

NOTIUNCULAE MARTYROLOGICAE V

BY

JAN DEN BOEFT AND JAN BREMMER

S. Ronchey, *Indagine sul martirio di san Policarpo*. Rome, Istituto storico per il medio evo, 1990. 240 p.; Th. Baumeister, *Genese und Entfaltung der altkirchlichen Theologie des Martyriums* = *Traditio Christiana*, vol. VIII. Bern, Peter Lang, 1991. XL, 202 p.; R. Pillinger, *Das Martyrium des heiligen Dasius* (Österr. Ak. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Klasse, SB 517). Wien, 1988. 59 p; F. Ruggiero, *Atti dei martiri Scilitani. Introduzione, testo, traduzione, testimonianze e commento* (Atti della Acc. Naz. dei Lincei. Cl. di sc. mor., stor. e fil. Memorie, s. IX, vol. 1, fasc. 2). Rome, 1991. 100 p.

Early Christian martyrdom keeps drawing scholarly attention. The main focus of this interest may be somewhat shifting towards its Jewish predecessors or, as some would have it, examples, but this does not entail a loss of interest in the Christian documents themselves. This is hardly surprising, since both the general character of these documents and many of their details still pose all kinds of questions, which can seldom be readily solved. In this instalment of our “brief inquiries” we shall deal with four interesting publications of recent years, each of which is stimulating for further research.

1. *The Chronology of the Martyrium Polycarpi*

Many would have thought that Dehandschutter’s thorough and detailed study of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* had closed a long debate about the status and reliability of this text.¹ Of course, numerous specific elements remain the object of controversy; among them the date proposed by Dehandschutter for both Polycarp’s passion itself and its report in the *Martyrium*, viz. “during the final years of the reign of Antonius Pius”.² Yet few can have expected the wellnigh revolutionary proposals put forward by Dr. Ronchey, whose primary concern is not so much with the date of Polycarp’s death as with the time in which the text of the *Mart. Pol.* received its present form. With a variety of

arguments R. tries to prove that the text cannot belong to the second century but should rather be ascribed to a date somewhere in the third quarter of the third century. Put very briefly, the main line of R.'s attack on current views argues that many details of the *Mart. Pol.* are anachronistic.³ These details all support the text's clear intention, which primarily aims to advocate a positive attitude towards the authorities of the Roman empire.

In her analyses and explanations R. avails herself of a wealth of scholarly erudition. She continually refers to a great variety of relevant studies, both in Italian and in other modern languages; indeed, the bibliographical apparatus is most instructive in its own right. Moreover, R. departs from the right premises, viz. that a study of the *realia* should confirm or refute the proposed dating of the *Mart. Pol.* Add to this R.'s sustained and successful effort to provide her study with a clear and cohesive unity, and the persuasive tone of her novel theses will be comprehensible.

The essential foundation of Ronchey's wholly new interpretation are the suggested "anachronisms" in *Mart. Pol.* If her arguments in favour of these "anachronisms" can really stand up against critical tests, the battle is as good as won. Unfortunately, one may wonder whether the author has prepared herself sufficiently for such a chronological analysis. She mostly relies on older historical studies and tends to neglect recent epigraphical literature which, however, is indispensable for studying institutions, social and religious relations, etc. This insufficient knowledge appears clearly, for example, from her statement that most martyrs belonged to the lower classes, for which she adduces as proof Perpetua (although the *Passio Perpetuae* 2.1 clearly says that she belonged to a good family), the fact that Papyrus was a *principalis* (but see below on *Mart. Lugd.* 1.9), and from her discussion of the *Martyrium Pionii*, the composition of which she dates to the era of Decius, but which in her opinion was based on a process under Marcus Aurelius.⁴ We cannot enter here into a debate of all of Ronchey's arguments, but the following discussion of three important problems will sufficiently show whether her main thesis can be upheld.

We shall start with the case of a Christian who was arrested before Polycarp. Readers of the *Mart. Pol.* have always understood that "the Phrygian named Quintus, who has recently arrived at Smyrna from Phrygia" (§ 4) is a counterpart to Polycarp: the bishop acted carefully according to God's will in not giving himself up spontaneously, whereas

Quintus surrendered himself in consequence of a rash, but short-lived impetuosity. The text explicitly states that such exhibitionism is not evangelical: οὐχ οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which contrasts with τὸ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μαρτύριον of Polycarp (1.1). Many have suggested that Quintus was an early representative of the Phrygian sect par excellence, Montanism,⁵ but this immediately raises the question of chronology. T.D. Barnes has shown that Montanus began prophesying in 168, at the earliest. Consequently, if Quintus was one of his followers, Polycarp's death can hardly have taken place before about 170—which would be an asset to H. Grégoire's well-known plea for 177.⁶

R., for her part, emphasizes the “necessità di distinguere tra veridicità del fatto e autenticità dello scritto” (63). If the mere mention of Quintus as “Phrygian” is enough to refer to Montanism, one can hardly imagine this still being “un’eresia nascente” (67). Another curious aspect is the addressee of the letter, the small diocese of Philomelium, which at the time stood outside all political and cultural interests and which does not seem to have any role in the rising Montanist movement.⁷ Now the real strength of the sect only developed in the third century, so that the “intenzione antimontanista” (79) of the *Mart. Pol.* proves the anachronistical character of the document, which aims to urge its readers to avoid conflicts with the state. Polycarp's exemplary attitude stays aloof from the “dissennatezza dell'autodistruttivo polemismo martirologico” (91). That was typical of Montanism and the main purport of the orthodox *Mart. Pol.* was to warn against such stupid ruptures with the Roman state.

It is impossible to summarize all details of R.'s well-considered argument regarding the Montanist background of Quintus, but we trust its essence has not been unduly detracted from above. Now if the *Mart. Pol.* in its present form really has its “Sitz im Leben” “nel secondo montanismo”, viz. of the third century, the question must be raised why its reference to Montanism is so extremely vague. Would the mere mention of Quintus' provenance have been significant enough? This is after all the only possible allusion to the sect.⁸ It definitively seems most unlikely that an adaptation of a report on Polycarp's passion for the purpose sketched by R. would not have dwelt on Montanist excesses in far more explicit terms. The arguments derived from Polycarp's “polite” attitude towards the Roman governor are even less convincing. Indeed, the bishop states that Christians have been taught to pay respect

ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναις (10), but if that has to be regarded as directed against inopportune Montanistic insubordination, then Rom. 13.1 and 1 Petr. 2.13-14 are specimina of anachronistic anti-Montanism, too. As to Polycarp's readiness "di spiegare all' inquisitore la propria dottrina" (88), this is exactly paralleled by Carpus in the *Mart. Carpi* (9-20 Greek vision, 2 Latin vision) and Speratus in *Pass. Scil.* 4: *Si tranquillas praebueris aures tuas, dico mysterium simplicitatis*. Regarding Quintus, then, we can only concur with Barnes' observation, albeit put forward without any arguments: "there is no necessity to imagine any allusion whatever to Montanism".⁹

We now come to our second example. After Polycarp had left the small estate on the outskirts of Smyrna and moved to a different estate, presumably further away from the city, the police seized two slaves, one of whom was prepared, after torture, to lead the police to the place where the bishop was hiding. The leadership of the operation was in the hands of the *eirenarchos* Herodes (6),¹⁰ but the actual chase was performed by "diogmitae and cavalry with their usual arms, as though quickly pursuing a robber" (7). Herodes himself did not participate in this pursuit,¹¹ but with his father Nicetes he met Polycarp only in Smyrna itself (8).¹²

Dr. Ronchey takes this arrest as her point of departure for studying the few examples of local institutions in this martyrdom, to which she dedicates two chapters (101-20). She first notes that in the *Mart. Pionii* the local elite is described as acting much more favourably to Pionius than to Polycarp in the *Mart. Pol.* She makes this observation because in her opinion the earlier is historically dependable, whereas the latter is not. Admittedly, the attitude of Herodes and his father was quite aggressive, but they, too, initially tried to persuade Polycarp in a friendly manner (8). Moreover, the intention of both *martyria* is rather different. The letter to the congregation of Philomelium was much less interested in mentioning local institutions and notables, whereas Pionius' own report which lies at the basis of the *martyrium* clearly intended to present Pionius as a local notable who was superior to his fellow "intellectuals".¹³

Subsequently R. focusses attention on the nature of the police that arrested Polycarp and Pionius. She points out that according to Ulpian (d. 223 A.D.) and the emperor Marcianus (450-457 A.D.) the task of arresting bandits and *sacrilegi* had been transferred from the *eirenar-*

chos to the pro-consul and his troops. However, in both Smyrnaean *martyria* the arrests were still carried out by local authorities: Polycarp by the *eirenarchos* and his *diogmitae*, Pionius by the *hipparchos* Theophilus (15.4-6).¹⁴ The presence of local authorities in the *Mart. Pion.* is of course no problem for R., since she dates this *martyrium* to the time of Marcus Aurelius (above), but their presence in the *Mart. Pol.* is rather unexpected—especially if the text should belong to the third quarter of the third century (above). R. tries to circumvent the problem by stating that “gli autori della *prosecutio* di Polycarpo non siano in realtà da identificarsi coi gendarmi sottoposti all’ autorità municipale, e cioè con i *diogmitae* propriamente detti, ma con militari e agenti alle dipendenze dell’ *officium* del proconsole” (117), but this surely will not do. Why would a late redactor introduce into his text such an archaic institutional detail about which he, anyway, would hardly have had any knowledge? R. explains the detail by a “volontaria anche se sfumata mistificazione” (119) in order to blame local but not Roman authorities. This is all highly unlikely, and against R. we suggest that the detail of the *eirenarchos* firmly locates the *Mart. Pol.* somewhere in the third quarter of the second century. Even the detail that the troops set out to arrest Polycarp on the command of the *eirenarchos* “as if pursuing a robber”, fits the times:¹⁵ in Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca*, which is persuasively dated to the period of 125-150 A.D., the heroine Anthia is saved from her robbers by an unexpected attack of the “eirenarch of Cicilia with a large force” (2.13).¹⁶ It was only towards the end of the second century that Roman troops became more and more visible in all areas of Asia Minor and gradually took over the duties of the *eirenarchos* and his *diogmitae*.¹⁷

R.’s last example of a supposed anachronism concerns the role of the Jews (*Mart. Pol.* 12, 17-18) in the request to let a lion loose on Polycarp and to burn his body in order to prevent the Christians from worshipping the martyr (159-77). R. rightly observes that the relationship between Jews and Christians in Smyrna is depicted as tense both in the *Mart. Pion.* and the *Vita Polycarpi*, which she with Delehaye and others dates to about 400 A.D. But are the reports of the tense relationship as depicted in the *Mart. Pol.* in themselves credible? According to R. this is not the case. She thinks it incredible that Jews would have participated in a public manifestation on the sabbath; the less so, since according to R. many orthodox Jews had emigrated to Smyrna after the unsuccessful revolt of Bar-Kokhba.¹⁸ In fact, though, we know that Jews

were educated in the gymnasium, participated in the athletic contests, and visited the theater—all occasions full of pagan religious rites.¹⁹ Moreover, we have no idea how many Jews were living in Smyrna at the time of Polycarp or what the history had been of the Smyrnan Jewish community.²⁰

R. also argues that in the second century the two communities, Jewish and Christian, were still seen by others as “un’entità culturale unica ancora non distinta”, whose “forti elementi di affinità e di coesione” made a hostile relationship improbable (175). This is a rather curious statement, since in the second century exclusive persecutions of Christians are well attested. R. has also overlooked that in the time of the *Mart. Pol.* (ca. 160-170 A.D.) Melito, the bishop of Sardis, had launched a biting attack on the Jews.²¹ The case is illustrative. Although in some big cities Jews seem to have been underrepresented, as e.g. in Ephesos, Sardis clearly had a considerable number of Jewish inhabitants.²² The same was probably true for Smyrna.²³ In the time of Pionius some Christians visited the synagoge (*Mart. Pion.* 13.1), although it is unclear for what reasons,²⁴ whereas the author of the *Mart. Pol.* probably knew Jewish martyrological literature.²⁵ If the connections between Jews and Christians seem to have been close, then, it is not improbable that friction arose precisely in Smyrna.

Finally, it will be clear that our survey of R.’s “anachronisms” does not induce us to accept her novel theses. R. has failed to produce convincing arguments, and the case of the Smyrnaean *eirenarchos* is a resounding confirmation of the traditional dating in the second century, however unprecise.

2. *The theology of martyrdom and the Martyrium Lugdunensium*

In the documents proper of martyrdom, the *Acta et Passiones Martyrum*, reflections on the meaning of suffering and death are more than once woven into the text. Although they themselves do not have a systematical character, these reflections can, nevertheless, be used to sketch the outlines and historical development of a theology of martyrdom. This theology is by no means uniform, which tallies with the wide variety of our documents, but, on the other hand, it is quite justifiable to define a few general trends or at least to mention recurring themes. Some examples: the strong belief in God as the Creator of the universe, the conviction that the real battle is not waged against human

persecutors but against the devil, the martyrs' joy and gladness, the power of steadfastness, the fear of eternal punishment and, above all, a strong personal relationship with Christ (see below on *Mart. Lugd.* 1.41).

In addition to this implicit theology of martyrdom, certain protreptic treatises, such as Tertullian's *Ad martyras* and other tracts in this vein, several of Cyprian's letters and treatises, Origen's *Exhortatio ad Martyrium* and the anonymous *De laude martyrii* (written in Latin and of uncertain date) display a more systematically elaborated theology. Some of these writings naturally reflect the general convictions of the authors concerned, e.g. the platonizing tendencies in Origen or the triumphalistic colouring of *De laude martyrii*.

A clear survey of martyrological thought in the first three centuries was a desideratum. Detailed studies of specific aspects and texts abound, but an overall picture of some proportion was welcome. Prof. Baumeister, whose expertise in this domain is manifested by a series of relevant papers, had provided a description of the early stages of the theology in question in his "Habilitationsschrift".²⁶ He now presents a survey of the whole period in the form of a selection of primary texts. These texts are printed in their original language, Hebrew (viz. Dan. 11.29 sqq.), Greek and Latin, and accompanied by a translation, a short app. crit. and many notes. The selection is introduced in a succinct "Einleitung" (XI-XXVI), equipped with an ample bibliography (XXVII-XXXVIII), and contains some useful indices (189-202).

Nearly the whole content of the book is concerned with pre-Constantinian martyrdom. Only the last text (*Sulp. Sev. Ep.* 2.8-13) introduces the *sine cruore martyrium* of the ascetics. This passage is certainly illustrative of that great theme, but without further support it is merely a marginal addition. Other post-Constantinian "martyrologica" might also have been introduced: the cult of the saints, the victims of Julian's restoration policy, the position of orthodox Christians who suffered at the hands of Arians (a problem which worried Basil of Caesarea), etc. However, B's decision to limit himself to the times of martyrdom in its original sense is prudent. It has resulted in a clear unity of conception, which would have been prevented by a widening of the scope.

B. is a moderate adherent of theories which advocate "die Verwurzelung der christlichen Theologie des Martyriums im Judentum" (XI). For this reason he has incorporated passages from Dan. and 2 and

4Macc. We shall return to the latter below but first deal with some other details. 1. 2Tim. 4.8 πᾶσι τοῖς ἡγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ: Judging by the remark “Der Kranz wird hier also nicht auf die Märtyrer beschränkt” (p. 18 n.2), B. is convinced of the correctness of πᾶσι, which is questioned by some. The rendering “... allen, die in Liebe auf sein Erscheinen warten” could be slightly improved upon; Bauer s.v. ἀγαπάω 2 proposes “herbeisehlen”, rendered by Arndt-Gingrich by “to long for something”. 2. It is not absolutely certain that Ap. 20.4 “die sich ... nicht vor seinem Bild niedergeworfen hatten” only refers to the “Ablehnung des Kaiserkultes” (p. 43 n.2).²⁷ 3. *Mart. Pol.* 2.2 states that the martyrs’ steadfastness during their plight showed ὅτι παρεστῶς ὁ κύριος ὠμίλει αὐτοῖς. B. notes: “Die Charakterstärke der Märtyrer ist also übernatürlich begründet, nicht rein menschlicher Heroismus” (p. 31 n.4). That is correct, but the quoted phrase also testifies to the close personal relationship with the Lord (see also below on *Mart. Lugd.* 1.41). 4. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4. 17.2 refuses to allot the title of “martyr” to those who have given themselves up “by their hatred of the Creator”, καὶν δημοσίᾳ κολάζωνται, “even if they are punished officially (by the authorities)”. Clemens here touches upon one of the essential conditions of true and full martyrdom, witness Hipp. Rom. *Trad. Ap.* 9, *confessor est qui non est ductus coram potestate*. The phrase *coram potestate* also refers to the official character of the proceedings.²⁸ 5. Min. Fel. *Oct.* 36.9 interprets man’s severe plight as a testing of his will, even in the face of death, by God, Who is certain *nihil sibi posse perire*. B. renders “dass ihm nichts entgehen kann” (p. 137). Surely the author wants to say that even during the most gruelling tests the faithful will not perish for God (cf. Beaujeu’s translation “que rien ne peut être perdu pour lui”). 6. Lact. *DI* 5.23: those whose health had been restored when the demons causing their illness were driven out, adhere to the Christian religion, *cuius potentiam senserunt*. Here a reference to R. MacMullen’s insistence on the importance of the “efficacy before one’s own eyes” of superrational power(s) in bringing about conversion would have been opportune.²⁹ 7. In Athan. *Vita Antonii* 46 the author reports that Antony encouraged Christian prisoners and accompanied them, ἕως τελειωθῶσιν. B. renders “bis sie es vollendet hatten”. This is quite unsatisfactory. The verb expresses these martyrs’ death, which in martyrological thought is the consummation of life.³⁰

One of the documents which contains most elements of implicit martyrological reflection is the *Letter from the churches of Vienne and*

Lyons, a large part of which has been incorporated by Eusebius in ch. 1 and 2 of his *HE*, book 5. We venture to add a few *notiunculae* on some passages of this invaluable text.

Martyrium Lugdunensium 1.9. In this section the writers introduce a young man named Vettius Epagathus, a devout and active Christian, who protested against the way in which his fellow-Christians were being tried. His protest gave offence to other bystanders: τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸ βῆμα καταβοησάντων αὐτοῦ, καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐπίσημος, κτλ. Musurillo's translation is remarkable: "Although he was a distinguished person the crowd around the tribunal shouted him down". The concessive conjunction evidently does not tally with the Greek text. None of the other translators make this curious mistake, yet it is doubtful whether in all cases the purport of the phrase καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐπίσημος is fully grasped. Rufinus for one goes fully astray: his *erat enim et nobilissimus inter suos et eruditissimus* is linked to Epagathus' readiness to defend his brethren. Other renderings, however, leave also something to be desired. Allegro's "distintosi in tal modo" misses the point completely, but neither "i quali conoscevano il giovane" (Saxer) nor "era in effetti personaggio assai noto" (Ronchey and, quite similarly, Lanata) is really satisfactory. The adjective does not merely express that Epagathus was well-known, which after all can be said about persons of any social status. For this reason "una persona ragguardevole" (Caldarelli) or "un homme distingué" (Bardy) should be preferred, because these renderings unambiguously refer to Epagathus' rank. In the substantial section of the prosopographical survey of the Lyonnese martyrs, which G. Thomas devotes to him, he tentatively concludes that the adjective may well be an "unofficial" designation of one of the ranks of the equestrian order.³¹ If this interpretation is correct, it means that the martyr was "a man of position". Kirsopp Lake, to whom we owe this translation, adds this explanation in a note: "Apparently the meaning is that his social position made the crowd even more indignant at his advocacy of Christians". The persuasiveness of this view is corroborated by G.W. Clarke's note ad *Cypr. Ep.* 8.1.1 *propterea cum sit persona insignis*, about the exact equivalent of the Greek phrase in question.³² Clarke mentions some other cases in which prominent figures were attacked in times of persecution. Presumably, such men were deemed to forsake their duties to the commonwealth and its well-being by associating themselves with people whose religious behaviour was endangering these. They thus fell victim of the same alarm and irritation which spurred Celsus' attacks on the

Christians' desertion of the Roman empire and its rulers. They abandoned their participation in the ἄρχειν τῆς πατρίδος, ἐὰν δέη καὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἔνεκεν σωτηρίας νόμων καὶ εὐσεβείας (Or. *Cels.* 8.75). Only men of rank could be the object of such complaints. The mob at Lyons gave vent to these in a manner other than their intellectual contemporary, but their instincts pointed in the same direction.

If this explanation is accepted, we have gained one more example of a Christian belonging to the higher classes. Peter Brunt once stated that to pagans of high rank and education the Christians must have appeared pretty worthless, because they were mostly low in degree and culture. Robin Lane Fox, too, suggests that in the larger cities very few Christians could afford higher education and in the smaller townships none at all.³³ There is reason to doubt if these observations are justified. For example, Polycarp seems to have owned various estates (*Mart. Pol.* 5-7), Papyrus was a *principalis* (*Mart. Carpi* 3.1, Latin version),³⁴ and Irenaeus, Justin, Tatian and Athenagoras were all highly educated people, and also the second-century Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles presuppose an educated Christian reading public. Moreover, Christianity attracted upper-class women from an early stage of its existence.³⁵ The fact that many early Christians belonged to the lowest strata of ancient society should not make us overlook the fact that early Christianity had also succeeded in recruiting a sizeable number of members of the middle and upper classes.

Martyrium Lugdunensium 1.41. Ever since O. Perler advocated the dependence of early Christian views of martyrdom on 4Macc., this idea has been exploited to detect precise terminological resemblances to 4Macc. in the Lyonnese letter.³⁶ In general we are cautious in recognising such influences, since in this letter reminiscences and allusions to the New Testament writings and to a Christian interpretation of Old Testament passages are far more prominent than those referring to Jewish martyrdom.³⁷ Yet one can also be too sceptical and the reference to Blandina καθάπερ μήτηρ εὐγενῆς παρορμήσασα τὰ τέκνα κτλ. (1.55) seems a clear allusion to the mother of the Maccabean martyrs. In a recent article D. Farkasfalvy provides a list of biblical, specifically "christological" references,³⁸ to which one, more hidden, allusion can perhaps be added, which also concerns Blandina. In 1.41 it is reported that διὰ τοῦ βλέπεσθαι σταυροῦ σχήματι κρεμαμένη, διὰ τῆς εὐτόνου προσευχῆς πολλὴν προθυμίαν τοῖς ἀγωνιζομένοις ἐνεποίει. Baumeister, *Genese* p. 37 n.4 notes: "Blandina ahmt nicht den Gekreuzigten nach; andere sehen ihn in ihr".

This may be right, but a further step seems possible. A person whose body takes the shape of a cross whilst he or she is strenuously praying and who in this way provides strength to those who are fighting may not merely be reminiscent of the crucified Lord, but rather form a reference to an Old Testament *typos* of Him, viz. Moses during Israel's battle with Amalek in Ex. 17.8-13, cf. especially vs. 11: "Whenever Moses raised his hands Israel had the advantage, and when he lowered his hands the advantage passed to Amalek". Examples of early typological interpretation are by no means lacking. In *Ep. Barn.* 12.2 the Spirit charges Moses ἵνα ποιήσῃ τύπον τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν, Just. *Dial.* 91.3 says that the force of the Cross manifested itself διὰ τε τοῦ τύπου τῆς ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Μωσέως, Tert. *adu. Marc.* 3.18.6 notes: *crucis quoque erat habitus necessarius, per quam Iesus uictoriam esset relaturus*, Cypr.(?) *Quir.* 2.21 deals with the passage in a chapter entitled *Quod in passione crucis et signo virtus omnis sit et potestas* and i.a. remarks *hoc signo crucis et Amalech uictus est ab Iesu per Moysen in Exodo*.³⁹ We refrain from quoting later testimonia of this interpretation,⁴⁰ since it was our purpose to show that the writer of the Lyonese letter may well have been aware of it. The absence of a direct reference to Ex. 17 entails some reserve, but, on the other hand, 2 or 4Macc. are never directly referred to either. We would at least suggest that there is an indirect link with Moses as a *typos* of Christ.

Martyrium Lugdunensium 1.41. πᾶς ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστοῦ δόξης παθών. The question why martyrs were prepared to undergo their ordeal and indeed to die is a legitimate one. A full discussion of this subject, however, cannot be envisaged within the framework of these *notiunculae*. We shall restrict ourselves to a few critical remarks. The question surely cannot be answered in the style of Ruggiero's characterization of the Scilitan martyrs: "... sono individui che sacrificano la vita in nome della libertà di coscienza e a testimonianza degli ideali in cui credono" (64). Such inopportune modernizing does not grace his worthwhile monograph (see further below). But would 'in order to defend their faith or religion' be a more correct answer? In this case their attitude would be similar to that of the Jewish martyrs who died ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ (God's) νόμων (2Macc. 7.9) or περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων (2Macc. 7.37). In the Hellenized version of 4Macc. this has become ὑπὲρ τῆς καλοκάγαθίας (1.10), where the preposition is not satisfactorily rendered by Baumeister: "in Hochherzigkeit" (17). It is, however, characteristic of Christian martyrs to express themselves in far more personal terms: ὑπὲρ θεοῦ

ἀποθνήσκω (Ign. *Rom.* 4.1), Polycarp is inspired by his long bondage to Christ (*Mart. Pol.* 9.3), Pionius placed his hope on God (10.8).⁴¹

This is not to deny that in later times other considerations made their entrance: Eusebius e.g. states that Christ's followers have prepared themselves to ὑπεραποθνήσκειν ἐτοιμῶς τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ (Eus. *Hierocl.* 4); when Ammianus Marcellinus says about the martyrs *ad usque gloriosam mortem intemerata fide progressi* (22.11.10), this may well reflect a type of martyrological thought in which acquiring glory is a primary objective of martyrdom, as e.g. in the final pages of *De laude martyrii*. These, however, are reflections of a later time. In the documents proper the martyrs are not suffering in defense or in honour of impersonal values, like Socrates φιλοσοφίας ὑπεραποθνήσκων (Eus. *Hierocl.* 41). The text quoted as lemma does not express that by his courageous stance the martyr contributes to the glory of Christ, but rather that his suffering and death make the presence of Christ's glory, which is a leitmotiv of the letter, manifestly visible. It can in fact be paralleled by John 11.4, where Jesus says that Lazarus' illness is ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, which means "in order that the glory of God may be revealed".

Martyrium Lugdunensium 1.62. After the bodies of the executed martyrs had been left unburied for six days, their adversaries decided to a complete annihilation. The bodies were burned and the ashes swept into the river Rhône. There is a remarkable parallel to this appalling behaviour in Ammianus Marcellinus' version of the murder of the outspoken and unpopular bishop George on 24 December 361 in Alexandria. Though by no means identical, the reports of the events in the church historians Socrates (*HE* 3.2.10) and Sozomenus (*HE* 5.7.3) are similar: George was put on a camel by the mob, driven through the city, badly maltreated and finally burned to death. The *Historia Acephala* reports that George and one of his companions were lynched and that their bodies were disfigured and burned afterwards (2.10). Ammianus Marcellinus, however, paints the scene in even more violent colours: the mob *dilaniata cadavera peremptorum camelis imposita uexit ad litus isdemque subdito igne crematis cineres proiecit in mare* (22.11.10).⁴² This exactly parallels Lyons, but with a telling difference of motivation. According to the letter the purpose of the Lyonnese people was ὅπως μηδὲ λείψανον αὐτῶν φαίνεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔτι, which is interpreted by the writers as a vain attempt to preclude the martyrs' παλιγγενεσία. The mob at Alexandria, however, wanted to prevent all endeavours to institute a

cult of the saints: *ne collectis supremis aedes illis exstruerentur*. Such a reflection was still out of the question in late 2nd century Lyons, but in 361 the cult of the martyrs was already a well-known phenomenon. Hence the different motivation.

3. *A new edition of the Acta Scillitanorum*

The *Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs* have regularly been studied and edited. Nevertheless, Ruggiero's claim that his book is the first monograph on the subject is not too bold, since he has gathered the evidence and the discussion of all aspects in one handy publication. R. provides a full survey of the manuscripts, which offers much information to the specialist but does not result in the presentation of a text which differs significantly from Robinson's "textus receptus", which was recently slightly revised by Bastiaensen.⁴³ In a few places R.'s text adheres more closely to the main ms., a ninth-century codex in the British Museum (A); throughout the text R. prefers *domnus* to Bastiaensen's *dominus*, in § 6 he keeps to A's *agnosco*, where all other mss. read *cognosco*, in § 11 A's *commutatio* is upheld against the usual *deliberatio* and in § 14 *oblatam sibi facultatem* is explained as an acc. abs. It would be the only clear example of non-classical syntax. The other proposals are more plausible. The reading *commutatio* is well defended in the commentary as expressing apostasy. As additional support for the meaning "change of opinion" we refer to Apul. *Met.* 9.12 *subita sectae commutatione* and Vulg. Ps. 54.20 *non enim est illis commutatio*. The case of *agnosco* or *cognosco* is more complicated, since it could imply a difference in interpretation of the whole phrase; cf. these renderings of *cognosco*: "Io non conosco il potere del secolo" (Caldarelli), "Io non conosco autorità supreme in questo mondo" (Chiarini in Bastiaensen's edition). When the phrase in question is rendered in this vein: "I do not recognize the empire of this world" (Musurillo), presumably on the assumption that *cognoscere* is here a synonym of *agnoscere* (cf. *TLL* III 1509.61-73), it is difficult to understand why A.'s *agnosco* should be rejected. In any case R. shows there is a good case for it, i.s. referring to Tert. *Apol.* 38.3.

R.'s commentary is extensive and detailed: covering 34 large pages, nearly one page per line of the text, it provides both ample discussion of major points and elucidation of all sorts of details with many parallels taken from patristic and classical literature. A few disputable

points: the etymological problems concerning *genius* are more complicated than is assumed on p. 97 (see R. Schilling, art. “Genius”, *RAC* 10.53-54); in the comments on ’s *Honorem Caesari quasi Caesari* (§ 9) the function of *quasi* as “Kausalpartikel” (Szantyr p. 675) might have been mentioned; the somewhat laboured explanation of the juxtaposition *habete et recordemini* (§ 13) on p. 111-112 seems unnecessary in view of the sobering remark in Kühner-Stegmann II 1, p. 186: “Bei Dichtern und in späterer Prosa wechseln übrigens Jussiv und Imperativ oft miteinander”; the interpretation of *secula seculorum* (§ 17) as “genitivo d’inerenza o identità” is quite curious. It is commonly regarded as a gen. “der Steigerung” (cf. e.g. Szantyr p. 55). But these are details, R.’s commentary will no doubt prove to be most helpful to those who are interested in martyrological studies.

4. *A new commentary of the Martyrium Dasii*

The *Martyrium Dasii* was first published by Franz Cumont in 1897, but although its description of the Kronia (below) has drawn much attention, it has never received a proper commentary. That is why one opens Dr. Pillinger’s study with great expectations. P. begins with a facsimile, transcription and translation of our only ms, a Parisinus from the tenth or eleventh century. The text offers no surprises, but P. rightly keeps the transmitted $\epsilon\chi\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ instead of Cumont’s emendation $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\iota$ (7.1);⁴⁴ she also keeps, against Musurillo’s emendation Douroston, the transmitted Dorostolon (today Silistria in Bulgaria), which recurs in the later tradition (12). The translation is better than Musurillo’s but sometimes not precise enough. In 1.3 she keeps the transmitted reading $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\upsilon\sigma\alpha\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ and translates with “den namenlosen und abscheulichen Götzenbildern”. Our compatriot Versnel who has recently dedicated an interesting discussion to the first part of the *martyrium* questions $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$, since “the god to whom this sacrifice was brought was *not* anonymous” and wonders whether we should not consider reading $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$.⁴⁵ This is not necessary, though, as $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ can also mean “not to be named, unspeakable” (Lampe, s.v.)—a perfectly appropriate meaning regarding this passage. Moreover, the expression may have been inspired by *Sapientia Salomonis* 14.27 $\eta\gamma\alpha\rho \tau\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omega\nu \epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omega\nu \theta\rho\eta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha$, which also seems to be alluded to in *Epiph. haer.* 69.31.3 $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma, \omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha\nu \omicron\iota \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. In 4 she translates $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\nu \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$ too weakly as “verachtete er

die Welt” and κατέπτυσεν τὸν διάβολον as “(er) verabscheute den Teufel”.

The commentary proper leaves something to be desired, since P. has mainly restricted herself to some observations on the date (on which she makes no progress), the authenticity, and the Kronia, but has refrained from a systematic discussion of the text. Let us start with the problem of the authenticity. The best discussion in this respect is still the one by Delehay, who perceptively noticed that the *martyrium* falls into two parts.⁴⁶ The first one describes the ritual of the Kronia, the second the actual interrogation and execution; the connection between the two parts is made by Dasius’ opting for his death. The last part, which probably goes back to a lost *Passio Dasii* describing the fate of a Moesian martyr (witness the apparently independent mention of Dasius in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and, we may add, his Illyrian name,⁴⁷) contains various anachronisms, such as the sign with the cross and elements of the Nicæan Confession, and is evidently of a relatively recent date.

P. does not enter into a debate with Delehay but offers new arguments of her own for the authenticity of the *martyrium*. Like many scholars before her, she notices the resemblance with Greco-Roman traditions about scapegoats or people who voluntarily died for the salvation of the people, although she makes no distinction between myth and ritual: Theban Menoikeus, Athenian *pharmakoi* or Roman Curtius—all are seen as historical figures or as connected with unproblematical rituals, whereas recent scholarship has invested much energy in distinguishing between myth and ritual in these cases.⁴⁸

Basing herself on an isolated testimony from the Suda that among the Getae Kronos was called Zalmoxis, P. concludes that the ritual connected with Dasius presents an important source for the “bis in die Spätantike weiterlebenden thrakischen Jenseitsglauben” (37). Moreover, without adducing any evidence, she states that the ritual survived in the Bulgarian Kykerski games with their wearing of animal skins and masks (37-38). Now continuity must be proved and can never be simply assumed and, even worse, P. has failed to notice that Kronos in this text stands for Saturn not Thracian Zalmoxis, who disappeared from sight in the early Empire.⁴⁹

The identity of Kronos with Saturn did not escape Versnel. He rightly notes that previous scholars usually considered the Romans to have possessed too much humanity to practice human sacrifice or were happy to ascribe the cruel elements to Oriental models. Against these biased ideas

he points out that we have various testimonia in Late Antiquity of *munera gladiatoria* dedicated to Saturn. These examples eventually lead him to the observation: “I would by no means deny that foreign customs may have exercised their influence, both in the Roman sacrificial *munera* and in the Saturnalian scene of Durostorum, but it is obviously too simple—and therefore wrong—to deny any Roman contribution to the development”. Versnel, then, also seems largely to accept the trustworthiness of the ritual and he is able to do this, since he rightly observes that a rite “may be generated at any moment in history”. Yet is such a *deus ex machina* ritual persuasive in this particular case?⁵⁰

Doubts rise when we realise that Versnel has not pondered the problem of the unity of the report. As Delehayé pointed out that the ritual is really independent from the rest of the story, we are not discussing a proper ritual but a literary composition which the author either made up or found in one of his sources. Now previous students of the ritual have often drawn attention to the parallel of the Greek *pharmakos* ritual. And indeed the choice of a soldier, who is dressed up as a king and lives for a short period a life of luxury looks like a calque on Greek customs—the more so when we see that according to the synaxarion of Constantinople (AASS Nov. 19-20, 241) the preferred candidate had to be “young and attractive”, as is regularly stipulated in Greek scapegoat myths.⁵¹ On the other hand, the appearance in the guise and resemblance of Saturn is unparalleled, as is the obligation of self-immolation after a month. In other words, there are sufficient indications suggesting that the author of the *martyrium* has composed an exciting story from various sources. For such a procedure we have the exact parallel of the *Acta S. Caesarii* (AASS Nov. 1, 106f). In this equally late martyrological story the future martyr is a beautiful young man, as was Dasius in the synaxarion (above), who also received a luxurious treatment before having to immolate himself for the *salus rei publicae* by jumping on horseback down a *mons marinus*. It is not hard to recognise here again elements of Greek scapegoat rituals (the luxurious treatment) and Roman tradition (the self-immolation of Curtius). The report of Dasius’ death, then, was the product of an inventive preacher not that of a sober church historian.

P. closes her study with good observations on the occurrence of Dasius in later synaxaria and menologia, and on his sarcophagus in Ascona. This is the most satisfactory part of an otherwise somewhat disappointing booklet.

NOTES

¹ B. Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi. Een literair-kritische studie = Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium*, vol. LII (Louvain, 1979); idem, The Martyrium Polycarpi: A Century of Research, *ANRW* II 27.1 (1993) 485-522.

² But see J. den Boeft, J.N. Bremmer, *Notiunculae Martyrologicae IV*, *Vig. Christ.* 45 (1991, 105-22) 108.

³ Earlier attempts to prove a late date of the *Mart. Pol.*, e.g. because of the reference to the cult of the saints in § 17, are discussed by B. Dehandschutter, *The Martyrium Polycarpi*, 492-97, 502-03.

⁴ *Contra Ronchey*, *Indagine*, 95-96 (Perpetua, Papyrus) and 106n22, 170n44 and 201n82 (Marcus Aurelius), cf. our *Notiunculae Martyrologicae III*, *Vig. Christ.* 39 (1985) 110-30, esp. 122; L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne* (Washington, 1994) 2-6 (refutes a date under Marcus Aurelius).

⁵ Although this view is explicitly combated by E. Gibson, *The "Christians for Christians" Inscriptions of Phrygia* (Missoula, 1978) 131.

⁶ Cf. T.D. Barnes, The Chronology of Montanism, *JTS* 21 (1970) 403-08; H. Grégoire and P. Orgels, La véritable date du Martyre de S. Polycarpe (23 février 177) et le "Corpus Polycarpianum", *Anal. Boll.* 69 (1951) 1-38.

⁷ For its pre-Constantinian Christian community see S. Mitchell, *Anatolia*, 2 vls (Oxford, 1993) II, 41.

⁸ R.E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia* (Macon, 1989), no. 20 on p. 12-13, has incorporated the passage as the first of the "Testimonia Concerning Montanism in Phrygia", but its Montanist character cannot be regarded as the generally accepted view. In any case, Ronchey's theory would deprive it of the first place in Heine's chronologically ordered list...

⁹ T. Barnes, *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire* (London, 1984) I, 512 (= *JTS* NS 19, 1968, 512).

¹⁰ On the basis of the name, R. (103) suggests that Herodes was a Jew or half Jewish, but the name Herodes was widespread under the early Empire. One need only think of the famous Herodes Atticus.

¹¹ *Contra* Mitchell, *Anatolia* I, 196.

¹² Nicetes was also the name of a Smyranean sophist (Philostratus *VS* 1.19), but a connection with "our" Nicetes cannot be proved, cf. G. Petzl on *I. Smyrna* 697.22.

¹³ See our observations in *Not. Mart.* III, 122-24.

¹⁴ Smyranean *eirenarchos*: *I. Smyrna* 469; for his *diogmitae* see most recently C. Jones, A Note on Diogmitae, *Illinois Class. Stud.* 12 (1987) 187-88. Smyranean *hipparchos*: *I. Smyrna* 641, 644, 791.

¹⁵ On the contemporary banditry see our observations in *Not. Mart.* IV, 109; add K. Hopwood, "Bandits, elites and rural order", in A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London and New York, 1989) 171-87; B. Shaw, "Il bandito", in A. Giardina (ed.), *L'uomo romano* (Rome and Bari, 1989) 335-84; idem, "Bandit Highlands and Lowland Peace: the Mountains of Isauria-Cilicia", *J. Ec. and Soc. Hist. Orient* 33 (1990) 199-233; A. Lewin, *Banditismo e civiltas nella Cilicia Tracheia antica e tardoantica*, *Quaderni Storici* 26 (1991) 167-84; Mitchell, *Anatolia* I, 234f.

¹⁶ Not by the eirenarch of Tarsus leading a band of horsemen, as is suggested by Mitchell, *Anatolia* I, 196. Date of Xenophon: N. Holzberg, *Der antike Roman* (Munich and Zurich, 1986) 62; E.L. Bowie, S.J. Harrison, *JRS* 83 (1993) 160.

- ¹⁷ Cf. Mitchell, *Anatolia I*, 228-35.
- ¹⁸ There is no evidence for this suggestion, neither for the idea that this supposed massive Jewish immigration resulted in “una serie di effetti patologici negativi nella realtà sociale della città ed in particolare nell’ antagonismo con la comunità cristiana” (161 n.8).
- ¹⁹ Cf. L. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1993) 57-63, 76-77.
- ²⁰ On Jews in Smyrna and Asia Minor see our Not. Mart. III, 117 and Not. Mart. IV, 109; add now P. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1991); Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*, 69-74, 362-69.
- ²¹ Cf. H.J. Auf der Maur, De paaspreek van Meliton van Sardes, in L. Bakker, H. Goddijn (eds), *Joden en christenen* (Baarn, 1985) 64-80; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 53-54.
- ²² Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 37-54. Ephesos: G. Horsley, The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the N.T., *Novum Testamentum* 34 (1992) 105-68, esp. 123-27.
- ²³ Although the observation of R. that of the resident foreigners in Smyrna “la maggioranza ... era ebrea di stirpe” (161) is not supported by the sources.
- ²⁴ For the complicated subject of proselytism see now Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*, 288-415; M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion* (Oxford, 1994).
- ²⁵ Cf. J.W. van Henten, Zum Einfluss jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums, II. Die Apostolischen Väter, *ANRW II* 27.1 (1993) 700-23, esp. 701-03, 714-23.
- ²⁶ Subsequently published as vol. 45 in the series *Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie*: Th. Baumeister, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums* (Münster, 1980).
- ²⁷ In fact, Ap. 20.4 is the starting-point of F. Millar, The Imperial Cult and the Persecutions, in *Le culte des souverains dans l’empire romain* = Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 19 (Geneva, 1973) 145-75. Miller’s objective is to show that “the Imperial cult ... plays only a modest role in the persecutions”, both because of its integration “into the wider spectrum of pagan cults” and of the “real fear of the abandonment of the ancient gods” (164).
- ²⁸ Cf. our Not. Mart. IV, 106 and n. 1.
- ²⁹ See R. MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven, 1981) 94 sqq. (p. 96 is quoted in the text); id., *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (New Haven, 1984) 25 sqq. and *Changes in the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 1990) 130-41. 322-27 (= Two Types of Conversion to Early Christianity, *Vig. Chr.* 37, 1983, 174-192).
- ³⁰ Cf. Clemens’ definition of τελείωσις in *Strom.* 4.14.3 (a passage to be found in Baumeister p. 128) and see in general J. den Boeft, J.N. Bremmer, *Notiunculae Martyrologicae II*, *Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982) 385-87, to be added to J.D.M. Derrett, *Studies in the New Testament V* (Leiden, 1989) 145-52.
- ³¹ G. Thomas, La condition sociale de l’Église de Lyon en 177, in *Les martyrs de Lyon* (177) (Paris, 1978) 102-06.
- ³² G.W. Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian I* = Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 43 (New York, 1984) 208-09.
- ³³ P. Brunt, Marcus Aurelius and the Christians, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I* (Brussels, 1979) 483-520, esp. 515; R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (London, 1986) 292-93.
- ³⁴ See our Not. Mart. II, 384.
- ³⁵ Cf. Bremmer, Why did Early Christianity attract Upper-class Women, in A.A.R. Bastiaensen, A. Hilhorst, C.H. Kneepkens (eds), *Fructus centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink à l’occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (Steenbrugge and Dordrecht, 1989) 37-47.

³⁶ O. Perler, Das vierte Makkabaeerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die ältesten Martyrerberichte, *Riv. di Arch. Christ.* 25 (1949) 47-72. The whole problem may appear in a new light if 4Macc shows Christian influence, as is argued by J. Bremmer, The Atonement in the Interaction of Jews, Greeks, and Christians, in J.N. Bremmer, F. García Martínez (eds), *Sacred History and Sacred texts in Early Judaism: a symposium in honour of A.S. van der Woude* (Kampen, 1992) 75-93, esp. 86-92.

³⁷ See our Not. Mart. IV, 115.

³⁸ D. Farkasfalvy, Christological Content and Its Biblical Basis in the Letter of the Martyrs of Gaul, *The Second Century* 9 (1992) 5-25.

³⁹ For doubts concerning Cyprian's authorship of *Ad Quirinum* see Ch. Bobertz, An Analysis of *Vita Cypriani* 3.6.10 and the Attribution of *Ad Quirinum* to Cyprian of Carthage, *Vig. Chr.* 46 (1992) 112-28.

⁴⁰ Cf. e.g. Victorin. *Poetov. fabr. mund.* 5 *Moyses ... leuauit manus et se ipsum crucifixit in proelio*, [Adamantius], *GCS 4*, p. 36.10-11 ὁμοία τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ ἔκστασις τῶν χειρῶν ἀμφοτέρων, προτύπωσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ Μωσέως γενομένη. Firm. *err.* 27.3 *circa uirgam Moyses expansis manibus extenditur* seems also to refer to Ex. 17, cf. Turcan's note ad loc.

⁴¹ For the close relationship of the martyrs with Christ see now J. Bremmer, "Christianus sum": The Early Christian Martyrs and Christ, in G.J.M. Bartelink, A. Hilhorst, C.H. Kneepkens (eds), *Eulogia. Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (Steenbrugge and The Hague, 1991) 11-20.

⁴² Cf. also καύσαντες καὶ τέφραν ποιήσαντες τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐσχορπίσαν (Epiph. *haer.* 68.11.2) and the comparable phrase in *Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 362.

⁴³ Cf. A.A.R. Bastiaensen *et al.*, *Atti e Passioni dei Martiri* (Milan, 1987) 100-05.

⁴⁴ See also our *Notiunculae Martyrologicae*, *Vig. Christ.* 35 (1981) 43-56, esp. 54.

⁴⁵ H.S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek & Roman Religion 2. Transition & Reversal in Myth and Ritual* (Leiden, 1993) 210 note 246 (Pillinger has to be added to his bibliography in note 245).

⁴⁶ H. Delehay, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 1921¹ (Brussels, 1966²) 230-35.

⁴⁷ See our Not. Mart., 52, to be added to Pillinger, 39-40.

⁴⁸ Cf. Bremmer, Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 299-320; D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991); Bremmer, Three Roman aetiological myths, in F. Graf (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1993) 158-74, esp. 165-70 (Curtius).

⁴⁹ Cf. M. Eliade, *Zalmoxis The Vanishing God* (Chicago and London, 1972) 21-75.

⁵⁰ Versnel, *Inconsistencies*, 210-27, esp. 227, 218 resp. (quotes).

⁵¹ Cf. the Parallels in Bremmer, Scapegoat Rituals, 305-06.

Utrecht, Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Groningen, Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid en Godsdienstwetenschap