents Rufinus's interpretation of ἦν δὲ θαυμάσια ὅπως καὶ οὗτος τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ἀδελφά, μᾶλλον δὲ κακίας (780,25-26).

143 This elegant expression replaced κακίας τὰ πρῶτα (780,26).

144 The fact that Rufinus regarded κακίας τὰ πρῶτα κτλ. (780,26-782,2) as an unnecessary tautology can have contributed to his omitting the clause.

145 Rufinus must have chosen his rendition because he regarded wizards and magicians as synonymous.

146 Rufinus may have omitted to translate καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας (782,3) because he could then clearly emphasize the manifestation of Maximin's superstition in his worship of idols. He possibly also thought that Eusebius's phrase τὴν ... περὶ ... τοὺς δαίμονας ... πλάνην (782,3-4) was not entirely adequate, suggesting, as it does, that the existence of the demons was a delusion.

*motum*¹⁴⁷ *sine auguriis et divinationibus ac symbolis*¹⁴⁸ *adquiesceret* (783,2-4). Rufinus emphasized idolatry as the most important point, and therefore he was able to clarify much more precisely than his source the reason why Maximin was the worst persecutor of the Christians. So the continuation is brief and concise: *unde et vehementior adversum nos et gravior prioribus persecutor*¹⁴⁹ *fuit* (783,4-5).

Eusebius's description (in 782,7-14) of Maximin's reestablishment of paganism was translated by Rufinus in an independent passage. He followed his source in the main, but saw no reason to translate νεὼς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐγείρειν (782,7). He felt that a simple mention of the restoration of the temples was insufficient and he considered it reasonable to explain why they had fallen into disrepair: *vetera quoque delubra et olim etiam ab studiosis cultoribus derelicta renovari omnia iubet* (783,5-6). The rebuilding happened διὰ σπουδῆς (782,8), which Rufinus also regarded as irrelevant information and therefore omitted. He wished to keep his account of Maximin's temple building programme to an absolute minimum. Exactly the same tendency is evident in his reduction of ἱερέας τε εἰδώλων κατὰ πάντα τόπον καὶ πόλιν (782,9) to *sacerdotesque his* (sc. *delubra*) (783,6-7). His source described the qualifications which the high priests must have, but he found it too uninteresting to translate (τῶν μάλιστα ἐμφανῶς κτλ., 782,10-11). He thought it quite sufficient to state that they had to be *nobiles*.¹⁵⁰ To the honours which they received, Rufinus added stipends to the military escort. His rendering then reads: *sacerdotesque his et pontifices per singulas provincias nobiles quosque*¹⁵¹ *et aliis iam honoribus functos ministris militaribus et salariis additis decernit* (783,6-9).

Rufinus quite clearly regarded Eusebius's reference to the magicians in ἀναίδην κτλ. (782,12-14) as a partial repetition of the contents of γοήτων κτλ. (782,1-2). Therefore he used this, as shown, in his translation of the last mentioned passage: *etiam publicos honores etc.*, 783,1-2.¹⁵² But here he wanted information on Maximin's appointments of civil and military leaders, apart from the priests. It seemed quite essential, as later in the account Eusebius spoke of ἡγεμόνας καὶ στρατοπεδάρχας (782,26-27) as Maximin's followers. They were clearly wicked characters, so Rufinus felt he was justified, on the basis of 782,12-14, in writing this sentence: *nec mirum, qui et manifestos maleficos vel rectores provinciarum vel duces militum promoveret* (783,9-10). He also managed, in this phrase, to insinuate that Maximin appointed priests in much the same way as he promoted civil and military leaders.

Rufinus had to rewrite several points in *cap.* 14,10 (782,14-20) as well, in order to compose a clear account which would be easily understood. He obviously found it difficult to discover the meaning of ἐκ δὴ τούτων ὀρωόμενος (782,14). He found no link to the previous passage either, so he simply replaced the words with the following sentence: *sed ob huiusmodi vanitatis ministerium quam plurimae copiae auri argentique quaerebantur* (783,10-11). Rufinus used *vanitas* to characterize Maximin's work in reestablishing paganism; he also explained that the work required large sums of money, so he managed to say that paganism was an economic burden on the population. Eusebius's description of Maximin's economic pressure lacked both precision and clarity, in Rufinus's opinion. Finally, he found the independent sentence τῶν γε μὴν εὐπόρων κτλ. (782,17-20) unfortunate in the context. Its reference to Maximin and his depriving the rich of their inherited possessions seemed to him quite isolated, as its content was connected to the previous account of the economic pressures on the population. The sentence also gave the false impression that he only distributed this wealth amongst his flatterers. Rufinus removed these incorrect points by breaking up the sentence: he integrated the first part into the account of the economic exploitation and from the second part – πλούτους κτλ. (782,19-20) – he created an independent sentence, in which he stated that Maximin apportioned the total economic proceeds. Consequently, his version has this form: *ex quo accidit, ut omnes ubique provinciae*¹⁵³ *diversis modis et occasionibus nudarentur,*¹⁵⁴ *gravan-*

147 Rufinus probably regarded οὐδὲ μέχρῃς ὄνουχος ὡς εἰπεῖν τολμᾶν τι κινεῖν (782,5) as one of Eusebius's hyperbolic expressions which, here as elsewhere, he saw no reason to translate.

148 The word was inserted by Rufinus. Its meaning is not very clear.

149 Rufinus chose to write simply *persecutor* instead of τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν ... ἐπετίθετο διωγμῷ (782,6-7) because Eusebius's expression could produce the false assumption that Maximin had taken the initiative in the persecution of the Christians – and up to this point, the account has said nothing of this. On the other hand, it was correct to depict him as the worst of the persecutors.

150 Rufinus supplied the information, which Eusebius did not, that the high priests ranked higher than the temple priests.

151 Rufinus chose a phrase in which *nobiles etc.* could refer, strictly speaking, to both the *sacerdotes* and the *pontifices*.

152 Rufinus saw no reason to translate ὡς ἂν εὐσεβείων καὶ θεῶν προσφιλέσιν (782,12-13). He doubtlessly considered it quite out of place even to hint that the pagan priests could be described as pious and god-loving. These words could only be used of the Christian clergy.

153 Rufinus thought that *omnes ubique provinciae* was quite sufficient as a translation

*do census, tributa multiplicando,*¹⁵⁵ *locupletiores quosque exquisitis aut etiam confictis iniuriis condemnando, alios vero etiam proscribendo,*¹⁵⁶ *omnes pariter bonis paternis avitisque familiis*¹⁵⁷ *evolvebat. unde et montes auri,*¹⁵⁸ *ut ita dixerim, congregatos familiaribus suis ac satellitibus*¹⁵⁹ *largiebatur* (783,11-17).

Eusebius's report in 782,23-784,2 could not be integrated into the context, in Rufinus's opinion, without being rewritten. He obviously considered *κραιπάλης κτλ.* (782,23-26) so laborious that it resembled a repetition. Moreover, the passage lacked clarity and cogency. At any rate, these considerations marked Rufinus's version: *deliciis, luxu atque omni dissolutionum genere fluitans turpissima*¹⁶⁰ *suis militibus praebebat exempla*¹⁶¹ (783,19-21). In this account, Rufinus apparently thought that *δι' ἀρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας -- κατὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων* (782,27-784,1) introduced a new line of thought which interrupted the continuity. The purpose here was to show that Maximin was a bad example to his surroundings, so the following account was necessary: *denique quidquid lascive, quidquid petulanter, quidquid luxuriose gestum a rectoribus vel militum vel provinciarum fuisset, inultum cedebat ob imperatoris exemplum* (783,21-785,1). Precisely because Rufinus was at pains to show that Maximin's sinful life also meant that the military leaders and provincial governors could freely live exactly as their Emperor, he could, without damaging his case, omit not only *δι' ἀρπαγῶν καὶ πλεονεξίας -- κατὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων*, but also *μόνον ουχὶ συντυραννοῦντας* (784,1).¹⁶²

In his version of 784,2-5, we note that Rufinus avoided Eusebius's rhetorical question *τί δεῖ τὰς ἐμπαθεῖς κτλ.* (784,2). He probably disliked its hyperbolic quality – here, as elsewhere, he exchanged such utterances for factual statements. But he also wanted to link the discussion of Maximin's immoral behaviour more closely to the previous description than Eusebius had done – this was quite natural as the theme had already been broached here. Instead of translating the two sentences in 784,2-4, he created this clear, comprehensible passage: *ne ullam, non dico urbem, sed vel breve oppidum*¹⁶³ *absque adulterio nobilium matronarum, quae per loca fuissent repertae, vel corruptione virginum praeteriret*¹⁶⁴ (785,2-4).

of the pleonastic phrase *πόλιν μὲν οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ χώραν, ὅλας δὲ ἄρδην τὰς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐπαρχίας* (782,14-15).

154 By writing *diversis modis et occasionibus nudarentur* instead of *ἡνία καὶ κατεπίεζεν* (782,17), Rufinus wanted to give a general description before going into more detail in the next passage.

Rufinus did not wish to translate *κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι κτλ.* (784,5-6). He probably thought that the continuity would be broken, if the text stated, as in Eusebius, that only the Christian women rejected Maximin's advances. Furthermore, this theme would be taken up in a later discussion, in the proper place. Apparently, Rufinus felt that the next passage – *οἱ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες κτλ.* (784,6-8) – could also be omitted to advantage. His reason probably was that the words could lead to the assumption that the Christians fought Maximin's tyranny. Rufinus considered such involvement in this world and its affairs unacceptable in Christians. Moreover, the statement was misleading because it is followed simply by a report on the Christians' struggle for their faith during Maximin's persecution.

The description of the Christians' steadfastness during the persecution appeared quite unmotivated in the context. This Rufinus found unsatis-

155 Rufinus's *gravando censum, tributa multiplicando* is an elegant and apposite translation of *εἰσπράξειςιν ἐπισκήψουσιν τε βασιυτάταις* (782,16-17).

156 Rufinus's translation created an excellent and grammatically correct link between *ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις καταδίκαις* (782,17) and *οὐσίας ἀφαιρούμενος* (782,18-19).

157 Rufinus apparently intended these words to clarify the meaning of *τάς ἐκ προγόνων περιποιηθείσας οὐσίας* (782,18).

158 Simple carelessness probably led Rufinus to write only *montes auri* here, despite the mention in 783,11 of *plurimae copiae auri argentique*.

159 Rufinus probably felt that *τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν κόλαξιν* (782,19-20) was far too imprecise, since he translated it by *familiares* and *satellites*. He probably used *familiares* to mean the members of Maximin's imperial household or court, whereas *satellites* must refer to the *rectores provinciarum* and *duces militum* mentioned in 783,9-10.

160 This excellent translation of *κραιπάλης δὲ καὶ ἀσωτίας μηδενὶ καταλιπὼν ὑπερβολήν* (782,23-24) created a fine link to the next passage, and, at the same time, Rufinus avoided Eusebius's hyperbolic expressions.

161 Rufinus used *exempla* to summarize the meaning of both *κακίας διδάσκαλον* (782,24) and *ἐνάγων* (782,26).

162 Rufinus probably felt that the two sentences *deliciis etc.* (783,19-21) and *denique etc.* (783,21-785,2) expressed the meaning of *κακίας διδάσκαλον τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσι τε καὶ ἀρχομένοις ἐάντων καθίστη* (782,24-25) and that, therefore, the passage could be omitted without problems.

163 Rufinus expanded the translation of *πόλιν* to *non dico urbem, sed vel breve oppidum*, probably because he wanted a more lively style, but he also wished to emphasize the fact that Maximin assaulted women everywhere in the country.

164 This is a correct and well written translation of *ἐκ παντὸς φθορὰς γυναικῶν παρθένων τε ἀρπαγὰς εἰργασμένον* (784,4-5). Rufinus probably chose *nobiles matronae* for *γυναῖκες*, quite simply because it seemed much more realistic. In addition, he could draw a parallel between Maximin and Maxentius, whose immoral behaviour towards *nobilium matronae* he had already described in 779,20-781,1.

factory. He wanted to show that Maximin's persecution of the Christians was closely connected to his sinful character, the theme of the previous account. Rufinus did this by summarizing the description up to this point under the term *hostis publicus*. It followed that he was *Christianorum hostis*. The result is this independent sentence: *talis hic tantusque vir, qui pudicitiae, honestatis, iustitiae ac totius aequitatis hostis publicus erat, quidni etiam Christianorum hostis et persecutor existeret?* (785,4-6).

Rufinus continued *adversum quos tantum crudelitatis exercuit, ut praecessores suos vincere festinaret in scelere* (785,7-8). He probably wanted to create a progressive account by emphasizing Maximin's *crudelitas* here. At least, this point of view dominates his version of the description of the Christians' struggle for their faith in 784,8-13: *ignes, lamminas, cruces, bestias, maris profundum, obtruncationes membrorum, effossiones oculorum et singulis membris specialia inferre supplicia*¹⁶⁵ *gestiebat, cum tamen magis illi constantes et fortes invenirentur in tolerando quam iste ingeniosus et callidus in exquirendo* (785,8-12). This lively, dramatic account exposes Maximin's *crudelitas* completely and helped Rufinus avoid the appearance of pure repetition of the previous martyrologies which is quite pronounced in Eusebius.¹⁶⁶

Rufinus refrained from mentioning, in 784,6, the Christian women's resistance to Maximin, and similarly, he omitted *οἱ ἄνδρες* in 784,8. So his version of 785,8-12 discusses the Christians in general and not, as his source, only the men's struggle. The alteration means that the men do not occupy a position out of all proportion in this context.

In 784,6, Eusebius talked of Christian women who had refused to commit adultery with Maximin, whereas in 784,15-18, he reported on women who, just like the men, had died as Christian martyrs for the sake of their faith – and what is more, his words suggest that he regarded them as separate groups. For Rufinus, however, both passages referred to the same women.¹⁶⁷ He expressed this clearly by saying, in the next passage, that the Christian women died both for their faith and to avoid Maximin's advances: *vincebatur*¹⁶⁸ *etenim saepius non solum a viris, sed etiam a feminis, quae verbo dei et fidei calore succensae ut feminae quidem comprehendebantur, sed ut viri fortes in certamine coronabantur, mortem promptius subire, immo vero et ultro expetere quam corporis maculam recipere malebant* (785,12-16).

Rufinus was so dissatisfied with Eusebius's account in *cap.* 14,15 (784,18-25) that he replaced it with a new, greatly expanded story. As far as we can judge, he had no other sources here, from which he could bor-

row,¹⁶⁹ so his account is extremely enlightening as to his treatment of Eusebius's text: sometimes he omitted matter from it and sometimes he added new material – all in an attempt to create a clear, coherent account.

Rufinus obviously felt that Eusebius diverged from the previous report. The introduction – μόνη γοῦν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου μεμοιχευμένων Χριστιανῆ (784,18-19) – he found quite useless, probably because the wording suggested that the Alexandrian woman was the only one who had resisted Maximin's advances. But this was misleading, as could be seen from Eusebius's earlier statement in 784,5-6. Nor could Rufinus accept the sentence τὴν ἔμπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον Μαξιμίνου ψυχὴν δι' ἀνδρειοτάτου παραστήματος ἐξενίκησεν (784,20-21) as it was, since it neither explained how the two had come to meet nor made it clear that her attitude as a Christian was the decisive factor.

The need for a clear account forced Rufinus to write an introduction which presented the two *personae dramatis* immediately: *verum cum duobus gravissimis dominis, libidine et crudelitate*,¹⁷⁰ *praeceps ageretur, fuit apud Alexandriam Dorothea*¹⁷¹ *quaedam satis nobili orta familia*,¹⁷² *ingentibus divitiis et propinquis nobilibus pollens* (785,16-18). Rufinus ob-

165 Rufinus followed his source very closely in this list. But he omitted *καυτήρας* (784,10) and felt it was sufficient to translate ὀφθαλμῶν κεντήσεις (784,10) by *effusiones oculorum*. He apparently considered τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἀρωτηριασμούς (784,10-11) a repetition of the previous expression, so he replaced the phrase by *singulis membris specialia inferre supplicia*. Since the passage was intended as a description of Maximin's *crudelitas*, he felt that λιμόν τε ἐπὶ τοῦτοις καὶ μέταλλα καὶ δεσμά (784,11-12) could be omitted – they contributed little towards an illustration of this point.

166 This was not a description of the actual persecution of the Christians, so Rufinus thought that he could happily omit ἡ τὸ σέβας τὸ εἰς θεὸν εἰδώλοισ ἀντικατηλλάξαντο (784,13).

167 In other words, Rufinus did not interpret αἱ δὲ ἐπὶ φθορὰν κτλ. as referring to women who had been condemned to the brothels because of their faith and who had taken their own lives to avoid this fate. In fact, he thought that the phrase referred to women whom Maximin wished to assault. The explanation is provided by the fact that Eusebius used ἐπὶ φθορὰν ἐλκόμεναι (784,16-17) to refer back to ἐκ παντὸς φθορᾶς κτλ. (784,4-6).

168 This refers to Maximin.

169 Cf. H. Delehay: "Les martyrs d'Égypte", *Analecta Bollandiana*, XL (1922), pp. 35-36.

170 Rufinus used this expression to make the story tally with the previous account, which has Maximin's *libido* and *crudelitas* as its theme. The next passage, as it stands, now provides a new example of these.

171 We have no way of knowing why Rufinus named the Alexandrian woman Dorothea.

172 Rufinus used this expression to rewrite ἐπισημοτάτη (784,19).

viously found Eusebius's description of the Alexandrian woman as ἔνδοξος ... παιδεία (784,21-22) all too short. It was necessary to enlarge upon this, at the same time emphasizing that her studies were more important for her than her high social position and wealth: *sed in ea ingenii atque industriae bonum ceterarumque honestarum artium studia magis quam haec vigeant* (785,19-20).

Rufinus felt that he must mention Dorothea's outward and inward beauty much more directly than Eusebius¹⁷³: *formae vero et decoris gloria tanta ei fuit, ut mirum ac speciale in ea dei figmentum crederetur* (785,20-21). These words not only gave the reason why Maximin coveted her but also emphasized Rufinus's conviction that beauty is a divine gift which no one can use at their own pleasure and which no one has the right to assail. When Eusebius wrote of the Alexandrian woman, πάντα γε μὴν δεύτερα σωφροσύνης τεθειμένη (784,22), this was not enough for Rufinus. He was in no doubt that her *pudicitia* stemmed from her choice of the Christian *virgo* ideal, and he wished to state this clearly: *sed illa, quae religione animi et honestate vitae pulchrior quam vultu corporis esse studeret, aequissimo mentis iudicio, quod pulchrum et decorum inter homines videbatur, id potius deo consecrare quam usui humano statuit indulgere, ut virgo deo sacrata persisteret* (785,21-25).

Having described Dorothea's human and Christian qualities, Rufinus turned his attention to Maximin. He described Maximin's desire to assault Dorothea in his ruthless *libido* and *crudelitas*: *at ille, qui divina atque humana libidine simul et crudelitate foedaret, cognito solius formae, non etiam ingenii ac propositi bono, ad temerandam virginem ac polluentem eius castitatem animum intendit* (785,25-28). This passage threw Maximin's lack of culture into relief; he was only driven by carnal desire and had no appreciation of his mental qualities. On these lines, Rufinus also explained more clearly Maximin's urge to assault virgins.

Now, the dramatic intensity of the tale increases. Rufinus describes the dilemma in which Maximin found himself, when he learned that Dorothea was a Christian: should he punish her as a Christian according to the anti-Christian laws which his *crudelitas* had prompted him to issue or should he exempt her from these in order to satisfy his *libido*?¹⁷⁴ His *libido* triumphed and he sent a message to her secretly, urging her to be his mistress and thus save her life.¹⁷⁵ The offer was flatly refused. She answered that she had dedicated herself to God and could therefore neither worship idols nor have sexual intercourse with anyone. She added that it was unseemly for a tyrant to show mercy and that it was not right for the

bloodthirsty persecutors of Christianity to coerce her into submitting to him.¹⁷⁶ Her answer only made Maximin's *libido* burn even more strongly and he therefore decided to use force. She chose to avoid any further advances by fleeing in secret with a few maids – and this meant that she abandoned all worldly things – her wealth, home and family – in order to retain her *castitas* as a *virgo*. As a result, Maximin became a laughing stock and turned insane.¹⁷⁷ This conclusion again differed from the source which ended by stating that Maximin sent her into exile and confiscated all her property.

Rufinus drastically revised Eusebius's story in nearly all respects, no doubt because he felt that, in the present context, it was rather an anti-climax. The treatment Maximin gave the aristocratic Egyptian was far less cruel than any of his actions against the other women. If the story was to have any point in the context, it would have to contain something new; so Rufinus must have reasoned. This could be achieved if it depicted a

173 Eusebius hinted at the woman's beauty when he used the word *λαμπροτάτη* (784.19).

174 *conperto vero, quod Christiana esset, quae secundum sua edicta poenae magis quam libidini subicienda videretur, in ambiguo positus aestuare coepit et in quam se partem verteret, ignorare* (785.28-31).

175 *sed ubi dubios animos libido, quae ei latius dominabatur, obtinuit et expectantem virginem pro matyrio ad supplicium rapi per occultos nuntios de stupro interpellavit* (785.31-33). Rufinus probably mentioned *occulti nuntii* here because he had found no explanation in Eusebius for Maximin's coming into contact with Dorothea. He probably also wished to specify that their only contact was through an intermediary. Eusebius's expression *ἦν καὶ πολλὰ λιπαρήσας* (784.22-23) could lead to the assumption that they had actually met repeatedly.

176 *illa aequae nefas sibi esse respondit templum corporis sui, quod semel deo consecraverat, idolorum cultu aut libidinis contagione polluere, proinde se quidem ad mortem paratam esse, a crudeli vero tyranno non decere blandum aliquid aut molle proferri nec esse dignum resolveri erga se truces animos, quos cottidie undatim Christianorum profusus cruor duraret* (785.33-787.2). When Rufinus made Dorothea answer – probably alluding to *1 Cor.* 3, v. 16 and *2 Cor.* 6, v. 16 – that she would not defile the temple of her body, neither with *idolorum cultu* nor with *libidinis contagione*, he was, strictly speaking, being inconsistent; the point in the section immediately previously was that she could escape the punishment which was her due as a Christian, by giving in to his *libido*. This inconsistency probably arose because Rufinus was at pains to show that Dorothea, like the other women, had to fight for both her faith and her *castitas*.

177 *ad quae responsa cum ille libidine accensus acrius incalesceret et nisi verbis adquevisset, vi agere decerneret, omnibus virgo pudicissima facultatibus suis domoque ac familia derelicta noctu clam cum paucis fidissimis famulis et cum amicissima sibi comite castitate discedit atque inlusum tyrannum vanum amentemque dereliquit* (787.2-7).

Christian woman who resisted all advances and was willing to sacrifice everything in order to live as a *virgo pudicissima*. At any rate, Rufinus's story had the additional purpose, which differed from Eusebius's, of describing Christian *virginitas* as a perfect lifestyle, Dorothea being the example. The study of the *artes liberales* also occupied a legitimate, though subordinate, place. But the story also shows that Dorothea made Maximin ridiculous and drove him mad by her *pietas* and *castitas*, and this was a new element in the description of Maximin – his *libido* and *crudelitas* finally resulted in his madness.

Eusebius's account of *μυρία δὲ ἄλλαι κτλ.* (784,25-786,2) must also have presented great difficulties for Rufinus. Its place and function in the context were not at all clear to him. He must also have been in doubt about the real meaning of the expression *πρὸς τῶν κατ' ἔθνος ἀρχόντων* (784,25-26). Even so, Rufinus did not feel that he should omit the section completely from his own version, possibly because he thought that Eusebius here resumed the line of thought from 784,5-6: *κατὰ πάντων γέ τοι αὐτῷ ταῦτα προνχῶρει, μὴ ὅτι μόνων Χριστιανῶν*. Whatever the case may be, a new account was required, with the following contents: *sed et alias plurimas nobiles mulieres simul ac virgines exemplo illius adortus, sed exemplo nihilominus illius paratiores ad mortem quam ad servitatem libidinis nactus, crudelibus suppliciis adfici iubet* (787,7-10). By thus making Maximin assail all the noble women who had chosen, with Dorothea as their example, to live as virgins, and who also rejected him as she had done, Rufinus linked this report closely to the previous account. It offers further evidence of Maximin's *libido* and *crudelitas*.¹⁷⁸ Rufinus was also at pains here to avoid any suggestion of a repetition. So finally, he emphasized the point that the women martyrs mentioned here, in contrast to those he had mentioned in 785,12-16, were indeed Christian but they had also chosen a life of *castitas* – and this encouraged them even more strongly to accept martyrdom: *quae multo promptius et laetius quam ceteri omnes mortem subibant, quod duplices sibi coronas a domino praeparandas non solum pro pietate, verum etiam pro castitate credebant* (787,10-13).

Cap. 14,16b-17 (786,2-15):

Maxentius and the Roman noblewoman

In *cap. 14,16 fin. -17* (786,2-15), Eusebius gives his readers a report on the Christian wife of a *praefectus urbis* in Rome who took her own life in order to avoid committing adultery with Maxentius.

The introductory words θαυμασταὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὐταὶ (786,2) refer to the women, mentioned immediately before in 784,25-786,2, who were tortured and died because they would not commit adultery. Eusebius continues ὑπερφυῶς γε μὴν θαυμασιωτάτη ἢ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὐγενεστάτη κτλ. (786,2-4), suggesting that the distinguished Roman woman became a martyr in even more horrible circumstances than they, but in fact, this is not the case at all. The words make much better sense if they are linked with the next lines – πασῶν αἷς ἔμπαροινεῖν ὁ ἐκείσε τύραννος κτλ. (786,4-5): exceedingly and most marvellous among the women against whom Maxentius attempted to act offensively. It must be noted, though, that this interpretation is at variance with the one which emerges from the text being discussed here.

In view of the fact that Eusebius completed his account of Maxentius in *cap.* 14,6 and went on to depict Maximin's tyrannical rule, it is surprising that, here again, he discusses Maxentius's indecency towards women – particularly because he described his *libido* in 778,19-780,2. These peculiarities must have appeared because the entire account constitutes a later insertion. We have already pointed out that Eusebius wanted to give a parallel account of Maxentius's and Maximin's governments, but that, in fact, Maximin received much more detailed attention than Maxentius. Perhaps Eusebius saw an opportunity to remove this imbalance by adding to the account the story of Maxentius and the distinguished Roman woman. It was also a perfect counterpoise to the report of Maximin's *libido* urging him to force his attentions on the Alexandrian noblewoman, so the story served as a specific example illustrating their competition in depravity. Another factor may also have contributed towards Eusebius's decision to include the story: it is a particular instance of the general points mentioned in *cap.* 14,2b (778,19-280,3)¹⁷⁹ and, at the same time, it proves that the Christian women in Rome, just like those in the East, preferred death to becoming a tyrant's mistress – the previous description of Maxentius had mentioned no such reaction. At any rate, Eusebius

178 To make this clear, Rufinus omitted πρὸς τῶν κατ' ἔθνος ἀρχόντων, πορνείας ἀπειλήν μὴδ' ἀκοῦσαι δεδυνημένα (784,25-26). He translated πᾶν εἶδος βασάνων καὶ στρεβλώσεων καὶ θανατηφόρου κολάσεως (786,1) by *crudelibus suppliciis* in order to emphasize Maximin's *crudelitas*. Moreover, he probably wanted to avoid the expressions which had previously been used to describe the sufferings of the martyrs.

179 It is surely no accident that Eusebius's description of Maxentius as ἔμπαροινῶν τοῖς ἐξοχωτάτοις (780,2-3) is repeated in the words γυνὴ πασῶν αἷς ἔμπαροινεῖν ... ἐπειρᾶτο (786,4-5).

linked the story to the existing account by inserting *θαυμασταὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὗται* (786,2) and probably also *τὰ ὅμοια Μαξιμίνῳ δρωῶν* (786,4-5). The new account is clear evidence that the link was very clumsy.

Eusebius states that the Roman woman was a Christian (*Χριστιανὴ δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἦν*, 786,6-7). This information is quite obviously an explanatory gloss, inserted into the text. The accuracy of this interpretation is also confirmed by the fact that the account itself shows no Christian characteristics. It simply states that the wife of the *praefectus urbis* chose to commit suicide to maintain her *pudicitia* rather than give in to the licentious ruler of Rome, albeit with her husband's approval. The absence of Christian features from the story justifies the assumption that Eusebius used a heathen text describing the tyrant Maxentius and his infamous deeds which did not even stop at the most distinguished, virtuous Roman matrons. The source described the wife of the *praefectus urbis* as *σωφρονεστάτη γυνή* (786,3-4), and therefore Eusebius was in no doubt that she was a Christian. He wanted to emphasize this specifically, however, by inserting *Χριστιανὴ δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἦν* (786,6-7). In *ἔργοις δ' αὐτοῖς κτλ.* (786,11-15), which concludes the account, Eusebius also tried, to all appearances, to make his heathen source Christian.

The conclusion states that the woman's suicide is a clear proclamation for everyone, then and in the future, that a Christian's virtue is his only invincible and imperishable possession. Eusebius had already described the Christian women's various sufferings and their executions, the punishments which they accepted to maintain both their faith and their chastity; therefore, it is surprising that this Roman woman in particular is held up as an eternal example because of her suicide. This obvious inconsistency is particularly striking since, elsewhere, Eusebius had said quite clearly that he wished to describe to his contemporary and future readers the Christians' struggle for their faith¹⁸⁰ – and that is certainly not the subject here. But the central passage in the conclusion – *ὅτι μόνον χρημάτων ἀήττητόν τε καὶ ἀνώλεθρον ἢ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ἀρετὴ πέφυκεν* (786,12-13) – also calls for comment. The expressions used are obscure in the context of the account up to this point. *σωφροσύνη* would have been a more natural word than *ἀρετή*. This is described as *μόνον χρημάτων*¹⁸¹ *ἀήττητόν τε καὶ ἀνώλεθρον*, so it agrees very badly with the previous account; it seems to refer to a context which cannot be traced. Nor is the meaning of *πέφυκεν*¹⁸² particularly evident. Finally, the expression *ἢ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ἀρετὴ* seems clumsy and imprecise; in fact, we may suspect that *παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς* constitutes a later addition.

All this indicates that, here, Eusebius was following a source in which the story of the Roman woman also showed that ἀρετή is the eternally indestructible possession which man should always covet. Even though the source was pagan,¹⁸³ the observation that, by her example, the woman became a permanent, powerful proclamation of the superiority of virtue, could have been a further reason for Eusebius to insert the story into his Church History – even more so, since he identified ἀρετή with σωφροσύνη and, by adding παρὰ Χριστιανοῦς, made it obvious that this was a Christian death.

Cap. 14,18 (786,15-21): Anarchy in the Roman Empire

In *cap.* 14,18a (786,15-17), Eusebius wrote that the account up to this point depicted the destructive effects of the depravity which the two tyrants practised simultaneously in both the East and the West.¹⁸⁴ With this

180 See VII,32,32 (730,18-21); VIII,2,3 (742,5-9).

181 Referring to *De vita Constantini*, I, 34, where we find the same account, Henri Valois thought that μόνον χρῆμα was the correct reading, see PG XX, 2, p. 787 note 80. Without justification, both Lawlor-Oulton: *Eusebius I*, p. 274, and G. Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée III*, p. 36, accepted this form for their translations. But no manuscript tradition supports this reading. However awkward, χρημάτων must therefore be retained. The meaning was unclear, as we have seen, because Eusebius was dependent here on his source.

182 The true meaning of this expression is not clear from the existing context. Again, the obscurity probably arose because Eusebius was reproducing his source, in which the meaning of the word would have been obvious.

183 Other features reveal the heathen provenance of the source. For example, the woman asked to be allowed to retire for a short time ὡς ἂν δὴ κατακοσμηθεῖ τὸ σῶμα (786,9). The meaning is evidently that she wanted to pretend to adorn herself for intercourse with Maxentius, but Eusebius most likely, would not himself have devised such a frivolous description, which even portrays her as treating the truth lightly.

184 τσαύτη δῆτα κακίας φορὰ ὑφ' ἑνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συνηρέχθη καιρὸν πρὸς τῶν δύο τυράννων ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν διειληφρότων κατεργασθεῖσα (786,15-17). διαλαμβάνειν constitutes a problem. Lawlor-Oulton wanted the word to signify “the two tyrants who had divided among them East and West” (*Eusebius I*, p. 273). Even though it can mean “divide”, a linguistically more correct translation would be “lay hold of”. The meaning is then that they seized control illegally of the East and the West. It implies that the Roman Empire was divided up between the two tyrants, but that is another matter altogether. It is also worth noting that in this list Maximin appears as the tyrant of the East before Maxentius as the tyrant of the West. Since the account just before this had discussed Maxentius, we would have expected the reverse order, but this is not the case, probably because, originally, 786,17-19 was the direct continuation of 786,2, which made it natural to name Maximin before Maxentius. The continuity was broken by the insertion of 786,2-15.

passage, he wanted to conclude the previous account in *cap.* 14,1-17. His summary also clearly showed that Eusebius considered it essential to compare Maximin and Maxentius: they were tyrants in the East and the West, respectively, they operated at the same time and, as the evil persons that they were, they ruled wickedly and harmfully.

The accounts of Maxentius and Maximin in *cap.* 14,1-17 are not parallel, however. This is true simply in terms of quantity since the description of Maximin and his rule is much more detailed than that of Maxentius. But the descriptions of the two tyrants are also different, despite certain similarities in terms of contents. Both were dominated by *libido*, but Maxentius only turned his attention to the aristocratic matrons of Rome, according to 778,17-780,3, and Maximin assailed both married women and virgins, as stated in detail in 784,2-6. Both confiscated wealth illegally: the senators suffered under Maxentius (780,10-13) but Maximin stole from all rich citizens. Both practised witchcraft: Maxentius practised repulsive portent taking and offered sacrifices (780,10-13), whereas Maximin could never act without portents and divinations (782,1-5).

The descriptions of Maxentius and Maximin are not truly parallel, particularly because they both contain special material. Thus we learn of Maxentius that he and his government degenerated after a promising start. He pretended at first to be a Christian and stopped the persecution of the Christians – and no more information is given on this subject. The entire section on Maxentius emphasizes his barbaric behaviour; he held the population of Rome in slavery by a bloody, despotic regime. In this connection, we also learn that his rule resulted in shortages and famine. The description of Maximin's idolatry and work for the reestablishment of paganism, together with his horrible persecution of the Christians, occupies a prominent position in the report on him. Only in connection with Maximin do we hear of drunkenness, extravagance and economic exploitation of the people. The report on Maxentius was an exclusive discussion of him, but here we learn of the highest civil and military officials whom Maximin favoured with positions and gifts and whom he seduced into following his own sinful example to the detriment of the entire population.

We have seen that Eusebius's account in *cap.* 14,1-17 reveals, again and again, that he used specific sources. The fact that the two descriptions are so very different, despite their similarities, makes it impossible to assume that he relied on one and the same account. We must presume that he borrowed from two quite independent descriptions of Maxentius and

Maximin.¹⁸⁵ They were of pagan origin and were written in Rome and the East, respectively. Moreover, they both defined their subjects, Maxentius and Maximin, as tyrants. This must be the reason why Eusebius compared them in his account.¹⁸⁶ The comparison is artificial, however, as is revealed in *cap.* 14,7-8a (780,22-782,2) and in the concluding passage in *cap.* 14,18a (786,15-17); these statements disagree with the descriptions of Maxentius and Maximin themselves.¹⁸⁷

Cap. 14,18b (786,17-20) states that the chaotic and ruinous situation¹⁸⁸ was a result of the persecution of the Christians. When they were permitted to practise their freedom,¹⁸⁹ this state of affairs ended.

In this account, the section belongs with *cap.* 14,18a (786,15-17), but both sections are marked by their own fundamental ideas. According to *cap.* 14,18a, the miserable state of the Roman Empire had been caused by

185 Eusebius's source for his account on Maxentius came from Rome, which is apparent from the fact that his criticism of Maxentius is largely centred on his treatment of the nobility of the Roman senate and his violation of the *libertas* of Rome. This is missing completely from the description of Maximin and indicates the Eastern provinces as its place of origin. We have seen how Eusebius's text in *cap.* 14,1-17 reveals time after time the fact that he made use of a specific source. But these two descriptions of the two tyrants are so different, despite certain common features, that we cannot presume that he was using one and the same source.

186 This interpretation differs from R. Laqueur's. Again, he was the first to subject *cap.* 14 to close scrutiny. But whilst he is quite correct in pointing out that Eusebius based his text on a source, the above analysis should have disproved the claim that *cap.* 14,1-18a (778,11-786,17) constitutes one unit taken from the same "Kaisergeschichte", cf. *op. cit.*, p. 155 f.

187 In this last passage, we note that Eusebius called Maxentius the tyrant of the West, whereas up to now, he has only been mentioned as the tyrant of Rome, cf. 778,11-12; 780,18-19, 23, 27. This difference no doubt indicates that, in the last instance, Eusebius reproduced the designation from the Roman source, whereas the first – inaccurate – expression is entirely of Eusebius's own making.

188 τὴν τῶν τοσοῦτων ... αἰτίαν (786,17-18) is explained in τὰ τῆς τοσῆσδε ... συγχύσεως (786,19-20).

189 τὰ τῆς παρρησίας ἀπολαβεῖν (786,20). This expression would naturally bring to mind the so-called Galerius edict which Eusebius translated in *cap.* 17,3-10. He never described it as τὰ τῆς παρρησίας, however. But he described Maximin's edict on complete religious freedom for the Christians, which he reproduced in IX, 10,7-11, as νόμον τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας αὐτῶν τελεώτατα καὶ πληρέστατα (842,1-2). Eusebius may have had this in mind – particular as Maximin died immediately afterwards. This meant that the political uncertainty which had in fact reigned in the Roman Empire since Maxentius's usurpation in October 306, now disappeared for a time. The obscurity of Eusebius's expression will be discussed later.

the wickedness of the two tyrants¹⁹⁰ – and this naturally implied that improvements presupposed their removal. But *cap.* 14,18b gives the persecution of the Christians as the cause. This striking contrast is definite proof that, originally, the two sections did not belong together.

In *cap.* 13,9-10, Eusebius described the *salus* of the Roman Empire and its absolute dependence on the relation of the Imperial Government to the Church. This explained why the persecution of the Christians produces political and economic anarchy. Here, *cap.* 14,18b expresses exactly the same idea, so it would be natural to regard the section as a direct continuation of *cap.* 13,9-10.¹⁹¹ The original continuity was destroyed when, as part of his continuing work with the Church History, Eusebius added *cap.* 13,11-14,18a in order to give a more detailed description of the miserable state of the Roman Empire.

Rufinus had obvious problems in accepting Eusebius's account in *cap.* 14,16b-17 (786,2-15). He must have found it misleading to regard the Roman matron as superior, because of her suicide, to the Christian women whose dreadful sufferings Eusebius had just listed. He apparently also found it superfluous to repeat the fact that Maxentius copied Maximin. At any rate, he completely omitted *cap.* 14,16b (786,2-5). But he considered it correct to compose a new passage which, besides explaining why the account of the wife of the *praefectus urbis* was included, would introduce the principal characters in the story to his readers: *sed in his relationibus positum silere aequum non puto etiam nobilissimae feminae in urbe Roma mirabile factum, Sofroniae,¹⁹² cuius vir praefectus urbis Romae sub Maxentio tyranno agebat* (787,13-15).

Rufinus also found it necessary to change the actual substance of the story and to add a number of details which would make it more fluent, more dramatic, and which would, last but not least, give it a markedly Christian quality.¹⁹³ Eusebius simply said that the wife of the *praefectus urbis* heard that Maxentius's procurers were in the house to bring her to him, but Rufinus felt that he should state explicitly that Maxentius coveted her because of her beauty: *qui cum de supra dictae feminae pulchritudine cognovisset, ut ei mos erat, missis stuprorum ministris deduci ad se feminam iubet* (787,15-17). Rufinus evidently also had difficulty in accepting Eusebius's account of the husband who allowed the procurers to take his wife with them, apparently because he feared for his life. At any rate, he put the case in a different way: initially, Sophronia, as a dutiful wife, left it to her husband to decide whether she should go or not: *illa rem*

ad maritum detulit (787,15-17). This threw him into a dreadful dilemma and only when she realized that he himself was afraid of having to pay the penalty for not complying with Maxentius's orders, did Sophronia decide to take her own life. Rufinus described this with dramatic intensity: *qui cum conperisset, multa secum volvens, ad ultimum altius ingemiscens: "et quid", inquit, "faciemus, quibus aut haec toleranda sunt aut anima ponenda?" tum illa, ut maritum vidit metu mortis perterritum prodidisse pudicitiam suam: "paulum", ait his qui missi fuerant, "expectate, donec composita, ut decet, et adornata procedam"*¹⁹⁴ (787,17-22). Similarly, Rufinus took pains to emphasize, much more strongly than Eusebius, the fact that the Roman matron was a Christian. He therefore made her pray to God before she threw herself on the sword and made her declare in a farewell message to Maxentius that Christian women would never yield to his lust: *dehinc ingressa cubiculum, cum prius defixis genibus orasset, tamquam pudicitiam suam deo immolatura, pectus ac viscera correpto mucrone transverberat, extremos huiusmodi nuntios ad tyrannum per adsistentes famulas mittens: "tales", ait, "magis placeant Christianae feminae tyranno"* (787,22-26). These words ended Rufinus's story of Sophronia; so he completely omitted Eusebius's conclusion: ἔργους δ' αὐτοῖς κτλ. (786,11-

190 κακία can be said to be the key word which was expanded upon in the description of the two tyrants and their rule. For example, it is said of Maxentius: ἡ ... τῶν κακῶν τῶν τυράννων κορωνίς (780,12-13), of Maximin: μᾶλλον δὲ κακίας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ νικητήρια τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην τυράννου κατοτροπίας ἀπενηνεγμένος (780,26-782,1), κακίας διδάσκαλος (782,24), and of both their operations: κακίας φορὰ (786,15). It should also be noted that Eusebius hardly mentioned persecution of the Christians in connection with Maxentius. But with Maximin, the persecutions were a part of his tyrannical rule.

191 Several individual points confirm the correctness of this interpretation. In the present context, the true meaning of τὴν τῶν τοσοῦτων -- αἰτίαν (786,17-18) is difficult to discover. But τοσαῦτα is crystal clear in the context of *cap.* 13,9-10, since the word refers to the political revolution which took place after the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian. τὰ τῆς τοσῆσδε ... συγχύσεως (786,19-20), too, is only fully intelligible when grouped with τὰ πάντα πράγματα ἀνατρέπει (774,21-22). R. Laqueur already pointed out the original connection between *cap.* 14,18b and *cap.* 13,9 ff., see *op. cit.*, p. 62. But his reconstruction of the writing of *cap.* 13,9-15 cannot be confirmed; for more details, see p. 58-65.

192 No satisfactory explanation can be found for Rufinus's choice of the name Sophronia for the main female character in the story any more than was the case with Dorothea.

193 Since it cannot be proved that Rufinus took this special matter from a martyrology or any other source, it must be ascribed to him alone.

194 Rufinus probably did not find Eusebius's phrase ὡς ἂν δὴ κατακοσμηθεῖ τὸ σῶμα (786,9) very suitable for a chaste Christian woman. Therefore, he had to replace it with the words *donec composita, ut decet, et adornata procedam*.

15). This decision probably resulted from Rufinus's view that Sophronia deserved praise no more than the other Christian women mentioned in Eusebius *cap.* 14,14-16. In fact, Rufinus made Sophronia appear in her farewell message as just one of many women who had chosen death to escape a tyrant's demand for promiscuity.

In the rest of his version, Rufinus only found use for *cap.* 14,18a: τὸσ' αὐτῆ δῆτα κακίας κτλ. (786,15-17) – a revised form of this could round off the description of Maxentius and Maximin. But *cap.* 14,18b (786,17-20) was useless to him, and he omitted it completely. He probably considered it positively misleading, as the account up to this point had mentioned no correlation between the evil government of the two tyrants and their relationship to Christianity. Another factor may also have influenced Rufinus's decision to omit the passage: he did not share Eusebius's opinion that the *salus* of the Roman government depended entirely on the state of Christian worship. But the rule of the two tyrants was entirely void of Christian significance; they tested the Christians' *virtus* and *fides* severely and thereby rendered these qualities more magnificent – in this sense, the tyrants' wickedness served a divine purpose. This aspect may also have been important to Rufinus because it explained the inclusion in the Church History of the extensive and often purely political description of Maxentius and Maximin. At any rate, he concluded this section in the following way: *hoc modo in oriente simul atque occidente*¹⁹⁵ *velut uno daemonis spiritu armati*¹⁹⁶ *et paribus isdemque vitiis accensi desaeviebant tyranni, cum tamen per haec Christianorum virtus animi et constantia fidei probator et magnificentior redderetur* (787,26-30).

Cap. 15,1-2 (786,21-788,5):

Civil war during the persecution of the Christians

This section describes the plots and wars which were commonplace throughout the entire ten-year period of the persecution of the Christians. No one could travel in safety, armies were mobilized, and famine and plague occurred frequently.

In the introductory sentence, Eusebius used the expression τῶν εἰς ἐπιβουλήν καὶ πόλεμον τὸν κατ' ἀλλήλων οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς διαλέλοιπεν (786,21-23). This must refer to all rulers in the Roman Empire during the ten years of the persecution. The perpetual intrigues and wars during this period must, in his eyes, doubtlessly be misfortunes which befell the Roman Empire as a result of the war against the Christians.

Here, we meet the same interpretation of the *salus* of the Roman Empire and its relationship to Christianity as in *cap.* 13,9-10 and 14,18b. But we also learn that the time of dissolution coincided with the period in which the Christians were persecuted. The persecutions began in 303, so, according to this information, they ended in 313. We know that Maximin issued an edict on the religious freedom of the Christians¹⁹⁷ in August 313, shortly before he died. Since Licinius became sole ruler of the East immediately after Maximin's death, this meant that peace was reestablished – for the time being, at least – throughout the Roman Empire. In the West, peace had been established at an earlier date, after Constantine's victory over Maxentius at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge on 28th October 312. The fact that the Christians were granted complete religious freedom almost simultaneously with the reestablishment of *pax Romana* is an obvious explanation for Eusebius's statement that the Roman Empire experienced plots and wars for as long as the Christians were persecuted.

The section itself contains a striking difference between the introductory passage (διὰ παντός κτλ., 786,21-23) and the rest of the account (ἄπλωτα κτλ., 786,23-788,7). The first part includes a brief and general statement describing conditions in the Roman Empire between 303 and 313. The remainder of the section is a detailed description of a widespread fear of enemy agents and of hectic mobilizations to counter an expected enemy attack both on land and at sea. In other words, Eusebius unfolded a situation which suggested a ruler in military difficulties whose adversary might attack at any time. The equipment at his disposal was insufficient for a war against the enemy, and he tried to improve his position by hastily producing weapons and warships.

Eusebius concluded his description by saying that, in due time, he would report on the famine and plague which befell the population.¹⁹⁸ He fulfilled his promise in IX,8, which describes these afflictions in Maxi-

195 Rufinus did not translate διειληφότων (786,17) in his version. He probably wanted to avoid giving the impression that Maxentius and Maximin had set themselves up as rulers over the West and the East respectively.

196 Rufinus used the addition, independently of his source, to emphasize the idea that their tyrannical rule was inspired by demons. Up to this point, the account had paid no great attention to this aspect.

197 Eusebius described the edict as τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας αὐτῶν τελεώτατα καὶ πληρέστατα [νόμον] (842,2-3) and he reproduced it in IX, 10,7-11.

198 τούτοις καὶ ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα λιμός τε καὶ λοιμὸς ἐγκατασκήπτει, περὶ ὧν κατὰ καιρὸν ἰστορήσομεν τὰ δέοντα (788,5-7).

min's provinces in detail. This indicates that Eusebius's specific and lively account of the civil war was based on his own experiences during Maximin's rule. The accuracy of this assumption is supported by information included in other sources on the final struggle between Maximin and Licinius.¹⁹⁹ We know from these that Maximin was heavily defeated by Licinius on 30th April 313 at the battle of *campus Ergenus*, in which he lost the majority of his troops and probably all his equipment too. He then retreated through Asia Minor to Tarsus, in order to establish a new line of defence at the Cilician gates and organized a new army of troops which had been moved up from Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Maximin was in a very difficult position. Weapons were urgently required for the new army, since Licinius, with his superior military strength, could attack at any moment, both on land and at sea.²⁰⁰ We would therefore be justified in stating that, in fact, Eusebius's account describes the hectic final phase of the battle between Maximin and Licinius. It is not surprising that Eusebius used the account as a basis for generalizations and extended his personal experiences of the war, applying them to the entire ten-year period of persecutions. After all, the war began to be felt seriously in Caesarea and Palestine only after Maximin's defeat at *campus Ergenus*. Before that, his provinces had only been slightly affected by the power struggle which had taken place since 306 in the rest of the Roman Empire and they had therefore experienced a period of peace and prosperity.²⁰¹ Moreover, Eusebius's personal experiences add lively intensity to his description.²⁰²

We have shown that *cap.* 15 and *cap.* 14,18b in the existing text are related in terms of contents, but they were probably not written at the same time. From *cap.* 14,18b, we would expect Eusebius, since he had already described the political chaos, to continue with an account of the new religious freedom for the Christians, which led to the reestablishment of *pax Romana*. But he did not. Instead, he described the political intrigues and civil wars in much greater detail than ever before. The reason must be that the whole of *cap.* 15 is a later insertion to explain τὰ τῆς συγχύσεως (786,19-20) – up to this point, the account has only included sporadic explanations.

When talking of political plotters and warmongers in *cap.* 15,1a, Eusebius must be referring to all the rulers of the Roman Empire, as has already been suggested. This was quite deliberate – only thus could he maintain that the Roman Empire depended on the attitude of the Imperial power to Christianity. It is hardly a matter of chance that the same line of thought occurs in *cap.* 13,9-10 and 9-11 respectively²⁰³ and in 14,18b.

These sections must originally have appeared side by side. Here, Eusebius regarded the Imperial power as a collective entity, which allowed him to claim that the Roman Empire depended entirely on its attitude towards the Christians. He later abandoned this concept, though, and instead gave separate discussions of the Emperors and their views of Christianity. This made it impossible to talk of the Roman Empire as a unit, so he must limit himself to describing the provinces ruled by each individual Emperor. But with this as a guiding principle, we should be able to reconstruct the process which led to the composition of *cap.* 13,9-15.

Originally, Eusebius had simply given a short description of the Roman Empire as dependent on the Emperors' attitude towards Christianity – and the Emperors are here viewed collectively. We find this again in *cap.* 13,9-10 and 9-11 and in 14,18b. Later, Eusebius must have felt that this description was too sketchy and therefore he added *cap.* 15. But subsequent treatments of each Emperor individually recur in *cap.* 13,11 and 13,12-14,18a. This is a long insertion which interrupts the continuity of the original account. The fact that he abandoned the collective concept of the Imperial power meant, however, that the new description was controlled by the contrast between the just and God-fearing Emperors and the tyrannical rulers. This fact – that the original account with the addition of *cap.* 15 and the long insertion are based on essentially different views – goes a long way towards explaining the obscurities and inconsistencies apparent in *cap.* 13,9-15.

199 For a more detailed justification of this account, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 246 ff.

200 In addition to an attack on Maximin's new defence line at the Cilician Gates, Licinius had also planned an attack from the sea with his fleet.

201 Maximin himself gave a similar description of the situation in his provinces in a letter to the population of Tyre, which Eusebius translated in excerpts in IX, 7,8-10.

202 Eusebius probably spoke of *ἐτομασῶν τε τριήρων τε καὶ τῶν κατὰ ναυμαχίαν ὄπλων* (788,3-4) because Caesarea, the home of the naval squadron in the Eastern Mediterranean, also had naval dockyards. This interpretation of *cap.* 15,1b-2 provides us with an important source of information on the final phase of the war between Maximin and Licinius. It proves that the defeat at *campus Ergenus* in no way finished Maximin. He worked with great energy and resolve to establish new, well equipped land and sea forces in order to turn the military developments to his advantage. Eusebius's description allows us to conclude that Caesarea was in a state of advanced mobilization. The description is a generalization, so we may also conclude that similar situations prevailed in all the provinces which were still under Maximin – that is, Syria, Palestine and Egypt.

203 Cf. pp. 113 ff.

Irrespective of the validity of the interpretation of *cap.* 15,²⁰⁴ the fact remains that Rufinus omitted it completely from his Latin version. He may have felt that Eusebius gave a biased description of conditions in the Roman Empire in the period 303-313. In *cap.* 13,12-14, for example, he stated that this period also saw just and God-fearing Emperors such as Constantius and his son Constantine. Another reason for the omission of this chapter could be that Rufinus thought it contained no material of any religious significance. This view was undoubtedly connected with the fact that he did not share Eusebius's opinion that the Imperial power depended on the worship of the Christian God. When seen in the light of his fundamental conviction that individual faith and individual salvation were essential concepts, the chapter must have appeared quite superfluous in a Church History which was written for the edification of the faithful.

Cap. 16,1-17,11 (788,8-794,25): The persecution is called off

Cap. 16,1 (788,8-16) reports on the persecutions which abated in their eighth year when God showed his mercy towards the Christians by making the Emperors bring them to an end.

The passage which introduces this section begins: *τοιαῦτ' ἦν τὰ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ διωγμοῦ παρατετακῶτα* (788,8). The phrase must refer to *cap.* 15 and summarizes the description given there. It seems strange that it continues *δεκάτω μὲν ἔτει σὺν θεοῦ χάριτι παντελῶς πεπαυμένον, λωφᾶν γε μὴν μετ' ὄγδοον ἔτος ἐναρξασμένου* (788,8-10). *Cap.* 14,18b-15,1a only mentions persecutions which ceased after ten years, when the Christians were granted religious freedom.²⁰⁵ This was modified here, however, when Eusebius wrote that the persecutions came to an end in their tenth year, though they were temporarily suspended after the 8th year.²⁰⁶ The subsequent account, which gives the reasons for this modification, shows, however, that the “palinode” which was issued in the 8th

204 Lawlor-Oulton's interpretation differs from the one given above. They regarded *cap.* 15 as belonging to the original account, with the exception of *δεκαέτους* (786,21), which is “probably substituted in the second edition for “period of eight years” (*Eusebius* II, p. 283) and the last sentence: *τούτοις κτλ.* (788,5-7): “The reference seems to be to the famine and pestilence recorded in ix, 8. But they were confined to Maximin's dominions, and this chapter deals with the empire as a whole. The allusion to them is therefore probably a later addition” (*ibid.*) This interpretation fails to account for the problems which result from regarding *cap.* 15 as part of the original account, supposedly written in the summer of 311, cf. *op. cit.*, p. 5. In addition, we proved above that Eusebius's description in *cap.* 15,1b-2 presupposed a political and military situation which arose only after Maximin's defeat at *campus Ergenus*. On the question of the date for the writing of *cap.* 13,9-15, see my article “The so-called *Appendix*”, *Class. et Mediaevalia* XXXIV (1983), p. 196 f.

205 Here, Eusebius was thinking of Maximin's edict on religious freedom for the Christians, which he reproduced in IX, 10,7-11. When he said it was issued in the “tenth year” of the persecutions (*δεκάτω ἔτει*, 788,8-9), he meant between February 312 and February 313. IX, 10,13 makes it clear, however, that the edict was issued shortly before Maximin's death, i.e. in the summer of 313.

206 *λωφᾶν* (788,9) was obviously chosen with great care by Eusebius. It can mean “cease”, but also “abate” which, in this context, must be the correct interpretation. But Eusebius may have wished to evoke the first meaning as well, in which case he was saying that the persecution ceased and gave temporary relief to the Christians.

year²⁰⁷ marked the complete cessation of the persecutions. There is therefore a distinct discrepancy between τοιαῦτ' κτλ. and the subsequent account.²⁰⁸

Our analysis of *cap.* 13,8a above showed that we must understand Eusebius to mean that he would now reproduce the palinode.²⁰⁹ But it does not appear until later, in *cap.* 16,1b (788,10-16). The conclusion is therefore unavoidable that that section is the direct continuation of *cap.* 13,8a. This is further supported by the fact that γὰρ (780,10) then receives proper emphasis. The original account was interrupted when Eusebius decided to insert the large section in *cap.* 13,8b-15,2, which was supposed to describe conditions in the Roman Empire in connection with the Imperial power as such and the individual Emperors' governments. *Cap.* 13,8b should be interpreted as a link connecting the original text to the later insertion, and the same is the case with *cap.* 16,1a. The peculiarities which occur in this chapter then have a natural explanation: they arose because Eusebius wanted to coordinate the large insertion, which assumes that the persecutions lasted for ten years, with the original version in which they were said to have ceased completely in the spring of 311, having lasted for eight years. Eusebius's text shows quite clearly that these viewpoints were impossible to harmonize.²¹⁰

Cap. 16,1b (788,10-16) is clear and well written. It is characterized by the basic conviction that God stopped the persecutions as an act of mercy.²¹¹ In other words, Eusebius regarded the persecutions here exactly as he did in *cap.* 1,7-9, as a matter between God and His Church: even though He allowed the persecutions to take place to chastise His disobedient and sinful people, He continued to watch over them and showed His mercy to them by bringing the atrocities to a close.

Eusebius continued by saying that the Emperors who had previously been responsible for the struggle against the Christians quite unexpectedly changed their minds and issued the "palinode",²¹² and this in itself could be taken to mean that they were solely responsible for starting the persecutions and for stopping them. In that case, the sentence suggests a friction, not to say a state of opposition, between God and the Emperors.

But Eusebius doubtlessly intended to say that God was using the Emperors as His instruments to implement His will. This appears not only from the previous passage – ὡς γὰρ κτλ. (788,10-11) – but also from Eusebius's statement that the complete change in the Emperors' previously hostile attitude happened παραδοξότατα (788,13). He was trying to indi-

cate that it was a divine miracle, that, in other words, God Himself had effected the change of mind in the Emperors.

The Emperors are seen here as one collective group. There was only one Imperial power, in which they all participated. Since its will was expressed in joint legislation, it was completely logical that, because of the anti-Christian legislation, all the Emperors were described as hostile towards the Church and to such an extent that it came as a complete surprise to the Christians when the persecutions were stopped. In other words, there was no question of some Emperors being hostile towards the Christians, and others friendly.²¹³

Eusebius described the cessation of the persecution like this: παλινωδίαν ἦδον χρηστοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν προγογγύμασιν καὶ διατάγμασιν ἡμερωτάτοις τὴν ἐπὶ μέγα ἀφθεῖσαν τοῦ διωγμοῦ πυρκαϊᾶν σβεννύντες (788,14-16). The expression παλινωδίαν ἦδον is a metaphor which indi-

207 μετ' ὄγδοον ἔτος (788,9-10) must be understood to mean that the persecutions were stopped by the palinode in the eighth year and consequently that the stop continued during the subsequent period, as indicated by μετά. In the present text, Eusebius considered the "palinode" to be Galerius's edict, which he reproduced in *cap.* 17, 3-10. This must have been issued in April 311, immediately before Galerius died on about 1st May, cf. my book *Maximinus*, p. 155. The statement that it was issued in the eighth year of the persecution is therefore incorrect since, from Eusebius's calculation of the period, the eighth year lasted from February 310 to February 311.

208 See also Lawlor-Oulton: "The awkwardness of the sentence gives ground for suspicion that the text is not as it was originally written. Moreover, a reference to the tenth year by way of introduction to an event of the eighth is curious; and that the edict should be described as "quenching the fire" of a persecution which continued for two years, with increasing violence (ix, 6,4) after it was issued, is almost a contradiction in terms" (*Eusebius II*, pp. 283-84).

209 See above p. 108.

210 For further discussions on the date of the various layers in the Church History, see my article "The so-called *Appendix*", *Class. et Mediaevalia XXXIV* (1983), p. 200 ff.

211 This is clearly marked by the subordinate clause in front: ὡς γὰρ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλω ἢ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις ἐνεδείκνυτο (788,10-11).

212 οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄρχοντες, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκείνοι δι' ὧν πάσαι τὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐνηργεῖτο πολέμων, παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην, παλινωδίαν ἦδον ... (788,12-14).

213 Lawlor-Oulton's comment on μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην (788,13) is therefore out of place: "Constantine and Licinius did not change their mind: they had never persecuted the Christians. The reference must therefore be to Galerius and Maximin" (*Eusebius II*, p. 284). Quite apart from the fact that it is incorrect to say that Licinius did not persecute the Christians, cf. my book *Maximinus*, pp. 152-153, the comment reveals a misunderstanding of the passage in question.

cates a recantation of an attack on a person²¹⁴ – and in this specific situation, it refers to the recantation of the anti-Christian laws. The “palinode” was implemented through laws and decrees. Eusebius mentioned *προγοράμματα καὶ διατάγματα*,²¹⁵ doubtlessly because he was thinking of the letters on the “palinode” which were sent from the Imperial chancellery to the provincial governors, who then sent the “palinode” out in new circulars to the local authorities. The important fact here is that the “palinode” was not seen as identical to a specific law but actually describes the decision to call off the persecution. The legal and administrative measures which were necessary to bring the decision into effect were of little consequence to Eusebius in this context. The Emperors were collectively responsible for the “palinode” and when the laws in which it was expressed were described as *χρηστά* and *ἡμερώτατα*, Eusebius wanted to indicate that they had abandoned their hostile attitude and would now show *humanitas* towards the Christians.

In *cap.* 16,2 (788,16-22), Eusebius took great pains to relate that the cessation of the persecution had no human cause, as some might claim, nor was it the result of the mercy of the rulers. It depended on Divine Providence which had become reconciled with its people and also wished to punish the instigator of the persecution. If the last remark – *τῷ δ’ αὐθέντη τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης* (788,22) – is ignored, the section expresses the same line of thought, though more explicitly and in greater detail, as was followed above, in *cap.* 16,1. Eusebius’s strong emphasis on the view that the “palinode” originated exclusively from God had a definite polemic purpose.²¹⁶ He wanted to dispel the notion that it should be attributed to the Emperors and their *humanitas* – many heathens must have suggested this²¹⁷ when the Christians insisted that the cessation of the persecution was evidence of God’s care for His people.²¹⁸ Eusebius, at any rate, maintained that such an interpretation disagreed with the actual facts, namely, that the Emperors had shown increasingly greater and more cunning cruelty towards the Christians from the start of the persecutions right up to the “palinode”.²¹⁹ Such *inhumanitas*, of course, meant that they could not have taken the initiative for the “palinode”. Again we note that the Emperors are considered as one entity, acting *in solidum*, as was the case above in *cap.* 16,1. There, Eusebius stated quite clearly that the Emperors were hostile to the Christians and fought them, but here he added that the Emperors had behaved with more and more refined cruelty.

Eusebius phrased his statement that the “palinode” originated solely

from God, thus: ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς θείας προνοίας ἐμφανῆς ἐπίσκεψις (788,20-21). So he said that Divine Providence revealed its loving care.²²⁰ But he continued: τῷ μὲν αὐτῆς καταλλαττομένης λαῶ, τῷ δ' αὐθέντη τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης (788,21-22), and this presents problems.

The first part states that God was reconciled with His people. This must mean that the Christians had been chastised by the persecutions so that they had confessed and done penance for their sins, and thus had become reconciled with God. The persecutions had then served their purpose, and God made them cease. A new aspect, as compared to the contents in *cap.* 16,1, is this: the “palinode” presupposed the reconciliation between God and His people.²²¹ In other words, Eusebius linked the passage to *cap.* 1,6-9 which made the basic point that God protects His people when they live according to His will, but punishes them with destruction when they turn away from Him in sin.

The second, coordinate part must be understood to mean that the revelation of the Divine ἐπίσκεψις manifested itself in God's punishment of

214 Cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 1293 *ad verbum* παλινωδία: “First used of an ode by Stesichorus, in which he recanted his attack upon Helen, Isoc. 10.64, Pl. *Ep.* 319e, *Phdr.* 243b.”

215 The words are synonymous, since they both usually represent *edicta*. But Eusebius, here as elsewhere, did not concern himself with the correct designations for the various forms of law; here, the phrase probably indicates, quite simply, the Imperial laws in general and at all levels.

216 The expression ὡς ἂν φαίη τις (788,17) proves this. He may also have included the section because it allowed him to remove completely the ambiguity which existed in *cap.* 16,1, namely, whether God or the Emperors were ultimately responsible for the palinode.

217 οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον δέ τι τούτου κατέστη αἴτιον οὐδ' οἴκτος, ὡς ἂν φαίη τις, ἢ φιλανθρωπία τῶν ἀρχόντων (788,16-17). We cannot know whether Eusebius had a fictitious or a real opponent in mind.

218 The Christians stated this to the heathens by way of an apology, which is clear from e.g. IX, 1,11b.

219 πλείω γὰρ ὀσημέραι καὶ χαλεπώτερα ἀρχῆθεν καὶ εἰς ἐκείνο τοῦ καιροῦ τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς ἐπενοεῖτο, ποικιλωτέραις μηχαναῖς ἄλλωτε ἄλλως τὰς καθ' ἡμῶν αἰκίας ἐπικαινοργούντων (788,17-20).

220 ἐπίσκεψις means a visitation, in the sense of either “to take care of” or “to strike with punishment and destruction”. The preceding passage makes it clear that the word was supposed to express the divine φιλανθρωπία, as opposed to the Emperors' treatment of the Christians. It should therefore be read in its first meaning and is thus completely parallel to τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν (788,10).

221 This is, of course, no real contradiction. *Cap.* 16,1 does describe God's intervention on behalf of His people as an example of His mercy, but it is defined as τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω (788,10-11), and the last word implies that God has granted His forgiveness.

the instigator of the horrible persecutions. But this, in fact, introduces a completely new line of thought which disagrees with the previous account. There, God was said to have initiated the persecutions, here, a person is identified as the originator.²²² Up to this point, the Emperors have been described as acting *in solidum* as an entity, but now one individual Emperor is singled out. He was responsible for the persecution, and God confronted him, punished him, and made him abandon his wicked enterprise.²²³ The contradiction in 788,20-22 is so striking that it must be explained as the result of Eusebius having revised an original text.

The close agreement in thought between 788,10-16 and 788,16-20 is no doubt the product of Eusebius's desire in the latter section to expand and justify his argument from the first section – namely that the “palinode” was God's own work. Later, he wanted to extend the account with a report on Galerius's illness and death based on information he had received by then. This he did by adding τῷ μὲν κτλ. (788,21-22). To link the insertion to ἐπίσκεψις would appear quite natural, particularly since it could exploit various nuances in the meaning of that word: God's loving care for those with whom He had become reconciled and His punishment of and fight against His adversaries.²²⁴

The BDM manuscripts only have τῷ δ' αὐθέντη τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης and continue with μέτεισιν κτλ. (788,22 ff.), but ATER also has the following text in between those two clauses: καὶ πρωτοστάτη τῆς τοῦ παντὸς διωγμοῦ κακίας ἐπιχολουμένης. καὶ γὰρ εἴ τι ταῦτ' ἐχοῖν κατὰ θεῖαν γενέσθαι κρίσιν, ἀλλὰ “οὐαί”, φησὶν ὁ λόγος, “δι' οὗ δὲν τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται” (788,24-26). Even though καὶ πρωτοστάτη κτλ. appears to be a repetition of τῷ δ' αὐθέντη κτλ. (788,22), the two parts are not completely identical. ὁ αὐθέντης must refer to the originator of the persecutions, but ὁ πρωτοστάτης, strictly speaking, only states that the person in question led the persecutions against the Christians. This implies that others were also involved in the persecutions. The next sentence, καὶ γὰρ κτλ. (788,25-27), explains that a person who acts as an instrument, but has not initiated the action himself, is still responsible for its execution. This cannot possibly refer to τῷ αὐθέντη, but must be linked to τῷ πρωτοστάτη. Moreover, the passage states that God's κρίσις absolutely had to take place, and this must allude to Eusebius's argument in *cap.* 1,7-2,1: God had to judge his sinful people – so He had to start persecutions to punish and chastise the disobedient Christians. The sentence therefore uses the quotation from *Luke* 17,1 to make the

point that, even though the person who led the persecutions of the Christians was simply God's instrument for the execution of His judgement, this did not relieve him of responsibility for his actions and he must be sentenced and punished.

This interpretation shows that the material particular to ATER served, in the context, to explain that there was no contradiction between God's sending the persecutions and His punishment of the person who was His instrument in executing His sentence. ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε κτλ. (788,20-22) might appear to be leading up to just this kind of misunderstanding. The material unique to ATER must therefore be considered as both supplementing and amplifying this sentence, which is why it may seem repetitive.

Eusebius probably inserted the explanatory gloss when he decided to expand his account to include a description of Galerius's illness and death. He removed it again, however, in his final version of the Church History.²²⁵ It is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for this revision.²²⁶ Perhaps he felt on closer consideration, that the statement could

222 Eusebius chose the expression τῷ αὐθέντῃ τῶν κακῶν to describe the one who had full power and authority to originate the evils, i.e. the persecution of the Christians.

223 The verb ἐπεξιούσης, sc. τῆς θείας προνοίας, must be taken to mean prosecute, i.e. that God took revenge on and punished those responsible for the persecution. But it is not clear whether God persecuted and punished the sinners only for retribution or if He wished to make the evil-doer repent and stop the persecution. The statement in question was made of Galerius, who repented and called off the persecution as a result of God's punishment, so Eusebius was probably thinking of the second factor, too.

224 But this does not make the addition successful, since, logically, the first part describes the conditions for the manifestation of the divine ἐπίσχεψις, whereas the last part states the results. It is understandable that various translators have experienced difficulties when faced with τῷ μὲν κτλ. (788,21-22). For example, Lawlor-Oulton gave this translation: "But it was due to the manifestation of the Divine Providence itself, which, while it became reconciled to the people, attacked the perpetrator of these evils" (*Eusebius* I, p. 274), while G. Bardy preferred to translate it thus: "Mais la vigilance de la Providence divine elle-même fut manifeste, d'abord en se réconciliant avec le peuple, puis en poursuivant l'auteur de nos maux" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 38).

225 This was proved by E. Schwartz, who also pointed out that the ATER text here contains material from an earlier edition which Eusebius found too good to remove, cf. *Eusebius* II, 3, p. XLVII.

226 E. Schwartz realized that reasons were difficult to find for Eusebius's rejection of καὶ πρωτοστάτη κτλ. (788,24-27). But he did give, as an explanation, the fact that Eusebius no longer wished to make Galerius fully responsible for the persecution – the responsibility should rather be ascribed to Diocletian, see *Eusebius* II, 3, p. L-LI. The explanation is not very useful, however. The removal of the section makes no difference in this respect, as long

lead to the false assumption that Galerius was unjustly treated when he suffered as dreadfully as he did just because he acted as an instrument of God's will. Eusebius's previous description of Diocletian as ὁ πρωτοστάτης of the persecution may also have prompted his revision. By omitting the remark in question, Eusebius avoided any possibility of confusion with him.

Cap. 16,3b-5 (788,22-790,12) describes Galerius's incurable illness and his killing of the doctors.

The section begins with the words μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θεήλατος κόλασις (788,22-23). They emphasized the fact that the illness which struck Galerius²²⁷ should be regarded as God's punishment of him for his participation in the persecutions of the Christians.²²⁸ The continuation – ἐξ αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ καταρξαμένη σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς προελθοῦσα (788,23-790,1) – must mean, literally, that God's punishment began as a physical illness which then developed into a mental illness. But the text continues to discuss only the bodily disease. Even though Eusebius could have been using the expression μέχρι τῆς ψυχῆς to allude to the fact that Galerius was deeply affected by God's anger at his sin – a reaction which he described later, in *cap.* 17,1a (790,12-13) – this cannot be regarded as an actual mental illness. The lack of agreement between ἐξ αὐτῆς κτλ. and the ensuing description must have been caused by Eusebius's borrowing

as both τῷ δ' αὐθέντῃ τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης and all of the following description of Galerius remained in the final edition. R. Laqueur continued Schwartz's discussion of the problem. He felt that τῷ δ' αὐθέντῃ κτλ. and καὶ πρωτοστάτῃ κτλ. "nur verschiedene Ausdrucksformen desselben Gedankens sind, so dass der eine Variante des andern ist: beide Lesungen befriedigen an sich den Leser" (*op. cit.*, p. 78). But he continued: "Um so notwendiger ist es, die Frage nach dem Grunde der Variante aufzuwerfen, und da wird denn auch sofort klar, dass durch die erste Formulierung Galerius als "der Vollbringer der Übel" charakterisiert wird, während er in der zweiten als "der Anstifter der Verfolgung" erscheint" (*ibid.*). Laqueur's interpretation of αὐθέντης and πρωτοστάτης presents problems, however. It actually puts the passage on its head, since αὐθέντης should, in fact, be translated by "Veranlasser der Verfolgung" and πρωτοστάτης by "Vollstrecker der Verfolgung". His conclusion must consequently be rejected as having no justification: "Dabei erscheint es mir wahrscheinlich, dass das Zitat aus Lukas samt seiner Einführung mit der ersten Formulierung zusammenhängt; denn die Vorstellung "Gott hat zwar die Christen bestrafen wollen; aber wehe dem, durch den das Ärgernis kommt, fügt sich zum mindesten besser in den Gedanken von der Vollstreckung der Strafe durch Galerius ein, als wenn dieser der Veranlasser wäre, welche Rolle vielmehr Gott selbst zukommt" (*ibid.*). The fact that the material particular to ATER constitutes a unit, as proved above, is also confirmed by Eusebius, who included this, of all passages, in its entirety in his final edition of the Church History.

from an account which explained that Galerius was attacked by an illness in both body and mind, but he only used that part of the text which described the effects of the bodily illness. The assumption that Eusebius used a source seems to be further supported by the account of Galerius's cancer – as we presume it to have been – which Eusebius presented in *cap.* 16,4 (790,1-8). The account, in fact, reads like a case-history, describing objectively and with no religious overtones, the development of the illness, and the reason must be that Eusebius reproduced his source here almost verbatim.

In *cap.* 16,5 (790,12), Eusebius reported that Galerius had the doctors killed who either could not bear the stench from his rotting body or were incapable of curing him. The point was not merely to show the dreadful extent of the illness, but also to illustrate Galerius's cruelty. However, these points lie beyond Eusebius's real purpose in writing about Galerius's illness, so they must also have been transferred from an account already in existence. It is characteristic, too, that the description of all the doctors who were murdered contains no religious aspect. From this, we may conclude that the account on Galerius which Eusebius used here was, first of all, political and not religious and had, as its primary purpose, the defamation of Galerius and his rule. There, his illness was perhaps described on the basis of the conviction that he was rewarded according to his deserts. But when Eusebius learned of this macabre account of the illness, he interpreted it immediately as a report on God's punishment of Galerius – a much more natural interpretation for him since he was convinced that a ruler's death was very closely connected to his attitude to the Church. Eusebius expressed this Christian interpretation in the sentence μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θεήλατος κόλασις (788,22-23), which indicated the frame of reference within which Galerius's illness should be understood.

Cap. 17,1-2 (790,12-20) makes the point that Galerius gave the order to stop the persecution of the Christians when under the influence of his dreadful illness.

The introductory words καὶ δὴ τοσούτοις παλαίων κακοῖς συν-

227 Note that, here too, Eusebius refrained from mentioning Galerius by name.

228 In the BMD text, μέτεισιν κτλ. could well refer to ἐπεξιέναι (788,22) giving more details on the nature of the divine punishment and prosecution. But the evidence of the ATER text makes much better sense, since μέτεισιν κτλ. must then be linked to ἐπιχολουμένης (788,24) to say that the divine anger manifested itself in the incurable illness which was Galerius's punishment.

αίσθησιν τῶν κατὰ τῶν θεοσεβῶν αὐτῷ τετολμημένων ἴσχει (790,12-13) must be understood to mean that Galerius recognized, in his fight with illness, that he had acted cruelly in persecuting the Christians.²²⁹ No information is given as to how he arrived at this conclusion, but from μέτεισιν κτλ. (788,22-23) we must assume that Galerius regarded his illness as a punishment sent by God because he had persecuted the Christians.

The continuation, συναγαγὼν δ' οὖν εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὴν διάνοιαν (790,13-14), states that Galerius debated the situation with himself. His reflections led, we are told in 790,14-18, firstly to his recognition of and profession of belief in the Christian God,²³⁰ and secondly, to his summoning his court officials²³¹ and ordering them to call a halt to the persecution forthwith. In an edict,²³² he encouraged the Christians to rebuild their churches, perform their rites and pray for the Emperors.²³³

Even though Eusebius's intentions are perfectly clear here, the entire passage in 790,12-18 is unsatisfactory in point of both language and contents. The introductory words καὶ δὴ τοσοῦτοις κτλ. (790,12-13) state that Galerius realized that he had acted cruelly towards the Christians by persecuting them, and it would be logical to expect this to result in a decision to halt the persecutions. But instead, a new line of thought is introduced by συναγαγὼν κτλ. (790,13-18). Even though, with οὖν (790,13), Eusebius wished to state that he was going to describe, in more detail, the results of Galerius's recognition of his cruel treatment of the Christians, it is obvious that συναγαγὼν ... εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὴν διάνοιαν actually repeats συναίσθησιν κτλ. Nevertheless, there is a pronounced difference between the two statements. The first passage, καὶ δὴ τοσοῦτοις κτλ. (790,12-13), is purely negative, saying that Galerius recognized that it was wrong to persecute the Christians. The second passage, συναγαγὼν κτλ. (790,13-15), says quite clearly that he recognized the Christian God, and this implies that his persecutions were a sin against God. So there is no connection between the two statements, and there can be no doubt that they were written at different times.

The text, as it stands, says that having collected his court officials, Galerius ordered them to halt the persecution of the Christians forthwith and at the same time, in an edict, to urge them to build up their churches and perform their religious rites. In other words, two separate measures are involved here, one aiming to stop the persecutions, the other favouring the Christians. This definitely seems a strange line of procedure. And if we add the linguistic obscurities in the text,²³⁴ we receive a very clear impression that Eusebius had revised an original account. In the

existing text, νόμῳ τε κτλ. up to and including ποιουμένων (790,16-18) is lucid and well written. If we remove this, we get a passage which is equally unambiguous: τοὺς ἄμφ' αὐτὸν ἀνακαλέσας, μηδὲν ὑπερθεμένους τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποπαῦσαι διωγμὸν προσιτάττει. There can be no doubt that this is the original text, which simply reported that Galerius had given his officials the order verbally to bring the persecutions to a close.²³⁵ Later, Eusebius inserted into this the section on the so-called Galerius edict and its contents. So the present text says that Galerius gave a verbal order for the cessation of the persecutions and urged the Christians in writing to resume their services, and this apparently puzzling information results from the fact that the text contains two layers which are so different in character that they actually invalidate each other.

The confirmation in *cap.* 17,2 lends further support to this interpretation: αὐτίκα γοῦν ἔργου τῷ λόγῳ παρηκολουθηκότος, ἤπλωτο κατὰ

229 No doubt, συναίσθησις simply points out that Galerius acknowledged his deeds against the Christians. Lawlor-Oulton's translation of "he was conscience-stricken" (*Eusebius* I, p. 275) reads more meaning into the word than is permissible. τῶν κατὰ τῶν θεοσεβῶν αὐτῷ τετολμημένων (790,12-13) should refer to the horrible deeds which Galerius, in his persecutions, had committed against the Christians. On the other hand, it is not certain that Eusebius would have understood the expression to mean that Galerius also admitted an offence against God. The word θεοσεβεῖς could suggest this, but was perhaps simply used as a name for the Christians.

230 ἀνθομολογεῖται τῷ τῶν ὄλων θεῷ (790,14-15). This expression denotes primarily recognition of the Christian God and profession of Christianity, but it also implies recognition and profession of his sins against God.

231 τοὺς ἄμφ' αὐτὸν (790,15) must indicate the most superior officers at Galerius's court, such as *praefectus praetorio*.

232 νόμῳ τε καὶ δόγματι βασιλικῷ (790,16).

233 τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπισπέρχειν καὶ τὰ συνήθη διαπραττεσθαι, εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου ποιουμένων (790,16-18). τὰ συνήθη denotes the Christian lifestyle in general, since the context describes, primarily, the life of divine worship. τὸ βασίλειον must mean the Imperial power.

234 The text itself is linguistically unsatisfactory. τοὺς ἄμφ' αὐτὸν is the grammatical object of προσιτάττει, meaning that Galerius ordered the officials, through an Imperial law, to urge the Christians to build churches etc. Apart from the fact that τοὺς Χριστιανούς is missing as the object of ἐπισπέρχειν, the interpretation fails, because the Emperor must have urged the Christians to build churches through an edict.

235 Two features prove that this is a later insertion: we have seen, again and again, that Eusebius's mention of the Galerius edict stems from a younger layer, but the language of the text also confirms its origin. The linguistic inconsistencies arose because νόμῳ κτλ. (790,16-18) was inserted and destroyed an existing text which, in point of language, was quite satisfactory. Moreover, the change meant that προσιτάττει (790,18) became isolated in the present text.

πόλεις βασιλικά διατάγματα, τὴν παλινωδίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῦτον περιέχοντα τὸν τρόπον (790,18-20). If we disregard the words τοῦτον ... τὸν τρόπον – they present a special problem which we will discuss presently – we have here a text in which the significant coupling of λόγος and ἔργον can only mean that the officials put the Emperor's verbal command into action immediately; they ensured that Imperial decrees containing the palinode – that is, the revocation of the anti-Christian legislation – were posted everywhere in the cities. If νόμῳ τε κτλ. (790,16-18) had been in the original text, Eusebius's readers would have expected to be told that the edict had been posted everywhere – particularly because it contained more than a simple revocation of the anti-Christian legislation.

When the existing text informs us that the Imperial decrees contained the palinode τοῦτον -- τὸν τρόπον (790,20), it refers to the edict which Eusebius reproduced in the very next passage, *cap.* 17,3-10. In other words, he identified τὴν παλινωδίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς (790,20) with precisely this edict, and it was therefore identical with the notice which had been posted in the cities. But in the edict, the cessation of the persecution and the permission to exist as Christians coincide, so this information disagrees with the previous account in which, in 790,15-17, two distinct procedures were mentioned: the palinode and the encouragement of the Christians to live according to their traditions. βασιλικά διατάγματα, τὴν παλινωδίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς περιέχοντα is in perfect harmony with the original text, which states that the officials received orders to carry the palinode into effect, but that is not true of τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, which identifies the palinode with a particular law. The words must therefore constitute a more recent addition, designed to form a link between the original account and the so-called Galerius edict, which Eusebius inserted into his Church History at a later stage.

To summarize all these observations and their implications: Eusebius originally reported simply that Galerius realized, under the influence of his illness, that his cruel persecution of the Christians had been wrong. Therefore, he gave his officials the verbal command that it should stop immediately and the order was put into effect by decrees which were posted up everywhere immediately. The decrees contained the palinode in its meaning as an annulment of the anti-Christian legislation.²³⁶ Later Eusebius learnt that Galerius had issued an edict which urged the Christians to build churches and be faithful to their traditions. It went beyond the palinode as such, and therefore he felt it important to mention the

edict. So he inserted νόμῳ τε κτλ. up to and including ποιουμένουσ (790,16-18). Eusebius's statement that Galerius had given the direct order for this edict, not only broke the original clear context, but also created a text, the grammar and contents of which are both deficient. Eusebius's interpretation of this edict as pro-Christian probably also prompted him to insert συναγαγῶν κτλ. το εἶτα (790,13-15) at the same time, in order to give further reasons for Galerius's new pro-Christian attitude – this was not at all clear in the original account.

Eusebius regarded the edict which Galerius issued, according to 790,16-18, as identical with the law on religious freedom which is reproduced in *cap.* 17,3-10 (790,21-794,22). The description that Eusebius gave of the contents of the edict in 790,16-18 can also be said to include the most important provisions of the legislation he reproduced: ἵνα αὐθις ὅσιν Χριστιανοὶ καὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο (794,15-16) and the demand for prayer περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ τῶν δημοσίων (794,19-20). But by listing these contents, Eusebius obviously made the edict appear much more pro-Christian than it was in fact. It was decidedly pagan and clearly stated that the Imperial power allowed the Christians to worship their God, because of their self will and stupidity and despite the deep-rooted Imperial convictions that fighting the Christians was the correct approach. This difference between Eusebius's interpretation of the pro-Christian character of the edict and its actual contents is so striking, despite the formal agreement, that the only possible explanation springs from the assumption that originally Eusebius knew a Christian version of the origin and contents of the Galerius edict, and then later became acquainted with its authentic text. Therefore Eusebius first inserted νόμῳ τε κτλ. (790,16-18) and then reproduced the edict itself at a later stage. He obviously thought that he could work it into his account quite easily by merely inserting the words τοῦτον -- τὸν τρόπον. But he altered the original line of thought decisively, since βασιλικὰ διατάγματα then became identified with the Galerius edict itself.

Having reproduced the edict in Greek, Eusebius in *cap.* 17,11 (794,23-24) gave the information that he had translated it himself from Latin to

236 This reconstruction suggests that the original account could have read: καὶ δὴ τοσοῦτοις παλαίων κακοῖς συναίσθησιν τῶν κατὰ τῶν θεοσεβῶν αὐτῷ τετολημένων ἰσχει, τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἀνακαλέσας, μηδὲν ὑπερθεμένους τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποπαῦσαι διωγμὸν προστάττει. αὐτίκα γοῦν ἔργου τῷ λόγῳ παρηκολουθηκότος, ἥπλωτο κατὰ πόλεις βασιλικὰ διατάγματα, τὴν παλινῳδίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς περιέχοντα.

Greek as best he could.²³⁷ Then he added τί δὴ οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις γίνεται, ἐπιθεωρῆσαι καιρός (794,24-25). In the present context, this sentence serves as a link between the reproduction of the Galerius edict and the continuation of the account. It appears rather abrupt, however, since ἐπὶ τούτοις (794,25) seems to refer to no passage in the actual edict. The expression makes much better sense if connected to *cap.* 17,2 – in its original form, though. In that case, Eusebius was announcing that he would now examine in greater detail what happened once the Imperial decrees containing the “palinode” had been posted up everywhere.

But before we pursue this theme in Eusebius’s continuation, Rufinus’s translation of *cap.* 16-17 must be more closely analysed.

Rufinus must have been very dissatisfied with Eusebius’s account in *cap.* 16,1-2. At any rate, he found very little which he deemed useful for his own version. Even the introductory passage, 788,8-10, seemed problematic to him. Since he had omitted *cap.* 15 as completely irrelevant in the context, τοιαῦτ’ ἦν κτλ. (788,8) was, of course, of no interest to him. Nor did he agree with his source which included an unqualified statement that ten years passed before the persecutions ceased completely – this was only true in Maximin’s provinces. He also considered his source misleading because Eusebius had written, in 788,12-13, that all the Emperors waged war on the Christians. Rufinus disagreed even more strongly with the claim in 788,17-20 that the persecutions had become more and more cruel. It obviously conflicted with the description he had given previously in *cap.* 13,12-14, of Constantius and Constantine as God-fearing Emperors. Rufinus must also have been puzzled by Eusebius’s account there of the Emperors who *in solidum* brought the persecutions to a complete close with humane legislation; after all, the account which followed had as its theme the assumption that Galerius had given the order to stop the persecutions while under the influence of God’s punishment of him as the instigator. Rufinus obviously disagreed with Eusebius’s heavy emphasis in 788,16-22 on the notion that God alone, not man, had stopped the persecutions. This did not tally with the next description of Galerius, and, even more to the point, it disregarded man’s free will and his consequent responsibility for his own actions. On the other hand, it was quite legitimate in a Christian context to talk of God’s Providence as protecting the faithful and punishing the godless.

Rufinus had noticed the unfortunate fact that Eusebius mentioned Galerius as the instigator of the persecution for the first time at this point in his Church History. This must have appeared very serious to him, partic-

ularly because it meant that the necessary basis for understanding why he was so sorely punished was lacking. He corrected this serious defect, as we have seen, by mentioning Galerius sooner in *cap.* 13,11 (775,13-17) in connection with the description of the individual Emperors.²³⁸ Finally, Rufinus felt that Eusebius had not been successful in linking *cap.* 17,1-2 with the preceding account of Maxentius and Maximin, the latter being the worst of the two tyrants. He must also have felt that Eusebius failed to make it clear that the persecution of the Christians was the central theme of the account – we have already seen that this made Rufinus omit *cap.* 15 completely from his version.

All the shortcomings which, in Rufinus's opinion, marked Eusebius's text, made it impossible for him to translate *cap.* 17,1-2. Instead he chose to select the points which he considered relevant and incorporate them into a new independent account: *Sed cum per decem continuos annos in orientis partibus similis etiam Maximiani principis erga Christianos fuisset grassata crudelitas et innumera hominum milia deum verum colentium neci dedisset cumque vires crudelitati ac libidini suae indesinenter suggereret temulentia et neque consilium neque satietas finem ullum aut modum inponeret, adest cultoribus suis divina providentia et quos per ignem probaverat, educit rursus ad refrigerium.*²³⁹ *ipsum namque auctorem sceleris ultio divina corripuit*²⁴⁰ (789,1-791,1).

In this new text, Rufinus dwelt heavily on Maximin's ten years of

237 We need not discuss Eusebius's own translation of the edict in this context; we only concern ourselves with the various revisions of importance to the problem: which version formed the basis of Rufinus's translation. It is sufficient to mention here that Eusebius removed every mention of Licinius and his titles from his final version of the preamble that listed the Emperors who had issued the edict, just as he deleted *κατεσχίκει καὶ ἄνοια* after *πλεονεξία* (794,1). See E. Schwartz, *Eusebius II*, 2, p. 794.

238 Here, Rufinus simply gave his own summary of the contents of the Galerius account in 788,22-790,12. He did, however, state as a new element that Galerius was stricken by *insania mentis* and that he committed suicide. He may have been influenced by the expression *θειλάτος κόλασις, ἐξ αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ καταξάμενη σαρκὸς καὶ μέχρη τῆς ψυχῆς* *προελθοῦσα* (788,23-790,1), where he interpreted *μέχρη τῆς ψυχῆς* as referring to insanity.

239 *refrigerium* replaced *λωφᾶν* (788,9) in Rufinus. Just as he omitted dates in his version, he saw no need to translate *τῷ ... αὐτῆς καταλλαττομένης λαῶ* (788,21-22). The reason probably was that he felt the phrase to be superfluous in a context which mentioned only a temporary relaxation of the persecution. In other words, Rufinus thought that the statement presupposed a definite stop to the persecutions, which, of course, only happened at the end of the ten years.

240 In his translation *ipsum namque auctorem sceleris ultio divina corripuit* (789,7-791,1), Rufinus summarized the aspects which he found important in Eusebius's text: *τῷ δ' αὐθέντῃ τῶν κακῶν ἐπεξιούσης, μέτεισιν δ' οὖν αὐτὸν θείλατος κόλασις* (788,22-23).

bloody persecution of the Christians²⁴¹ and on his *crudelitas* and *libido* which could not be restrained, and the reason probably was that he wanted to conclude his account on Maximin.²⁴² He used the expression *similis etiam Maximiani principis*, not only to form a link with the description of Galerius²⁴³, but he also wished to indicate that the latter persecuted the Christians in exactly the same way as Maximin. His independent note placed him in a position different from Eusebius's; he could offer much more cogent reasons for God's punishing Galerius with the terrible illness. Unlike his source, Rufinus did not say that the persecution was called off, but that God sent mitigation to the faithful whom he had tested in the fire of persecution.²⁴⁴

In the statement that this happened when God's punishment and revenge struck Galerius as the instigator of the persecution, Rufinus resumed the thread from his source.

But he still produced no literal translation of 788,23-790,12. He decided to re-arrange the material from Eusebius to give a clearer picture of Galerius's disease. This is obvious even from the introductory words: *et ille, qui laetis ac saginatis carnibus incedebat superbus*,²⁴⁵ *inflatibus subito visceribus subpuratisque distenditur* (791,1-2). Rufinus brought out the point from τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου ... μεταβεβληκότος (790,5-7) so that he could depict Galerius from the start as a man whose *superbia* towards God showed itself in self-indulgence while he was persecuting the Christians. At the same time, instead of the less definite ἐξ αὐτῆς κτλ. (788,23-790,1), Rufinus wanted to describe immediately the effect on the illness with which God had punished Galerius. The details were then given in the ensuing account.

Rufinus obviously found Eusebius's account of the illness confused. At any rate, he felt the passage in 790,1-4 could be abbreviated to advantage in the following way: *in profundioribus dehinc pectoris partibus obortum vulnus totos intrinsecus viscerum secessus tabo serpente depascitur* (791,2-4). He was also surprised that his source mentioned all the worms which appeared, but gave no further explanation. He expanded ἀφ' ὧν ἄλεκτόν τι πλῆθος σκολιγῶν βρῦειν (790,4) and produced this graphic description: *post etiam fistulis quibusdam in superficiem purulentis meatibus adapertis de interioribus putrefacti vulneris venis ebullire undatim coepit innumera vermium multitudo* (791,4-6). Eusebius mentioned the sight, but Rufinus referred to the stench from the bloated body as the reason why the doctors stayed away. It was therefore quite sufficient to give the meaning of θανατώδη (790,4-9) in this sentence: *foetor vero tam*

intolerabilis erat, ut nullus omnino ne medicorum quidem propius posset accedere, quod carnes satis laetae et in omni luxuria nutritae graviozem ex corruptione nidorem putredinis exhalabant (791,6-9). Rufinus also regarded *cap.* 16,5 (790,8-12) as excessively elaborate; here Eusebius mentioned first the slaughter of the doctors who could not bear the stench and then the killing of those who could not cure Galerius. He therefore restrained himself and gave this version: *denique plerosque²⁴⁶ medicorum, quod nec morbo aliquid mederi nec vim foetoris tolerare possent, interfici iubet²⁴⁷* (791,9-11).

It should also be noted that Rufinus omitted [τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου] εἰς ἀνέλπιστον σωτηρίας ἀποπεπρωκότος (790,10-11). He did this, no doubt, because the expression implied that Galerius might have been cured if his treatment had started in time. This line of thought disagreed, however, with the tone of the entire account: God had sent the illness as a punishment and therefore, as a matter of simple logic, Galerius could never have been healed by men, only by God.

Rufinus found fault with his source, first and foremost because Eusebius did not explain how the illness could have made Galerius conscious of his sins and, as a result, discontinue the persecution of the Christians. But an explanation was needed if the ensuing account was to have any place in the context. And Rufinus had no doubts about the true facts of

241 The uncertainty concerning the length of the persecution which was so noticeable in his source was quite simply removed by Rufinus; he made it last for ten years and take place in the East (*in orientis partibus*) and last as long as Maximin was alive.

242 Because he omitted *cap.* 15, Rufinus obviously felt that this account was absolutely necessary although it was missing in the source.

243 Here, Rufinus, in contrast to his source, called Galerius by name for the first time. As in all contemporary sources, he is named Maximian (789,2).

244 Eusebius mentioned that the Emperors quenched the great fire of the persecution (τὴν ἐπὶ μέγα ἀφθεΐσαν τοῦ διωγμοῦ πυρκαϊᾶν σβεννύντες, 788,15), but Rufinus omitted it as false testimony. However, he allowed himself to be inspired by the expression and talked of the fire of the persecution as an instrument of Divine Providence testing the faithful and purifying them of their sins.

245 For a follower of Christian asceticism such as Rufinus, it was easy to discover a close connection between material luxury and *superbia*.

246 Rufinus was always anxious only to include information which could be borne out by the facts, and that is the reason why he used *plerosque*.

247 Eusebius used the passive forms *κατεσφάπτοντο* (790,9-10) and *ἐκτείνοντο* (790,11-12), but Rufinus wished to state specifically that the murders took place on Galerius's express orders. It happened *ἀνηλεῶς* (790,11), but that was so obvious that there was no need to mention it.

the case. Not only did God send the illness as a punishment for Galerius's sin, but he also provided someone to explain its implications to the sinner: *in quibus cum quidam iugulandus potius quam medicaturus adisteret, inspiratus a deo:*²⁴⁸ "cur", inquit, "imperator, erras et quod deus infert, ab hominibus putas posse revocari? nec humanus est iste morbus nec a medicis curatur. sed recordare quanta in servos dei egeris quamque in religionem divinam impius et profanus extiteris, et intelleges, unde tibi sint poscenda remedia. nam et ego quidem mori cum ceteris potero, tu tamen a medicis non curaberis" (791,11-17). Thus Galerius learned that no cure would be possible unless he confessed his sin and stopped persecuting the Christians. Finally, we must emphasize the point that by including this call for repentance, Rufinus gave the account of Galerius's illness a clear Christian tone which was nowhere to be found in Eusebius.

Rufinus also used his source freely in his version of *cap.* 17,1 (790,12-18). He probably regarded συναγαγών κτλ. το θεῶ (790,13-15) as a repetition of καὶ δὴ τοσοῦτοις κτλ. (790,12 f.). Moreover, the doctor's call for repentance in the section immediately before this provided the basis for understanding the point of these statements, so Rufinus was able to replace them with this clear passage: *Tunc primum*²⁴⁹ *se Maximianus hominem esse*²⁵⁰ *intellexit et scelorum suorum immanitatem recordatus primo omnium errasse se et impie egisse profitetur et velut satisfacere incipit deo,* -- (791,18-20). It is interesting that the source had ἀνθομολογεῖται τῷ τῶν ὄλων θεῶ (790,14-15), but Rufinus specifically mentioned a confession of sin and acts of penance. This probably mirrored current practices but Rufinus was obviously very careful to avoid making Galerius appear a Christian, which was, strictly speaking, the implication of Eusebius's expression. By writing *velut satisfacere incipit deo*, he questioned the Christian qualities of Galerius's *satisfactio*.

Rufinus could not accept Eusebius's account from εἶτα κτλ. το προστάττει (790,15-18) as it stood, for a number of reasons. He regarded his source as misleading at the point where it stated that Galerius had given a verbal command to stop the persecutions of the Christians and that he had issued a law in writing to permit them to practise their rites – it was quite clear from the next passage that there was only one law and that it included both provisions. The meaning of τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν (790,15) and their function in the context apparently also required further explanation, in his opinion. He wanted to make it absolutely clear that Galerius's new attitude to the Christians was the product of his desire to be cured, with their help, of his illness. Considerations of this kind deter-

mined Rufinus's independent version which, unlike his source, is clear and well-arranged: *tum deinde convocatis his, qui in officio publico sibi parebant, legem scribi et confestim emitti iubet, qua non solum a Christianis desinat persecutio et arceatur omnis iniuria,*²⁵¹ *verum et reaedificari eorum permitterentur ecclesiae,*²⁵² *ut solitiis cultibus et obsecrationibus vacantes etiam pro ipsius salute excelso supplicent deo*²⁵³ (791,20-25). Rufinus chose the last words to make it clear that Galerius wished to mobilize the Christians in order to achieve *salus* by their prayers to the true God – and this means his salvation in a spiritual sense as well as a bodily cure. The *salus* of the Imperial power and of the Roman Empire was of no interest to him which was why he omitted [εὐχὰς] ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου (790,18).

Unlike Eusebius, Rufinus had stated quite clearly that Galerius had given his officials the command to prepare and send out immediately an edict which halted the persecution and allowed the Christians to perform their services. This caused minor changes in his translation of αὐτίκα κτλ. (790,18-20), which then read: *quibus dicto citius procuratis, continuo per singulas quasque urbes edicta mittuntur*²⁵⁴ *continentia hunc modum*²⁵⁵

248 Rufinus probably used this expression to indicate that the doctor was a Christian.

249 With these words, Rufinus linked the account closely to the previous section: the doctor's prophecy that only God could cure the disease with which He Himself had inflicted Galerius, determines the next acknowledgement.

250 Here, Rufinus no doubt wished to say that Galerius came to realize his position as a man who, like everyone else, had to answer to God for his actions.

251 Rufinus added a phrase which has no parallel in Eusebius: *et arceatur omnis iniuria*, by which it was decreed that the Christians must not be harassed or discriminated against in any way. Although, strictly speaking, there was no basis for this in the "Galerius edict", Eusebius wanted, in this way, to state the implications of the decree on the cessation of the persecution.

252 In τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπισπέρχειν (790,16-17), Rufinus had felt that ἐπισπέρχειν was unfortunate, so he changed it to *permitterentur*, which was a clear statement that the Christians were allowed to do this. Finally, he translated οἰκοδομεῖν by *reaedificari* to indicate that it meant the rebuilding of churches which had been destroyed – he possibly felt that Eusebius's expression could lead some readers to believe that there had been no churches previously.

253 Rufinus's translation of τὰ συνήθη (790,17), specified that divine worship was the subject of discussion.

254 When Rufinus replaced ἤπλωτο (790,19) with *mittuntur*, he was being quite consistent; previously, he had simply said that Galerius had given his officials notice to prepare and send out the "Galerius edict".

255 *Modus* probably indicated that the edicts had the same form and content as the ensuing Galerius edict, which was the reason why the latter was the one sent out.

(791,25-26). Rufinus's omission here of τὴν παλινοφθίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς (790,20) is particularly interesting. He probably felt the passage to be superfluous and even meaningless, since the edicts sent out were identical with the "Galerius Edict" itself and this prescribed many more measures than a simple cessation of the persecution.²⁵⁶

Rufinus's version of the "Galerius Edict" is based solely on Eusebius's Greek translation of the Latin original (792,10-794,20).²⁵⁷ But even though this was an official document, he still did not feel bound to give a literal translation. In fact, he made a number of changes which, on the whole, were determined by his desire to provide his readers with a text which was both easily read and easily understood.

Rufinus followed his source in naming Galerius and Constantine as those who issued the edict.²⁵⁸ He translated the Imperial titles almost without alteration, but it should be noted that he omitted μέγιστος (maximus) from the epithets *Germanicus*, *Aegyptiacus*, *Thebaicus*, *Sarmaticus*, *Persicus*, *Carpicus*, *Armenicus* (793,1-2), and instead of Μήδων μέγιστος, Ἀδιαβηνῶν μέγιστος (792,3-4) he decided to write *Medorum et Adiabenororum victor* (793,2-3). Whether he omitted *maximus* simply because he found it superfluous or because it emphasized Galerius's greatness unfairly in comparison with Constantine's, is impossible for us to decide.

Rufinus's translation of *cap.* 17,6 (792,10-15) contains several diversions from his source. He probably found ἄπερ ὑπὲρ τοῦ χρησίμου καὶ λυσιτελοῦς τοῖς δημοσίοις διατυπούμεθα (792,10-11) too lengthy and even tautological, so he wrote more simply *quae pro utilitate rei publicae disponimus* (793,7). Where Eusebius had κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοσίαν ἐπιστήμην τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων (792,11-13), Rufinus wanted the latter expression to indicate the traditional Roman religion, since he apparently considered that, in this context, the passage was a comment on Imperial religious policy. It is impossible to suggest a reason for his change of ἐπανορθώσασθαι (792,13) to *moderari*: guide and rule without any hint of the idea of restoration. Instead of translating τοῦτου πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι (792,13), he replaced it with *hoc addere*, probably because the expression referred to the Christian God alone and should not therefore be used to describe the godless Emperors and their religious policy. Similarly, he wanted to avoid translating εἰς ἀγαθὴν πρόθεσιν (792,15) because the expression might suggest that worshippers of idols possessed *bonae mentes*.²⁵⁹ Rufinus's reservations towards his source prompted him to give this translation: *Inter cetera, quae pro utilitate rei publicae disponimus, nos quidem primo*²⁶⁰ *volueramus secundum*

antiquas leges et publicam Romanae observantiae disciplinam cuncta moderari, inter quae etiam hoc addere,²⁶¹ ut Christiani, qui paternam religionem reliquerant, ad eam rursus reverterentur (793.7-11).

Rufinus followed closely and translated precisely the contents of ἐπιπερὸ κτλ. (792,15-794,5). He omitted ἄπερ ἴσως πρότερον καὶ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἦσαν καταστήσαντες (794,2-3), probably because he regarded it as a superfluous repetition of τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι καταδειχθεῖσιν (794,1-2). The result was this clear and intelligible rendering: *verum quoniam iudicio quodam animi sui tanta eos obstinatio rei huius habuit, ut nullo modo²⁶² redire vellent ad ritum religionis antiquae, quae a maioribus fuerat instituta,²⁶³ sed eo magis pro voluntate sua unusquisque²⁶⁴ legem sibi ipse constituit²⁶⁵ et in locis diversis plebs²⁶⁶ diversa concurrat ...* (793,11-795,4).

256 See above, p. 188.

257 Rufinus's translation of *cap.* 17.11a – ταῦτα κατὰ κτλ. (794,23-24) – made this crystal clear: *haec de latino in graecum versa, nos rursus transfudimus in latinum* (795,19). From this, we can conclude that he did not know of the "Galerius edict" in the original Latin version, as found, for example, in Lactantius: *De mortibus persecutorum, cap.* XXXIV. Although Rufinus gave information which is not in Eusebius and which could suggest influence from Lactantius's account, the fact that Rufinus did not copy Lactantius's Latin text of the "Galerius edict" proves that he did not know of Lactantius's work.

258 The original on which Rufinus based his version followed, as was stated above, the text which is represented by BDM and not by ATER.

259 The expression in the original text.

260 Rufinus emphasized the factual priorities when he translated πρότερον (792,11) by *primo*.

261 ἐπανορθώσασθαι and τοῦτου πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι (792,13) are coordinate, but Rufinus regarded the second part as subordinate, probably because the persecution of the Christians only broke out at a later date.

262 Rufinus increased the forcefulness of the Christians' rejection when he added *nullo modo*.

263 No actual difference exists between Rufinus's *quae a maioribus fuerat instituta* (795,2) and Eusebius's τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι καταδειχθεῖσιν (794,1-2). But Rufinus's version suggests a more critical attitude.

264 Rufinus considered *pro voluntate sua* an adequate rendition of the pleonastic expression κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν πρόθεσιν καὶ ὡς ἕκαστος ἐβούλετο (794,3-4). On the other hand, he inserted *eo magis* and spoke of individual Christians rather than Christians as a collective group.

265 Rufinus omitted καὶ τούτους παραφυλάσσειν (794,4-5). Perhaps he regarded the phrase as superfluous in the context, suggesting that the Christians followed laws of their own making.

266 Rufinus's translation of πλῆθη (794,5) as *plebs* was probably influenced by the common expression *plebs Christiana*.

The translation of *cap.* 17,8 (794,5-9) again supports our observation that Rufinus made an effort to create a simple, clear text. For example, he rewrote the finite sentence (τοιγαροῦν κτλ.) as a subordinate clause: *cumque etc.* (795,4 ff.). Eusebius's specification of the provisions in the Imperial edict – ὥστε ἐπὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων κατασταθέντα ἑαυτοῦς μεταστήσαιεν (794,6-7) – was translated by Rufinus with the words *ut ad patrias leges redirent et antiquitus constitutas* (795,4-5), obviously because he wished to make the passage more consistent with the aim of the Imperial policy as described in the introductory section. Rufinus regarded the main clause *πλεῖστοι μὲν κινδύνῳ ὑποβληθέντες, πλεῖστοι δὲ ταραχθέντες παντοίους θανάτους ὑπέφερον* (794,8-9) as a little too cryptic for all readers to discover its meaning. He corrected this by composing the sentence *plurimi eorum periculo se potius subicere mortes innumerabiles tolerare quam oboedire praeceptis talibus*²⁶⁷ *maluerunt* (795,5-7).

When translating *cap.* 17,9 (794,9-18), Rufinus also diverged from his source at several points. He could not bring himself to translate τῶν πολλῶν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπονοία διαμενόντων (794,9-10) unchanged – he obviously felt that he could not describe the Christians' adherence to their faith as *dementia*. He therefore chose to rewrite it thus: *et quoniam multos adhuc in eodem animi iudicio durare pervidimus ...* (795,7-8). This version had the additional advantage of creating complete agreement with 793,11 where *iudicio quodam animi* was mentioned as the quality which enabled the Christians to reject paganism.²⁶⁸ Nor did the phrase μήτε τῷ [θεῷ] τῶν Χριστιανῶν προσέχειν (794,11-12) meet with Rufinus's unqualified approval; he translated the words by *nec suae religioni satisfacere viderentur* (795,9). Perhaps he believed that Eusebius's construction could be taken to mean that the Christians had stopped worshipping their God. Rufinus's own version did not, at any rate, leave scope for such an interpretation, since it simply reported the Emperors' subjective opinion which did not necessarily coincide with the actual facts. τοὺς οἴκους ἐν οἷς συνήγοντο, συνθῶσιν (794,16) also required some comment to make it clear that it applied to the permission which sanctioned not only the erection of new churches but also the rebuilding of those which had been destroyed during the persecution. His version therefore reads like this: *conventicula, in quibus orare consueverunt, extruant et reaedificent* (795,12-13). When Rufinus translated ὑπεναντίον τῆς ἐπιστήμης (794,16-17) by *contra disciplinam publicam* (795,14), he added the last words on his own initiative to emphasize the point that this referred to the public order, and so avoided any confusion with the *disciplina* mentioned in 793,8-9.²⁶⁹

Rufinus did not find much to alter in *cap.* 17,6 (794,18-22), except that he changed the duty to pray *περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ τῶν δημοσίων καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν* (794,20-21) to *pro salute nostra et pro rei publicae statu* (795,16-17). The alteration was no doubt inspired by his desire to avoid the secular meaning of *σωτηρία*, which was implied by the use of the word of the edict. It could only be used of divine salvation and was of importance, therefore, only to people, not to the Empire, which belonged to this transient world. The thought that the Christians should have been commanded to pray for the salvation of the Empire was obviously so monstrous to Rufinus that he refused to include it in his Latin translation – the Christians always prayed, as commanded by God, for the Emperors and their salvation. By ignoring the notion, Rufinus also succeeded in changing the text to suggest that Galerius had asked the Christians to intervene with God to achieve the salvation for which he was then striving. The specific objective of the command to the Christians in the edict to pray for their own *salus* became quite clear in Rufinus's version of *ἵνα κτλ.* (794,21-22): *ut omni modo incolumi degente re publica etiam ipsi securi agere in propriis laribus possint* (795,17-18).

This translation of the "Galerius Edict" once again proves that Rufinus worked hard to produce a clear, intelligible account by removing all possible sources of misunderstanding and all inaccuracies which might give rise to false conclusions. Another characteristic feature was his constant awareness of a duty to edify his readers, within the framework of a faithful translation as he conceived it, by true Christian instruction.

In *cap.* 17,11 (794,23-25), Rufinus informed his readers that the edict just reproduced had been translated from Latin into Greek and that he himself had undertaken the translation back into Latin. In his version of *ταῦτα κτλ.* (794,23-24), he saw no reason to translate *κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν*

267 Even though the edict did not contain any reference to *praecepta talia*, Rufinus must have been thinking of the individual ordinances which the anti-Christian laws contained. It should be pointed out that in doing so he introduced a contradiction which is not in Eusebius. It should also be noted that his efforts to create a clear text meant that, in his translation, he could not bring out the deliberate vagueness of *πλεῖστοι κτλ.* (794,8).

268 For purely stylistic reasons Rufinus created a qualifying object to *pervidimus* (795,8) from the absolute genitive *τῶν πολλῶν κτλ.* (794,9-10), and then he changed *μητε κτλ.* (794,10-12), which was the object of *ἔωρῶμεν* (794,10) in the source, to a consecutive clause.

269 It should also be mentioned that Rufinus abridged *ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν διηνεκῆ συνήθειαν* (794,12-13) to *respicentes ad solitam mansuetudinem clementiae nostrae* (795,9-10). The reason for this translation is not obvious.

and omitted τοῦτον εἶχεν τὸν τρόπον, too. In other words, his version did not state that Eusebius had translated the “Galerius Edict” into Greek, it simply says: *Haec de latino in graecum versa, nos rursus transfudimus in latinum* (795,19).

In his version of the last passage – τί δὴ κτλ. (794,24-25), Rufinus chose to write *videamus* instead of ἐπιθεωρῆσαι καιρός, providing book VIII with this conclusion: *sed post haec quid consecutum sit, videamus* (795,20).

LIBER IX

Cap. 1,1-11 (802,1-806,18): Maximin's reluctant recantation of the persecution of the Christians

In this chapter, Eusebius described the process by which the “palinode” became known throughout Asia and the neighbouring provinces. Maximin, the godless tyrant, was dissatisfied with it and refused to publish it, but as he could not go against his superior Emperors, he found a way out by verbally ordering his officials to stop the persecution, implying, however, that he did not expect them to fulfil his command. Sabinus, who was *praefectus praetorio*, passed it on in writing to the provincial governors who, in turn, conveyed it on to the local authorities. Everyone misunderstood Maximin's true intentions, so all imprisoned Christians were released, and they returned home rejoicing and singing God's praises. Their church life was quickly restored and the pagans rejoiced with them at the unexpected change in their conditions and acclaimed their God as the only great and true one.

This account is found in all manuscripts. But ATER also contain Sabinus's *epistola* in a Greek translation (802,16-24 and 804,13-26),¹ because these manuscripts comprise material which Eusebius had again rejected when he wrote his final revised version of the Church History. This proves, at least, that Eusebius continued to reorganize the account in this chapter, his efforts extending far beyond the mere removal of Sabinus's *epistola*. Only a thorough analysis of the chapter can determine the precise, comprehensive nature of his revisions.²

1 ATER reproduce the Sabinus circular, and continue: ἐπὶ τοῦτοις οἱ κατ' ἐπαρχίαν (804,26), where the other manuscripts have simply οἱ δὲ (802,16). But apart from this particular material, the ATER text is identical to that in BDM.

2 R. Laqueur also made substantial contributions to critical discussions of the account in this chapter; see *op. cit.*, pp. 65-76. But his numerous important observations cannot hide the fact that his research is based on no close analysis of the text as a whole. Our examination of the chapter will show that even the perspicacious Laqueur overlooked quite a few problems and difficulties. This fact in itself makes it necessary to subject his results to critical scrutiny.

The passage which introduces the chapter begins: τὰ μὲν δὴ τῆς παλινωδίας τοῦ προτεθέντος βασιλικοῦ νεύματος ἤπλωτο (802,1-2). The expression τοῦ προτεθέντος βασιλικοῦ νεύματος, on analogy with the expressions τοῦ προτεθέντος γράμματος (802,6) and τὸν προεκτεθέντα νόμον (802,9), which were used later, must be understood to refer to the “Galerius edict”; this had been reproduced previously in VIII, 17,3-10.³ The use of βασιλικὸν νεῦμα to refer to a law is striking, since in all other cases the expression has the meaning of Imperial will or command, as in the subsequent νεῦμα βασιλικόν (804,4).

By itself, τὰ τῆς παλινωδίας means “those things pertaining to the palinode.” When taken in conjunction with τοῦ προτεθέντος νεύματος, the expression seems florid and artificial.⁴ Eusebius previously wrote, however, of ἤπλωτο -- βασιλικὰ διατάγματα, τὴν παλινωδίαν τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς περιέχοντα (790,19-20) – to translate the presumably original version. On this basis, it would be natural to inquire whether the expression here should not be taken as referring to the ordinances which contain the palinode, since τὰ implied διατάγματα. If so, the line of thought coincides not just with the description in 790,19-20, but also with Eusebius’s previous words: παλινωδίαν ἧδον χρηστοῖς περὶ ἡμῶν προγράμμασιν καὶ διατάγμασιν ἡμερωτάτοις (788,14-15).

On this assumption, Eusebius’s phrase combines two quite different texts – the ordinances with the palinode and the “Galerius edict”. VIII, 17,2 (790,19-20) presented an identical case. There, we proved that the mention of the “Galerius edict” constituted a later addition, and we may reasonably assume that this phrase is of a similar construction. If we follow that clue, προτεθέντος must be regarded as a later insertion. Consequently, Eusebius originally wrote: τὰ μὲν δὴ τῆς παλινωδίας τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νεύματος ἤπλωτο. Further proof that this reconstruction is correct can be taken from the fact that τὰ τῆς παλινωδίας now comes into its own, just as νεῦμα is used in its usual meaning as in 804,4. Finally, προτεθέντος seems out of place in this context, since, as we have seen, it must have a somewhat unusual meaning whereas, immediately afterwards, it must be taken in its other, more straightforward, meaning of to publish.

Eusebius further explained that the “Galerius edict” – we are talking about the intentions of the present text – was made known τῆς Ἀσίας πάντη καὶ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τε τὰς ἀμφὶ ταύτην ἐπαρχίας (802,2-3). If *Asia* means *dioecesis Asia*,⁵ *provinciae* is a surprising sequel, since we would naturally expect *dioecesis Pontus*. But if the word means *provin-*

ciae Asiae, the phrase τὰς ἀμφὶ ταύτην ἐπαρχίας seems awkward because it lacks precision. On the basis of these imprecise definitions, the pointed phrase πάντη καὶ πανταχοῦ appears strange. So, here too, we must ask whether the obscurities appeared because Eusebius exaggerated his reworking of the original text. If we delete the problematic words Ἰασία and ἀμφὶ ταύτην, a clear text remains: ἤπλωτο πάντη καὶ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τὰς ἐπαρχίας. In support of this reconstruction, we might add that it enables us to explain the imprecision of the text. Eusebius learned about the “Galerius edict” after completing the first version. He considered it important, as we shall see, to draw attention to the fact that the edict was made known only in the provinces which belonged to Galerius and not in the areas for which Maximin was responsible. Therefore, Eusebius inserted τῆς Ἰασίας and ἀμφὶ ταύτην together with προτεθέντος. He did not produce a new text here, as in so many other instances; he limited himself to working his change into an existing account and thereby created obscurities in his own text. He did not concern himself with accuracy, but probably only wanted to state that the “Galerius edict” was made known in the provinces of Asia Minor, which were Galerius’s particular area of authority.⁶ He probably happened to write *Asia* simply because he had seen a copy of the “Galerius edict” there.⁷

The next passage, 802,3-8, which describes Maximin’s verbal command to halt the persecution, begins ὃν τοῦτον ἐπιτελεσθέντων τὸν τρόπον (802,3). This could refer to the posting of the palinode in the provinces of Asia Minor. It makes more sense, however, to assume that the expression refers to the whole of the previous description of Galerius,

3 προτίθημι: “earlier set forth” cannot mean “earlier published” because of ἤπλωτο which follows immediately after; it must mean “earlier quoted”. Conversely, the verb in conjunction with προεκτίθημι in 802,6 and 802,9 can only mean “earlier published”.

4 More recent translators make it clear that the passage in question cannot be given an exact translation. Henri Valois apparently saw no other solution than to rewrite the expression completely: *Et hæc quidem palinodia imperialis rescripti quod supra retulimus ...* (PG XX, 2, col. 798B). Lawlor-Oulton preferred this version: “The recantation of the imperial will set forth above was promulgated broadcast ...” (*Eusebius I*, p. 279).

5 See also Lawlor-Oulton, *Eusebius II*, p. 290.

6 Since Eusebius took great care to show that the “Galerius edict” was posted up in Galerius’s provinces, we would have expected him to mention the Balkan provinces.

7 It is true generally that neither the Balkans nor the West fell within Eusebius’s horizon, a fact which affects his description of “the great persecution” and the circumstances in the Roman Empire as a whole.

who, as the true persecutor of the Christians, issued the “palinode” because of his dreadful illness, and had it published everywhere.

Maximin is then described as οὐδαμῶς τοῖς γραφεῖσιν ἄρεσθεῖς (802,5-6).⁸ In this context, the phrase must signify that he was dissatisfied with the “Galerius edict” – which is clear from the fact that the ensuring ἀντὶ τοῦ προτεθέντος γράμματος (802,6) refers to the edict. Maximin is described, quite concisely, as the tyrant of the East, the most impious person of all and the worst persecutor of the Christians, and this explains his dissatisfaction with the “Galerius edict” which was, in Eusebius’s opinion, pro-Christian. It is still surprising, however, that he preferred the indefinite τὰ γραφέντα to a specific statement that the already published “Galerius edict” is the subject of discussion. It is also striking that he omitted any mention of the fact that the “Galerius edict” was sent to Maximin with a command to publish it, since this piece of information was essential to an understanding of the criticism of him in the ensuing account.

Eusebius continued ἀντὶ τοῦ προτεθέντος γράμματος λόγῳ προσάπτει τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν τὸν καθ’ ἡμῶν ἀνεῖναι πόλεμον (802,6-8). The interpretation of ἀνεῖναι is of central importance here. If the word is taken to mean “relax”,⁹ the passage says that, instead of publishing the “Galerius edict”, which decreed the cessation of the persecution, Maximin ordered his officials¹⁰ to ease up on the persecution of the Christians. But the point of the next passage is that Maximin ostensibly followed the command to stop the persecution, so ἀνεῖναι must mean to discontinue or halt the persecutions.¹¹ The meaning is then that Maximin issued a verbal command to his officials ordering them to stop the persecution – he did not post the “Galerius edict”.¹² There is no actual criticism of Maximin here – he simply chose to stop the persecutions by other means than by publishing the “Galerius edict”. Only οὐδαμῶς τοῖς γραφεῖσιν ἄρεσθεῖς, just before this passage, contains a hint that Maximin’s order might constitute an evasive action on his part.

ἐπεὶ γὰρ κτλ. (802,8-12) does, however, describe Maximin’s feelings when he found himself in the situation of having either to publish the “Galerius edict”¹³ or to refuse to obey his superior Emperors.¹⁴ He found a way out by hiding the edict and giving his leading court officials¹⁵ notice by word of mouth that the persecution should be brought to a close.¹⁶

We note that the lines contain a repetition of οὐδαμῶς κτλ. (802,5-8).¹⁷ Both passages discuss exactly the same matter. Moreover, identical expressions appear in the two sections,¹⁸ but the second account is both

fuller and clearer than the first one which simply said that Maximin was dissatisfied with the “Galerius edict”. Here, we learn that he wanted it under no circumstances to become known in his provinces. His dissatisfaction was based on his impiety and anti-Christian attitude. It is described in detail so that we can appreciate his dilemma when he was obliged to publish an edict for which his superiors were responsible. The

8 ὁ ἐπ’ ἀνατολῆς τύραννος, δυσσεβέστατος εἰ καί τις ἄλλος, καὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεῶν εὐσεβείας πολεμιώτατος γεγονώς (802,3-5). This description is much more precise than can be justified by reference to the account in VIII, 14,8-9. It should also be noted that, as regards impiety, Maximin far surpassed the details previously given about Galerius.

9 Lawlor-Oulton translate ἀνεῖναι by “relax” (*Eusebius* I, p. 279) and G. Bardy by “relâcher” (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 44).

10 οἱ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχοντες must mean the highest officials at Maximin’s court. The phrase seems unusual though, since the Imperial court officials are otherwise referred to as οἱ ἄμφ’ αὐτόν, cf. 790,15. It would therefore be natural to regard the expression as synonymous with οἱ ἄμφ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχοντες, meaning the officials and here primarily the official governors in general, as was the case in 782,24-25. But it was a verbal command, so the phrase can only refer to the officials at the court.

11 H. Valois also understood the matter in this way: *ut ab oppugnatione nostrorum abstinerent* (PG XX, 2, col. 799 A).

12 In this interpretation, the statement is completely parallel with 790,15-18, in which Galerius is described as τοὺς ἄμφ’ αὐτὸν ἀνακαλέσας, μηδὲν ὑπερθεμένους τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποπαῦσαι διωγμὸν ... προστάττει.

13 τὸν προεκτεθέντα νόμον (802,9).

14 αὐτῷ μὴ ἐξῆν ἄλλως τῇ τῶν κρείττωνων ἀντιλέγειν κρίσει (802,8-9). οἱ κρείττονες must mean the Emperors who were above him in the Imperial hierarchy and whom he was therefore obliged to obey. Apart from Galerius, they were Constantine and Licinius. Eusebius accepted the view that the last two were superior to Maximin because, according to the account in VIII, 13, they were true *augusti*, whereas Maximin had usurped the title arbitrarily. Moreover, in the preamble to the “Galerius edict” in VIII, 17,3-5, Eusebius omitted Maximin’s name, so that Constantine and Licinius appear together with Galerius as those who ordered the cessation of the persecutions. The word κρίσει (802,9) could suggest this; possibly Eusebius also wanted to hint that Maximin had been given specific directions to publish the “Galerius edict”.

15 τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν (802,11) must have the same meaning as in the corresponding expression in 802,7.

16 τὸν καθ’ ἡμῶν διωγμὸν ἀνεῖναι (802,11-12). Here, too, the verb must mean “cease with”, not “relax”.

17 E. Schwartz appended a brief note: “6-8 ἀντὶ – πόλεμον Doublette zu 11/12 ἀγῶν-φοι – προστάττει” (*Eusebius* II, 2, p. 802).

18 This applies to τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν τὸν καθ’ ἡμῶν ἀνεῖναι πόλεμον (802,7-8) ≠ τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν τὸν καθ’ ἡμῶν διωγμὸν ἀνεῖναι (802,11-12), τοῦ προτεθέντος γράμματος (802,6) ≠ τὸν προεκτεθέντα νόμον (802,9) and λόγῳ προστάττει (802,6-7) ≠ ἀγράφῳ προστάγματι ... προστάττει (802,11-12).

passage is quite specific: he had actually decided on an evasive plan of action when, instead of publishing the “Galerius edict”, he gave verbal commands on the cessation of the persecution. The lines, in fact, read like an explanatory note to 802,5-8. Eusebius obviously felt that his earlier hints needed to be expanded and rendered precise, which explains both the similarities and the differences between the two passages.

It is important, at any rate, to remember Eusebius’s point in *both* passages: Maximin ostensibly obeyed the decision to discontinue the persecutions,¹⁹ but in reality, he sabotaged it by not publishing the “Galerius edict”, issuing instead verbal commands to the same effect. This criticism of Maximin presupposes that his duty required him to have the “Galerius edict” posted in his provinces. We shall simply say here, however, that Eusebius mentions no such requirement made of Maximin.

Eusebius continued: οἱ δὲ τὰ τῆς παρακελεύσεως ἀλλήλοις διὰ γραφῆς ὑποσημαίνουσιν (802,12-13). In the context, ἀλλήλοις must refer to τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν (802,11). But the court officials had already been instructed verbally to discontinue the persecutions, so it seems strange to read that they now wrote to each other about the decree to stop the persecutions. If the sentence is to make sense, it must refer to officials in general, not only to the highest court officials, but in that case, no natural link exists to the preceding passage.²⁰ We should also note that the sentence, when seen in isolation, is parallel to Eusebius’s earlier comments about Maximin’s officials, once he had given his verbal instructions on the immediate cessation of the persecutions: αὐτίκα γοῦν ἔργου τῷ λόγῳ παρηκολουθηκότος, ἤπλωτο κατὰ πόλεις βασιλικά διατάγματα, τὴν παλινφθίαν τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ... περιέχοντα (790,18-20).

Eusebius went on to say (802,13-16) that Sabinus as *praefectus praetorio*²¹ notified the provincial governors of the Imperial decision in a Latin *epistola*. Eusebius probably wanted to give a more detailed explication of the passage immediately before this.²² Strictly speaking, however, the lines are contradictory, since only Sabinus, not the officials, passed on the Emperors’ decree in writing to the provincial governors. Conversely, we would have expected Maximin to have addressed himself verbally to Sabinus on the question of the cessation of the persecutions and not to the highest court officials, as stated in 806,6-12.²³ The Sabinus passage, in fact, constitutes a new break in the continuity of the text.

We have already mentioned that only ATER give Sabinus’s *epistola*, but from the final revised edition of the Church History we may deduce that it appeared in an earlier version. Eusebius’s information that Sabinus addressed the provincial governors διὰ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐπιστολῆς

(802,15-16) seems superfluous and pedantic. But it was necessary in the earlier version which continued: ἤς καὶ αὐτῆς ἡ ἔρμηνεία τοῦτον περιέχει τὸν τρόπον (802,16-17). Because Eusebius removed these words along with the *epistola* itself, however, the information that the letter was written in Latin has no function in the new context. The entire account in 802,16-804,4 in fact presupposes the Sabinus circular. Eusebius's description of the provincial governors making the Imperial decision known in writing to λογισταῖς καὶ στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἀγροὺς ἐπιτεταγμένοις (804,1-2)²⁴ also seems unduly detailed on the basis of the imprecise mention of the officials in *cap.* 1,1. But it makes good sense if we know of the Sabinus circular, since we then realize that the provincial governors did what the document told them.²⁵ Finally, οἱ δὲ τὴν τῶν γραφέντων αὐτοῖς ἐπαληθεύειν προαίρησιν νενομικότερες (802,16-804,1) can only be

19 Maximin had no other choice, which is clear from the words ἐπεὶ γὰρ αὐτῷ μὴ ἐξῆν ἄλλως τῆ τῶν κρείττωνων ἀντιλέγειν κρῖσει – (802,8-9). ἄλλως must here mean “at all events”.

20 Lawlor-Oulton comment: “As § 2 shows, Eusebius means that Maximin communicated orally with his chief ministers, and they in writing to the praesides of the provinces” (*Eusebius* II, p. 290). However plausible, this attempt at harmonisation is not based on the actual wording of the text.

21 Sabinus is introduced thus: ὁ παρ' αὐτοῖς τῶ τῶν ἐξοχωτάτων ἐπάρχων ἀξιόματι τετιμημένος (802,13-14). This Greek translation of *eminentissimus praefectus* indicates Sabinus's position as *praefectus praetorio*, cf. R. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, p. 68 referring to Hirschfeld: Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten, p. 455. Eusebius undoubtedly found this title in the preamble to Sabinus's *epistola*, which he omitted, however, in this translation. In this context, παρ' αὐτοῖς must mean the officials. The passage then explains that they honoured him with the title of *praefectus praetorio*. Even though this interpretation is possible, R. Laqueur was undoubtedly right when, in connection with Stigloher's remark *ad locum* in his translation of Eusebius, he claimed that παρ' αὐτοῖς referred to the Emperors: “denn nur bei diesen gibt es den praef. praet. Es ist also sachlich vollkommen in Ordnung, wenn der “bei den Kaisern” mit der Würde des praef. praet. bekleidete Sabinus eine Verfügung erlässt, in welcher er Bezug nimmt auf die Anschauungen eben “der Kaiser”” (*op. cit.* p. 68-69). This interpretation means that παρ' αὐτοῖς appears quite unintegrated in the context; it is sufficient at present merely to draw attention to this fact.

22 This shows the connecting particle γοῦν (802,13).

23 Sabinus, in fact, specifically stated that this was the case in his *epistola* to the provincial governors: ἡ θεϊότης τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν τῶν δυνατωτάτων αυτοκρατόρων ... ἐκέλευσεν διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς καθοσίωσσεως τῆ σῆ ἀγχινοῖα διαχαράξαι ἴν' κτλ. (804,15 ff.).

24 The Greek appellations represent *curatores civitatis*, *duumviri civitatis* and *praepositi pagi*. Eusebius used the expression τοῖς κατ' ἀγροὺς ἐπιτεταγμένοις, but the Sabinus circular has τοὺς πραιποσίτους τοῦ πάγου (804,24), undoubtedly because he wished simply to explain the implications of the transcribed Latin term.

25 γράψαι τοιγαροῦν πρὸς τοὺς λογιστὰς καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς πραιποσίτους τοῦ πάγου ἐκάστης πόλεως κτλ. (804,23-26).

fully intelligible, again, if the readers know the Sabinus circular. Without this knowledge, the statement becomes cryptic.

In this context, it is sufficient to say of the circular itself that Sabinus informed the provincial governors of the Emperors' decree of some time previously that everyone, including those who lived by non-Roman traditions, should worship *di Romani*.²⁶ Since the Christians in their obstinate intransigence could not be induced to do so either by the reasonableness of the order or by its ominous punishment, but in fact chose to put themselves in great danger, the Emperors decreed that they could follow their own religion²⁷ unhampered and without punishment. The provincial governors, therefore, were to inform the various local authorities in writing that the contents of the letter must, from then on, determine their behaviour towards the Christians.²⁸

The provincial governors, the text goes on to say in 802,16-804,2, took the Sabinus circular at its word²⁹ and in letters to the local authorities they conveyed the Imperial decision that the Christians should be granted religious freedom and not be molested.³⁰ Here, Eusebius actually hinted that the governors ought to have realized that Sabinus's *epistola* was not to be taken literally, but no ground for such a consideration has, in fact, been given in the text up to this point. The criticism was directed solely against Maximin for not having published the "Galerius edict" because of its pro-Christian nature. There is not the slightest hint that he was being insincere, when he verbally ordered the persecutions to be discontinued.

Eusebius then related, in 804,3-8, that the Imperial decree was carried out to the letter, not only in writing but, more to the point, in actions: the Christians were released from prisons and mines – for this was mistakenly presumed to be the Emperor's wish.

Eusebius began this section οὐ μόνον δ' αὐτοῖς διὰ γραφῆς ταῦτα προουχῶρει, καὶ ἔργοις δὲ πολὺ πρότερον, κτλ., and, as the text stands, the words bring the local authorities listed in 804,1-2 to mind. But the problem then arises that they did not send letters, as stated in διὰ γραφῆς. The use of ταῦτα also seems strange if it is supposed to refer to τὴν βασιλικὴν ... γνώμην (804,2). These difficulties suggest that the provincial governors are the subject of the passage, which then states that they wrote to the local authorities about the Imperial decision on the cessation of the persecutions, and also that they themselves carried it out. Even so, ταῦτα still seems strange. The word, however, becomes completely intelligible if we assume that it refers to τὰ τῆς παρακελεύσεως (802,12). In that case, the passage in 804,3-7 is a direct continuation of οἱ

δὲ τὰ τῆς παρακελεύσεως ἀλλήλοις διὰ γραφῆς ὑποσημαίνουν (802,12-13) and means that the officials carried out, in writing and in action, the Emperor's verbal command. When Eusebius then pointed

26 For a more detailed discussion of the Sabinus circular and its contents, see below pp. 223 ff.

27 The important provision reads: εἴ τις τῶν Χριστιανῶν τοῦ ἰδίου ἔθνους τὴν θρησκείαν μετιῶν εὐθεσίῃ, τῆς κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐνοχλήσεως καὶ τοῦ κινδύνου αὐτὸν ἀποστήσειας καὶ μὴ τινα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς προφάσεως τιμωρῶν κολαστέον νομίσειας (804,19-21).

28 The purpose of publication was described thus: ἵνα γνοῖεν περαιτέρω αὐτοῖς τοῦτου τοῦ γράμματος φροντίδα ποιεῖσθαι μὴ προσήκειν (804,25-26). The interpretation of this sentence presents problems. *Crux interpretationis* is τοῦτου τοῦ γράμματος here. J. E. L. Oulton remarks in the Loeb Classical Library edition: "If the Greek here is a correct translation of the Latin original, the words "that letter" must refer to some previous document ordering the persecution of Christians" (*Eusebius* II, LCL 265, p. 331). G. Bardy prints this remark almost verbatim (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 45 note 7) and therefore gives this very free translation: "afin qu'ils sachent que désormais il ne leur convient pas de se préoccuper de cet édit" (*ibid.*). The interpretation is difficult to maintain, however, for the simple reason that the persecution of the Christians which raged under both Diocletian and Galerius was not based on one definite edict, but on several laws, see, on this matter, my book *Maximinus*, p. 72 ff. Since the Sabinus circular had already stated that the persecution of the Christians rested on an Imperial κέλευσις (802,24-804,13), we would, in addition, have expected a ταύτης τῆς κελύσεως rather than a τοῦτου τοῦ γράμματος. – H. Valois was in no doubt that the text should be emended by replacing γράμματος with πράγματος, and he found support for this emendation in Nicephorus Callistus, who wrote: Μὴ προσήκον ἐκείνοις περαιτέρω φροντίδα περὶ Χριστιανῶν ποιεῖσθαι, see PG XX, 2, col. 801 note 5 – he was discussing *Hist. Eccl.* VII, 24.1 (PG LXLV, col. 1260). Though this probably does convey the sense, it is a paraphrase which cannot be used in support of Valois' emendation. – Another translation is possible, however, if we understand τοῦτου τοῦ γράμματος to mean the Sabinus circular itself – and the emphatic use of the demonstrative article suggests just this. If περαιτέρω is taken as a preposition meaning "beyond", the phrase is saying that the provincial governors were told that they should not care for anything beyond the commands in Sabinus's *epistola*. In other words, this should form the only basis in the future of their treatment of the Christians – and it implies, of course, the recantation of the existing anti-Christian laws. This interpretation, indeed, has one weak point: there is no grammatical object for φροντίδα ποιεῖσθαι. It would be tempting to supply τοῦ πράγματος and explain its omission as the result of its similarity with τοῦ γράμματος which appeared immediately before. This matter, πράγμα, would then refer to the efforts to make the Christians worship the Roman gods – and, on the basis of the Sabinus circular, the provincial governors should no longer occupy themselves with this problem.

29 τὴν τῶν γραφέντων αὐτοῖς ἐπαληθεύειν προαίρεσιν νενομικότες (802.16-804.1).

30 τὴν βασιλικὴν διὰ γραμμάτων ἐμφανῆ καθιστώσι γνώμην (804,2). This must mean that the decisive provisions in Sabinus's *epistola* were incorporated into new circulars to the various local authorities. It should however be noted that whereas Eusebius had criticized Maximin for not publishing the "Galerius edict", but only issuing a verbal command that the persecution of the Christians should cease, he considered it quite acceptable that the

out καὶ ἔργοις δὲ πολὺ πρότερον, ὡς ἂν νεῦμα βασιλικὸν εἰς πέρας ἄγοντες³¹ κτλ. (804,3-4), he obviously wanted to say that, by releasing the prisoners, they, in fact, went beyond the Imperial decree. Strictly speaking, it ordered the cessation of the persecutions, but they themselves drew the practical consequences of this by setting the Christians free.³²

This description actually contradicts the Sabinus circular, which demanded that the Christians should no longer be molested and punished,³³ and so implied that they should be released. The Imperial decree included not only the command to stop the persecutions, but also instructions as to its implementation – in other words, it did not depend on the officials' own initiative. The discrepancy can be explained, however, if we assume that the passage in question was written before Eusebius learned of Sabinus's *epistola*.³⁴ This also provides further confirmation of our claim that 804,3-7 was the direct continuation of 802,12-13.

Eusebius added this remark to the account in 804,3-7: τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας βασιλεῖ δοκεῖν ὑπειλήφασιν ἠπατημένοι (804,7-8). He wanted to emphasize the point that the officials deceived themselves when, with their independent initiative, they thought they fulfilled Maximin's true intentions. The remark repeats Eusebius's earlier statement in 802,16-804,1.³⁵ Since this evidently referred to the Sabinus circular, then the remark here must also have been inserted at the same time. Eusebius was again trying to point out that the conclusion drawn naturally from the account in 804,3-7 was a fallacy: the officials did not fulfill the Emperor's intention and desire.

In 804,8-806,2, Eusebius reported that after this, the congregations met in every town in full strength³⁶ and continued their worship³⁷ and that the non-believers proclaimed the Christian God the only true one, in amazement at the unexpected turn of events.

The first words in this section – καὶ δὴ τούτων οὕτως ἐπιτελεσθέντων (804,8-9) – must refer, in the text as it now stands, to the whole of the previous account of the Emperors' decision to halt the persecutions, which resulted in the release of the Christians from the prisons and mines.

He continued ἀθρόως οἷόν τι φῶς ἐκ ζοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ἐκλάμψαν (804,9). Eusebius undoubtedly wanted this allusion to 2 *Cor.* 4, v. 6³⁸ to indicate that God had revealed his glory by stopping the persecutions so

provincial governors sent on the Imperial decision – τὴν βασιλέως γνώμην (802,15), τὴν βασιλικὴν γνώμην (804,2) – in new independent circulars to the various local authorities. We should remember that this was perfectly normal practice.

that the Christians could again meet freely and worship Him at their divine services.³⁹ The cessation of the persecutions was thus viewed here as God's powerful act of revelation which had the additional effect of making the non-believing pagans realize that only the Christian God was almighty and true.⁴⁰

This religious interpretation does not agree with the previous account

31 The expression must mean "bring to completion". It may also suggest, however, that the officials put the Imperial decision into effect to the very furthest limits – that is to say, everywhere in the provinces.

32 ὄσους εἶχον δεσμοτηρίοις καθειργμένους διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ὁμολογίαν, εἰς φανερὸν προάγοντες ἡλευθέρουν, ἀνιέντες τούτων δὴ αὐτῶν τοὺς ἐν μετάλλοις ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ δεδομένους (804,4-7). E. Schwartz remarked on this construction: τούτων δὴ αὐτῶν [ist] unverständlich, auch der Anschluss von ἀνιέντες τοὺς – δεδομένους durch das Particium ist inconcinn» (*Eusebius* II, 2, 804 *ad locum*). The linguistic clumsiness probably resulted from the fact that ἀνιέντες κτλ. was a later insertion. After completing ὄσους εἶχον κτλ. up to ἡλευθέρουν (804,4-6), Eusebius presumably found that it lacked the information that the authorities had also released the Christians who had been condemned to the mines – particularly because later, he described their return home in detail. He therefore inserted ἀνιέντες κτλ.

33 Cf. note 27 above.

34 We should say that neither do the contents of the passage mentioned here agree with the "Galerius edict". When the Imperial powers had given the Christians freedom of religion, it says: δι' ἑτέρας δὲ ἐπιστολῆς τοῖς δικασταῖς δηλώσομεν τί αὐτοὺς παραφυλάσσασθαι δεήσει (794,17-18) – meaning that the provincial governors will receive further instructions on the implementation of the Imperial decision. This proves, of course, that the passage in question was written at a time when Eusebius did not know of the "Galerius edict".

35 This has been pointed out already by E. Schwartz: τοῦτο – ἡπατημένοι Doublette zu 802,16-804,1 τὴν – νανομκότει (*Eusebius* II, 2, p. 804 *ad locum*).

36 κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν συγκροτουμένας παρῆν ὄραν ἐκκλησίας συνόδους τε παμπληθεῖς καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τούτων ἕξ ἔθους ἐπιτελουμένας ἀγωγὰς (804,10-11). In this florid passage, ἐκκλησίαι surely means the churches themselves which were filled by the congregations. συνόδους παμπληθεῖς could, on the other hand, suggest the meeting of Christians at the graves of the martyrs.

37 καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τούτων ἕξ ἔθους ἐπιτελουμένας ἀγωγὰς (804,11). ἐπὶ τούτων refers to the meeting of the Christians both in the churches and at the graves of the martyrs.

38 Cf. E. Schwartz: *Eusebius* II, 2, p. 804 *ad locum*.

39 The text as it stands makes it difficult to decide whether ἀθρόως should be connected to the preceding phrase – τούτων οὕτως ἐπιτελεσθέντων (804,8-9) – or to the next one – κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν κτλ. (804,10-11).

40 καταπέπληκτο δ' οὐ' σμικρῶς ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶς τις τῶν ἀπίστων ἔθνῶν, τῆς τσαύτης μεταβολῆς τὸ παραδόξον ἀποθαυμάζων μέγαν τε καὶ μόνον ἀληθῆ τὸν Χριστιανῶν θεὸν ἐπιβώμενος (804,12-806,2). ἐπὶ τούτοις must mean the full Christian congregations.

in which the cessation of the persecutions was described not as a result of God's intervention but as an act of the Emperors and their officials. It is quite parallel, however, to the line of thought in VIII, 16,1 (788,10-16): God in His mercy brought about the completely unexpected cessation of the persecutions organized by the anti-Christian Emperors. This agreement in content justifies our assumption that 804,13-806,2 was originally the direct continuation of 788,10-16, which is further supported by the fact that the expression τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς τὸ παράδοξον ἀποθανυμάζων (806,1) both presupposes and links up with παραδοξότατα μεταθέμενοι τὴν γνώμην (788,13). The phrase τούτων οὕτως ἐπιτελεσθέντων (804,8-9) must therefore have referred, in the original context, to παλινωδίαν ἤδον κτλ. (788, 14-16). This, in fact, produces a much clearer and more concise explanation than is found in the existing text. Since the "palinode" appeared quite suddenly and unexpectedly, then the words ἀθρόως οἶόν τι φῶς ἐκ ζοφεροῦς νυκτὸς ἐκλάμπαν (804,9) also become completely intelligible, which is more than can be said of them in the present context.

This interpretation of the original unity between 788,10-16 and 804,13-806,2 can be seen as the conclusion to Eusebius's religiously defined description of the persecutions: God watched jealously over His people and therefore sent persecution as a punishment for their sins but once He had become reconciled with them, He showed His compassion by bringing the persecutions to a close. This account was also intended to be apologetic. A widespread belief had existed among the heathen that the persecution of the Christians had shown their God to be powerless since he had not come to their assistance in their suffering and adversity. Eusebius wanted to counter this belief by pointing out that the persecutions demonstrated God's Providence: He cared for His Church and always had the power to control events so that they served His purpose. Therefore, Eusebius considered it essential to say that the pagans had to abandon their disbelief at the unexpected cessation of the persecutions and recognize the Christian God as the only true divine power.

Eusebius had more to say, however. He continued in *cap.* 1,9 (806,2-8) to report that the liberated *confessores* gave witness to all of their faith⁴¹ and that the apostate⁴² begged both the *confessores* and God for mercy.⁴³ Eusebius wanted to show that the Church reestablished itself quickly and overcame the damaging refutation and apostasy caused by the persecutions.

In *cap.* 1,10 (806,8-12), Eusebius went on to describe the happy and

inexpressibly joyful return to their homes of the Christians who had been released from the misery of the mines. The section resumes the thread from τῶν δ' ἡμετέρων up to παρρησίαν (806,2-4), but discusses, more specifically, the Christians who had been released from the mines.⁴⁴

Cap. 1,11 (806,12-18) finally reports on great crowds of those that had been exiled⁴⁵ who now returned home. At this unexpected sight, their former persecutors⁴⁶ rejoiced with the Christians at the events which had

41 οἱ μὲν τὸν τῶν διωγμῶν ἀγῶνα πιστῶς καὶ ἀνδρικῶς διηθληκότες τὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας αὐθις ἀπελάμβανον παρρησίαν (806,3-4). It is not clear how we should translate παρρησία. If we assume that it means “outspokenness” or “freedom of speech”, it must suggest that the *confessores* could once again witness to their faith freely and openly to everyone – which makes good sense in the entire context. Lawlor-Oulton’s translation – “once more resumed their confident bearing in the sight of all” (*Eusebius I*, p. 280) seems less satisfactory since confidence had characterized their attitude during the persecution itself. The same criticism can be levelled at G. Bardy’s translation: “retrouvant à nouveau leur franchise à l’égard de tous” (*Eusèbe de Césarée III*, p. 46).

42 Eusebius chose the following paraphrase for the apostate: τὰ τῆς πίστεως νενοσηκότες τὰς ψυχὰς ἐτύγχανον κεχειμασμένοι (806,5).

43 ἀσμένως περὶ τὴν σφῶν θεραπείαν ἔσπευδον, ἀντιβολοῦντες καὶ σωτηρίας δεξιάν τοὺς ἐρωθιμένους αἰτούμενοι τὸν τε θεὸν ἵλεων αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι καθικετεύοντες (806,6-8). The passage must, by implication, mean that the prayers of the penitents were heard, so that they were received into the Church again.

44 This connection was established in such a way that it produced near repetitions: οἱ γενναῖοι τῆς θεοσεβείας ἀθληταί (806,8-9) thus repeats οἱ τὸν τῶν διωγμῶν ἀγῶνα πιστῶς καὶ ἀνδρικῶς διηθληκότες (806,3-4), just as παρρησίας ἔμπλοει (806,12) repeats τὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας αὐθις ἀπελάμβανον παρρησίαν (806,4).

45 The section begins: στίφη δ' οὖν πολυάνθρωπα κατὰ μέσας λεωφόρους καὶ ἀγορὰς ὠδαῖς καὶ ψαλμοῖς τὸν θεὸν ἀνυμνοῦντα τὰ τῆς πορείας ἤγνεν (806,12-14). On the face of it, we might presume that Eusebius was introducing a new group, different from the liberated Christian mineworkers mentioned previously. The continuation καὶ τοὺς μετὰ τιμωρίας ἀπνησεστάτης μικρῷ πρόσθεν δεσμίους τῶν πατριδῶν ἀπεληλαμένους εἶδες (806,14-15) seems, however, only to make sense if we assume that it refers to the Christians who were condemned to the mines. In this case, cap. 1,11a is a simple repetition of cap. 1,10. But perhaps the ambiguous expression was introduced because Eusebius wished to point out that release was also granted to those who had been condemned to exile and imprisonment; in other words, it discusses the return of all categories of condemned and punished Christians.

46 In τοὺς πρότερον καθ' ἡμῶν φονῶντας (806,17), the verb must be derived from φόνος, murder, so the expression has to be translated “those who previously were murderous towards us”. But an exact translation is difficult to establish as demonstrated by H. Valois, who translated it *illi ipsi qui prius caedem nobis atque excidium minabantur* (PG XX, 2, p. 801D); Lawlor-Oulton chose this version: “those who formerly were thirsting for our blood” (*Eusebius I*, p. 280). But quite apart from the question of a correct translation, it is not clear to whom the phrase refers. It would be natural to think of the Emperors who were

taken place.⁴⁷ Even though *cap.* 1,11a (806,12-16) probably refers to the release of all categories of condemned Christians, the description of their return home seems to be a repetition of *cap.* 1,10,⁴⁸ adding only that they were singing praises to God when they returned.⁴⁹

Cap. 1,11b (806,16-18) also seems to repeat the line of thought in *cap.* 1,8b (804,8-806,2). There is one difference, however: in the latter section, the pagans were led to the recognition of the Christian God by the total reversal of the Emperors' attitude towards the Christians, but here Eusebius simply says that the persecutors rejoiced with the Christians in their liberty. This does not actually imply that the pagans abandoned their religion, so the second passage describes a much less extreme reaction on the part of the heathen. This makes τὸ θαῦμα παρὰ πᾶσαν ὀργῶντας ἐλπίδα (806,17-18) seem strange in the context. Like τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς κτλ. (806,1-2), it was probably intended as a statement to the effect that the Christians' release was the result of a divine miracle. In the first passage, it made excellent sense, but not here – the persecutors had never entertained any hope that the Christians would be allowed to worship their God. We must assume that Eusebius used this expression to establish a parallel to *cap.* 1,8b, but since the section was intended to show that the Christians' former persecutors now sympathized and rejoiced with them, it is out of place in the context – in fact, we are given no explanation for the sudden change from opposition to goodwill. But the observation does lead us to the conclusion that the section was inserted later and, despite its variant point, had to be worked into the original version in *cap.* 1,8b.

If we turn, after this analysis, to Rufinus's version of *cap.* 1, we find an account which is independent in several respects. Its deviations from the source are obvious products of Rufinus's desire to correct what he considered to be its shortcomings.

The very first passage (802,1-3) seemed to Rufinus to require re-working in order to be clear and intelligible. He believed that Eusebius referred

persecuting the Christians. But this clashed with the ensuing account of Maximin's attitude towards the Christians. Instead, it must refer to all, whether public officials or ordinary citizens, who wished to exterminate the Christians. Bardy could find no satisfactory interpretation and therefore chose the following translation: "ceux mêmes, qui naguère criaient contre nous" (*Eusèbe de Césarée III*, p. 47). He gave no explanation for this, but we may assume that he thought φονῶντας was a mistake for φωνοῦντας.

to the “Galerius edict” in τὰ — τῆς παλινφθίας τοῦ προτεθέντος βασιλικοῦ νεύματος (802,1), and therefore he felt the need to simplify this ornate expression. He obviously thought that Eusebius’s τῆς Ἀσίας πάντη καὶ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τε τὰς ἀμφὶ ταύτην ἐπαρχίας (802,2-3) confusedly collocated the diocese *Asia* with *provinciae*, in a passage which could only be discussing dioceses. At any rate, he replaced the introductory passage with this short, precise version: *Huiusmodi*⁵⁰ *edictis imperialibus per omnem locum Asiae Pontique propositis* — (803,1-2). But where Eusebius went on immediately to describe Maximin’s pretended recantation of the persecution, Rufinus provided this continuation: *velut ex ingentibus tenebris subitum lumen refulsit* (803,2). In other words, he took out ἀθρόως οἷόν τι φῶς ἐκ ζοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ἐκλάμψαν (804,9) and placed it in the introductory sentence. This was undoubtedly done on the grounds that the picture of the light which suddenly shone in the darkness was connected to the mention of the publication of the “Galerius edict”, since this brought the persecutions to a close, completely unexpectedly for the Christians, and allowed them to perform their divine services.⁵¹

The detailed description in 802,3-5 of Maximin as the tyrant of the East and the worst of all the impious and Christianity’s greatest enemy was felt by Rufinus to be out of place here. He may have regarded it as unsatisfactory that Maximin was introduced here as if he had not been mentioned previously, when VIII, 14,7-16 had, in fact, given a full account of him and his rule. He may have considered this description to be not quite commensurate with the previous one, in which Galerius appeared as the persecutor of the Christians *par excellence*. Rufinus must also have thought that 802,8-12 contained the same information as 802,3-8, and

47 ουγαίρειν τοῖς γεγενημένοις (806,18). The last word refers to both the “palinode” itself and the release of the Christians.

48 Thus ἴλαροῖς καὶ γεγηθόσι προσώποις τὰς αὐτῶν ἐστίας ἀπολαμβάνοντας (806,15-16) is parallel to γαῦροι καὶ φαιδροὶ ... εὐφροσύνης τε ἀλέκτου ... ἔμπλεοι (806,10-12) just as τὰς αὐτῶν ἐστίας ἀπολαμβάνοντας (806,16) repeats ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ἐστέλλοντο (806,10).

49 The entire description can be regarded as a more detailed version of παρησίαις ἔμπλεοι (806,12) and its implications.

50 This is saying that *edicta imperialia* were identical with the “Galerius edict” which had just been reproduced.

51 Rufinus may have considered this re-arrangement justifiable if, in 804,8-9, he interpreted καὶ δὴ τούτων οὕτως ἐπιτελεσθέντων to mean that Eusebius was now going to provide the continuation he indicated in 802,3 with the words ὃν τοῦτον ἐπιτελεσθέντων τὸν τρόπον.

that the two sections should therefore be integrated. But he found it hard to believe that Maximin could have solved his problems in relation to his superior Emperors by simply giving a verbal command that the persecutions should cease – written or verbal, the result of the command would be the same. Any avoiding action must have taken the form of orders from Maximin that the persecutions should only be suspended for a time. Rufinus obviously felt that he was justified in assuming this to have happened because, according to *cap.* 2,1a, Maximin restarted the persecution of the Christians after less than six months. Critical considerations of this type must have prompted Rufinus to create from 802,1-11 this new text, which is clear and coherent, and also appears as an integrated part of the account: *sed Maximinus, qui in orientis partibus Caesaris tyrannidem potius quam locum tenebat, tamquam crudelitatis suae materiam sibi subtrahi non ferens,⁵² cum ei displiceret edictum⁵³ nec tamen auderet obsistere,⁵⁴ proponi publice legem et omnibus in notitiam venire non patitur,⁵⁵ verbo tamen iudicibus⁵⁶ praecepit indutias Christianis interim dare* (803,2-7).

Rufinus completely omitted οἱ δὲ τὰ τῆς παρακαλεῦσεως ἀλλήλοις διὰ γραφῆς ὑποσημαίνουσιν (802,12-13). He probably felt that the passage was rather superfluous or, indeed, contradictory because Eusebius went on to say that Sabinus notified the provincial governors of the Imperial decision.

Rufinus's version of ὁ γοῦν κτλ. up to διὰ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐπιστολῆς (802,13-16) diverges markedly from the source. He says that Galerius sent the "Galerius edict" on to the provincial governors.⁵⁷ It was quite unambiguous in its demand that the persecutions should cease, so Rufinus could only believe that Sabinus repressed Maximin's decision to suspend the persecutions temporarily. Since this decision was not made known to the provincial governors, there was, of course, no basis for Eusebius's remark: οἱ δὲ τὴν τῶν γραφέντων αὐτοῖς ἐπαληθεύειν προαίρεσιν νενομικότες (802,16-804,1) which was therefore left out of Rufinus's version. Generally speaking, his rendition of 802,13-804,1 carefully avoids all superfluous elements: *sed Sabinus, qui per illud tempus praefecturae culmen regebat,⁵⁸ omnium provinciarum iudicibus scribens et praelatam imperatoris inserens legem manifestum efficit cunctis id, quod Maximinus obscurare temptaverat* (803,7-10).⁵⁹

Rufinus probably felt that Eusebius's account in 804,1-8 (λογισταῖς κτλ.) was somewhat confused. He saw no reason to reproduce the information in his source that the provincial governors notified the local

authorities of the Imperial decision in writing: λογισταῖς καὶ στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἀγροὺς ἐπιτεταγμένοις (804,1-2). Apart from the fact that these designations perhaps meant very little to his readers, he probably felt that they had no place in an account which only discussed the provincial governors. Rufinus believed that the “Galerius edict” was sent out, and this should be stated clearly and directly. In 804,2-4, Eusebius says that the officials themselves – either the provincial governors or the local authorities, we have no way, as we have seen, of knowing which – took the initiative to release the Christians, but Rufinus thought that they simply carried out the instructions actually contained in the provisions of the “Galerius edict” itself. So, he completely omitted οὐ μόνον δ' ὑποῖς διὰ γραφῆς ταῦτα προυχώρει, καὶ ἔργοις δὲ πολὺ πρότερον, ὡς ἂν νεῦμα βασιλικὸν εἰς πέρας ἄγοντες (804,3-4). Similarly, he omitted τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας βασιλεῖ δοκεῖν ὑπειλήφασιν ἠπατημένοι (804,7-8) because, like the related οἱ δὲ κτλ. (802,16-804,1), it conflicted with his interpretation of the real nature of the case. On the basis of this clear critical scrutiny of consistency and accuracy, Rufinus created a new version from 804,1-8: *iudices vero per singulas civitates edicta mittentes legemque praeferentes relaxari cunctos, qui tenebantur in carcere, quique in met-*

52 Rufinus referred in these words to the account on Maximin VIII, 14,7-16, which depicts his *crudelitas*.

53 Rufinus chose *edictum*, instead of the rather imprecise τοῖς γραφεῖσιν, to suggest that it was the “Galerius edict”.

54 Since Rufinus simply translates τῇ τῶν κρειττόνων ἀντιλέγειν κρίσει (802,8-9) by *obsistere*, it is not immediately obvious whom Maximin set himself against.

55 Rufinus's translation conveys the essential feature in Eusebius: τὸν προεκτεθέντα νόμον ἐν παραβύσῳ θεῖς καὶ ὅπως ἐν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν μέρεσιν μὴ εἰς προὔπτον ἀχθεῖη, φροντίσας (802,9-10).

56 *iudicibus*, which translates τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν (802,7), refers to the provincial governors, as is clearly shown by the very next phrase *provinciarum iudicibus* (803,8-9). Rufinus saw no reason to explain to his readers how Maximin could have given them verbal orders on the cessation of the persecution.

57 This interpretation was particularly natural for Rufinus, since his source did not contain Sabinus's *epistola*, as R. Laqueur mistakenly presumes, *op. cit.*, p. 69; it only had the “Galerius edict”.

58 These words translate ὁ παρ' αὐτοῖς τῶ τῶν ἐξοχωτάτων ἐπάρχων ἀξιωματι τετιμημένος (802,13-14). Rufinus omitted translating παρ' αὐτοῖς, probably because he found the expression unintelligible and, in any case, superfluous in the context.

59 From what follows on immediately, we must imagine that Sabinus wrote to the provincial governors and asked them to publish the enclosed “Galerius edict”.

*allis aut quibuslibet vinculis*⁶⁰ *adservabantur, omnes abscedere liberos iubent* (803,10-805,3).

Rufinus felt that Eusebius had sound reasons for emphasizing the fact that the cessation of the persecutions, the release of the prisoners, and the reestablishment of Church life meant new times for the Christians. But he had already included οἶόν τι φῶς κτλ. (804,9) in the first sentence of the chapter, so he provided this composition instead: *quibus ita gestis velut post nimiam tempestatem si solis splendor caelo redditus fuisset ac terris ...* (805,3-5).

Rufinus clearly felt that Eusebius had given an incomplete description in 804,8-11 of the Church and its resumed functions, and he therefore replaced κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν κτλ. (804,10-11) with this account of its restoration: ... *duces populi nostri per singulas quasque urbes frequentare conventus, concilia agere,*⁶¹ *sacerdotia reparare,*⁶² *singulas quasque ecclesias, si cui quid deesse videbatur, instruere* (805,5-7). Note here that Rufinus considered the bishops the natural leaders of the restoration.

In 804,12-806,2, Eusebius described the effect of the cessation of the persecution on the heathen. Rufinus made an effort to remove from this passage any features which he considered to be hyperbolic and have no basis in historical fact. He composed a version which was more restrained than his source: *quae cum ita gererentur, stupor ingens habebat infideles gentilium*⁶³ *de tanta tamque subita conversione*⁶⁴ *rerum, ita ut admiratione ipsa fateri cogerentur*⁶⁵ *magnum et solum verum deum esse, quem Christiani colunt* (805,7-807,2).

Rufinus must have considered 806,2-8 somewhat unsatisfactory, in point of both style and content, because Eusebius mentioned the fighters for the faith and the reinstatement of the apostate in one and the same passage. He did not object to the actual description of the fighters for the faith and their joy, but he felt that more accuracy was needed in the description of the reinstatement of the apostate into the Church. In Eusebius, the penitents implored both the *confessores* and God for salvation and mercy, but Rufinus wanted to make it clear that the *confessores* interceded with God for those who wished to be reconciled with Him. Therefore, his version reads: *nostrorum vero si qui in agonibus fideliter et viriliter perduraverant, cum omni fiducia et laetitia agebant,*⁶⁶ *si qui vero languidius et ignavius egerant,*⁶⁷ *cum omni humilitate et supplicatione medicinam poscere*⁶⁸ *ab his, qui incolumes persisterant, properabant et per eos repropitiari sibi omnipotentem deum*⁶⁹ *supplicabant*⁷⁰ (807,2-6).

Rufinus was apparently dissatisfied with Eusebius's account in 806,8-

16, because it did not specify whether the return home of two different groups of exiled Christians was being discussed or whether Eusebius was referring only to the Christian mineworkers. Rufinus himself was in no doubt that the second assumption was the correct one. But it must be made more precise and the account tightened up to avoid the repetitions

60 Rufinus's list is a drastic abbreviation of Eusebius's full description *δοσους κτλ.* (804,4-7). On his own account, Rufinus added *aut quibuslibet vinculis* (805,2-3), probably in order to include the various forms of imprisonment to which the Christians were subjected. On the other hand, he saw no need to translate *διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ὁμολογίαν* (804,5) and *ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ* (804,7), since the previous full account of "the great persecution" made it quite clear that the Christians were punished in these various ways because of their faith.

61 Rufinus probably felt that this phrase defined the meaning of Eusebius's almost tautological expression: *συγκροτουμένας ... ἐκκλησίας συνόδους τε παμπληθεῖς* (804,10-11).

62 Considering the fact that Eusebius, in VII, 2,1, had described apostasy amongst the priests, Rufinus obviously felt the need to point out that the restoration of the Church also implied *sacerdotia reparare*. The context also called for a reference to the reconstruction of individual church buildings, where such reconstructions were necessary. But he saw no reason to translate *καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τούτων ἕξ ἔθους ἐπιτελουμένας ἀγωγάς* (804,11). He probably regarded the phrase as superfluous, since the resumption of divine worship was a natural prerequisite for his description of the restoration of the Church.

63 Instead of *πᾶς τις τῶν ἀπίστων* (804,12), Rufinus simply wrote *infideles gentilium*, which has a less absolute quality. Not all unbelievers recognized the Christian God.

64 This expression replaces *τῆς τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς τὸ παράδοξον* (806,1). Rufinus wished to state expressly that he was writing on events which had previously been discussed: the cessation of the persecution and the restoration of the Church.

65 Rufinus did not translate *ἐπιβιώμενος* (806,2) but chose to write *fateri cogentur* (807,1). He probably wanted to show that their confession of the Christian God did not express their personal convictions, and that, in their hearts, they remained heathen.

66 Rufinus translated *τὸν Χριστιανῶν θεόν* (806,2) by *deum ... quem Christiani colunt* (807,2), perhaps to emphasize his view that the confession of the unbelievers was a result of the resumption of divine Christian services.

67 Rufinus probably found the phrase *τὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας αὐτῆς ἀπελάμβανον παρρησίαν* (806,4) misleading, suggesting that the fighters for the faith had not always behaved with *παρρησία*. When translating the expression by *cum omni fiducia et laetitia agebant* (807,3), he brought out as something new the point that their conduct was marked by joy because of their release.

68 Rufinus chose this expression instead of *τὰ τῆς πίστεως νενοσηρότερες τὰς ψυχὰς ἐτύγχανον κεχειμασμένοι*. He was probably prompted by a desire to avoid Eusebius's metaphorical language.

69 Rufinus's translation of *ἀντιβολοῦντες σωτηρίας δεξιάν* (806,6-7) emphasized his view that penance, which is here described as *medicina*, requires *humilitas* and *supplicatio*.

70 Since penance for Rufinus meant that God is reconciled with mankind, he chose to state this explicitly, instead of simply reproducing *τόν τε θεὸν ἴλεων αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι* (806,7-8).

which the source then contained. Rufinus achieved this in the following way: *iam vero illi,⁷¹ qui de metallis⁷² fuerant relaxati, venientes per urbes singulas magnanimi sublimesque incedebant et ineffabilem laetitiam atque exultationem dei⁷³ ecclesiis exhibebant,⁷⁴ toto itinere per plateas quoque civitatum et vicos cum psalmis et hymnis digredientes,⁷⁵ ita ut stuperent et magnificarent deum hi, qui eos paulo ante victos et catenatos trahi in metalla viderant, laetos vero nunc atque exultantes cernebant ad propria remeare* (807,7-13).

In his version, Rufinus wrote *ita ut stuperent et magnificarent deum* (807,10-11), which was not in the source. He probably wished to give a more detailed description of the process by which the pagans arrived at their new notion of God. *Magnificarent deum* no doubt plays on *fateri ... magnum et solum verum deum esse* (807,1-2), and the section can be said to be an expansion of this theme. A new feature is introduced here, the sight of the jubilant return of the Christian mineworkers made the heathen magnify the Christian God.

Rufinus took out *ὡς καὶ τοὺς πρότερον κτλ.* (806,16-18) and rewrote it as an independent passage. He probably thought that *τοὺς πρότερον καθ' ἡμῶν φρονῶντας* (806,17) indicated public officials who could not simply be discussed together with those who observed the return of the liberated Christians. But even here he found it impossible to follow Eusebius who said, judging from the text, that those who had been intent on killing the Christians were now rejoicing at their liberation. At any rate, Rufinus's version was much more circumspect: *ex quo etiam ipsi, qui*

71 Rufinus found no reason to translate of *γενναῖοι τῆς θεοσεβείας ἀθληταί* (806,8-9). He probably felt it to be superfluous following, as it does, immediately after *qui in agonibus fideliter et viriliter perduraverant* (807,2-3).

72 Rufinus simply translated *τῆς εἰς τὰ μέταλλα κακοπαθείας* (806,9) as *de metallis*, probably as a result of his efforts to be brief and concise. The same objective induced him to omit completely *ἦν οὐδὲ λόγῳ δυνατὸν ἐρμηνεῦσαι* (806,11-12).

73 Note here Rufinus's skill in varying the translation of *γαῦροι καὶ φαιδροὶ ... εὐφροσύνης τε ἀλέκτου καὶ ... παρησίας ἔμπλοιοι* (806,10-12).

74 By putting these words in place of *ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ἐστέλλοντο* (806,10), he adroitly avoided the repetition in his source, which later mentioned again *τὰς αὐτῶν ἐστίας ἀπολαμβάνοντας* (806,16).

75 Here, Rufinus coupled *διὰ πάσης ἰόντες πόλεως* (806,10-11) with *κατὰ μέσας λεωφόρους καὶ ἀγορὰς φῦδαις καὶ ψαλμοῖς τὸν θεὸν ἀνυμνοῦντα τὰ τῆς πορείας ἦνυσεν* (806,12-14). But he did not translate *σίφη πολυάνθρωπα* (806,12), since it could give the impression that he had moved to a discussion of a different group. For the same reason, he also joined the finite sentences 806,8-12 and 806,12-16 into one single passage by rephrasing the last section into a participial construction.

*prius infesti nobis videbantur*⁷⁶ *et adversi, nunc subitae conversionis miraculo*⁷⁷ *congratulabantur nobis et communem sibi ducebant laetitiam nostram*⁷⁸ (807,13-15).

76 By simply writing *videbantur*, Rufinus undoubtedly wanted to suggest that the people mentioned here only seemed to oppose the Christians, which was the reason why they found it easy to rejoice when the Christians could once more live freely. In other words, Rufinus was at pains to distinguish between this group and the real persecutors of the Christians, in whom no such sympathy could be expected.

77 Rufinus used these words to translate τὸ θαῦμα παρὰ πᾶσαν ... ἐλπίδα (806,17-18).

78 Rufinus probably decided that συγγαίρειν τοῖς γεγενημένοις (806,18) was too general as a description of the active sympathy which the Christians now enjoyed. Therefore, he replaced the expression by this lively description: *congratulabantur nobis et communem sibi ducebant laetitiam nostram* (807,14-15).

EXCURSUS:
The origins of *cap. 1*

Our analysis of *cap. 1* has proved that the account lacks continuity. The repetitions and contradictions show that Eusebius must have added new material to an earlier account and, at the same time, viewed the entire course of events from constantly changing angles. The various layers in the text do, however, permit us to trace the origins of this chapter in general outline.

As we have seen, *cap. 1,8* (804,8-806,2) agrees so closely with the reasoning in VIII, 16, 1b (788,10-16) that we were justified in concluding that the two sections originally belonged together. The depiction of the persecutions as defined by God's concern for His people was interrupted when Eusebius later inserted new material which argued that the Emperors – not God – were responsible for the persecutions. We find this, at any rate, in VIII, 16,2b-17,11 (788,22-794,25) and IX, 1,1-7 (802,1-804,8) and possibly in 1,9-11 (806,2-18). But we need further analysis. The fact is that even though the insertions view the Imperial government as responsible for the persecution, the description is by no means uniform. Eusebius kept on revising and adding new material which depicted the Emperors and their relations with the Christians from various points of view.⁷⁹

Even *cap. 1,1a* (802,1-3) represents, in its present form, a revision of the original text, which probably contained the following: τὰ μὲν δὴ τῆς παλινωδίας τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νεύματος ἤπλωτο πάντα καὶ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τῆς ἐπαρχίας. This does not refer to the "Galerius edict" but to the προγράμματα καὶ διατάγματα which were mentioned VIII, 16,1b (788,14). The phrase was probably inserted to create a link with an account of Maximin bringing the persecution to a close in his provinces.

When Eusebius chose to describe the cessation of the persecution in Maximin's provinces in more detail, he probably did so because he could draw on his own first hand experience. He knew that Maximin was *maximus augustus* on Galerius's death and therefore the leader of the tetrarchy, and this knowledge may also have played a part. By describing how Maximin halted the persecutions, he actually indicated events that happened in the entire Roman Empire.

At any rate, Eusebius expanded the original account with a description of Maximin's verbal order to halt the persecution and his officials' uni-

versal execution of the order which led to the release of the Christians from the prisons and the mines. This account is the basis of 802,3-804,7, and with the possible exception of some details, it must have read: [Μαξιμῖνος] λόγω προστάττει τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεῖναι πόλεμον (802,6-9). οἱ δὲ τὰ τῆς παρακελεύσεως ἀλλήλοις διὰ γραφῆς ὑποσημαίνουσιν (802,12-13). οὐ μόνον δ' αὐτοῖς κτλ. up to δεδομένους (804,2-7). In this account, οἱ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἄρχοντες means Maximin's officials in general and has no special reference to the court officials – in fact, Eusebius was probably thinking primarily of the provincial governors. It is also worth noting that there is no hint whatsoever that Maximin was playing a double game: the officials acted in complete accordance with his will and desire, when they halted the persecution *and* set the Christians free. In other words, Maximin appeared as an Emperor who had completely abandoned his previous enmity towards the Christians.

Having finished this account, Eusebius learned about Sabinus's *epistola*. He felt that it should be included, maybe because he regarded it as an official document which provided the legal basis for the cessation of the persecution. The textual variations which can be traced in this account show that the insertion comprises ο' γοῦν κτλ. (802,13-804,2). It begins with a short note on Sabinus as *praefectus praetorio*, followed by Sabinus's *epistola* itself and it ends with the information that the provincial governors obeyed the order in the *epistole* to pass on the Imperial decision to minor local authorities.

Eusebius did not wish to defame Maximin in any way by publishing the Sabinus circular. On the contrary, he intended to show Maximin's new attitude and that of the Imperial rule to the Christians. Sabinus's *epistola* was to be regarded as an example of the χρητὰ προγράμματα καὶ διατάγματα ἡμερώτατα which, according to VIII, 16,1b (788,14-15), extinguished the great fire of the persecution. But this means that the two passages – οἱ δὲ τὴν τῶν γραφέντων αὐτοῖς ἐπαληθεύειν προαίρεσιν νενομικότες (802,16-804,1) and τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπ' ἀληθείας βασιλεῖ δοκεῖν ὑπειλήφασιν ἠπατημένοι (804,7-8) – which state that Maximin was playing a double game, are later additions. But the insertion was meant as an illustration of Maximin's complete change towards the Christians, and

79 The *Appendix* (796,2-797,12) should also be included in this development. I have analysed this section and discussed its importance to the origins of VIII, 13,10-IX, 1 in "The so-called *Appendix* to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII", *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XXXIV, 1983, p. 177-209, so I shall limit myself, on this question, to a reference to this article.

therefore it must have been inserted before November 311 when he once again began to obstruct the Christians' worship.

Eusebius no doubt also inserted Sabinus's *epistola* because he could use it for a more detailed account of the officials' execution of Maximin's verbal commands on the cessation of the persecution. But it produced several inconsistencies in the new account. Originally, Eusebius had stated that the officials published the Emperor's verbal orders in writing. But the insertion says that the orders were publicized in the letter written by Sabinus in his capacity as *praefectus praetorio*. This introduces a contradiction, which is strikingly obvious in Eusebius's very next sentence on Sabinus – οἱ δὲ τὰ τῆς παρακελεύσεως ἀλλήλοις διὰ γραφῆς ὑποσημαίνουσιν (802,12-13) – at the same time, he allowed the original version to remain: τὴν βασιλέως ἐμφαίνει γνώμην διὰ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐπιστολῆς (802,15-16). Another contradiction appears when the original version said that Maximin gave his officials orders to halt the persecution, whereas Sabinus said in his circular that Maximin had commanded him to send on the Imperial orders in a circular to the provincial governors. As a consequence τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἄρχουσιν (802,11) becomes obscure. Originally, the phrase referred unambiguously to officials in general, but in the new context it must refer to court officials. It then seems quite unintelligible that those who heard the Emperor's verbal command needed to communicate the orders to each other in writing. When Eusebius mentioned that Sabinus was *praefectus praetorio* παρ' αὐτοῖς (802,13), he must be referring to the Emperors, because the expression comes from the preamble to the Sabinus circular in which the Emperors are listed. But when it was inserted into the original account, this meaning was obscured, and in the new context it must be understood as referring to the officials.

Originally, Eusebius had described how the officials had, on their own initiative, gone further than simply halting the persecutions: they had released all the Christians who were held prisoner. But the orders in the Sabinus circular in fact implied the release of the Christians, so the officials acted on the Emperors' initiative. Again, the new account contains a clear contradiction here.

After inserting Sabinus's *epistola*, Eusebius became acquainted with the "Galerius edict", which had been published in Galerius's provinces and thus also in Asia Minor. He read and interpreted it in the light of the Christian interpretation of Galerius's illness and conversion on his death bed as the cause of the cessation of the persecutions. Therefore, he was in no doubt that the edict was basically Christian. As it was also an official

document, of quite a different nature from the Sabinus circular, issued by Galerius as *maximus augustus* and addressed directly to all inhabitants in the Roman Empire, he had every reason to include it in his Church History. But it was just as important that Eusebius's newly acquired knowledge of the "Galerius edict" made him revise his previous opinion of Maximin.

Eusebius probably wondered why Maximin had not published the "Galerius edict" in his provinces. On comparing it with the Sabinus circular, he must have reached the conclusion that this was no accident. Maximin was dissatisfied with the "Galerius edict" because it was pro-Christian and would not, therefore, promulgate it in his provinces. On the other hand, he was obliged to obey Galerius as *maximus augustus* and the other Emperors who were responsible for the edict with its demand for the cessation of the persecutions. Instead, Maximin had commanded his praetorian prefect by word of mouth to tell the provincial governors that the persecution must be halted, and this must be explained as his solution to the problem how to avoid publishing the "Galerius edict" while still giving the appearance of obeying his superior Emperors.

But Eusebius not only assumed that Sabinus's *epistola* was different from the pro-Christian "Galerius edict". He was also of the opinion that it was purposely ambiguous,⁸⁰ giving the officials to understand that the Emperor was only making a pretence of ordering them to halt the persecution. This interpretation would have seemed quite natural to him, as Maximin took steps less than six months after Sabinus's *epistola* to limit the Christians' religious freedom. In other words, he could hardly have been serious when he ordered the persecutions to be halted.

This new realisation of Maximin's double game made it necessary to revise previous descriptions of Maximin. The revision probably took place when the "Galerius edict" was incorporated and consisted of a number of insertions with which Eusebius expanded the account already in existence. In all probability, these comprised *προτεθέντος* (802,1), *τῆς Ἀσίας* and *ἀμφὶ ταύτην* (802,2), *ὁ ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς κτλ.* *το τοῦ προτεθέντος γράμματος* (802,3-6), *ἐπεὶ γὰρ κτλ.* *το προσάττει* (802,8-12), *οἱ δὲ κτλ.* *το νενομικότες* (802,16-804,1) and *τοῦτο γὰρ κτλ.* *το ἠπατημένοι* (804,7-8).

With these additions, Sabinus's *epistola* assumed a new place and func-

⁸⁰ In this context, only Eusebius's opinion is of any interest, so we need not debate whether his interpretation was correct. For a discussion of this question, see my book, *Maximinus*, p. 175 ff.

tion in the context. Originally, Eusebius reproduced it as an example of the Imperial ordinances which had quenched “the great fire of the persecution”, but now it was to provide evidence of Maximin’s double dealing. Eusebius soon became dissatisfied with this new account, however. Perhaps he realized that the Sabinus circular did not have the double meaning which he had attributed to it and that it was therefore unsuitable as proof of Maximin’s double game. At any rate, he removed Sabinus’s circular when he subjected the Church History to its final critical revision in 324.⁸¹ But Eusebius was convinced that Maximin had not been serious when he commanded his officials to stop the persecutions. Therefore, he left all of the rest of the account on Maximin’s double game unchanged. This had its price, however, since the removal of the Sabinus *epistola* meant that the remaining account was unintelligible in several places.

To all appearances, *cap.* 1,8 (804,8-806,2) in the original account was an effective conclusion to Eusebius’s description of “the great persecution”. Afterwards, he added *cap.* 1,9-11, doubtlessly because he desired to report on the recovery and flourishing state of the Church in order to provide the background for Maximin’s resumption of his struggle against the Christians. This also proves that it was written and inserted into the Church History together with the account of Maximin and his new religious policy.

It is, however, equally clear that *cap.* 1,9-11 was not written all at once. The first section of the new passage is to be found in *cap.* 1,9 (806,2-8), where Eusebius wanted to show how the Church overcame the losses suffered during the persecution and once again received the apostate into the community. But the mention of the *confessores*, to whom the apostate appealed to intercede for them with God, caused him to give a fuller account in *cap.* 1,10 (806,8-12) of their return home – the preceding account in 804,6-7 had only mentioned in passing the release of the Christian mine workers. But this expansion did not satisfy Eusebius completely. Perhaps he felt he should give a more thorough description of the favourable impression made by the liberated Christians on the heathen,

⁸¹ E. Schwartz justified the omission of Sabinus’s *epistola* in the following way: “das Schreiben des Gardepraefecten Maximins greift auf das Toleranzedict zurück, und da mochte der Ausdruck ἡ τινῶν ἔνοστασις καὶ τραχυτάτη βουλὴ (802,23), von den Christen gebraucht, nach 323 anstössig erscheinen” (*Eusebius* II, 3, p. LI). The argument does not seem awfully convincing since, on exactly the same grounds, Eusebius should have removed the “Galerius edict” together with Sabinus’s *epistola*, because this contains many more expressions which were objectionable to the Christians.

in order to create a natural link with the ensuing description of Maximin and his anti-Christian religious policy. He therefore prepared the report in *cap.* 1,11 (806,12-18) which was to amplify the description. This explains why the report seems to be a repetition of Eusebius's statements in 804,12-806,2 and 806,8-12.

Cap. 2-6,4 (806,19-812,18): Maximin's resumption of the persecution of the Christians

In *cap.* 2a (806,19-808,2), Eusebius explains that Maximin⁸² could not accept the new, strong position of the Church,⁸³ and after less than six months,⁸⁴ he again restricted the Christians' freedom of religion. Initially, he attempted to prevent them from meeting at their cemeteries;⁸⁵ next, through intermediaries, he prompted the citizens of Antioch and other towns to send delegations to him seeking permission to exclude the Christians from their cities.

Eusebius described these measures as devices *πρὸς ἀνατροπήν τῆς εἰρήνης* (806,22). Strictly speaking, they did not imply the resumption of the persecutions; they were limitations on the practice of the Christian religion, barring Christians from the cemeteries and from city areas. According to Eusebius, the new policy was a result of Maximin's wickedness,⁸⁶ and his use of intermediaries to conceal this fact made matters even worse.

The phrase *τοὺς Ἀντιοχέων πολίτας παρορησίας* (806,25) would naturally, because of the verb, be regarded as a more detailed explanation of *διὰ τινων πονηρῶν ἀνδρῶν* (806,24). But "the men of Antioch" and "certain wicked men" are not the same, and there is no obvious connection between them. We may consider linking *τοὺς Ἀντιοχέων κτλ.* to *πρὸςβέβηται*. This would specify that the delegation came from Antioch, but then *παρορησίας* (806,25) would have no natural place in the context. The present text is therefore not terribly coherent. One reason for this could be that *τοὺς Ἀντιοχέων κτλ.* was a later addition. In support of this assumption, we note that a clear and logical text results from regarding *ἐπὶ τὸ κτλ.* (806,25-808,1) as the direct continuation of *πρὸςβένεται*. Originally then, Eusebius only said that Maximin arranged for delegations to be sent to him, but did not mention Antioch. If this hypothesis proves to be correct, then *καὶ ἑτέρους δὲ ταῦτὸν ὑποβαλεῖν διαπράξασθαι* (808,1-2) must also have been inserted into the original account together with *τοὺς Ἀντιοχέων κτλ.*

Cap. 2b-3 (808,2-16) describes the cheat Theotecnus, an evil person who is supposed to have been *curator* in Antioch.⁸⁷ Again and again, he opposed the Christians; he tried in every way possible to drive the Christ-

ians away, he devised accusations and allegations against them and was responsible for innumerable deaths. His anti-Christian activities culminated when he built a shrine to *Zeus Philios* with priests and prophets;⁸⁸ through an oracle, in the presence of Maximin, he made Zeus command that the Christians, as his enemies, should be driven from the city of Antioch and its environs.

The section begins ὧν πάντων ἀρχηγὸς ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐπι-

82 When Eusebius wrote ὃν ἔφαμεν τῶν ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς ἄρχειν μερῶν (806,20-21), he was probably referring to *cap.* 1,1a, which describes Maximin, however, simply as ὁ ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς τύραννος (802,3-4).

83 ταῦτα δ' οὐκέθ' οἶός τε φέρειν (806,19) must refer to the description which Eusebius gave in *cap.* 1,8-11 of the reestablishment of the Church and the sympathy shown towards it by the population.

84 οὐδ' ὄλους ἐπὶ μῆνας ἕξ (806,21). Even though Eusebius offered no explanations for this dating, its precise character suggests that he based it on the date of the issue of the "Galerius edict". In his Church History he gave no precise date, but his calculations suggest that he must have known the exact date of issue, i. e. 30th April, 311, as given by Lactantius in his translation of the edict in *De mortibus persecutorum*, *cap.* XXXV. Maximin's new policy towards the Christians took effect, most probably, in November 311.

85 πρῶτον μὲν ἔργειν ἡμᾶς τῆς ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις συνόδου διὰ προφάσεως πειρᾶται (806,23-24). The wording suggests that the reason for this measure, formally speaking, was not anti-Christian *per se*. And though we cannot discover its exact nature we would not be far wrong in supposing that Maximin wanted to restrain the celebrations of the martyrs which had been allowed to develop freely at the cemeteries. In themselves the festivals illustrated the impotence of the pagan Imperial powers in relation to the Christians, so these cult meetings must have been a thorn in Maximin's flesh.

86 When describing Maximin as ὁ τύραννος μισόκαλος καὶ πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐπίβουλος (806,19-20), Eusebius probably wanted to state the reason for his renewed persecutions of the Christians which, according to this passage, were not inspired by the Emperor's embracing a pagan religion.

87 ἐδόκει δὲ λογιστεύειν τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν (808,4-5). Subsequently, Theotecnus should have occupied the position of *curator rei publicae*, the official appointed by the Emperors to take charge of the financial administration of the city. Cf. my book *Maximinus*, p. 178 and note 100. By writing ἐδόκει here, Eusebius undoubtedly wished to indicate that his information was based on "hearsay" and that he dared not vouch for its accuracy. This is rather surprising, considering that, in *cap.* 11,5, he said of Theotecnus ἦδη καὶ ἡγεμονίας ἤξιωτο παρὰ Μαξιμίνου (850,11-12). The explanation for this discrepancy is probably to be found in the fact that Maximin only appointed Theotecnus provincial governor at a later stage as a reward for his efforts in the fight against the Christians.

88 τελετάς τε ἀνάγνους αὐτῷ καὶ μῆσεις ἀκαλλιερῆτου ἐξαγίστους τε καθαροὺς ἐπινοήσας ... τὴν τερατεῖαν δι' ὧν ἐδόκει χρησιμῶν ἐπεδεικνυτο (808,10-12). This implies that Theotecnus had equipped his shrine with both priests and prophets. The implication is borne out by *cap.* 11,6 in which Eusebius refers to the shrine again with the words: τοὺς τοῦ νεοπαγοῦς ξοάνου προφήτας καὶ ἱερεῖς (850,13-14).

φύεται Θεότεκνος (808,2-3). These words imply that Theotecnus was responsible for the resumption of the persecutions as described in the lines immediately before. But this is a clear contradiction of *cap.* 2a, which names Maximin as the initiator of the new persecutions.⁸⁹ We have here, in fact, two parallel accounts pointing to Maximin and Theotecnus respectively as the chief perpetrator.⁹⁰

Having said this, we should add that the account on Theotecnus in the present context undoubtedly served as a detailed report of the events in Antioch. When writing ὧν πάντων κτλ. (808,2-3), Eusebius perhaps only wanted to suggest that Theotecnus was the initiator of the anti-Christian activities in Antioch. But even so, the passage contradicts the previous mention of Maximin as the originator of the persecution. No matter how we construe Eusebius's statement, *cap.* 2a and 2b remain discontinuous.

A decisive factor in the description of Theotecnus's anti-Christian activities is the mention of the oracle at his *Zeus Philios* shrine. Eusebius says that the shrine supplied oracles exactly as Theotecnus wished, so he must have been responsible for the oracle in which Zeus demanded that the Christians should be driven out of the area around Antioch. It was given while Maximin was present⁹¹ – meaning that it was a divine order which he was obliged to obey. In other words, Maximin is depicted here as being passive and manipulated by Theotecnus. We are also told that he stirred up the demon *κολακεία τῆ καθ' ἡδονὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος* (808,13), so Eusebius obviously wanted to indicate that his desire to please Maximin made him act as he did. Maximin thus still appears as the true instigator of the persecutions. Perhaps Eusebius was trying to harmonize Maximin's and Theotecnus's activities by making the persecution of the Christians in Antioch appear to be the result of their cooperation. But this attempt to eliminate the contradictions is not convincing. It could point towards regarding *κολακεία κτλ.* as a later addition. If these words are omitted, a clear, consistent, and unambiguous text remains, making Theotecnus responsible for the expulsion of the Christians from Antioch.

This analysis of the account on Theotecnus in *cap.* 2b-3 should prove that it could not originally have belonged with *cap.* 2a. It must be regarded as a later insertion.

In *cap.* 4,1-2a (808,16-22), Eusebius informed his readers that the public officials in the towns in Maximin's provinces⁹² hastened to make similar applications.⁹³ This happened at the instigation of the provincial governors who realized that it pleased the Emperor. With the greatest pleas-

ure he granted these petitions⁹⁴ in an ordinance, and the persecutions were rekindled immediately.

The section begins τούτω δὲ πρώτῳ κατὰ γνώμην πράξαντι (808,16). The dative construction is determined by τὴν ὁμοίαν ... ψήφον ποιήσασθαι (808,18), and the line of thought is that the *decuriones* in the cities sent petitions to Maximin similar to that sent by Theotecnus. But of course, Theotecnus sent no petition; he simply told Maximin, through the oracle, that Zeus had demanded the expulsion of the Christians from the area in and around Antioch. Quite a different meaning could result from assuming that the statement in question refers to 806,25-808,2 (ἐπὶ τὸ κτλ.), which mentions a petition to Maximin for permission to forbid the Christians to live in Antioch. But this is unacceptable, too; πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ κτλ. (808,17 ff.) cannot possibly be regarded as a direct continuation of the account in *cap.* 2. The concepts in the two passages differ too widely for this. The latter said that Maximin had prompted the petition from the cities, but the former named the provincial governors. This contradiction is very striking, especially as Eusebius used the same phrases to describe their activities. He said of Maximin καὶ ἑτέρους δὲ ταῦτὸν ὑποβαλεῖν διαπραξασθαι (808,1-2), and about the provincial governors he said καὶ τοῦτ' αὐτὸ διαπραξασθαι τοῖς ὑπηκόοις ὑποβεβληκότων

89 In his critical apparatus, E. Schwartz had already noted: “[806,] 24/25 steht in sachlichem Widerspruch zu S. 808, 2/3 ὧν .. ἀρχηγὸς .. ἐπιφύεται Θεότεκνος ..” (*Eusebius Werke* II, 2, p. 806 *ad locum*).

90 The parallel is revealed in the very choice of words. Eusebius wrote of Maximin: πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν τῆς εἰρήνης μηχανώμενος (806,22) and then used the same verb again of Theotecnus in 808,8.

91 μέγχι καὶ βασιλέως (808,11). This is connected to τὴν τερατείαν δι' ὧν ἐδόκει χρησμῶν ἐπεδείκνυτο (808,12) and therefore it does not, strictly speaking, refer to the ensuing description of the oracle which made Zeus order the expulsion of the Christians from Antioch and its environs. But the context seems to require us to assume that Eusebius did make the link.

92 πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει τὰς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν πόλεις οἰκοῦντες (808,17-18).

93 τὴν ὁμοίαν ὀρμῶνται ψήφον ποιήσασθαι (808,18). By analogy with παρορμήσας (806,25), ὀρμῶνται could be reasonably translated by “they are urged”, that is, by the provincial governors as stated in the next passage. The verb may also be translated as meaning “they hasten”, a rendering which was accepted by Lawlor-Oulton: *Eusebius* I, p. 281, and G. Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 48.

94 ὧν δὴ καὶ αὐτῶν τοῖς ψηφίσμασιν δι' ἀντιγραφῆς ἀσμενέστατα ἐπινεύσαντος τοῦ τυράννου (808,20-21). ψηφισμα actually means “a decree”, but here it must signify a “petition”, as Lawlor-Oulton pointed out quite correctly in *Eusebius* I, p. 281.

(808,19-20).⁹⁵ The remark that Maximin granted the petitions most gladly also proves that the Emperor was passive in this case, his sole function being to endorse the initiative taken by the cities at the instigation of the provincial governors.⁹⁶ This is also in complete agreement with 808,20 where Eusebius stated that the persecutions only began again when Maximin had granted the petitions. In other words, the first specific instance of the renewed persecutions occurred when the Christians were driven out of the cities.

In *cap.* 4,2b (808,22-810,2), Eusebius wrote that Maximin⁹⁷ appointed priests of the idols in each city and, above them, high priests, people who had distinguished themselves in public service and who enjoyed good reputations in every respect.⁹⁸ They brought great zeal to the worship of the gods.⁹⁹

It is striking that this description of Maximin's organization of a competent and zealous pagan priesthood is in no way linked to the persecutions of the Christians. This is surprising since it appears in a section which was ostensibly reporting on Maximin's resumption of the persecutions.

Moreover, the section has no link to the one immediately preceding it. Whereas Theotecnus and the provincial governors caused the Christians to be driven out of the towns in the latter case, here Maximin is regarded as the initiator. But the section agrees completely with the account in *cap.* 2,1a. If we assume that *cap.* 4,2b originally belonged with *cap.* 2,1a, the passage at least makes excellent sense: not only did Maximin make the cities persecute the Christians, he also installed a zealous pagan priesthood. In other words, the expulsion of the Christians had its positive counterpart in an increased effort to further the worship of pagan gods.

But quite apart from the question of this section and its position in the present context, it seems surprising that Eusebius gave no hint of his previous, much more detailed description of Maximin's work in the re-establishment of paganism: VIII, 14,9. It is even more striking because Eusebius used cross references quite readily elsewhere. Nothing new is being reported here, but the account implies it. When Eusebius mentioned, first, Maximin's temple building programme, in VIII, 14,9, and then the establishment of the priesthood, he stated quite clearly that this restoration of paganism was inextricably connected to his struggle against the Christians – that is not the case at this point in the text.

On the actual description of the establishment of the priesthood, the two accounts largely agree. But differences do occur. In *cap.* 4,2b, it is not

clear whether οἱ μάλιστα ταῖς πολιτείας διαπρέψαντες καὶ διὰ πασῶν ἔνδοξοι γενόμενοι (808,24-810,1) refers to both ἱερεῖς and ἀρχιερεῖς, but in VIII, 14,9, there is no doubt that the equivalent expression applies only to the second category.¹⁰⁰ The latter passage alone mentions the honours which Maximin conferred on the high priests to raise their social standing: μετὰ στρατιωτικοῦ στίφους καὶ δορυφορίας ἐκτάσσω (782,11-12). But there is no mention of the pagan priesthood's zealous worship of their gods. Other differences include IX, 4,2b, which mentions ἱερεῖς κατὰ πόλιν τῶν ξοάνων (808,22-23), whereas in VIII, 14,9, we meet the expression ἱερέας τε εἰδώλων κατὰ πάντα τόπον καὶ πόλιν (782,9-10). This is the more detailed of the two passages, and it also has εἰδωλα instead of ξόανα. εἰδωλα was a word which the Christians pre-

95 E. Schwartz was the first to point this out: “1/2 καὶ – διαπράξασθαι schlecht redigierte Doublette zu 19/20 καὶ – ὑποβεβληκότων” (*Eusebius* II, 2, p. 808 *ad locum*).

96 The provincial governors were in fact responsible for the petitions, and that is not contradicted by these words about them: προσφιλες εἶναι τοῦτο βασιλεῖ τῶν κατ' ἐπαρχίαν ἡγεμόνων συνεωρακότων (808,18-19). They thought that their initiative really reflected Maximin's deepest wish. In this very restricted sense, he could of course be said to have provided the true inspiration, as was the case in this expression from the description of Theotecnus: κολακεία τῇ καθ' ἡδονὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος (808,13).

97 The emphasis on πρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαξιμίνου (808,23-24) suggests that, usually, the emperor did not appoint priests and high priests himself. H. Valois was mistaken when he stated that only the high priests were appointed by Maximin, but his comment *ad locum* still retains its validity: *Sacerdos provinciae suffragiis decurionum creabatur, iique potissimum ad honorem sacerdotii promovebantur, qui omnibus curiae muneribus egregie perfuncti essent, ut legitur in codice Theodosiano, titulo de decurionibus. Id ergo ut novum et inusitatum notat Eusebius, quod Maximinus ipse sacerdotes provinciae designaverit* (PG XX, 2, p. 805, n. 16). H. Valois was perhaps thinking here of *Cod. Theod.* XII,1,75 (371 Jun. 28). Th. Mommsen, *Theodosiani Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis* I (Berlin 1895), p. 681: “*Qui ad sacerdotium provinciae et principalis honorem gradatim et per ordinem muneribus expeditis, non gratia emendicatisque suffragiis, et labore pervenerint, probatis actibus, se consona est civium fama et publice ab universo ordine conprobantur, habeantur immunes, otio frutiuri quod continui laboris testimonio promerentur liberumque sit corpus eorum ab his iniuriis, quas honoratos non decet sustinere. Honorem etiam eis ex comitiis addi censemus, quem ii consequi solent, qui fidem diligentiamque suam in administrandis rebus publicis adprobarent.*”.

98 οἱ μάλιστα ταῖς πολιτείας διαπρέψαντες καὶ διὰ πασῶν ἔνδοξοι γενόμενοι (808,24-810,1) would normally apply to both ἱερεῖς and ἀρχιερεῖς.

99 οἷς καὶ πολλή τις εἰσήγετο σπουδὴ περὶ τὴν τῶν θεραπευομένων πρὸς αὐτῶν θρησκείαν (808,1-2).

100 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων [the appointed idol priests] ἐκάστης ἐπαρχίας ἀρχιερέα τῶν ἐν πολιτείας ἕνα γέ τινα τῶν μάλιστα ἐμφανῶς διὰ πάσης ἐμπρέψαντα λειτουργίας (782,9-11).

ferred to use when describing idols. Finally, we should note that IX, 4,2b has this wording – οἱ μάλιστα ταῖς πολιτείαις διαπρέψαντες καὶ διὰ πασῶν ἔνδοξοι γενόμενοι (808,24-810,1), whereas VIII, 14,9 reads τῶν ἐν πολιτείαις ἕνα γέ τινα τῶν μάλιστα ἐμφανῶς διὰ πάσης ἐμπρέψαντα λειτουργίας (782,10-11). This appears to be an expansion of the line of thought in IX, 4,2b.

When we collate these observations, there is hardly any doubt that VIII, 14,9 contains an account written later than IX, 4,2b. It is clearer, more detailed and above all, because of the expressions used, more critical of the pagan priesthood and their worship of the gods.¹⁰¹ Moreover, the account on Maximin in VIII, 14,7-16a, of which the description of the persecution of the Christians forms a part, was inserted into the Church History at a time when IX, 4,2b had been written. A comparison of the two texts justifies the conclusion that *cap.* 4,2b was the source for VIII, 14,9. But Eusebius did not give a merely slavish reproduction; he created a new version which was both more detailed and more decidedly critical than the source. This accounts for both the striking similarities and the marked differences in the two passages and also for the fact that IX, 4,2b contains no reference to the more detailed account in VIII, 14,9.

In *cap.* 4,3 (810,2-8), Eusebius reported that in his immense “superstition”¹⁰² Maximin urged his subjects, in so many words, to take action against the Christians in order to please him:¹⁰³ in expectation of some reward, they sought the Christians’ lives and displayed new kinds of malice.

The section, which consists of one single passage, seems to be a summary of the account in *cap.* 2-4,2. Strictly speaking, this is true only of ἡ γούνη κτλ. up to ἐνῆγεν (810,2-5), since he must have been thinking of the cities’ petitions for permission to drive the Christians from their areas. But Eusebius adds a new feature by describing the policy as a result of Maximin’s δεισιδαιμονία. For him, this word meant idolatry, so he may have wanted to indicate the reason for Maximin’s desire to establish a devout and zealous pagan priesthood while at the same time persecuting the Christians.

The second half of the passage – ταύτην κτλ. (810,5-8) – goes beyond the account up to this point by saying that Maximin’s subjects wanted to kill the Christians and exhibited new instances of malice against them. This then indicates extensive persecutions of the Christians corresponding to the ones which the “palinode” had brought to a close.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, these anti-Christian activities were inspired not only by a desire to please Maximin, but also by expectation of a reward from him. In other

words, the population was prompted by purely selfish motives to take part in his anti-Christian policies.

The fact that the second part of the passage – ταύτην κτλ. – is of a nature quite different from the first, might suggest that originally the two did not belong together. There is much evidence to support an assumption that ταύτην κτλ. was a later addition¹⁰⁵ inserted to create a link with the ensuing account.

810,8-14 describes the fabrication of false anti-Christian Memoirs of Pilate and Jesus;¹⁰⁶ on Maximin's orders,¹⁰⁷ they were sent out into his

101 πᾶσιν γόησιν, ὡς ἂν εὐσεβέσιν καὶ θεῶν προσοφίεσιν, ἡγεμονίας καὶ τὰς μεγίστας προνομίας δωρούμενος (782,12-14).

102 ἡ γοῦν ἔκτοπος τοῦ κρατοῦντος δεισδαίμονία (810,2-3).

103 ... πάντας τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἄρχοντας τε καὶ ἀρχομένους εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ χάριν πάντα πράττειν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐνήγεν (810,3-5). ἄρχοντες could here, by analogy with the use of the word in 802,7,11, simply be a term for the officials. Since Eusebius used the word, in 808,19, of the provincial governors, he may well have had this group in mind here too. Most likely, perhaps, the word should be understood to comprise all those in the Imperial service – including the provincial governors.

104 Eusebius no doubt used the expression καθ' ἡμῶν φωνᾶν (810,7) quite intentionally. He wanted to suggest the sudden change of attitude in the population, about which he had just written: τοὺς πρότερον καθ' ἡμῶν φωνῶντας τὸ θαῦμα παρὰ πᾶσαν ὀδῶντας ἐλπίδα, συγκαίρειν τοῖς γεγενημένοις (806,17-18).

105 This assumption seems to be further supported by the fact that χάρις appears with slightly different meanings in the first and second parts of the passage. In the first case, εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ χάριν (810,4) must be understood to mean "in order to secure his favour". In the second case, the word in ταύτην αὐτῷ χάριν μεγίστην ... ἀντιδουρούμενον (810,5-7) must be taken to mean a boon or favour which they granted him. The supposition that ταύτην αὐτῷ χάριν κτλ. is a later addition also explains the stylistically clumsy genitive construction, 810,6-8.

106 πλασάμενοι δῆτα Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα πάσης ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας (810,8-10). The wording suggests that this false document had the title "Memoirs of Pilate and Jesus" or, to use the Latin equivalent: *Acta Pilati et Salvatoris*. In I, 9,3, Eusebius spoke of τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθῆς καὶ πρόφην διαδεδοκότων (72,8-10). But no definite conclusions can be drawn from this about the title of the work. Finally, it should be added that Rufinus mentioned this *Acta Pilati* in his independent description of Lucian's martyrdom (813,37). But the work has definitely been lost, whatever its exact title may have been. As to the contents, Eusebius simply wrote that this *Acta* was ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας (810,9). Rufinus went into more detail, however, when he wrote *sed nec nos sua morte decepit, quibus post diem tertiam resurrexit, non ut ista, quae nunc falso conscribuntur, continent acta Pilati, sed innocens, immaculatus et purus ad hoc solum mortem suscepti, ut eam vinceret resurgendo* (813,36-815,2). From this, we can confidently conclude that the work described Jesus as a criminal who had been justly condemned to death. On the basis of *cap.* 5,1, this falsification must date from the time when the persecutions were resumed in November 311.

107 γνώμη τοῦ μεζζονος (810,10).

dominions in edicts which also contained commands that they should be posted everywhere and that teachers should make the children memorize them, as the only teaching material.

Eusebius provides no information on the identity of those responsible for these fabrications and their publication. The officials at Maximin's court could possibly have been behind this anti-Christian propaganda. Maximin appears here only as the man who endorsed the initiative. The account was to serve as a specific example of officials displaying *τινας εἰς ἡμᾶς καινοτέρας κακοηθείας* (810,7-8), in order to ensure Maximin's favour and receive rewards from him.

In *cap.* 5,2-6,1a (810,14-24), Eusebius went on to say that, at the same time as these events,¹⁰⁸ a *dux* in Damascus¹⁰⁹ had apprehended two prostitutes; in order to defame the Christians, he had forced the prostitutes, under threat of torture, to report in writing what he wanted them to say, one statement being that, as former Christians, they had witnessed criminal and dissolute actions in the churches.¹¹⁰ He included their report in an *Acta* which was sent to Maximin¹¹¹ who decreed that it should be published everywhere. Shortly afterwards, the *dux* committed suicide and was thus punished for his wickedness.

This account is clear and well written. Eusebius obviously wanted to give a new example of the *καινοτέραι κακοηθείαι*, for which Maximin's officials took the initiative. Maximin's role here is therefore limited to sanctioning and forwarding the anti-Christian propaganda which his *dux* in Damascus had originated.

The expression *ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης* (810,14-15) seems to presuppose that another *dux* has been mentioned in the preceding account, but this is not the case.¹¹² The inaccuracy can only be explained by assuming that the report here was taken from a fuller account which told what others apart from the *dux* in Damascus had achieved in their fight against the Christians. The final remark – that his suicide was the *dux*'s well deserved punishment – points in the same direction. Its laconic style suggests that it must have been taken from a detailed report. Moreover, it seems quite unmotivated in a context which contains no other mention of punishment for those whom Maximin had induced either directly or indirectly, to adopt an anti-Christian policy. Eusebius's inclusion of this note on the suicide of the *dux* from Damascus can only be attributed to his dependence on his source.

In *cap.* 6,1b (810,25-28), Eusebius related how banishments and, later, persecutions and the provincial governors' terrible measures¹¹³ again

struck the Christians.¹¹⁴ This resulted in some famous Christians¹¹⁵ being imprisoned and condemned to death.

In this context, the section must be regarded as a summary of the preceding account in *cap.* 2-6,1a. The banishments referred to (φυγαί, 810,25) must be the expulsion of the Christians from various cities and their environs. But the expression διωγμοὶ χαλεποὶ (810,25) seems surprising because the previous account contained nothing to suggest severe persecutions of the Christians. The correct interpretation of δειναὶ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαναστάσεις (810,26-27) is equally uncertain. In *cap.* 4,1, of course, Eusebius had described the provincial governors' prompting of the cities to send petitions to the Emperor for permission to expel the Christians. But a description of this as δειναὶ ἐπαναστάσεις seems to be out of all proportion. It could be that Eusebius had the provincial gover-

108 ὃν τοῦτον ἐπιτελουμένων τὸν τρόπον (810,14), which introduces the section, must refer to the immediately preceding description of the publication of the false *Acta Pilati* and their use in school teaching.

109 ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης, ὃν δοῦκα Ῥωμαῖοι προσαγορεύουσιν, ἀνὰ τὴν Δαμασκὸν τῆς Φοινίκης (810,14-16). Here, Eusebius used *dux*, the precise designation for the military leader of a province, which had been coined by Diocletian when he reorganized the provinces and their administration. cf. G. Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 50 *ad locum*.

110 ὡς δὴ εἰησάν ποτε Χριστιαναὶ συνειδεῖν τε αὐτοῖς ἀθεμιτουρίας ἐν αὐτοῖς τε τοῖς κυριακοῖς πράττειν αὐτοὺς τὰ ἀκόλαστα καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα λέγειν αὐτὰς ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τοῦ δόγματος ἤθελεν (810,18-20).

111 ὃν καὶ οὗτος ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν τὰς φωνὰς ἐντεθείσας βασιλεῖ κοινοῦντα (810,21-22). Note here that Maximin is described with no reservations as βασιλεὺς, suggesting that he was regarded as the rightful Emperor.

112 R. Laqueur maintained that “ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης die Erwähnung des *Theo-tekno*s voraussetzt” (*op. cit.*, p. 121). But Eusebius's text does not seem to substantiate this. In his description of the persecution of the Christians, VIII, 4,3, however, Eusebius mentioned ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης (746,4). From the description of the purge of Christians from the army which this man carried out it appears, as previously demonstrated, that he must have been a local military commander rather than an Emperor. If we compare this with the ordinary use of the term στρατοπεδάρχης it would be natural to assume that he was a *dux*, a military commander of a province. On this basis, it is tempting to make ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης refer to the στρατοπεδάρχης mentioned in VIII, 4,3 as the first *dux*, in which case they must both have occurred in an account describing the officials' anti-Christian activities.

113 τῶν τε κατὰ πάσας ἐπαρχίας ἡγουμένων ἀνθις δειναὶ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαναστάσεις (810,25-27).

114 ὡς καὶ τινες ἀλόνας τῶν περὶ τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἐπιφανῶν ἀπαραίτητον τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ψῆφον καταδέξασθαι (810,27-28). This must refer not only to ἐπαναστάσεις but also to φυγαί and διωγμοὶ χαλεποί.

115 οἱ περὶ τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἐπιφανεῖς (810,27) probably means, quite simply, Christians. cf. G. Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 51 *ad locum*.

nors in mind when, in *cap.* 4,3, he described the actions of the officials and subjects as: τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν φονᾶν καὶ τινὰς εἰς ἡμᾶς καινοτέρως κακοηθείας ἐνδείκνυσθαι (810,7-8). But this is not quite satisfactory either. Perhaps Eusebius used the expression merely to suggest a number of terrible measures against the Christians which were like persecutions but which he had not felt the need to describe in detail. This resulted, however, in a lack of congruity between the passage under discussion here and the preceding account, which it appears to summarize. Finally, it should also be noted that the passage repeats, albeit in greater detail, Eusebius's earlier account in *cap.* 4,2a, where, after mentioning the fact that Maximin had granted the petitions of the cities, he concluded αὐθις ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ὁ καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεφλέγετο διωγμός (808,22).

In *cap.* 6,1c-3 (810,28-812,15), Eusebius listed some of those who suffered martyrdom as a result of the new persecutions. First, he mentions three martyrs in Emesa – including Bishop Silvanus – who were sentenced to be thrown to wild animals. When he says of them that Χριστιανοὺς σφᾶς ὁμολογήσαντες (812,1), he must be implying that even a confession that they were Christians was punishable by death. Then he mentions the martyrdom of bishop Peter of Alexandria. We are told that it was groundless and completely unexpected,¹¹⁶ and perhaps Eusebius wanted to suggest that the bishop too was condemned simply because he was a Christian. τῶν τε κατὰ πάσης ἐπαρχίας κτλ. (810,25-27) naturally makes us assume that the *praeses Aegyptiae* had occasioned Peter's decapitation. But even so, there is no doubt that the execution agreed entirely with Maximin's desire and will.¹¹⁷ A short note, giving no details, finally states that many other bishops suffered martyrdom by decapitation along with Peter.¹¹⁸

Finally, Eusebius mentions the martyrdom of Lucian, the presbyter at Antioch. It took place in Nicomedia. Eusebius writes that Lucian made a speech of defence in front of Maximin before he was thrown into prison and killed, and it must mean that this was done on Maximin's direct orders¹¹⁹ because of his confession of the Christian faith.

This list of martyrs does give the impression that Maximin was the real persecutor of the Christians. It also suggests that the confession of the Christian faith itself was a crime punishable by death. Strictly speaking, this presupposes the specific prohibition of Christianity, but the preceding account contained no mention of such a decree. Nor do the other extant sources show that a confession of Christianity was in itself a punishable offence in the period which Eusebius described as the resumption of the persecutions of the Christians.

The list is surprising because its comments on several of the martyrs are, in fact, repetitions of Eusebius's words in VIII, 13,1-7a. This is true of bishop Silvanus of Emesa, bishop Peter of Alexandria and presbyter Lucian from Antioch. A comparison of the two sections makes it quite clear, however, that the list of martyrs in cap. IX, 6,1c-3 was written after the one in VIII, 13,1-7a.¹²⁰ Eusebius felt the need to include a list in IX, too, probably because he wished to show that the new persecutions were just as severe as the ones which were stopped by the "Galerius edict". Moreover, he could then correct the mistakes in the list, i.e. reports on martyrdoms which took place after Maximin's ostensible resumption of the persecution of the Christians. At any rate, he prepared a new list of martyrs on the basis of the one already given in VIII, 13. The list in VIII, 13 concerned μαρτυρησάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχόντων (770,29-30), but the new one discusses τῶν περὶ τὸ θεῖον λόγον ἐπιφανῶν (810,27). Eusebius perhaps felt that this new specification justified his retention of the first and older list of martyrs, although it meant that new lists would become in part repetitive.

116 ἔξ οὐδεμιᾶς ἀνάρπαστος γεγονῶς αἰτίας, μηδεμιᾶς προλαβούσης προσδοκίας, ἀθρόως οὕτως καὶ ἀλόγως (812,6-8).

117 ὡς ἂν Μαξιμίνου προστάξαντος (812,8). This expression does not suggest a direct command from the Emperor.

118 σὺν αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἐπισκόπων ἄλλοι πλείους ταῦτὸν ὑπομένουσιν (812,9-10).

119 ... ἀχθεις ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομηδέων πόλεως, ἔνθα τηνικαῦτα βασιλεὺς διατρίβων ἐτύγχανεν, παρασῶν τε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τὴν ὑπὲρ ἧς προῖστατο διδασκαλίας ἀπολογίαν (812,12-15). ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος could well refer to the provincial governor. Lawlor-Oulton, referring to Rufinus's translation, maintained that it should "probably" be understood to mean "the praeses (of Bithynia)" (*Eusebius* II, 296). Their idea is of limited value, however, since Rufinus, as we shall see, recast the original in his efforts to create a clear account free of contradictions. Since only Maximin is mentioned in the preceding passage, he must also be the one referred to by ὁ ἄρχων.

120 R. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, p. 42, pointed this out on the basis of the "Einzelvergleich" he gave on p. 42, note 1. I wish to add some new observations to Laqueur's comments in order to show that Eusebius created, with his new list of martyrs, a text which was better both in terms of contents and style. For example, he wrote in VIII, 13,2 of Lucian: τὸν πάντα βίον ἄριστος (772,3), but he expanded this in IX, 6,3 to τὰ πάντα ἄριστος βίῳ τε ἐγκρατεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασιν συγκεκροτημένος (812,11-12). Nor did he feel it sufficient in this connection simply to write βασιλέως ἐπιπαρόντος (772,4); he preferred a more detailed version: ἔνθα τηνικαῦτα βασιλεὺς διατρίβων ἐτύγχανεν (812,13-14). Eusebius was not satisfied with simply repeating the wording from VIII, 13,7 on bishop Peter: θεῖον τι χορηγία διδασκάλων τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ θεοσεβείας (772,26), but chose this new description as more appropriate: θεῖον ἐπισκόπων χορηγία βίου τε ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων συνακήσεως (812,5-6).

In *cap.* 6,4 (812,15-18), Eusebius said that the new persecutions seemed much worse than the previous ones under Diocletian,¹²¹ because of the measures initiated by the evil Maximin.

In the present context, the section concludes the description which began in *cap.* 2 of the resumption of the persecutions. In *cap.* 6,4, Maximin is made out to be the one and only initiator of the new persecution of the Christians. The only basis for this can be found in *cap.* 2,1a (806,19-807,2) and – although very indirectly – in the mention of his participation in the martyrdoms of bishop Peter and the presbyter Lucian in *cap.* 6,2-3. In the rest of the account, however, the officials' anti-Christian activities are in the forefront. In other words, a clear discrepancy arises here between the previous account and the supposed summary.

In addition, it seems very surprising that Eusebius could describe the new persecution as being worse than the first, which began with Diocletian and ended with the "Galerius edict". The statement can hardly be justified on the basis of the list of martyrs given here. It contains very few martyrs: *τινας ἀλόνοντας κτλ.* (810,27-28), whereas Eusebius gave detailed reports on numerous martyrdoms which were supposed to have taken place in the first persecution. But perhaps he considered the new persecutions worse because they included as a new feature an official campaign against the Christians. The continuation in *cap.* 7,1 might possibly lend support to this, but not very convincingly, considering the fact that no general demand to sacrifice was issued in the second case. There is therefore clear incongruity between the view that had to be justified and the justification.¹²²

The explanation for the lack of continuity between *cap.* 2-6,3 and the summary in *cap.* 6,4 is not hard to find, however. *Cap.* 2-6 in its present form did not originally comprise one unit. It is the result of Eusebius's continued expansion of an original account to include new material.

Initially, Eusebius probably only gave a report on Maximin's resumption of the persecution of the Christians by placing limitations on their freedom to meet at the cemeteries and by urging the cities to send petitions for permission to expel them. Eusebius may also have mentioned the point that the provincial governors took part in this action against the Christians. We find the original account in *cap.* 2a (806,19-808,1) and 4,1b-2a (*πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ κτλ.*, 808,17-22). Here, it says that Maximin granted the petitions, so it makes excellent sense to conclude the account with the words *αὐθις ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ὁ καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεφλέγετο διωγμός* (808,22).

Later, Eusebius realized that Theotecnus was the real initiator of the expulsion of the Christians from Antioch. As was his wont, he then wished to use the new material which had come to his notice. So he inserted the Theotecnus report into *cap.* 2b-3 (ὧν πάντων ἀρχηγὸς κτλ., 808,2-16). This addition interrupted the original continuity; to counteract this, and to create a new continuous account, he inserted τούτῳ δὲ πρώτῳ κατὰ γνώμην πράξαντι (808,16) and, in all probability, τοὺς Ἀντιοχέων πολίτας (806,25) and καὶ ἐτέρους δὲ ταῦτόν ὑποβαλεῖν διαπράξασθαι (808,1-2) too.

To underline the new difficult position in which the Christians found themselves, Eusebius must have decided to expand the report again with the mention of Maximin's establishment of a pagan priesthood and of the zeal which everyone displayed in their persecutions of the Christians hoping to please Maximin and receive a reward from him. The new expansion is found in *cap.* 4,2b-3 (ἰερεῖς δῆτα κτλ., 808,22-810,8).

It is difficult to determine the exact extent of the insertion: did it include *cap.* 5,1-6,1a (810,8-24) with the description of the falsified *Acta Pilati* and the "findings" of the *dux* at Damascus concerning the Christians? The facts that ἡμῶν δ' αὖφυγαί κτλ. up to καταδέξασθαι (810,25-28) is an extremely unhappy continuation of *cap.* 6,1a, and that it appears to be a summary of the account in *cap.* 4,2b-3, point rather to the section in question being a later addition, in which Eusebius probably wanted to elucidate the implications of the expression τινὰς εἰς ἡμᾶς καινοτέρας κακοηθείας ἐνδείκνυσθαι (810,7-8).

The concluding remark τοσαῦτα δῆτα κτλ. (812,15-18) does not agree with the list of martyrs in *cap.* 6,1c-3 (810,28-812,15), as Maximin had no prominent part here. But a meaningful context would result from accepting the passage as the direct continuation of *cap.* 6,1b (810,25-28). Eusebius probably chose to disturb the continuity by inserting the list of

121 ὡς τοῦ προτέρου δοκεῖν πολλῶν χαλεπώτερον τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἐπεγηγέρθαι διωγμὸν (812,17-18). We must remember that Eusebius was talking of two persecutions here, whereas in VIII, 16,1 he reckoned with only one single persecution which then abated in intensity with the issue of the "Galerius edict". In other words, we have two varying interpretations of the course of the persecution in the period 303-310.

122 Cf. R. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, p. 120: "Wohl aber fragt man sich vergeblich, woher der Autor bei einem Vergleich der vorliegenden Märtyrerliste mit seinem Buch VIII die Überzeugung gewinnen konnte, dass die Verfolgung von 311-313 schwerer gewesen sein sollte. Wenn er nun gar berichtet, dass "sogar einige" das Martyrium erlitten haben, dann kann es sich dabei nur um eine unbedeutende Bewegung gehandelt haben."

martyrs because he wanted to prove specifically that the new persecution also involved renowned Christians among its victims. The assumption that this is a later insertion provides us with an explanation for the discrepancy between ὡς καὶ τινὰς ἀλόντας τῶν περὶ τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἐπιφανῶν ἀπαραίτητον τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ψῆφον καταδέξασθαι (810,27-18) and the account of the individual martyrs in *cap.* 6,1c-3.

No matter how we regard this reconstruction of the creation of *cap.* 2-6, its lack of unity and continuity must be an indisputable fact, and the explanation must be that Eusebius linked heterogeneous material together. Despite all his efforts to integrate his material and create a continuous report, the result was an account which is obscure and often downright contradictory. Rufinus felt this, which is obvious from his version of *cap.* 2-6.

Eusebius began *cap.* 2: ταῦτα δ' οὐκέθ' οἷός τε φέρειν (806,19), but Rufinus decided that he owed his readers a more detailed explanation of the specific meaning of this statement. At the same time, he was apparently at pains to create a closer link with the preceding account than the one provided by his source. At any rate, his thorough translation of 806,19-20 fulfils these purposes: *verum cum haec ita in agris ac vicis et urbibus agentur et pro reddita sibi pace Christianorum populi modesta exultatione gauderent,*¹²³ *totius boni inimicus tyrannus ferre*¹²⁴ *non potuit, quin insita sibi nequitiae rabie*¹²⁵ *gaudia ista subrueret* (807,16-19). Rufinus must also have felt that ὅσα δ' οὖν πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν τῆς εἰρήνης μηχανώμενος (806,22) required further definition and so he rewrote ὃν ἔφαμεν κτλ. (806,20-22) to form this independent construction: *entenim Maximinus, quem orientis atque Aegypti partium tyrannidem*¹²⁶ *tenere supra diximus, sex non amplius menses passus est nostros in pace persistere, et protinus quidquid ad obturbendam eam nancisci potuit, molitur* (807,19-22).

Rufinus translated πρῶτον μὲν εἰργεῖν κτλ. (806,23-24) literally, with the exception of διὰ προφάσεως which he omitted in favour of *per occasiones quasdam* (807,23). We cannot know if this was the result of his inability to discover the true meaning of Eusebius's expression. Perhaps he gave his translation in order to suggest that the actual commemoration days for the martyrs at the graves were being discussed.

Rufinus was obviously in no doubt that τοὺς Ἀντιοχείων πολίτας παρορμήσας (806,25) was a further explanation of διὰ τινῶν πονηρῶν ἀνδρῶν (806,24). For the sake of clarity, he therefore summarized 806,24-808,1 in this concise text: *tum deinde nequissimos quosdam Anti-*

*ochenae urbis viros instigat legationem mittere adversum nos, deposcentes, ne in propria patria degere liceat Christianis*¹²⁷ (807,23-26).

Rufinus must have found Eusebius' description of Theotecnus and his activities downright misleading because it made him the instigator of the persecution of the Christians. It was evident to Rufinus that Maximin had initiated the resumption of the persecutions, which implied that Theotecnus had to be described as his chief agent in the persecution of the Christians from Antioch. Consequently, he omitted ὧν πάντων ἀρχηγός (808,2) and wrote briefly: *cuius legationis initium facit per Theotecnum quendam curatorem Antiochenae urbis*,¹²⁸ *pravi ingenii hominem pessimique propositi*¹²⁹ (807,26-809,2). Rufinus placed this sentence immediately after the description of the delegation from Antioch and its petition to Maximin. He omitted καὶ ἐτέρους δὲ ταῦτὸν ὑποβαλεῖν διαπράξασθαι (808,1-2) here, because he thought that it interrupted the continuity in Eusebius, but he found that it made good sense if placed after the short note on Theotecnus. He felt, however, that he must expand the text from his source, which allowed him at the same time to conclude the report on the delegations from the towns that Maximin had had sent to him: *sed et alios per singulas civitates similiter deterrimos cives ad simile facinus inpellit et ex omnibus provinciis*¹³⁰ *huiuscemodi legationem dirigi conponit* (809,2-4).

123 The subject of *gauderent* is of course the population, since the section is linked directly to 807,10 ff.

124 Rufinus omitted οὐδέτι (806,19) in his version. He probably felt, quite correctly, that the word could imply that Maximin had been able to tolerate for a time the population's rejoicing in the *pax Christianorum*.

125 These words replaced πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐπίβουλος ὑπάρχων (806,19-20), possibly because Rufinus regarded them as a repetition of μισόκαλος (806,19).

126 Eusebius remarked about the tyrant Maximin τῶν ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς ἄρχειν μερῶν (806,20-21), but Rufinus wanted greater accuracy here too.

127 Rufinus found no reason to translate μηδαμῶς (806,26) and ὡς ἐν μεγίστῃ δωρεᾷ παρ' αὐτοῦ τυχεῖν (808,1). He probably felt that they were superfluous in the context.

128 Eusebius surmised in 808,4-5 that Theotecnus was *curator* in Antioch, but Rufinus presented it as a fact.

129 The basis for this description was δεινὸς καὶ γόης καὶ πονηρὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ τῆς προσωνυμίας ἀλλότριος (808,3-4). Rufinus did not translate γόης, probably because, unlike Eusebius, he never mentioned Theotecnus's sorcery after this.

130 Unlike Eusebius, Rufinus emphasized the point that all the provinces sent delegations to Maximin. Perhaps he was thinking of the provincial diets. They did send petitions of exactly this kind, as proved by the Arykanda inscription, which reproduces the petitions to Maximin from the Lycian and Pamphylian diets, see p. 179 in my book *Maximinus*.

Maximin alone was responsible for the persecution, so of course Rufinus could not accept the account on Theotecnus's bloody anti-Christian activities in *cap. 3a*: πλείστα κτλ. (808,5-9). He therefore omitted 808,5-9¹³¹ completely and wrote instead *multaque alia adversum nos speciali quodam odio et obstinata contentione machinatur, donec omni modo mala, quae iam quieverant, renovaret* (809,4-6). The basis for his translation was ὅσα δ' οὖν πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν τῆς εἰρήνης μηχανώμενος (806,22). He chose to include a more detailed version in order to provide a progressive account which would bring out more clearly than his source the point that Maximin had resumed the persecutions of the Christians – the account of his measures so far did not, strictly speaking, justify this assumption.

Theotecnus was a mere instrument in the implementation of Maximin's anti-Christian policy, so Rufinus saw no reason to translate the information in his source that Theotecnus had set up a temple to *Zeus Philios* and, through its oracles, had made Maximin order the expulsion of the Christians from Antioch. Rufinus did want to retain the claim that the Zeus oracle had played a part in Maximin's new persecution of the Christians; it had sanctioned his decision to expel the Christians from the cities – and not only from Antioch. His efforts to remove the contradictions and obscurities contained in the whole of *cap. 2-3* (806,19-808,16) and to create a consistent account which pointed unequivocally to Maximin as the initiator of the persecutions, resulted in this completely new version: *mala mens malusque animus velut sitim quandam et famem se pati putabat, nisi laniari carnes civium et sanguinem eorum profundi videret, interea repperisse se occasionem maximam ratus ex eo, quod apud Antiochiam simulacrum quoddam Iovis Amicalis nuper consecratum artibus quibusdam magicis et impuris consecrationibus¹³² ita conpositum est, ut falleret oculos intuentium et portenta quaedam ostentare videretur ac responsa proferre.¹³³ idque omnibus et ipsis imperatoribus pro certo confirmatur.¹³⁴ quod posteaquam ab universis creditum est, adseveratur item deus ille dedisse responsa, ne Christiani in urbibus habitarent neque in vicinis urbi locis, sed quanto fieri potest, longius fugarentur* (809,6-16).¹³⁵

In his translation of *cap. 4,1-2a* (808,16-20), Rufinus omitted the introductory words τούτῳ δὲ πρώτῳ κατὰ γνώμην πρῶξαντι (808,16). The reason for this was, of course, that Theotecnus was given much too prominent a position, which obscured the fact that Maximin was the real instigator of the persecutions. The same motive made him omit 808,19-20, in which the provincial governors persuaded the *decuriones* to send peti-

tions to Maximin. Moreover, he probably realized that the passage contradicted 808,1-2 in which the same words were used to describe Maximin's responsibility for this activity. Rufinus must also have regarded 808,20-22 (ὄν δὴ κτλ.) as quite superfluous – it was obvious that Maximin would grant most willingly the petitions which he himself had prompted. Rufinus may also have omitted the passage because the Imperial ordinances would be discussed in greater detail later in the account. Finally, Rufinus must have felt a need to link this section more closely to the preceding account. At any rate, he succeeded with this independent version: *quibus cognitit¹³⁶ omnes¹³⁷, qui ... ab ipso fuerant invitati* (809,16-20). We should also note that Rufinus must have regarded the main clause αὐθις ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ὁ καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεφλέγετο διωγμός (808,22) as a meaningless repetition of 806,20. The style, at this point, required a change in the mode of expression to produce actual progression in the line of thought. Therefore, his version reads: *tum vero rursus adversum nos persecutionis rabies instauratur* (809,20-21), by which he emphasized the point that the persecution was intensified by the petitions from the cities and provinces.

131 Certain concepts from this passage are used later, and then hardly in specific reference to Maximin. But Rufinus tempered the description of the bloody persecution considerably, no doubt because he realized that it did not agree with the actual facts. This applies, for example, to the statement: *καὶ θανάτου δὲ αἴτιος μυθίοις ὅσοις γεγρονός* (808,8-9).

132 The last words replace *μαργανείαις τισὶν καὶ γοητείαις ... τελετάς τε ἀνάγνουσ ἀὐτῷ καὶ μῆσεις ἀκαλλιερότους ἐξαγίστους τε καθαρμούς ἐπινοήσας* (808,9-11). Rufinus probably found this mode of expression ornate and difficult for his readers to understand.

133 Rufinus omitted *δι' ὃν ἐδόκει χρησμῶν ἐπεδείκνυτο. καὶ δὴ καὶ οὗτος κολακεία τῇ καθ' ἡδονὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐπεγείρει κατὰ Χριστιανῶν τὸν δαίμονα* (808,12-14). He did so, not only because he wished to remove what he considered to be a false notion: that Theotecnus could manipulate Maximin; he also wanted to avoid giving the impression that the demons could be controlled by magic. In fact, he went out of his way to show that the whole idea was a great fraud. He inserted, on his own account ... *ut falleret oculos intuentium et portenta quaedam ostentare videretur ac responsa proferre* (809,11-12).

134 Rufinus probably meant by this that the oracle was universally accepted. The word *imperatores* is striking however, since the other rulers were not pagan according to the account up to this point.

135 Rufinus omitted *ὡς ἂν ἐχθροὺς αὐτῷ* (808,15). But he wrote *sed quanto fieri potest, longius ...*, probably in order to create a more lively account.

136 Rufinus used these words to refer to the Zeus oracle, which decreed the expulsion of the Christians from the cities.

137 With this expression, Rufinus wanted to indicate that the entire population was involved.

At the same time, the passage served as a description of Maximin's establishment of a pagan priesthood which Rufinus then linked much more closely than his source to the preceding account. For the same reason, no doubt, he wanted to make it absolutely clear that the priests and high priests had been appointed by Maximin as agents in his persecutions of the Christians. He had bought them, quite simply, for this bloody purpose. This interpretation meant that Rufinus saw no point in following his source which said that Maximin had chosen the new priests and high priests because of their past services, their good reputation, and their great zeal in worshipping their gods. In other words, only selfish motives, not religious ones, determined their hostile attitude to the Christians.

Cap. 4,3 (810,2-8) must also have seemed unsatisfactory to Rufinus. It was not properly integrated into the text, and it contained material which he must have resented. Eusebius's comments in 810,2-3 no doubt seemed quite superfluous and meaningless to him; they identified Maximin's "superstition" as the inspiration for general persecutions of the Christians. Quite apart from the fact that this point had been discussed in detail in VIII, 14,8, he found it inappropriate in this connection, which states that the prospect of reward made Maximin's subjects persecute the Christians. Finally, he probably also felt that the facts contradicted the claim that Maximin induced both his officials and his other subjects to mount a bloody persecution. In his opinion, this was only true of the officials, and more particularly the new priesthood mentioned immediately before. On the basis of such critical considerations, Rufinus felt himself justified in treating the two disparate accounts in *cap. 3,2b* and *4,3* as one, and he provided this new version: ... *et Maximinus interim summa instantia per urbes singulas et provincias sacerdotes simulacrorum ac pontifices statuit multisque eos honoribus et muneribus adfcit et omnia prorsus diligenter agit, quatenus cunctos beneficiis suis praeveniat, ut per haec promptiores eos efficeret in odia et necem Christianorum. idque eo magis obtinebat, quo gratiorem sibi duceret eum, quem erga nostros saeviolem nequiolemque sensisset* (809,21-811,6).

Eusebius's description of the falsified *Acta Pilati* also required revision, in Rufinus's opinion, to fit into the entire context. The description identified the officials as the initiators and reduced Maximin's role to that of giving simple legislative support, but Rufinus wanted to emphasize the view that the Emperor was the instigator here too. He felt it appropriate also to emphasize the point that Maximin wanted to base his persecutions of the Christians on these falsifications. But, to avoid giving the false impression that Maximin's actions and legislation acquired validity from

the absolute Imperial power, he had to stress at the same time his view that Maximin, the usurper, had arrogated the title of *augustus* to himself. He therefore composed this passage: *et quamvis ei agere ... agat* (811,6-8). Since Rufinus had thus established a close connection to the preceding account, there was apparently nothing to prevent him from reproducing the text of the original with only a few alterations: *confinguntur acta quaedam velut apud Pilatum de salvatore nostro habita*,¹³⁸ *in quibus adversum Christum omnis blasphemia conscribitur. quae acta per omnes regni sui provincias*¹³⁹ *praelato edicto mitti praecipit*¹⁴⁰ *et per urbes singulas, per vicicos, per agros*¹⁴¹ *etiam proponi, praeceptoribus quoque puerorum tradi iubet*,¹⁴² *uti pro his, quae ad meditandum vel ediscendum dictare solent, haec tradant pueris memoriae commendanda*¹⁴³ (811,8-14).

Rufinus evidently felt that the account on the *dux* at Damascus and his anti-Christian activities in *cap.* 5,2-6,1a (801,14-24) was an isolated episode. Here too, he had to show specifically that the account was a part of the description of Maximin's persecutions. He was evidently in no doubt that this was the case, since the *dux*'s attempt to defame the Christians could only be attributed to his desire to please Maximin, whose anti-Christian attitude he had heard about – Maximin was therefore once again the real instigator. Consequently Rufinus began his version thus: *cum vero haec ita per omnem locum diligenti nequitia gererentur*,¹⁴⁴ *dux*¹⁴⁵

138 This translation merely clarifies δῆτα Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα (810,8-9).

139 Here, Eusebius only had τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχήν (810,10).

140 This translation replaced γνώμη τοῦ μείζονος ... διαπέμπονται ... διὰ προγραμμάτων παρακελεύόμενοι (810,10-11). In contrast to Eusebius, the translation makes it completely clear that Maximin was responsible for the falsification.

141 Rufinus apparently felt that the order of κατὰ πάντα τόπον, ἀγρούς τε καὶ πόλεις (810,11-12) in his source was not very appropriate, and that it lacked a direct mention of *vici* along with *urbes* and *agri*.

142 Where Eusebius apparently assumed that the order to the teachers to use the *Acta Pilati* as teaching material in the schools was included in the published edicts, Rufinus's version implies that it was a separate order.

143 Rufinus provided this thorough revision of ἀντὶ μαθημάτων ταῦτα μελετᾶν καὶ διὰ μνήμης κατέχειν παραδιδόναι (810,13-14) in order to make the meaning of his source quite clear.

144 Rufinus's version of ὃν τοῦτον ἐπιτελουμένων τὸν τρόπον (810,14) left his readers in no doubt, unlike his source, as to the true nature of the subject.

145 Greek readers required the explanation ἕτερος στρατοπεδάρχης, ὃν δοῦκα Ῥωμαῖοι προσαγορεύουσιν (810,14-15), which was, of course, completely superfluous for Rufinus's Latin readers. We should note that he also omitted ἕτερος in his translation.

*Damasci*¹⁴⁶ *cognita imperatoris sui erga Christianos libidine et placere ei in talibus studens ...* (811,14-16). Rufinus's next lines reproduce his source with only a few minor alterations: ... *quasdam mulierculas*¹⁴⁷ *de trivio conquisitas sibi facit et agitari in his plurimam quaestionem, per quam cogeret eas*¹⁴⁸ *actis profiteri fuisse se quondam Christianas et scire, quod inter ipsa mysteria eorum*¹⁴⁹ *spurca quaedam et impura committerentur, aliaque huiusmodi flagitia, quae ne audire quidem bonus quisque pateretur,*¹⁵⁰ *mulierculas actis prosequi facit eaque conscripta ad imperatorem refert* (811,17-22).

Rufinus must have thought that καὶ δὴ κτλ. (810,22-23) required an added remark emphasizing the fact that a falsification was involved. At any rate, he provided this version: *at ille ... gavisus sit* (811,22-24). He obviously felt too that Eusebius's mention of the *dux*'s suicide could give the impression that God punished men in this fashion. But for Rufinus, this was quite wrong, since no one had the right to take his own life. He therefore composed a new conclusion which stated that the *dux* at Damascus achieved nothing from his falsification or from his attempt to please Maximin: *brevi namque ... intulit manus* (811,24-26). At the same time, Rufinus wanted to suggest that the *dux* became mad with despair at his guilt and committed suicide – his crime therefore was a punishment in itself.

When translating ἡμῶν δ' αὖ φυγαὶ κτλ. (810,25-27), Rufinus wanted to bring out more clearly than his source the point that Maximin was in fact responsible for the persecutions. At the same time, he wished to avoid the slightly repetitive quality of Eusebius's account. He wrote: *Nostrorum vero rursum fuga, rursum persecutio et supplicia renovari.*¹⁵¹ *iudices provinciarum tamquam gratum aliquid ex hoc imperatori exhibentes in nostros atrocius desaevire*¹⁵² (811,27-29). He omitted ὡς καὶ τινὰς ἀλόγους κτλ. (810,27-28), probably because he felt that this statement was an inaccurate description of the various martyrs mentioned immediately before this passage.

Rufinus replaced Eusebius's lines on the three martyrs, including Silvanus, with this report: *igitur apud Tyrum Foenices urbem tres quidam iuvenes correpti, cum se Christianos esse confiterentur, bestiis subriguntur, cum quibus et Silvanus episcopus quadraginta annis functus sacerdotio, vir mansuetudine animi et ipsa iam senectute venerabilis* (811,29-813,1). Note here that, on his own account, Rufinus added a reference to three young men who had been caught.¹⁵³ Afterwards Silvanus was introduced as a new martyr whose *mansuetudo animi* Rufinus felt required emphasis.

He deviated from his source by not mentioning that the four men came from Emesa, and similarly, he named Tyre and not Emesa as the scene of their martyrdom. These changes had the effect, deliberate or accidental, that Rufinus's account appeared as no simple repetition of VIII, 13,3 which was the case in Eusebius.

Eusebius mentioned bishop Peter of Egypt as if his readers had never heard of him, but Rufinus considered it appropriate to remark that he had been discussed previously. He also felt that he should give a much more detailed description of Peter which would constitute a genuine progression in thought.¹⁵⁴ On the other hand, he saw no need to translate μηδεμιᾶς προλαβούσης προσδοκίας (812,7-8) and ἀλόγως (812,8) – this was quite obvious even without the specifications. Consequently, his version reads: *per idem ... vere et sacerdos et hostia dei*¹⁵⁵ *subito rapitur et tamquam ex Maximini praecepto capite obruncatur* (813,1-6).¹⁵⁶

Rufinus accepted, on the whole, Eusebius's account of the martyrdom of Lucian in *cap.* 6,3 (812,10-15). He did, however, omit to mention, unlike Eusebius, that Lucian was taken to Nicomedia and he removed all

146 Rufinus omitted τῆς Φοινίκης (810,16), undoubtedly because he realized that this was the wrong name for the province and, in addition, because it could be of no great interest to his readers even if he gave the correct name.

147 Rufinus did not translate ἐπίρρητα (810,16), probably because he wanted to remove any possible suggestion that prostitutes could ever have been Christian.

148 This more lucid account replaced βασάνους αὐταῖς ἐπιθήσειν (810,17).

149 Rufinus apparently felt that Eusebius's ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς κυριακοῖς (810,19) referred to baptism and the Eucharist as the sacraments reserved for believers only.

150 This replaced καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα λέγειν αὐτὰς ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τοῦ δόγματος ἤθελεν (810,20). Rufinus probably felt that his source merely repeated itself here.

151 Rufinus replaced διωγμοὶ χαλεποὶ with *persecutio et supplicia*, probably because, in the first place, he regarded it all as just one persecution as stated also by Eusebius in 812,18, and in the second instance, he wished to remark that the Christians were also subjected to punishment, a feature which Eusebius had ignored completely.

152 Rufinus in fact takes up the thread from 810,3-8 and applies it directly to the provincial governors.

153 Rufinus gave *correpti* as a translation of τινὰς ἀλόγτας (810,27). While he omitted, as mentioned, the general statement ὡς καὶ τινὰς ἀλόγτας κτλ. (810,27-28), he thought that he could apply the expression to *tres iuvenes*.

154 A contributory reason probably was that, in this way, Rufinus avoided making IX, 6,2 (812,5-6) an actual repetition of VIII, 13,7 (772,26) as was the case in his source.

155 Rufinus added this on his own account, perhaps with the intention of providing variation from the term *correpti* (811,30).

156 Rufinus further translated σὺν αὐτῷ κτλ. (812,9-10) quite literally, apart from ταῦτον ὑπομένουσιν (812,10) which he replaced by the simpler and more precise *trucidantur*.

suggestions that Lucian may have been presented before the Emperor or the provincial governors by completely omitting ἐνθα τηνικαῦτα βασιλεὺς διατρέβων ἐτύγγανεν (812,13-14). Perhaps Rufinus imagined that Lucian was interrogated by the provincial governor in Antioch.¹⁵⁷ At any rate, his version comprised the following: *Lucianus quoque vir moribus, continentia et eruditione praecipuus, Antiochenus presbyter, cum ad tribunal iudicis fuisset adductus ...* (813,7-9). But Eusebius continued παρασχών τε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τὴν ὑπὲρ ἧς προῖστατο διδασκαλίας ἀπολογίαν (812,14-15), and Rufinus replaced this short note by a detailed report on Lucian's *oratio de fide nostra* (813,11) held at the request of the provincial governor.¹⁵⁸

In his *oratio* (813,13-815,17), Lucian described the Christians, their rejection of man-made gods, and their worship of the only God who, in His exalted majesty, cannot be perceived by man but who appeared in Christ and the Holy Ghost.¹⁵⁹ He took pity on mankind's false worship of the gods, He sent His *verbum* and His *sapientia*, and He made Himself flesh in order to teach mankind the acknowledgement of the true God and to give *leges ac disciplinae praecepta*.¹⁶⁰ He prophesied that the Christians would be persecuted, as was now the case, and through His death, gave them *patientiae exemplum*. Christ's defeat of death through His own death and resurrection is certified firstly by the fact that almost the whole world had come to believe in this truth and secondly, by the supernatural events at His death, such as the eclipse of the sun and the splitting of the rock of Golgotha, facts to which the Romans' own *annales* testified.

Eusebius wrote a laconic concluding note, δεσμωτηρίῳ παραδοθεὶς κτίννυται (812,15), but Rufinus went on to say that Lucian almost convinced his audience by this *oratio* and, in order to stop him, the provincial governor ordered him to be taken to prison, where he was killed without interference from the crowd.¹⁶¹

Only Rufinus included this *oratio pro nostra fide*, which raises the question of whether he composed it himself or borrowed it from sources already in existence. The latter seems to have been the case. The very expression *huiuscemodi orationem de fide nostra habuisse dicitur* (813,11-13) suggests this, since it states that Rufinus was drawing on a written or oral tradition, the historical authenticity of which he was obviously not prepared to guarantee. G. Bardy rightly pointed out that the *oratio* describes the Church and its position in the Roman Empire in a way which corresponds quite closely to the situation at the beginning of the 4th century: the Church had expanded considerably but was being persecuted

now because the Christians were faced with the demand to sacrifice to the gods, and because the cultural elite rejected Christianity as foolishness and delusion.¹⁶²

Even more noteworthy, however, is the fact that the *oratio* is in reality a polemic against the *Acta Pilati*, which must quite clearly have described Christ as an impostor who suffered death justly.¹⁶³ The *oratio* also gave detailed information on the contents of Christ's *leges ac disciplinae praecepta*, which was probably an attempt to refute the accusation against Christ and the Christians that they led a depraved life, an opinion expressed, in all likelihood, by the *Acta Pilati*. Lucian was finally described by the examining judge as a *vir rationabilis et prudens* (813,9), probably in order to emphasize the point that the Christians were not, as alleged, people who allowed themselves to be fooled by falsehood and fraud; they founded their faith on clear proof.

If the *oratio* purported to refute the *Acta Pilati*, it follows that it must have been written at a time when its attack on Christianity constituted a

157 Rufinus had already stated, in VIII, 13.2, that Lucian was martyred in Nicomedia, and he may also have had that city in mind here.

158 ... "cur", inquit ad eum praeses, "vir rationabilis et prudens sequeris sectam, cuius reddere non potes rationem? aut si est aliqua, audiamus" (813,9-10).

159 ... nos Christiani quem colimus, deus unus est per Christum nobis adnuntiatus et per spiritum sanctum nostris cordibus inspiratus. ... auctor nobis de deo deus est. neque enim possit sublimis illa maiestas sensibus humanae mentis inlabi nisi vel spiritus sui virtute delata vel verbi ac sapientiae suae interpretationibus indicata (813.13-19).

160 These included the following: *servare parsimoniam, paupertate gaudere, mansuetudinem colere, studere paci, puritatem cordis amplecti, patientiam custodire* (813.29-31).

161 *Et cum paene iam his verbis auditoribus suadere coepisset, abripi iubetur in carcerem ibique quasi absque tumultu populi necari* (815,18-19).

162 Cf. G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 150: "La perspective historique de l'apologie nous découvre une période où le christianisme est en pleine expansion. La plus grande partie de l'univers, ou presque, est convertie. ... Sans doute, l'empire est toujours hostile: le sang des martyrs continue à couler; et les magistrats s'étonnent de voir un homme intelligent et sage embrasser une religion dont, prétendent-ils, il est impossible de fournir la preuve." Bardy also quite rightly pointed out that the basic concepts in the *oratio* are in complete agreement with the apologetics we find, for example, in Arnobius and Lactantius at the beginning of the 4th century (see *ibid.*).

163 Compare, for example, the following passage: *non ut ista, quae nunc falso conscribuntur, continent Acta Pilati, sed innocens, immaculatus et purus ad hoc solum mortem suscepit, ut eam vinceret resurgendo* (813,37-815,2). It continues: *requirite in annalibus veteris: invenietis temporibus Pilati Christo patiente fugato sole interruptum tenebris diem* (815.13-15), and this is undoubtedly also polemic; the point is that the official *annales* should be consulted – not *Acta Pilati*, which falsely claimed to be an official record.

real danger. Unfortunately we are not now in a position to discover the exact extent of the knowledge and influence of the *Acta Pilati*, but we cannot be far wrong in assuming that it was at its peak in the years before Constantine's victory over Licinius. Then the *oratio* must have been written in this period. If the *Acta Pilati* was written sometime in the course of 312 and Lucian suffered martyrdom on 7th January 312,¹⁶⁴ the *oratio* cannot, of course, be attributed to him. It could possibly be attributed to an author, unknown to us, who wrote a *Vita Luciani*, a work which must have been composed in the years after his martyrdom. It would have been quite natural for the author to feel justified in linking the *oratio* to Lucian's martyrdom, since it was a well-known fact that, immediately before being convicted, he had delivered a defence of Christianity.¹⁶⁵

Even though the evidence points to the fact that Rufinus had discovered Lucian's *oratio* – possibly in a *Vita Luciani* – this does not mean that he simply copied it. Rufinus's *oratio* contains at least one passage which suggests that, as was his wont, he recast his source when he felt the need. His *adstipulator his ipse in Hierusolymis locus et Golgothana rupes sub patibuli onere dirupta, antrum quoque illud, quod avulsis inferni ianuis corpus denuo reddidit animatum ...* (815,7-9) presupposes access to Jesus's tomb and Golgotha which was blocked until 324, when the Anastasis Church was built in Jerusalem.¹⁶⁶ Rufinus must then have inserted the passage from the knowledge he had gained during his long stay in Jerusalem.

Rufinus probably felt that he must reproduce Lucian's supposed *oratio*; he no doubt found it extremely useful in his attempt to refute the false account of Christianity and the accusations against the Christians which were contained in the *Acta Pilati* and, for that matter, in the confessions of the prostitutes from Damascus.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, by including the *oratio*, Rufinus avoided simply repeating the description in VIII, 13,7, as did Eusebius when he mentioned Lucian's martyrdom.

Rufinus clearly found no evidence to support Eusebius's statement in *cap.* 6,4 (812,15-18) that Maximin's new persecution seemed much worse to the Christians than the first. He saw that the passage was not well integrated into the account, and the fact that he had included Lucian's *oratio* in his version, made a free translation necessary. This resulted in *sed et per alia nihilominus loca tanta in brevi crudelissimus tyrannus adversum nos excitavit*,¹⁶⁸ *ut longe saeviora prioribus et diriora patrentur* (815,19-21). By inserting *per alia loca*, Rufinus was able at the same time to stress the point that the list of martyrs was not to be regarded as an

exhaustive description of the bloody persecution. By omitting διωγμὸν (812,18), and instead simply saying *saeviora et diriora*, he expressed himself more temperately than his source.¹⁶⁹

164 Cf. G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936.

165 This is evident from Eusebius's note on Lucian in IX, 6,3: παρασχών τε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τὴν ὑπὲρ ἧς προΐστατο διδασκαλίας ἀπολογία (812,14-15).

166 Pointed out by G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 152. If we assume that the above mentioned passage belonged to the original account, the *oratio* was written after 324. This opinion remains a possibility which cannot be dismissed out of hand.

167 Rufinus felt such a refutation to be necessary, which must suggest that the falsifications were relatively widespread and were regarded still as a dangerous weapon in the pagan struggle against Christianity. Admittedly, G. Bardy made this claim about the *Acta Pilati*: "son succès fut de peu de durée. ... passé temps de la persécution, les Actes de Pilate furent oubliés" (*op. cit.*, p. 153) – but this is merely an assertion which has no basis in the sources.

168 Rufinus translated συνεσεύαστο (812,16) by this word. He possibly wanted to include the officials and others who, directly or indirectly, persecuted the Christians at his suggestion.

169 Cf. note 121 above.

Cap. 7,1 - 9a,12 (812,19 - 838,16): Maximin is forced to discontinue the persecution of the Christians

In *cap.* 7,1 (812,19-23), Eusebius related how, as something completely new,¹⁷⁰ the petitions from the cities and the Imperial ordinances were engraved on copper tablets and set up in the cities and that the children in school recited the *Acta Pilati* daily.

This passage was undoubtedly intended to substantiate the passage in *cap.* 6, which stated that the new persecutions were more fierce than the previous ones. The comprehensive official campaign against the Christians and their faith, which was in progress at the time, can hardly be said, in itself, to justify talk of new, more terrible persecutions, so the explanation for the discrepancy must surely be found in the fact that the passage did not originally follow immediately after *cap.* 6,4. In fact, linking *cap.* 7,1a (812,19-21) to *cap.* 4,1-2a (808,16-22) makes excellent sense: the petitions from the cities and the Imperial *rescripta* were posted up in the cities. But *cap.* 7,1b (812,21-23) cannot originally have belonged with *cap.* 7,1a.¹⁷¹

The passage as it exists offers no very clear interpretation of βασιλικῶν πρὸς ταῦτα διατάξεων ἀντιγραφαί (812,20-21). On analogy with ἀντιγραφὴ in 808,21, ἀντιγραφαί could naturally denote *rescripta*, in which case we are faced with a tautology, since βασιλικαὶ πρὸς ταῦτα [ψηφίσματα] διατάξεις must also mean *rescripta*.¹⁷² On this basis, we might suggest that ἀντιγραφαί should be taken to mean “copies”, but this is equally unsatisfactory; the word should then, strictly speaking, also have included ψηφίσματα (812,19). That would require the genitive διατάξεων. The obscurity no doubt arose because the expression in question was the result of a revision. Perhaps Eusebius’s original phrase was simply ψηφίσματα καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντιγραφαί, since, as we have already mentioned, *cap.* 7,1a must have constituted a direct confirmation of *cap.* 4,2a. Later, he added to the account a description of the false *Acta Pilati*. He had just stated that the *Acta* had also been posted publicly κατὰ πάντα τόπον, ἀγρούς τε καὶ πόλεις, ἐν ἐκφανεῖ ταῦτα τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐκθεῖναι (810,11-12), so, in his attempt to integrate the new insertion into the original account, he added βασιλικῶν and διατάξεων. But he produced an ornate, obscure expression.

In *cap.* 7,2 (812,23-29), Eusebius wrote that he felt the need to insert the letter from Maximin which had been set up on tablets. In this way, he emphasized the boastful and overweening wilfulness of this hater of God.¹⁷³ God always hates the evil in ungodly men, and He punished him.¹⁷⁴ Because of the punishment, Maximin soon changed his policy towards the Christians and promulgated the change in written laws.¹⁷⁵

Though this section consists of one sentence only, it falls into two quite different parts: 813,23-26 and 813,27-29. In the first half, Eusebius wrote of ταύτην τὴν ἐν στήλαις ἀνατεθεισαν τοῦ Μαξιμίνου γραφὴν (812,24-25), referring to Maximin's ordinance to the people of Tyre which is reproduced in *cap.* 7,3-14. The wording suggests no separate ordinance but only one letter, which Maximin sent out and which was posted up in all cities. The description hints that, in the letter, Maximin revealed a blasphemous attitude.

Strictly speaking, we would have expected Eusebius to reproduce Maximin's letter immediately, but he did not. Instead, in the second half of the passage, he wrote that God made a stand against Maximin's wickedness and forced him to change his policy towards the Christians completely.¹⁷⁶ This resembles an introduction to a more detailed account of the

170 Eusebius composed his text in such a way that ὁ μὴ δὲ ἄλλοτε ποτε (812,19) refers only to the publication of the petitions from the cities and the Emperor's answer.

171 οἱ τε παῖδες ἀνά τὰ διδασκαλεῖα Ἰησοῦν καὶ Πιλάτον καὶ τὰ ἐφ' ὕβρει πλασθέντα ὑπομνήματα διὰ στόματος κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔφερον ἡμέραν (812,21-23). A comparison with *cap.* 5,1 makes it evident that τὰ ὑπομνήματα refers to the *Acta Pilati* and not to the "confessions" of the whores in Damascus, although they also appear in ὑπομνήματα (812,23).

172 The differences in various translations also substantiate the point. Henri Valois rendered the expression as *constitutionum imperialium rescripta* (PG XX, 2, p. 810 A) completely omitting πρὸς ταῦτα. Lawlor-Oulton chose this tautological translation: "rescripts containing imperial ordinances in reply" (*Eusebius* I, p. 283), which was accepted by G. Bardy: "les rescrits contenant les ordres impériaux qui y répondaient" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 52).

173 τοῦ ἀνδρὸς θεομυσείας ἢ ἀλαζῶν καὶ ὑπερήφανος αὐθάρδεια φανερὰ κατασταίη (812,25-26).

174 καὶ τῆς παρὰ πόδας αὐτὸν μετελθούσης ἱεῖρας δίκης ἢ αἴπνος κατὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν μοσπονηρία (812,27-28). The word δίκη here probably means the divine judgement which does not permit the existence of evil and which therefore fights it with punishments.

175 πρὸς ἧς ἐλαθεῖς οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν τάναντία περὶ ἡμῶν ἐβουλευσάτο τε καὶ δι' ἐγγράφων νόμων ἐδογματίσεν (812,28-29). τάναντία refers primarily to Maximin's hostile attitude towards the Christians, but also, more specifically, to Christian legislation; similarly, his new policy towards the Christians resulted in new pro-Christian legislation.

176 Eusebius undoubtedly introduced ὁμοῦ in order to turn the passage into a unified whole. He was not successful, however, since καὶ τῆς παρὰ πόδας κτλ. (812,27-29) cannot

punishment which Maximin suffered and which resulted in new pro-Christian legislation. But the detailed account does not follow immediately. Instead, Eusebius reproduced Maximin's ordinance to the people of Tyre, and only then did he describe the effects on Maximin of God's punishment.

The lack of continuity between τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κτλ. (812,25-29) and, on the one hand, the preceding ἐνταῦθά μοι ἀναγκαῖον κτλ. (812,23-25) and, on the other, the ensuing reproduction of Maximin's ordinance, must be explained by the fact that, originally, they did not constitute a single unit. But we obtain a clear continuous account if we regard τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κτλ. as the direct continuation of *cap.* 6,4 and *cap.* 6,4-7,1: Maximin had begun dreadful persecutions of the Christians but God punished him and forced him to stop.¹⁷⁷ In that case, both ἐνταῦθά μοι ἀναγκαῖον κτλ. and the reproduction of Maximin's ordinance itself represent later additions. We must therefore imagine that, after completing the account in *cap.* 6,4 and 7,2b and *cap.* 6,4-7,1 and 7,2b, Eusebius heard about the ordinance and wanted to use it. He inserted *cap.* 7,2a and 7,3-9, but in such a way that the result was a text confused in both language and content.

The heading ἀντίγραφον ἔμμενείας τῆς Μαξιμίνου πρὸς τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν ψηφίσματα ἀντιγραφῆς (814,1-2) naturally makes us expect a reproduction of the whole ordinance as it had appeared on the tablets in Tyre.¹⁷⁸ In fact, Eusebius only gave excerpts from it and they do not permit us to draw conclusions with any degree of certainty regarding the structure and content of the full text.

The first large excerpt which Eusebius felt was relevant appeared in *cap.* 7,3-9 (814,4-816,28). It includes Maximin's statement that people had now finally realized that everything was governed and established by the benevolent providence of the immortal gods.¹⁷⁹ He was immensely pleased to notice that the people of Tyre had again demonstrated their well known piety towards the gods, which had resulted also in the prosperity of their city.¹⁸⁰ When they had seen that the Christians were again beginning to expand,¹⁸¹ their first thought had been to appeal to the Emperor for help. This was obviously divine inspiration: Zeus, the protector of their city, had clearly shown that worshipping the immortal gods ac-

possibly be regarded as a clause coordinate with τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κτλ. (812,25-26). It is equally difficult to conceive of the concepts contained in this passage as resulting from the publication of Maximin's letter, which must be the point of Eusebius's sentence construction.

ording to tradition was an excellent and wholesome practice.¹⁸² It was due to the benevolence of the gods that seeds sprouted and developed until harvest time, that there were no wars and drought,¹⁸³ no floods, no sudden and dangerous storms, earthquakes or avalanches. These and

177 *Cap.* 7.1 (812,19-23) may be seen as a later addition or as belonging originally with *cap.* 6,4, but that is of no importance in this connection, since the line of thought here suffers no decisive interruption.

178 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Τύρῳ στήλης μεταληφθείσης (814,2-3). In *cap.* 7.1, Eusebius reported that the petitions from the cities and the Imperial rescripts were engraved on στήλαις χαλκαῖς (812,21), and from that we would presume that the full rescript had been reproduced.

179 ἐπιγνώνα ὡς τῆ τῶν ἀθανάτων θεῶν φιλαγάθῃ προνοίᾳ διοικεῖται καὶ σταθεροποιεῖται (814,8-9). According to Σ, the original text had τὸ πᾶν or τὰ πάντα, cf. E. Schwartz: *Eusebius' Werke* II, 2, p. 814 *ad locum*. At any rate, that is the meaning of the passage in question.

180 διόπερ ἐπαξίως ἢ ὑμετέρα πόλις θεῶν ἀθανάτων φόβον [ἄφθορον?] ἵδρυμά τε καὶ οἰκητήριον ἐπικαλοῖτο· πολλοῖς γοῦν παραδείγμασιν καταφαίνεται τῆ τῶν οὐρανῶν θεῶν αὐτὴν ἐπιδημία ἀνθεῖν (814,15-18).

181 ... ὅτε πάλιν ἦθετο τοὺς τῆς ἐπαράτου ματαιότητος γεγονότας ἔρπειν ἄρχεσθαι καὶ ὡσπερ ἀμεληθεῖσαν καὶ κεκοιμημένην πυρὰν ἀναζωπυρουμένον τῶν πυρῶν μεγίστας πυρκαϊὰς ἀναπληροῦσαν -- (814,20-816,1). This refers to the rise of the Church following the publication of the "Galerius edict".

182 ἐκείνος τοιγαροῦν, ἐκείνος ὁ ὑψιστος καὶ μέγιστος Ζεὺς, ὁ προκαθήμενος τῆς λαμπροτάτης ὑμῶν πόλεως, ὁ τοὺς πατρώους ὑμῶν θεοὺς καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἐστίαν καὶ οἴκους ἀπὸ πάσης ὀλεθρίου φθορᾶς ὀνόματος, ταῖς ὑμετέροις ψυχαῖς τὸ σωτήριον ἐνέπνευσεν βούλημα, ἐπιδεικνὺς καὶ ἐμφαίνων ὅπως ἔξαίρετόν ἐστιν καὶ λαμπρὸν καὶ σωτηριῶδες μετὰ τοῦ ὀφειλομένου σεβάσματος τῆ θρησκείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἱεροθρησκευταῖς τῶν ἀθανάτων θεῶν προσίεναι (816,5-12).

183 μηδ' αὐτὸ ἀσεβοῦς πολέμου πρόσσπιν ἀνεπικωλύτως ἐπὶ γῆς στηρίζεσθαι καὶ φθαρείσης τῆς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὐκρασίας ἀνχμῶντα τὰ σώματα πρὸς θάνατον κατασύρεσθαι (816,16-18). R. Laqueur commented on this text that "das Fehlen des Krieges" rendered disjointed the account of the six "Naturerscheinungen", which was supposed to prove the benignity of the gods: "Ferner sind diese sechs Glieder derart disponiert, dass sie jedesmal durch μήτε bzw. μηδὲ (816,14; 16; 18; 19; 21; 23) eingeleitet werden und je einen Gedanken umfassen; nur wieder der Gedanke vom fehlenden Krieg steht im Rahmen des zweiten Gliedes als zweiter Gedanke" (*op. cit.*, p. 108). For grammatical reasons and from the contents, ἀσεβοῦς πολέμου πρόσσπιν ἀνεπικωλύτως ἐπὶ γῆς στηρίζεσθαι καὶ (816,16) must consequently be regarded as a later addition. Originally Eusebius's second "Naturerscheinung" must have meant, simply, that "die Temperatur bleibt gleichmässig, so dass die menschlichen Körper nicht verdorren" (*ibid.*). Laqueur's argumentation seems convincing. But the passage presumably suggests, first of all, a drought which would kill all living creatures – whether human beings or animals – a drought caused by unstable weather conditions. Laqueur's contention, p. 108, that the insertion of the note on "das Fehlen des Krieges" was Eusebius's own idea entirely, is perhaps somewhat doubtful. He was probably inspired by the part of the ordinance which he saw no need to reproduce, and included the idea with the list of the catastrophes which threatened human life – this would be quite natural since φθαρείσης κτλ. (816,17-18) could suggest the victims of the war.

worse catastrophes had often occurred in earlier times,¹⁸⁴ and they had begun again when Christianity with its pernicious falsity became popular amongst men.¹⁸⁵

In a second excerpt,¹⁸⁶ the people of Tyre were encouraged to rejoice in their bounteous cornfields which were ripe for the harvest, in meadows because of abundant rainfall and mild weather.¹⁸⁷ Furthermore, they should rejoice in the fact that Ares had been propitiated through Maximin's sacrifices, so that they could enjoy peace in security and quiet.¹⁸⁸ The Christians should also rejoice because they had been led from delusion to the worship of the gods, so that they could enjoy life after being healed.¹⁸⁹ Those who retained their Christian belief, however, must be expelled from Tyre and its environs according to the petition from the people of Tyre, so that, on the removal of this profanation and godlessness, they could offer the immortal gods their due worship.¹⁹⁰ So that they might know to what extent their petition pleased Maximin, he requested them to ask whatever they wished as a reward. That this should be a temple, however, is made quite clear to them.¹⁹¹

In *cap.* 7,15 (820,9-12), Eusebius wrote that the measures against the Christians were publicized in every province and that this deprived them of all human hope, so that many fell from the faith, as was predicted in the Scriptures.¹⁹²

From the text as it stands, we would assume that ταῦτα δὴ καθ' ἡμῶν (820,9) allude to the ordinance to the people of Tyre which had just been published. This is impossible, however, because of κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπαρχίαν ἀνεστηλίτευτο (820,9), which seems rather to refer back to *cap.* 7,1a: the description of the engraving on tablets of the cities' petitions and the Imperial ordinances (στήλαις, 812,21). Another possibility would be to regard the passage as the direct continuation of *cap.* 4,1-2 (808,16-22): Maximin granted the petitions which the provincial governors had prompted the people to send, after which the persecution began and, since the petitions were published everywhere in the provinces, the Christians regarded their situation as hopeless. This interpretation has the additional characteristic of introducing real progress into the account. But we shall limit our observations to these indications of the different possibilities in interpretation at this point.

The Christians lost their faith, according to Eusebius, apparently because they felt that the dreadful tribulations of the persecution suggested either that God had forsaken His chosen people or that He was unable to save them.

In *cap.* 7,16 (820,12-18), Eusebius continued by saying that at a time when most had lost nearly all hope, and the Imperial ordinance against the Christians had not yet been universally published, God as the protec-

184 ἄπερ πάντα καὶ τούτων ἔτι πολλῶ χαλεπώτερα κακὰ πρὸ τούτου πολλάκις γεγενῆσθαι οὐδεὶς ἀγνοεῖ (816,23-25). This general statement appears strange, since the point of the entire passage is that these destructive events were attributed to the Christians. It probably served to emphasize the fact, borne out by the account, that the events constituted a continuous threat to mankind and therefore everything possible must be done to avert these catastrophes – and that meant expelling the Christians whose presence prevented the worship of the gods.

185 καὶ ταῦτα σύμπαντα διὰ τὴν ὀλέθριον πλάνην τῆς ὑποκένου ματαιότητος τῶν ἀθεμίτων ἐκείνων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένετο, ἥνικα κατὰ τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐπετόλαζεν (816,25-27). Since ταῦτα σύμπαντα refers to the catastrophes listed previously, the passage states, strictly speaking, that the Christians were the cause of them. According to the general statement immediately before this, however, the point must be that they recurred because the Christians had increased greatly in numbers. Eusebius's next words καὶ σχεδὸν εἰπεῖν τὰ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης αἰσχύναις ἐπέεζεν (816,27-28) should not of course be taken at face value. He must have used this hyperbolic expression to emphasize the acute danger which Christianity constituted for mankind.

186 τοῦτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει (818,1).

187 ἐφοράτωσαν ἐν τοῖς πλατέσιν ἡδὴ πεδίοις ἀνθοῦντα τὰ λήϊα καὶ τοῖς ἀστάχυσιν ἐπικυμαίνοντα (818,2-3) corresponds exactly to the first part of the list in 816 ff. Eusebius went on to write καὶ τοὺς λειμώνας δι' εὐομβρίαν φραῖς καὶ ἄνθεσιν λαμπομένους καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀέρος κατάστασιν εὐκρατὸν τε καὶ πρασιότατην ἀποδοθεῖσαν (818,3-5). Two elements are apparently introduced: εὐομβρία and ἡ τοῦ ἀέρος κατάστασις εὐκρατὸς τε καὶ πρασιότατη. Only the latter seems to have any connection with the second part of the list, in which the expression τῆς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὐκρασίας (816,17) is used. But the abundant rain and the temperate weather must be regarded as two sides of the same issue – in fact they both refer to the second part. Since the whole of 818,2-5 is thus the positive counterpart to 816,14-18, this is new evidence that ἀσεβοῦς πολέμου κτλ. (816,16-17) is a later insertion.

188 The manuscripts TERBDMΣ give this text: διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας ἰερούργιας τε καὶ τιμῆς τῆς τοῦ δυνατωτάτου καὶ στεροτάτου ἀέρος ἐξευμενισθείσης (818,6-7). The text apparently discusses worship of the air (ἀήρ), a force which could even be pacified. This idea is so unusual in Greco-Roman religions that we must conclude that the text is corrupt. But the terminology implies quite clearly a divinity which can be worshipped and to which sacrifices can be offered. It is also evident, from the immediately preceding passage, that the god was involved in questions of war and peace. On this basis, it would be natural to suppose that the text did not originally discuss ἀήρ, but the god of war Ἄρης. Manuscript A, at least, interpreted the matter in this way, since it uses the expression ἀφ' ἑωσ δυνάμεως, and δυνάμεως simply repeats the contents of the preceding phrase τοῦ δυνατωτάτου καὶ στεροτάτου (818,7), so the expression must be regarded as a later addition of which only Ἄρης belonged to the original text. This was altered in later copies to ἀήρ, perhaps because the war god Ares had not been named in the excerpts of the ordinance reproduced by Eusebius. But ἀήρ had, cf. τὴν τοῦ ἀέρος κατάστασιν, 818,4. According to Eusebius's account in *cap.* 8,3, Maximin had asserted that he had averted war

tor of the Church suddenly extended His heavenly aid to Christians, while at the same time stopping the tyrant's boasting.

The introductory words in this section – ἤδη γέ τοι σχεδὸν τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις ἀποψυχούσης προσδοκίας (820,12-13) – appear to repeat *cap.* 7,15a (820,9-11), but with the difference that the statement is less categorical since some Christians still seemed to put their trust in God and hope that He would come to the assistance of His persecuted Church. And the main clause ἀθρόως ... ὁ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας ὑπέρμαχος θεὸς ... τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οὐράνιον συμμαχίαν ἐπεδείκνυτο (820,13-18) can only mean that God suddenly stopped the persecution.

by his sacrifices, and therefore it would be reasonable to assume that the question of war and peace had been discussed in greater detail in those parts of the ordinance which Eusebius had not reproduced. This was obviously an essential question, which may explain why Eusebius felt it necessary to insert ἀσεβοῦς πολέμου κτλ. (816,16-17) in the list of the catastrophes which threatened mankind – all the more so since the theme was taken up again in 816,7-9. It seems quite likely, then, that the passage in question originally stated that Maximin had sacrificed to the war god and had thus ensured peace.

189 καὶ ὅσοι τῆς τυφλῆς ἐκεῖνης πλάνης καὶ περιόδου παντάπασιν ὠφελιθέντες εἰς ὀρθὴν καὶ καλλίστην διάνοιαν ἐπανήλθον, μειζόνως μὲν οὖν χαιρέτωσαν ὡς ἂν ἐκ χειμῶνος ἀπροσδοκίτου ἢ νόσου βαρείας ἀποσπασθέντες καὶ ἡδεῖαν εἰς τοῦτιδον ζωῆς ἀπόλαυσιν καρπώσασμενοι (818,9-13). The passage refers to the Christians, and it states that many of them had renounced their faith and reverted to the worship of the gods, in order to avoid persecution and so that they could enjoy a good life. We should note that the passage contains a number of the expressions used in the "Galerius edict" to justify "the great persecution" e. g. ἵνα καὶ οἱ Χριστιανοί, -- εἰς ἀγαθὴν πρόθεσιν ἐπανελθοῖεν (792,14-15) and the mention of the Christian ἄνοια (794,1 ATER) and ἀπόνοια (794,9-10). In other words, Maximin introduced his measures against the Christians, because he wanted to achieve exactly the same result as that produced by Diocletian's persecution.

190 ἴν' οὕτως κατ' ἀκολουθίαν τῆς ἀξιεπαίνου ὑμῶν περὶ τοῦτο σπουδῆς παντὸς μίσσητος καὶ ἀσεβείας ἀποχωρισθεῖσα ἡ ὑμετέρα πόλις καὶ τὴν ἔμφυτον αὐτῇ πρόθεσιν μετὰ τοῦ ὀφειλομένου σεβάσματος ταῖς τῶν ἀθανάτων θεῶν ἱερουργίας ὑπακούοι (818,15-19). We should notice that the worship of the gods is inherent in the very nature of man; the neoplatonic Emperor Julian accepted the same concept.

191 This is evident from the words μεγαλοδωρεῖν -- ἥτις παρασχεθεῖσα τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ πόλει εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἀθανάτους θεοὺς φιλοθέου εὐσεβείας παρεῖξει μαρτυρίαν -- (820,3-5).

192 ὡς κατ' αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ θεῖον ἐκεῖνο λόγιον, εἰ δυνατόν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοὺς σκανδαλίζεσθαι (820,11-12). The Scripture reference is to *Matt.* 24,24, but Eusebius used σκανδαλίζεσθαι instead of πλανᾶσθαι, which is more widely accepted. In fact, he used the same Scriptural passage in VI, 41,10 when writing on Decius's persecution edict: καὶ δὴ καὶ παρῆν τὸ πρόσταγμα, αὐτὸ σχεδὸν ἐκεῖνο οἷον τὸ προορηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παρὰ βραχὺ τὸ φοβερώτατον, ὡς, εἰ δυνατόν, σκανδαλίσει καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς (604,3-5).

Into this main clause, Eusebius inserted a participial construction: καθ' ὁδὸν ἔτι τὴν πορείαν ἔντισιν χώραις διανυόντων τῶν τὴν προκειμένην καθ' ἡμῶν γραφὴν διακονουμένων (820,14-15). The γραφή mentioned here is in fact the ordinance from Maximin mentioned in *cap.* 4,2a, which granted the petitions of the cities. The point is that the ordinance had not yet reached all the provinces and, as a result, the persecutions had not developed fully when God brought them to a halt. But in that case, the insertion contradicts the preceding text: *cap.* 7,15 claimed that both the petitions and the Imperial ordinances had been posted in every province. For this reason alone, *cap.* 7,16 cannot originally have belonged with *cap.* 7,15.

Eusebius also wrote that God curbed Maximin's boasting¹⁹³ at the same time as He halted the persecutions. There is nothing, however, in the account up to this point to explain the meaning of the tyrant's μεγαλαυχία – the word is used here for the first time.¹⁹⁴ It seems to indicate that μόνον κτλ. (820,16-17) is a later insertion, an assumption which is also confirmed by a stylistic break in the continuity.

In *cap.* 8,1 (820,18-25), Eusebius wrote that the normal winter rain never fell, which resulted in an unexpected famine. Plague started spreading along with another disease, known as anthrax, which primarily affected the eyes and made many blind. Moreover, *cap.* 8,2 (820,25-822,6) states that there was a war with the Christian Armenians, Rome's traditional *foederati*,¹⁹⁵ whom Maximin wanted to force to sacrifice to idols and demons. Finally, *cap.* 8,3a (822,6-10) claims that these events, taking place suddenly and at the same time, refuted Maximin's boasting against God;¹⁹⁶ Maximin had been wont to say presumptuously that his zeal for the idols and his persecution of the Christians had kept away famine, pestilence and war during his reign.¹⁹⁷

The whole of *cap.* 8,1-3a is a self-contained section which serves to

193 μόνον οὐχὶ τὴν τοῦ τυράννου καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιστομίζων μεγαλαυχίαν (820,16-17).

194 We do however find a corresponding account in *cap.* 7.2 where Eusebius wrote that he would publish Maximin's ordinance to the people of Tyre to demonstrate τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρός θεομισείας ἢ ἀλαζῶν καὶ ὑπερήφανος ἀνθάδεια (812,25-26).

195 ὁ πρὸς Ἀρμενίους πόλεμος, ἄνδρας ἕξ ἀρχαίου φίλους τε καὶ συμμάχους Ῥωμαίων, οὓς καὶ αὐτοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ὄντας καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν διὰ σπουδῆς ποιουμένους, ... (822,1-4).

196 τῆς τοῦ τυράννου θρασύτητος τὴν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγαλαυχίαν διήλεγξεν (822,7-8).

197 τῆς περὶ τὰ εἶδωλα αὐτοῦ σπουδῆς καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν ἔνεκα πολιορκίας (822,8-9).

show that Maximin's idolatry could not ensure bread, good health, and peace for the Roman Empire and its people – and his *μεγαλαυχία* consisted of just these claims, we now learn. The passage immediately preceding (*μόνον οὐχὶ κτλ.*, 820,16-17) asserted that the Christian God halted this boasting, so the meaning must be that He omitted to send the winter rain and inflicted the dreadful plagues on the population. The Armenian war does not fit into this pattern, however, since it was caused by Maximin himself. The point here is that he made a political blunder by forcing the Christian Armenians to worship idols. It simply made them rise up against him.¹⁹⁸ In other words, Maximin's pagan religious policy did not promote the interests of the Roman Empire; it damaged them by changing previous *foederati* into enemies. The description of the Armenian war displays tendencies quite different from the immediately preceding account, so, originally, the former probably did not belong with the latter.

However that may be, according to Eusebius, three catastrophes took place at one and the same time: famine, war and pestilence.¹⁹⁹ Maximin's *μεγαλαυχία* manifested itself in his ordinances on the petitions of the cities,²⁰⁰ and therefore it was the *terminus a quo* for the period in which the disasters occurred. Some time had probably passed from the resumption of the persecutions in November 311 until the petitions from the cities reached the Emperor, so they and his ordinances could not have been published before the spring of 312. From this calculation, the winter rain failed in 312-313, and the famine along with the pestilences and the Armenian war did not occur until the spring and summer of 313. This date does not, however, agree with the order of Eusebius's account; the disasters should have taken place before Constantine's victory over Maxentius in 312 and before Maximin's battle against Licinius in the spring of 313. The chronology suggests that the disasters should have happened in the year 312. But that creates impossible problems too. We must conclude that Eusebius had no clear idea of the exact time of the disasters.

Cap. 8,3b (822,10-12) goes on to say that all these events happened simultaneously and marked the beginning of his overthrow.²⁰¹ This statement evidently repeats Eusebius's comments in the immediately preceding passage.²⁰² There is a distinct difference, however. Whereas the disasters in 822,6-10 were regarded as those which unveiled Maximin's ungodly boasting, they were considered in 822,10-12 as the factor that introduced the decline and fall of his rule. The perspective was no longer religious but political. The difference justifies the assumption that the two sections were not written at the same time.²⁰³

The existing text leaves little doubt that Eusebius used the two related statements to indicate that the disasters in question served the double function of belying Maximin's godless boasting and initiating his political downfall. In this context, religion and politics were two sides of the same coin for Eusebius. But we must not forget that neither 822,6-10 nor 822,10-12 agrees with the account in *cap.* 7,16 (820,12-18) which promotes the basic idea that God Himself intervened and helped His Church by stopping the persecutions.

In *cap.* 8,4-5 (822,12-20), Eusebius stated that while Maximin and his army²⁰⁴ exhausted themselves in the Armenian war, famine and plague devastated the rest of the city dwellers in his empire.²⁰⁵ Countless people died in the cities but losses were even greater in the country which, in a short time, was almost completely depopulated for want of food and by a pestilential disease.²⁰⁶

198 τούτοις προσηπανίσταται τῷ τυράννῳ ὁ πρὸς Ἀρμενίου πόλεμος (820,25-822,1).

199 ἀθρόως δὴ ταῦτα πάντα ὑφ' ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συρρεύσαντα καιρὸν, ... (822,6-7). The use of ἀθρόως seems quite misleading, since these calamities did not occur suddenly.

200 The relationship between these ordinances and the Tyrenian ordinance will be discussed in detail at a later stage.

201 καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ καταστροφῆς περιειλήφει τὰ προόμια (822,11-12). καταστροφή probably refers to the fall of Maximin's rule. But the word can also be understood to mean "subjugation, reduction", cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 915, which strictly speaking implies, not his ruin, but only a limitation of the exertion of his authority.

202 ταῦτα δ' οὖν ὁμοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπελθόντα (822,10-11) corresponds exactly to ταῦτα πάντα ὑφ' ἓνα καὶ αὐτὸν συρρεύσαντα (822,6-7). The meaningless ἀθρόως (822,6) is not repeated, however.

203 Also R. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

204 αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν πρὸς Ἀρμενίου πόλεμον ἅμα τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατοπέδοις κατεπονεῖτο (822,12-13). Lawlor-Oulton translated τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατοπέδοις by "with his commanders" (*Eusebius* I, p. 286). It is better, though, to translate the expression by "with his armies", as in Henri Valois: *una cum exercitu* (PG XX, 2, p. 815 C) and Gustave Bardy: "avec ses armées" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 58).

205 τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς τῶν τὰς ὑπ' αὐτὸν πόλεις οἰκούντων δεινῶς ὁ λιμὸς τε ἅμα καὶ ὁ λοιμὸς κατετροχέτην (822,13-15). In this context, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς κτλ. seems strange, since no obvious reason can be discovered for the mention of "the rest of the inhabitants of the cities". Henri Valois avoids the difficulty in this translation: *Reliqui vero qui urbes ejus imperio subditas incolebant ...* (PG XX, 2, p. 815 C).

206 ἀθρόως σχεδὸν ἀπάντων ἐνδεία τροφῆς καὶ λοιμῶδε νόσῳ διεφθαρμένων (822,19-20).

This section which forms a coherent unit, is parallel to *cap.* 8,1-3a (820,18-822,10).²⁰⁷ In the text as we have it, the section is closely connected to *cap.* 8,3b (822,10-12) and was probably intended as a more detailed report on the disasters in question and their importance to the overthrow of Maximin.²⁰⁸ The Armenian war must have resulted in military enfeeblement, which could indeed have led to Maximin's overthrow, but it is difficult to see how famine and plague could be regarded as factors contributing to his downfall. Quite apart from this, however, the verb used – *κατετροχέτην* (822,15) – also indicates that this account simply served to describe how war, famine and pestilence exhausted the whole population – soldiers and civilians in both the cities and the rural districts.

But the section calls for further comment. Eusebius wrote *ὁ λιμός τε ἄμα καὶ ὁ λοιμὸς κατετροχέτην, ὡς ἑνὸς μέτρου πυρῶν δισχιλίας καὶ πεντακοσίας Ἀττικὰς ἀντικαταλλάττεσθαι* (822,14-16), and it is obvious that *ὁ λοιμὸς* interrupts the coherent description of a famine which overtook the population of the cities because the price of corn was so very high that they could not afford it. Perhaps Eusebius inserted *τε ἄμα καὶ ὁ λοιμὸς* in order to provide an analogy with the account in *cap.* 8,1-3 in which he had stated that plague as well as famine ravaged the population.

Cap. 8,6-10 (822,20-824,13) gives a detailed and dramatic account of the famine. We learn that some sold their relations as slaves to wealthier citizens for a little food,²⁰⁹ while others sold off their property bit by bit until they found themselves in the utmost poverty. Others again ruined themselves and died because they had chewed blades of grass and eaten poisonous plants. Some rich women were forced to beg,²¹⁰ others walked about like lifeless ghosts,²¹¹ who collapsed in the street while crying out pitifully for bread, and yet other prosperous people hardened themselves and stopped distributing large amounts²¹² for fear of ending up as beggars themselves. All this resulted in dead people lying for days in the squares and streets before they were buried. The situation was so serious that dogs ate some of the corpses, and consequently they were slain to prevent them from attacking living people.²¹³

The section makes up a clear, well written unit describing the famine in the cities. It does not, however, fit in with the preceding account in *cap.* 8,5 (822,16-20) which described the death from famine and plague of almost the entire population in the cities and in the country. But quite a different and very sensible reading results from seeing the section as the direct continuation of *cap.* 8,4 *fin.* (822,15-16); it then describes the effects of the astronomical prices at which corn was sold in the cities. The

continuity is, however, broken by *cap.* 8,5. It is also true of this section that it provides a factual account with no moral or religious overtones.

Cap. 8,11 (824,13-20) goes on to say that the plague haunted every family,²¹⁴ first and foremost the wealthy who had food – including rulers, provincial governors and numerous officials. There were lamentations and funeral processions everywhere.²¹⁵

In this section, ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡγεμόνες καὶ μυροῖοι τῶν ἐν τέλει (824,15-16) is placed in opposition to οἱ γοῦν ἐν περιουσίαις (824,15). Since strictly speaking only some of the well-to-do could have been involved – not all of them, as Eusebius's text suggests – we must ask if the words were inserted later. In that case, Eusebius was insinuating that Maximin's officials had lined their own pockets instead of helping the starving and destitute. But if we disregard this passage with its implicit criticism of Maximin's officials, it is clear that this section too is a plain account of the plague.

According to Eusebius, the plague took what the famine had left.²¹⁶ Or

207 There is however one difference: *cap.* 8,1, mentioned both λοιμός and τινος ἑτέρου νοσήματος ... ἐπιφορά (820,20-22), whereas *cap.* 8,4-5 only mentions λοιμός (822,15) and λοιμώδης νόσος (822,20) respectively.

208 This is evident from οὖν (822,12).

209 τὰ ἐαντῶν φύλατα (822,21) could in fact simply mean "their dearest possessions", as in Lawlor-Oulton's translation (*Eusebius I*, p. 286). κτήσεις (822,22) appears in the very next line, so the expression probably refers to family members who were sold as slaves.

210 καὶ γυναίων δὲ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις εὐγενίδων τινὲς εἰς ἀναίσχυντον ἀνάγκην πρὸς τῆς ἀπορίας ἐλαθεῖσαι, μετατείν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγορῶν προελήλυθεσαν. τῆς πάλαι ἐλευθερίου τροφῆς ὑπόδειγμα διὰ τῆς περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αἰδοῦς καὶ τῆς ἀμφὶ τὴν περιβολὴν κοσμοτότητος ὑποφαίνουσαι (822,25-30). This description would no doubt be more appropriate, if the distinguished ladies had been forced by necessity into prostitution rather than beggary.

211 ὥσπερ εἶδωλα νεκρά (822,30) is striking, since Eusebius normally uses εἶδωλον to signify "idol".

212 οὐχ ἡκιστα δὲ καὶ ὁ λοιμὸς πάντας οἴκους ἐπεβόσκετο ... (824,13-14).

213 This must be the meaning of the words: οἱ ζῶντες ἐπὶ τὴν κυνακονίαν ἐτράποντο δέει τοῦ μὴ λυσοῦσαντας ἀνθρωποφαγίαν ἐργάσασθαι (824,11-13).

214 ὁ λοιμὸς πάντας οἴκους ἐπεβόσκετο (824,13-14).

215 πάντα δ' οὖν οἰμωγῶν ἦν ἀνάπλα, κατὰ πάντας τε στενωποὺς ἀγοράς τε καὶ πλατείας οὐδ' ἦν ἄλλο τὴν θεωρεῖν ἢ θρήνους μετὰ τῶν συνήθων αὐτοῖς αὐλῶν τε καὶ κτύπων (824,18-20). Since this passage belongs to the section on the plague, it must mean that the wealthy families could bury their dead in the traditional manner, whereas the dead from poor families lay about on the streets for days.

216 Cf. ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες τῆ λοιμώδει νόσφ πρὸς τοῦ λιμοῦ καταλελειμμένοι (824,16-17).

in his own words: famine and plague ravaged the lower, poorer class of society and the higher, affluent groups respectively. He was not entirely successful in maintaining this view, however. For example, a discrepancy occurs when, in the report of the famine in *cap.* 8,6-7, he mentions those who became poor by selling off their possessions (τὰς κτήσεις, 822,22) as well as the aristocratic ladies who were forced to beg, and then says in *cap.* 8,11 that the well-to-do still had food in spite of the famine. This might perhaps indicate that the two sections did not originally belong together.

Cap. 8,12 (824,20-24) says that Death waged war with plague and famine as its two weapons and in a short time devoured whole families so that often two or three family members had to be buried at the same time.²¹⁷

In the present context, this passage forms the conclusion to the description of the famine and plague in *cap.* 8,6-11. It does not have the same dramatic quality as the corresponding conclusion in *cap.* 8,5. There, famine and plague wiped out the entire population, but here, the effect is limited to whole families which were heavily decimated. First and foremost, however, we must concentrate on the fact that death is described in this passage as an enemy, who waged war on the population and used these dreadful weapons²¹⁸ – there was therefore every reason to feel sympathy for them.

Since the preceding account had carefully described the famine and the plague in that order, it is striking that we now meet them in the reverse order: τοῖς προδεδηλωμένοις λοιμοῦ τε ὁμοῦ καὶ λιμοῦ (824,21-22). Eusebius had just reported on them in detail, so τοῖς προδεδηλωμένοις also seems quite out of place. But the explanation must be sought in the fact that the words were inserted later as an explanatory gloss to δυοῖν ὄπλοις.

In *cap.* 8,13-14 (824,24-826,8), Eusebius claimed that these catastrophes were the punishment for both Maximin's boasting and for the petitions to him from cities for permission to expel the Christians. In this situation, the Christians gave the heathen clear proof of their zeal and piety.²¹⁹ They alone showed compassion and humanity; some tended the hordes of dying people and subsequently buried them, while in every city, others collected crowds of starving people and gave them bread. When news of these actions spread amongst the heathen, they glorified the Christian God and confessed that the Christians alone were truly pious.

The introduction to this section reads τοιαῦτα τῆς Μαξιμίνου μεγαλαυχίας καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις καθ' ἡμῶν ψηφισμάτων τὰ ἐπίκειρα ἦν (824,24-25). τοιαῦτα must refer to the catastrophes mentioned in the

preceding account, i.e. the Armenian war, famine, and plague. They are regarded as the punishment which befell both Maximin and the cities – which is made quite explicit here for the first time.

It is, however, difficult to see how these catastrophes can be considered as a punishment from God for Maximin's *μεγαλαυχία*. On the basis of *cap.* 8, 1-2, it consisted of his priding himself on having prevented famine, disease, and war by his piety and idolatry. Maximin had provoked the exhausting Armenian war himself and since he was not affected by the famine or the plague, it is difficult to see how they could be counted as punishment. It makes excellent sense, however, to see these two catastrophes as divine punishment of the cities for their anti-Christian *ψηφίσματα*. We must add, however, that nothing in the previous description of the famine and the plague indicates that they were sent by God to punish the cities.

Logically, we would have expected Eusebius to have mentioned, first the city petitions to Maximin and then his *ἀντιγραφαί*, in which he granted their wishes – this is the order in 812,19-21. If we compare the lack of consistency with the difficulty in construing the events as a punishment for Maximin's boasting, we should naturally assume that the introduction had undergone some revision. At any rate, by regarding *τῆς Μαξιμίνου μεγαλαυχίας καὶ* (824,24) as a later addition, we obtain a clear, intelligible text: the cities were punished by famine and plague because of their anti-Christian *ψηφίσματα*. There is scarcely any doubt that Eusebius used the ensuing description (*ὅτε κτλ.*) to contrast the Christians' piety with Maximin's. The basis for this contrast was Maximin's comparison of his piety to that of the Christians. It occurred in the ordinance to the people of Tyre, in which he had praised his own piety towards the gods in contrast to the godlessness of the Christians.²²⁰ Eusebius was therefore at

217 ὡς ὄραν ἤδη δυεῖν καὶ τριῶν σώματα νεκρῶν ὑπὸ μίαν ἐκφορὰν προκομιζόμενα (824,22-24).

218 τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τρόπον δυοῖν ὄπλοις τοῖς προδεδηλωμένους λοιμοῦ τε ὁμοῦ καὶ λιμοῦ στρατεύσας, ... ὁ θάνατος ... (824,20-22).

219 ὅτε καὶ τῆς Χριστιανῶν περὶ πάντα σπουδῆς τε καὶ εὐσεβείας πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν διάδηλα κατέστη τὰ τεκμήρια. μόνου γοῦν ἐν τηλικαύτῃ κακῶν περιστάσει τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ φιλόπρωπον ἔργου αὐτοῖς ἐπιδεικνύμενου (824,25-826,1).

220 Maximin thus mentioned the *θεοσέβεια* πρὸς τοὺς ἀθανάτους θεοῦς of the people of Tyre which manifested itself in words but not in deeds, cf. 814,13-15, and praised them for having taken refuge πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν εὐσεβείαν, ὥσπερ πρὸς μητροπόλιν πασῶν θεοσεβειῶν (816,1-2). This is contrasted with the Christians of whom he used the expression *τὴν ὀλέθριον πλάνην τῆς ὑποκένου ματαιότητος τῶν ἀθεμίτων ἐκείνων ἀνθρώπων* (816,25-26).

pains to show that this *μεγαλαυχία* was quite unfounded, a fact which the heathen population also accepted by acknowledging the Christians as *εὐσεβεῖς τε καὶ μόνους θεοσεβεῖς τούτους ἀληθῶς* (826,7-8). At the same time, he was anxious to point out that the Christians' humane behaviour towards the dying and starving contrasted with that shown by Maximin's officials – high and low – since, as suggested in *cap.* 8,11, they had acquired riches without giving a thought to the destitute.

As the section presupposes the famine situation which was described in *cap.* 8,6-10, it would have been more natural to place it in that context.²²¹ Furthermore, it does seem strange that, after having said that famine and plague had ravaged the population and cost so many lives, Eusebius suddenly claimed that the Christians had such large reserves that they could feed great numbers of starving people. The explanation for this undeniably unusual feature must be sought in the fact that the description of the Christians' compassion and philanthropy in *cap.* 8,13b-14 (824,25-826,8) was a later addition. This interpretation is supported by the fact that there is no real stylistic link between this account and the previous one.²²²

In *cap.* 8,15 (826,9-19), Eusebius wrote that God again granted the Christians peace after having punished all those who had made a strong stand against them and He made it plain for all to see that God Himself watched over His people by once more, after the inevitable chastisement, showing mercy towards those who trusted in Him.

The section consists of one sentence whose wording and context is extremely compact. This makes interpretation difficult.

The introductory words – *ἐφ' οἷς τοῦτον ἐπιτελουμένοις τὸν τρόπον* (826,9) must refer to the catastrophes by which God punished Maximin and the cities.²²³ But then the continuation *ὁ μέγας καὶ οὐράνιος Χριστιανῶν ὑπέρμαχος θεὸς κτλ.* (826,9-12) in fact appears to be a repetition. If we pay attention to the wording Eusebius used here, however, it is clear that the continuation is no straight repetition. For example, he does not talk of God's punishment, *τὰ ἐπίχειρα*, as in 824,25, but of God's *ἀπειλή καὶ ἀγανάκτησις* (826,11), which manifested itself in the catastrophes already mentioned (*διὰ τῶν δεδηλωμένων* 826,10-11) and these were directed against everybody because of their violent behaviour towards the Christians.²²⁴ In other words, God in His anger, threatened all persecutors of the Christians with the disasters in question. Eusebius then continued *τὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ φαιδρὰν τῆς αὐτοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς προνοίας αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν ἀγῆνην ἀπεδίδου* (826,12-13); it must mean that God showed

His concern for His Church by bringing the persecutions to an end. But this presupposes that *ὁ μέγας κτλ.* means that the catastrophes were the instruments used by God to force the persecutors of Christianity to stop their attacks on the Christians.

As mentioned above, *ἐφ' οἷς τοῦτον ἐπιτελουμένοις τὸν τρόπον* (826,9) in the text as it stands must refer to the catastrophes which were discussed in the preceding account. The fact that the very next passage reveals a different line of thought could, however, give us occasion to consider whether the words in question might not have a different meaning. There is a striking resemblance between *ὁ μέγας κτλ.* in this section and *cap. 7,16*, which is almost identical: *ὁ τῆς ἰδίᾳς ἐκκλησίας ὑπέρομαχος θεὸς ... τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οὐράνιον συμμαχίαν ἐπεδείκνυτο* (820,15-18). This could indicate that the two sections originally belonged together, or that *cap. 8,15a* at least resumed the arguments from *cap. 7,16*. But in that case, *ἐφ' οἷς κτλ.* must refer to the description of the development of new persecutions of the Christians and must be paraphrased thus: “while the persecutions were conducted in the way described, God came to the assistance of his Church by bringing them to a halt” – and this theme had already been introduced in *cap. 7,2a*. We shall return to the wider implications of this interpretation later.

In the second half of the passage: *ὡς ἐν βαθεῖ σκοτῶ κτλ.* (826,13-14), the subject is no longer God and the persecutors of the Christians but God and his relationship to His people. Here Eusebius's purpose was to show that God had always watched over the Christians; He had chastised them through misfortunes to lead them to conversion and when this had

221 We could imagine, for example, that Eusebius had reported on the philanthropy of the Christians when he mentioned that the well-to-do ended by rejecting the hungry hardheartedly: *μετὰ τὸ μυρία παρασχεῖν εἰς ἀπηνῆ λοιπὸν καὶ ἄτεγκτον ἐχώρουν διάθεσιν* (824,6-7). It should also be mentioned in passing that, initially, these wealthy people had helped the hungry. The Christians were therefore not the only active philanthropists.

222 The connection is established by *ὅτε* (824,25), but not very successfully: Eusebius found it necessary soon after to rephrase it into *ἐν τηλικαύτῃ κακῶν περιστάσει* (824,27).

223 In the present context, the above mentioned word should strictly speaking refer to the immediately preceding description of the pagans who recognized the piety of the Christians and the Christian God as a result of these philanthropic deeds. This contradicts, however, quite distinctly the next passage, which states that God came to the aid of the Christians and that this made the pagans realise that they were surrounded by God's providence.

224 ... *κατὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ... ἀνθ' ὧν εἰς ἡμᾶς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐνεδειξάντο* (826,10-12).

been accomplished, he had shown His compassion towards them by halting the persecutions.²²⁵

The chastisement (παιδεία, 826,18) which God sent to His people is mentioned in διὰ τῶν περιστάσεων (826,16-17). Since Eusebius had just used this word when describing the famine and plague, as in ἐν τηλικαύτη κακῶν περιστάσει (824,27), it would be natural to see in these afflictions the means used by God to bring about the conversion of His people. But the interpretation collapses because the famine and plague were regarded solely as God's punishment of Maximin and the anti-Christian cities. Moreover, we must remember that, far from being a means to punish the Christians for their sins, the famine and plague offered them the opportunity to demonstrate that they possessed true piety. The expression therefore cannot refer to these catastrophes.

It is clear that *cap.* 8,15b (826,13-19) discusses exactly the problem which was raised in *cap.* 7,15 (820,9-12). There, Eusebius reported on the persecution, which Maximin had instigated, and which had made the Christians' situation appear so hopeless that many lost their faith. Eusebius's express claim that God would show His mercy towards τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν τὰς ἐλπιδας ἔχουσιν (826,18-19) undoubtedly refers back to the situation mentioned in *cap.* 7,15. Eusebius wanted to point out that the persecution of the Christians in no way meant that God had ceased to care for His people, but it should be seen as the means by which He punished them for their sins, and then again, after their conversion, he showed compassion towards them by halting the persecutions. From this interpretation it follows that διὰ τῶν περιστάσεων did not refer to famine and plague, but on the contrary, to the persecutions initiated by Maximin. Since this was a tool in God's παιδεία towards His sinful people, Eusebius here expressed exactly the same opinion as he had done in VIII, 1,7-9 and 16,1-2 with reference to "the Diocletian persecution".²²⁶

We have already seen that Rufinus weakened Eusebius's statement in his version of *cap.* 6,4, by simply saying that there were *longe saeviora prioribus et diriora* (815,21). He felt that this had to be explained, but no explanation would come out of just translating Eusebius's account in *cap.* 7,1 (812,19-23). Rufinus therefore chose to rewrite the account to present a complete summary of all the measures taken against the Christians: *Quando enim adversum nos legationes provinciarum vel urbium,*²²⁷ *quando tot et tanta imperialia edicta venerant,*²²⁸ *ita ut etiam aereis tabulis incidi leges, quae adversum nos datae fuerant, iuberentur, quando pueris schola-*

*ris meditatio de Pilato et Iesu haberi contumeliae nostrae gratia iussa est*²²⁹ et *confictis referta blasphemis per totam diem decantari?* (815,22-26).

As Rufinus did not intend to reproduce Maximin's ordinance, there was no reason for him to translate ἐνταῦθά μοι ἀναγκαῖον κτλ. (812,23-26). He must also have regarded καὶ τῆς παρὰ πόδας κτλ. as confusing in the context; the theme was not discussed in the subsequent passage. Rufinus obviously interpreted ταύτην τὴν ἐν στήλαις ἀνατεθεισαν τοῦ Μαξιμίνου γραφὴν (812,24-25) as referring, not to an ordinance to the city of Tyre in particular, but to a letter which had been posted up in all the cities. To model his text closely on Eusebius and reproduce the ordinance to the people of Tyre would, for this reason alone, be misleading. Moreover, Rufinus probably saw no reason why he should present his readers with a document which defamed Christianity so openly;²³⁰ that described Christianity as a great danger and a threat to human existence; that praised the eternal gods and the blessings which they provided when they were worshipped, while at the same time proclaiming Maximin's own zealous piety. Rufinus had no need then, to translate *cap.* 7,3-7 (814,4-816,12). He was content to extract the important points from the

225 This discusses the cessation of the persecution, which is quite clear from the phrase: ὡς ἐν βαθεῖ σκότῳ παραδοξότατα φῶς ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καταλάμπων εἰρήνης ... (826,13-14). Note also that Eusebius used the same expression as those who had ended "Diocletian's persecution". It happened παραδοξότατα (VIII, 16,1, 788,13) and could be described οἶόν τι φῶς ἐκ ζοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ἐκλάμπαν (IX, 1,8, 804,9). Eusebius then wrote, in 826,14-16, that the cessation of the persecution demonstrated quite clearly for all to see that God always watched over his people and their circumstances. This corresponds to *cap.* 1.8 in which he said that the heathens proclaimed the Christian God as the only true God when the Christians were no longer persecuted.

226 The similarity between these sections extends even to the contents. Eusebius thus wrote in VIII, 1,8: οὐχ ὅπως εὐμενὲς καὶ ἴλεω καταστήσασθαι τὸ θεῖον προυθυμούμεθα (738,20-21), 16,1: ὡς γὰρ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπισκοπὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ ἴλεω ἡ θεία καὶ οὐράνιος χάρις ἐνεδείκνυτο (788,10-11), and then, in IX, 8,15, he used again the expression: μετὰ τὴν αὐτάρκη παιδείαν ἴλεω καὶ εὐμενῆ ... ἀναφαινόμενον (826,17-19).

227 This replaces ψηφίσματα πόλεων (812,19-20).

228 This statement appears instead of βασιλικῶν πρὸς ταῦτα διατάξεων ἀντιγραφαί (812,20-21), so it means *edicta* only, not *rescripta*.

229 Unlike Eusebius, Rufinus felt it necessary to draw attention specifically to the fact that this happened under orders, to defame the Christians. He chose to write *pueris scholaris meditatio* instead of παῖδες ἀνὰ τὰ διδασκαλεῖα (812,21-22), probably for the sake of clarity, since he was also referring directly to *cap.* 5,1b.

230 By omitting τὰ ὑπομνήματα (812,22-23), Rufinus possibly wanted to make it clear that only the *Acta Pilati* were being discussed here.

ordinance for his account and to use them in an independent report.²³¹ He therefore replaced the whole of *cap.* 7,3-14 (814,4-820,8) with this much abbreviated version: *in his vero legibus, quas adversum nos aere incisas singulis quibusque civitatibus proposuerat velut in aeternum mansuras, iactanter satis et superbe descripserat,*²³² *quod ex quo Christiani sedibus*²³³ *suis urbibusque pelluntur, et aeris esset laeta temperies et terrae fecunditas abundantior,*²³⁴ *ac segetum copia uberior, et ideo satis recte consuli ad deorum immortalium gratiam, quibus nullae ita acceptabiles victimae litarentur, quam ut invisum his hominum genus ex omnibus locis, in quibus eorum maiestas colitur,*²³⁵ *PELLERETUR. addit quoque etiam illud, ut quoniam tam piam tamque religiosam petitionem hanc ab imperatore poposcerint, quidquid illud est, quamvis difficile videatur, quod suis commodis aestiment profuturum, pro hac gratia nihil sit, quod impetrare non possint, tantum ut hoc diligentius observent, ne Christianis qualitercumque urbium concedatur ingressus* (815,26-821,2).

In his translation of *cap.* 7,15 (820,9-12), Rufinus saw no reason to include ταῦτα δὴ καθ' ἡμῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπαρχίαν ἀνεσθηλίτευτο (820,9). This would simply be a repetition since he had already given the information in the preceding section, at 815.26-817,1. He obviously had doubts about translating πάσης ἐλπίδος ... ἀγαθῆς τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀποκλείοντα (820,10-11) since it was a characteristic of the Christians that they placed their trust in God. At any rate, he preferred a translation, which had the added advantage of giving a precise description of the Christians' desperate situation: *Et quidem ... electi* (821,3-5).

Rufinus did not see that he could use *cap.* 7,16 (820,12-18) in his translation as it was. He probably regarded τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις ἀποψυχούσης προσδοκίας (820,13) as a repetition of the preceding πάσης ἐλπίδος κτλ. which meant that a revision was required. Apparently he also felt that a simple, direct translation of the words in his source would be meaningless: ὁ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας ὑπέρμαχος θεὸς ... τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οὐράνιον συμμαχίαν ἐπεδείκνυτο (820,15-18). The wording suggests that the statement was at best a truism, the point of the entire Church History was, in fact, to demonstrate this truth. The help which Eusebius referred to here, must, on the contrary, consist in God's not allowing the faithful to succumb to despair. Rufinus expressed this in the passage *sed postquam ... non patitur* (821,5-7).

He was in no doubt that God helped His people by removing the basis for Maximin's μεγαλαυχία. It was a decisive feature of Eusebius's text. But Rufinus must have felt the lack of a clear definition of the way in

which Maximin's arrogance manifested itself and of some indication of the process by which God deprived him of his argument. He therefore supplied them himself: *continuo namque nec mora,*²³⁶ *dum adhuc per aliquas longius positas civitates impia mitterentur edicta, adrogantiam tyrannicae vocis refrenans, qua laetas segetes pro Christianorum fuga et uberes frugibus descriperat campos,*²³⁷ *imbres restringit in nubibus et effetas arida sterilitate segetes derelinquit*²³⁸ (821,8-12).

In *cap.* 8,1 (820,18-25), Rufinus largely followed Eusebius's account, but he wished to indicate the dreadful extent of the drought by emphasizing the fact that it also affected the cattle: *arescit ... grassatur* (821,12-14). Rufinus also wanted a more precise explanation for the sudden attacks of disease suffered by the people. In his opinion, a climatic change was the cause, so he wrote: *aeris quoque temperies, quam suis impiis artibus descriperat famulari, in tantam corruptionem versa est,*²³⁹ *ut humana corpora ulceribus pessimis, quae ignis sacer appellantur, nec non et his, qui dicuntur carbunculi, replerentur, ita ut et ora hominum atque oculos occuparent, ut si qui forte ex his effugisset mortem, luminibus orbaretur* (821,14-19). In his final *ut*-clause, Rufinus diverged from his source by

231 This is indeed the reason why Rufinus alluded again to some of the basic concepts in the ordinance in 821,14-15 and 823,6-8.

232 Rufinus used these words to translate Eusebius's description of the ordinance: ἡ ἀλαζὼν καὶ ὑπερήφανος αὐθάδεια (812,26). His own ironic addition: *velut in aeternum mansuras* served to emphasize this passage.

233 Rufinus wished to make it absolutely clear that the Christians had been expelled from their homes.

234 Here, Rufinus omitted completely any allusion to the list in *cap.* 7,8 of the catastrophes which threatened people. He merely translated the examples mentioned in *cap.* 7,10. He put *aeris laeta temperies* first and compared it to *terrae fecunditas*, for the obvious reason that they were necessary for the occurrence of *segetum copia uberior*.

235 This passage was composed independently by Rufinus in order to point out to his readers the irony of the situation: the pagan gods would only be satisfied when the Christians were sacrificed to them.

236 These words replace ἀθρόως (820,13).

237 For the sake of clarity, Rufinus found it necessary to repeat, although with variations, his reproduction in 817,2-819,1 of the contents of the edict: *descriperat, quod ex quo Christiani sedibus suis urbibusque pelluntur, et aeris esset laeta temperies et terrae fecunditas abundantior, ac segetum copia uberior*.

238 Rufinus made meaningful use here of οἱ μὲν οὖν κτλ. (820,18-19) from the next passage. We should note that, unlike Eusebius, he not only stated that God kept the rain away, but also said specifically that this resulted in a drought which parched the fields.

239 Rufinus resumed the line of thought from 817,3 here but added that *aeris temperies* was the result of magic, an idea which has no basis in Maximin's ordinance.

underlining, quite clearly, the fact that the famine had claimed many lives. He changed the order in Eusebius's text when he described the *carbunculi*-disease first, probably because he regarded λοιμός as an even more dreadful illness, which should therefore be mentioned last. He also found no indication that this had caused many deaths, which he rectified by linking μυρσίους ὄσους ἄνδρας ἅμα γυναιξίν καὶ παισίν (820,24-25) with λοιμός; on that basis, he composed the following sentence: *sed et ... nihilominus ... cadebant* (821,19-21).

Rufinus probably had no major objection to Eusebius's account in *cap.* 8,2 (820,30-822,6). But he must have decided that by stating the reason for the Armenian war first he could provide a more logical sequence, and he wanted to point out much more decisively that the Armenians had taken up arms against Maximin's godless edicts in defence of their Christianity.²⁴⁰ His version therefore reads as follows: *additur illud ... bellum inferunt* (821,21-823,5).

Rufinus read *cap.* 8,3a (822,6-10) as the conclusion of the account in *cap.* 8,1-2, but in his opinion, it should be much more emphatic. It must specify, quite clearly, that the *mala* which were mentioned just before this passage, should be regarded as a punishment for Maximin's *arrogantia* – this was not sufficiently clear from διήλεγξεν (822,8). He therefore composed this succinct passage: *quae simul omnia coacervata stultae ab eo poenas adrogantiae deposcebant, pro quo per fugam persecutionemque Christianorum²⁴¹ pacem sibi et rerum omnium copias atque ipsius etiam aeris temperiem deservire iactaverat* (823,5-8).²⁴²

Rufinus omitted *cap.* 8,3b (ταῦτα δ' οὖν κτλ., 822,10-12) completely, first of all because he felt that it was a repetition of the facts given by Eusebius immediately before this passage. Perhaps Rufinus also thought that the context offered no explanation of the *mala* described here or of their alleged status as precursors of Maximin's downfall. Rufinus considered the religious rather than the political aspect relevant in a Christian context, so he was quite happy to omit the passage in question.

In Rufinus's translation of *cap.* 8,4 (822,12-16), we note that he diverged from the original. Presumably he wished to create a clear, well ordered account, which, besides mentioning the Armenian war, gave an exhaustive account of the famine and emphasized the fact that it helped to reveal Maximin's *arrogantia*. This meant that Rufinus had to expand his source, but the source contained irrelevant material which was superfluous in the context. This was true for example of τε ἅμα καὶ ὁ λοιμός and ὡς ἐνὸς μέτρου κτλ. (822,14-15) – and in addition, the last piece of

information was hardly of any interest to Latin readers. Rufinus's re-writing produced the following text: *igitur cum ipse et exercitus*²⁴³ *bello Armenico vehementer et acriter urgeretur, populos per urbes et vicos,*²⁴⁴ *quibus divina atque humana prospere cuncta cessura legum suarum auctoritate promiserat, fames dira absque ulla miseratione*²⁴⁵ *vastabat* (823,8-11).

To Rufinus, the account in *cap.* 8,5 (822,16-20) rendered ὡς ἤδη κτλ. (822,18-19) superfluous. It reported on the country districts which had been so violently ravaged by death that the census registers had been made totally useless, and this at any rate would be meaningless information for his readers. Apparently, Rufinus also disliked ἀθρόως κτλ. (822,19-20). Not only was the passage hyperbolic, but it also appeared in the wrong place. It anticipated facts which became evident only from the subsequent description of *lues*. So, it was rejected too. From the remaining segments, Rufinus created this account: *in urbibus tantae per dies singulas multitudines cadebant, ut nec loca ad sepulturas invenirentur.*²⁴⁶ *in agris vel vicis plurimae domus penitus vacuae remansere*²⁴⁷ (823,11-14).

In his translation of Eusebius's description of the famine in *cap.* 8,6-10 (822,20-824,13), Rufinus diverged from his source on several occasions.

240 Eusebius gave a rather vague phrase: ὁ θεομισῆς εἰδώλοισι θύειν καὶ δαίμοσιν ἐπαναγκάσαι πεπειραμένους (822,4-5), but Rufinus believed that Maximin had issued edicts which commanded idol worship. It should, however, be noticed that no edicts with such contents have been mentioned in connection with the new persecution, which Maximin is supposed to have initiated in November 311.

241 These words replace τῆς περὶ τὰ εἶδωλα αὐτοῦ σπουδῆς καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν ἔνεκα πολιορκίας (822,8-9). Rufinus wanted to say that Maximin was responsible for the expulsion and the persecution of the Christians.

242 Rufinus's source has μὴ λιμὸν μηδὲ λοιμὸν μηδὲ μὴν πόλεμον (822,9-10), but he chose its positive counterpart: *rerum omnium copiae, aeris temperies*, which leaves out λοιμός, and then finally *pax*. He changed the order at the same time, so that it corresponded to the events as described in the account itself.

243 This word translates τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατοπέδοις (822,13).

244 Rufinus chose to replace τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς τῶν τὰς ὑπ' αὐτὸν πόλεις οἰκούντων (822,13-14) with *populos per urbes et vicos* because Eusebius's expression simply said that *fama* affected the city inhabitants, a view which is clearly denied in the subsequent account.

245 Rufinus introduced this expression himself, to describe the dreadful situation in which the famine had placed the population.

246 Rufinus himself included this feature, undoubtedly to create variety in the account.

247 This independent composition probably resulted from his desire to create a varied account.

He apparently found the sentence τινὲς μὲν οὖν τὰ ἑαυτῶν φίλιτατα βραχυτάτης τροφῆς τοῖς εὐπορωτέροις ἀπεμπολᾶν ἤξιουν (822,20-22) far too restricted to convey any real impression of the devastation produced by the famine. He therefore replaced it with a new account which also made quite clear his conviction that his source was describing the buying and selling of slaves: *quod et si aliqui imminentem videntes stragem filios suos ad urbem venundaturi abduxerant, dum emptor moratur aut retractat etiam ipse moriturus accedere, cum liberis suis, quorum ex pretio alendos se speraverant, interibant* (823,14-17). On the other hand, Rufinus did not translate ἄλλοι δὲ τὰς κτήσεις κατὰ βραχὺ διαπιπράσκοντες εἰς ἐσχάτην ἐνδείας ἀπορίαν ἤλαυνον (822,22-23), probably because he felt that it contradicted the later description in *cap.* 8-11, which claimed that the well-to-do did have enough food. Furthermore, he understood χόρου διαμασώμενοι σπαράγματα (822,23-24) to mean that they sucked the juice in order to quench their thirst. He included this in his version: *aliqui ... corrumpebantur* (823,17-19).

Rufinus accepted, with a few exceptions, Eusebius's description in *cap.* 8,7 (822,25-30) of the distinguished women who were forced to beg. This is clear from his translation: *mulieres quoque matres familias*²⁴⁸ *et honesto loco*²⁴⁹ *natae vi famis cogente pudoris oblatae ad publicum*²⁵⁰ *stipis petendae gratia descendebant, et quas verecundia aspicere in faciem hominum non sinebat, expetere aliquid cibi vel etiam de manu rapere fames cogebat* (823,19-23). The most remarkable point here is his replacing of τῆς πάλαι ἐλευθερίου τροφῆς ὑπόδειγμα διὰ τῆς περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αἰδοῦς καὶ τῆς ἀμφὶ τὴν περιβολὴν κοσμιότητος ὑποφαινοῦσαι (822,28-30) with *et quas* etc. The reason probably was his instinctive resistance towards placing any emphasis on the aristocratic ladies' upbringing and garments – they were of this world and this world should be renounced. On the other hand, in contrast to Eusebius, he hinted with *de manu rapere* that their situation was so desperate that they were not even ashamed to steal.

Rufinus reproduced Eusebius's account in *cap.* 8,8 (822,30-824,4) more or less unchanged, but he added several features which all served to emphasize its dramatic qualities: *quam plurimi vero ita exhausti incedebant, ut simulacra magis carne carentia quam homines putarentur*;²⁵¹ *colore taetro, luminibus in profundum demersis*,²⁵² *huc atque illuc corpore nutabundi et iam iamque lapsuri ingrediebantur, nec voce iam stipem, sed ultimum trahendo spiritum deposcentes, ita ut nonnumquam si forte fragmentum panis aliquis*,²⁵³ *quo frui non liceret, aspiceret, dum manum cona-*

*tur extendere nec desiderium vires corporis consequuntur, in medio conatus invalidi ictu frustrante concideret*²⁵⁴ (823,23-825,5).

But Rufinus obviously had critical reservations towards Eusebius's account in *cap.* 8,9a (824,4-8). His suggestion that rich people had at first distributed food to the poor appeared to Rufinus to contradict his later description stating that the Christians alone had organized this relief. He was in no doubt that it was a misunderstanding. At best, only a few rich individuals might have given food out of compassion to the hungry but because of their great numbers, it remained simply a kind thought. Or in Rufinus's words: *quod si quis forte locupletium, miseratione permotus, impertiri aliquid cibi indigentibus voluisset, constrictus et praefocatus multitudinem eorum, in quibus nemo erat, qui repellendus videretur, deserebat inceptum nec misericordia propositum per vim eorum, quos inedia impudentes fecerat, valebat explere* (825,5-9).

ὥστ' ἦδη κτλ. in *cap.* 8,9b (824,8-10) should refer, in Rufinus's opinion, to the whole of the preceding account in *cap.* 8,5-9a and not only to *cap.* 8,9a, which is the impression given by the source. He solved this problem by making the clause an independent sentence: *interea per plateas omnes et angiportus erant omnia repleta cadaveribus mortuorum nec erat omnino qui sepeliret, dum et ipsi, qui adhuc superesse videbantur, morbo invalidi essent et quasi continuo morituri* (825,9-12). Rufinus added to his source a statement to the effect that the living did not have the strength to bury the many dead,²⁵⁵ because he wanted to emphasize even more strongly the appalling consequences of the famine.

248 Rufinus probably chose this version of γυναίκων τινες (822,25-26) to indicate that many women took up begging to get food for their families.

249 Translates τῶν κατὰ πόλεις εὐγενίδων (822,26).

250 By translating ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγορῶν (822,27) as *ad publicum*, Rufinus wanted to emphasize the point that the ladies approached the public in general, rather than visit the *fora* only.

251 An expanded version of ὥσπερ εἶδωλα (822,30).

252 With these words, Rufinus wanted to emphasize their exhausted state.

253 This replaced ὀρέξαι σφίσι μικρὸν τρύφος ἄρτου κατηντιβόλουν (824,2). Rufinus probably modified the expression used in the original because he had not forgotten that, given the food situation, people were by no means always in a position to offer the hungry a piece of bread.

254 Rufinus added the last words, *dum manum* etc., in order to provide this description with a natural ending which he did not find in his source.

255 Rufinus had already mentioned another explanation why numerous dead bodies remained unburied: *ut nec loca ad sepulturas invenirentur* (823,12-13). This plays no part in the context, however.

In *cap.* 8,9b, Rufinus omitted *θέαν τοῖς δόϋσιν οἰκτροτάτην παρέχειν* (824,10), but he used the phrase in his version of *cap.* 8,10 (824,10-13), which made it quite clear that seeing dogs eating the dead was the most horrible sight imaginable. Since this was the point of the section for Rufinus, he did not know how to use *δι' ἣν μάλιστα κτλ.* (824,11-13). Perhaps he thought it improbable that dogs would attack the living and even if they had done so, it was difficult to imagine that the survivors, who did not have the strength to bury their dead, could have managed to kill the dogs. At any rate, he decided to omit this part of the text completely, so that his version simply reads: *ex quo fiebat spectaculum miserabile, ita ut quam plurimi canibus devorarentur* (825,12-13).

Eusebius's account in *cap.* 8,11 (824,13-20) was inadequate in Rufinus's eyes. He did not feel that the description of the plague was properly integrated into the preceding report on the famine. He must also have thought that his readers needed to know why the rich had survived the famine whereas the poor had not. On the other hand, he must have regarded the reference to the funeral processions (*πάντα δ' οὖν οἰμωγῶν κτλ.*, 824,18-20) as a detail of such minor importance that it could be omitted. Furthermore, the passage on Maximin's officials – *ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡγεμόνες καὶ μυρίοι τῶν ἐν τέλει* (824,15-16) – created a break in the entire context, in point of both style and content. His critical reservations resulted in the recasting of his source, in order to provide a clear, intelligible account. He felt he achieved this with *igitur duae pestes validissimae, fames et lues dividebant sibi populum, et pauperiores quosque, quibus cottidianus victus opere manuum quaerebatur, velut vicinos sibi et proximos populabatur inedia, illos vero, qui locupletes et referti opibus videbantur, lues sibi velut proprios defendebat, ita ut videres numerosae familiae domum intra breve tempus ex uno in alterum contagione currente extinctis omnibus vacuam derelinqui* (825,14-20).

In *cap.* 8,12 (824,20-24), Rufinus apparently took exception to Eusebius's text which, from the wording, described death as the enemy that waged war on people with famine and plague. This contradicted the *scopus* of the entire account, which introduced the famine and plague as the means used by God to punish Maximin. He must also have felt that *ὡς ὁϋάν κτλ.* (824,22-24) was a less than suitable conclusion to the description of these *mala*. He therefore replaced the entire section in Eusebius with this passage: *sic discretis quidem castris fames luesque, sed uno mortis exitu bellantes, urbes agrosque vastabant* (825,20-21).

Cap. 8,13 (824,24-27) was quite unacceptable to Rufinus. In his opin-

ion, the preceding passage had depicted the Armenian war, the famine, and the plague as God's punishment for Maximin's *arrogantia*, as revealed in his idolatry and in his persecution of the Christians. Eusebius's statement was, therefore, meaningless: that these *mala* should also be regarded as the wages for the cities' petitions against the Christians – what is more, Maximin himself was the real instigator here too. For this reason, Rufinus refused to translate καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις καθ' ἡμῶν ψηφισμάτων (824,24-25). He felt too that the description of the Christians' pity (ὅτε κτλ., 824,25-27) had been inserted carelessly with no link to the preceding account. Rufinus saw the passage as a comparison between paganism and Christianity so he required a translation which concentrated solely on Maximin: *haec extitit legum Maximini et elationis atque adrogantiae eius et iudicii de Christianis habit*²⁵⁶... *maiestas* (825,21-24).

Rufinus must definitely have felt that Eusebius's description of the Christians' philanthropic behaviour in *cap.* 8,14 (824,27-826,8) left many questions unanswered. For example, how did the Christians manage to survive and even have food to give away, when everybody else died of either starvation or plague? He also wanted information to explain why the pagans, who had up to now persecuted the Christians and expelled them from their towns, suddenly changed their attitude completely and praised the Christians and their God, thus distancing themselves from the paganism which was Maximin's religion. His demand for clarity and immediate intelligibility made a new version necessary. Rufinus explained that the pagans' total impotence and helplessness had made them beseech the Christians for food for the hungry and for assistance to bury their dead – because only with the Christians were *humanitas* and *pietas* to be found: *verum, ut superius diximus, cum et inhumata mortuorum cadavera, quos fames consumpserat, in plateis iacerent et quos lues usque ad unum interemerat, nihilominus insepulti in domibus manerent, qui vero superesse videbantur, urgerentur inedia, clamare omnes et sponte Christianorum pietatem misericordiamque inprecari, quosque paulo ante extorres patria et domo egerant, nunc suppliciter exorare, ut more sibi solito viventibus alimoniae auxilium deferant, mortuis insepultis sepulturae iusta persolvant apud ipsos tantummodo miserationes valere, apud ipsos*

256 The exact meaning of this expression is not clear. Perhaps it refers to the fact that Maximin had retained the traditional anti-Christian prejudices, which manifested themselves in his efforts to discredit the Christian people.

solos, quae humanitatis sunt pietatisque, servari. nec tam veram religionem, tam sanctam tamque in omnibus perfectam ullam esse, quae universis hominibus consulere tamquam propinquis et proximis suadeat, nec esse alium ullum praeter Christianorum deum confitebantur (825,24-36). The Christians were able to answer this prayer for help, Rufinus went on, because God in His mercy had saved them by a miracle from famine and plague, so that they were able to comply with their Lord's command to love their enemies: *tum vero nostrorum populi, quibus re vera per dei gratiam, quod maxime omnibus mirabile fuit,²⁵⁷ neque fames in aliquo neque lues fuerat dominata, in nullo prorsus iniuriae memores, more sibi solito et ad misericordiam etiam inimicorum praeceptis dominicis instituti, conferre certatim unusquisque prout poterat cibos et sustentare ac reficere pereuntes et non solum cibos cum eis, sed et affectum participare, ex quo indigentibus etiam parva sufficere videbantur, quod cum magna pietatis affectione praebebantur.²⁵⁸ illos quoque, qui morbi contagione laborabant, ad quos nullus gentilium, ne propinquorum quidem introibat, sedula et frequenti visitatione curare nec pati omnino aliquid per contagium, quippe quos gratia divina circumdaret, cadaveribus quoque mortuorum sepulturam deferre et quae sunt naturae iusta conplere* (825,36-827,10).

Since Rufinus had already given the information contained in ὡς περιβόητον κτλ. (826,6-8) in 825,33-36, he had to create a new conclusion to avoid repetition. His solution emphasized the extent to which the Christians, in their behaviour towards the pagans, had cancelled out Maximin's false accusations against Christianity published in the ordinances: *ita brevi ingressu solo Christianorum per urbes et vicos malorum facies inmutata rebus ipsis atque operibus veram esse et piam religionem Christianorum in cordibus omnium scripsit multo tenacius quam tabulis aereis eam falsam esse tyrannus inciderat* (827,10-13).

Rufinus quite clearly had trouble in discovering a connection between *cap.* 8,15 (826,9-19) and the previous account. Furthermore he must have felt that the section largely constituted a repetition of previous points. This applied to ὁ μέγας κτλ. (826,9-12) which simply repeated *cap.* 7,16 (820,12-18). He must also have found problems in the following phrase: τὴν εὐμενῆ καὶ φαιδρᾶν τῆς αὐτοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς προνοίας αὐτῆς ἡμῖν αὐγῆν ἀπεδίδου (826,12-13), since it could be misunderstood to mean that the Christians had not always been surrounded by divine πρόνοια. At any rate, he omitted *cap.* 8,15a (826,9-13) and in its place he gave this independent description which was closely linked to the immediately preceding account and provided a continuation for it: *igitur cum haec a nos-*

tris ita gererentur et per gestorum bonitatem tacita quadam praedicatione dei nostri veritas nosceretur, ita ut completum videretur illud, quod scriptum est in Genesi: quia Aegyptiis erant tenebrae palpabiles et crassae, filiis autem Israhel erat lux in omnibus habitationibus suis, pergit nihilominus dominus deus noster magnificari in sanctis suis et coeptae virtutis opus prosperioribus successibus propagare atque iterum nobis in obscuro positus splendorem suae lucis accendere (827,13-21).

In *atque iterum etc.*, Rufinus reproduced, more or less completely, ὡς ἐν βαθεῖ σκότῳ παραδοξότατα φῶς ἡμῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καταλάμπων εἰρήνης (826,13-14). Eusebius's phrase depicted the cessation of the persecution, but Rufinus wanted to regard it instead as meaning that God again granted the Christians salvation.²⁵⁹ He followed his source, though, when describing God's chastisement of the Christians for their sins; this led to their conversion, so that He could be reconciled with them and save them. Rufinus phrased this in an independent fashion, however, by quoting and expanding *Ps. 79,6: etenim secundum propheticum dictum cibavit nos pane lacrimarum et potum nobis dedit lacrimas, sed in mensura.*²⁶⁰ *haec est ergo correptionis eius emendationisque mensura, ut non in perpetuum indignetur neque in aeternum irascatur nobis, sed repropitiatur servis suis sperantibus in se* (827,21-25). Since this interpretation of God's *correctio et emendatio* was a central point in Rufinus's Christian exegesis, he followed his source quite happily.²⁶¹ But despite his independent composition, he was for once unsuccessful in integrating this thought properly into the account as a whole. To an even greater extent than in Eusebius, *etenim etc.* appears unmotivated in the context.

257 Rufinus made a point of stating that everybody saw it as a *mirabile*. He probably included this as a further reason for the pagans to recognize the Christian God.

258 Rufinus had an analytic mind. He knew that the Christians' store of food must have been so limited, despite the *mirabile*, that it must have been distributed in very small individual portions. This was offset, however, by the fact that the material help was offered with *affectus*, spiritual care.

259 The use of the Scriptural text from *Ps. 79,6* is closely related to this interpretation.

260 Rufinus's Latin version corresponds exactly to LXX, but deviates from the Masoretic text. He is therefore justified in interpreting *in mensura* as a limited goal.

261 But Rufinus did not want to omit ἐκφανές τε τοῖς πᾶσιν καθιστάς θεὸν αὐτὸν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπίσκοπον διὰ παντὸς γεγεμέναι πραγμάτων (826,14-16). He obviously regarded it as an unnecessary repetition of the comments in the account of the Christians' deeds of charity. Moreover, it had little relevance in a context which Rufinus read as a discussion of the Christians' own salvation.

Cap. 9,1 appears in different versions, as we know, in the manuscripts ATER and BDM.²⁶² The decisive disparity concerns Constantine and Licinius who are described as being equally powerful in the first group of manuscripts, but not in the second group.

ATER has retained features from an earlier version of the Church History than the final one as shown in BDM, and here Eusebius was saying that God had set up Constantine and Licinius as the two God loving Emperors against the two godless tyrants; Maxentius was killed by Constantine and Maximin by Licinius at a slightly later time.²⁶³

The section begins οὕτω δῆτα (826,20) which indicated that the ensuing account was a detailed description of God's mercy to His people which He showed by stopping the persecution once it had served His purpose of chastising them for their sins and leading them to conversion. The Emperors, on the other hand, were simply tools for carrying out His will.

The section is permeated by a clear contrast between Constantine and Licinius as the pious Emperors on one side and the two godless tyrants on the other.²⁶⁴ We are told that Constantine had held his position longest, but apart from that there was no difference between them.²⁶⁵ Thus, συνέσει καὶ εὐσεβείᾳ τετιμημένων (826,22-23) applied to both, just as God set them both up and in a miraculous way came to their assistance in the battle against the tyrants.

When writing about Constantine at the beginning of the section, Eusebius described him as ὃν βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως εὐσεβῆ τε ἐξ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ πάντα σωφρονεστάτου γεγονέναι προειρήκαμεν (826,20-21). In doing so, however, he distinguished him from Licinius. Since this is clearly in contradiction to the symmetrical design of the entire section, which describes them as equals,²⁶⁶ the anomaly must be explained as a result of the later insertion of ὃν βασιλέα κτλ.²⁶⁷

The section lacks continuity in another respect, too. When Eusebius wrote πολέμου τε νόμῳ παραταξαμένων, θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτοῖς παραδοξότατα (826,22-23 ATER)²⁶⁸ of Constantine and Licinius, the words signalled an actual shift in thought. God was not seen here as having raised them to battle, but as the helper in a war which was already under way and which could not therefore have been instigated by Him.

As mentioned above, we would, from the introductory words in this section (οὕτω δῆτα, 826,20), have expected a description of God's termination of Maximin's persecution of the Christians. When, even so, Eusebius wrote of the God loving Emperors' defeat of the two godless ty-

rants, he extended his perspective. It was no longer simply a question of the cessation of the persecution but of Christianity's victory over paganism.

In *cap.* 9,2-11 (828,3-832,14), Eusebius gave a detailed description of Constantine's victory over Maxentius and his triumphant entry into Rome.

In *cap.* 9,2 (828,3-8), his readers were told that Constantine²⁶⁹ took pity on the population of Rome who were oppressed by tyranny and that, after calling upon God and Christ for help, he advanced with his army²⁷⁰ to secure for the city its time honoured freedom. The passage states, quite unambiguously, that Constantine's motives for defeating Maxentius were purely political and secular: to free Rome from tyranny and regain its *libertas*.²⁷¹ This contradicts the preceding passage, which gave the impression that he went to war against Maxentius, the godless tyrant, to assist the Christians and ensure the victory of Christianity over paganism. Since Constantine took the initiative himself for this Italian campaign on

262 See E. Schwartz: *Eusebius Werke*, II, 2, p. 826 *ad locum*.

263 πίπτει μὲν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίνου Μαξεντίου, ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς οὐ πολλὴν ἐπιζήσας ἐκείνῳ χρόνον, αἰσχίστῳ καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ Λικίνιου καταστρέφει θανάτῳ (826,25-828,3 ATER). BDMΣ inserted οὐπω μανέντα τότε between Λικίνιου and θανάτῳ.

264 This is pointedly expressed in the words: δύο θεοφιλῶν κατὰ τῶν δύο δυσσεβεισάτων τυράννων (826,22-23).

265 Λικινίου τε τοῦ μετ' αὐτόν (826,22). Deleted in BDMΣ.

266 Furthermore, it led to a meaningless repetition, since in this description, Constantine is characterized as εὐσεβῆς and then, immediately afterwards, compared to Licinius συνέσει καὶ εὐσεβεῖα (826,22).

267 Since the description of Constantine corresponds to the one Eusebius had already given in VIII, 13,13b: ἐπὶ διαδόχῳ γνησίῳ παιδί πάντα σωφρονεστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ (776,16-18), the above mentioned passage must have been inserted no earlier than the one in Eusebius's account.

268 BDMΣ shows that Eusebius changed παραταξαμένων to παραταξαμένου and αὐτοῖς to αὐτῷ, thus stating that Constantine fought with both Maxentius and Maximin. The very next phrase, however, specifically contradicts this. BDMΣ gives the original text, according to which Licinius was responsible for Maximin's death.

269 The introductory words in this section read: πρότερός γε μὴν ὁ καὶ τιμῇ καὶ τάξει τῆς βασιλείας πρῶτος Κωνσταντίνος ... (828,3-4). This was Eusebius's formal connection to *cap.* 9,1 and he used it to explain that he would describe, first, Constantine's defeat of Maxentius and then Licinius's battle against Maximin.

270 πρόεισιν πανστρατιᾷ (828,7). Literally, this means that Constantine advanced with all his troops.

271 ... Ῥωμαῖοις τὰ τῆς ἐκ προγόνων ἐλευθερίας προμνόμενος (828,7-8).

political and secular grounds,²⁷² we can safely conclude that there is no connection between *cap.* 9,1 and 9,2.

But then Eusebius wrote of Constantine: θεὸν τὸν οὐράνιον τὸν τε τούτου λόγον, αὐτὸν δὴ τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, σύμμαχον δι' εὐχῶν ἐπικαλεσάμενος (828,5-7). In the present context, this meant that God and the Saviour Christ would give back to Rome its former glorious political position.²⁷³ This is another clear contradiction of the preceding passage, in which the point of the divine assistance was the rescue of the Christians from their opponents. The explanation for this glaring contradiction is probably to be found in the fact that Eusebius had inserted θεὸν κτλ. into an account which had originally been purely political, and he did so in order to create a link with the preceding Christian description.²⁷⁴ At any rate, the passage can be removed without producing the slightest break in continuity.

Cap. 9,3 (828,8-16) goes on to say that Maxentius trusted the magical arts rather than the goodwill of his subjects, that he did not dare leave Rome but, with his innumerable soldiers, fortified his tyrannical rule throughout Rome and Italy. Constantine placed his trust in divine help, met Maxentius's armies in three battles, and having defeated them easily, he proceeded down through Italy to Rome.

The criticism of Maxentius expressed in this clear report is based on the fact that he was a *superstitiosus* who relied on magic, and a *tyrannus* whose rule was founded on his military power. We learn nothing, however, of his attitude to Christianity, not even that he was said to have persecuted the Christians. By describing Constantine as ὁ τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ συμμαχίας ἀνημμένος βασιλεύς (828,13-14), Eusebius undoubtedly wanted to place him in contrast to Maxentius. As this is not apparent from the report itself,²⁷⁵ it is natural to assume that the words were inserted later in order to Christianize an original political account which was purely pagan. Therefore, like the parallel addition in *cap.* 9,2 (θεὸν κτλ., 828,5-7) the words can be omitted with no damage to continuity.

Constantine's Italian campaign before his march on Rome is described very briefly. We learn of his three victorious battles against Maxentius's armies,²⁷⁶ but no dates and places are given. The text merely suggests that the battles must have taken place in North Italy.²⁷⁷

Cap. 9,4-8 (828,16-830,21) is a description of Constantine's victory over Maxentius outside Rome on the River Tiber.²⁷⁸ God had made Maxentius march far outside the city walls. Only the Christians had believed in the word of the Scriptures on the fate of the godless, but now it revealed itself through miraculous events which made everybody believe in it.²⁷⁹ In

Ex. 15,4-5,²⁸⁰ God let Pharaoh and his armed forces perish in the Red Sea, and now Maxentius and his soldiers were drowned in the Tiber,²⁸¹ when trying to cross the river on a pontoon bridge, as they fled from Constantine. Maxentius had built the pontoon bridge as a trap for Constantine, but he himself fell into it when the bridge collapsed. Constantine and his soldiers had won with God's help, and they were in fact filled with the hymn of praise sung by the Israelites after their victory over the godless tyrant, Pharaoh.

Several individual features in this account call for comment, for example the information in *cap.* 9,4 that God forced Maxentius away from Rome, so that the population would not be involved in Constantine's battle with him.²⁸²

272 Previous passages described God as being gentle and merciful to His Christian people, see for example, *cap.* 8,15b (826,17-18), but at this point Constantine is said to have shown mercy to the Roman people: φειδῶ λαβῶν (828,5). Otherwise, Eusebius uses this expression only of God.

273 Constantine prayed to God, of his own accord, for help in the campaign against Maxentius. In other words, the train of thought is the same as that which, we decided above, lay behind the expression πολέμου τε νόμῳ παραταξαμένων, θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτοῖς (826,23-24).

274 This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the fact that θεὸν κτλ. (828,5-6) is clearly connected to πρὸς τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ τε τῶν ὄλων καὶ σωτήρος (826,22).

275 In the words Μαξεντίου δῆτα μᾶλλον ταῖς κατὰ γοητείαν μηχαναῖς ἢ τῇ τῶν ὑπηκόων ἐπιθαρσοῦντος εὐνοίᾳ (828,8-9), we might have expected, instead of the last part, an expression such as ἢ ἐκ θεοῦ συμμαχία, if the opposition to Constantine was indeed an integral part of the text itself.

276 ἐπιῶν πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη τοῦ τυράννου παρατάξει εὖ μάλα τε πάσας ἐλών (828,14-15).

277 This is apparent from προείσιν ἐπὶ πλείστον ὅσον τῆς Ἰταλίας ἤδη τε αὐτῆς Ῥώμης ἄγχιστα ἦν (828,15-16).

278 In the subsequent account, we learn simply that the battle between Constantine and Maxentius took place just north of the Tiber, but no more definite identification of the place is given.

279 καὶ τὰ πάλοι δὴ κατὰ ἀσεβῶν ὡς ἐν μύθῳ λόγῳ παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις ἀπιστοῦμενα, πιστὰ γε μὴν πιστοῖς ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἐστηλιτευμένα, αὐτῇ ἐναργεῖα πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς εἶπεῖν, πιστοῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις, ὀφθαλμοῖς τὰ παράδοξα παρειληφῶσιν, ἐπιστώσατο (828,19-22).

280 Eusebius's quotation from *Ex.* 15,4-5 is identical to LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs), with the one exception that he has πόντος ἐκάλυψεν αὐτούς (830,1) and the latter has πόντῳ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτούς.

281 The words ὡσπερ (828,22) and κατὰ τὰ αὐτά (830,1) indicate that this is an analogy, whose common feature is the point that God made a godless tyrant perish.

282 εἶθ' ὡς μὴ τοῦ τυράννου χάριν Ῥωμαίοις πολεμεῖν ἀναγκάζοιτο, θεὸς αὐτὸς δεσμοῖς τισιν ὡσπερ τὸν τυράννον πορρωτάτῳ πυλῶν ἐξέλεκει (828,16-18).

Eusebius was trying to explain why the battle took place outside Rome, in spite of Maxentius's fear of moving outside the city walls. But we know nothing about the means which God used to force Maxentius away from Rome. The interesting point in Eusebius's account, however, is that God appears as the protector of the Roman people. Since this concept is quite foreign to the basic interpretation in the Church History of God as the protector of the Church, we are justified in suspecting that Eusebius here used material which he had found in a revised form.

Eusebius did not report on the beginning of the battle between Constantine and Maxentius's forces, nor on its development; he only gave the one fact that the latter fled. The flight is described thus: *ἡ δὲ δούξ [sc. Maxentius] τῆ ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ Κωνσταντίνου δυνάμει* (830,3-4). This is an extraordinary expression. While *δύναμις* in the quotation just given from *Ex.* 15,4 means "military forces", it here refers to the divine power. At no other point in this account did Eusebius suggest that God had sent His power to dwell with Constantine, so we may well ask whether these peculiarities occurred because he had revised a text which originally simply read *ἡ δὲ δούξ τῆ Κωνσταντίνου δυνάμει*, *i.e.* Maxentius fled from Constantine's army. Eusebius inserted *ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ* in order to emphasize his view that God was supporting Constantine to ensure his victory. Eusebius perhaps also derived inspiration for this addition from the original text in the continuation of the verses just quoted from the "Song of Israel": *ἡ δεξιὰ σου, κύριε, δεδόξασται ἐν ἰσχύϊ· ἡ δεξιὰ σου χεῖρ, κύριε, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθρούς* (*Ex.* 15,6).

Eusebius described the pontoon bridge which Maxentius had built over the Tiber, as a *μηχανὴ ὀλέθρου* (830,5). He gave no further details, but he did say that the bridge proved Maxentius's own undoing, so that *Ps.* 7,16-17 could be applied to him: arrangements which he had made in his wickedness to ruin others, struck him instead.²⁸³

Eusebius went on to say in *cap.* 9,7 (830,9-13) that the pontoon bridge had been destroyed and could not therefore take the fleeing Maxentius and his soldiers,²⁸⁴ so that in accordance with the scriptures in *Ex.* 15,10,²⁸⁵ they sank into the deep river and were drowned. In fact, he was repeating his own comments in *cap.* 9,5a (828,28-830,3). The only difference is that the later passage offers a more detailed explanation for the events. It is characteristic that, apart from the scripture reference *ἡ τὰ θεῖα κτλ.* (830,12-13), the passage includes an account which provides a natural explanation for the destruction of Maxentius and his soldiers. *ὀπηνίκα κτλ.* (830,3-6) constitutes another factual account, if we disregard *ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ*. In other words, these two accounts – when stripped of their Christ-

ian elements, that is – together make up a report which plainly states that Maxentius perished with his army because he himself fell into the trap he had laid to defeat Constantine. So, there was a natural explanation for his death.

Constantine received God's help, in Eusebius's opinion, when he defeated Maxentius, and the outcome of the battle was therefore completely analogous to the Israelite victory over the tyrant Pharaoh. For this reason, the "Song of Israel" in *Ex.* 15,1-21 could also be applied here.²⁸⁶ In quoting verses 1-2 and 11 Eusebius made the points that God himself had protected Constantine and helped him to victory and that Constantine recognized Him as the only true God.

Cap. 9,9-11 (830,21-832,14) describes Constantine's triumphal entry into Rome and the jubilation of the entire city.

In introducing this section, Eusebius again emphasized Constantine's spontaneous praises, as he entered Rome, to the sovereign ruler who had granted him the victory.²⁸⁷ A careful description was made of the acclaim offered with beaming faces by the Senate, the senior officials²⁸⁸ and the entire population of Rome to their saviour and deliverer. This did not go

283 Eusebius's complete quotation of *Ps.* 7,16-17 corresponds to the LXX text (ed. A. Rahlfs).

284 ταύτη δῆτα τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ζεύγματος διαλυθέντος, ὑφιζάνει μὲν ἡ διάβασις, χωρεῖ δ' ἀθρόως αὐτανδρα κατὰ τοῦ βύθου τὰ σκάφη ... (830,9-11). Eusebius's account does not explain how and by whom the bridge of boats was broken.

285 ἢ τὰ θεῖα προαναφωνεῖ λόγια, ἔδυσαν ὡς εἰ μόλιβδος ἐν ὑδατι σφοδρῶ (830,12--13). This must be understood to mean that the prophecy in *Ex.* 15,10 is fulfilled by the destruction of Maxentius and his army. In that case, Eusebius went further than in the preceding section, which simply drew a parallel between the fates of Pharaoh and Maxentius.

286 When Eusebius wrote: ὥστε εἰκότως εἰ μὴ λόγοις, ἔργοις κτλ. (830,13-16), he wanted to say that Constantine and his soldiers had been guided by the truth which was expressed here, even though they did not use the words of the "Song of Israel". It is also worth noting that Eusebius described the Song as τὰ κατὰ τοῦ πάλαι δυσσεβοῦς τυράννου (830,16), which makes the parallel with Maxentius as ὁ δυσσεβέστατος τύραννος (cf. 826,22-23) even clearer. Strictly speaking, this juxtaposition means that, just as Pharaoh persecuted and fought Israel as God's people, Maxentius opposed God's Christian people, but Eusebius did not bring out this aspect.

287 ταῦτα καὶ ὅσα τοῦτοις ἀδελφά τε καὶ ἐμπερῆ Κωνσταντίνος τῷ πανηγυρόνι καὶ τῆς νίκης αἰτίῳ θεῶ αὐτοῖς ἔργοις ἀνυμνήσας, ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς μετ' ἐπινικίων εἰσήλυνεν ... (830,21-24).

288 τῶν ἄλλως διασημοτάτων may be a translation of *clarissimi* as well as *perfectissimi* and, in the words of G. Bardy, the phrase here means "certains fonctionnaires de l'ordre équestre: praefecti, praesides, correctores, duces, officiers supérieurs du fisc ou de la chancellerie" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 63 note 16).

to his head, however, since he knew that God had helped him. Therefore, Constantine commanded immediately that a cross²⁸⁹ should be placed in the hand of a statue of him in the *Forum Romanum*, and that an inscription should be engraved, listing his good works on behalf of the Roman people.

This account is, in fact, an exact description of an Imperial triumphal procession. The fact that the whole population acclaimed him as *λυτρωτὴν σωτηρᾶ τε καὶ εὐεργέτην* (832,1-2) proves the point. It is difficult to imagine that Eusebius himself could have written the description, since the epithets properly pertained only to the Christian God, so he must have used a report, already in existence, describing Constantine's entry into Rome. Moreover, Eusebius obviously felt uneasy with these pagan ovations. This is clear from his zeal to emphasize the suggestion that, during his entry into Rome, Constantine was governed by his faith in the Christian God and from his equally fervent assertions that this faith saved Constantine from accepting these acclamations as a personal tribute.²⁹⁰

Eusebius's phrase: *αὐτίκα τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους ὑπὸ χεῖρα ἰδίας εἰκόνας ἀνατεθῆναι προστάττει* (832,5-7) is not very clear. On the face of it, the words must be taken to mean that Constantine ordered a cross to be placed in the hand of a statue which was already in existence. This seems very odd indeed; a much more likely interpretation would describe these words as a rather imprecise way of saying that Constantine had given orders for a statue of himself to be erected with the sign of a cross in his hand.

In direct continuation of this, Eusebius said: *καὶ δὴ τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντα αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μάλιστα τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δεδημοσιευμένῳ τόπῳ στήσαντας αὐτὴν δὴ ταύτην προγραφὴν ἐντάξει ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐγκελεύεται φωνῇ* (832,7-10), and after this he gave the actual inscription in a Greek translation (832,10-14). This passage is unsatisfactory, too. From the point of view of style, it seems strange that *τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον κατέχοντα* precedes rather than follows *αὐτὸν*. The word *αὐτὸν* refers, of course, to Constantine, but in the present context, we would have expected the term to apply to the statue, which would have required a *αὐτὴν*. The information that the statue of Constantine had been erected in the *Forum Romanum* would have seemed more natural in the preceding section. The same is true of the note that the cross was placed in its right hand. Conversely, we are told nothing of the identity of the *στήσαντες*²⁹¹ nor of the placing of the inscription.

For Eusebius, τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους and τὸ σωτηριώδες σημεῖον were identical.²⁹² But the validity of this view is questionable. The command to place a cross on the statue of Constantine must indicate a confession of belief in Christ. But the fact that the inscription itself praised Constantine as the one who had delivered Rome from the yoke of the tyrant and restored freedom and glory to *senatus populusque Romanus* makes it difficult to accept the idea that the inscription could be related to a confession of belief in Christ. This raises the question of whether τὸ σωτηριώδες σημεῖον is a precise translation of the Latin original. We shall return to this point later in a discussion of the relationship between Eusebius's version and Rufinus's Latin text.

It is striking that Eusebius mentioned two commands pertaining to the cross and to the inscription, where, as a matter of course, it must have been one and the same directive. Moreover, the fact that αὐτίκα κτλ. (832,5-7) and καὶ δὴ κτλ. (832,7-10) are quite disparate statements seems to suggest that they did not originally belong in the same context. Since the second statement contains information which, as mentioned above, would have occurred naturally in the first statement of a continuous ongoing account, we can conclude that the second statement must be the older of the two. What is more, the first statement evidently belongs with ὁ δ' ὥσπερ κτλ. (832,3-5), since it implies that, by depicting a cross on his statue, Constantine wanted to honour God, not himself, for delivering Rome. The whole of 832,2-7 must therefore be regarded as a later insertion. The same applies in all probability to καὶ δὴ τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντα (832,7), but we shall return to this point. If we leave out the insertions, αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μάλιστα κτλ. (823,8-14) becomes the direct continuation of, at any rate, ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κτλ. (830,23-832,3). We

289 τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους (832,6).

290 ὁ δ' ὥσπερ ἔμφυτον τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐσέβειαν κεκτημένος, μηδ' ὄλως ἐπὶ ταῖς βοαῖς ὑποσαλεύόμενος μηδ' ἐπαιρόμενος τοῖς ἐπαίνοις, εὖ μάλα τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ συνησθημένου βοηθείας (832,3-5). Constantine's inborn piety towards God implies, strictly speaking, that no actual "conversion" took place in connection with the Italian campaign, far less in connection with the decisive battle against Maxentius by the River Tiber.

291 G. Bardy's translation "et tandis que les *artisans* la [statue] dressent, tenant dans sa main droite le signe sauveur ..." (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, pp. 63-64), is a free paraphrase which simply obscures the problems in the text. The same is true of H. Valois' version: *Cumque Romani in celeberrimo urbis loco statuam ei dedicassent, quae dextra manu salutare crucis signum gestabat ...* (PG XX, 2, p. 823 B).

292 Thus Eusebius considered τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους (832,6) as identical with τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον (832,7), which in turn was regarded as a synonym for τὸ σωτηριώδες σημεῖον (832,10) of the inscription.

then have an account which states that Constantine responded to the acclaim of the Roman people by ordering the erection of an inscription to commemorate him as the saviour and liberator of Rome. The continuity was interrupted, however, when Eusebius inserted ὁ δ' ὡσπερ κτλ. (832,3-7) in order to Christianize a pagan account. This interpretation of the origins of *cap.* 9,9-11 is further confirmed by the explanations which it provides for the peculiarities in the text. Since the original text included the information necessary for understanding the section on the Constantine statue in 832,8-10, Eusebius assumed that this was known when he added 832,3-7, the result being that, in the present context, the addition appeared rather cryptic. In the original account, there was not the slightest doubt that στήσαντες indicated *senatus populusque Romanus*, but the insertion obscured this connection. And the awkward construction of τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντα (832,7) also becomes intelligible on the basis of this reconstruction. It was the result of Eusebius's efforts to incorporate the new text into the original account. This simply comprised αὐτὸν κτλ., which referred to Constantine. When Eusebius inserted τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντα before this, in order to show that Constantine had the cross in his right hand, a clumsy grammatical construction arose; it was also imprecise in content since, in the new context, αὐτὸν referred to the statue itself.

This analysis of *cap.* 9,2-9 proves that Eusebius's report, as it stands, contains material dominated by diverse points of view. We can extract sections which make up an account of Constantine as the deliverer of Rome from the tyrannical rule of Maxentius. They include πρότερός γε κτλ. (828,3-16) with the exception of θεὸν τὸν οὐράνιον κτλ. (l. 5-7) and τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ συμμαχίας ἀνημμένος (l. 13-14); νῶτα δοὺς κτλ. (830,3-6) with the exception of ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ (l. 3) and ταύτη δῆτα κτλ. (830,9-11); ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κτλ. (830,23-832,3) and αὐτὸν κτλ. (832,8-14). It is a characteristic of this description that it is a factual account with a political bias, which was to provide more details of Constantine's victory over Maxentius. Its obvious pagan features make it unlikely that Eusebius composed it himself.

Eusebius must have used a description already in existence. But he has abbreviated or even omitted a number of points necessary for understanding the course of events. For example, the remark ἐπιὼν πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη τοῦ τυράννου παρατάξει (828,14-15) cut down to the point of incomprehensibility a much more detailed original account of the great, important battles at Turin, Brescia and Verona in North Ita-

ly.²⁹³ The reference to Maxentius's *superstitio* and his desire not to leave Rome is, like the remark ὡς μὴ τοῦ τυράννου κτλ. (828,17), so laconic that it only becomes intelligible when read on the basis of a detailed description, like the one in Lactantius's *De mortibus persecutorum*.²⁹⁴ We learn absolutely nothing about the battle between Constantine and Maxentius, and therefore the information on the latter's flight appears completely groundless. Here again, Eusebius must have extrapolated information from his source, while omitting the background necessary for it to be understood. Exactly the same process was repeated when he wrote of Maxentius μηχανὴν ὀλέθρου καθ' ἑαυτοῦ συνεστήσατο (830,5-6). This remark must be compared with similar passages in other sources²⁹⁵ to discover the point that the making of a pontoon bridge was part of Maxentius's carefully designed strategy. He had the permanent bridge – *pons Mulvius* – on the Via Flaminia disconnected and, instead, constructed a pontoon bridge which could be made impassable at any time, because he had decided to engage in direct combat with Constantine before he had a chance to cross the Tiber. If Maxentius failed to defeat Constantine's army, he himself could retreat across the river with his forces and by loosening the chains which held the boats together, he could prevent Constantine from pursuing him. Eusebius must have known of this strategy, because his quotation from *Ps.* 7,16-17: τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ζεύγματος διαλυθέντος (830,9-10), was also quite clearly taken from a wider context, which described in detail the reasons why Maxentius's retreat ended in catastrophe. These observations justify our conclusion that the account which Eusebius used was much more comprehensive in its depiction of Constantine's victory over Maxentius than his own fragmentary report would seem to indicate on a first reading. There is little hope of identifying this source.

293 Such a detailed description of Constantine's conquest of North Italy was given by the pagan rhetor in the *panegyricus* he held for Constantine in Trier in the summer of 313, see *Panegy.* IX, 3 (ed. Galletier). This does not mean, of course, that Eusebius was dependent on this *panegyricus*.

294 Likewise, this statement does not imply that Eusebius based his work on Lactantius's writings.

295 We may mention the *Vita Constantini* I, 38, Zosimos II, 15-16, and the relief on the Arch of Constantine which has Constantine's victory over Maxentius and his entry into Rome as its theme. In one of the scenes which depicts the drowning of Maxentius and his forces, the ruined *pons Mulvius* can be seen beside the bridge of boats, cf. H. P. L'Orange and A. v. Gerken: *Der spätantike Bildschmuck des Konstantinbogens* (Studien zur spätantiken Kunstgeschichte, 10), 1939, pp. 70-71.

The material which Eusebius took from this politically inspired account of pagan origin was expanded by him with a number of statements about Maxentius. They are clearly Christian and include θεὸν τὸν οὐράνιον κτλ. (828,5-7), τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ συμμαχίας ἀνημμένος (828,13-14), εἶθ' ὡς κτλ. (828,16-830,3), ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ (830,3), ἐφ' ᾧ ἦν κτλ. (830,6-9), ὥστε εἰκότως κτλ. (830,13-23) and ὃ δ' ὥσπερ κτλ. (832,3-7).

Eusebius felt that he was completely justified in using these additions to emphasize the Christian implications in the original, purely political description of Constantine's victory over Maxentius. He believed that the existence of the Roman Empire and its entire welfare depended on the Emperor's attitude to the Christian God, and Constantine's miraculous liberation of Rome from the tyrant's yoke was striking evidence of the truth of this belief. The fact that Maxentius's death strikingly resembled the annihilation of Pharaoh and his forces in the Red Sea was for him further proof that the Christian God had intervened on this occasion too.

Eusebius quite clearly made an effort to create a continuous account of a definite Christian nature. For example, instead of referring to the Sybilline oracles, he simply wrote θεὸς αὐτὸς δεσμοῖς τισιν ὥσπερ τὸν τύραννον πορρωτάτω πυλῶν ἐξέλκει (828,17-18). And when he wrote in a lapidary style: τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ζεύγματος διαλυθέντος (830,9-10), without indicating that someone must apparently have played a foul trick on Maxentius, the reason probably was that he wanted to exclude anything which could inspire the incorrect assumption that Maxentius's fall was brought about by human beings. But he was not entirely successful; the material he took from his pagan source still bore the stamp of its origins and could not therefore be integrated without contradictions into his own, Christian, concept. The account in *cap.* 9,2-9 therefore lacks continuity.

Before we continue to study the rest of Eusebius's account, Rufinus's version of this section, which forms a separate entity at least thematically, should be analyzed closely – for its own sake and also to provide a perspective for Eusebius's account.

Rufinus only knew *cap.* 9,1 in the BDM version and must have felt that the entire account would benefit greatly from the omission of the entire section. Apart from the fact that the fall of Maxentius and Maximin was discussed again later in more detail, the section contained features which Rufinus disliked. Eusebius contradicted himself, for example, when he wrote first that God had raised Constantine to battle against the two

tyrants and then went on to say that Licinius was responsible for Maximin's death.²⁹⁶ Rufinus found the following statement from Eusebius problematic: πολέμου τε νόμῳ παραταξαμένου, θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτῷ παραδοξότατα (826,23-24) since, in his opinion, God did not provoke nor engage in bloody warfare. Moreover, he believed that the divine miracle was of a nature quite different from the one which Eusebius depicted in his account.

Eusebius's description in *cap.* 9,2 (828,3-8) was far too brief to satisfy Rufinus. He wanted detailed reasons why Constantine applied to God for help and an account of the way in which He granted his request. But Rufinus must have known the *Vita Constantini*, or at any rate a similar source, which provided him with the clear, intelligible account that he wanted. It was therefore natural for him to use material from this to create the following account to meet his readers' needs for clarity and intelligibility: *Etenim cum religiosissimus imperator Constantinus,*²⁹⁷ *Constantii adaeque moderatissimi et egregii principis filius,*²⁹⁸ ... *inviatur* (827,26-829,8).

Rufinus's account served at least one purpose: to explain by what right Constantine had appealed to God and had used the sign of the cross which was otherwise reserved for those who had been baptized. His answer was that Constantine had already been converted to Christianity and that now he was told, in a revelation, to mark himself with the cross. For further justification, he referred to Paul who had also been converted by a revelation.

As a result of this divine revelation, Rufinus went on, Constantine fixed crosses to the military banners and gave the Imperial standard the

296 A similar contradiction arose when, in his final version of the Church History, Eusebius deleted Λικιννίου τε τοῦ μετ' αὐτόν, συνέσει καὶ εὐσεβεῖα τετιμημένων (826,22-23 ATER) and δύο θεοφιλῶν (826,23 ATER) and changed ἀνεγηγερομένων (826,24 ATER) and παραταξαμένων (826,24 ATER) to ἀνεγηγερομένου and παραταξαμένου, but retained κατὰ τῶν δυσσεβεστάτων τυράννων.

297 Since Rufinus's text did not contain the words Λικιννίου τε τοῦ μετ' αὐτόν (826,22 ATER), it is understandable that he omitted ὁ καὶ τιμῇ καὶ τάξει τῆς βασιλείας πρῶτος (828,3-4). Nor did he find πρότερός ... τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατατυραννουμένων φειδῶ λαβόν (828,3-5) useful, since there was no mention later of others who pitied the enslaved Romans. He probably objected to the expression on principle, since it attributed to Constantine a prerogative which was God's alone.

298 These introductory words are based on *cap.* 9,1a: οὕτω δῆτα κτλ. (826,20-21), but Rufinus wanted to redress the balance in the descriptions: Constantius's piety was much more strongly emphasized than his son's. Rufinus believed that this should be reversed.

shape of a cross, so that it was evident that a Christian army had taken up arms against the unbelievers: *exin signum, quod in caelo sibi fuerat demonstratum, in militaria vexilla transformat ac labarum, quem dicunt, in speciem crucis dominicae exaptat*²⁹⁹ *et ita armis vexillisque religionis instructus adversum impiorum arma proficiscitur*³⁰⁰ (829,8-11). Rufinus also added this information: *sed et in dextera sua manu signum nihilominus crucis ex auro fabrefactum habuisse perhibetur. verum non puto absque re videri, si paululum excedentes etiam quid propositi religiosus dux in hoc bello gesserit, proferamus* (829,11-14). In other words, Rufinus was making it clear here that this was a rumour which seemed likely but for which he himself could not vouch without further proof.³⁰¹

Cap. 9,3 (828,8-16) was almost completely omitted by Rufinus in his version. He probably found that the report on Maxentius's superstition and his tyrannical rule (828,8-13) repeated the points given in VIII, 14,1-6. We learn here for the first time that all Italy was in his power and that he worked his reign of terror through his soldiers, but that did not change matters for Rufinus. In addition, to avoid repetition, Rufinus clearly took great care to organize the account around the central theme as he saw it: God granted Constantine victory over Maxentius at Rome. Since the very lapidary passage in 828,13-16, describing Constantine's conquest of North Italy and his march on Rome, contributed nothing to this theme, it could also be omitted without any ill effects.

However, Rufinus described another consideration which worried Constantine. He wished, as a Christian emperor, to win everyone over by his piety, but at the same time, in his capacity as *imperator Romanus* and *pater patriae*, he was obliged to liberate Rome from Maxentius's tyrannical control. Consequently, he wanted to avoid defiling his right hand, which was marked with the sign of the cross, with Roman blood – and he asked God for help. In Rufinus's words: *igitur ubi divinae virtutis auxilio – cruore Romani sanguinis maculetur* (829,14-24). This independent account is particularly interesting because Rufinus here described the dilemma with which, in his opinion, a Christian emperor would be confronted when he had to fulfil his obligations as a Roman Emperor, including the duty to wage war if necessary, and at the same time observe the Christian confession which forbade bloodshed.

Constantine's prayer did not remain unanswered: *haec ei die noctuque poscenti praestitit divina providentia* (829,24). The rest of the account proceeds to show in detail the way in which God granted Constantine's request.

Rufinus did not feel that he could use Eusebius's description in *cap.* 9,4-8 (828,16-830,21) in its entirety. Properly understood, ὡς μὴ τοῦ τυράννου κτλ. (828,17-18) contained an important point but it required elaboration. Conversely, he decided to omit καὶ τὰ πάλαι κτλ. (828,19-22) completely. He probably refused to accept that Maxentius's death fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies and he saw no reason for regard-

299 Rufinus's text is not very clear at this point. Strictly speaking, *signum [crucis] -- in vexilla transformat* means that Constantine used the cross itself as his military banner. But he then said that the *labarum* was shaped like a cross, so *transformat* perhaps has a rather weaker meaning that he placed the sign of the cross on the *vexilla*. When mentioning the *labarum*, Rufinus added *quem dicunt*, which suggests some doubt about the accuracy of this information. Perhaps he felt that it took so long to make a cruciform *labarum*, that this, according to the account, simply could not be done in the time available.

300 These words appear instead of πρόεισιν πανστρατιᾶ, Ῥωμαίοις τὰ τῆς ἐκ προγόνων ἐλευθερίας προμνόμενος (828,7-8). Rufinus obviously wanted to emphasize the purely religious aspect of the confrontation between Constantine and Maxentius.

301 Rufinus's account in 827,26-829,14 bears many striking similarities to the description which Eusebius gave in *Vita Constantini*, I, 28-32. Both state that Constantine was anxious and uncertain about the result of the planned campaign against Maxentius. But at this point, Eusebius left Constantine in ignorance of the nature of the Christian God and of his relationship to him – Rufinus did not. Both agree that Constantine saw the sign of the cross in the sky. According to Eusebius, this vision, which was also seen by the army, appeared just after midday and included, apart from the cross itself, an inscription with the words τούτῳ νίκα. In Rufinus, only Constantine saw the sign of the cross and it appeared in the East – *ad orientis partem*, i.e. early in the morning, and only after that did he find with him angels who proclaimed τούτῳ νίκα. In Eusebius's account, *cap.* 29, Constantine could not discover the meaning of this sign, but the next night, Christ appeared before him and commanded him to make a replica of the cross and to fight his enemies using this for protection; then Constantine manufactured the *labarum* with the monogram of Christ. Rufinus mentions no vision and no corresponding command. Instead, he said that, having seen the angels, who proclaimed that he would win by the cross, Constantine changed his *vexilla* to banners of the cross and made a cruciform *labarum* and, for himself, a gold cross which he would hold in his right hand. Finally, we should note that, in *cap.* 32, Eusebius also described a vision of Christ, which Constantine was said to have had the night before the battle at the Milvian bridge. Rufinus mentioned only the one vision, however, strictly speaking a vision of angels only, which appeared before the beginning of the campaign itself.

On the strength of the considerable similarities between Rufinus and the *Vita Constantini*, it would be natural to assume that Rufinus took his material from this text, and incorporated it into an independent account. But the differences are also considerable, and they cannot be fully explained by the fact that Rufinus had been extremely selective in his choice of material from Eusebius – material, indeed, which he often subjected to drastic revisions. Conjecture remains the only approach available to us on this point, and the most probable answer seems to be that Rufinus relied on a tradition here, which despite all the similarities, is independent of Eusebius's account in *Vita Constantini*.

ing it as a miracle which made everyone believe in the truth of these prophecies. But apart from this, he probably felt that the passage was meaningless until his readers had learnt the exact nature of τὰ παράδοξα (828,22). At any rate, he clearly desired to create a logical, ongoing account by giving his translation of ὡσπερ γοῦν κτλ. (828,22-830,1) after his account of Maxentius's death.

Rufinus quite clearly wanted a more detailed connection between the remark that God had lured Maxentius far outside the walls of Rome, and the note on Maxentius's construction of the pontoon bridge as a death trap and on his own death. He provided the details in a new report which was, however, markedly different from his source. He never mentioned a battle between Constantine and Maxentius, since God Himself intervened to bring about the latter's death and thus made it possible for Constantine to liberate Rome without shedding blood. Rufinus probably felt himself all the more justified in presenting this interpretation since it was the only possible explanation for the inclusion of the reference to *Ex.* 15,4-5 which identifies God as the direct cause of the tyrant's death. Rufinus's interpretation meant that he could not translate δπηνίκα νῶτα δοῦς τῇ ἐκ θεοῦ μετὰ Κωνσταντίνου δυνάμει, τὸν πρὸ τῆς πορείας διήει ποταμόν (830,3-4), because the phrase presumed a direct military confrontation between Constantine and Maxentius. Instead, Rufinus wrote *et cum iam non procul a ponte Mulvio castra posuisset*³⁰² ... *vi divina correptus Maxentius*³⁰³ ... *cum paucis ingressus est pontem*³⁰⁴ ... *interitu*³⁰⁵ *atque inpollutam religiosi principis dexteram a civili cruore servavit* (829,24-33).

This description of Maxentius's death must be given before the Scriptural passages which Eusebius had reproduced in *cap.* 9,5-6 in order to account for their inclusion. Even so, he felt that he had to recast his source at this point, too; he wrote: *tum vero nihilominus in hoc quam in Moyseo atque Hebraeorum populo gestum videres, ut digne etiam super his dici deberet: currus Farao et virtutem eius proiecit in mare. electos ascensores ternos statores demersit in rubrum mare, ponto adoperuit eos.*³⁰⁶ *ita namque Maxentius atque hi qui cum ipso erant armati satellites demersi sunt in profundum pontibusque his devolutus est, quos ad religiosi principis aptarat exitium,*³⁰⁷ *sed et illud super eo competenter dicitur: lacum aperuit et refodit eum et incidit in foveam, quam operatus est. convertetur dolor eius in caput eius et in verticem eius iniquitas eius descendit* (829,33-831,8).

Rufinus interpreted *Ps.* 7,16-17 as a statement which applied to all the

godless. He did not, however, apply the “Song of Israel” to the pious, only to Moses and Constantine. This represented a divergence from his source, which simply mentioned the Israelites (τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὸν μέγαν θεράποντα Μωυσέα, 830,14-15), and Constantine’s armed forces (τοὺς παρὰ θεοῦ τὴν νίκην ἀραμένους, 830,15); the reason probably was that in the very next passage, *cap.* 9,9a (830,21-23), Eusebius claimed that Constantine alone was filled with the words of the “Song of Israel”.³⁰⁸ His version therefore reads: *haec impiis competenter aptantur, Constantino vero tamquam famulo dei digne illa iungentur, quae Moyses post victoriam prostratis cecinit inimicis, dicens: cantemus domino, gloriose enim honorificatus est, equum et ascensorem proiecit in mare. adiutor et protector meus est et factus est mihi in salutem. quis similis tibi in diis, domine? quis similis tibi, gloriosus in sanctis, mirabilis in claritate, faciens prodigia?* (831,8-15).

Rufinus broke up *cap.* 9,9 (830,21-832,3) into two independent sentences, which translated – albeit with alterations – 830,21-24 and 830,24-832,3 respectively. The first sentence reads *haec etiam, si non verbis, rebus tamen gestisque*³⁰⁹ *Constantinus ipsi, a quo victoriam meruerat, ex-*

302 Since Rufinus had omitted to translate Eusebius’s mention in 828,15-16 (πρόκειον κτλ.) of the fact that Constantine had advanced close to Rome, he had to give the information at this point, and unlike Eusebius, he made it clear that the events took place at the *pons Mulvius*.

303 We are not told how this happened, probably because it was a divine miracle, which, in the nature of the case, eludes any form of explanation.

304 Maxentius advanced onto the bridge from the Roman side, but Eusebius said that he came fleeing from the North.

305 It was obviously important for Rufinus to emphasize the point that, by this divine miracle, only Maxentius and a few who followed him on to the bridge were killed.

306 Where Eusebius had πόντος ἐκάλυψεν αὐτούς (830,1), Rufinus had *ponto adoperuit eos*, which makes it even clearer that God himself had brought about their destruction. It is impossible to decide if Rufinus followed LXX or *Itala*.

It should be noted in general that this scriptural text gave the essential point for Rufinus and therefore, he found it superfluous to translate the allusion to *Ex.* 15,5: ἔδυσαν εἰς βυθὸν ὡς εἰ λίθος (830,2-3), and the reference to *Ex.* 15,10 as a prophecy of Maxentius’s death: ἦ τὰ θεῖα προαναφώνει λόγια, ἔδυσαν ὡς εἰ μόλιβδος ἐν ὕδατι σφοδρῶ (830,12-13). Rufinus probably thought that both passages actually repeated previous statements.

307 This was Rufinus’s detailed explanation of the points implied by μηχανὴν ὀλέθηθου (830,5). On the other hand, he saw no need to translate καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ συνεστήσατο (830,5-6) – that was obvious from the quotation from *Ps.* 7,16-17.

308 He must have found additional justification for this in LXX and *Itala* which actually name Moses along with Israel.

309 Rufinus omitted εἰ μὴ λόγοις, ἔργοις δ’ οὖν (830,14) in his translation of *cap.* 9,8:

*celso*³¹⁰ *concinens deo urbem Roman triumphaturus*³¹¹ *ingreditur* (831,15-18). The second sentence is *tum vero laeti omnes cum coniugibus ac liberis, senatus populusque Romanus ingenti peste liberati et iugo tyrannicae immanitatis exempti Constantinum velut salutis auctorem ac restitutorem libertatis excipiunt* (831,18-833,2). On several points, this passage is more terse than the account in the source.³¹² The most noteworthy feature, however, is Rufinus's translation of οἷα λυτρωτὴν σωτηρὰ τε καὶ εὐεργέτην μετ' εὐφημιῶν καὶ ἀπλήστου χαρᾶς ὑποδεχομένων (832,1-3). He obviously took exception to the fact that the pious Constantine who praised God and attributed the victory over Maxentius to Him, had accepted acclamation which belonged to God alone. To neutralize this apparent blasphemy, he inserted, in contrast to Eusebius, *ingenti peste liberati et iugo tyrannicae immanitatis exempti* (831,19-833,1), which described the frame of reference within which the ovation should be understood. On the basis of this assumption, he accepted the expression *auctor salutis*, since it clearly referred to political salvation. His translation of εὐεργέτης, *restitutor libertatis*, must then have seemed all the more well-founded in the light of the published inscription. He omitted the word λυτρωτής, however, probably because he considered it to be an exclusive Christian concept.

In his version of *cap.* 9,10 (832,3-10), Rufinus did not translate ὁ δ' ὥσπερ ἔμφυτον τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐσέβειαν κεκτημένος (832,3-4). Perhaps he felt that it did not explain with sufficient clarity, the fact that Constantine's *familiaritas* (cf. 829,22) was of quite recent date. He must also have found it awkward that Eusebius spoke of two commands issued by Constantine, one about a cross (832,5-6) and the other about an inscription (832,9-10), when in fact they must have been one and the same event. He also clearly understood τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους ὑπὸ χεῖρα ἰδίας εἰκόνας ἀνατεθῆναι (832,6) to mean that the sign of the cross should be put on an εἰκὼν which was already in existence. Since this was impossible, if the word referred to a statue, then it must mean a picture. Rufinus was perhaps guided here by the purely pragmatic consideration that, unlike statues, pictures could be quickly produced – here as on so many other occasions, he took the time span into consideration. At any rate, there must have been several honorary images, not just one. This explains why

instead, he used them here as the introductory words, which replace ταῦτα καὶ ὄσα τούτοις ἀδελφά τε καὶ ἔμφροη (830,21-22). He probably regarded the phrase as a repetition, and also as being far too imprecise.

the reference in 832,8-9 to the fact that a picture was placed in the *Forum Romanum* was superfluous, not to say misleading. These critical reservations made Rufinus translate his source thus: *ille tamen nec in laudes adclamantis populi nec in plausum tantae urbis ac talis animos relaxabat*,³¹³ *neque suae virtuti rem gestam, sed divino muneri deputabat*.³¹⁴ *statim denique, ubi imagines sibi ob honorem triumphanti senatus erexit*,³¹⁵ *vexillum dominicae*³¹⁶ *crucis in dextera sua iubet depingi et subter adscribi ...*³¹⁷ (833,2-6).

Rufinus followed his source in *cap.* 9,11 (832,10-14) to the extent that he also reproduced the wording of the inscription: *in hoc singulari signo, quod est verae virtutis insigne, urbem Romam senatumque et populum Romanum iugo tyrannicae dominationis ereptam pristinae libertati nobilitatique restitui* (833,6-9). If we compare this Latin text with Eusebius's Greek version, a number of differences become obvious. Where Rufinus spoke of *in hoc singulari signo* (833,6), we find in Eusebius the expression τούτω τῷ σωτηριώδει σημείῳ (832,10), which has a decidedly Christian note compared to Rufinus's, in itself ambivalent, expression. Where Rufinus has *quod est verae virtutis insigne* (833,7), Eusebius has τῷ ἀληθεῖ ἐλέγχῳ τῆς ἀνδρείας (832,10-11), which seems to indicate a specific interpretation. The rest of the inscription – *urbem Romam etc.* (833,7-9) –

310 This word translates τῷ πανηγυρόνι (830,22).

311 An excellent paraphrase of μετ' ἐπινικίων (830,23).

312 Rufinus thus omitted καὶ τῶν ἄλλως διασημοτάτων (830,25) as completely superfluous words. Eusebius mentioned both φαειροῖς ὄμμασιν αὐταῖς ψυχαῖς (832,1) and μετ' ἀπλήστου χαρᾶς (832,2), but Rufinus felt it sufficient to write, simply, *laeti*. ἀθρόως seemed quite unmotivated, so he did not translate it, and he changed the order of ἅμα κομιδῇ νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξίν in the source, to *cum coniugibus ac liberis*.

313 Rufinus went further than Eusebius in stating that the self-esteem was boosted, particularly because this tribute came from Rome, *Romani imperii caput* (829,19).

314 Rufinus uses *neque suae virtuti etc.* instead of εὖ μάλα τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ συνησθημένου βοηθείας (832,5). The reason, surely, was that no battle ever took place between Constantine and Maxentius, as presupposed in Eusebius's phrase. He also emphasized the point that Rome was not liberated on the strength of Constantine's *virtus*, probably because he wanted to forestall any incorrect interpretation of the wording of the ensuing inscription: it did not imply a glorification of Constantine.

315 His source mentioned, quite generally, στήσαντας (832,8-9), but Rufinus was in no doubt that the Senate had set up these *imagines in honorem Constantini*.

316 Translates τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους (832,6).

317 Unlike Eusebius, Rufinus gave the exact location for the inscription. The information that it was written τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ (832,9-10) was of course omitted; it was superfluous, when the inscription was quoted in Latin.

appears in a different form in the Greek text: τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ ζυγοῦ τοῦ τυράννου διασωθεῖσαν ἠλευθέρωσα, ἔτι μὴν καὶ τὴν σύγκλητον καὶ τὸν δῆμον Ῥωμαίων τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἐπιφανείᾳ καὶ λαμπρότητι ἔλευθέρωσας ἀποκατέστησα (832,11-14). Even though this version seems clearer than the Latin equivalent, it does contain repetitions and a rather imprecise distinction between *urbs Roma* and *senatus populusque Romanus*. This fact in particular seems to suggest that Rufinus disregarded the Greek version of his source completely and gave instead the original Latin text, which he knew from the city of Rome. In relation to this, Eusebius's text must be regarded as a paraphrase. It also received a Christian slant which is shown in the fact that *in singulari signo* was translated by τῷ σωτηριῳδῶδε σημεῖῳ making it synonymous with the cross itself. We cannot, however, decide whether or not Eusebius himself was responsible for the Greek text.

In *cap.* 9,12 (832,14-21 ATER),³¹⁸ Eusebius wrote that Constantine and Licinius in mutual agreement, published a complete law in favour of the Christians and sent it to Maximin with an account of the miracles wrought by God for them.

The date ἐπὶ τούτοις (832,14) must indicate that the report concerns events which took place after Constantine's liberation of Rome, as described in *cap.* 9,2-11. From the context, it would also appear that the liberation occurred immediately after his victory over Maxentius. In complete agreement,³¹⁹ Constantine and Licinius issued νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατον πληρέστατα (832,17-18). This description is the only piece of information on the contents of the law. But we are told that they issued the law on full religious freedom for the Christians in gratitude to God who had bestowed such good fortune upon them³²⁰ – and, in the light of *cap.* 9,1, this must mean the victory over both Maxentius and Maximin.

That seems quite clear, but the following passage presents problems: καὶ τῶν πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ παραδόξα τά τε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ τυράννου νίκης καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτὸν Μαξιμίνῳ, τῶν ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς ἔθνων ἔτι δυναστεύοντι φιλιαν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὑποκοριζομένῳ, διαπέμπονται (832,18-21). Eusebius seems to be saying that Constantine and Licinius sent out a report on the miracles God had performed for them, along with the law on complete religious freedom. Here again, the words τῶν πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ παράδοξα (832,18-19) must refer to both Constantine and Licinius. This is further confirmed by the

fact that τὰ παράδοξα resumes the account from *cap.* 9,1 ATER, in which it was stated that they defeated the two godless tyrants because God aided them in the battle *παραδοξότατα* (826,24). But in that case, we would have expected Eusebius to have described Licinius's victory over Maximin as well as Constantine's victory over Maxentius.

Eusebius limited himself here, however, to the simple specific statement: τὰ κατὰ τοῦ τυράννου νίκης (832,19). This must refer to the same fact as τὰ παράδοξα, and as Eusebius had not mentioned Licinius's victory over Maximin, the expression must be understood as a further explanation of God's miraculous actions.³²¹ In other words, the passage refers to Constantine alone, not to Licinius. This also explains the rather surprising fact that Maximin pretended to be a friend of Constantine and Licinius. It simply means that the three Emperors recognized each other as legitimate rulers, each having his own area of authority, and Maximin controlled the Eastern provinces. But then the section contradicts *cap.* 9,1 which drew a line between the two God loving Emperors, Constantine and Licinius, on the one side, and Maxentius and Maximin as the godless tyrants on the other.

The essence of the section – when seen in isolation – is the point that Constantine sent the report on his defeat, with God's help, of Maxentius and the law on complete religious freedom for the Christians, to Maxi-

318 ATER has βασιλεὺς Λικίννιος 832,15, but in his final version of the Church History Eusebius deleted βασιλεὺς, as shown by BDMΣΛ. On the other hand, he inserted οὐπω τότε ἐφ' ὕστερον ἦν ἐκπέτωκεν μανίαν τὴν διάνοιαν ἐκτραπεῖς (832,15-16).

319 ἄμφο μᾶ βουλῆ καὶ γνώμῃ (832,17). This *concordia* between the Emperors is not contradicted by the expression αὐτὸς τε Κωνσταντῖνος καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ βασιλεὺς Λικίννιος (832,14-15), since this refers to the hierarchy which existed between them, and which was also given in 826,22.

320 θεὸν τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπάντων αὐτοῖς αἴτιον εὐμενίσαντες (832,16-17). The differences between the existing translations prove the point that this passage is rather complicated. Henri Valois gave this translation: ... *Deum omnium quæ sibi everant bonorum auctorum venerantes placantesque* (PG XX, 2, p.823C). But Lawlor-Oulton rendered it: "... having propitiated God as the Author of all their good fortune" (*Eusebius* I, p. 290) and G. Bardy gave this translation: "... se conciliaient la faveur de Dieu, l'auteur de tous les biens pour eux" (*Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 64). Apart from the fact that "propitiate" (cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 722) covers only εὐμενίζομαι, the word, given in this sense, seems quite meaningless in the context. It does not lead up to the Emperors' reconciliation with God, it merely states that they were not hostile towards Him – and this is in fact the meaning of εὐμενίζω – because of the favours he had granted them.

321 The expression appears so clumsy in the style of this context that it must be a later insertion, serving as an explanatory gloss.

min, whom he recognized as the legitimate Emperor of the Eastern provinces. The implicit suggestion was that Maximin should publish it in his provinces. Licinius was named with Constantine because the law was also issued in his name, so that he was then included in considerations which pertained to Constantine alone. From this we may further conclude that Eusebius knew of a law in which Licinius was named after Constantine as legislator.³²²

Cap. 9,13 (832,22-834,3) describes Maximin's reaction to Constantine and Licinius's report and to the request that the law on religious freedom be published.

Eusebius began the section with the words: ὁ δ' οἷα τύραννος περι-αλγῆς ἐφ' οἷς ἔγνω, γεγενημένος (832,22). It is surprising that, having treated Maximin in the immediately preceding passage as a legitimate Emperor, he describes him suddenly as a tyrant. But this change in attitude explains why he was greatly pained³²³ by the information in Constantine and Licinius's account.³²⁴ We would have expected his pain to have been caused by their acknowledgment of the Christian God and their demand that he should introduce complete religious freedom for the Christians, since this ran contrary to his religious policies, based on his acceptance of the official pantheon. But the ensuing account shows that his pain was caused by the fact that the letters from Constantine and Licinius had placed him in a dilemma which threatened his political independence. If he obeyed their orders to publish the law on religious freedom in his provinces, he would recognize them as his superiors and thus surrender his political independence.³²⁵ On the other hand, a refusal to obey would be tantamount to insubordination, and could result in repercussions against him.³²⁶ In other words, the question of complete religious freedom for the Christians was linked to the question of possession of the superior legislative power in the Roman Empire. Eusebius assumed that Maximin would have to subordinate himself politically to both Constantine and Licinius, but in fact he would only have to accept Constantine's superiority. This is worth noting in passing.

Maximin felt, however, that he could avoid his painful dilemma by preparing a letter, which was favourable to the Christians, in his own name to his provincial procurators.³²⁷ In that way, he thought he could maintain his political independence and still appear to follow Constantine and Licinius's orders.³²⁸

From this account, we would expect Maximin's letter to the provincial procurators to have given the Christians complete religious freedom –

particularly because Eusebius wrote specifically that this happened ἐπ' ἀνάγκης (834,1). But that is not the case in the existing text. Eusebius defined the letter (τὸ γράμμα, 834,1-2) as τοῦτο πρῶτον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν, which implies that it really was favourable to the Christians, but it was also placed in relation to another, later law which also benefitted the Christians. There is little doubt that Eusebius meant, by the first letter, Maximin's circular to Sabinus, which he reproduced in *cap.* 9a,1-9, and by the second, his edict on religious freedom, which was reproduced in *cap.* 10,7-11. Eusebius actually defined the letter as νόμον τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας [τῶν Χριστιανῶν] τελεώτατα καὶ πληρέστατα (842,1-2), which implies in a wider context that the first letter was not of such a kind. Eusebius did not draw attention to, let alone elaborate on this point, however obvious it seems to be.³²⁹

If we compare this observation with the fact that the entire account leads up to Maximin's granting the Christians the same religious freedom as Constantine and Licinius – in a law which Eusebius describes as νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατον πληρέστατα (832,17-18) – we may suspect

322 This is indeed the point of the expression Κωνσταντῖνος καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ βασιλεὺς Λικίνιος (832,14-15). It describes, no doubt, the hierarchy which existed between them and which implied that Constantine was in a superior position and exerted the actual power of legislation, even though he always listed his fellow Emperors with himself in the laws issued by him.

323 The word *περιαλγής* simply means that Maximin felt extreme mental pain.

324 Even though Eusebius only included ἐφ' οἷς ἔγνω from the preceding passage, the phrase suggests that he was familiar with the contents of Constantine's and Licinius's letters. R. Laqueur did not accept this as the real meaning: "in Wahrheit führt der Ausdruck ἐφ' οἷς ἔγνω darauf, dass der Kaiser eine Erkenntnis gewonnen, nicht irgend eine Mitteilung erhalten hatte" (*op. cit.*, p. 136). But this interpretation is quite unfounded and seems to be determined by his assumptions concerning the composition of this section.

325 See my book *Maximinus*, p. 232.

326 εἶτα μὴ δοκεῖν ἑτέροις εἶξαι βουλόμενος μὴδ' αὐτῷ παρεκθέσθαι τὸ κελευσθὲν δέει τῶν προστεταχότων (832,22-24). The implicit assumption is that Maximin was their subordinate and therefore obliged to obey them.

327 ὡς ἂν ἐξ ἰδίας ἀuthεντίας τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἡγεμοῖσιν τοῦτο πρῶτον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπάναγκες διαχαράττει τὸ γράμμα (832,24-834,2).

328 Eusebius's account criticizes Maximin for pretending to possess the right to legislate himself and be politically independent, although he was in fact subordinate to Constantine and Licinius and therefore obliged to obey them and publish their law on religious freedom in his provinces. Exactly the same criticism is implied in the definition of Maximin as οἷα τύραννος (832,22), since, like another usurper, he appropriated power which did not belong to him.

329 This happens later, however, in *cap.* 9a,11.

that the existing text has been subjected to revision. The stylistically unfortunate position of τοῦτο πρῶτον (834,1) seems to mark it as a later insertion. In that case, the original text would simply have stated that Maximin granted the Christians complete religious freedom under duress. Later, Eusebius discovered Maximin's circular to Sabinus and decided to reproduce it; this, then, required the insertion of τοῦτο πρῶτον which altered the original sense. (We shall return to the problem suggested here at a later stage.)

The concluding words in this section: τὰ μηδέπω ποτὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ πεπραγμένα ἐπιπλάστως αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ψευδόμενος (834,2-3) refer to the letter mentioned immediately before, which Maximin issued in support of the Christians. The interesting point is that it was not criticized for granting the Christians incomplete religious freedom. On the contrary, the criticism is directed at the fact that Maximin, falsely and mendaciously, took the credit for initiatives which were not his own. Perhaps Eusebius was referring to the impression which Maximin produced that he had himself granted religious freedom to the Christians, although in actual fact he had done so under duress. Another, perhaps better, possibility is to regard the criticism expressed here as being directed at Maximin's circular to Sabinus. Then Eusebius must, first and foremost, be referring to Maximin's maintaining here that he suspended the persecution of the Christians³³⁰ when he came to Nicomedia in 311 and that he had always advocated that the Christians should not be forced to worship the gods.³³¹

On the subject of Maximin's circular to Sabinus in *cap.* 9a,1-9 (834,5-838,2), it is sufficient in this context to note³³² that he forbade any use of force against the Christians to make them revert to the worship of the gods – they should be won over by persuasion, and that had been his policy all along.³³³ If they still chose to practise their own worship, they should be allowed to do so.³³⁴

Having reproduced Maximin's letters, Eusebius described, in *cap.* 9a,10-11 (838,3-11), the reaction of the Christians to Maximin's so-called pro-Christian legislation. As mentioned above, Eusebius wrote in *cap.* 9,13 that Maximin had prepared a letter (τὸ γράμμα, 834,1-2), benefitting the Christians, to the provincial procurators. We learn nothing more of this. Instead, Eusebius includes Maximin's circular (ἐπιστολή, 834,4) to Sabinus. In this, Sabinus was told to make the Imperial decision known to the provincials by a decree,³³⁵ but Eusebius provided no information as to how this was effected. He presumes, however, that Sabinus issued a

διάταγμα as Maximin had commanded him, but he does not reproduce it.³³⁶ So we are in no position to know whether Sabinus sent on the entire circular accompanied by an order to the provincial governors to make it known to everybody, or whether he simply extracted the crucial provisions and sent them in an independently written decree to the local authorities – both possibilities were administratively open to him. Even though Eusebius does not say so, we must assume from the extant text that the letter from Maximin to the provincial governors which was mentioned in *cap.* 9,13 simply means the διάταγμα prepared by Sabinus.

In *cap.* 9a,10 (838,3-7), Eusebius maintained that the Christians had no confidence in Maximin's decisions in their favour. When Eusebius began the section with the words ταῦθ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἐκβεβιασμένος (838,3), he resumed the discussion from *cap.* 9,13 in which he said that Maximin had been compelled to order religious freedom. The approach here is quite different though. The point is not, as in *cap.* 9,13, Maximin's

330 The phrase ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐγὼ εὐτυχῶς τὸ πρῶτον εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν παρεγενόμην (834,13) compared with τῷ παρελθόντι ἐνιαυτῷ εὐτυχῶς ἐπέβην εἰς τὴν Νικομήδειαν (834,24-25) refers to the spring of 311; the provinces of Asia Minor had belonged to Galerius, but when he died, they were taken over by Maximin.

331 ἐκάστῳ τῶν δικαστῶν ἐντολὰς δέδωκα ὥστε μηδένα τούτων τοῦ λοιποῦ προσφύρεσθαι τοῖς ἐπαρχιώταις ἀπηνῶς (834,16-17). Eusebius may also have come across Maximin's claim that initially, he had rejected the request from the citizens of Nicomedia for the expulsion of the Christians from their city, according to the text in *cap.* 9a,4-5.

332 For a more detailed discussion of the problems caused by Maximin's circular to Sabinus, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 229 ff.

333 The decisive provisions read μήτε ὑπὸ τῶν βενεφικιστῶν μήτε ὑπ' ἄλλων τῶν τυχόντων ὕβρεις μήτε σεισμοὺς ὑπομένοιεν (836,16-17) and ταῖς κολακείαις καὶ ταῖς προτροπαῖς μᾶλλον τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦς ἡμετέρους ἐπαρχιώτας ποιήσεις ἐπιγνώσκειν (836,18-20).

334 εἰ δέ τινες τῆ ἰδίᾳ θρησκείᾳ ἀκολουθεῖν βούλοιντο, ἐν τῇ αὐτῶν ἐξουσίᾳ καταλείποις (836,22-23).

335 ἵνα δὲ αὕτη ἡμῶν ἡ κέλεις εἰς γνώσιν πάντων τῶν ἐπαρχιωτῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἔλθῃ, διατάγματι ὑπὸ σοῦ προτεθέντι τὸ κεκελευσμένον ὀφείλεις δηλῶσαι (836,28-838,2).

336 R. Laqueur thought, though, that the διάταγμα prepared by Sabinus was identical with Maximin's "letzte Urkunde", which in turn was identical with the law on complete religious freedom reproduced in *cap.* 10,7-11, see *op. cit.*, p. 163-179. This interpretation must be rejected, however. The difference between Maximin's circular to Sabinus and the edict on religious freedom is in itself so fundamental that the latter cannot possibly be seen as the accomplishment of the Imperial κέλεις. Moreover, the political development renders Laqueur's theory completely untenable – he largely neglected that question, however, in this connection. For a more detailed argument, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 229 ff.

possible submission to his Imperial superiors, but his trustworthiness. He could not be trusted, we are told, because his decision about the Christians had been forced from him and did not arise from inner conviction.³³⁷ This objection presupposes, in fact, that same independence which he was upbraided for showing in *cap.* 9,13 – here, all things considered, his own conviction was of no importance, since it was simply his duty to obey orders by giving the Christians the religious freedom required. We should also note that the criticism is not directed against the contents of the Imperial decree, and this fact suggests that the decree did explicitly grant the Christians religious freedom. On the contrary, the criticism concerns the point that Maximin's decrees could not be relied upon. As an additional reason for this distrust, Eusebius finally stated that Maximin had, on a previous occasion, cancelled the order to give the Christians religious freedom³³⁸ – he was referring, of course, to Maximin's resumption of the persecution of the Christians.

This argument remains valid, however, only if Maximin had, at this stage, formally reintroduced the same religious freedom that he had granted in 311. But this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with Eusebius's knowledge of Maximin's circular to Sabinus. This seems to indicate that the section was written at a time when Eusebius was unaware of it. When he did learn about it, he criticized its contents. This is quite clear from the next section.

In *cap.* 9a,11 (838,6-11), Eusebius wrote that no Christians dared to gather for divine worship³³⁹ nor to confess their Christian faith.³⁴⁰ The reason was that Maximin's letter was not specific on these points. It simply stated that the Christians must not be maltreated, but gave no orders concerning their divine services, on building new churches, or on respecting their traditions.

The passage begins οὐκ οὖν (838,6) which indicates that the lack of confidence in Maximin's sincerity meant that the Christians did not dare to meet or to live as Christians. But when Eusebius continued by saying ὅτι μηδὲ τοῦτ' ἠθέληεν αὐτῷ τὸ γράμμα (838,8), he introduced a new, quite different reason. In the passage immediately preceding, Eusebius had stated that the Christians did not dare to take advantage of the religious freedom which Maximin had granted them, because it was not seriously intended, but here he wrote that the Imperial letter did not give them permission to be Christians at all – it simply abolished the use of violence against them. In other words, Maximin's letter in favour of the Christians was criticized for being so inadequate that it was of no practical importance to them.

Eusebius stated clearly that this criticism was directed at Maximin's circular to Sabinus. So, he must have known about it. When he wrote of it: αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ ἀνεπηρέαστον ἡμῖν ἐπιτρέπον φυλάττεσθαι (838,8-9), he referred without doubt to the order mentioned several times in the letter, that the Christians must not be subjected to ὕβρεις μήτε σεισμούς (836,16-17 and 25). In a sense, Eusebius's description of Maximin's letter drew attention to an important feature: the strongly negative nature of the letter. But this is, in fact, a misinterpretation. The order was given to the officials not to inflict ὕβρεις μήτε σεισμούς on the Christians, but the implications of the order are not clear. It is clear, though, that no one could force them by coercive measures to renounce their Christian faith. Their right to exist as Christians is defined quite explicitly in the decision that they were free to follow their own worship – τῇ ἰδίᾳ θρησκείᾳ ἀκολουθεῖν (836,22-23), if they wanted to – and the right to hold divine services was a natural consequence of this. Eusebius was therefore wrong in assuming the conclusion from the formally negative provisions that the Christians were forbidden to hold divine services, build churches and follow the tradition of their church in any way.³⁴¹ Although this criticism of Maximin's circular is unjustified to some extent, it is interesting because Eusebius here stated the requirements which had to be fulfilled before the Christians could be said to have been granted complete religious freedom. Eusebius may have been thinking of a specific law, but we shall return to this question at a later point.

In *cap.* 9a,12 (838,11-16), Eusebius wrote that Maximin's circular to Sabinus amounted to a refusal to obey Constantine and Licinius's order

337 ... ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ γνώμην τὴν αὐτοῦ διακελευσάμενος, οὐκέτ' ἀληθῆς οὐδ' ἀξιόπιστος παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἦν (838,3-5).

338 τῆς πρόσθεν ἤδη μετὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν συγχώρησιν παλιμβόλου καὶ διεψευσμένης αὐτοῦ γνώμης ἕνεκα (838,5-6). The συγχώρησις mentioned here refers to the religious freedom which Maximin had granted the Christians after Galerius's death in 311. The statement is interesting because it contradicts Eusebius's own claim, in *cap.* 1, that Maximin had granted the Christians religious freedom.

339 Eusebius used the expression σύνδοον συγκροτεῖν (838,7) here, which must mean "to come together as a congregation for divine worship". Synonymously with this, he went on to use συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι (838,9-10).

340 ἑαυτὸν ἐν φανερῷ καταστήσασθαι (838,7-8) must indicate that Christians could come forward openly and confess their faith.

341 οὐ μὴν συνόδους ἐπικελεύον ποιεῖσθαι οὐδ' οἴκους ἐκκλησιῶν οἰκοδομεῖν οὐδ' ἄλλο τι τῶν ἡμῖν συνήθων διαπραττεσθαι (838,9-11). We should note that this is, in fact, a repetition of σύνδοον συγκροτεῖν and ἑαυτὸν ἐν φανερῷ καταστήσασθαι (838,7-8). 838,9-11 is decidedly a more precise expression, but it is essentially superfluous.

to grant the same complete religious freedom to the Christians that they had themselves effected in their own areas.³⁴² Maximin only complied when God forced him to do so, after having punished him for his animosity.

Cap. 9a,12a (838,11-13) is closely connected to *cap.* 9,12. Thus, Constantine and Licinius again appear as the Christian Emperors who will bring the persecution of the Church to an end – this is implied by the expression of τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ εὐσεβείας προήγοροι (838,11-12 ATER). But a new aspect is added. The passage states quite clearly that the two Emperors ordered Maximin to grant the Christians religious freedom.³⁴³ Furthermore, Eusebius explained to his readers – again in contradiction to *cap.* 9,12 – the exact nature of the religious freedom which they themselves had granted their subjects: the duty to hold divine services, build churches and observe the traditions of the Church.³⁴⁴

Maximin refused to give the Christians religious freedom, Eusebius stated in *cap.* 9a,12b (838,14-16), because in his godlessness, he would not yield on this point.³⁴⁵ This was another new aspect. Maximin's political independence from Constantine and Licinius is not the essential point here. His deprecatory attitude does not depend on the desire to assert his political independence from Constantine and Licinius, but on his enmity towards God – which is juxtaposed to their piety. In other words, the point is now purely religious and concerns the relationship between God and Maximin alone. Therefore only God can force him to grant the Christians complete religious freedom – by punishing him for his godlessness.³⁴⁶ This was to be the theme for the ensuing account in *cap.* 10,1-12.

Whether we accept the above analysis of and explanation for the creation of *cap.* 9,12-9a,12 or not, Rufinus felt, at any rate, that the section showed many weaknesses in style and content, which called for drastic revisions of his source.

In *cap.* 9,12(832,14-21), Eusebius was leading up to Constantine and Licinius's joint statement on the miracles which God had performed on their behalf, as well as to their complete law in favour of the Christians, both of which were sent to Maximin. But Rufinus only accepted the existence of one law, the contents of which must be given in greater detail. His version therefore reads like this: *per idem tempus*³⁴⁷ *conspirante etiam tum secum Licinio, nondum enim in id vesaniae inciderat, quo postmodum delapsus est, scientes et profitentes auctorem sibi bonorum omnium deum,*³⁴⁸ ... *et ipsum sibi auctorem totius virtutis atque operis profitentur*

*ipsumque de tyranno praestitisse victoriam*³⁴⁹ et ideo ab universis huic venerationem cultumque deferendum (833,9-15). We should note that in this account Rufinus regarded Constantine and Licinius's confession of the Christian God and all His benefits towards them as the reason why the law was issued. This probably also explains why he thought that the law was more than a permission for the Christians to worship their God – this was, in fact, still possible for them despite all the unpleasant limitations.³⁵⁰ So, the law must also include a demand that everyone should

342 καίτοι γε ταῦθ' οἱ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ εὐσεβείας προήγοροι Κωνσταντίνος καὶ Λικίνιος αὐτῷ τε ἐπιτρέπειν ἐπεστάλκεσαν καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοὺς ἅπασιν διὰ προγραμμάτων καὶ νόμων συγκεχωρήκεσαν (838,11-13 ATER). In the last edition, Eusebius deleted Κωνσταντίνος καὶ Λικίνιος, as is apparent in BDMΣΛ, but he did not change the original meaning.

343 αὐτῷ τε ἐπιτρέπειν ἐπεστάλκεσαν (838,12) means that Maximin received written orders to grant religious freedom. If we compare this with the account in *cap.* 9,12, we would naturally assume that Maximin had been given orders to publish the νόμος ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατος (832,17-18). This is an incorrect conclusion. Maximin was ordered to publish the provisions, not the entire text, and he was free to decide the actual form of publication. This interpretation is substantiated by the comment on Constantine and Licinius, namely that they granted complete religious freedom διὰ προγραμμάτων καὶ νόμων (838,13).

344 ταῦτα (838,11) is the object of both ἐπιτρέπειν ἐπεστάλκεσαν (838,12) and συγκεχωρήκεσαν (832,13). It refers to *cap.* 9a,11b, which describes the exact nature of complete religious freedom: the order to hold divine services, build churches and live by the traditions of the Church. In other words, these points are identical to the provisions contained in the νόμος ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατος (832,17-18) which was mentioned in *cap.* 9,12. Again we leave the question open as to whether this can be identified as a law which we know from other sources.

345 οὐ μὴν ὁ δυσσεβέστατός γε αὐτῆ ἐνδοῦναι προήρητο ... (838,14).

346 εἰ μὴ ὅτε πρὸς τῆς θεῆας συναλαθεῖς δίκης ὑστατόν γε ἄκων ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἤχη (838,14-16).

347 This expression replaced ἐπὶ τούτοις (832,14). The law was issued in close connection with Constantine's order to place an inscription on his statue.

348 Rufinus chose to translate εὐμενίσαντες (832,17), which is in itself difficult to understand, by *scientes et profuentes*.

349 Rufinus chose these words instead of τῶν πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ παράδοξα τὰ τε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ τυράννου νίκης (832,18-19). So he emphasizes, much more strongly than his source, the point that God Himself was responsible for the victory over Maxentius – Eusebius is obscure, but Rufinus makes it clear that this is the relevant event.

350 When Rufinus wrote: *in qua [scil. lege] deum Christianorum plenissimis laudibus prosequuntur* (833,12-13), he probably felt that he had brought out the essence of the expression νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατον πληρέστατα (832,17-18). For Rufinus, the law did not grant the Christians unlimited religious freedom: it prescribed the worship of the Christian God as the only permissible kind of religious practice. This was the obvious inter-

worship the same God as the Emperors. It followed naturally then that Maximin should issue a law to this exact effect.

Rufinus's translation goes on: *hanc legem etiam ad Maximinum, qui tunc orientis partibus dominabatur amicitiasque eorum expetere videbatur, emittunt* (833,15-17). Here he followed his source closely with one exception: according to Eusebius, Maximin gave the appearance of having *amicitiae* with Constantine and Licinius, but Rufinus merely said that he appeared to seek their friendship. He probably introduced this alteration because he regarded it as misleading to say, on the basis of the account up to this point, that there was a *foedus amicitiae* between Maximin and the other Emperors.

Rufinus accepted completely the description from his source of the dilemma in which Constantine and Licinius's letters placed Maximin. He must, however, have felt a need for a more precise reason why the law sent to Maximin was totally unacceptable to him and why he gave the appearance of acting completely independently. He therefore phrased his version like this: *at ille ingentibus imperatorum rebus gestis perterritus,³⁵¹ tamen si quae scribebantur contraria sibi et aliena mentis suae proposito viderentur,³⁵² tamen quoniam resistere non audebat et rursus alienae auctoritati cedens invitus videri in hoc venisse erubescibat, metu simul ac pudore usus, miserimis consiliariis,³⁵³ statuit velut ex suo arbitrio atque auctoritate legem pro Christianis similis sententiae promulgare ...³⁵⁴* (833,17-835,5).

Rufinus did not doubt that Maximin had issued a law which was identical in content to his circular to Sabinus. He saw no reason to reproduce it, however, but felt that a paraphrase of its basic contents would suffice for his readers. This he gave in the following way: *... in qua [sc. lege] adseveraret maioribus quidem suis prioribus Augustis visum fuisse Christianorum gentem tamquam deorum cultui adversam penitus esse delendam, se quoque aliquamdiu ratum simili debere uti sententia. sed quoniam eo magis gens ista propagetur et crescat, quo maxime putatur inhiberi, velle se potius, ut si quidem blandis quis ad deorum cultum persuasionibus adquiescat, recipiatur, nullus vero cogatur invitus, sed habeat in arbitrio suo quo quisque velit ritu colere deum, neque pro hoc commotionem ullam vel turbationem provincialibus inferendam* (835,5-839,1).

This version of Maximin's circular is by no means pejorative.³⁵⁵ We

pretation for someone who, like Rufinus, has experienced Emperor Theodosius's injunction against paganism as it is to be found in *Cod. Theod.* XVI, X, 10 ("Nemo se hostiis", 24th February 391) and 12 ("Nullus omnino", 8th November 392).

simply learn that he had originally agreed with and followed Diocletian and Maximian's anti-Christian policies. In recognition of the effect of this approach: that the Christians simply increased in numbers, he began a new policy of trying to win them over by persuasion. He therefore decreed that they must not be violently forced to accept the *cultus deorum* but that they were free to worship their God without being the object of *commotio ulla vel turbatio*.³⁵⁶

We must also point out that Rufinus did not doubt that Maximin was telling the truth when he stated the reason why he had adopted a new policy towards the Christians. This made it difficult for him to see the point of Eusebius's comment on Maximin's circular to Sabinus: τὰ μηδέπω ποτὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ πεπραγμένα ἐπιπλάστως αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ψευδόμενος (834,2-3). He chose, at any rate, to omit it completely from his version.

In fact, Rufinus also omitted *cap.* 9a,10 (838,3-6) and replaced it with the following: *haec Maximinus ad Sabinum praefectum scribit*,³⁵⁷ *cum tamen omnes scirent eum non id animo gerere, sed simulata haec humanitate*

351 Rufinus obviously felt that this rendered the meaning of περιωλήγης ἐφ' οἷς ἔγνω, γεγενημένος (832,22). By *perterritus*, he probably meant to suggest that Maximin was filled with terror at the thought of the Christian God supporting Constantine and Licinius.

352 Rufinus chose this expression to emphasize the point that the law which was sent ran contrary to all Maximin's beliefs, mainly because it recognized the Christian God – the question of his political independence came second to this.

353 Rufinus inserted *miserrimis consiliariis* (835,3-4), because he wanted to specify for whom Maximin found it necessary to set up this show.

354 This replaced τοῦτο πρῶτον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν (834,1), which made very little sense in Rufinus's new context. According to 839,1-2, Maximin sent this law to Sabinus, so it was also best to omit completely τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἡγεμόσιν (832,24-834,1).

355 Rufinus did not allude at all to the events in Nicomedia mentioned in *cap.* 9a,4-6, though they could be used to place Maximin in a disadvantageous light in the eyes of the Christians.

356 The basis of *neque pro hoc commotionem ullam vel turbationem provincialibus inferendam* (837,4-839,1) is undoubtedly καὶ μηδενὶ ἐξουσία δοθῆ ὥστε τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἐπαρχιώτας ὑβρῶσι καὶ σεισμοῖς ἐπιτρίψαι (836,24-26). Gustave Bardy argued along with several other scholars, that σεισμοί can mean "les extorsions d'argent" and, in support of this, he referred to Rufinus's translation in 837,4, see *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 66 note 6. The interpretation is scarcely tenable, however. A conclusion based on a simple paraphrase in Rufinus is bound to be dubious; moreover, we have no other evidence of "les extorsions d'argent" from the Christians during the persecution.

357 *Haec* must refer to the provisions contained in the law. This seems awkward, however, since the previous section led us to expect *hanc*, sc. *legem*. It is a result of Rufinus's dependence on his source, and it also explains why he omitted to report that Sabinus had been told to send on the Imperial decisions.

*decernere*³⁵⁸ (839,1-3). The criticism thus concerns the lack of consistency between Maximin's actions and motives.³⁵⁹

Rufinus was not satisfied with *cap.* 9a,11 (838,6-11). He did not find the position of the particle οὐχουν (838,6) appropriate, since the section could not, without further explanation, be seen as a logical inference from the previous passage. Quite evidently, he disagreed with Eusebius's interpretation of Maximin's circular to Sabinus, as expressed in αὐτὸ μόνον κτλ. (838,8-11). At any rate, he limited himself to this abbreviated version: *denique*³⁶⁰ *nostrorum nullus audebat vel concilia agere*³⁶¹ *vel in publico quicquam, quod ad religionem pertinet, commovere,*³⁶² *id est vel ecclesias reparare vel si quid huiusmodi usus noster poscebat, explere, quod fieri lex ad eum ab imperatoribus missa censebat*³⁶³ (839,3-7).

From this it appears that Rufinus saw Eusebius's criticism of Maximin as referring to the fact that he had not reproduced the contents of Constantine and Licinius's law. But in 835,4-5, he stated that Maximin had in fact done so, which means that Rufinus's account, strictly speaking, contains a contradiction. In other words, not even Rufinus's systematic approach could change his contradictory source into a completely clear account.

For Rufinus, the point of the account was the contradiction between the actions which Maximin was forced to take, and those which he performed by his own volition. In Rufinus's opinion, this was not sufficiently

358 The policy of winning over the Christians to the gods by persuasion and not by force was, in itself, an expression of *humanitas* in Maximin, as far as Rufinus was concerned. It was *simulata* however, since it did not arise from charity towards them; it was simply a better means of realizing the intention behind his religious policies – the annihilation of Christianity.

359 In this context, Eusebius's remark: ἤδη μετὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν συγχώρησιν παλιμβόλου καὶ διεψευσμένης αὐτοῦ γνώμης ἔνεκα (838,5-6), seemed irrelevant to Rufinus, not to say erroneous, so he omitted the passage in question.

360 Here, the word probably means "in short" or "briefly".

361 Here, the expression probably means "to convene councils of bishops".

362 This was Rufinus's paraphrase of ἐαυτὸν ἐν φανερωῷ καταστήσασθαι (838,7-8).

363 Rufinus's translation, in fact, links σύνδοον συγχροτεῖν οὐδ' ἐαυτὸν ἐν φανερωῷ καταστήσασθαι (838,7-8) and συνόδους ... ποιεῖσθαι οὐδ' οἴκους ἐκκλησιῶν οἰκοδομεῖν οὐδ' ἄλλο τι τῶν ἡμῖν συνήθων διαπράττεσθαι (838,9-11), although they were quite separate in his source. In that way, he made the account clear and consecutive at this point. We should also note that *quod fieri lex etc.* (839,6-7) is an abbreviated version of *cap.* 9a,12a (838,11-13). Rufinus did not translate καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦς ἄπαισιν διὰ προγραμμάτων καὶ νόμων συγκεχωρήκεσαν (838,12-13), probably because the account up to this point had mentioned only one law, the one that had been "sent" to Maximin.

clear from *cap.* 9a,12 (838,11-6). οὐ μὴν ὁ δυσσεβέστατος κτλ. (838,14-16), quite on the contrary, said that God had forced Maximin against his will to give the Christians complete religious freedom. Consequently, he omitted the whole section and replaced it with this account which, in his opinion, expressed more precisely the correct interpretation: *sed ille impius et mente ferox hoc solum, quod metus extorquebat, indulserat, nec in aliquo mutavit affectum, donec digna in eum verbera ultio divina proferret* (839,7-9).

Cap. 10,1-15 (838,16 - 848,8): Maximin is forced to give the Christians complete freedom of religion

In *cap.* 10,1 (838,16-24), Eusebius wrote that Maximin was incapable of discharging the duties of Emperor but above all, he was arrogant towards his superiors, Constantine and Licinius, whose qualities surpassed his in every respect. He therefore presumed to call himself *maximus augustus*.

This section consists of only one sentence. It begins: ἐκπεριῆλθεν κτλ. (838,16). From the preceding context, we would have expected an account of God forcing Maximin to give the Christians complete religious freedom – ἐκπεριῆλθεν should therefore be another expression for πρὸς τῆς θείας συνελαθεῖς δίκης (838,15). This does not happen, however. Instead, we are given a description of Maximin's rule and his insubordinate attitude to Constantine and Licinius.³⁶⁴ There is no connection, in fact, between this section and the preceding one. ἐκπεριῆλθεν κτλ. is therefore best understood as a kind of heading the following account which describes Maximin's defeat by Licinius and his death.

The text says of Maximin: τὸ μέγεθος τῆς οὐ κατ' ἀξίαν ἐπιτροπείσης ἡγεμονίας αὐτῷ³⁶⁵ μὴ οἷός τε φέρειν (838,16-17). He is described as an incompetent Emperor who was unable to live up to the requirements and duties of Imperial power, and Eusebius provides details of this, writing that he lacked the qualities necessary for a Roman Emperor and consequently ruled like a bungler.³⁶⁶

In ἐπὶ πᾶσιν κτλ. (838,19-24), the point is that Maximin had dared to usurp the title of *maximus augustus* although he was far below Constantine and Licinius in both birth and virtues.³⁶⁷ In this statement, it is notable that Maximin is described on the one hand as a full member of a college of Emperors which numbered Constantine and Licinius besides himself.³⁶⁸ On the other hand, they appear to be his superiors. We should also notice that the three Emperors are equals in every respect and therefore no superior/inferior relationship can exist between them.³⁶⁹ In other words, the statement gives a confusing picture of the hierarchy within the college of Emperors. Only one point is clear: Maximin was guilty of an unlawful act by adopting the title of *maximus augustus*.

In *cap.* 10,2 (838,24-840,3), Eusebius described how, in his madness,³⁷⁰ Maximin broke the treaty he had made with Licinius and waged war

against him. He quickly created chaos everywhere³⁷¹ and after amassing a multitude of soldiers, he went out to fight Licinius, trusting in the gods and his large army.³⁷²

In this section and the next, attention is centred solely on Maximin and Licinius. We learn that this was the first treaty which existed between them. But apart from this short note, Eusebius gave no details on its contents or reasons why Maximin broke it. Nor do we learn when the war broke out, except that it must have happened after Constantine's victory

364 τολμᾶν ὄρητο θρασύνεσθαι καὶ πρῶτον ἑαυτὸν ταῖς τιμαῖς ἀναγορεύειν (838,23-24).

365 This must be understood to mean that Maximin had been undeservedly trusted with Imperial authorities, which implies that he was, strictly speaking, a legitimate Emperor! Eusebius's account expresses exactly the same criticism of Maximin's appointment to the rank of Emperor as Lactantius's description in *De mortibus persecutorum* XVIII, 13-14 of his rise to the position of *caesar* in 305.

366 ἀλλὰ δι' ἀπειρίαν σόφρονος καὶ βασιλικοῦ λογιμοῦ ἀπειροκόλως τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγχειρῶν (838,17-19). Eusebius no doubt chose ἀπειροκόλως in order to suggest that Maximin had behaved like an uneducated barbarian. At this point, he also agreed with Lactantius, who described Diocletian as *adulescentem quendam semibarbarum*, quite unfit to be entrusted with *tutela rei publicae*, cf. *De mortibus persecutorum* XVIII, 13-14. Add to this Lactantius's own characterization of Maximin as a man *qui neque militiam, neque rem publicam sciret ...* (*De mortibus persecutorum* XIX, 6).

367 τὰ πάντα αὐτοῦ προφερόντων γένει καὶ τροφή καὶ παιδεία ἀξιωματί τε καὶ συνέσει καὶ τῷ γε πάντων κορυφαιοτάτῳ, σωφροσύνη καὶ τῇ περὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα (838,20-23). This is really "ein Kaiserspiegel", which describes the qualities of a true Emperor. This is decidedly of pagan origin. Perhaps Eusebius used a source already in existence. He christianized it, at any rate, by inserting περὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ θεόν (838,23), in order to state that recognition of the Christian God is also characteristic of a true Emperor.

368 Cf. the expression κατὰ τῶν τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνῶν (838,20). Maximin's fellow Emperors are not mentioned by name, but they are of course Constantine and Licinius.

369 It is interesting that, even as regards his descent (γένος, 838,21), Licinius was by no means inferior to Constantine. But the interpretation is in clear contrast to the previous account, which describes Constantine as *maximus augustus*, cf. VIII, 14-15 and IX, 9,1. At this point, the account must refer to a situation in which Constantine and Licinius officiated as Emperors of equal status. Since we know that Constantine had already proclaimed himself Emperor by birth in a *panegyricus* at Trier, in order to establish his superiority over the other Emperors, see my book *Maximinus*, p. 219 f., then the idea of their equality must have been launched by Licinius in the period after his victory over Maximin.

370 ἐπιτείνας δ' εἰς ἀπόνοιαν τὰ τῆς μανίας ... (838,24-25). Strictly speaking, the wording implies that the preceding section had given an account of the mad acts committed by Maximin.

371 εἴτ' ἐν βραχεὶ τὰ πάντα κυκήσας πᾶσάν τε πόλιν ἐκταράξας ... (838,26-27).

372 ἔξῃσιν εἰς μάχην αὐτῷ παραταξάμενος (840,1-2). This, in fact, refers to a specific battlefield.

over Maxentius, and we are not told where Maximin drew up his army.³⁷³ But Eusebius was at pains to point out that Maximin felt certain of victory, for two reasons: his expectations of help from his false gods and his military strength.³⁷⁴

In *cap.* 10,3 (840,3-5), Eusebius noted briefly that Maximin was deprived of God's help when the battle was joined; God gave Licinius the victory.³⁷⁵ Here, God clearly means the Christian God – He caused Maximin's defeat. When compared with the immediately preceding passage, this means that trusting in false gods is in vain.

Cap. 10,4 (840,5-12) goes on to report that Maximin's loyal soldiers were killed and that his bodyguard deserted him for Licinius. Then, Maximin divested himself, like a coward, of the Imperial insignia and escaped into the crowd. He roamed around and only just managed to escape his enemies.

In this section, Maximin's defeat is ascribed, strictly speaking, to a military catastrophe. Furthermore, it was obviously crucial to emphasize the fact that his behaviour, only thinking about his own safety, was quite unfitting for an Emperor.³⁷⁶ This description therefore illustrates Maximin's lack of βασιλικὸς λογισμὸς (cf. 838,18). In other words, the section adopts a political perspective.

In *cap.* 10,4b-5 (840,12-19), Eusebius wrote that Maximin's unsuccessful battle with Licinius proves the truth of the Scriptural text 377 which says that a ruler will not be saved by his military power but by his fear of God and his hopes for God's mercy.³⁷⁸ Here again, Eusebius argued along purely religious lines, because he used the text to substantiate the point that only those who trust in God will be victorious. Maximin lost because he relied on false gods instead of the true Christian God, like Licinius.

Cap. 10,6 (840,19-842,2) reports on Maximin's return to his own provinces,³⁷⁹ where first of all, in his mad rage,³⁸⁰ he killed many priests and prophets of the gods whom he had previously admired and whose oracles had inspired the war against Licinius; he claimed that they were swindlers and, above all, had jeopardized his salvation.³⁸¹ After that, he glorified the Christian God and issued a law decreeing complete religious freedom for all Christians.

This account quite clearly aims to show that Maximin's defeat made him abandon the pagan gods and acknowledge the Christian God. The perspective is again purely religious. This is also evident from the fact that we learn here – for the first time – that the pagan oracles had prompted Maximin to begin the war against Licinius – obviously intending to safe-

guard the pagan gods to the detriment of the Christian God. The passage does not discuss Maximin's presumptuous behaviour towards his fellow Emperors or the madness of starting a civil war.

Eusebius simply stated that Maximin acknowledged the Christian God.³⁸² He gave no further explanation of the reasons for this radical change, though. But we are justified in saying, based on the preceding passage, that Licinius's victory over him must have made him realize that the Christian God was the only almighty deity. This resulted in his issuing a law which corresponded in content with Constantine and Licinius's law, mentioned in *cap.* 9,12, in that it granted complete religious freedom.³⁸³

With this, Eusebius had strictly speaking concluded the account begun in *cap.* 10,1a with the words: ἐκπεριήλθεν δ' αὐτὸν τοιαύτη τις αἰτία (838,16) – in the sense that the Christians had now gained absolute religious freedom.

Eusebius had, however, one more remark to make in this passage:

373 The battlefield lay outside Maximin's area of authority, which is evident from the fact that later Eusebius said of his flight: ἐπὶ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔλθῶν μέρη (840,19-20).

374 δαιμόνων ἐλπίσιν, ὧν δὴ ᾤετο θεῶν, καὶ ταῖς τῶν ὀπλιτῶν μυριάσιν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπιηρέμενος (840,2-3).

375 καὶ δὴ συμβαλὼν εἰς χεῖρας, ἔρημος τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ καθίσταται ἐπισκοπῆς, τῆς νίκης ἕξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάντων ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου θεοῦ τῷ τότε κρατοῦντι πρυτανευθείσης (840,3-5).

376 δειλῶς καὶ δυσγενῶς καὶ ἀνάδρωος ὑποδύνηι τὸ πλῆθος ἀπειτα διαδιδράσκει κρυπταζόμενος τε ἀνὰ τοὺς ἀγρούς καὶ τὰς κώμας μόλις τῶν πολεμίων τὰς χεῖρας, τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῷ προμνώμενος (840,9-12).

377 ἔργοις αὐτοῖς εὖ μάλα πιστοῦς καὶ ἀληθεῖς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποφίνας χρησμούς (840,12-13).

378 Eusebius quoted *Ps.* 32,16-19 in a form which is completely identical with LXX (ed. A. Rahlfs).

379 τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔλθῶν μέρη (840,20). We cannot determine the exact reference of Eusebius's expression. In addition to Syria, Palestine and Egypt, which Maximin had possessed as *caesar* since 305, it may include Asia Minor of which he assumed control in 311 after the death of Galerius.

380 ἔμμανεῖ θυμῷ (840,20).

381 ... ὡς ἂν γόητας καὶ ἀπατεῶνας καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν προδότας τῆς αὐτοῦ γενομένους σωτηρίας ἀναρεῖ (840,22-842,1). Again Eusebius took the opportunity to emphasize his view that Maximin was an unworthy Emperor, who only thought of his own safety, just as had been the case when he was defeated by Licinius.

382 This is implied in the phrase: δοὺς δόξαν τῷ Χριστιανῶν θεῷ (842,1).

383 This is clear from the fact that Eusebius used exactly the same words to describe the two laws: νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατον πληρέστατα (832,17-18) and νόμον τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας αὐτῶν τελεώτατα καὶ πληρέστατα (842,2-3).

δυσθανατήσας αὐτίκα μηδεμιᾶς αὐτῶ χρόνου δοθείσης προθεσμίας τελευτᾶ τὸν βίον (842,2-4). When seen in isolation, this could be regarded as a factual statement, to the effect that he died immediately after issuing the law on religious freedom. But in a wider context, the words might be taken to mean that the painful death which he suffered immediately afterwards was God's punishment for his earlier anti-Christian policies. In this way, Eusebius wanted to emphasize, as in the case of Maximus, the point that God sends persecutors of Christianity to a shameful death.

In addition, Eusebius gave a translation in *cap.* 10,7-11 (842,9-844,21) of Maximin's Latin decree. We do not need to dwell on its contents. We should merely say that, without disavowing Diocletian and Maximian's³⁸⁴ persecution of the Christians, Maximin clearly dissociated himself from all previous coercive measures and putative limitations on the freedom of the Christians to worship their God; he specified that they were free to practise the faith which they had chosen.³⁸⁵ They were also allowed to build churches,³⁸⁶ and he decided that the houses and lands which had been confiscated on Diocletian and Galerius's orders by the Imperial government or by the cities, and which had been sold or given as gifts, should be returned to the Christians as their rightful property.³⁸⁷

In *cap.* 10,12 (844,22-846,9), Eusebius developed the implications of this radical change in more detail. He began by saying that the law just reproduced was issued less than one year after the publication of Maximin's anti-Christian decrees.³⁸⁸ He then mentioned that Maximin now issued pro-Christian legislation, whereas shortly before he had considered the Christians to be godless and a decided plague on human life,³⁸⁹ which had resulted in their being expelled everywhere.³⁹⁰ In view of the fact that Eusebius had just reproduced the law on complete religious freedom, his next statement is rather surprising: *παρὰ τούτῳ διατάξεις ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν καὶ νομοθεσίαι συνετάπτοντο* (846,2-3). A passing reference to the law would have sufficed, but the discrepancy suggests that the section is not "aus einem Guss".

Eusebius went on to say, in *cap.* 10,12b (846,3-7), that the Christians, who had shortly before been maltreated and killed in the most horrible way in Maximin's sight because they were considered godless,³⁹¹ were now allowed by him to perform their religious ceremonies.

This statement identifies the law on complete religious freedom as the reason why the bloody persecutions of the Christians had ceased. This is surprising because, previously, Eusebius mentioned Maximin's circular

to Sabinus which did not legalize persecutions of the Christians but, in fact, allowed them to practise their worship. The only way of explaining this state of affairs is to assume that Eusebius had no knowledge of the Maximin circular when he wrote this statement. At any rate, he wanted to say that the law on religious freedom brought the persecution to a complete stop.

The short, terse *θρησκευειν ομολογοῦνται θρησκείαν* (846,7), finally, Eusebius expounds in 846,7-9, stating that the Christians were allowed to build churches and that Maximin conceded that they had a claim to

384 Cf. the expression *ἐκ ταύτης τῆς προφάσεως ἐξ ἧς κεκελευσμένον ἦν ὑπὸ τῶν θειοτάτων Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ* (842,19-20). It is not clear whether this refers to Emperor Maximian, Diocletian's fellow *augustus* in the West, or Galerius, his *caesar* and later successor as *augustus* in the East. The latter seems the more probable explanation, because Galerius officiated under the name of Maximian.

385 The decisive provision is found here in *cap.* 10,10 (844,5-12).

386 *καὶ τὰ κυριακὰ δὲ τὰ οἰκεία ὅπως κατασκευάζοιεν, συγκεχώρηται* (844,12-13). Although all the manuscripts contain this passage, it may not have been a part of the edict. It is difficult to imagine the pagan Emperors using the Christian expression *οἰκεία κυριακὰ*. Moreover, the very next phrase mentions only *οἰκίαι*. And finally, the entire passage interrupts the continuity. Cf. my book *Maximinus*, p. 252, note 245.

387 The provision ordering the return of the confiscated Church property is contained in *cap.* 10,11 (844,13-21). The expression here – *ἐκ τῆς κελεύσεως τῶν γονέων τῶν ἡμετέρων εἰς τὸ δίκαιον μετέπεσεν τοῦ φίσκου* (844,16-17) – refers to Diocletian and Maximian *alias* Galerius, who have already been mentioned by name.

388 *αὐταὶ τοῦ τυράννου φωναί, οὐδ' ὅλον ἐνιαυτὸν τῶν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἐν στήλαις ἀνατεθειμένων αὐτῶν διαταγμάτων ὑστερήσασαι* (844,22-24). The *διατάγματα* mentioned here refer to *cap.* 7.1 and signify Maximin's granting of the petitions of the cities, the forged *Acta Pilati* and the defamations of the *dux* in Damascus against the Christians. Eusebius's information that the law on complete freedom was issued just before Maximin's death, should be compared with *οὐδ' ὅλον ἐνιαυτὸν* (844,22) – i.e. 10-12 months after the publication of the ordinance mentioned, and that then suggests that the ordinances date from the summer of 312, while the edict appeared the following summer.

389 *Ἰν καὶ παρ' ᾧ γε μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἠνοσηθεν δυσσεβεῖς ἐδοκοῦμεν καὶ ἄθεοι καὶ παντὸς ὄλεθροι τοῦ βίου* (844,24-846,1), Eusebius undoubtedly thought of Maximin's accusations against the Christians in his ordinance to the people of Tyre, see *cap.* 7.9.

390 Eusebius elaborated this in the following phrase: *ὡς μὴ ὅτι γε πόλιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ χώραν οὐδ' ἐρημίαν οἰκεῖν ἐπιτρέπεσθαι* (846,1-2). Taken literally, this means that the Christians were forbidden to stay anywhere in Maximin's provinces. This is incorrect, however. Eusebius lapsed into an exaggerated generalization, which must not be mistaken for a factual statement.

391 *καὶ οἱ πρὸ βραχέος πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ θηρίων τε καὶ οἰωνῶν βορᾶ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ διαφθειρόμενοι καὶ πᾶν εἶδος κολάσεως καὶ τιμωρίας ἀπαλλαγῆς τε βίου οἰκτρότατα ὡς ἂν ἄθεοι καὶ δυσσεβεῖς ὑπομένοντες* (846,3-6). We should notice that this description of Maximin's persecution does not agree in any way with the previous account.

certain property rights. This last statement referred to the decrees in Maximin's law.³⁹² Eusebius added these specific provisions no doubt because he wanted to show that the new law on religious freedom included the points which he felt were missing in Maximin's circular to Sabinus.³⁹³ But this then meant that, in this gloss – which, in fact, it is – Eusebius presupposed his readers' knowledge of the circular. Therefore, a clear contradiction exists between this and the statement immediately preceding it.

If we review the whole of *cap.* 10,1-12, it is evident that the section is quite complex; it consists of elements too diverse to form an obvious, homogeneous pattern. Here, as elsewhere, we are undoubtedly entitled to assume that the discrepancies suggest revision by Eusebius himself.

In *cap.* 10,13 (846,9-12), Eusebius's readers are told that Maximin, whose sufferings had been unduly lessened because of his confession, was suddenly struck by the scourge of God and died in the second battle of the war.

The introductory words *καὶ δὴ τοιαῦτα ἐξομολογησάμενος ...* (846,9) are ambiguous. *ὁμολογεῖν* was used twice in the preceding section in the sense of "grant" or "concede" (846,7 and 9), so it would be natural to consider *ἐξ-* as intensifying this, meaning "clearly granted", since *τοιαῦτα* refers to the provisions in the law on the religious freedom just listed in 846,7-8. This would make excellent sense. But *ἐξομολογεῖν* is also a religious term meaning "acknowledge God and confess one's sins", and perhaps this sense is implied as well. Maximin's law on religious freedom suggests acknowledgement of the Christian God.³⁹⁴

Eusebius argued that Maximin's radical change produced some reward; he suffered less than he deserved, as a former persecutor of Christians.³⁹⁵ Eusebius was probably referring to *cap.* 10,6b (842,1-3), where he reported on Maximin's painful illness without giving any details. Here, though, his sufferings are not curtailed.

The text goes on, however: *ἀθρόα θεοῦ πληγὴς μάστιγι ἐν δευτέρῳ τοῦ πολέμου συμβολῆ καταστρέφει* (846,11-12). Taken in isolation, these words must mean that Maximin fell in battle in the second encounter with Licinius. This implies that God killed him with His sentence and consequently brought about Licinius's victory. We should also note that the idea that Maximin suffered less because of his new attitude to Christianity is alien to this context.

We have seen many contradictions in Eusebius. Even so, we may well ask if he could really accept such a striking contradiction saying first that

Maximin died of a painful disease and then that he fell in battle. The expression ἐν δευτέρῳ τοῦ πολέμου συμβολῆ καταστρέφει (846,11-12) must be understood in the full context as meaning that he died while the second battle was taking place, but that he may not necessarily have taken part in it himself. The very next passage, in fact, confirms this interpretation.

But it is quite surprising that a second encounter between Maximin and Licinius is mentioned here. It presupposes that, after his return to his provinces, Maximin had gathered new forces to resume the struggle against Licinius. We learn that the battle coincided with Maximin's death, but we are not told where it took place. The explanation for this lack of information must be sought in the fact that Eusebius used a fuller account which described in detail the military clash between Maximin and Licinius right up to his painful death in connection with the second encounter.

Cap. 10,14 (846,12-848,2) offers particulars about Maximin's death. He did not die like a commander who falls in a battle for virtue and family; he died of disease while his army was drawn up for battle. God struck him down with an illness which reduced him to skin and bone and produced the most terrible burning pains. His eyes fell out of their sockets so that he became blind, *cap.* 10,15 (848,2-8) continues, and after having acknowledged Christ and confessed his sins against Him, he was released by death.

Cap. 10,14-15 (846,12-848,8) constitutes a complete unit. It begins γίνετα δ' αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς καταστροφῆς ... (846,12-13) which suggests that Eu-

392 καὶ δικαίων τινῶν αὐτοῖς μετεῖναι αὐτὸς ὁ τύραννος ὁμολογεῖ (846,8-9) presupposes knowledge of this provision in Maximin's law: οἰκίαι καὶ χωρία <ᾗ> τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ... ἐτύγγανον ὄντα (844,15-16).

393 Eusebius thus criticized the following point in the circular: οὐ μὴν συνόδους ... συνήθων (838,9-11). It should be pointed out that Maximin's law contains no direct order to build churches or to follow the Christian traditions. But the two directives were, of course, implied, when the Christians were granted permission to perform their worship and when their confiscated church property, including the churches themselves, was returned to them.

394 In this case, the idea from 842.1 is repeated: δοὺς δόξαν τῷ Χριστιανῶν θεῷ.

395 ... ὥσπερ τινὸς τυχῶν εὐεργεσίας τούτων δὴ αὐτῶν ἔνεκα, ἤττον ἢ παθεῖν αὐτὸν χροῖν δήπου παθῶν (846,10-11). Eusebius combined two lines of thought here: he who persecutes the Christians must suffer his just punishment but, if he acknowledges God he will be rewarded. Exactly the same concept is applied to Galerius in *App.* 1a (796,2-3), see my article in *Classica et Mediaevalia* XXXIV (1983), p. 179.

sebius now meant to give a report on the details of Maximin's death. In other words, this is an amplification of points mentioned in *cap.* 10,13.

Eusebius wrote that, unlike other generals, Maximin did not meet the glorious death of a hero on the battlefield, but died in a sickbed. This implied criticism of him for being an incompetent general and thus also an unworthy Emperor, who avoided the battle and abandoned his army. The accusations differ, however, to such a marked extent, from the essence of this section: God's punishment of the godless Maximin, that we may ask whether Eusebius borrowed the passage from a text already in existence.

An analysis of the entire section γίνεται δ' αὐτῷ κτλ. (846,12-17) reveals only these words with religious connotations: ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἄτε τις δυσσεβῆς καὶ θεομάχος (846,15-16). They interrupt the natural connection between ... συνέβη (846,15) and τῆς παρατάξεως κτλ. (846,16-18), and we may conclude that they constitute a later addition to an account which was otherwise entirely devoted to the description of Maximin's ignominious end as a general and Emperor. In other words, Eusebius used this insertion to place an account which was originally neutral, from a religious point of view, in a Christian context. He probably found it in the fuller account which had described in detail the entire military struggle between Maximin and Licinius. We may note in passing that Eusebius took no trouble to explain the actual consequences of Maximin's death for the military outcome.

As mentioned above, the section is dominated by God's punishment of Maximin, with a most painful disease, as a δυσσεβῆς καὶ θεομάχος.³⁹⁶ The detailed description of Maximin's fatal illness uses the devices of rhetoric to such an extent that we are unable to define its exact character, not to mention its actual course.³⁹⁷ Even so, the account is no doubt based on the historical truth that Maximin fell victim to an extremely painful form of plague.

Eusebius wrote of Maximin that ἀνθομολογούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ θάνατον ἐπεκαλεῖτο (848,5-6), which means, no doubt, that he acknowledged Christ and confessed his sins before Him³⁹⁸ and prayed to be released from his agonies by death. With the words καὶ τὸ πανύστατον κτλ. (848,6-8), Eusebius wanted to show that Maximin himself accepted that the pains were a just punishment for his struggle against Christ. His subsequent death suggests that he was released from further suffering as a reward for his confession.³⁹⁹

Cap. 10,14-15 and *cap.* 10,13 have a common theme; both passages de-

scribe how Maximin was struck by God's scourge of punishment.⁴⁰⁰ In the existing text, however, the relationship between the two is this: *cap.* 10,14-15 explains in greater detail the points briefly suggested in *cap.* 10,13.⁴⁰¹ From this, we are justified in concluding that *cap.* 10,14-15 is a later addition. Eusebius found that the short and, in itself, obscure note in *cap.* 10,13 was insufficient; he had to provide a detailed report on Maximin's painful illness. The need was perhaps even greater, because only in this way could he reveal the complete parallel in the fates of the two cruel persecutors of the Christians, Maximin and Galerius. At any rate, we have already suggested that the descriptions of their illnesses and deaths display several common features: both were struck by painful disease from which they wasted away; because of their sufferings, they were forced to acknowledge the Christian God and their guilt in persecuting the Christians, and because of this confession, they were released from further agonies as a reward – they died. There is one striking difference between the two accounts, though: whereas illness forced Galerius to issue the “Galerius edict”, Licinius's military defeat of Maximin opened the latter's eyes to the powerlessness of the pagan gods, made him acknowledge the Christian God and grant the Christians complete freedom of religion. But this means that *cap.* 10,13-15, taken as a whole, has a purely religious scope. It certainly focussed on Maximin's personal confession of sin towards Christianity, but the essential point for Eusebius was to show that he who resisted the true God was struck by His punishment and died a painful death.

396 ἀθρόα θεοῦ πληγεῖς καθ' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος μάστιγι (846,18). The extent to which the rest of the section is dominated by the concept of God's just punishment of Maximin is demonstrated by the expressions: θεηλάτω πυρρί (846,20) and ἐνδίκως ταῦτα τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παροινίας χάριν ὁμολογήσας παθεῖν (848,6-7).

397 Eusebius himself also provided the description of Galerius's illness in VIII, 16,4-5, and this explains the common features which the two accounts reveal, cf. Gustave Bardy: *Eusèbe de Césarée* III, p. 72 note 15.

398 ἀνομομολογούμενος must be read in its Christian meaning, just as ἐξομολογησάμενος (846,9), and it implies both recognition of Christ (in this case) and acknowledgment of his sin against Him. This interpretation is substantiated by the very next phrase: ἐνδίκως ταῦτα τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παροινίας χάριν ὁμολογήσας παθεῖν (848,6-7).

399 Consequently, there is complete agreement between 848,6-8 and 846,10-11.

400 Cf. the parallel expressions: ἀθρόα θεοῦ πληγεῖς μάστιγι (846,11) and ἀθρόα θεοῦ πληγεῖς ... μάστιγι (846,18).

401 This purely stylistic expression τὰ τῆς καταστροφῆς (846,12-13) links the section to καταστρέφει (846,12), the last word in *cap.* 10,13.

Cap. 11,1-8 (848,9 - 852,6): The restoration of the churches and the removal of Maximin's officials and family

In *cap.* 11,1 (848,9-15), Eusebius says that, when Maximin, the last and the worst of the enemies of Christianity, was gone, the fundamental restoration of the churches began. The word of Christ spread even faster than before, while the enemies of Christianity became the objects of the greatest dishonour and disgrace.

Here, Maximin is described as ὁς μόνος ... ἀναπέφηνεν (848,9-10). Eusebius undoubtedly wanted to say that Maximin was the last and the most cruel of the members of the Imperial college established by Diocletian, whose religious policy aimed at eliminating Christianity. But the statement is striking, since it takes no account of his acknowledgment of the Christian God or of his confession of his sins as a persecutor, as mentioned in the passage immediately preceding.

Eusebius wrote: οὕτω δῆτα Μαξιμίνου ἐκποδῶν γενομένου, ... τὰ μὲν τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀνανεώσεως ἐκ θεμελίων⁴⁰² χάριτι θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἠγγείρετο κτλ. (848,9-12). The phrase creates the impression that the persecutions stopped only after God had brought about Maximin's death. But this also contradicts the previous account, according to which the persecution ceased with the law on religious freedom, as pointed out quite clearly by Eusebius in *cap.* 10,12. We will not discuss these observations, but they do show that the section is no straightforward continuation of the previous account.

The section has a pronouncedly Christian bias. The restoration of the churches was made possible by God, and because of the new freedom His word spread and was received to glory of the Almighty.⁴⁰³ Eusebius continued: τὰ δὲ τῆς δυσσεβείας τῶν τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθρῶν αἰσχύνης ἐσχάτης καὶ ἀτιμίας ἐνεπίμπλατο (848,14-15). The phrase seems to refer to the enemies of Christianity in general. But the subsequent passages make it clear that Eusebius must have been thinking, first and foremost, of Maximin and his family.

Cap. 11,2 (848,15-24) reports that Maximin was declared by Constantine and Licinius to be an enemy of society⁴⁰⁴ and, in public decrees, the most godless tyrant.⁴⁰⁵ Portraits of him and his children set up in every town in his honour were either destroyed or blackened, and statues were knocked down; the result was that he became a laughing stock.

Eusebius gave his readers a lively and no doubt authentic description of the *damnatio memoriae* which overcame Maximin. It is difficult to know if Eusebius reproduced the descriptions used in the decrees or composed his own on the basis of the common rhetorical pattern of a tyrant. It is at any rate a fact that Maximin was officially stamped as *tyrannus* and was therefore liable to *damnatio memoriae*.

Next, *cap.* 11,3-4 (848,24-25) states that the other enemies of Christianity were deprived of their honours and all Maximin's supporters⁴⁰⁶ were killed, particularly those whom he had given the highest positions and who – in order to flatter him – had raged against Christianity.⁴⁰⁷ Amongst them were Peucetius and Culcianus and many others who had sustained and consolidated Maximin's rule.

Eusebius wrote εἶτα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθρῶν πᾶσαι τιμαὶ περιηροῦντο, ἐκτείνοντο δὲ καὶ πάντες οἱ τὰ Μαξιμίνου φρονοῦντες, ὅσοι μάλιστα τῶν ἐν ἀρχικοῖς ἀξιώμασιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τιμημένοι κτλ. (848,24-850,2). This produces a contradiction, in fact. First, we are told that all Maximin's supporters were killed, then that only his highest officials suffered this punishment. The explanation no doubt, is that, on second thoughts, Eusebius felt it was necessary to modify the first statement by saying that it applied only to the highest officials. At the same time, he wanted to prove the truth of his claim by listing the names of some of them. This interpretation is then confirmed by 850,7-8: ἄλλοι τε ἐπὶ τούτοις οὐκ ὀλίγοι, δι' ὧν μάλιστα τὰ τῆς Μαξιμίνου τυραννίδος

402 Eusebius's expression probably refers to both the restoration of the church buildings and the spiritual renewal of the Church following the difficult time of the persecutions.

403 ὁ τε τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, εἰς δόξαν τοῦ τῶν ὄλων θεοῦ διαλάμπων, μεῖζονα τῆς πρόσθεν ἀπελάμβανεν παρρησίαν (848,12-13).

404 πρῶτος τε γὰρ Μαξιμίνος αὐτὸς κοινὸς ἀπάντων πολέμιος ὑπὸ τῶν κρατούντων ἀναγορευθεὶς (848,15-16). πρῶτος probably refers to τῶν τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐχθρῶν (848,14) in the preceding passage. But it hardly means that he was the first to suffer *damnatio memoriae*, as Lawlor-Oulton's translation apparently suggests: "For Maximin himself was the first to be proclaimed by the rulers as a common enemy of all" (*Eusebius* I, p. 295). Henri Valois' version is more precise: *Primum enim Maximinus ipse, hostis publicus ab imperatoribus renuntiatus, edictis etc.* (PG XX, 2, p. 838 A) – κοινὸς ... πολέμιος (848,15-16) is probably translated into *hostis rei publicae*. ὑπὸ τῶν κρατούντων ἀναγορευθεὶς (848,16) must mean that Constantine and Licinius were responsible for his official condemnation to *damnatio memoriae*.

405 δυσσεβέστατος καὶ δυσωνυμώτατος καὶ θεομισέστατος τύραννος διὰ προγραμμάτων δημοσίων ἀνεστηλίτευτο (848,16-18).

406 οἱ τὰ Μαξιμίνου φρονοῦντες (848,25-26).

407 ὅσοι μάλιστα τῶν ἐν' ἀρχικοῖς ἀξιώμασιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τιμημένοι τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολακείᾳ σοβαρῶς ἐνεπαροίησαν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγῳ (848,26-850,2).

ἐκροταιοῦτό τε καὶ ἠϋξέτο. The people mentioned here must be οἱ τὰ Μαξιμίνου φρονοῦντες in 848,25-26, so 850,7-8 is, in fact, a repetition. 848,26-850,8 must therefore be regarded as an addition, both modifying and specifying the number of Maximin's supporters who were punished by death. In other words, they must have been the highest officials who, as an inner circle, had comprised the *concilium* with whom Maximin discussed and planned his policies. Eusebius's addition also makes it clear that they suffered death because they had consolidated and extended τὰ τῆς Μαξιμίνου τυραννίδος. The motivation is therefore clearly political. This explains why we only hear of Peucetius's political career: he was Maximin's closest colleague and friend, was a consul three times and was in charge of the Imperial finances.⁴⁰⁸ Similarly, we are told that Culcianus held the highest positions.⁴⁰⁹ The section also suggests that their persecutions of the Christians were a contributory reason why they were ousted. Eusebius wrote of three officials: τῆ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολακεία σοβαρῶς ἐνεπαροίησαν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγῳ (850,1-2). This applied to Peucetius too. It is said quite specifically of Culcianus that ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς μυρίοις τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον Χριστιανῶν ἐλλαμπρυνάμενος αἵμασιν (850,5-7), but the sentence must be regarded as a later insertion; it breaks the rhythm of a carefully constructed sentence.⁴¹⁰ *Cap.* 11,2-8 was therefore originally a purely political section. The question then arises whether 850,1-2 was perhaps also a later addition to an account of Licinius's clash with Maximin and his supporters. If this proves to be the case, Licinius's purge was inspired by politics, not by religion.

Cap. 11,5-6 (850,8-20) reports that Licinius killed Theotecnus and the prophets and priests of the Zeus statue set up by him, because the cult of its oracle was based on deception.

The section begins ἐκάλει δὲ ἄρα καὶ Θεότεκνον ἢ δίκη (850,8-9), meaning divine justice, which – it goes on to say – does not let anti-Christian acts go unpunished.⁴¹¹ The introductory sentence provides a kind of heading, which indicates the theme for the ensuing account.

We hear, first, that Theotecnus seemed to prosper after having set up the statue of Zeus in Antioch. He was even made provincial procurator.⁴¹² Eusebius is here referring to his account on Theotecnus in *cap.* 2-3. He goes on to say that when Licinius came to Antioch, in search of γοηταί,⁴¹³ he subjected the prophets and priests of the Zeus statue to torture to discover the true nature of their activities.⁴¹⁴ They were forced to disclose the fact that the entire oracle cult was a fraud contrived by Theotecnus.⁴¹⁵ Licinius then punished him and all those who had participated in γοητεία by torture and death.

The introductory sentence in *cap.* 11,5-6 stated that the section described God's punishment of Theotecnus, but the investigations and punishments were, in fact, organized by Licinius.⁴¹⁶

It is surprising, too, that 850,8-10 discusses the punishment of Theotecnus's anti-Christian behaviour, whereas the rest of the section describes Licinius's fight against the γοητεία.⁴¹⁷ Now, such measures were often inspired by fears of political conspiracy. The question is then whether Licinius's battle against magic should also be seen in this light. The γοητεία was connected with the Zeus shrine which had been of such great

408 Eusebius described his position as τῶν καθόλου λόγων ἑπαρχος (850,4), which means that he was *praefectus for summae rationes*.

409 850,5: Κουλικιανός τε ὡσαύτως διὰ πάσης ἀρχικῆς προελθὼν ἐξουσίας. H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton make this appropriate comment: "Eusebius seems to think that he was appointed Prefect by Maximin, which is certainly not the case" (*Eusebius* II, p. 304).

410 It probably read: Κουλικιανός τε ὡσαύτως διὰ πάσης ἀρχικῆς προελθὼν ἐξουσίας, ἄλλοι τε ἐπὶ τούτοις κτλ.

411 850,9-10: ἡ δίκη, οὐδαμῶς τὰ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν αὐτῶ πεπραγμένα λήθη παραδιδούσα.

412 Since Theotecnus was presumed to reside in Antioch, he must have become *praeses* of the province *Coele Syria*.

413 850,12-13: Λικίνιος δ' ἐπιβὰς τῆς Ἀντιοχείων πόλεως φώραν τε γοήτων ποιησάμενος. It is tempting to relate this to *cap.* 3 (808,5-7): καὶ πάντα τρόπον τοῦς ἡμετέρους ὡσπερ τινὰς φώρας ἀνοσοῦς ἐκ μυχῶν θηρεῦσαι διὰ σπουδῆς πεποιημένους. In that case, Eusebius wanted to point out that Theotecnus got his just deserts.

414 850,13-15: τοῦς τοῦ νεοπαγοῦς ξοάνου προφήτας καὶ ἱερεῖς βασάνοις ῥιζίζετο, τίνι λόγῳ τὴν ἀπάτην καθυποκρίνοντο, πυνθανόμενος. Lawlor-Oulton translated the sentence like this: "to find out by what contrivance they were practising this deceit" (*Eusebius* I, p. 295). This translation does render the meaning, but strictly speaking it finds no support in the actual text. If seen in isolation, the words could be translated: with what right or by what reason they proclaimed falsehoods. This translation disagrees, however, with the subsequent account which clearly presupposes that Licinius was in reality unaware of the events at this shrine. Taken literally, the words make little sense. The question is, therefore, whether this is the original text. If we remove τὴν ἀπάτην, a clear line of thought, at least, appears: Licinius would investigate their justification and reason for speaking in oracles. τὴν ἀπάτην must then have been inserted to avert the misunderstanding that Licinius might have doubted the deceitful nature of the shrine.

415 Eusebius used the word τὸ μυστήριον. He undoubtedly wished to state that it was a cult shrine, the rites of which corresponded to the mystery religions, an interpretation clearly suggested by the description in *cap.* 2. Eusebius used the word to emphasize the suspect and dubious nature of the shrine. This is clearly supported by the play on the words ἐπικυβεσθαι (850,15) and ἐδήλουν (850,16).

416 850,17-18: τοῖς πᾶσιν τὴν ἀξίαν ἐπιθεῖς δίκην.

417 The introductory words on Licinius: φώραν γοήτων ποιησάμενος (850,12-13), and the statement that he punished by death τοῦς τῆς γοητείας κοινωνοῦς (850,18-19), clearly establish this as the basic theme.

importance to Maximin. This was an additional reason why it must be destroyed⁴¹⁸ – otherwise, it might have become a dangerous rallying point for Maximin's supporters, constituting a threat to Licinius's political position. Therefore, Licinius's purge of those who served the shrine of the oracle was part of his struggle to eliminate Maximin's supporters. The account is therefore, in essence, determined by political considerations. Since, however, the shrine set up by Theotecnus had also given the impetus for renewed persecutions of the Christians, Eusebius regarded its destruction and the death penalty on Theotecnus as God's own punishment. This was the interpretation which he was putting forward when he inserted 850,8-10. But this conclusion also makes it probable that 850,10-20 belongs with 848,15-850,8, perhaps as its direct continuation.

Cap. 11,7 (850,29-26) reports that Maximin's sons and all his family died in the utmost disgrace.⁴¹⁹ Eusebius only says of Maximin's sons that they shared in the Imperial dignity and were therefore depicted together with their father.⁴²⁰ This must imply that they were killed, since they had been chosen to succeed him to the Imperial throne. On the other hand, the rest of his kin are said explicitly to have been killed because they had been actively involved in the oppression⁴²¹ – they had taken part in Maximin's tyrannical rule.

Eusebius gave yet another reason, though, for their deaths. They paid no heed to the Scriptures which say that those who trust their rules will perish.⁴²² We are presented here with a double reason of a political and a religious nature. Now, in the account to date, Eusebius has not mentioned Maximin's family at all. His statement that they all perished must have been taken from an account which described Licinius's annihilation not only of Maximin's supporters but also of his entire family. He must have felt that the simple political reason, their acts of oppression, was insufficient; he wanted to emphasize the point that they perished because they had not placed their trust in God – although they had been offered numerous opportunities.⁴²³ Eusebius's addition introduces a religious perspective into the account of Licinius's political power struggle with Maximin's family and supporters – it was part the universal struggle between Christianity and paganism.⁴²⁴

This aspect also predominates in the next section, 852,9-14.⁴²⁵ The purge of the godless, it says, secured Constantine and Licinius's rightful supremacy. In recognition of the fact that God had granted them this supremacy, they showed their love and gratitude towards Him by legislating in favour of the Christians.

The previous passage only reported on the purge which Licinius had undertaken, but in fact the purge also benefitted Constantine.⁴²⁶ Their rightful rule was now ensured and was no longer threatened by usurpers.⁴²⁷ The text clearly states that Constantine and Licinius were in complete accord – together they represented piety against the godlessness of Maxentius and Maximin. And when it says that their Empire endures, it in fact expresses the concept that the Imperial power rises and falls with Christianity.

Eusebius's comment on Constantine and Licinius οἱ τῶν πρόσθεν

418 We must interpret the matter thus: the annihilation of the entire priesthood implied that the shrine of the oracle was closed.

419 Strictly speaking, Eusebius was describing Maximin's sons only: τούτοις ἅσασιν προσετίθεντο (850,20), which means that they died too, along with Maximin's political and religious supporters, as reported in the previous account. It says of Maximin's family, however: τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς προοδηλωμένοις μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀτιμίας ἔπασχον (850,24) – in other words, death.

420 850,20-22: οἱ Μαξιμίνου παῖδες, οὓς ἤδη καὶ τῆς βασιλικῆς τιμῆς τῆς τε ἐν πῖναξιν καὶ γραφαῖς ἀναθέσεως πεποίητο κοινωνοῦς. According to this, Maximin gave his sons a share of the Imperial power, which must mean that he made them *caesares*. In other words, Maximin had established an Imperial dynasty, or rather wanted to continue the Imperial family established by Diocletian.

421 850,22-23: καὶ οἱ συγγένειαν δὲ τοῦ τυράννου τὸ πρῶν αὐχοῦντες καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους καταδυναστεύειν. He must have been thinking of the Imperial family in the broadest sense. He was probably referring to the Imperial family established by Diocletian, which included all relations, whether they had become members by birth or by marriage. But Eusebius did not discuss the identity of any individuals at this point.

422 Eusebius was quoting *Ps.* 145,3-4 here. The only difference from LXX (ed. A. Rahlf's) is that Eusebius's text has ἐπὶ υἱοῦς ἀνθρώπων instead of καὶ ἐφ' υἱοῦς ἀνθρώπων and he wrote ἀποστρέψει instead of ἐπιστρέψει.

423 Eusebius thus wrote ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐδέξαντο παιδείαν μηδὲ ἔγνωσαν μηδὲ συνῆκαν τὴν φάσκουσαν ἐν ἱεροῖς λόγοις παρακάλειυσιν (850,25-26).

424 ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐδέξαντο κτλ. (850,25-852,2) refers, in the strictest sense, only to Maximin's relations. But Eusebius may, in fact, have been thinking of Maximin's supporters in general when he provided this addition.

425 The section given here is retained in ATERM and belongs to the oldest version.

426 Eusebius's words: οὗτω δῆτα τῶν δυσοσεβῶν ἐκκαθαρόθέντων (852,9) must, in the context, refer to Maximin's family and supporters, who had been mentioned previously. But the next phrase requires a reading which interprets οἱ δυσοσεβεῖς as referring to Maxentius and Maximin.

427 852,9-11: μόνοις ἐφυλάττετο τὰ τῆς προσηκούσης βασιλείας βέβαια τε καὶ ἀνεπίφθονα Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ Λικιννίῳ. The passage mentions Constantine and Licinius's βασιλεία, to which they were rightly entitled: the opposite must be the rule of Maxentius and Maximin. The use of ἀνεπίφθονα confirms this interpretation: no one is now jealous of the legitimate rulers – and they must be usurpers.

ἀπάντων ἐκκαθάραντες τοῦ βίου τὴν θεοεχθρίαν (852,11) appears to be a repetition of οὕτω δῆτα τῶν δυσσεβῶν ἐκκαθαρθέντων (852,9).⁴²⁸ This raises the question whether 852,11-14 originally belonged with 852,9-11. In support of the hypothesis that they were originally two independent pieces, we may note that they describe, respectively, Constantine and Licinius's consolidated Empire and their legislation in favour of the Christians. In the first sentence, the perspective is political, in the second, religious, since the legislation reflected their gratitude to God for the gifts he had granted them.

The fact that οἱ δυσσεβεῖς in 852,9 must refer to Maxentius and Maximin means that, originally, 852,9-11 was not the direct continuation of the previous section. In fact, the expression refers back to *cap.* 9,1 which said that Constantine and Licinius, as God loving Emperors were chosen by God to fight the godless tyrants whom they defeated with His help.⁴²⁹ A connection between 852,9-11 and the account which formed the basis of *cap.* 9,1 now seems to explain the passive form ἐκκαθαρθέντων: with God's help, the godless tyrants were purged. This then means that God was the grammatical object of ἐφυλάττετο: God had safeguarded Constantine and Licinius's Empire. This interpretation makes οἱ τῶν πρόσθεν ἀπάντων ἐκκαθάραντες (852,11) seem confusing, but the next phrase makes excellent sense: in gratitude for the gifts God had granted them, they issued pro-Christian legislation. οἱ τῶν πρόσθεν κτλ. must therefore be a later insertion which serves to establish a connection to the purge mentioned in *cap.* 11,2-8.⁴³⁰

The precise meaning of διὰ τῆς ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ... νομοθεσίας (852,13-14) is not clear. The expression seems to presume that readers did not know that Constantine and Licinius issued a law in favour of the Christians. But since Eusebius mentioned this fact in *cap.* 9,12-13, the expression proves that 852,11-14 belonged to an earlier version – probably the original one. We cannot decide if Eusebius might have published the so-called Milan Edict in connection with this law. He probably did not, since the ensuing doxology makes it clear that the law had freed the Christians from all their troubles.

The various manuscripts place the doxology, 852,2-6, in different places,⁴³¹ but it probably does belong to the original version, since it describes the Christians' gratitude to God and Christ for the help they had received. From this, it appears that the original version must have been defined by the religious viewpoint that God had come to the aid of the Church and had stopped the persecution which had begun again.

In this context, the Imperial power was of no independent importance, and the doxology ends, most appropriately, with the following prayer to God through Christ: τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης ἐκ τε τῶν ἕξωθεν ὀχληρῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ διάνοιαν βέβαια καὶ ἀσάλευτα φυλάττεσθαι ἡμῖν διὰ παντὸς εὐχόμεθα (852,4-6). The Church will continue to be wholly dependent on God's mercy.

428 In the first case the purge was described by a passive construction and in the second case by an active construction, but this difference is of no importance to the contents.

429 Eusebius wrote in 826,22-23 (ATER): δύο θεοφιλῶν κατὰ τῶν δύο δυσσεβεστάτων τυράννων ἀνεγηγεμένων.

430 This explains why the account states that Constantine had purged τὴν θεοεχθρίαν, although the preceding section mentioned only Licinius's purge. The original section described Constantine and Licinius exclusively as one entity, just as *cap.* 9,1, and this determined the insertion.

431 Only the manuscripts BD placed the doxology at the end of the ninth book. ATERM places it at the beginning of the tenth book.

Conclusion

Rufinus's version of Eusebius's Church History is very free – and this is particularly true of his rendering of *lib.* VIII-IX. A detailed comparison between his translation and Eusebius's original exposes so many digressions both large and small that his *interpretatio*, although it reproduces the structure of Eusebius's work, is in actual fact an independent piece of work.

Now, in most cases it is possible to indicate the motives which have prompted Rufinus to deviate from Eusebius. It even appears that his digressions nearly always follow a very distinct pattern. His translation is governed by very definite principles which make it justifiable to talk of Rufinus's *ars interpretandi*.

Many of Rufinus's deviations from the original arise from his desire to produce a clear and immediately intelligible Latin translation. This meant in respect to style that he had to rework the heavy prose style of the original – it certainly did not lend itself to a literal translation – by breaking Eusebius's long sentences into short succinct sentences. He was, moreover, anxious to make the meaning quite clear. This could be done, for example, by rearranging the elements of a sentence and making negative sentences positive. At other times, to achieve his aim, he felt bound to abbreviate Eusebius's verbose sentences. Where the original had what he considered superfluous repetitions or where its phraseology was needlessly complicated and obtuse, he quite simply left it out. Conversely, he felt himself justified in replacing imprecise words and phrases in Eusebius with expressions which were clear and unambiguous. Nor did Rufinus hesitate to rewrite or add explanations of his own if this would aid understanding. Moreover, when he found that Eusebius had not been successful in bringing about a satisfactory connection between various sentences and sections, he tried to remedy the situation by using new conjunctions and on the whole by editing the material in such a way that clear continuity was created between the separate parts of the text. The stylistic means which Rufinus employed in the reshaping of his original reveal his dependence on contemporary rhetoric with which he must have been familiar – here he is not being original. But then it must be added that Rufinus did not cherish literary ambitions; he did not wish to produce a work of literary brilliance, but simply to present a translation of such simplicity that the Christians of Aquileia could easily understand it and benefit from it.

As far as the actual contents were concerned, Rufinus also repeatedly had to depart from Eusebius's original. He therefore corrects what to his mind is wrong and misleading historical information. When he finds that Eusebius has not given sufficient background for understanding the course of events, he supplies it himself. It is further characteristic of Rufinus that he is anxious to let the inner unity and continuity stand out in the *historia rerum gestarum* which he presented to his readers – that this concern also prompted many of the above mentioned stylistic alterations goes without saying. In the same way he is anxious that the description of the history of the Church should appear as a coherent progressive account. Therefore we see him time and again establishing the connecting link between the various parts of the account which he finds missing in his original. If he lacks an explanation in Eusebius of why such and such a person acted as he did, or why such and such an event took place, he himself gives what he considers to be the right answer. On the other hand, when Eusebius has excessive repetitions and superfluous digressions, he removes them in order to create a close knit text which highlights the points at issue. It is equally characteristic of Rufinus that he always tries to remove all inconsistencies and mere contradictions which he detects in Eusebius. This he accomplishes either by completely omitting the problematical passages or by creating a new text in which the difficulties are resolved.

At the same time as he endeavours to create a continuous and consistent account in his version, Rufinus considers it essential to emphasize the religious and moral lessons of the *res gestae* which comprise the history of the Church. If he finds that the original has not made them sufficiently clear for the readers, he considers it his duty to remedy this defect. To achieve this purpose he often gives a rather free paraphrase of his original. At other times he makes his own additions, which point to the spiritual implications of the *res gestae*. Conversely, he occasionally also considers himself bound to omit things in Eusebius which contain biased teaching or which are open to misunderstandings. Where the original calls for it, he feels free to add new material which he has otherwise come across and found relevant.

In conclusion, it must be said of Rufinus's translation of *lib. VIII-IX* that it is an expression of the desire to create in a lucid style a clear and intelligible text, which gives a consistent, progressive account of the history of the Church and emphasizes the religious and moral teachings which this Christian *historia rerum gestarum* contains. With this con-

ception of *historia rerum gestarum*, Rufinus has a sharp eye for deficiencies and omissions in Eusebius and these he tries to correct and improve upon in his translation. He has in his version of Eusebius manifested such acute and discerning powers that one can almost state categorically that, where he deviates from the original, the reason is that it is “revisionsfähig” in the places at issue because of inconsistencies, contradictions, imprecise and even wrong information, and lack of continuity. Rufinus’s translation of *lib. VIII-IX* shows in fact that they, to an even greater extent than scholars have realized, constitute a “patchwork”. He knows precisely where he has to reshape the original and this is accomplished with such consistency that in most cases it is even possible to state the reasons for his deviations.

Rufinus was convinced that he had faithfully translated Eusebius. This without doubt is due to the fact that he considered his adaptation of Eusebius’s original to be the best way of allowing its meaning to stand out clearly. In other words, his conception of a faithful translation did not mean a simple literal rendering of the Greek text but rather a translation which brought the *sensus* out clearly. Since Rufinus indeed considered that he had reproduced exactly the mind and spirit of Eusebius, he undoubtedly found it unnecessary in his *prologus* to tell his readers that his *interpretatio* was not intended to be an *interpretatio literalis*. He must have taken it for granted that the correct *ars interpretandi* consisted of rendering the original *sensus*, so that his readers could grasp it immediately, in which case it was superfluous to state the principles behind his translation.

If one should ask how far Rufinus in his revision of the original in fact does render Eusebius’s *sensus*, a simple answer cannot be given. In many places where the original is vague and difficult to understand he has been successful in reproducing Eusebius’s meaning. Where he has abbreviated the original or expanded it with new material, he has in several cases grasped what Eusebius was aiming at. On other occasions, there are a number of revisions which stem from Rufinus’s own conception of what the true point in the original must be. Often a case can be made for the basic correctness of his interpretation. However, for many cases, his alterations are prompted by ideas different from those of Eusebius – for instance as regards the relation between the Church and the Roman Empire and political and social problems. Incidentally, this fact in itself makes Rufinus’s translation of Eusebius’s Church History a valuable source for his own theological thinking.

In this study I have restricted myself solely to Rufinus's translation of *lib.* VIII-IX of Eusebius's Church History, precisely because it is admirably suited to illustrate how Rufinus works with an original text which simply is a "patchwork". It should be evident that Rufinus's translation can in no way be described as "willkürlich". It is on the contrary the result of a meticulous attempt to understand his original and to translate it clearly and understandably into Latin – Rufinus knows exactly what he is doing, because he works from a precise conception of what the correct *ars interpretandi* requires. In addition, the insight gained from these two books is not without some significance in evaluating the many other translations into Latin which Rufinus undertook, first and foremost the writings of Origen, for which we do not possess the original texts.

The examination undertaken here has a wider perspective in yet another respect. Through his translation of *lib.* VIII-IX, Rufinus has proved himself to be a competent scholar and independent thinker. He possesses critical acumen and discernment and at the same time has his own conception of the implications of a *historia rerum gestarum*. Finally, his method of arranging his material and his efforts to create consistency and unity manifest a clear understanding of Christianity.

With this in mind and in view of the great influence which Rufinus wielded for more than a thousand years in the West through his translations, it is amazing that he has received such scanty attention by scholars. Undoubtedly this is owing to Jerome's elegant, but embittered and spiteful attack on him as a heretic. But even if Rufinus is not the same brilliant stylist as Jerome, this by no means justifies his being overshadowed by Jerome to his detriment, as happened in the Renaissance. Rufinus has qualities which to a great extent can bear comparison with Jerome. He deserves a careful examination because of his personal merit as a scholar and a theologian, but most certainly also because in an independent way he imparted the theological scholarship of the East to the West.

Bibliography

- Allard, P. *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle*. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged. Paris, 1898.
- Allard, P. *La persécution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'Église*. 2 vols. Paris, 1890.
- Bardy, G., ed. and trans. *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire Ecclésiastique*. 4 vols. Sources Chrétiennes, 31, 41, 55, 73. Paris, 1952-1960.
- Bardy, G. *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école*. Paris, 1936.
- Barnes, T. D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, Mass., 1981.
- Barnes, T. D. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
- Christensen, T. *C. Galerius Valerius Maximus: Studier over politik og religion i Romerriget 305-13*. Festschrift published by the University of Copenhagen. Copenhagen, 1974.
- Christensen, T. "Rufinus of Aquileia and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. VIII-IX of Eusebius." *Studia Theologica*, 34 (1980), 129-152.
- Christensen, T. "The So-called *Appendix* to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica VIII*." *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XXXIV (1983), 177-209.
- Delehaye, H. "Les martyrs d'Égypte." *Analecta Bollandiana*, XL (1922), 5-154.
- Delehaye, H. "S. Barlaam: Martyr à Antioche." *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXII (1903), 129-145.
- Fritzen, M. H. *Methoden der diokletianischen Christenverfolgung: Nach der Schrift des Eusebius über die Märtyrer in Palästina*. Munich, 1962.
- Galletier, E., ed. and trans. *Panegyriques Latins*. 3 vols. Paris, 1949-1955.
- Grant, R. M. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford, 1980.

- Grant, R. M. "Eusebius, H. E. VIII: Another Suggestion." *Vigiliae Christianae*, 22 (1968), 16-18.
- Halkin, F. "L'»Apologie« du martyr Philéas de Thmuis (Papyrus Bodmer, XX) et les Actes latins de Philéas et Philoromus." *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXXXI (1963), 5-27.
- Hirschfeld, O. *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. 2nd. ed., revised. Berlin, 1905.
- Janne, H. "L'histoire ecclésiastique d'Eusèbe et le système de M. Laqueur." *Byzantion*, VIII (1933), 741-749.
- Laqueur, R. *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte*, 11. Berlin and Leipzig, 1929.
- Lawlor, H. J. & Oulton, J. E. L., eds. and trans. *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine*. 2 vols. London, 1927-1928.
- L'Orange, H. P. & Gerkan, A. von *Der spätantike Bildschmuck des Konstantinbogens. Studien zur spätantiken Kunstgeschichte*, 10. Berlin and Leipzig, 1939.
- Mason, A. J. *The Persecution of Diocletian: A Historical Essay*. Cambridge, 1876.
- Musurillo, H., ed. and trans. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford, 1972.
- Oulton, J. E. L., ed. and trans. *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History II*. The Loeb Classical Library, 265. London, 1932.
- Schoenebeck, H. von "Beiträge zur Religionspolitik des Maxentius und Constantins." *Klio*, Beiheft XLIII (1939).
- Schwartz, E., ed. and trans. *Eusebius: Werke II*. 3 vols. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Vbl. IX, 1-3. Leipzig, 1903-1909.
- Schwartz, E. *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*. Vol. 3 in *Gesammelte Schriften*. Berlin, 1959.
- Seston, W. *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie I: Guerres et réformes 284-300*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, CLXII. Paris, 1946.

- Straub, J. A. *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*. Forschung zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, 18. Stuttgart, 1939.
- Valois, H. "Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae Historiae." *Migne, Patrologia Graeca*, vol. XX, 2. Paris, 1857, pp. 10-910.

Title. – Titles should be kept as short as possible and with an emphasis on words useful for indexing and information retrieval.

Abstract, Summary. – An abstract in English is compulsory. It should count 10–15 lines, outline main features, stress novel information and conclusions, and end with the author's name, title, and institutional and/or private postal address. – Papers in Danish may be provided with a summary in another language by agreement between author and editor.

Typescript. – Page 1 should contain title, author's name and the name of the Academy. Page 2: Abstract, author's name and address. Page 3: Table of contents if necessary. Captions should be delivered on separate sheets. Footnotes should be avoided if at all possible; if indispensable, they, too, should be typed on separate sheets. Consult a *recent* issue of the series for general layout.

Typewrite with double space throughout and leave a 4 cm margin *right*. Indicate desired position of illustrations and tables with pencil in margin *and repeat it in the galley proof*.

Use three or fewer grades of heading unless more are indispensable. Avoid long headings. Indicate clearly the hierarchy of headings.

Figures. – Please submit two copies of each graph, map, photograph, etc., all marked with the author's name. Whenever possible all figures will be placed within the text; the nature of the illustrations will govern the editor's choice of paper quality.

All figures, also line drawings, must be submitted as glossy, photographic prints suitable for direct reproduction. Prints fitting the indicated printed area are preferred, but the final size is the responsibility of the editor. The scale should be indicated in the caption or, preferably, on the illustration itself.

Fold-out figures and tables should be avoided. Use distinct (but not dominant) capital letters for the items in composite figures. For transfer lettering use simple, semi-bold typefaces. The size of the smallest letters should not be less than 1.5 mm. Intricate tables are often more easily reproduced from line-drawings or from technically perfect original computer or type processor output.

References. – In general, the editor expects all references to be formally consistent and in accordance with accepted practice within the particular field of research. Bibliographical references should preferably be given as, e.g., Shergold 1975, 16, the latter figure indicating the page number unless misunderstandable.

Correspondance

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editor, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, H.C.Andersens Boulevard 35, DK-1553, Copenhagen V, Denmark (tlf. +45.1.11 32 40). Questions concerning subscription to the series should be directed to the publishers.

Publisher

Munksgaard Export and Subscription Service
Nørre Søgade 35, DK-1370 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Editor: Poul Lindegård Hjorth

© (Year). Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the copyright owner.

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab

Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter

Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

Priser excl. moms / Prices abroad in Danish Crowns.

Vol.

- 10:3.** OLDENBURG, EVELYN, and RØHWEDER, JØRGEN: The Excavations at Tall Darūk and at 'Arab al-Mulk. (Publications of the Carlsberg Expedition to Phoenicia 8). 1982 200.-
- 10:4.** BUHL, MARIE-LOUISE: Sūkās VII. The Near Eastern Pottery and Objects of Other Materials from the Upper Strata. (Publications 9). 1983 200.-
- 11.** STEENBERG, AXEL: Hal og gård i Hejninge. En arkæologisk undersøgelse af to sjællandske landsbytomter. 1986 200.-
- 12.** LUND, JOHN: Sūkās VIII. The Habitation Quarters. (Publications of the Carlsberg Expedition to Phoenicia 10). 1986 400.-

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser

Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

Vol.

- 52:1.** Part I-II. MATTHIESSEN, POUL CHRISTIAN: The Limitation of Family Size in Denmark. (Princeton European Fertility Project). 1985 180.-
2. KØLLN, HERMAN: Der Bericht über den Dänenkönig in den St.-Wenzels-Biographien des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts. 1986 100.-
3. MCKINNON, ALASTAIR: Dating Kierkegaard's Battles with Fate. 1986 50.-
- 53.** ANDERSEN, LENE: Studies in Oracular Verses: Concordance to Delphic Responses in Hexameter. 1987 300.-
- 54.** PETERSEN, ARNE FRIEMUTH: Why Children and Young Animals Play. A New Theory of Play and its Role in Problem Solving. 1988 120.-
- 55.** OLSEN, BIRGIT ANETTE: The Proto-Indoeuropean Instrument Noun Suffix *tlom and its Variants. 1988 100.-
- 56.** HANSEN, MOGENS HERMAN: Three Studies in Athenian Demography. 1988 .. 50.-
- 57.** KRISTENSEN, ANNE KATRINE GADE: Who were the Cimmerians, and where did they come from? 1988 220.-
- 58.** CHRISTENSEN, TORBEN: Rufinus of Aquileia and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. VIII-IX, of Eusebius. 1989 450.-

Printed in Denmark by Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri A/S

ISSN 0106-0481. ISBN 87-7304-178-5