

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 54 (2008)

Artikel: The problem of fanaticism
Autor: MacMullen, Ramsay
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660957>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 19.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

VI

RAMSAY MACMULLEN

THE PROBLEM OF FANATICISM

Fanaticism I take in a quite conventional sense, to mean devotion to a religious belief for which one would die, if need be. Nothing of the sort was to be found in the ancient world in polytheist times and regions. Did Artemis or Isis demand such sacrifice? No, it was neither claimed nor wanted by any of the immortals. As to mortals, those who were polytheist were content to see piety offered to any deity and expressed in any manner one might choose. Greek and Latin lacked even a term for what we call fanatics.¹

¹ The word's root lies among devotees and officiants in temples, *fana*; thence, into many modern languages. Random illustrations in E. GIBBON's *Decline*, often (of Circumcellions, monks, Nestorians, and Montanists, but never of a faith defined in his day as orthodox), cf. A.H.M. JONES, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (London 1948), 123, of Donatists ready to endure death, or W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge 1972), 35, 70, 89, etc., of "heretics"; or Byzantinists like A.A. VASILIEV, *Justin the First* (Cambridge, Mass. 1950), 211, 242, or J. JARRY, *Hérésies et factions dans l'empire byzantin du IV^e au VII^e siècle* (Le Caire 1968), 221, 260, 313, of "fanatical" anti-Chalcedonians; or in T. RICE HOLMES, *A History of the Indian Mutiny* (London 1898), 90, "Mahomedan fanaticism", or F.S. ROBERTS, *Forty-One Years in India* (London 1911), 15, "a religious fanatic" calmly suicidal over "insult... to their religion"; 43, similar suicidal act; or 56, "animated by religious fanaticism". Greek has no equivalent. *Zelotes* is sometimes taken in this sense, cf. H. St. J. THACKERAY in the Loeb Library translation of JOS. *Bell.Jud.* (hereafter *BJ*) 2. 444 (= 2.17.9), or PHILO AL. *Migr.* 62, "fanatiques" in C. MÉZANGE, *Les sicaires et les zélotes au tournant de notre ère* (Paris 2003), 138. Yet notice, a Christian can recommend a brother as a *zelotes*, EUS. *HE* 5. 4. 2. Latin *fanaticus* hasn't the modern sense, either, cf. *ThLL* s.v., where *fanatici* as madmen (but without the will to give their lives) may rather be those who are punished by the gods for desecrating *fana*. For other modern applications of fanatic, cf. n.5, below.

Monotheists were quite different. They insisted on the truth of one god alone, perhaps worshipped in one certain way (for, as Henry Chadwick points out, one's enemy might be a theological cousin, a heretic or schismatic). They were certain they were right. For this, they would surrender life itself — but only if it was required of them (hence a recent reminder, "it takes two to make a martyr"). Generally they could live at peace with their neighbors; the true nature of their certainty needn't emerge. Without the active expression of an opposing belief perhaps rising to the level of angry argument or even persecution, one might never suspect the deadly nature of their faith.²

The phenomenon is distinguished by another quality: its irrationality — which in some sense *is* religion. Fanatical actions had about them no pretense of calculation, no reckoning of worldly, material, commonsensical benefit, no reaching for money or land or the political influence which is power. They were inspired rather by feelings, not thoughts.

Further: the usual instruments and routines serving public order couldn't control fanaticism because it was, either in its passive or desperate form, utterly intractable. It could not be controlled — except by extreme force, which, in the form of arms of war and capital punishment, remained a monopoly of the imperial government, not the local. All ordinary disturbances and crimes fell to the latter to take care of, but not fanaticism.

And notice, finally and most obviously: fanaticism was an internal problem of the empire even when it became a military problem, perhaps on a grand scale.

² H. CHADWICK, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church* (Oxford 2003), 1, "Perhaps the monotheistic religions manifest these strong cleavages in an exceptional degree", as seen in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, marked by "feelings of anger and alienation". Or Eus. *Laud. Const.* 16 (PG 20.1424B); and notice (for the perception if not the truth) how Jews in Judaea under Augustus "slaughtered each other as if seized by some fit, and really possessed by some fiend, were forever engaged in wars and battles". Quoted, "it takes two", is R. LANE FOX, *Pagans and Christians* (New York 1989), 434.

An early illustration of the phenomenon is provided by the historian Josephus. He describes a group of young men, religious patriots, who openly tore down a forbidden emblem on the Temple gate that Herod the Great had there displayed; whereupon he asked them, "Why so exultant, when you will shortly be put to death?" They answered, "Because after our death we shall have the enjoyment of greater blessings".³ The three elements in the exchange recur typically, in similar scenes later: the puzzlement of the oppressor, the exalted joyous mood of those who defy him, and their certainty that their willingness to die for their religion would assure a heavenly reward.⁴

There is much of these very elements in the first of three Jewish revolts. Of the population enduring the Roman siege of Jerusalem, Josephus estimates more than a million died; the number who fell in other battles and sieges was huge; and, rather than surrender, many so-called *sicarii* joined in a mass suicide at Masada.⁵ Other *sicarii* seeking refuge in Egypt

³ In 4 B.C., *BJ* 1. 653 (= 1. 33. 3) and *Ant. Jud.* (hereafter *AJ*) 17. 149ff. (= 17. 6. 2f.); the more famous scene under Gaius Caligula, at *AJ* 18. 261ff. (= 18. 8. 2f.), the willingness to die; but also *BJ* 2. 258-260 (= 2. 13. 4), of the late A.D. 50s, where Roman army action against religious extremists "destroyed a great number" — though not specified as seeking death.

⁴ Joyous mood under torture and certainty of reward, *BJ* 2. 152-154 (= 2. 8. 10f.), among Essene martyrs; the model in e.g. *2 Macc.* 7. 10 and 12, and elsewhere; under Caligula, PHILO AL. *Legat.* 192, willingness to die; the same, 209, 233-236 at Caesarea before the governor; or *BJ* 3. 321 (= 3. 7. 33), the Jews' common "contempt, *hyperopsia* of punishments", so that a captive, tortured, "even under the ordeal of fire, was finally crucified, meeting death with a smile".

⁵ On mortality in Jerusalem, cf. IOS. *BJ* 6. 420ff. (= 6. 9. 3), repeated by EUS. *HE* 3. 6. 17; on Masada, *BJ* 7. 320ff. (= 7. 8. 6ff.); M. SIMON, *Verus Israel. A Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)*, transl. H. McKEATING (Oxford 1986), 28, the "fanatical" *sicarii*; but the term "fanatical" should be applied to all the Jewish hopes of a God-sent messiah, in the decades leading up to the outbreak of the war and to its leader, Simon ben Giora, cf. A. MOMIGLIANO, in the *Cambridge Ancient History X* (Cambridge 1934), 854 (*sicarii*), W.H.C. FREND, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (New York 1967), 59, Judaea in Jesus' day "a homeland permeated with nationalist fervor and fanatical orthodoxy", or V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (Eds.), *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (Cambridge 1957-64), I 90 n.82, on messiahs; and another example of fanaticism (of several in Josephus), *BJ* 3. 355ff. (= 3. 8. 4ff.), mass suicide long settled on by a company of rebels, ever to stand fast by ancestral laws of God.

invited, by their violence, corresponding violence from the government, which sought to make them acknowledge Caesar as Lord; but “There was no one at all who was not astonished at the steadfastness and either insanity or strength of mind, however it should be termed”, that sustained them then “under every sort of torture and agony”.⁶

The resistant energy generated among the Jewish population required some 50,000 troops to confront them, in Judaea, and in Egypt, the same number or more. Including the vast effort of siege-craft at Masada, the Romans spent seven years on the effort.⁷ It was a great war. To make clear its lesson, the Romans killed and sold into slavery great numbers of Jews both in Judaea and in Egypt, where Josephus puts the death-total at 50,000 (*BJ* 2. 494-498 = 2. 18. 8). His figures reflect his estimate of the Jews’ determination in the face of certain defeat, a determination close to suicidal.

In spite of the lesson, a second rebellion broke out in 115, lasting for three years. It involved the Jewish population of Libya, Cyprus, Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia and, in much lesser degree, Palestine; and once again, a huge Roman army commitment.⁸ In Cyrene the rising had a messiah as its leader, a “King”; in Syria, it had its martyrs later remembered as saints. In Egypt, a target for destruction was polytheist temples.

⁶ Jos. *BJ* 7. 412 (= 7. 10. 1), quoted (*aponoia*); their violence and *aponoia*; the same term, 7.437 (= 7. 11. 1); and again used by Eus. *HE* 4. 6. 3 of the rebellion’s inspiration; later, the emperor refers to a Jewish martyr as “crazy, *mainomenos*”, cf. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Acta Alexandrinorum*, ed. with transl. & comm. by H.A. MUSURILLO (Oxford 1954), 67.

⁷ For the emperors’ troop numbers in Judaea, see B. LEVICK, *Vespasian* (London 1999), 29, 31; 60,000 in Egypt at the attack on Ptolemais, *BJ* 3. 64-69 (= 3. 4. 2). The end of the Masada siege, tying up a full legion and thousands of auxiliaries, is not easily dated (AD 71? 73?).

⁸ Eus. 4. 2. 1-5 speaks of “very great numbers”, “many thousands” of Jewish dead. The best treatment remains that of V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (above, n.5), I 86-93, II 237-44, esp. I 89 on the papyrological evidence of depopulation in Egypt, and at I 86f., speaking of “a great military force” under the Roman commander; “King”, I 88f.; temples destroyed, I 87 n.79; I 90; briefly updated in the *Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. S. KATZ, IV (Cambridge 2006), 93ff.

Everywhere, the savagery of the rebels against their oppressors was unrestrained, resulting in gigantic loss of life and property. At the end, in retribution, the victors assured by their acts of devastation that the Jews throughout the rebellious areas would simply disappear from the historical record.⁹

But not in Judaea itself. There, in the three generations following the first rebellion, the population had somewhat recovered, and could support a third rising under a "Prince of Israel" with messianic claims, a leader commonly called Bar Kochba, in 132. Once again, more (perhaps much more) than 50,000 Roman troops had to be drawn in from all over the empire in fighting that lasted several years. Once again there were martyrs enduring torture for their faith, and extraordinary resistance inviting or requiring destruction of lives and dwellings. Dio Cassius' report of 985 villages entirely razed is confirmed at least to this extent: that no village so far excavated has failed to show the signs of destruction.¹⁰ Hadrian, perhaps present in person for a part of the war, must in the end have formed an

⁹ V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS, I 93; *Cambridge History of Judaism* IV, 98; "saints" commemorated in martyr literature by the third century, cf. W. HORBURY, "Pappas and Lulianus in Jewish resistance to Rome", in *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the 20th Century: Proc. of the 6th EAJS Congress...* 1998 (Leiden 1999), I 290-94; A.R. BIRLEY, *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor* (London 1997), 269, "the Jewish population in the Cyrenaica, Egypt and Cyprus had been in effect wiped out in 116-7".

¹⁰ "Bar Kochba" was the *nom de guerre* given to Bar Kos(i)ba. On the size of the government forces, see briefly the *Cambridge History of Judaism* IV, 123; at more length, A.R. BIRLEY (n.9), 268; S. APPLEBAUM, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second [!] Jewish Revolt (A.D. 132-135)* (Oxford 1976), 24f., 45f.; N. SCHUR, *History of the Samaritans* (Frankfurt am Main 1988), 49; M. MOR, "The Geographical Scope of the Bar-Kokhba Revolt", *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives*, ed. by P. SCHÄFER (Tübingen 2003), 110, 113-27 *passim*, minimizing; W. ECK, "Hadrian, the Bar Kokhba revolt, and the epigraphic transmission", *ibid.*, 163, 165, defending his article, "The Bar Kokhba Revolt: the Roman Point of View", in *JRS* 89 (1999), 78-81; S. MORTENSEN, *Hadrian: eine Deutungsgeschichte* (Bonn 2004), 142f.; A.R. BIRLEY, 270 on martyred rabbis, and ID., "Hadrian, circumcision, and the Bar Kokhba War", in *JRA* (2006), 680f.; on village-destruction, W. ECK, in *JRS* 89 (1999), 78, with 580,000 Jews slain, M. MOR also (*art.cit.*, 107) dwelling on this figure from Dio Cassius; and A. KLONER and B. ZISSU, "Hiding Complexes in Judaea: an Archeological and Geographical Update", in *The Bar Kokhba War*, 182.

over-all objective for his own and his generals' efforts. It amounted to ethnic cleansing. That was the solution, such was the problem.

The nature of that problem, meaning, a settled hostility between Jews and non-Jews, cannot be pictured in detail; yet some features are evident.

The most important is the very wide diffusion of Jewish residents and whole communities among the cities of the eastern provinces — and not only the eastern.¹¹ It was, however, diffusion without fusion, one may say. Jews preferred to live with their own kind; their "self-containedness and lack of contact with the larger, non-Jewish outside world" struck Arnaldo Momigliano "as the most outstanding characteristic of the Jewish community of Rome". Or, as Martin Goodman puts it, "The need to live close to a synagogue was one cause of the tendency of Jews to cluster in particular quarters in each city, but this trait reflects also the general attitude that separation from the non-Jewish world was in itself desirable and pious... to Tacitus it appeared that Jews 'stayed apart in their meals and their beds' out of 'a certain hatred of the human race'".¹² Tacitus' choice of terms indicates, no

¹¹ The extent of the diffusion of Jews in the empire is well indicated by Map 1 in K.L. NOETHLICH, *Die Juden im christlichen Imperium Romanum (4.-6. Jahrhundert)* (Berlin 2001), 245, with reff. at 57 and *passim*.

¹² See my "The Unromanized in Rome", in *Diasporas in Antiquity*, ed. by S.J.D. COHEN and E.S. FRERICHS (Atlanta 1993), 54, 62f.; D. NOY, *Foreigners at Rome. Citizens and Strangers* (London 2000), 265f. (but needless doubts at 489 n.499); T. BRAUN, "The Jews in the Late Roman Empire", in *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998), 142-49, an excellent collection of reff. on Jewish quarters in Rome, Dura, Antioch, and elsewhere; A. MOMIGLIANO's views in L.V. RUTGERS, *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome* (Leiden 1995), 45 (quoted) and 96, unconvincingly discounted; M. GOODMAN, quoted, in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed., X (Cambridge 1996), 778, though one might add TAC. *Hist.* 5. 5. 1, on the Jews' *adversus omnes alios hostile odium*; P. SCHÄFER, *Judaephobia. Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass. 1997), 3, quoting to agree with M. SIMON, "The basic cause of Greco-Roman anti-Semitism lay in Jewish separatism. This means, in the last analysis, that it lay in their religion..."; on communities, PHILO AL. *Flacc.* 55, *Legat.* 132, and JOS. *BJ* 2. 494-498 (= 2. 18. 8), on the districts, *moirai*, in Alexandria; in Antioch, J. HAHN, *Gewalt und Religiöser Konflikt... (von Konstantin bis Theodosius II.)* (Berlin

doubt, marriage and religious festivals, the latter being in fact the ordinary venue for friends and neighbors to eat together — the ordinary social occasion of the week or season or year. Jews held themselves apart from both marriage and mixing.

Why so aloof? The rules of Jewish life in which their neighbors could see no sense could not explain what was more likely to be plain dislike, unsociability, arrogance: they are “a proud race, and turn away from the society of others on the ground that they are not on the same level of piety”. Their portrait was painted for them by a certain Celsus, a close observer in the region of their ancestral concentration.¹³

Piety could be carried to the length of hostility, creating that setting for martyrdom — that pairing — to which reference was made, above. If the Jews were judges, non-Jews were not only wrong but required correction, and must be persuaded of their shocking error. Of course, then, non-Jews responded as one might expect. In their judgment, Jews in denying reality to others’ worship and in speaking of Artemis and the rest as existent only in man-made objects, mere speechless, mindless idols — those Jews denied the gods themselves. They were nothing but “atheists”. The reproach became a familiar one — while, given the right chance, Jews for their part would destroy the polytheist and his altar.¹⁴ They became in consequence, though

2004), 140; in the Egyptian city of Hermopolis, “the Jewish *laura*” in *PAmh* 98 (late 2nd/3rd s.); and notice their definition as *politeumata*, e.g. in Berenike in Cyrenaica, V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (n.5), I 91-92 n.85.

¹³ ORIG. *Cels.* 5. 42.3, who goes on to observe the Jews exaggerated claims, *alazoneia*.

¹⁴ PLIN. *Nat.* 13. 46, “the nation of Jews, remarkable for so despising the gods”, *gens contumelia numinum insignis*; add, such biblical denials of gods, and mockery of them, as *Exod.* 20. 2f., *I Paralip.* 16. 26, or *Pss.* 95 (96).5, to which S.D. Fraade, by personal communication (with my thanks), compares for explanation *Lev.* 19. 4 and 26.1, *Pss.* 97. 7, and *Hab.* 2.18; for the extreme in the conduct of the Essenes, cf. HIPPOL. *Haer.* 9. 26 quoted in C. MÉZANGE (n.1), 18; and on the Jews as “impious” or “unholy”, *anosioi*, cf. H.A. MUSURILLO (Ed.), *Acta* (n.6), 67. On Jewish destruction of altars and temples, cf. PHILO AL. *Legat.* 202, and APP. *BCiv.* 2. 380, in V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (n.5), I 87, 89f. n.80.

not always nor everywhere, the object of hatred, as they in turn hated their enemies.¹⁵ So it went. One need read only the Sibylline Oracles in the wake of the first and second rebellion to sense the longing for vengeance and vindication among the Jewish population, though there is no knowing what circulation these prophetic versified inventions enjoyed.¹⁶

Charged relations between monotheists and polytheists found expression in the opening days and weeks of the first rebellion. Gentiles then massacred Jews by the scores of thousands wherever they could be found in substantial communities: in Caesarea, Damascus, Gerasa, Scythopolis, Tyre, Ptolemais, Askelon, Sebaste, Philadelphia the City of Brotherly Love. It was the same again in the course of the second rebellion; and in the third, too, there were massacres in many cities.¹⁷ It could not be argued that the gentile majorities had suffered injuries needing to be avenged, nor of course that the Jews did not retaliate wherever they could — only, that hostility as a routine of life took command over action.

I review all these quite familiar facts, not only as a reminder of the large scale of the fanatical phenomenon, which is clear and consciously expressed by gentile observers: “I accuse them [the Jews] of wishing to stir up the entire world”.¹⁸ Rather, my aim is to call attention to the passions on both sides, as they

¹⁵ The word for *hate* appears not seldom in *Jos.* e.g. *BJ* 3. 410 (= 3. 9. 1); felt by others against Jews, 2. 461-465. 477-480 (= 2. 18. 2 and 5); cf. the hostile characterization of the Jews in Alexandria as “foreigners and immigrants”, by a Roman governor of the 30s A.D., after the Jews had been in the city for centuries (PHILO *AL. Flacc.* 54).

¹⁶ The fourth and fifth are the most apposite, foreseeing (that is, wishing eventually for) the extermination of the Romans; W.H.C. FREND (n.5), 145, would add the third Oracle, perhaps; and to these, P. VEYNE adds the prophet Esdras ca.270 (*L'empire gréco-romain* [Paris 2005], 300).

¹⁷ *Jos. BJ* 2. 457ff. and 477ff. (= 2. 18. 1f. and 5); 7. 41-42 (= 7. 3. 2); E. SCHÜRER, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. - A.D. 135) (Edinburgh 1987), II 117; III 132; M. GOODMAN (n.12), 778; and W.H.C. FREND (n.5), 101.

¹⁸ *The Acta Alexandrinorum*, in V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (n.5), II 79, cf. II 41, Claudius in A.D. 41 corrects himself to say the “rioting” in Alexandria, *tarache*, is more truly called a “war”.

were made unmistakably clear in action; for fanaticism, my subject, is (to repeat) not a thing of calculations but of feelings.

Feelings: yes, they exist. But they are sometimes left out of account, and their existence, denied. A fashion took hold upon the historical guild, long ago, to explain events in terms of the material interest that the participants could perceive in some one choice or some other — to explain, that is, in terms of one's material interests. These could be quantified. Thus they looked reassuringly scientific and up-to-date; and social history could be folded into the fashion, with social class being treated as an economic epiphenomenon. Applied to the three Jewish rebellions, a properly sophisticated treatment would thus make bare mention, or no mention at all, of the provocative insults offered to religious devotion. What rather deserved consideration were wealth or poverty, caste and occupation, influence or dependence, town or country.¹⁹ Applied to the violence within the Christian community which I describe a little later, we are told “it is in the domain of economic dependence that we will find the common denominators of disorder, however much was added by cultural (read, “religious”) or doctrinal passions. And if we wish to assert that cognitive (read, apparently, “theological”) allegiances of this kind were more important springs to destructive conflict than social and economic relations”, we must still privilege the latter.²⁰

Considerations like these latter, however, determined no more than the choice of the means to an end. They determined the details of action among the actors in an event, not the choice of the end itself. They contributed nothing to that essential element, sheer energy. A commitment to a religious inheritance

¹⁹ J. HAHN, *Gewalt und religiöser Konflikt... (von Konstantin bis Theodosius II.)* (Berlin 2004), 18, on “social tensions” and political inequalities in Alexandria, without addressing the separation of the communities in the first place; H. ESHEL, in the *Cambridge History of Judaism* (n.8), IV 105ff.; or B. LEVICK (n.7), 26.

²⁰ N. PURCELL, “The Populace of Rome in Late Antiquity”, in *The Transformations of Urbs Roma in Late Antiquity*, ed. by W.V. HARRIS (Portsmouth, RI 1999), 158f.; and see further, below, n.51.

was really the moving cause, as many have said who have discussed the matter. It could be appealed to in simple slogans and calls for action, by charismatic figures such as are reported in various sources for all three rebellions. "Religious enthusiasm asks few questions and needs no rational answers".²¹

Of course, once under way, all three rebellions show urges and needs of a material sort at work, to seize power and property whenever the chance offered. No-one supposes that religion determined what everyone did at every moment, or that people so driven made up even a majority of all those involved. Yet "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (*1 Cor. 5. 6*). The fanatical elements need not have predominated in numbers, to determine general levels of energy and resolution.

What Chadwick counted as a characteristic of monotheism (n.2), a sort of ferocity even in schisms, can be seen within the body of Judaism, dividing those whose center of worship was in Jerusalem from those whose center was atop Mt. Gerizim; and in the 50s A. D., the Roman army had to intervene in the hostilities between the two (*Jos. AJ* 20. 118-124 = 20. 6. 1); yet the two were or should have been brothers. Again in the 60s during the first rebellion the army went against the Samaritans on their very mountain, and slew nearly twelve thousand (*BJ* 3. 307-315 = 3. 7. 32).²² Later chapters in the Samaritan story must, however, be deferred until a later page.

A third branch of Judaism was of course Christianity, which the army had to deal with from Jesus' day under Tiberius, to Ignatius' under Trajan, and so to the time of the Tetrarchs, a stretch of almost three centuries.²³ The troops were used not

²¹ V.A. TCHERIKOVER and A. FUKS (n.5), I 90f. and 92, quoted; A.R. BIRLEY (n.9), 270, "Religion was unquestionably the driving force...".

²² Equal legitimacy as Israelites yet animosity between the two sects, E. SCHÜRER (n.17), II 17, 19; N. SCHUR (n.10), 43; and L.M. WHITE, "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity", in *Sects and Religious Movements*, *Bull. John Rylands Library* 70 (1988), Nr. 3, 11.

²³ On the government's monopoly of capital punishment, among many sources, cf. *Jo.* 18. 32 (confirmed by *Mt.* 27. 26-35, *Mc.* 15. 15-24, *Jo.* 18-19, but confused or erroneous in *Lc.* 23. 26-38).

against a mass movement but rather against single fanatics, and in no great numbers, either: a total of a few thousands, including those who suffered in the so-called Great Persecutions.²⁴ These differed from all ordinary criminals in their head-on disobedience, their *lèse-majesté* or *contumacia*, which placed them in the special category of insurrectionaries. Hence their handling by the military, whether to identify them as trouble-makers, or to make the arrest in the first place, or to serve thereafter as jailors or torturers or executioners. Though the martyrs were seldom persons of any local standing, nevertheless their importance to the whole body of their coreligionists at the time and subsequently insured that accounts about them would be carefully kept and handed on, to show us quite specifically how the army's agents were drawn in to the contest everywhere.²⁵

Like the Jewish martyrs whom they remembered and sometimes refer to, the Christians are reported to have bravely confronted or even sought out their fate, to the bewilderment of the authorities. Like Jewish martyrs, too, they endured the most exquisite agonies with a smile. "The poor wretches have convinced themselves first and foremost that they are going to be immortal and live for all time, in consequence of which they despise death and even willingly give themselves into custody".

²⁴ For a single exception where the army did act to annihilate a Christian community, in A.D. 303, see EUS. *HE* 8. 11. 1; on the number of martyrs, see my *Changes in the Roman Empire. Essays in the Ordinary* (Princeton 1990), 156.

²⁵ TERT. *Fug.* 13 (*PL* 2. 118f.), on *beneficiarii* and *curiosii* as a detective force; examples of other roles in EUS. *HE* 5. 1. 8 (Lyon), 17, 30; 6. 40. 2, 4, 21f.; *Mart. Polyc.* 7.2; 11.20; and in the collection *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. by H. MUSURILLO (Oxford 1972), 22, 40, 156, 175ff., 198, 214, 280ff., 295, or in the *Atti e passioni dei martiri*, a cura di A.A.R. BASTIANSEN *et al.* (Milano 1995), 26, 66, 88, 118, 128, 138, 316; *Gesta apud Zenophilum* 9, and other North African items in J.-L. MAIER, *Le dossier du donatisme* (Berlin 1987-89), I 59, 63, 210f., 226, 265, 271, 282, 284; J. NELIS-CLÉMENT, *Les Beneficiarii: militaires et administrateurs au service de l'Empire (1^{er} s. a.C. - VI^e s. p.C.)* (Bordeaux 2000), 226; C. BRÉLAZ, *La sécurité publique en Asie Mineure sous le Principat (I^{er} - III^{ème} s. ap. J.-C.)* (Basel 2005), 271-75.

Insane!²⁶ Incomprehension is something the Christian writers glory in discovering among their enemies, who simply did not know Christ; and they glory also in the martyrs' immunity to pain, not caring if the scenes as described were credible in everyday terms; for the value of the teaching outweighed the value of everyday truth. To dismiss the record as a mere literary production, a pastiche of tropes, would quite miss the point.

Like Jewish martyrs or rebels, too, the Christians are described as atheists. How so? Incomprehension began with the very word *theos, deus*, god.²⁷ In their view, everyone else's object of worship except their own either had no existence, and was in fact no god at all but a fiction rendered in stone or metal, or it belonged instead to a category of disgusting lesser

²⁶ Quoted, LUC. *De morte Peregrini* 13; EPICT. 4. 7. 6; and "you wretched men, if you want to die, there are cliffs and halters", TERT. *Scap.* 5. 1; CLEM.AL. *Strom.* 4.7 and *passim*, Christians (but seen as heretical) "hasten to give themselves up... desire to die"; H. MUSURILLO (n.25), 22, the *Mart. Carp. et al.* 9, "Stop being an idiot, *me morainete*"; 86, the *Mart. Scill.* 1, "If you recover your senses..."; 88, at §8, "Don't get caught up in his madness"; 190, the *Mart. Con.* 4. 7, the martyr's *moria*, "idiocy"; 252, the *Mart. Marcell.* 4. 2, "What madness possesses you, *furor*?"; 282, the *Mart. Agap. et al.* 3. 2, "What madness is this, *mania*?"; 316, the *Mart. Eupl.* 2.4, *insania haec*; behavior that is *alogos*, in the *Acts of Phileas* line 173; AUG. *Sermo Morin Guelferbytanus* 28. 2 and 4f. (*PL Suppl.* 2, 615ff., Donatists are mere suicides, "unhappy wretches"; possessed by *dementia, insani*, etc., *Sermo* 313E 4f. (*ibid.*, pp. 618ff.); EUS. *Mart. Pal.* 3. 4, the governor's "great astonishment" at martyrs' eagerness to be killed; idem, *HE* 8. 9. 5, full description of joy, etc., among martyrs; and the despairing question of the emperor, "What can we do to such pertinacity, which fails to obey orders and despises tortures, to such an extent that they (the anti-Chalcedonians) think it would be great and joyous for them to abandon their bodies rather than their religious opinions?" (*Coll. Avellana* #232, A.D. 520). The Montanists from the mid-second century and in Phrygia and the adjoining East provide the fullest examples, see A.R. BIRLEY, "Die 'freiwilligen' Märtyrer. Zum Problem der Selbst-Auslieferer", in *Rom und das himmlische Jerusalem*, hrsg. von R. VON HAEHLING (Darmstadt 2000), 105-21, esp. 109f. on perceived madness.

²⁷ Reff. gathered in my *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)* (New Haven 1984), 18, 129f., and *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to the Eighth Centuries* (New Haven 1997), 34, 121; and add EUS. *HE* 4. 13. 3 (no less relevant for being in an invented document), and Cyril of Jerusalem as representative of the later period, in his *Catechesis* 6.11 and 33 (PG 33. 556Af. and 597A).

powers invoked only by the wicked for wicked purposes. Throughout the Apologists these are the familiar strains. They are picked up by the ecclesiastical historians, beginning with Eusebius, and noisy champions like the emperor Constantine.²⁸ The entire growing body of literature was meant to equip the faithful with answers in defense of their faith. It would thus reach an audience of polytheists — if only indirectly. Moreover, in the trials that punctuated the persecutions, challenge was offered directly and in public by such heroes as a certain Carpus in Pergamon under Marcus Aurelius, as by a dozen others in other provinces and junctures, earlier and later, and not only offered but aggressively pushed in the face of judges and spectators.²⁹ The reaction was entirely human and predictable: rage, or at least hostility. “I will not listen to you speaking ill of our sacred rites”, says a governor in charge of the hearing; all too evidently, all Christians “are the opponents and enemies of the great gods” — thus, not only offensive but a threat even to the empire’s fortunes, the *pax deorum*.³⁰

Soldiers in the various capacities mentioned above were used to control these deluded men and women. A complaint as usual would be lodged with some imperial official, or occasionally by an official himself or an emperor of a more deeply

²⁸ E.g. CLEM.AL. *Protr.* 2-3 (11-45), and pagans therefore “impious”, LACT. *Epit.* 38. 3; EUS. *HE* 9. 4. 2f., or *VConst.* 3. 57 (PG 20. 1124Af); and Constantine himself referring to “the God that really exists”, *to theion ho monon ontos esti*, *ibid.*, 2. 28 (PG 20. 1005B).

²⁹ Common knowledge that Christians “spit upon the gods and mock their rites” (MIN.FEL. *Oct.* 8. 4), or H. MUSURILLO (n.24), 22, deities are mere images, or demons; again, 138, the accusation of idol-worship in Smyrna under? Decius; more public denials of the reality of pagan deities, *ibid.*, 176, 250, 294, 296, 304, 306, 316; and the scriptural foundations (n.14), picked up in *Gal.* 4.8 or *1 Cor.* 10. 20 quoted by AUG. *Serm.* 198. 34 (PL *Suppl.* 2 [1960]).

³⁰ Quoted, H. MUSURILLO (above, n.25), 88, the governor addressing the martyrs in Carthage A.D. 180, and *ibid.*, 312, in Sicily A.D. 304; the pagan as imagined by Porphyry in the 280s, “ranting, angry and excited”, adding that Christ himself “deserves to be hated for driving religion from the earth and barring access to the worship of the gods,” in ARNOB. *Nat.* 1. 42 and 2. 2; *pax deorum*, in G.E.M. DE STE. CROIX, “Why were the early Christians persecuted?”, in *Past and Present* 26 (1963), 24 (a crucial essay).

felt religiosity than was common. Then soldiers were told to act. It is rare to hear that they objected, those of them who may have been Christians. There is indeed Maximilianus who simply wouldn't serve in the army at all, protesting his Christianity, and so died for it; but what of the pious Julius who served for nearly three decades before jibbing at the usual (probably daily) religious routines? Or a certain Marcellus who declared his faith only after service that had raised him to centurion rank?³¹ Persecutors reminded Maximilianus that his coreligionists could certainly be found in the armed forces (this, in the late third century); what then was his objection? Yet soldiers seem never to have disobeyed the anti-fanatical orders given them. Evidently religion was one thing, duty was another. So the men serving Constantine did so just as loyally after his conversion as before; likewise, those serving his enemy, the Tetrarch Licinius. In any case, the subversive element constituted only a tiny per cent. It could hardly influence decisions. No soldier opposed the emperor Julian when he took command, nor when a successor to him was nominated who was of the old faith; nor again when a Christian was ultimately selected instead. Later centuries of course were different.

Arriving now at the later empire, we must expect to find everything changed. Under Christian emperors, polytheists rarely provoked argument and reaction. They held to their

³¹ H. MUSURILLO (n.25), 262, *Passio Iulii veterani* 2. 3 of A.D. 204 in Moesia; the four soldiers in Egypt during the Decian persecution, Eus. *HE* 6. 41. 22; MUSURILLO, 246, the *Acta Maximiliani* 2. 9 in Tebessa under Diocletian, Christians' refusal to be conscripted though reminded that "there are Christians in Our Lords' imperial Guards who do serve"; and 250, *Acta Marcelli* 1. 1, Tingitana under Diocletian, a Christian but apparently not a recent convert. Notice in A.D. 324 or 326, mass shouts by soldiers calling on the gods, plural, to save Constantine, *Codex Theod.* 7. 20. 2. Later, there is a little more evidence of soldiers choosing sides in sectarian strife: cf. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, transl. by C. MANGO and R. SCOTT (Oxford 1997), 81, A.D. 362/3, alleged apostasy of Christians, tricked; CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYM. *Procatechesis* 10 (PG 33. 349Bf.); martyrs under Julian; THDT. *HE* 3. 11 (PG 82. 1105Af.); ZOS. 5. 23. 4 A.D. 403; THDT. *Ep.* 144 (145), A.D. 451; *The Syriac Chronicle Known as That of Zacharias of Mitylene*, transl. by F.J. HAMILTON and E.W. BROOKS (London 1899), 53f.; sixth century, J.-B. CHABOT, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (Paris 1899-1924), II 89, 180.

practices as inconspicuously as they could, and only in diminishing numbers and social position. The many laws declaring acts of pagan cult to be punishable by death have left no trace of actual victims in our (of course) Christian sources, until in the sixth century some stubborn persons were crucified for their faith, necessarily through the physical act of soldiers. Otherwise, we are told of the military being summoned only to the destruction of pagan temples. Force against polytheists and their cult sites was more frequently employed by clerics and civilians in mob action.³² What need to make martyrs?

Logic dictated instead that the age of fanatics was now over. It was hostile force that had always made them. Now force was in the hands of their fellow in faith, Constantine, commander in chief. But logic and history have nothing to do with one another. Christians turned on each other, first over unfinished business, as it may be called, remaining from the persecutions. Rome, Carthage, and Alexandria bitterly debated the question: "Should members who yielded to the persecutors be re-admitted without penance or allowed to serve as clergy?" The debate brought out its martyrs, the army playing its role as in times past.

To look first at the rigorists in Africa: taking their name from the bishop and his successors whom they considered legitimately ordained, the Donatists rejected the identical claims of the Caecilianists. After a century of hostility, the latter led by Augustine of Hippo enlisted a friendly emperor to procure the decree of capital punishment for violence offered to Caecilianists, and, a few years later, through a friendly judge, to procure the declaration of Donatism as a forbidden heresy.³³

³² On crucifixions, see my *Christianity* (n.27), 25ff.; on riots and vandalism, *ibid.*, 13-17 and Chap. I *passim*.

³³ *Const. Sirmond.* 14 (a. 409); *Codex Theod.* 16. 5. 51 (a. 410) and 56 (a. 410 or 415), capital punishment; and, after the hearing of A.D. 411, victory followed up by flogging, fines, confiscation of all property, and permanent exile for the heretics, the Donatists, cf. *Codex Theod.* 16. 5. 52 (a. 412); also, my *Voting About God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven 2006), 70f., and *Concilia Africæ A. 345 - A. 525*, cura et studio C. MUNIER (Turnhout 1974), 213-16, on the dealings of the Caecilianists with the emperor and his *comitatus*, pre-411.

It was the imperial army that stood behind these ultimate threats; but it was the same army, leading up to the final settlement, that had first been enlisted by the Caecilianists to arrest, torture, and execute the dissenters — a little later, had been enlisted by a Donatist bishop on his own side, in support of what is called a “regime of fanaticism” in the countryside imposed by extreme elements, the Circumcellions — and thereafter it was enlisted by the Caecilianists for their cause against the same target.³⁴ Circumcellions were truly wild believers who, by the fervor of their faith, “destroy themselves as if in love with martyrdom”. Their fanaticism was mocked as suicidal madness, just as derision has been seen in earlier contexts, in order to discount sincerity.³⁵

The descendants of the victorious Caecilianists, claiming “orthodoxy” (as did all parties to schisms and heresies), were

³⁴ J.-L. MAIER (n.25), I 198f., 210f., in A.D. 317, in the *Pass. Donat.* (no kin to the sect leader), 13f., a tribune presiding over torture, the martyrs declaring, “in our battle, victory is to be killed by the enemy”; I 256, 258, the emperor Constans initiates the “persecution” of Caecilianists in the A.D. 340s through his officials and troops, cf. OPTAT. 3. 1. 1ff., *Traité contre les Donatistes* 2, éd. M. LABROUSSE, *Sources chrétiennes* 413 (Paris 1996), 11, and I 265, in the *Pass. Isaac et Maximiani* 6ff., the two arrested men die of their beatings; see also I 276, 282, for other Donatist martyrs (one, Marculus, along with many others, honored in his *Passio* in *PL* 8. 762), and 272, 284, soldiers acting as jailors, etc.; M.F. PETRACCIA and M. TRAVERSO, “Il concilio di Cirta e lo scisma donatista”, in *L’armée romaine de Dioclétien à Valentinien I^{er}. Actes du Congrès... 2002*, édités et rassemblés par Y. LE BOHEC and C. WOLFF (Lyon 2004), 512, on soldiers’ roles against Donatist martyrs; A. GOTOH, “Circumcellions: the ideology behind their activities”, in *Forms of Control and Subordination in Antiquity*, eds. T. YUGE and M. DOI (Leiden 1988), 305, interposition of Count Taurinus in A.D. 340, and (306, 310) of Count Gildo for the Caecilianists in A.D. 388.

³⁵ *Sancti Beati a Liebana Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, rec. E. ROMERO POSE (Roma 1985), I 51f., calling such persons a different species, misguided *superstitionis*; J.-L. MAIER (n.25), II 66f., quoting Filastrius of Brescia, of the 380s, on Circumcellions “in haste to die without reason, *sine causa*”; and *ibid.*, II 205 (early 400s), the *dementia* of Circumcellions; AUG. *Sermo* 198. 45, 313E. 2, 313E. 4f. (*PL Suppl.* 2 [1960], 615-619); *Codex Theod.* 16. 5. 38, “madness” of Donatists; 16. 5. 60, of all sects that are simply too disgusting to name; and *Novell. Theod.* 3. 8, of Jews, Samaritans, pagans, and heretics alike, possessed by *naturalis vesania, furor, dementia*.

later persecuted, themselves, by the Vandal king Gaiseric. "How many in those days, how many famous bishops and noble priests were done to death by various forms of torture..., how many and numerous were the priests then slaughtered by them, and who could count them?" The same raging ruler first exiled and then executed four of his council who would not be converted to his faith. He raged on, with crowds of victims who would not abandon their beliefs, while the tireless bishops and presbyters belonging to the oppressor church "went about among the villages and cities with troops of soldiers".³⁶

Bishops played the chief role in the shaping of religious opinions, and inducing action. It was in recognition of this fact of life that the Caecilianist clergy were now in the fifth century destroyed from the top down, by arrest, deposition, exile, and execution, to the extent they resisted conversion; and the clergy that were at war with them in quite predictable fashion made use of local garrisons, as can be seen in greater detail in other settings to the east.³⁷

As to the rigorist debate in Alexandria: it pitted the so-called Meletians against the bishop Athanasius. The surviving account picks up only ten years after Nicaea; and, if it were not for a chance papyrus or two, it would not pick up at all. The scattered details in the ecclesiastical historians would still be dismissed as partisan invention; but the familiar players, a bishop and borrowed troops at work, can be quite plainly seen

³⁶ Victor de Vita. *Histoire de la persécution vandale en Afrique*, éd par S. LANCEL (Paris 2002), 99, Victor's *Hist. persecut.* 1. 5, A.D. 429, quoted; further details, 103ff., *Hist. persecut.* 1. 14f.; the four martyrs, 105 n.52, citing Prosper, *Epit. Chron.* 1329 (*MGH AA* IX 475); subsequent actions, 109f., *Hist. persecut.* 1. 27 and 41; conversions sought by torture, a triumphant bishop exclaiming at his success, "Now you've become a Christian, one of us", 198 (*Hist. persecut.* 3. 45f.); and 199 (3. 48, quoted, "villages").

³⁷ See in the preceding note, and S. LANCEL, 110 (*Hist. persecut.* 1. 29), 197 (3. 42); for bishops in control of troops in the eastern provinces, see my *Voting* (n.33), 139; for the routine garrisoning of troops in eastern cities, my article in *Revue des Études Militaires Anciennes* 3 (2008).

in action in their familiar fashion, just as in earlier decades and centuries.³⁸

Athanasius' engagement in defense of the Nicene creed as well introduces another area of dispute: the theological. The story there begins at the council itself, from which stubbornly non-compliant bishops were dragged off to one or another place of exile. No Christian commander would care to make examples of them in the extreme sense, by execution — not even the peremptory Constantine. Nor his son. The proof lies in a certain bishop's five public letters to Constantius, spread over a term of five or six years. The writer is Lucifer of Calaris in Sardinia, challenging the emperor's orthodoxy. He is as insulting as he can be, saying things that the recipient cannot believe are seriously meant, and so has to ask in turn, Who is this madman, does he have any idea what he's saying? To ME? But Lucifer declares, "Foulest of monarchs..., by tortures, God's martyrs are consecrated..., the death brought to the martyrs is the harvest of true faith..., we will meet all your arms with scorn". Thus Lucifer invited his fate.³⁹ Yet he who so

³⁸ H.I. BELL, *Jews and Christians in Egypt. The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy* (London 1924), 55f., A.D. 335, the bishop's "partisans" making use of "the Dux's men", *stratiotai*, while his opponents (two other bishops of Meletian persuasion) draw into the conflict other soldiers "who have the fear of God in their hearts", i.e. are Meletians; cf. J. HAHN (n.12), 276ff. and T.D. BARNES, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993), 32.

³⁹ A. DI BERARDINO, *Patrology IV: Golden Age of Latin Patristic Literature*, transl. P. SOLARI (Westminster 1994), 65f.; *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* s.v. "Lucifer", col. 1083; and LUCIFER's *Moriendum esse pro dei filio*, CSEL 14 (Wien 1886), 286, in which (2) he rebukes Constantius, "you have slaughtered so many in Alexandria... but all these are martyrs; and, as we trust, all these most blessed, butchered by your sword, are in paradise... We are ready for death... Such great blessedness as the holy martyrs have won, no one has attained, as we see, save those who have conquered death by dying for God's only Son"; and he goes on to address the emperor as *imperator immanissime*, and *tormentis martyras dei consecrari, martyribus per te inlata mors... fidei faeneratio, ista crudelitas tuae carnificina nobis sit utilis ad gloriam sempiternam*, etc. (287-291, 2-3), with more insults and name-calling (292ff., 313ff., 13ff.) where it is the emperor's army that is the instrument of oppression (*licet totum militem tuum in nos decrevissas iacere regni tui tela*). Hilary of Poitiers writes in a very similar vein, more briefly, in *Contra*

plainly longed for a noble death was frustrated by the imperial patience, patience beyond any expectation. He had in the end to be satisfied only with his own fearless intent. Pious ambition cruelly balked! Later, his sanctification was subscribed to by only a few western churches.

The fanatical impulse wrapped up in hagiographical tradition and literature nevertheless often found satisfaction. Martyrs aplenty! There is no need to lay out, here, their fate in all the military violence aroused by sectarian disputes. The catalogue is far too large; it is spread too amply across all periods of late Antiquity, across all the major cities, many of the minor ones, and a majority of the provinces of the empire, especially the eastern ones — amounting, all together, to a sort of quantification of the willingness to die.⁴⁰ But there is much material, where the detail is adequate, specifically to show bishops and army in collaboration.⁴¹ Their role is crucial. They confront an opposition that will not sign on to an approved credo, that will maintain the struggle to the point of arms and even of death itself. In short, fanatics. In opposition to them, the essentials of correct belief must be enforced by the emperor himself. He engages his *maiestas* in

Constantium: let me be a martyr in Jewish-hero fashion, suffering fire and steel, etc. and speaking of *diabolici ingenii tui fallentem subtilitatem*, 4f., 17 (PL 10. 581Aff, 594B).

⁴⁰ My *Voting* (n.33), 137ff.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 139; on the Alexandrian patriarch Proterius in the A.D. 450s, when in consequence he “filled their (the soldiers’) hands with the blood of believers, who were slain..., and many died at the very altar”, etc., in F.J. HAMILTON and E.W. BROOKS (n.31), 48, Zacharias’ *Chron.* 3. 2; F.J. HAMILTON and E.W. BROOKS, 52 (*Chron.* 3. 5), Juvenal bishop in Jerusalem, with J.-B. CHABOT (n.31), II 89f., when “the whole world suffered under persecution...., Juvenal persecuted the faithful aided by soldiers”, whom “he ordered to kill those who would not accept the Council” of Chalcedon; II 173, A.D. 519f., the bishop of Antioch, “Paul spurred on the Roman soldiers, barbarous men without pity. Those who received the persecuted in their villages, he caused to be stripped of their possessions”; II 185, the Antioch bishop uses another bishop and “a troop of soldiers” against the noncompliant monks in the A.D. 520s; II 193, at the complaint of the bishop of Alexandria, a general with 6,000 men is sent against his rival in the see; A.D. 536, the bishop of Constantinople and of the bishop of Rome while a guest at the eastern court dispatch troops against a bishop of another creed, cf. *John of Ephesus. Lives of the Eastern Saints*, transl. by E.W. BROOKS (Paris 1923-24 —PO 17-18), I 26-29.

Christology; difference in faith was thus *lèse-majesté*. But then, his successor inclines in another direction; difference is re-defined; and so it goes on in the centuries that followed.

We have the patriarch of Constantinople in the A.D. 360s inflicting forcible baptism, forcible administration of the host, and every sort of torture on all those in the neighborhood of the capital who held to a Nicene Christology (Socr. *HE* 2. 38); and the same device of a forcible sacrament was employed again by soldiers acting on the orders of clergy in the A.D. 520s, against the protests of the local bishop: "It is in thy power, O Lord, to take my soul from me rather than that I should see... the persecution of thy church"; and from his disciple, prepared for the *agon*, we have the declaration, "I will contend until death with the renegades... Cursed are the renegades", as he assaults the very bishop himself whose hateful credo has inspired the persecution.⁴² The protestations and terminology of the challenge recall that of Lucifer.

A decade later, "the king [emperor] Valens commanded by law that those [of another creed] in Alexandria and in Egypt should be driven out; and everything was laid waste and turned upside down, and some were dragged before the courts, others thrown into chains, and still others tortured in various ways; for various were the punishments inflicted on people wishing only for peace. And when these matters were concluded to the satisfaction of Lucius in Alexandria, Euzoius too returned to Antioch" — Lucius being the Egyptian metropolitan and obviously in charge of the operation, while Euzoius bishop of Antioch was his coadjutor. It is made explicit in the neighboring paragraphs of the historian Socrates' account, that the instruments of these actions were soldiers.⁴³ What other force could

⁴² E.W. BROOKS (preceding note), I 95f., 100 (quoted), the scene being the area around Amida in northern Mesopotamia.

⁴³ SOCR. *HE* 4. 24 (PG 67. 521Dff.). No trace of Valens' law survives but the events indicate that there could indeed be enforcement of similar laws, later, in *Codex Theod.* 16. 5. 5ff., e.g. capital punishment at 9, 15, and 60, and at 16. 1. 4 and 16. 4. 1. For further details on Lucius, see C. HAAS, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore 1997), 451 n.5, 455 n.34,

be imagined, in any case, for these and dozens of similar ones where, perhaps, the sources do not specify the actors quite fully?

In the 450s, the Alexandrian patriarch "had the soldiers execute anyone who refused to declare the impure teachings of Chalcedon; 24,000 men were slaughtered, most of them priests, monks, and bishops".⁴⁴ However inflated the number may be by partisan horror and outrage, the victims had a choice, either to signify their compliance with the patriarch's doctrines, or not. For a sixth-century instance, we have the Antioch bishop (Ephrem, A.D. 527-45) asking the emperor for an army "so that, while we exhort with words and engage with the people of the cities and villages to accept the Council of Chalcedon, we can subdue with force those who won't let themselves be persuaded by speech".⁴⁵

For a little detail, finally, in the eastern provinces of the A.D. 520s,

"many (who were soldiers) went everywhere from place to place and tried to compel such persons as they met to change their ancestral faith... the Montanists whose home was in Phrygia, shutting themselves up in their own sanctuaries, immediately set their churches on fire, so that they were destroyed together with the buildings in a senseless fashion; and consequently the whole Roman empire was filled with murder and exiled men. And when a similar law was immediately passed touching the Samaritans also, an indiscriminate confusion swept through Palestine. Now all the residents of my own Caesarea and of all the other cities, regarding it as a foolish thing to undergo any suffering in

where he acts to crush the resistance of monks in Nitria with troops. For monks as targets of large-scale army action in repeated campaigns, in which those not signing on to Chalcedon suffered exile and death in various ways, see A. SCHER, *Histoire Nestorienne... Seconde partie* I (Paris 1909, *PO* 7. 2), 142f., A.D. 519; E.W. BROOKS (n.41), II 514f., 523f.; *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis*, transl. by R.M. PRICE (Kalamazoo, Mich. 1989), 181ff.; P.T.R. GRAY, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)* (Leiden 1979), 58; J.-B. CHABOT (n.31), II 170ff., 185, 206f.

⁴⁴ J.-B. CHABOT (n.31), 124, and the recall (151) how "tens of thousands perished in the massacres" meant to win converts to a certain creed.

⁴⁵ J.-B. CHABOT (n.31), 206f.

defense of a senseless dogma, adopted the name of Christians... [but in contrast] all the farmers, having gathered in great numbers, decided to rise in arms against the emperor, putting forward as emperor for themselves a certain brigand named Savarus. And when they engaged with the soldiers, they held out for a time, but finally they were defeated... and it is said that 100,000 men perished in this struggle".⁴⁶

Mention of the Samaritans returns us to the starting point: Jewish fanatics. The scattering and very great reduction in numbers of those Jews whose center was Jerusalem was recalled, above; but a compact if far smaller population remained much less reduced, in Samaria. How restless and resentful they were can be known from the fact, with however little detail, that they rebelled in the mid-fourth century, and again in A. D. 418, and in 484, before the fourth rising just mentioned.⁴⁷

About its origins, Malalas has a most interesting passage:

"In the city called Neapolis... the Samaritans attacking the Christians there slaughtered many, and here is how it happened. It was the common custom there, throughout Palestine's lands and all the east, on the Sabbath after the bible reading, for the Christian children to leave the church and go to play at the

⁴⁶ PROCP. *Anecdota* 11.14-29 (quoted, 21ff., based on Loeb Classical Library, transl. by H.B. DEWING VI); MALAL. *Chron.* 18. 35, ed. J. THURN (Berlin 2000), 260; and J.A.S. EVANS, *The Age of Justinian* (London 1996), 248, the number of dead perhaps (with captives) "not greatly exaggerated".

⁴⁷ B. ISAAC, *The Limits of Empire: the Roman Army in the East* (Oxford 1990), 89f., Procopius being the chief source for the third of these events (*Aed.* 5. 7. 5f.), which resulted in the Christians' seizing of the sanctuary atop Mt. Gerizim henceforth occupied by troops; also ZACHAR. *Chron.* 9. 8, in F.J. HAMILTON and E.W. BROOKS (n.31), 232; and N. SCHUR (n.10), 87ff., and R.M. PRICE (n.43), 181-84. For the fourth, see Procopius in the preceding note; also MALAL. 15. 8, ed. J. THURN (Berlin 2000), 305, and *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, von Ed. SCHWARTZ (Leipzig 1939), 172, in the *Vita S. Sabae*, along with Justinian' *Nov.* 103a. 2f., A.D. 536, assigning the governor large forces and warning him to beware of disorders arising from "religious differences", especially in Palestine. B. ISAAC goes on to mention two further sixth-century revolts, cf. MALAL. 18. 119 and THEOPHANES, *Chron.* a.555/6 = A.M. 6048, in C. MANGO and R. SCOTT (n.31), 337, with J.-B. CHABOT also (n.31), 262. This war was marked by spectacular cruelty.

Samaritan synagogues, and to throw stones at their houses; for it was the Samaritan custom on this day to withdraw and be by themselves. But this time they could not bear to yield the place to the Christians, and when the children after the holy scripture came out and headed for the synagogues of the Samaritans and threw stones at them, the Samaritans came out against the children with their swords and killed many of them. And many children fled to the holy altar of the St. Basil church which is there, and some of the Samaritans chased them and butchered them right at the holy altar". Justinian, when he learnt of this "mobilized army units under the Dux Irenaeus" to inflict punishment, "and he butchered many..." (A.D. 530).⁴⁸

This picture of Saturday-afternoon playtime gives an unusually clear, even intimate, glimpse into the relations between neighbors of differing monotheistic faiths. Children learned hatred in the dusty streets, by a routine of action that their parents' generation approved; it is certain that they learnt it in their churches, too, since the foremost Christian spokesmen of these late centuries whose sermons have come down to us speak out so strongly against the Jewish people.⁴⁹ Jerusalem-centered Jews for their part evidently hated the Christians and did horrible things to their children, on occasion; and there is no reason to think the Jews of Samaria behaved differently.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ "Custom, *ethos ekratei*," in *Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Const. Porph.* III (Berlin 1905): *Excerpta de insidiis*, ed. C. DE BOOR, 171 = *ex Ioanne Malale* 44; *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* II, *s.v.* "Irenaeus" (7), and IIIB, *s.v.* "Theodotus Megalas".

⁴⁹ Perhaps Augustine is the best example, ignoring scripture (n.22) in order to ascribe all details of the Crucifixion to Jews, cf. *Symb.* 3. 10 (*PL* 40. 634, *tenant Iudaei, insultant Iudaei, ligant Iudaei*, etc.); also *Civ.* 6. 11; *CHROMAT. Serm.* 9. 4-18. 1, in *Cromazio di Aquileia, Catechesi al popolo. Sermoni*, trad. e note a cura di G. CUSCITO (Roma 1979), 82-106 and *passim*; on Jerome and Chrysostom, M. SIMON (n.5), 217, 229f.; *Cambridge History of Judaism* (n.8), 505; and in general, G. GARDENAL, *L'antigiudaismo nella letteratura cristiana antica e medievale* (Brescia 2001), 46-57 *passim*; and earlier, EUS. *V. Const.* 3. 18f., and, a little later, CYRILL. *HIEROSOLYM. Procatechesis* 10 (*PG* 33. 349Bf.).

⁵⁰ THDT. *HE* 3. 15 (*PG* 82. 1112Bf.); J.-B. CHABOT (n.31), 262, massacre in A.D. 555 of Christians by Jews and Samaritans in Caesarea, who are harshly punished by an army; and *Codex Theod.* 16. 8. 18.

In estimating the impact of monotheistic passions on the life of the times, certainly surpassing in importance any other challenge to the civic order, we must rely in disproportionate degree on writers who are particularly concerned with religion: Josephus, Eusebius. The disproportion must be acknowledged; but it is no cause for special doubts; or if there is some likelihood of distortion in the sources, it can be sorted out: for example, in the excesses of hagiography, or the intrusion of the un-fanatical into scenes of resistance, who sought only the pleasures of pillage and butchery. They can be distinguished from the more sincere who constituted the leaven in the lump (as I termed it, above).

Acknowledgement must also be made for the embarrassment felt in Western historiography when fanaticism needs to be discussed, given the part that Judaism and Christianity constitute in the Western heritage. Gibbon is not its only student to reserve the term “fanatical” for religious enthusiasm subsequently judged un-Orthodox.⁵¹ Since Gibbon’s day, however,

⁵¹ Above, n.1; neglect of inter-Church violence where treatment would be expected, e.g. in C. FRATEANTONIO, *Religiöse Autonomie der Stadt im Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen 2003), 185ff. (a timid glance at the subject, 197); N. POLLARD, *Soldiers, Cities, and Civilians in Roman Syria* (Ann Arbor 2000), 99 (army involvement pro-Chalcedon “relatively rare”! — cf. above, nn.43f.); R.S. BAGNALL, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton 1993), 161-72, a dozen pages on “Order and Disorder” without mention of church disputes; P. BROWN, *Authority and the Sacred. Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World* (Cambridge 1995), 27-54 on “The Limits of Intolerance” without mention of sectarian disputes, and only an occasional “lapse in good taste”; Averil CAMERON, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity AD 395-600* (London 1993), 171-75, “Urban Violence” without mention of religion; or J. HAHN (n.12), in a discussion of over 300 pages, where mentions of force used by Christians against Christians would all fit within a single page. N. PURCELL (n.20), 158, discounts the whole body of evidence for inter-Christian violence in the three centuries post-313 not as mis-cited or invented, but as nothing new. He supposes that earlier writers (these would be Dio Cassius, Dio Chrysostom, Philostratus, Herodian, Tacitus, Suetonius, Plutarch, etc., etc.) might have seen just as much mahem but didn’t think it worth their while to report it; the murder of public officials singly, or of parties of dozens, or of hundreds or thousands or even tens of thousands of victims, wouldn’t have interested their readers (!). Whereas Christian writers differed.

evidence to correct the distortion is more easily found, thanks in part to the increasing accessibility of minor ancient writers. W.H.C. Freud (to name only one particularly useful scholar) has shown what can be discovered among and about Donatists and Monophysites.

But even these obstacles to understanding seem less awkward than the fact that fanatics act out their *feelings*. They cannot be discussed or explained within the traditions of what is seen as 'good' treatment, meaning something rational and scientific, because they are not contesting for rational objectives. They — fanatics — are not ambitious to defeat the emperors and lord it over the Roman world, nor to make converts of the crowds that attend their final moments in the arena or court-room; certainly not, to gain some material object at the risk of their lives. To understand them, then, one must enter the affective zones of their mind, not the cognitive. It is not the denotation of their thought — simple enough, and of no great interest — which needs to be made clear; rather, it is the animating emotions that surround their thought, these, that need to be summoned from the sources and seized by empathy, so as to know the *force* that accounts for or produces anything of historical significance.

This, however, is a suggestion offered at greater length, elsewhere.⁵²

⁵² The methodological point is discussed in my *Les émotions dans l'histoire, ancienne et moderne* (Paris 2004) = *Feelings in History, Ancient and Modern* (Claremont 2003).

DISCUSSION

A. Chaniotis: If in your definition of fanaticism (“devotion to a religious belief for which one would be prepared to die”) we replace the term “religious belief” with “idea”, or “principle”, then one might be tempted to characterize also Socrates as a “fanatic”. Is it the irrationality of religious belief that makes fanatics or should we also add the willingness to kill for their belief (not only the willingness to die)? If we include the willingness to kill, then there are isolated instances of “fanaticism”, even in the world of paganism (e.g., an attack against worshippers of Artemis Ephesia in Sardes in the fourth century, the lawsuits for *asebeia* in Athens).

R. MacMullen: It’s certainly important to say how one means to use a key term in any discussion, and it’s good to be reminded of this need by your question. But I did try to play fair on this front by saying, at the outset, it was “a quite conventional sense” of my focus-word that I was going to deal with. Of course, we stretch terms to make our thought clearer by analogy, or to make it more striking, and “fanaticism” is no exception. One can be a “fanatic” about cleanliness, just as one can be described as brushing one’s teeth “religiously” twice a day. But these usages seem to me to take off from the core meaning, without disturbing it. For that reason I thought I might fairly exclude such a strength of belief as Socrates showed, just as I meant to exclude the love of country that shows itself in a soldier’s willingness to die.

I didn’t know of the Sardis and Athenian evidence you mention, but perhaps they fit with the fury at denial which I mentioned — at atheism — in a given locality. Lucian aroused it in Abonuteichus in Pontus, as you know, and was afraid of being

lynched, not for not believing, but for endangering the community by obvious, blatant disrespect toward some supernatural being.

A. Chaniotis: I am also interested in the factors which enhance fanaticism. The same religious group may respond in different ways under different conditions. E.g., in the same time in which the Christian mob was lynching Hypatia in Alexandria, Christians in Asia Minor were still attending the synagogues, very much to the despair of the Christian Fathers. I mention a few factors which lead to different responses: expectation of success vs. hopelessness; various degrees of integration vs. ghettoization; martyrdom not to avoid hell in after-life but in this life (through stigmatization by one's own group, punishment by the authorities); legislation.

R. MacMullen: It is curious how monotheists can get along perfectly well with polytheists in a given setting, maybe for generations or even centuries, and we see the evidence in inter-marriage and common burial sites and minority representation in honorific positions, presumably attained by the conventional means, namely, euergetism. Then, for no reason we know of, the place suddenly bursts into flames of violence — or rather, perhaps, for one of those very good reasons you mention. One or another of them puts an edge on a religious loyalty; and you might have mentioned also the appearance of some more than usually charismatic personality, a messiah-type. But you remind us of the limits to historical explanation. We can define a particular phenomenon, it really is a distinct and identifiable thing; but then, there is always detail, individuality, apparent random chance.

A. Lintott: I would like to make one observation and pose three questions. The observation is that, although you rightly stress the importance of emotion, emotions are not self-generated but have causes and this is what my questions concern.

First, how far do you think that conversion to monotheism was by its very nature productive of fanaticism? Secondly, how significant was millenarianism in that period? And thirdly, to what extent do you accept W.H.C. Frend's view that a certain kind of fanaticism, Donatism and the *circumcelliones*, was generated by a particular geographical location?

R. MacMullen: Indeed, your main point must be made and understood, and your choice of specifics certainly helps to do the job. I agree entirely. I would say, nevertheless, that external causes of a material sort, which I think you have in mind, produce in their turn some emotion. Poverty produces jealousy and frustration and plain old hunger, all of which are or may be powerful feelings; assault likewise, whether it's personal or military; and so forth. As to conversion, I do think it implanted a potential for fanaticism. It's my reading of this change, that the believer feels obliged to repudiate past beliefs, and so the cycle commences which is my concern. It's the Bible that lies at the heart of both Judaism and Christianity, and at the heart of the Bible, one may surely say, lie the Ten Commandments, declaring not once but again, that God requires the abomination of all alternatives (*Exod.* 20. 3f.; 33. 13f.).

About millenarianism, I recall no mention of it in Josephus' account of the first rebellion, or it was in any case a minor factor. It was distinct from the belief in a national leader whose victory was compatible with a separate and continued existence of a Jewish people, without bringing on an end of the world; and it does not appear at all in the inter-Christian violence of later times. So I would discount its significance as the spur to the determination to die for one's belief.

As to Frend's linking of region and belief in North Africa, the specialists in those provinces today seem to have reduced the force of his argument without entirely discounting it. The Cae-cilianists whom Augustine supported so successfully were stronger in the larger towns and coastal areas, their opponents stronger in the inland and uplands; but there was much overlap,

many towns with two bishops. The two sides, after all, could muster exactly the same number of bishops in 411.

W. Riess: I wholeheartedly welcome your plea for an “emotional turn” in historiography. It is certainly true that historians have neglected the pervasive powers of feelings for too long. But the study of feelings is a very complex issue. They are generated by external factors and react to conditions outside the person concerned. Your example of Christians in the Roman army is telling. Most Christian soldiers had no problems serving under pagan emperors. Only a tiny portion of Christian soldiers became fanatics and subversive elements in the Roman army. So the question is when, why, and under what circumstances a small portion of believers start deviating from mainstream faith and behavior. Here, I think, we are at the core of the problem: How can we explain the emergence of fanaticism? As you say in your paper at various points, “it takes two to make a martyr” and “it was hostile force that had always made them”. So I wonder if you adhere to the approach that political scientists call “constructionist”, i.e. the assumption that state authorities create their own enemies, fanatics, and terrorists by their very worldview, propaganda, and legislative as well as military actions.

R. MacMullen: In a comment by Angelos, there were connections drawn to various kinds of reckless self-sacrifice that ought to be treated in a constructionist fashion, just as you bring out: for example, the patriotic self-sacrifice of Gauls against Caesar. They were quite as ready to give their lives as the Jews or Christians, and they were provoked by state action, meaning armed invasion. But that willingness wasn't religious. It aimed at the protection of their property and independence of action, and so, we might say, it was perfectly ordinary. A householder who struggles with some fierce burglar will behave in the same way — behavior in the usual sense “rational”, as religious fanaticism was not.

We may say the persecution of Christians by non-Christians, and in due course by fellow Christians, can be looked at in a constructionist way, since it was initiated by the state. True. The point you bring out I quite agree with, so far as it provides an element of explanation. Still, there was something special in the phenomenon I was concerned with: namely, a mind-set that enemies could call suicidal. This was always latent among both Jews and Christians. It was latent, yes, and then it had to be brought out, and state action would serve to do so, just as you suggest. But action by an opposing majority of the local population would also do it, at Caesarea to begin the first Jewish war, or much later producing police action against the Samaritans. In these examples, as often in Alexandria, too, evidently the mind-set was always there as a part of religious belief, but it wasn't always at the ready, waiting to explode. Exactly when someone in or out of a governmental position might trigger the outbreak — that is something we only rarely can discern. The Samaritan scene I ended with is a rare example.

W. Riess: I was struck by your phrase “religious enthusiasm asks few questions and needs no rational answers”. Am I right in assuming that you wrote these lines in the light of what is currently going on in the Near East? If this is the case, we could substitute “religious enthusiasm” with “Islamistic fanaticism”. Then your outlook is a very pessimistic one and the statement becomes frightening. In this scenario, we should ask ourselves if our attempt to counter Islamistic terrorism can ever be successful. If rational dialogue with these groups is impossible, does it make sense for us at all to address social and economic inequalities and try to reduce them in the hope of containing terrorism by these measures? On a theoretical level, we might wonder if the political implications suggested and sometimes even demanded by post-colonial models are futile and doomed to fail from the outset.

R. MacMullen: We all read the news, we live in our own times, and obviously we have somewhere in our minds, these days, a consciousness of the dynamic potential of Islamic monotheism. No one can look attentively at fanaticism in other periods, without rousing echoes of the present in his own mind. And, myself, I see no difference in the latent tendencies I've concentrated on, whether in ancient or modern times. However, as the comments of yourself and other colleagues bring out, monotheists could and did get along perfectly well with their non-believing neighbors, if they were not pushed too hard. How hard is "too" hard? That's what counts, and the answer is both obvious, and circular: "too hard" is what monotheists can interpret as a sort of attack, a word or a gesture of challenge.

We read of murderous reaction among the crime-ready young today, if they are, in the slang term, "dissed": treated with disrespect. A fixed hostile stare is enough. Here now, I have it fixed on Yann Rivière across the table, as best I can. It seems to have no effect at all! But it would get me in trouble in some confrontations. I venture on an analogy. Well informed writers in the media often say, Talk with the enemy — for instance, Iran. Don't put the enemy in a corner, don't insist on a response that means loss of face. Don't diss anyone. That seems to me good advice, and not beyond the powers of self-restraint that civilized governments may command, in their own best interests. So I don't see "doom" as inevitable.

H. van Wees: Your emphasis on the driving force of emotions as opposed to material interests in creating fanaticism strikes me as a very important contribution to the discussion of public order and security, insofar as it reminds us that life, limb and livelihood are not the only important matters which may be threatened and defended by force. Violent emotions may also be provoked by perceived challenges to less tangible assets such as one's "honour" — which may be at risk from something as little as a word or a look — or one's beliefs. In themselves,

these challenges need pose no danger to life or property, yet they may provoke such powerful emotions that violence ensues and material interests are ultimately affected as well. Although becoming highly violent about intangible interests may seem “irrational” to the outside observer, for those involved, “honour” and “truth” presumably seem no less, or indeed more, worth dying and killing for than life and property are. If so, might it not be better to avoid contrasting “emotional” and “rational” motivations and to concede that even the pursuit of intangible goals may be rational on its own terms? One might then stress instead the importance of emotions as a driving force behind all kinds of violence, whether in pursuit of material or intangible goals, and ask why it is in particular the emotions provoked by challenges to the “truth” of religious belief which pose the major threat to public order at certain times and in certain places.

R. MacMullen: Absolutely! I agree that all human action begins with an emotion — with an impulse, a motive which may be acquisitive or aggressive or concupiscent or social (that is, desirous of approval). These and others are so many expressions of our fundamental nature, “hard-wired” as the psychologists express it by an analogy to a house, with its network of copper cable accessible to a TV set or a lamp; or like a computer’s built structure, to which various programs or capacities can be added; or like a human brain, on which behavioral patterns may be impressed by a surrounding community.

I think our trouble may lie in a mere word, “rational”, which I would equate with common sense. But what is “common-sensical”? That depends on a culture. In Alexander Hamilton’s day it was rational to engage in a duel. What was at stake was one’s standing in one’s community. The bristling duellist understood, “rationally”, that fighting might gain him honor while if he flinched he would suffer loss of approval. Yes, that was a calculation. Everyone would understand — back *then*. The need or drive for approval from one’s community — approval which constituted “honor” — is as you say, an excellent test of the nature of motive

(cf. my article "The Power of the Roman Empire", in *Historia* 55 [2006], 471-481). Today, if it were alleged in defense against a murder charge, it would be called madness, just as the monotheist diehards in antiquity were called mad by their oppressors.

It was in recognition of the problem you point out so well, that I put quotation marks around the word "good". This was at the end of my paper, when I spoke of "good" treatment, meaning something rational and scientific" offered as historical explanation. I meant to challenge such explanations. They really are well entrenched, as I don't need to say. I may instead quote G. Loewenstein and J.S. Lerner, that "Until recently, emotions attracted little attention from decision researchers. Decision makers were assumed to evaluate the potential consequences of their decisions dispassionately" (in my *Feelings* book of 2003, 56). The statement comes from psychologists; but it could equally have come from market analysts like the Nobel laureate, Daniel Kahneman. It could be addressed in warning to all those historians who look for explanations in terms of material or political or military profit. Such interpreters are numberless. I think we are at one in wishing to open their eyes a little wider.

And approval may be conferred on some form of behavior which has nothing to do with material possessions. Yes, I agree.

The possibility gets to your final question: What was it about religion that produced very large-scale violence? Is not the answer, that certain religious beliefs were shared by very large numbers of people? So "their impulses came together", as I expressed it a moment ago?

C. Brélaz: Je souhaiterais vous demander quelle est, selon vous, la dimension politique des mouvements que vous qualifiez de fanatiques. Il semble, en effet, dans plusieurs cas, que la religion puisse servir de prétexte à une opposition de nature sociale ou politique (comme ces paysans samaritains, que vous citez, qui allèrent jusqu'à nommer un empereur rival du souverain de Constantinople [Procop. *Anecdota* 11, 27]). Les motivations religieuses et politiques sont parfois indissociables, comme pour

les Juifs de Palestine, qui se considèrent comme un peuple d'exception et réclament un traitement privilégié au sein de l'empire romain. Je me demande si, tout autant qu'un attachement intransigeant au dogme monothéiste et qu'une conception émotionnelle de leur religion, ce n'est pas également une forme d'exclusivisme et de communautarisme, au besoin justifiée par la théologie, qui pousse certaines catégories de fidèles à adopter un comportement radical et intolérant envers les autres croyances.

R. MacMullen: Isn't the question looking at the chain of cause and effect? Well, suppose we have a chain involving the «Gaius» who always appears in the explanations offered by Roman *jurisperiti* – that exemplary «Gaius» – and in the chain, first, he is insulted or «dissed», then he gets angry, then he calls on his friends, and so they engage in a civil war. He wins. It is exactly in this manner that Gaius Julius Caesar in fact explained his resort to arms. The outcome was certainly political and desirable. But was his anger a mere pretext, a pretense? In answer: if anger if often attested as a response to insult and disappears when appeased, without a material pay-off, then is it not fair to suppose that it may be real?— even when the expression of it sometimes produces a result desirable in entirely different terms?

To answer such difficult questions, I think the most promising way is to go back as far as one can in the chain, bearing in mind the *comparanda* – similar narratives in the setting of the society's value system. So, for example, the first Jewish revolt had a particular small moment of explosion, from which no political benefit could have been expected; and again, for the Samaritans in their reaction to having their temple being stoned. Granted, both groups wanted to live as their faith taught them, and they became your enemies if denied that right, and your friends if granted that right. The right could only be expressed in political terms. But it was not the first link in the chain of cause and effect.

Certainly the analyst's problems are challenging, and you bring out their nature in a very probing way.