

was a vain oath or would lead to perjury. They could thus claim that they had a greater conscience of oaths than did the Elizabethan regime. Such an argument was powerful because, unlike constitutional arguments, the regime could not easily contradict it without calling into question the very mechanism upon which it relied: oaths.

*Jnl of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 64, No. 3, July 2013. © Cambridge University Press 2013  
doi:10.1017/S002204691300064X

## *The Eusebius Essay Prize*

---

The *Eusebius Essay Prize*, of £500, is offered annually for the best essay submitted on a subject connected with any aspect of early Christian history, broadly understood as including the first seven centuries AD/CE. Scholars in any relevant discipline (theology, classics, late antique studies, Middle Eastern Studies etc.), whether established in their field or graduate students, are encouraged to enter the competition. Submissions from younger scholars are particularly welcomed. The essay should not exceed 8,000 words, including footnotes, and for this year should be submitted by 30 September. A judgement will be made at the end of November (the editors reserve the right not to award the prize if no essay of significant quality is submitted). The essay of the successful candidate will be published in the *Journal*, probably in the number appearing in July 2014. Other submissions entered into the competition may also be recommended for publication. All essays should be sent as two hard copies, prepared to journal style, to Mrs Anne Waites, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Robinson College, Cambridge CB3 9AN.