



## Two Notes on the Great Persecution

Norman H. Baynes

*The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 3/4. (Jul. - Oct., 1924), pp. 189-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%28192407%2F10%291%3A18%3A3%2F4%3C189%3ATNOTGP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>

*The Classical Quarterly* is currently published by The Classical Association.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## TWO NOTES ON THE GREAT PERSECUTION.

### I. THE FOURTH EDICT.—A SUGGESTION.

WHO was the author of the Fourth Edict in the great persecution of Diocletian's reign we do not know. Its precise terms are not recorded; of the date of its issue we are not informed. It is true that Mr. Kidd has recently written: 'On April 30, 304, Maximian put out the Fourth Edict in the name of himself and his co-Augustus,' but he discreetly forbears to give the reader any hint of the source on which he bases that statement. It may be doubted whether he has any better authority in mind than the ambiguous *Passio S. Sabini*, which, as even Mr. Mason admitted many years ago,<sup>2</sup> 'is not in the highest class of the historical relics of its age.' If, indeed, this supposition does not do Mr. Kidd an injustice, it would have been well to have given some reasoned defence of the document. Dufourcq<sup>3</sup> regards the *Passio S. Sabini* as a product of the Ostrogothic period, and contends that its picturesque exordium does not depend upon any earlier source. Until his detailed criticism of the *Passio* is answered, we can hardly use it for the reconstruction of the history of the fourth century.

As is well known, the two really distinctive phases of the persecution are respectively marked by the issue of the First and Fourth Edicts. That distinction is preserved in the records of the African Church by the two terms *dies traditionis* and *dies thurificationis*—the surrender of Christian writings and of church furniture, and the compulsion to sacrifice. Lactantius, it will be remembered, does not distinguish clearly in his account between the different edicts, and combines the *dies traditionis* and the *dies thurificationis*; Eusebius, after a date clause, which marks that the second year of the persecution has begun<sup>4</sup> (*ca.* Easter, 304), relates the arrival of Urbanus as governor of Palestine: after this the imperial edict ordering *general* sacrifice and libation is published, and the narrative then proceeds to recount the contemporaneous deaths of Timotheos in Gaza, and of Agapios, Thekla, and six others in Caesarea on March 24—i.e. in the year 305.

Is there any earlier date than this for the application of the Fourth Edict in the provinces immediately subject to Diocletian? I do not profess to be able to find my way in the maze of Egyptian martyrologies,<sup>5</sup> but, so far as I know, the only relevant document for our present purpose is the *Acta Phileae et Philoromi*. The martyrdom of Phileas and Philoromus took place under the praefect Culcianus. The dates of the praefects of Egypt at the time of the great persecution have been hotly disputed.<sup>6</sup> Eusebius names Culcianus (*H.E.* IX. 11. 4) and Hierocles (*Mart. Pal.* V. 3, long recension; *An. Boll.* XVI., p. 127; ed. Schwartz, p. 919). Culcianus appears as praefect in a document of the year 303 (*Pap. Ox.* I., p. 132; cf. Cantarelli,

<sup>1</sup> *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, I., pp. 520-521, Oxford, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> A. J. Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 213, Cambridge, 1876.

<sup>3</sup> Albert Dufourcq, *Études sur les Gesta Martyrum romains*, II., pp. 91-97, Paris, 1907.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *De Mart. Pal.* c. III. 1. I am not sure of the precise meaning of the words *δευτέρου δ' έτους διαλαβόντος*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. Delehay, *Les Martyrs d'Égypte*. *An. Boll.* XL., pp. 5-154, 299-364.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Seymour de Ricci, *Proceedings of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, XXIV. (1902); Cantarelli, in *Memorie of the Accademia of the Lincei*, Ser. V., T. XIV.; C. Schmidt, in *Texte und Untersuchungen* XX. (1901), Heft IV., Part II., pp. 47-50; M. Delehay, *An. Boll.*, XL. (1922), pp. 27 sqq.

*Memorie*. XIV., p. 324). Hierocles at the beginning of the persecution was consularis of Bithynia (Lact. *De Mort Pers.* XVI. 4), and must therefore have succeeded Culcianus. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LXVIII.; Migne, *P.G.* XLII., pp. 184-5) must be in error in stating that Culcianus was governor of the Thebaid while Hierocles was praefect of Alexandria. The doubtful point is therefore the date at which Hierocles entered on his office. P. Delehayé has recently argued that Hierocles must have become praefect of Egypt in the year 305. I believe that this contention cannot be supported. Hierocles was praefect of Egypt at the time of the martyrdom of Aedesius, who was executed shortly after (σμικρὸν τῷ χρόνῳ ὕστερον, Schwartz, p. 919) the martyrdom of his brother Aphianus, who suffered on April 2. Of what year? P. Delehayé supposes this to be April 2, 305. But the succession of events in Eusebius, *Mart. Pal.* is: Second year of the persecution begins (ca. Easter, 304)—Fourth Edict published; March 24, 305, martyrdom of Timotheos and others—abdication of Diocletian; in the course of the *third* year of persecution Maximin sends out letters ordering universal sacrifice; on April 2 Aphianus suffers martyrdom, and 'a little later' Aedesius appears before Hierocles. The year must be 306.<sup>1</sup> Hierocles need not, therefore, have entered upon his office until some time after April 2, 306. The martyrdom of Phileas and Philoromus on February 2 at the hands of Culcianus may fall in the spring of 306.<sup>2</sup>

For our present purpose we cannot make use of the Acta of Claudius, Asterius, and Neon. For the two Latin recensions of these Acta cf. (i.) Surius [1573] IV., pp. 873-875; (ii.) Ruinart [1859], pp. 309-311; and cf. *Synaxarium eccl. Constantinopolit.*, col. 178; *Menologium* of Basil, p. 151 [1727]. For a discussion of these Acta cf. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche*, Fasc. 5 (= *Studi e Testi* 27, Roma, 1915), pp. 107-118, in whose view, until earlier texts are found, it is impossible 'precisare con sicurezza il valore storico' of the Acts. The memory of the martyrs was preserved at various dates—August 23, October 30, and January 27.

The martyrdom of S. Theodotus of Ancyra presents great difficulties. The text has been published by Franchi de' Cavalieri in *Studi e Testi* VI., Roma, 1901, pp. 61-87; its historical value he has defended at length, *ibid.*, pp. 9-57. But our present text of the *Martyrium* can scarcely have been composed before the reign of Julian (cf. προστάτης τῶν Γαλλικαίων); the account is full of miraculous elements, while the date of the martyrdom is uncertain. Hunziker would place it in the persecution of Maximin between 308 and 311, *Zur Regierung und Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Diocletian*, p. 233, n. 4, and with this Harnack agrees (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II. 2, p. 480) on account of the order (c. 7 of the *Martyrium*) to contaminate the bread and wine with *idolothuta* (cf. Eusebius, *Mart. Pal.* 9. 2, and Franchi de' Cavalieri's criticism, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32). Franchi de' Cavalieri himself would date it to the spring of 303 (pp. 28 sqq.), but it would appear that since the governor orders Theodotus—an innkeeper—to sacrifice (p. 75. 14), the martyrdom, if historical, must be placed after the publication of the Fourth Edict. The whole story, however, contains wildly improbable details. Can it be conceived e.g. that to a provincial innkeeper a Roman judge should promise that if he sacrificed τῆς ἡμετέρας πρὸ πάντων ἀπολαύσεις φιλίας καὶ τῶν καλλιῶνων δὲ βασιλέων ἴση φίλος ὄψωσ καὶ γραμμάτων ἀξιοθήγη παρ' αὐτῶν τιμῆς σοι μεγίστης ἕνεκεν καὶ γράφης αὐτοῖς ὅτε χρεῖα καλέσῃ (75. 15 sqq.). We are surely in the world of the Arabian Nights. Following P. Delehayé, I cannot but regard the *Martyrium* as a pious romance, even though, with Harnack, we admit that it may preserve 'einen Kern alter Über-

<sup>1</sup> P. Delehayé's argument as against Schmidt, who would place the martyrdom of Aedesius in A.D. 308, is to my mind conclusive. The words of Eusebius (σμικρὸν τῷ χρόνῳ ὕστερον)

in this connexion cannot cover an interval of years.

<sup>2</sup> The Acta are printed in Ruinart (edition of 1859), p. 519-521.

lieferung' (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II. 2, p. 481; cf. H. Delehaye, *An. Boll.* XXII. [1903], pp. 320-328).

In a word, so far as I know, there is no *certain* date for the application of the Fourth Edict in the provinces directly subject to Diocletian before March 24, 305.

To turn to the western provinces governed by Maximian. The *Passio Maximae, Secundae et Donatillae An. Boll.*, IX. (1890), pp. 110-116, despite its opening words, 'In illis diebus Maximianus et Gallienus imperatores litteras miserunt per omnem illam prouinciam ut Christiani sacrificarent' (*An. Boll.* IX., p. 110), may be regarded as belonging to the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian,<sup>1</sup> and, if so, it certainly falls in the period after the issue of the Fourth Edict. The date of martyrdom is July 30,<sup>2</sup> and thus the year is 304. The *Passio* of S. Fabius also speaks of the *turificationis nefas*, and as it is dated to July 31 under Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius, and Maximian, this date must = July 31, 304.<sup>3</sup> The *Passio Crispinae*,<sup>4</sup> though the date has been disputed,<sup>5</sup> falls in the same year on December 5. Thus in Africa the first *certain* date for the application of the Fourth Edict would seem to be July 30, 304; it was, on the other hand, not yet being enforced in Africa on February 12, 304, as is shown by the *Acta Saturnini, Datiui, et aliorum*.<sup>6</sup>

This dating for Africa is confirmed for Sicily by the *Acta S. Eupli*.<sup>7</sup> Saint Euplus, deacon of Catania, desirous of martyrdom, brings into court on August 12, 304, a copy of the Gospels. It is manifest that he had not been called upon as yet to sacrifice. In court he is met by the demand to sacrifice according to the imperial order. It certainly looks as though the edict commanding general sacrifice had only just reached Sicily.

The *Acta Typasii*<sup>8</sup> are, it would appear, irrelevant for our present purpose. Typasius suffered under the application of the Fourth Edict (*An. Boll.*, IX., p. 119. 12) in the month of January ('*tertio iduum ianuari[ar]um*,' p. 123. 18), shortly before (p. 122. 33) the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian: this points to January, 305.

I am not aware of any martyrdoms in Rome or Italy, of which we have such accounts that they can be used as a basis for this enquiry. Thus in respect of the provinces directly subject to Maximian, our conclusion would be that there is no clearly established case of the application of the Fourth Edict before the month of July, 304. It will be unnecessary to consider its application in the provinces subject to Constantius, as it is well known that the Fourth Edict was not enforced there.

We pass to the provinces subject to Galerius. The Greek original of the *Acta* of Agape, Irene, and Chione, from which Sirleto made his Latin translation (Ruinart [1859], pp. 424-427), was published by Franchi de' Cavalieri in *Studi e Testi* IX. (1902), pp. 15-19. In their case the First Edict had already been enforced and their Christian literature taken from them, though it appears that Irene had subsequently collected in her house the Christian MSS. belonging to others (cf. *Studi e Testi* IX., pp. 11-12); there then follows the application of the Fourth Edict—the order to sacrifice and probably to taste the sacrificial food (cf. *ibid.*, p. 8). Irene's two sisters were first martyred; later Irene also is burned to death. As Franchi de' Cavalieri has shown, to the primitive interrogatory has been added a later introduction and epilogue. The author of the introduction and epilogue has at times misrepresented the statements elicited by the interrogatory, but there is, it would seem, no reason to question the date given for the martyrdom

<sup>1</sup> Though we can no longer use the reference to these martyrs in the *Acta S. Crispinae* in support of this view. Cf. Franchi de' Cavalieri in *Studi e Testi* IX. (1902), p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *An. Boll.*, IX. (1890), pp. 123-134; at pp. 123-5, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

<sup>4</sup> Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Studi e Testi*, IX.,

pp. 32-35.

<sup>5</sup> See reff. in *Studi e Testi* IX., p. 26, n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Ruinart [1859], pp. 414-422. On these *Acta*, cf. H. Delehaye, *Les Passions des Martyrs et les Genres littéraires*, Brussels, 1921, pp. 114 sqq.

<sup>7</sup> Ruinart [1859], pp. 436-439.

<sup>8</sup> *An. Boll.* IX., pp. 116-123.

of Irene—April 1, 304. Since there is an interval of some days at least between the martyrdom of Agape and Chione and the death of Irene (*ibid.*, pp. 4-5), the Fourth Edict, we conclude, was in application at Salonica (*ibid.*, p. 5) in February, 304.

Probus, a governor under Galerius, must have been a man after the Caesar's own heart: his persecuting energy is quite exceptional. The *Passio S. Pollionis*, § 1 (Ruinart [1859], p. 435), states 'Quo tempore [i.e. under Diocletian and Maximian] haec praeceptio cum uenisset ad Sirmiensem ciuitatem Probus praeses imperata sibi persecutione a clericis sumsit exordium et comprehensum sanctum Montanum presbyterum ecclesiae Singidunensis . . . iussit necari. Irenaeum quoque episcopum Sirmiensem ecclesiae . . . temporalis morti tradidit.' Comparing the *Passio S. Irenaei* (Ruinart [1859], p. 433) we see from the command of Probus, *Sacrifica*, that *haec praeceptio* is the Fourth Edict. Irenaeus of Sirmium, after repeated hearings before Probus, was martyred on April 6 (for the date cf. Ruinart [1859], note on p. 432). Since Montanus was martyred before Irenaeus, the Fourth Edict would seem to have reached Probus in the month of February; as this date is borne out by the *Acta* of Agape, Irene, and Chione, there can hardly be any doubt that the year is 304. Probus, still unsatisfied (*Passio S. Pollionis*, § 1), 'uicinas peragrandas esse credit ciuitates, et cum sub specie publicae necessitatis ad urbem Cibalarum peruenisset,' he immediately ('eodem die') arrests Pullio, Primicerius Lectorum of the church at Cibalis. Pullio suffered martyrdom on April 27. Under Maximus, governor of Moesia, at Dorostorum, the veteran Julius was put to death. In the earlier form of the *Acta S. Iulii Veterani*, published in *An. Boll.*, X. 50-52, no date is given for the martyrdom, but his *natale* was commemorated on May 27 (and for the date cf. the *Acta* in Ruinart [1859], p. 570). Julius is ordered to sacrifice to the gods, and his martyrdom probably falls, not under the early military persecution, but under the application of the Fourth Edict. Valentio had previously suffered martyrdom, and his memory is preserved on May 25. If these martyrdoms took place under Diocletian and under the terms of the Fourth Edict, the dates must necessarily belong to May, 304. The *Acta SS. Marciani et Nicandri* together with the *Acta S. Iulii* and those of SS. Pasicrates and Valentio, of which we only possess the *résumé* of the synaxaria, probably originally formed parts of a single account, which, like the *Acta* of SS. Marcian and Nicander, was written in Greek. Thus as victims of Maximus we have the list: Valentio and Pasicrates, Julius, Marcian, and Nicander, while the Hesychius mentioned in the *Acta S. Iulii* is to be found in the entry of the *Martyrolog. hieron.* under June 15 (17), 'in Dorostoro natalis sancti Isici.' (On June 17 as the date of the martyrdom of SS. Marcian and Nicander, cf. *A. SS.*, June 17, p. 215.) For our present purpose it is unnecessary to consider the difficult questions connected with the names of SS. Marcian and Nicander; it will be enough to refer to Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Nuovo Bullettino di archeologia cristiana* X. (1904), pp. 22-26, and *Note agiografiche* (= *Studi e Testi* XXIV.), Fasc. IV., Roma, 1912; *I SS. Marciano e Nicandro d' Egitto e gli omonimi di Mesia*, pp. 141-157; H. Delehaye, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie*, *An. Boll.*, XXXI. (1912), at pp. 268-272, and *Les Martyrs d'Égypte*, *An. Boll.*, XL. (1922), at pp. 54-60.

Later in the year 304, in the month of September, Philippus, Bishop of Heraclea, was martyred at Hadrianople (Ruinart [1859], pp. 439-448). On the *Passio Philippi* cf. Franchi de' Cavalieri in *Studi e Testi* XXVII. (1915), pp. 97-103.

The result of our enquiry can be thus formulated:

The Fourth Edict in the provinces subject to Galerius is already enforced in February, 304;

In those subject to Maximian such enforcement cannot be proved before July, 304;

In those subject to Diocletian it cannot be proved before March, 305.

In the *De Mortibus Persecutorum* of Lactantius, c. 18, there is a curious statement which, so far as I know, has not been noticed in this connexion by any modern writer. On the eve of Diocletian's abdication in May, 305, Galerius arrives in Asia 'non ut patri [sc. Diocletiano] gratularetur, sed ut eum cogeret imperio cedere. *Iam conflixerat nuper <cum> Maximiano sene cumque terruerat iniecto armorum civilium metu.*' I would suggest that in this passage is mirrored the origin of the Fourth Edict. Diocletian falls ill on leaving Rome in December, 303; Galerius takes his opportunity, and in the provinces directly subject to himself issues the Fourth Edict (February, 304). Maximian, always loyal to Diocletian and Diocletian's policy, refuses to acknowledge the edict; but, owing to Diocletian's illness, he can no longer rely on the support of the senior Augustus. Holding the Danubian recruiting grounds, Galerius threatens Maximian with civil war; to this threat Maximian is forced to yield. At the end of July the Fourth Edict has reached Africa; in August it begins to be enforced in Sicily. Early in 305 Galerius goes to the court of Diocletian and faces the shattered emperor with a *fait accompli*. Diocletian feels that it is too late to resist his Caesar's fatal policy; in March, 305, the Fourth Edict is being enforced in the eastern provinces. But that enforcement should be left to its author. In May Diocletian abdicates, and Galerius is master of the East.

## II. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE NINTH BOOK OF THE *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA* OF EUSEBIUS.

Professor Lawlor has devoted a chapter in his *Eusebiana*<sup>1</sup> to this subject, and since it would appear difficult to accept his conclusions it may be worth while very briefly to reconsider the data. Professor Lawlor unfortunately bases his reconstruction of the chronology on one of the most doubtful sections of the ninth book of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. In *H.E.* IX. 9. 12 Eusebius states that after Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge (October 28, 312) both he and Licinius *μῆ ἀ βουλή καὶ γνώμη νόμον ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν τελεώτατον πληρέστατα διατυπῶνται, καὶ τῶν πεπραγμένων εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ παράδοξα τὰ τε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ τυράννου [i.e. Maxentius] νίκης καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν Μαξιμίνῳ . . . διαπέμπονται.* The result of this communication was the issue by Maximin of his letter to Sabinus, which Professor Lawlor would date to January-February, 313 (p. 219), since he identifies the *νόμος τελεώτατος* of Eusebius with the 'Edict of Milan.' Eusebius himself would, it is true, appear to have made this identification; but the statement of Eusebius in this passage is doubtless due to a confusion of the 'Edict of Milan' with the communication sent to Maximin by Constantine—now Senior Augustus<sup>2</sup>—directly after his victory demanding a cessation of persecution in the eastern provinces.<sup>3</sup> We cannot, therefore, use this passage in order to date to February, 312, the letter of Maximin to Sabinus.

Let us, rather, start from the certain date of the 'Palinode' of Galerius, published in Nicomedia on April 30, 311 (Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* 35. 1). Maximin, wherever he was at the time—perhaps in Antioch—would receive it in May.<sup>4</sup> On its receipt his Praetorian Praefect Sabinus wrote to the provincial governors permitting a cessation of the persecution; this permission was liberally interpreted—the prisons were emptied, the exiles returned. Meanwhile Maximin

<sup>1</sup> Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912, pp. 211-234.

<sup>2</sup> Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* 44. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hermann Hülle, *Die Toleranzverlässe römischer Kaiser für das Christentum bis zum Jahre 313*. Greifswald Diss., Berlin, 1895, pp. 63 sqq. The attempt of Valerian Şesan (*Kirche und Staat im römisch-byzantinischen Reiche*, etc., I., Czernowitz, 1911) to prove that Con-

stantine issued in the autumn of 312 a general edict of toleration is misconceived (cf. *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit. Festgabe zum Konstantins-Jubiläum*, 1913, ed. F. S. Dölger; Joseph Wittig, *Das Toleranzreskript von Mailand 313*, pp. 40-65 at p. 64).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Otto Seock, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* I., p. 53.

forestalled Licinius by his seizure of the dioceses of Asia and Pontus, and while in Nicomedia received a petition from the pagans asking that the Christians might be excluded from the city. This was in 311, as is shown by the fact that this visit is referred to as having taken place 'last year' in a rescript issued in the summer of 312.<sup>1</sup> The memorial from the pagans of Nicomedia—possibly (as Professor Lawlor suggests, p. 222) August, 311—gave Maximin his pretext for changing his religious policy. The period of peace did not last 'six whole months';<sup>2</sup> this would take us to October-November, 311. And in the month of November, if we may trust the Syriac *Martyrology*, Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, was suddenly and without warning martyred in Egypt (November 24, 311);<sup>3</sup> 'about the same time'<sup>4</sup> Silvanus suffered death at Emesa, while on January 7, 312, Lucian was martyred at Nicomedia. Other cities followed the example of Nicomedia and memorialized Maximin. All these memorials are answered in a rescript of 312.<sup>5</sup> When this rescript was composed the corn was ripe in the fields;<sup>6</sup> this would, I suppose, give us the date *ca.* June, 312. In November of 312 Maximin would receive news of Constantine's victory, and as a result he issues the letter to Sabinus, permitting Christian worship, late in 312.<sup>7</sup> Early in 313 he marches against Licinius, and is defeated on April 30, 313: he flees to Nicomedia. Here he was allowed time to collect new forces. If, indeed, a rescript of toleration was issued by Constantine and Licinius from Milan towards the end of January, 312,<sup>8</sup> Maximin would doubtless while in Europe have learned of this. To secure the Christian population from deserting to the side of Licinius he issues his edict of toleration.<sup>9</sup> 'Last year,' he states, 'he had decreed by letters sent to the governors of every province that if anyone wished to follow the custom [of the Christians] or the observance of that religion' he should be at liberty to do so, but that his commands had been misunderstood.<sup>10</sup> This passage, which obviously refers to the letter to Sabinus, proves that that letter dates from the year 312. But the edict of toleration was itself penned 'not a whole year' after the rescript of *ca.* June, 312:<sup>11</sup> it was doubtless issued in May, 313. Licinius only published his edict in Nicomedia on June 13, 313.<sup>12</sup> Maximin retreated to Tarsus before the advance of Licinius, and must have died *ca.* August, 313.

Provided that we do not identify the message of Constantine of the autumn of 312 with the 'Edict of Milan,' the chronology of the ninth book of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* is consistent with itself and with our other authorities.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
LONDON.

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.* IX. 9. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 2. 1.

<sup>3</sup> If the month is right the martyrdom must be in 311 (not 312, as Professor Lawlor, p. 268), for it is dated to the ninth year of the persecution (*H.E.* VII. 32. 31) = *ca.* Easter 311 - *ca.* Easter 312.

<sup>4</sup> *H.E.* IX. 6. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 7. 2 sqq. Inscription of Arykanda in Osca von Gebhardt: *Acta Martyrum Selecta*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 184-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 7. 10.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 9a. For motive, cf. Hülle, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>8</sup> Despite the able article of John R. Knipping—*Das angebliche 'Mailänder Edikt' v. J. 313 im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte XL.*, pp. 206-218—I am not convinced that there was no such rescript.

<sup>9</sup> *H.E.* IX. 10. 7 sqq.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* 10. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* 10. 12.

<sup>12</sup> Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* 48. 1.