Classical Quarterly **52.2** 500–506 (2002) *Printed in Great Britain*

FIVE EGYPTIANS COMING FROM JERUSALEM: SOME REMARKS ON EUSEBIUS, *DE MARTYRIBUS PALESTINAE* 11.6–13[1]

In *MP* 11.6–13 Eusebius refers to the trial of five Egyptians, whom he says were martyred with Pamphilus and his companions in the seventh year of the Great Persecution (winter A.D. 309/310). In this paper I shall argue that Eusebius invented the story, taking its content from Orig. *Princ.* 4.3.6–8 and making up the context for it from two other accounts contained in the long version of *MP*[2] (*MPSyr.* 28–30, 36–7). The aim of the historian could have been to work out his own view of the heavenly Jerusalem, so as to build up the theological framework for his account of Pamphilus' martyrdom. Considered from this point of view, the episode of the Egyptians provides a useful key to understanding Eusebius' attitude and purpose.

THE THEOLOGICAL CONTENT OF THE EPISODE

The pretext for the martyrdom for Pamphilus and his companions, who had been in prison for two years (see *MP* 7.4–6), was the arrival in Caesarea of five Egyptians,[3] who had accompanied the Egyptian confessors to the mines of Cilicia and were on their way back to Egypt.[4] Arrested at the gates of Caesarea, the following day (16 February 310, according to Eusebius) they were conducted along with Pamphilus and his companions before the magistrate, the governor Firmilianus, who after torturing

[1] I am very grateful to Dr Sebastian Brock for his guidance in the analysis of the Syriac version of *MP*, and to Professor Fergus Millar for his valuable suggestions. I also thank Tim Edwards and Rotraud Hansberger for helpful discussions during the translation of some passages of the Syriac text, and the editor and the anonymous referee of *CQ* for their remarks and suggestions for improvement. It goes without saying that all remaining errors and inconsistencies are entirely my responsibility.

[2] Two recensions of *MP* exist, a long version which is an independent work, surviving only in a Syriac translation, apart from a few chapters (among them also that concerning Pamphilus' martyrdom, *MP* 11.1–28), which are preserved also in the original Greek text; and a short Greek version, which is an abridgement and a partial reworking of the long version without beginning or end, handed down to us in four manuscripts of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (MSS. ARET). The Syriac translation has been preserved in a manuscript dated November A.D. 411 (for a description of this manuscript, see W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, part 2 [London, 1871], 631–3). The chronology of those recensions, and their mutual relationship, are still under discussion. However, scholars agree that the long version was completed around A.D. 311, when the persecution for the first time came to an end. The date, setting, and purpose of the short version are more problematic, but, as regards its composition, a date around A.D. 313/4, when the persecution was finally over, is generally accepted. On this topic, see E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke. Die Kirchengeschichte,* GCS II/3 (Leipzig, 1909), LXI–CXLVI; H. J. Lawlor and J. E. Oulton, *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine* 2 (London, 1928), 7–9; T. D. Barnes, 'The editions of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*', *GRBS* 21 (1980), 191–201, at 193–6; id., *Constantine and Eusebius* (London, 1981), 148–50 and 155–8; id., 'Some inconsistencies in Eusebius', *JThS* 35 (1984), 470–5, at 470–1; R. W. Burgess, 'The dates and editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*', *JThS* 48 (1997), 471–504, at 502–3.

[3] Eusebius refers to their story also in the chapters that in the long version introduced the account of Pamphilus' martyrdom, but were removed from the short version (*MP* 11.1k–l).

[4] Christians who accompanied confessors condemned to mines are attested elsewhere in *MP*; see e.g. *MPSyr.* 36–7, 49. The reference to the Syriac version is given according to the pages of the Syriac text of Cureton's edition, W. Cureton, *History of the Martyrs in Palestine* (London, 1861).

them asked for their names. The Egyptians replied giving the names of the prophets, Elias, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Samuel and Daniel,[5] names that they had taken instead of the pagan names they had been given by their parents. In that way—Eusebius comments—they showed themselves to be 'the secret Jew and the true Israel of God, not only by their deeds, but also by the words [*φωναῖ* refers to the names of the prophets which had been mentioned in the former sentence] which they properly pronounced' (. . . *τὸν ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖον* (Rom. 2.29) *γνήσιόν τε καὶ εἰλικρινῶς Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ* (Gal. 6.16) *οὐ μόνον ἔργοις, ἀλλὰ φωναῖς κυρίως ἐκφερομέναις ἐπιδεικνυμένων*, *MP* 11.8). When Firmilianus, who had not understood the meaning of the name Israel, asked them what was their native land, the chief of the Egyptians replied that it was Jerusalem. He meant—Eusebius explains—the Jerusalem about which Paul had said 'the Jerusalem above, which is our mother, is free' (Gal. 4.26), and 'you have come to Mount Zion and the city of the living God, Jerusalem in the heaven' (Heb. 12.22). Although the martyr was thinking about that Jerusalem, Firmilianus, whose thought was fixed on the earth, became concerned that the Christians had built a city for themselves against the Romans,[6] and persisted in trying to find out where this city was.[7] Since after many tortures he had not obtained any answer, he ordered the Egyptians to be beheaded (*MP* 11. 6–13).[8]

Prior to Eusebius, the interpretation of Jerusalem as the heavenly homeland of the Pauline *ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος* (Rom. 2.29), and the reference of Gal. 4.26 and Heb. 12.22 to that city, are found only in Origen's *De Principiis*.[9]

[5] On the Hebrew names of Egyptian Christians at the beginning of the fourth century, and more in general on Egyptian onomastics in late antiquity, see the controversy between Bagnall and Wipszycka: R. S. Bagnall, 'Religious conversion and onomastic change in early Byzantine Egypt', *BASP* 19 (1982), 105–24; E. Wipszycka, 'La valeur de l'onomastique pour l'histoire de la christianisation de l'Égypte. A propos d'une étude de R. S. Bagnall', *ZPE* 62 (1986), 173–81; Bagnall, 'Conversion and onomastics: a reply', *ZPE* 69 (1987), 243–50; Wipszycka, 'La christianisation de l'Égypte aux IV^{e}–VI^{e} siècles. Aspects sociaux at ethniques', *Aegyptus* 68 (1988), 117–65, repr. in id., *Études sur le Christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive* (Roma, 1996), 63–105; Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, 1993), ch. 8.

[6] Some scholars have considered this account as evidence of the oblivion into which the name of Jerusalem had fallen at the beginning of the fourth century (in favour of that of Aelia Capitolina), since it shows the Roman governor in Palestine as not knowing where the Jerusalem mentioned by the Egyptians is: W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* 2 (London, 1870), 27; Lawlor and Oulton (n. 2), 334, n. 10; G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclésiastique (Livres VIII–X) et le Martyrs en Palestine*, *SC* 55 (Paris, 1993^{4}), 159, n. 15; R. L. Wilken, *The Land called Holy* (New Haven and London, 1992), 83.

[7] The possibility of a twofold interpretation of the same expression, which at the same time can bear either a 'literal' or a 'spiritual' sense, is the core of another episode in *MP* (*MPSyr.* 37–8).

[8] My thanks to Sebastian Brock, who pointed out to me a story from the collection of the Persian martyrs, which in some respects recalls Eusebius' account. It is the story (in Syriac) of the Persian Martha, who was martyred about A.D. 341 at Karka d-Ledan. The Mobed, or Zoroastrian priest, who was interrogating Martha, urged her to marry, so that she would not have been forced to give up her religion, but still would have saved her life. Martha refused, on the grounds that she was already betrothed to a man. When the Mobed enquired about the identity of this man, she replied that his name was Jesus and that he had set out on a long journey on business, but he was on his way back. The Mobed, still not understanding, asked her in which city he was at that moment, and she answered 'He has gone off to heaven, and he is now in Jerusalem on high' (S. P. Brock and S. Ashbrook Harvey, *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient* [Berkley and London, 1987], 70).

[9] Wilken (n. 6), 70. On the idea of a heavenly Jerusalem, which at that time was well established among patristic writers, see E. Lamirande, 'Jérusalem Céleste', in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 8 (Paris, 1974), 944–58; see also P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places: Christian Attitudes to*

In *Princ.* 4.3.6–8[10] Origen in fact includes among some examples of *ἀναγωγὴ μυστική* the opposition between *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα* and *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα* (*Princ.* 4.3.6). The *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα*, to which the Scriptures refer, is in reality a figure of the *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα*, the spiritual Israel that Paul called *ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος* (Rom. 2.29), and that Origen indicates as *ἐν ψυχήων γένει ὁ Ἰσραὴλ* (*Princ.* 4.3.8). Since the Israel of the Scriptures is a figure of the spiritual Israel, consequently—Origen explains (*Princ.* 4.3.8)—the city of Jerusalem also is a figure of the heavenly, the spiritual Jerusalem spoken above.

Since it seems quite implausible that the Egyptians answered the Roman governor with *Princ.* 4.3.6–8 in mind, we can explain the resemblance of Eusebius' and Origen's passages by arguing that the bishop invented the episode either partially or in its entirety in the light of Orig. *Princ.* 4.3.6–8.

This mystical interpretation of both Israel and Jerusalem, whose primary source is Origen's passage, is perfectly consistent with the idea of the heavenly Jerusalem, as it emerges from Eusebius' other works.[11] In the *Commentarius in Isaiam*,[12] where Eusebius deals at length with this topic, he understands Jerusalem according to three possible meanings (even if the boundaries between the different entities for which it stands are not always clear-cut):[13] the historical city; the historical Church (= the Church as institution, the godly polity); the angelic polity, a spiritual reality already existing in heaven.[14] An analogous distinction also occurs in *MP* 11.6–12, where Eusebius implicitly differentiates between Jerusalem as historical entity, to which the Roman governor refers (even if he does not know where it is), and Jerusalem as both the godly polity and the angelic polity, which is the gist of Egyptians' speech. The chief of the Egyptians in fact claims that their native land is *μόνων . . . τῶν θεοσεβῶν . . . πατρίς* (*MP* 11.11): in Eusebius' terminology the adjective *θεοσεβής*, usually connected with *πολίτευμα*,[15] refers to the godly polity of the Church.[16] On the other hand, when Eusebius anticipates the episode in *MP* 11.1k, he says that the Egyptians indicated Jerusalem as their native land, the heavenly city of God, *ἐφ' ἣν καὶ ἔσπευδον*. The reference to Jerusalem as the city toward which they were hastening seems to suggest that Eusebius intended it as a reality already existing in heaven, the spiritual Jerusalem.[17] Their martyrdom—Eusebius explains—arose out of the con-

Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century (Oxford, 1990); Wilken (n. 6), in particular 65–81.

[10] H. Crouzel et M. Simonetti, *Origène, Traité des Principes (livres III–IV)*, tomes 3–4, SC 268–9 (Paris, 1980); in particular on *Princ.* 4.3.6–8, see tome 4.205–13.

[11] For Eusebius' understanding of Jerusalem, see M. J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah* (Oxford, 1999), 160–4 and 174–5.

[12] The date of the *Commentarius in Isaiam* is still controversial. However, an allusion to *MP* 11.6–13 shows that it was composed after it (*CIs.* 44.5, GCS IX, 283.28–33). On this topic, see Hollerich (n. 11), 19–26.

[13] These interpretations are differently applied to the various passages of Isaiah's prophecy; for a list of them, see Hollerich (n. 11), 176–8.

[14] Hollerich (n. 11), 175. In connection with the usage of Jerusalem as the historical Church and the angelic polity, Eusebius usually quotes Heb. 12.22 (and sometimes Gal. 4.26).

[15] On the meaning of *πολιτεία* and *πολίτευμα* in Eusebius' work, see Hollerich (n. 11), 116–30.

[16] It is worth noting that the Syriac translator replaced Heb. 12.22 with a sentence (which does not seem to have been taken over from the Bible) that explicitly refers to the heavenly Jerusalem mentioned by the Egyptians as the 'holy Church': 'Jerusalem on high is free, and it is our mother in which we believe, the holy church' (*MPSyr.* 43).

[17] For a reference to an already existing heavenly reality, inhabited by angels and faithful, see also *MPSyr.* 23.

fusion of the three Jerusalems, a confusion against which the historian had explicitly warned the reader in *CIs.* 51.17 (GCS IX, 326.31–5).

We can conclude that in the episode of the Egyptians martyred with Pamphilus, Eusebius worked out his own view about the possible meanings of Jerusalem; but why was he interested in inserting it into the context of Pamphilus' martyrdom?

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ALLEGORY IN PAMPHILUS' MARTYRDOM

In the group of Christians martyred with Pamphilus, Eusebius sees a summary of the structure of the Church, as he openly affirms when claiming that they ἐν βραχεῖ embraced the perfect figure (τύπος) of the ecclesiastical body (*MP* 11.1f). Even if they were few in number,[18] they did not lack any of the τάγματα (orders, ranks) that can be found among men (*MP* 11.1g). This allegory of the Church is especially developed in the introductory chapters (*MP* 11.1a–m), which in the long version preceded the proper account of the martyrs' death, but were removed from the short version (they still exist in the original Greek form, and for this reason in dealing with them we always refer to the Greek text rather than to the Syriac translation). In those chapters Eusebius is concerned to point out how those martyrs were a symbolic representation (ἀφομοίωμα) ἐν εἰκόνι σμικρᾷ of the Church which contains innumerable people (*MP* 11.1f). They covered in fact the whole range of possible ages (*MP* 11.1b), of the condition of their souls (*MP* 11.1c), of their mode of life (*MP* 11.1e) and finally—and most importantly—of hierarchical ranks in the Church (*MP* 11.1f). Pamphilus, a presbyter in the diocese of Caesarea, had an exceptional education in the traditional Greek disciplines; as regards the divine doctrines and the inspired scriptures, he was so well trained that no one among his contemporaries was equal to him. He was outstanding because of his intelligence and wisdom (*MP* 11.1d); throughout his life he distinguished himself by every virtue, by his renunciation and contempt of worldly life, by his charitable disposition toward the poor, and by his philosophical life and asceticism (*MP* 11.2). The old Valens, deacon in the Church of Aelia, was more learned than anyone else in the divine scriptures that he knew by heart (*MP* 11.4). Paul from Iamnia was very reckless and ardent in spirit (*MP* 11.5). Porphyrius, a servant in the household of Pamphilus, was very young, and expert in the art of calligraphy (*MP* 11.15–19). Seleucus, from Cappadocia, after leaving the Roman army because of his profession of Christianity, had devoted himself to charity towards widows, orphans, and the poor (*MP* 11.20–3). The aged Theodulus held the first rank among the servants in the household of the governor (*MP* 11.24). Julian was from Cappadocia, and had just arrived in Caesarea from a long journey, when he was arrested and martyred (*MP* 11.25–7). Moreover, Eusebius refers in general to readers, catechumens, and faithful, who suffered martyrdom on the same day (*MP* 1f).

The key to understanding why Eusebius used such an allegory in the context of his historical work lies in Pamphilus himself. He was in fact the most outstanding figure

[18] These martyrs were twelve, a number almost certainly conventional, chosen by Eusebius to equate the number of the martyrs with that of the patriarchs, the prophets and the apostles—a correspondence that he explicitly underlines (*MP* 11.1h; *MP* 11.1); on the number twelve in biblical symbolism, see B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan, *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (Oxford, 1993), 562.

among the martyrs mentioned in *MP*,[19] either because of his importance as a scholar in Caesarea,[20] or because of his familiarity with Eusebius himself, of whom he was the master and friend. In his works the historian often expresses affection and devotion toward him, whom he calls ἐμὸς δεσπότης (*MP* 11.1d), and he himself was traditionally known as 'Eusebius son of Pamphilus' (Phot. *Bib.* 13; Arethas in a scholium on *PE* 1.3.6, GCS VIII/2, 427).[21] They had together composed six books in defence of Origen, five of which were written by the two of them when the martyr was in prison, and the last one by Eusebius, after his master's death (Phot. *Bib.* 118).[22] In the light of Pamphilus' prominence, either in Caesarea, or in Eusebius' life, we can safely assume that the historian intended the death of his master as the heart of the entire work. For this reason, he not only emphasized the account of his martyrdom as much as he could, but also gave it a general meaning, which went far beyond the episode of the death itself: Pamphilus and his companions were intended as representing the ecclesiastical body and—even if implicitly—their martyrdom as typifying the persecution which affected it. Furthermore, in the allegory of the Church developed in the story of Pamphilus' martyrdom, we find outlined Eusebius' specific doctrine of the Church, which was to be fully expounded in his exegesis of Isaiah.[23] From the *Commentarius in Isaiam* we know that Eusebius' doctrine of the Church was mainly focused on the Church as an earthly institution, and on the hierarchical differentiation of orders in it, to the extent that a number of Isaiah's prophecies were applied to the institutional Church.[24] It is the same attitude we find in *MP*, where Eusebius is especially concerned with stressing the possible forms of differentiation within the Church,[25] which—he continuously repeats—do not affect its unity.

When the account of Pamphilus' death is considered from this perspective, the meaning of the story of the five Egyptians, with its reference to the heavenly Jerusalem, stands out at once. In fact, in including such an episode in the narrative, Eusebius might have been intending to provide the allegory of the Church he was developing with the necessary theological framework. This is not different from what happens in the *Commentarius in Isaiam*, where the focus of Eusebius' interest—the argument concerning the Church as an earthly institution—is always set into a theological framework, which refers to the godly polity of the Church (usually symbolized by the heavenly Jerusalem). But in Pamphilus' martyrdom this theological framework was built up by Eusebius into a form appropriate for an historical work, as *MP* is, and for this reason it was given the appearance of an historical episode, rather than the proper shape of a passage of theological speculation.

[19] Eusebius explicitly calls him 'the most glorious among our contemporary martyrs because of all his virtues' (*MP* 7.4).

[20] On Pamphilus' life, see E. Venables, 'Pamphilus', in W. Smith and H. Wace (edd.), *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines, During the First Eight Centuries* (London, 1887), 178–9; E. Schwartz, *R.E.* VI (1909), 1371–3.

[21] It is not known where this sort of 'patronymic' comes from. According to Barnes ([n. 2, 1981], 94), 'it inexorably implies that Pamphilus adopted him [Eusebius] as his son'.

[22] On this topic, see E. Junod, 'L'*Apologie pour Origène* de Pamphile et la naissance de l'origénisme', *Studia Patristica* 26 (Leuven, 1993), 267–86, at 270–86.

[23] Hollerich (n. 11), 165–203.

[24] See, for instance, the interpretations of Isa. 19.18 (GCS IX, 133.11–16), and Isa. 54.12 (GCS IX, 342.11–343.3).

[25] However, this is in line with the general attitude of the entire work, where Eusebius often insists on the rank held by the martyrs in the Church (*MP* 3.3, 7.3, 10.3, 13.4; *MPSyr.* 4, 5, 7, 12, 47, 50).

THE GENESIS OF THE EPISODE

Even if the episode of the Egyptians as Eusebius presents it may be not authentic, the elements from which it is made up seem to rest on historical 'data'. In its background, in fact, we can distinguish two other accounts from *MP*,[26] from which Eusebius might have drawn the circumstances of the arrest and the trial of the Egyptians.

In the sixth year of the persecution (A.D. 308/309) a group of Egyptian Christians, who had been condemned in Egypt, was sent to the city of Diocaesarea,[27] where the governor Firmilianus (who was to condemn the five Egyptians with Pamphilus) sentenced them to the copper mines (*MPSyr.* 28–30). In this trial too the Egyptians had given the names of the prophets as their own: their parents—Eusebius explains—had chosen them, so that they might call their sons after the names of the prophets.[28] This story seems as a whole to be trustworthy. For instance, as regards Diocaesarea, although Eusebius was not right in saying that all its inhabitants were Jews (*MPSyr.* 29), the evidence shows that the city might have been predominantly Jewish.[29] As to the condemnation of the confessors, from the second century onwards it was quite common for Christians to be condemned to hard labour in mines or quarries, and to be moved over greater or lesser distances, wherever *metalla* were found (Ulpian, *Dig.* 48.19.8.4);[30] *MP* itself is important evidence for this practice. In the light of the general reliability of this account, even as to the names of the Egyptians, we should regard as trustworthy the story in *MPSyr.* 28–30, while considering that in *MP* 11.6–13 as a reworking of it. In particular, we can hypothesize that Eusebius transferred and adapted the theme of the names of the martyrs from *MPSyr.* 28–30 into the context of Pamphilus' martyrdom, because it gave him the opportunity to develop the argument about the heavenly Jerusalem, which was the core of his account.

The way in which the historian comments on the Hebrew names of the Egyptians is a significant proof of the connection between the two passages. In both cases, Eusebius points to the correspondence between the deeds of those who so courageously suffered martyrdom and their names, which came from those of the prophets (*MPSyr.* 30; *MP* 11.8).[31] Moreover, the fact that Eusebius provides the same names in

[26] These two accounts are preserved only in the Syriac translation, while in the short Greek version just a few hints are given about them (*MP* 8.1, 10.1). Despite the apparent freedom of early Syriac translations from Greek, there is some hope of reconstructing the main lines of Eusebius account; for an appraisal of the translations from Greek into Syriac, see S. P. Brock, 'Towards a history of Syriac translation technique', *III Symposium Syriacum*, OCA 221 (1982), 1–14, repr. in id., *Studies in Syriac Christianity* (Aldershot, 1992), ch. X; see also id., 'Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek', *Journal of the Syriac Academy* 3 (1977), 1–17; and id., 'Aspects of translation technique in antiquity', *GRBS* 20 (1979), 69–87, both repr. in id., *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London, 1984), chs. II and III.

[27] The Syriac text erroneously says that in Syriac the city was called Lud (*MPSyr.* 29), a mistake, since the Greek name of Lud was Diospolis. Diocaesarea is the pagan Roman–Greek name that was acquired by Sepphoris, in Galilee, from the end of the reign of Antoninus Pius.

[28] According to Lawlor and Oulton ([n. 2], 334, n. 8), Eusebius' arguments entail that the Egyptians of *MPSyr.* 28–30 were born as Christians, within Christian families, while the Egyptians in *MP* 11.8 were converted from paganism.

[29] See Epiph. *Pan.* 30.11.10; GCS I, 347.15–17). On Diocaesarea/Sepphoris, see S. S. Miller, *Studies in the History and Traditions on Sepphoris* (Leiden, 1984); Y. Tsafir, L. Di Segni, and J. Green, *Tabula Imperii Romani; Iudaea-Palaestina* (Jerusalem, 1994), 227–8; F. G. B. Millar, *The Roman Near East* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1996^3), 369–70.

[30] See F. G. B. Millar, 'Condemnation to hard labour in the Roman Empire, from the Julio-Claudians to Constantine', *PBSR* 52 (1984), 124–47, at 139–43.

[31] *MPSyr.* 30: 'And it turned out that their deeds corresponded to their names' (translation from Syriac); for the translation of *MP* 11.8, see above p. 501.

both episodes (Elias, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and in *MP* 11.8 also Samuel) strengthens the hypothesis that in some ways there might be a particular connection between the stories, even though it cannot be excluded that he gave his Egyptians conventional rather than true Hebrew names.

In *MP* 10.1 Eusebius refers to some Egyptians who were arrested at the gates of Ascalon,[32] when travelling from their own land in order to provide nourishment for the confessors of Cilicia (*MPSyr.* 36–7). Their names were Ares, Promus, and Elias, names that are perfectly plausible.[33] The resemblance of this episode to the circumstance of our Egyptians' arrest is remarkable. In both accounts we have some Egyptians connected with the martyrs in the mines of Cilicia (in one case they were on their way to Cilicia, in the other on their way back), who were arrested before the gates of a city (Ascalon or Caesarea), and when asked by the guards who they were, spoke the truth and were arrested. Moreover in both episodes the gatekeepers are described as 'barbarian' (*βάρβαροι*, *MP* 11.6; (')nāšā barbarāyē, *MPSyr.* 37), and the martyrs are said to have been arrested as they were 'malefactors' (*κακοῦργοι*, *MP* 11.6; 'ābday bīšātā, *MPSyr.* 37). Although this coincidence is not conclusive evidence for the connection of the two episodes, it cannot, however, be excluded that Eusebius 'borrowed' the circumstances of the arrest of the Egyptians martyred with Pamphilus from the account of the Egyptians arrested at the gates of Ascalon.

It is worth noting that the chapters from which Eusebius might have picked up either the names of the Egyptians or the story of their arrest were drastically abridged in the short version, making it impossible for the reader of the latter to catch the web of links which appears to lie beneath the narrative.

Oxford ERICA CAROTENUTO
erica_carotenuto@hotmail.com

[32] On Ascalon, see Tsafir et al. (n. 29), 68–70.
[33] For references, see n. 5.