

حٖصٖل دٖاصٖل دٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل
 لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل
Magnificent sepulcher (لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل لٖاصٖل) ⁶ is an apt description of the tomb which was built, along with Old St. Peter’s Basilica, during Constantine’s reign. According to the *Liber Pontificalis* the donations for the tomb and church came exclusively from the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire which were not in Constantine’s control until after 18 September 324.⁷ However, logistics related to the procurement and transferring of both the kinds and quantities of the donations listed in the *LP*⁸ would require c. three years between the imperial order and the arrival of the donations in Rome.⁹ Some of these commodities were imported from outside the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire via the maritime trade routes of the Red Sea: nard and pepper from India;¹⁰ frankincense and myrrh from Arabia and Somalia;¹¹ Cassia from China and SE Asia;¹² Balsam produced in Judea;¹³ and the most exotic of all, cloves from the Molucca islands of Indonesia.¹⁴ We may note here that Pietri deduces that the construction of the church did not even begin until c. A.D. 327.¹⁵ Over the bronze sarcophagus in the tomb was placed a golden cross weighing 150 pounds on which was found an inscription acknowledging *HELENA AUGUSTA*:¹⁶ CONSTANTINVS AVGVSTVS ET HELENA AVGVSTA HANC DOMVM REGALEM SIMILI FVLGORE CORVSCANS AVLA CIRCVM DAT. Helena was given the title *Augusta* in November 324 and had died by early 329.¹⁷ The latter is thus the *terminus ante quem* for the dedication inscription. Taking into further consideration the logistics for the construction of the Basilica, which had a seating capacity of c. 4000, and the tomb which was elaborately decorated, it is reasonable to suggest that ten years were required for the construction of both structures. If Krautheimer’s suggestion for the beginning date of c. A.D. 322 (at the latest) is correct, that would bring us to c. A.D. 332 for the termination.¹⁸ We must, however,

allow for a period of a few years at least to elapse between the termination of the construction of both edifices and the remark made by Eusebius in Theoph. 4.7, that even to the time of writing, great multitudes of the Roman Empire were running to them as to a great tomb and temple of God” (ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ). This would point to the late 330’s as the time of writing.

It has been proposed, however, that A.D. 325 must be the *terminus ante quem* for the Theophany because in II.14 Eusebius mentions the practice of cultic prostitution at Heliopolis in Phoenicia.¹⁹ According to this hypothesis, since Constantine was reported to have ordered the destruction of the shrine there c. 325,²⁰ Eusebius must have written the work before that date. However, the claims of Eusebius in VC III.58 should be considered with caution,²¹ and several later writers indisputably attest to the continuation of paganism, along with the temple of Zeus at Heliopolis, well into the late 6th century A.D.²²

Two passages (IV.6; V.49) refer to the construction of churches in Antioch²³ and Alexandria. The former certainly describes the great octagonal cathedral begun by Constantine in 327, dedicated in 341, and mentioned in some detail in the VC and LC.²⁴ The reference to Alexandria undoubtedly refers to the large metropolitan church which was completed in 328.²⁵ The references to the church in Antioch fit much better in the late 330’s than in the late 320’s. The composite picture that can be deduced from the data just now surveyed would lead me to the conclusion that Eusebius wrote the Theophany most likely in the years 337-8.

II. SOTERIOLOGICAL FORMULAE IN *THEOPHANY, BOOK III*

The Theophany contains 336 universalism passages, and each book has a distinct soteriological theme. Book I concerns the transcendence of God the Father and the immanence of God the Son, whom Eusebius throughout the work calls “the universal Saviour” (سبحه الله ورحمته وبركاته),²⁶ and their interrelationship to the providential design of, and care for, the universe.

The Saviour of all creation who came to earth for the salvation of all races and to destroy the error of polytheism is the theme of Book II. Book III posits that universal salvation is available only through Christ. Citing 166 biblical passages mostly from the N.T., Book IV argues that Christ’s foreknowledge of events now being fulfilled in Eusebius’ time indisputably prove his divinity.²⁷ The final Book develops an argument based primarily upon the universal dissemination of the Gospel to all nations which, again, proves Christ’s divinity, the truth of scripture, the trustworthiness of the Apostles’ witness, and thus dismantles the pagan accusation that Christ and his disciples were deceivers. Hence universalism is the cornerstone of Eusebius’ soteriological paradigm in the *Theophany*.

The specific example of universalism to be analyzed is سبحانه الله ورحمته وبركاته *the divine power of the Saviour of us all* and cognate soteriological formulae which occur fifteen times in Book III,²⁸ a vast majority of which demonstrate that Eusebius made significant modifications to the earlier works from which they derive.²⁹ These can be divided into three sub-categories. All six passages in the first group (III.33(b); 38; 39(a); 39(b); 40(a); 71) contain the term سبحانه الله ورحمته وبركاته, *the Saviour of all*. In three of these Eusebius has changed *our Saviour* of the LC to *Saviour of all*:

Theoph. III. 33 (b): ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ; parallel text: LC XVII.12: ὁ σωτήρ ὁ ἡμέτερος; Theoph. III.38: ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ; parallel text: LC XVI.9: τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτήρος; and Theoph. III.71: ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ; parallel text: LC XVI.9-10: μόνος ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτήρ

Two of the remaining three passages are not exact parallels. The *Incorporeal Word of God*, ὁ ἀσώματος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος (LC XIV.1); and the phrase *the salvation and benefaction for all*; σωτήριόν τε ὅμου καὶ εὐεργετικὸν τοῖς πᾶσιν (Heikel, 165b); are again changed to ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ, *the Saviour of all*, in Theoph. III.39 (a) and III.40 (a), respectively. Finally, III.39 (b), in which occurs ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ, should be compared with ὁ κοινός ἀπάντων σωτήρ of LC XIV.5, which is Eusebius' preferred epithet, best translated *the Universal Saviour*, with an exact Syriac parallel ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ at Theoph. III.1, and found in all five books. Compare also DE IV.13 (168d, Heikel): εὐεργετικὸν ἑαυτὸν καὶ σωτήριον; and DE VII.1, which speaks similarly of the healing and salvation of all men (καὶ θεοῦ λόγῳ ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων ἀνθρώπων θεραπείας τε καὶ σωτηρίας), without the soteriological epithets but employing the same general argument.

All eight passages of the second group again contain the common element ܘܗܘ,³⁰ five of which have the first person, plural, possessive suffix ܘܗܘܢ. Seven of the earlier works (6 from the LC and 1 from the DE) which provide parallel texts simply contain either ἡ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν or τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτήρος, and Eusebius modifies these to convey a more encompassing soteriology. For example, LC XVI.6: ἡ μὲν γε τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν δύναμις and LC XVI.9: καὶ τοῦτο δὴ μόνου τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτήρος ἔργον ἦν (Gressmann's [p. 86] restored Greek text: ἡ τοῦ σωτήρος τῶν ὅλων δύναμις) have been changed to ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ (Theoph. III.2) and ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ (Theoph. III.6), respectively. Five passages address the theme of *the power or divine power(s) of the Saviour of all/us all*:

Theoph. III.17: ܘܗܘ ܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ ܕܡܫܘܥ; parallel: LC XVI.11: τοσοῦτον ἐναργῶν ἀποδείξων τὴν τὸν θάνατον ἀρετὴν τε καὶ δύνάμιν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν pistoumevnwn;

Theoph. III.19: **ܡܫܘܚܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**; parallel: LC XVI.12: **τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτήρος τὴν ἀφανὴ δύναμιν αὐτοῦ**; Theoph. III.33 (a): **ܘܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**; parallel: LC XVII.12: **τῆς ἐνθέου δυνάμεως τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν**; Theoph. III.37: **ܡܫܘܚܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**; parallel: LC XVII.15: **ἐνθέου δυνάμεις τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν**; Theoph. III.40 (b): **ܘܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**; parallel: DE III.4 (108a, Heikel): **τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ἐνθέου δυνάμεως**

In each case Eusebius has modified the original terminology to convey a more nuanced universalism by employing either **ܡܫܘܚܐ** (III.17; 19; 37) or **ܘܗܘܐ** (III.33(a); 40(b)). Finally, Theoph. III.57, **ܡܫܘܚܐ ܕܗܘܐ**, and the Greek parallel text **ὁ πάντων ἐπινίκιος σωτήρ**, demonstrate that the Syriac translator gives **ܡܫܘܚܐ** for the Greek **ὁ πάντων σωτήρ**, significant because, of the fifteen passages analyzed in this paper, this is the only one derived from the original Greek text of the *Theophany*.³¹ Both passages stress the victory (**ἐπινίκιος**; **ܕܘܚܘܒܐ**) through Christ in the conflict (**ἄγων**; **ܕܘܚܘܒܐ**) over the demons (**δαίμονες**; **ܕܘܚܘܒܐ**). The final category has only one passage from the *Theophany* and a parallel text from the LC:

Theoph. III.7: **ܡܫܘܚܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**; parallel: LC XVI.9: **ἀλλὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα τυγχάνει δείγματα τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἐνθέου ζωῆς**. “But these became trivial proofs of our Savior’s divine life after His death.” (trans.: Drake)³²

Both offer *small proofs* of Christ’s deity either by stressing his post-crucifixion life (LC), or the revelation of the Godhead of *the Saviour of us all* (Theoph.); the key difference, again, being the all-encompassing **ܡܫܘܚܐ** which indicates a wider audience for this last apologetic work than that for either the PE or the DE.³³ It should also be added here that the changes we have noted are not restricted to Book III of the Theophany. For example, Book V contains five passages which derive from the DE,³⁴ and in each one Eusebius has inserted his favorite soteriological formula, **ܘܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ**, which is absent from the parallel Greek passages.³⁵

Of the fifteen passages analyzed, only two have an exact parallels with **وَالصَّلَاةِ**³⁶ and one with **وَالصَّلَاةِ**.³⁷ Both **وَالصَّلَاةِ**, *Saviour of all*, and **وَالصَّلَاةِ**, *Saviour of us all*, occur more frequently in the *Theophany* than in the PE, DE, VC, or LC.³⁸ Also, since about 70% of the work derives from the PE and the DE,³⁹ and both of these larger works aimed much of their arsenal at Porphyry,⁴⁰ it should not surprise us that the great Neoplatonic philosopher was the main adversary of the *Theophany* as well.⁴¹ The claims found in his Prologue to his *De philosophia ex oraculis*⁴² to what appears to be Porphyry's answer to Christian universalism⁴³ which, in the words of Peter Brown, was "open to the mass of men,"⁴⁴ were still haunting the Bishop in his final years.⁴⁵ Many of the universalism passages of Book III⁴⁶ were undoubtedly aimed at Porphyry's rejection of Christ as the *via universalis salutis animae*.⁴⁷ The great reverence accorded to the apostles Peter and Paul in Theoph. 4.7, with an emphasis upon the Constantinian churches built in their memory, is a response to Porphyry's attack upon them in a number of fragments of the *Contra Christianos*.⁴⁸

In conclusion, the changes made to the soteriological formulae analyzed in this paper were intentionally designed, strategically located,⁴⁹ and served an anti-Porphyrian purpose in Eusebius' apologetic argument. A soteriological universalism, undergirded by a heightened triumphalism, helps to explain the attitude of confidence which exudes the *Theophany* expressed in the changes we have noted. Although Augustine could years later more accurately reflect upon the marriage of Church and Empire and conclude that "Having a Christian emperor had not made the empire Christian,"⁵⁰ The optimism of Eusebius during its honeymoon, expressed in the *Theophany*, was flying quite high.

¹ See Michael Bland Simmons, "Porphyrian Universalism: A Tripartite Soteriology and Eusebius' Response," HTR 102:2 (2009): 169-92; Id., "Universalism in the *Demonstratio evangelica* of Eusebius of Caesarea," SP XLVI (2010): 319-24; Id., "The Emperor Julian's Order to Rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem: A Connection with Oracles?" ANES 43 (2006): 68-117; Id., "*Via universalis salutis animae liberandae*: The Pagan-Christian Debate on Universalism in the Later Roman Empire (A.D. 260-325)," SP XL (2006): 245-51.

² See Samuel Lee, *Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea on The Theophania or Divine Manifestation of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. A Syriac Version edited from an Ancient Manuscript recently Discovered*. (London, 1842); Id., *Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea on The Theophania or Divine Manifestation of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Translated into English with notes from an Ancient Syriac Version of the Greek Original now Lost*. (Cambridge, 1843); Hugo Gressmann, ed., *Eusebius Werke. Dritter Band. Zweiter Teil. Die Theophanie. Die Griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der Syrischen Überlieferung*. (Berlin, 1992). The latter originally was published in GCS 1904, Eusebius Werke Band 3. The 1992 ed. includes at pp. 1-37, Gressmann's 'Studien zu Eusebs Theophanie,' TU (Leipzig, 1903).

³ Cf. the works by Lee and Gressmann cited in the preceding note.

⁴ See See Aryeh Kovsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*. (Leiden: Brill, 2002): 279, referring to Angelo Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae. Tomus Quartus* (Rome, 1847); Lee, and Gressmann as the only scholars who have studied the contents of the work in any detail.

⁵ A more detailed publication on dating the Theoph. is forthcoming.

⁶ Cf. Gressmann's (175) *einer herrlichen Grabstätte*.

⁷ L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955): 176ff. Cf. also H. Geertman, 'Il *Liber Pontificalis* e la Storia Materiale,' in *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome. Atti del colloquio internazionale, 21-22 febbraio 2002*. (Assen: 2003): 285-355.

⁸ Some donations came from various parts of the Eastern Empire and as far away as China or India, e.g., 200 lb. of Nard oil (Antioch); 300 lb. nard oil (Alexandria); 50 lb. Isaurian Storax (Alexandria); from Passinopolimse, Egypt: 50 medimmi of pepper; 100 lb. Saffron; 150 lb. Storax; 200 lb. Cassia spices; 300 lb. Nard oil; from Hybromius in Egypt: 200 lb. Nard oil; on which see Duchesne (1955): 177f. ; and Eivind H. Seland, "The *Liber Pontificalis* and the Red Sea Trade of the Early-Mid Fourth Century AD," forthcoming in *Proceedings of the fifth Red Sea Conference. Society for Arabian Studies Monographs*. (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2011). I am grateful to Dr. Seland for sending me a copy of this paper before publication.

⁹ E.g., weather, seasonal maritime trade, time required for heavy cargo, procurement of exotic goods, etc.

¹⁰ *Oleum nardinum*: Seland (2011): 6f; Duchesne (1955): LP, 177f.

¹¹ Ibid.: *Aromata*, undoubtedly frankincense; *stacte*.

¹² Ibid.: *Cainnamomum cassia*.

¹³ Ibid.: *Balsamum*. Judea imported most of its Balsum from Arabia, on which see J. Innes Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire 29 B.C. to A.D. 641*. (Oxford: OUP, 1969): 101f.; some of which was imported.

¹⁴ Ibid.: *Cariophylum*.

¹⁵ C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*. 33ff; 53ff; Barnes (1981): 310, n. 61. This coheres with the LP which states that it was at the request of Silvester, pope from 314-335, that Constantine built both church and tomb.

¹⁶ CONSTANTINVS AVGVSTVS ET HELENA AVGVSTA HANC DOMVM REGALEM SIMILI FVLGORE CORVSCANS AVLA CIRCVMDAT. The English translation is found in Raymond Davis, ed., *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis). The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715. TTH Latin Series V.* (Liverpool, 1989): 18-20.

¹⁷ For the title: EUs., VC III.47; Soz., HE II.2.4; Theoph., a.m. 5816; for the date of death see Jan W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*. (Leiden & N.Y.: Brill, 1992): 73.

¹⁸ Cf. Richard Krautheimer, et al., eds., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The Early Basilicas of Rome (IV-IX cent.)*. Vol. V. (Rome: Pontificio Istituto de Archeologia Cristiana, 1977): 171.

¹⁹ See T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981): 310, n. 61, with reference to chapter X of the same work where he argues for a date c. 325 for the Theoph.

²⁰ Eus., VC III.58; Soc., HE I.18; II.4 (PG 67, 941ff).

²¹ See Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall, *Eusebius Life of Constantine*. (Oxford: OUP, 1999): 305 (on Eus., VC III.58): "He gives few specific examples, twists his material to give it an apologetic meaning, and embeds his statements within a context of highly coloured and tendentious rhetoric."

²² Cf. Soz., HE VII.15; Theodoret, HE IV.19; John of Ephesus (d. c. A.D. 586), HE III.27-34. The latter says that the Christians in Heliopolis were a small and oppressed minority. Cf. also Cameron Hall (1999): 304f. (on Eus., VC III.58); G. Clarke, "Third Century Christianity," CAH 12 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 2005): 589-671, 602; H. Kennedy, "Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia," CAH XIV (Cambridge, 2000): 588-611, 597.

²³ For the octagonal church in Antioch see Eus., VC III.50 and LC IX.15, and Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church. Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400*. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009): 118; Cameron and Hall (1999): 299; R. Krautheimer, "The Ecclesiastical Building Policy of Constantine," in *Costantino il Grande. Dall'antichità all'Umanesimo. Colloquio sul Cristianesimo nel mondo antico*. (Macerate: Università degli studi di Macerata, 1993): 509-52, 537, 547; Id., *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979) 3rd ed., 79; S.S. Alexander, "Studies in Constantinian Church Architecture II. Topographical Aspects of Constantinian Church Architecture," *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* 49 (1973): 33-44, 41; W. E. Kleinbauer, "The Origin and Functions of the Aisled Tetraconch Churches in Syria and Northern Mesopotamia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 27 (1973): 89-114, 111-4; Frans van de Paverd, "Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen dei Johannes Chrysostomos," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 187 (Rome: Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970): 3-7; G. Bovinni, *Edifici cristiani di culto d'età costantiniana a Roma*. (Bologna: Casa Editrice Riccardo Pàtron, 1968): 348; G. Downey, *Ancient Antioch*. (Princeton: PUP, 1963): 144, n. 3; W. Eltester, "Die Kirchen Antiochias im IV. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristums* 36 (1937): 251-86, 254, 260. For the dates given see Jer., Chron. Olymp. 276.3 (PL 27.498) and

Philos., HE p. 212 Bidez, ed.; and for the time required for construction see Chron. miscelaneun (CSCO, Script. Syr., ser. 3 & 4, 130, z.21ff., text, Brooks), and cited in de Pavard (1970): 7:

Antiochiae Syriae, ecclesia sphaericae formae completa est intra 15 annos.

²⁴ Eus. VC III.50 and LC IX.15.

²⁵ Cf. MacMullen (2009): 117.

²⁶ E.g., Theoph. I.23, 25, 35, 68, 72; II.1, 2, 20, 94, 95, 97; III.1; IV.1, 8; V.1, 8, 14, 16, 34, 46.

²⁷ Michael Frede, "Eusebius' Apologetic Writings," in M. Goodman, et al., eds., *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*. (Oxford: OUP, 1999): 223-50, 230, suggests that PE I.3.12 refers to an earlier work on fulfilled prophecies of Christ now lost which may have been reworked to form Bk. IV of the Theoph.

²⁸ Twelve derive from the LC: XIV.1; XIV.5; XVI.6; XVI.9 (three); XVI.11; XVI.12 (three); XVII.15; XVI.9-10; two from the DE: DE III.4 (Heikel, 108a); DE IV.10 (Heikel, 165b); and one comes from a fragment of the original Greek text of the Theophany: Gressmann [1903, p. 8]: Bruchstück no. 3 = Theoph. III.41-62, pp. 4-15, and the section of the *Theophany* is Σ 109.20-21 (Gressmann [1903]: 152).

²⁹ For the following citations from the Theophany, I sometimes give letters after numbers (e.g., III.39(a) indicating the sequential order of the terminology found in the same section of Book III.

³⁰ Eight have ܩܘܝܢܐ: III.2; III.33(a); III.33(b); III.38; III.39(a); III.39(b); III.40(a); and III.71; one has the variant ܩܘܝܢܐ: III.71; and six have ܩܘܝܢܐ: III.6; III.7; III.17; III.19; III.37; and III.57.

³¹ Gressmann [1903, p. 8]: Bruchstück no. 3 = Theoph. III.41-62, pp. 4-15, and the section of the *Theophany* is Σ 109.20-21 (Gressmann [1903]: 152).

³² H. A. Drake, *In Praise of Constantine. A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press, 1976).

³³ Kovsky (2002): 278.

³⁴ A forthcoming publication will provide an analysis of these five passages and parallel Greek texts.

³⁵ Cf. Theoph. V.8 (DE III.6 [Heikel, 126f.]); Theoph. V.14 (DE III.6 [Heikel, 129f.]); Theoph. V.16 (DE III.6 (Heikel, 131b-c)); Theoph. V.34 (DE III.5 (Heikel, 117c]); and Theoph. V.46 (DE III.7 [Heikel, 137a]).

³⁶ Theoph. III.39(b); parallel: LC XIV.5; and Theoph. III.40(a); parallel: DE IV.10 (Heikel, 165b).

³⁷ Theoph. III.57; parallel: Gressmann [1903, p. 8]: Bruchstück no. 3 = Theoph. III.41-62, pp. 4-15, and the section

of the *Theophany* is Σ 109.20-21 (Gressmann [1903]: 152).

³⁸ I here refer to the LC, though technically all the parallel passages under that designation derive from *De sepulchro Christi* or SC, which covers Chapters 11-18 of the LC, on which see Drake (1976): 30-45. For **κοινὸς ἀπάντων σωτήρ** in the LC see (e.g.) VI.8; XII.4; XII.6; XIV.4; cf. LC II.2, 3, 4: **ὁ μὲν τῶν ὅλων σωτήρ** (cf. DE IV.6, 10, 12); XI.1: **τοῦ κοινοῦ σωτήρος**; XII.1: **πάντων σωτήρ** (cf. DE IV.13); and XV.13: **τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας** (cf. DE III.1: **περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος τοῦ κόσμου**). The preferred formula in the DE is the simple **ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν**: cf. DE I.4, 10; II.3; III.2, 5, 6, 7; IV.16; V.3, 5; VI.13, 17; IX.1, 17; X.7, 8.

³⁹ Kovsky p. 278.

⁴⁰ For the fragments of *Contra Christianos* see: Adolf von Harnack, *Porphyrius „Gegen die Christen“ 15 Bücher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate* (Berlin: AKPAW, 1916); Robert M. Berchman,

Porphyry Against the Christians. AMMTC I (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2005); Enrique A. Ramos Jurado, et al., eds., *Porfirio de Tiro. Contra los Cristianos. Recopilación de fragmentos, traducción, introducción y notas*. (Cádiz: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádiz, 2006).

⁴¹ Theoph. III.3, 19, 40 (Christians cannot offer proof for their beliefs: see Simmons [1995]: App. III-IV, 332-7); III.4, 6 (Christ is only a mortal: Civ. Dei XIX.23; cf. Simmons [1995]: 216-42); III.7 (Christ civilized the barbarians: cf. Theoph. II.54-6; Eus., PE IV.16; LC XIII; Porph., Abst. II.54ff.); III.13 (Christ implicated in error: Civ. Dei XIX.23); III.15f. (superiority of bloodless sacrifices: Porph., Abst. II.34); III.21 (women in Christian ministry: Jurado [2006]: CC 27 [Harn. 97; Berchman 66]); III.23, 28, 38 (Christian rustics were taught virtue and temperance: cf. Simmons [2009], on Porphyry's 'Second Way of Virtue'; and Jurado [2006]: CC 26, Jer., in Psalm. LXXXI [Harn. 4; Berchman 93]; and 52, Jer., Tract. in Marc. 29-35, de principio Marci, I:1-12 [Harn. 9a; Berchman: no listing]; III.25, 54 (Christ fulfilled OT prophecies: e.g., Jurado [2006]: 21, Eus., DE VI.18.11.1 [Harn. 47; Berchman 19]); 22, Eus., Chron. fr. Apud Hier., Chron. a. Abr., praef. (Helm, 8.1-7; Harn. 40; Berchman 21); 23, Eus., C.Porph. VI & VII apud Cod. Lau. (Athos) 184.B64 Saec. X (Goltz, TU 17.4, 41ff.) fol.17: Schol. Act. 15.20 (Harn. 8; Berchman 24); 30a, Jer., in Dan. Prolog., 1-32 (Harn. 43A; Berchman 70); III.63 (the whole race of humanity has been changed by Christian virtue: a critique of Porphyry's "Second Way" [cf. Simmons (1995)]; Jurado [2006]: CC 20, Eus., DE III.5.95.1-100.1 (Harn. 7; Berchman 17), where Porph. accuses the disciples of mendacity, self-love, blasphemy, etc.; III.71, 78 (God does not need blood and smoke; offering hymns to God, etc.; cf. Porph., Abst. II.34.

⁴² Andrew Smith, *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*. (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1993): 303 F (Eus., PE IV.6.2-7.2 = Porph., Phil. or., Prolog.)

⁴³ See the works by the present author noted above and *Arnobius of Sicca* (Oxford: OUP, 1995): 264-303.

⁴⁴ Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography*. New Edition (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000): 98.

⁴⁵ See Simmons (2009). No one to my knowledge has ever done a study on the presence of universalism in the *Contra Christianos*.

⁴⁶ There are 336 universalism passages in the *Theophany* (5 bks.), 471 in the DE (10 bks.) (Simmons, 2010), and 187 in the PE (15 bks.) (Simmons, SP XL [2006]), revealing that there is a higher proportion of these passages in the Theoph.

⁴⁷ See Simmons (2009) and (e.g.) Aug., Civ. Dei X.32; Phil. or., Prolog. (Eus., PE IV.7); Jurado (2006): CC 4, Aug., Ep. 102 (Harn. 81; Berchman 112); CC 17, Eus., PE V.1.9f. (Harn. 80; Berchman 15); CC 24, Eus., HE VI.19.2-9 (Harn. 39; Berchman 20); CC 26, Jer., in Psalm. LXXXI (Harn. 4; Berchman 93); CC 30 D, Jer., in Dan. I, 2:31-5 (Harn. 43D; Berchman 74), interpreting וְנִמְלֵת כָּל-אֲרֶעָא at the end of Dn. 2:35 as applying to the eternal (and universal) rule of the people of Israel; CC 34, Jer., in Matth. I, 9:9 (Harn. 6; Berchman 95); CC 48, Jer., Ep. 133 (Harn. 82; Berchman 106); CC 105, Methodius, C.Porph. (Bonwetsch, 345f.; Harn. 84; Berchman 10). There are 88 universalism passages in Theoph. III.

⁴⁸ Cf. (e.g.) Jurado (2006): CC 39, Jer., in Gal. prolog. (Harn. 21a; Berchman 100); CC 42, Jer., in Gal. 2:11ff. (Harn. 21c; Berchman 103); CC 43, Jer., in Gal. 5:10 (Harn. 22; Berchman 104); CC 46, Jer., Ep. 112.6 (Harn. 21b; Berchman: no listing); CC 47, Jer., EP 130.14 (Harn. 25b; Berchman 105).

⁴⁹ See n. 38 above.

⁵⁰ Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society. From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. (Oxford: OUP, 2001): 478.