



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—A MARTYROLOGICAL FRAGMENT FROM JERUSALEM.

In describing the library of the Greek Convent of the Holy (properly the Most Holy) Sepulchre at Jerusalem, in 1889, Professor J. Rendel Harris mentioned a fragment of a Greek Martyrology, probably of the ninth century, and published nine lines of it.¹ While working in the same library, in the winter of 1900, I saw the manuscript and made a transcription of the better preserved side of it. Since my return my notes have been supplemented by some readings sent me by the accomplished librarian, Kleophas, the discoverer of the mosaic map at Madaba, and by photographs taken for me through the kindness of Professor C. W. Votaw of the University of Chicago.

The manuscript is a double leaf now measuring 32 by 25.5 *cm.* but doubtless larger originally, for at least one line and probably more are missing at the tops of the columns. The mutilated condition of the leaf is due to its having been used in the binding of a book, and the glue spread over one side of it in this process has left that side practically illegible. The leaf is inscribed in neat slightly decorated uncials of the later type, in single columns now of 32 lines each, but originally longer. In the library catalogue, the leaf appears under Marsaba 704, and is assigned to the eighth century, but Professor Harris favors the ninth. The parchment is lined in the usual indented way, the letters standing on the line, not depending from it. There are the usual abbreviations, $\overline{\chi\nu}$ $\overline{\alpha\nu\theta\nu}$ $\overline{\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\nu}$ $\overline{\theta\nu}$, an imperfect punctuation, (high point, comma) breathings in the rectangular form, a few accents, —grave, acute, circumflex—and a single mutilated marginal capital at the top of the first recto. The diaeresis is used, though not uniformly, over initial ν , and over ι and υ in diphthongs.

The manuscript came into the library of the Greek Convent of the Holy Sepulchre from the library of the Convent of Marsaba a few years ago, when Nicodemus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, united in the buildings of the Greek Convent of the Sepulchre the

¹ Haverford College Studies I (1889) p. 13.

libraries of the neighboring convents of Marsaba and the Holy Cross. The library further possesses a unique distinction in containing the famous *Codex Constantinopolitanus* in which Bryennius discovered the Didache, which was sent from the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople to the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, as being the seat of the Jerusalem Patriarchate to which the Constantinople Convent belongs.

It is not quite certain what the order of the pages is, but the character of its contents and the lower half of a large marginal capital at the top of it make it probable that the page beginning *καὶ τῆ μανία κτέ* comes first. At any rate, this capital and the contents of the first column make it very probable that it began a new martyrdom. The double leaf may easily have been the outer one of a quire of four, but the upper and lower margins having disappeared, no trace of a quire number can be found. If it was the outer leaf of the quire, at least 448 lines and probably more must have intervened between the end of recto 1 and the beginning of verso 2. Viewed thus the illegible side constitutes the first verso and the second recto of the fragment, while the lines here printed are chiefly from the first recto and the second verso.

I *Recto*.

Κ
 καὶ τῆ μανία τῶν εἰδώλων
 ἐκβακχεύων καὶ λυμε-
 νόμενος τὰς τοῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ ἐκκλη-
 5 σίας, δόγμα ἐκτίθεται εἰς πᾶ-
 σαν τὴν οἰκουμένην κατὰ
 τοῦ γένους τῶν Χριστιανῶν.
 ἐν εἰρήνῃ οὖν ἐτι τ[[ο]]ῶν ἐκκλη-
 σιῶν διαγοσῶν καὶ τῶν θε-
 10 σμῶν συνήθως ἐπιτελουμέ-
 νων, ἀρχὴν λαμβάνει ὁ δι-
 ωγμός. γραμμάτων γὰρ οὐ[ν]
 καὶ προσταγμάτων κατ' αὐ-
 τῶν καταφυτῆσάντων εἰς
 15 τὴν οἰκουμένην θαρρῶν
 τὴν τῶν κρατούντων ἀρχόν-
 των δεινότητα ἀπέστειλεν
 καὶ κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλιαίων πόλεως

3 l. λυμαινόμενος.

8 ω written over ο

14 l. καταφυτευσάντων.

18 There is an Ἑλεία mentioned in C. I. G. III. addl. 2561 b, l. 77; but that is a Cretan inscription.

τὸ δόγμα περιέχων τὴν κέ-
 20 λευσιν ταύτην· βασιλεὺς με-
 γας Αὐτοκράτωρ Διοκλιτι-
 ανὸς παντὸς λαοῦ καὶ ἔθνους
 ἀνθ(ρώπων) φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν
 δεσπότης πᾶσιν τοῖς εὐνοῖ[κῶ]ς
 25 διακειμένοις περὶ τοὺς ἀητ-
 τήτους θεοῦς· χαίρειν. Παρεγ-
 γνῶ ὑμῖν διὰ παντὸς πάσῃ σπου-
 δῇ χρῆσασθαι εἰς τὴν τῶν θε-
 ῶν θεραπείαν καὶ εἰς ενεργε-
 30 σίαν τοῦ ἑμοῦ κράτους· ἀνε-
 γείρειν τε τοὺς τῶν θεῶν
 θεραπείαν καὶ εἰς ἐνεργεσίαν
 τοῦ ἑμοῦ κράτους ἀνεγείρειν

End of column?

I *Verso*.

· · · · ·
 δαττειθ . . . βον . . . λενω τοῦ
 ζῆν τοὺς ἀπειθομένους τῷ
 νεύματι τοῦ κράτους [ἔμο]ῦ
 5 ἰς μυριάδας ἀργυρίου ἐκ τοῦ
 ἑμοῦ λαμ-
 βάνειν

Traces of 25 lines.

II *Recto*.

· · · · ·
 καὶ πρώτη τῆς πόλεως ἔστιν ἀν-
 τή· ἡρώτα δὲ αὐτοὺς, τίς ὁ ἀνὴρ
 αὐτῆς καὶ ποίας θρησκείας τυγ-
 5 χάνουσιν; οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ

Traces of 27 lines.

II *Verso*.

· · · · ·
 πων καὶ ἦλθον ἐν πόλει Δυ[ρ]-
 ραχίῳ· καὶ εἰσελθόντες τὴν
 πύλην τῆς πόλεως, εἶδον τὸν
 5 ἄγιον Ἀστέιον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον
 τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως κρεμάμε-
 νον ἐπὶ σ(αυ)ροῦ μέλιτι χρισμέ-
 νον καὶ τιτρωσκόμενον ὑ-
 πὸ σφικῶν καὶ μυῶν διὰ τὴν

19 ἰ. περιέχων.

21 ἰ. Διοκλητιανός.

32-33 θεραπείαν—ἀνεγείρειν by an error of the eye—homoioteleuton—are repeated from 29-31 above; hence the impossible τοὺς . . . θεραπείαν. Probably 32 should begin with ναοὺς or some such word.

II recto 2 The reference may be to the Church as the Bride of Christ.

- 10 πίστην τοῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ καὶ δοξάσαν-
 τες τὸν θεὸν ἐμακάρισαν τὸν
 ἄγιον· πᾶσα δὲ ἡ πόλις εἰδωλικὴν
 ἔορτὴν τοῦ μαροῦ Διονύσου ἐ-
 πετέλει· ἐρωτηθέντες δὲ πα-
 15 ρά τινος ταξ[ε]ώτου οἱ ἄγιοι
 ὡμολόγησαν ἑαυτοὺς Χριστι-
 ανοὺς εἶναι καὶ κρατήσαντες
 αὐτοὺς ἤγαγον πρὸς τὸν ἀνθύ-
 πατον Ἀγρικολάον· καὶ ἀναγ-
 20 κασθέντες προσκυνήσαι τῷ
 Διονύσῳ, ὡμολόγησαν τῷ Χ(ριστ)ῷ
 πιστεύειν· καὶ τούτων βασαν-
 υσθέντων ἐνέβαλον εἰς πλοί-
 ον καὶ ἐν τῷ . ασα . . . του . . .
 25 μετὰ τοῦ πλοίου βιθίζουσιν
 αὐτοὺς· ὡς ἡ θάλασσα τὰ τίμα
 λείψανα ἅμα τοῦ πλοίου ἐκρί-
 ψασα εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον ἄλλο-
 να τοῦ κεραμέως ἐνθα οἱ κακοῦρ-
 30 γοὶ ἀνηλίσκοντο, κατέχευσεν
 τῇ ψάμμῳ· ἐτῶν δὲ ἐνενή[κο]ν-
 τα παρελθόντων, ἐμφανίζον-
 ται οἱ ἄγιοι τῷ ὀσιωτάτῳ ἀρχι-

End of column?

The martyrology, at least in this part of it, evidently dealt with the persecution of Diocletian as experienced in the city of Elia (Aelia? τὴν Ἐλαιῶν πόλιν); though later the scene shifts to Dyrrhachium. The fragment derives a good deal of interest from the fact that it purports to give the opening lines of Diocletian's famous First Edict against the Christians. Our knowledge of this edict, (the one of February 23, A. D. 303, as Lactantius fixes the date) has been confined to notices in Eusebius (H. E. 8 : 2 : 4) and Lactantius, neither of whom undertakes to give the text of the decree. Eusebius, who puts the date of its promulgation a few weeks later than Lactantius (March, H. E. 8 : 2 : 4; April, Mart. Pal. *ἰνδλ.*), gives the substance of the edict as follows: τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι προστάττοντα, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους ἀτίμους, τοὺς δὲ ἐν οἰκετίας, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν τῇ τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ προθέσει, ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι προαγορεύοντα.¹

7 λ. κεχρισμένον. 9 λ. σφικῶν. 10 λ. πίστιν. 12 ἡ συμβί. Corr. 28 λ. ἄλωνα.

¹ Eusebius H. E. (Ed. Heinichen, 1868) 8 : 2 : 4.

Now it seems probable, however many leaves intervened between verso I and recto II in the quire, that the same work is being continued; at least that must be the presumption. But on verso II capital punishment is being inflicted upon mere profession of Christianity; a condition not explicitly contemplated until the Fourth Edict of A. D. 304, which made Christianity a *religio illicita*.¹ The martyrdom of Asteius, the bishop, would of course be intelligible enough on the basis of the Second Edict, which prescribed that bishops be thrown into prison and subjected to every possible inducement to offer sacrifice. But the prompt arrest and execution of the band of Christians related in verso II, clearly presupposes the Fourth Edict. It seems probable, then, that the author of this martyrology followed the text of the First Edict with the text or purport of the three succeeding ones, before entering upon the martyrdoms themselves.

Upon the assumption that the two leaves belong to the same work, the closing lines of verso II afford a *terminus a quo* for the determination of its date. The writer seems about to say that the relics of the martyrs were found ninety years after. The martyrdom was then written not earlier than A. D. 394. How much later it is impossible to determine.

But the important problem here is not the date of the work but the authenticity of the edict. To have even the opening lines of Diocletian's missing First Edict against the Christians would be a matter of some importance, and to have the whole text of that edict would almost certainly clear up some obscure matters in Eusebius's report of it. The few lines preserved contain little more than the opening formula and the beginning of the preamble. The formula βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀυτοκράτωρ Διοκλητιανὸς παντὸς λαοῦ καὶ ἔθνους ἀνθρώπων φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν δεσπότης will afford the safest and most obvious ground for testing the authenticity of the decree. The decrees preserved in Eusebius, H. E. 8: 17: 3—the Revocation Edict of A. D. 311—and 9: 10: 7—the Toleration Edict of Maximin—fairly illustrate the imperial titles employed in such formal documents. The original Latin of the Revocation Edict is preserved in Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.*, ch. 34. In the Greek of Eusebius it begins thus: Ἀυτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Γαλέριος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμίνος, ἀνίκητος, σεβαστὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος, Αἰγυπτιακὸς μέγιστος, Θηβαϊκὸς μέγιστος, Σαρματικὸς

¹ McGiffert, Eusebius, pp. 325, 344.

μέγιστος πεντάκις, Περσῶν μέγιστος δις, Καρπῶν μέγιστος ἕξακις, Ἀρμενίων μέγιστος, Μήδων μέγιστος, Ἀδιαβηνῶν μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ εἰκοστὸν, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἑννεακαίδεκατον, ὕπατος τὸ ὄγδοον, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος· καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Φλαύιος Οὐαλέριος Κωνσταντῖνος, εὐσεβῆς, εὐτυχῆς, ἀνίκητος, σεβαστὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ πέμπτον, ὕπατος, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος· καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Οὐαλέριος Δικινιανὸς, εὐσεβῆς, εὐτυχῆς, ἀνίκητος, σεβαστὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ τέταρτον, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ τρίτον, ὕπατος, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος, ἐπαρχιώταις ἰδίῳι χαίρειν.¹ The second begins more simply: Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Γάιος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμῖνος, Γερμανικὸς, Σαρματικὸς, εὐσεβῆς, εὐτυχῆς, ἀνίκητος, σεβαστὸς.²

It is quite intelligible that in quoting a decree in a literary work, considerable liberties should be taken in the matter of long titular formulas, which, if given *in extenso*, would weary the reader without serving any immediately useful purpose. While it is not impossible that our martyrologist may have given a faithful representation of the substance of the decree while reducing and distorting its opening formula till little of the original but the name of Diocletian remained, the evidence of the decree quoted and in general the whole feeling of the formula in the fragment are against the authenticity of the decree as here given, which rather recalls the oriental decrees quoted in the Old Testament³ than the more reserved and dignified formulas of Roman state papers. But the most convincing comparison is with the preamble of an edict of Diocletian himself, the famous *De Pretiis Rerum Venalium*. Of the numerous fragmentary copies of this monument, only one preserves the names and titles of the emperors and Caesars who issued it. This is the inscription brought from Egypt to Aix in Provence in 1807. Its opening lines, with the restorations of the editors of the *Corpus*, are as follows:

Imp. Caesar C. Aurel. Val. Diocletianus p. f. inv. Aug. po||nt.
max. Germ. max. VI Sarm. max. IIII Persic. max. II Britt. max.
Carpic. max. Armen. max. Medic. max. Adiabenic. max. trib. p.
XVIII coss. VII imp. XVIII p. p. procons. et imp.
Caesar M. Aurel. Val. Maximianus p. f. inv. Aug. pont. max. Germ.
max. V Sarm. || max. IIII Persic. max. II Britt. max. Carpic.

¹ Eusebius, H. E. (Ed. Heinichen, 1868) 8 : 17 : 3-5.

² Eusebius, H. E. (Ed. Heinichen, 1868) 9 : 10 : 7.

³ E. g., Daniel 4 : 1.

max. Medic. max. Adiabenic. max. tri || b. p. XVII coss. VI
 imp. XVII p. p. procoss. et Fla. Val. Constantius
 Germ. max. II Sarm. max. II Persic. max. II Britt. max. *Carpic.*
 max. Armenic. max. Medic. max. Adiaben. max. trib. p. VIII
 coss. III nobil. Caes. et G. Val. Maximianus
 Germ. max. II Sarm. || *max. II Persic. max. II Britt. max.*
Carpic. max. Armenic. max. Medic. max. Adia || b. max. trib.
 p. VIII coss. III nobil. Caes. dicunt.¹

The suspicion thus thrown upon the historical character of the decree is increased by the representation in the closing lines, of the saints revealing to some arch[bishop?] the hiding place of the martyrs' relics. Its claims to being considered historical are thus probably no greater than those of the mass of works of that golden age of martyrologists, the fifth to the eighth centuries, and it is among these that the Jerusalem fragment must claim a place.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

¹ C. I. L. III, 802, 824.