

ANCIENT JUDAISM
AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Eusebius and the Jewish Authors

*His Citation Technique
in an
Apologetic Context*



SABRINA INOWLOCKI

brill

Eusebius and the Jewish Authors

Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken
Judentums und des Urchristentums

Edited by

Martin Hengel (Tübingen),
Pieter W. van der Horst (Utrecht),
Martin Goodman (Oxford),
Daniel R. Schwartz (Jerusalem),
Cilliers Breytenbach (Berlin),
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg),
Seth Schwartz (New York)

VOLUME 64

Eusebius and the Jewish Authors

His Citation Technique in an
Apologetic Context

By

Sabrina Inowlocki



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2006

Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity has previously been published as *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* (ISSN 0169-734X)

This translation was made possible through a generous grant from the Fondation Universitaire in Brussels (www.fondationuniversitaire.be).

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Inowlocki, S.

Eusebius and the Jewish authors : his citation technique in an apologetic context / by Sabrina Inowlocki.

p. c.m. — (Ancient Judaism and early Christianity ; v. 64 = *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*)

Revision of the author's thesis—University of Brussels, 2003.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 90-04-14990-2 (alk. paper)

1. Eusebius, of Caesarea, Bishop of Caesarea, ca. 260-ca. 340. *De evangelica praeparatione*. 2. Eusebius, of Caesarea, Bishop of Caesarea, ca. 260-ca. 340. *Demonstration of the Gospel*. 3. Christianity and other religions—Judaism.

4. Judaism—Relations—Christianity. 5. Quotation—Christianity. I. Title.

II. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* ; Bd. 64.

BR65.E73D4356 2006

239'.1—dc22

2005057162

ISSN 1871-6636

ISBN-13: 978 90 04 14990 8

ISBN-10: 90 04 149 902

© Copyright 2006 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic
Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted
by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Pour Michèle, πολυνοῦς διδάσκαλος

CONTENTS

Preface	xv
Acknowledgements	xvii
Abbreviations	xix
 Introduction	 1
 Chapter One Sources and Method	 11
1. Eusebius of Caesarea and the <i>Apodeixis</i>	11
2. The Jewish Authors Quoted by Eusebius	20
3. <i>Status Quaestionis</i>	24
4. Presentation of the Material	27
 Chapter Two The Citation Process in Greek Antiquity and in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	 33
1. The Citation Process in Antiquity	33
A. <i>The Cutting of Citations</i>	34
B. <i>'Discriminating' Citations</i>	35
C. <i>The Use of Citations</i>	37
D. <i>Referring to Cited Works</i>	38
E. <i>Faithfulness to the Text Cited</i>	40
Omissions	43
Word Order Modification	44
Lexical Additions and Substitutions	44
Grammatical Changes	45
Combined Citations	45
Semantic Changes	46
F. <i>Conclusion</i>	47
2. The Citation Process in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	48
<i>To Which Tradition Does Eusebius' Citation Technique in the</i> <i>Apodeixis Belong?</i>	50
3. Eusebius' Citation Technique in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	54
A. <i>The Citations in the Apodeixis: A Rhetorical Technique in</i> <i>Its Own Right</i>	55
B. <i>The Weight of Auctoritas in the Apodeixis: Horizontal</i> <i>and Vertical Relations</i>	59

C. <i>Citing Authors, Authors Cited: A Subtle Play of Authority in the Apodeixis</i>	62
D. <i>Strategies of Concealment and Identification of the Sources in the Apodeixis</i>	65
E. <i>Quantitative Assessment of the Citations in the Apodeixis</i>	66
F. <i>The Commentary on the Citations in the Apodeixis</i>	66
G. <i>Levels of Agreement between Eusebius' Discourse and the Citations in the Apodeixis: Polyphony, Symphony, and Cacophony</i>	67
H. <i>Strategies of Distinction of the Citations in the Apodeixis</i>	68
I. <i>Promises of Faithfulness in the Apodeixis</i>	69
J. <i>References to the Text Cited in the Apodeixis</i>	70
4. <i>Conclusions</i>	71
 Chapter Three The Citations of Non-Jewish Authors in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	75
1. The <i>Auctoritas</i> of the Cited Authors in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	75
A. <i>Pagan Authors</i>	75
B. <i>Christian Authors</i>	80
C. <i>Biblical Authors</i>	83
2. Eusebius' Faithfulness to the Cited Text in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	85
A. <i>Citations of Pagan Authors</i>	86
B. <i>Citations of Christian Authors</i>	90
C. <i>Citations of the Bible</i>	90
3. Eusebius' Use of Citations in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	90
A. <i>Citations of Pagan Authors</i>	91
B. <i>Citations of Christian Authors</i>	95
C. <i>Biblical Citations</i>	100
4. <i>Conclusion</i>	103
 Chapter Four The "Hebrews" and the "Jews" according to Eusebius: The Jewish Authors' Status in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	105
1. The "Hebrews" according to Eusebius	109
A. <i>Ancient Hebrews</i>	109
B. <i>Post-Mosaic Jews as "Hebrews"</i>	115
2. The "Jews" according to Eusebius	121
A. <i>"Jews" before Christ</i>	122
B. <i>"Jews" after Christ</i>	131
3. <i>Conclusions</i>	137

Chapter Five	The “travail de la citation” in the <i>Apodeixis</i> :	
	The Case of the Jewish Authors’ Citations	139
1.	Discovery and Selection of the Jewish Authors’	
	Citations	139
	A. <i>Clement of Alexandria</i>	139
	B. <i>Origen</i>	142
	C. <i>Two Possibilities: Porphyry and Anatolius</i>	146
2.	Ablation of the Jewish Authors’ Citations	147
3.	Eusebius’ Use of Second-Hand Sources	148
	A. <i>Citations of Jewish Authors Derived from Collections:</i>	
	<i>Some Hypotheses</i>	149
	<i>PE</i> VII. 13 and XI. 15	149
	<i>PE</i> VII. 21	151
	<i>PE</i> VIII. 14	152
	<i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 397d–402d	153
	B. <i>Pagan Authors Cited through Jewish Authors</i>	154
4.	Strategies of Discrimination of the Jewish Authors’	
	Citations	156
	A. <i>Carefully Cut Jewish Authors’ Citations</i>	157
	<i>PE</i> VII. 13. 1–2 = Philo, <i>Quaestiones in Genesim</i>	
	II. 62	157
	<i>PE</i> VII. 13. 3 = Philo, <i>De agricultura</i> 51	157
	<i>PE</i> VII. 14. 1 = Aristobulus fr. 5 ^e Holladay	158
	<i>PE</i> VIII. 2. 1–4; VIII. 2. 5–5. 5; VIII. 5. 6–5. 10;	
	VIII. 9. 1–38 = <i>Letter</i> of Pseudo-Aristeas 9–11;	
	28–46; 310–317; 128–171 Respectively	158
	<i>PE</i> VIII. 12. 1–19 = Philo, <i>Probus</i> 75–91	159
	<i>PE</i> VIII. 13. 1–6 = Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 7–12	159
	<i>PE</i> VIII. 14. 1–72 = Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 3;	
	15–33; 99–112	159
	<i>PE</i> IX. 3–5; IX. 9; IX. 11. 1–4; IX. 13–16;	
	X. 7 = Josephus, <i>Bγ</i> II. 119–159 (= Porphyry);	
	<i>CA</i> I. 197–204 (= Ps.-Hecataeus); 176–181	
	(= Clearchus); 172–174 (= Choerilus); <i>Aγ</i> I. 93–95;	
	105–108; 117–120; 158–161; 165–168; 239–241;	
	X. 221–222 (= <i>CA</i> I. 136–137); 146–154; 215–218;	
	6–26 Respectively	162
	<i>PE</i> X. 13. 1–22 = Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 73–75; 82–90;	
	103–104	163

PE IX. 16–37; 39 = Jewish Authors Cited through Alexander Polyhistor	164
PE XI. 24. 1–12 = Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 24–27; 29–31; 35–36	165
PE XIII. 18. 12–16 = Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus</i> I. 13–17; 20	166
DE VI. 18. 291 b–c = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> IX. 224–225	166
DE VIII. 2. 399 a = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 34–35	166
B. <i>Jewish Authors' Citations Which Were Cut Incoherently</i>	167
PE VII. 18. 1–2 = Philo, <i>De plantatione</i> 8–10	167
PE VII. 21. 1–4 = Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 50–51	167
PE VIII. 8. 1–55 = Josephus, <i>CA</i> II. 163–228	167
C. <i>Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion</i>	168
PE VII. 21. 1–4 = Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 50–51	168
PE XI. 15. 1 = Philo, <i>De confusione</i> 97	169
PE XI. 24. 1–6 = Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 24–27	169
DE VIII. 2. 397 d–398 a = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XX. 247–249	170
DE VIII. 2. 398 b = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 92–93	170
DE VIII. 2. 402 d–403a = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 55 = <i>Bj.</i> II. 169—DE VIII. 2. 403 a = Philo, <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i> 299	171
DE IX. 5. 431 a–b = Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 116–117	172
5. The Arrangement of the Jewish Authors' Citations	172
A. <i>Association of Jewish Citations</i>	173
B. <i>Citations of Jewish Authors Associated with Citations of Christian Authors</i>	175
C. <i>Citation of a Jewish Author Associated with a Pagan Author and a Christian Author</i>	176
6. References to the Citations from the Jewish Authors	177
A. <i>In Which Form Did Eusebius Read the Jewish Authors' Works?</i>	178
B. <i>Exact References to the Jewish Authors' Texts</i>	185
C. <i>Vague or Erroneous References to the Jewish Authors' Citations</i>	187
D. <i>Examples of Cross-References</i>	188

7. Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors'	
Citations	190
A. <i>Status Quaestionis</i>	191
B. <i>Examples of Textual Changes in the Historia ecclesiastica</i>	194
C. <i>Textual Changes in the Praeparatio</i>	195
<i>PE VII. 13. 1–2 = Philo, Quaestiones in Genesim</i>	
II. 62	195
<i>PE VII. 13. 3 = Philo, De agricultura</i> 51	196
<i>PE VII. 13. 4–6=Philo, De plantatione</i> 8–10	197
<i>PE VIII. 13. 2 = Philo, De opificio mundi</i> 8	200
<i>PE VIII. 14. 1 = Philo, De providentia</i> II. 3	203
<i>PE XIII. 18. 15 = Philo, De specialibus legibus</i> I. 17	203
<i>PE XIII. 18. 16 = De specialibus legibus</i> I. 20	204
D. <i>Textual Changes in the Demonstratio</i>	206
<i>DE III. 5. 124 b–c = Josephus, AJ XVIII. 63–64</i>	
(<i>Testimonium Flavianum</i>)	206
<i>DE VIII. 2. 397d–398a = Josephus, AJ XX.</i>	
247–249— <i>DE VIII. 2. 398b = Josephus,</i>	
<i>AJ XVIII. 92–93</i>	211
<i>DE VIII. 2. 399 a = Josephus, AJ XVIII. 34–35</i>	212
<i>DE VIII. 2. 402 d = Josephus, BJ VI. 299</i>	213
<i>DE VIII. 2. 402d–403a = Josephus, AJ XVIII.</i>	
55 ff.; <i>BJ II. 169 ff. and Philo, Legatio ad Gaium</i>	
299	214
<i>DE IX. 5. 431 a–b = Josephus, AJ XVIII.</i>	
116–117	220
8. Conclusions	220
Chapter Six Eusebius' Use of the Jewish Authors' Citations	
in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	223
1. Function of the Jewish Authors' Citations in the	
<i>Apodeixis</i>	223
A. <i>Jewish Authors' Citations as Intermediary between</i>	
<i>Jewish-Christian and Greek Thought: The Case of Philo's</i>	
<i>and Aristobulus' Texts</i>	223
B. <i>Jewish Authors' Citations as a Source of Apologetic</i>	
<i>and Polemical Themes: The Cases of Philo, Josephus,</i>	
<i>Aristobulus, Pseudo-Aristeas and the "Minor" Jewish</i>	
<i>Authors</i>	233

C. Jewish Authors' Citations as a Source for Christian History	235
2. Exploitation of the Jewish Authors' Citations in the <i>Apodeixis</i>	236
A. Jewish Authors' Citations as "Hebrew" Testimonies	236
"Hebrew" Authors as Carriers of the "Hebrew" Tradition: PE VII. 13. 1-6 = Philo, QG II. 62; De agricultura 51; Plantatione 8-10 Respectively—PE VII. 14. 1 = Aristobulus fr. 5 ^e Holladay—PE VII. 18. 1-2 = Plantatione 18-20—PE XIII. 12. 1-16 = Aristobulus fr. 3-4-5 Holladay	236
"Hebrew" Authors as Biblical Exegetes: PE VII. 13. 1-6 = Philo, QG II. 62; De agricultura 51; Plantatione 8-10—PE VII. 14. 1 = Aristobulus fr. 5 ^e Holladay—PE VII. 18. 1-2 = Plantatione 18-20—PE XI. 15.1-6 = Philo, De confusione linguarum 97; 146-147; 62-63—PE XI. 24. 1-12 = Philo, De opificio mundi 24-27; 29-31; 35-36—PE XIII. 12. 1-16 = Aristobulus fr. 3-4-5 Holladay—PE XIII. 18. 12-16 = Philo, De specialibus legibus I. 13-17; 20—DE VI. 18. 291b-c = Josephus, AJ IX. 224-225	240
"Hebrew" Authors as Predecessors of the Christians: PE VII. 21. 1-4 = Philo, De providentia II. 50-51—PE X. 13. 1-12 = Josephus, CA I. 73-75; 82-90; 103-104—PE XI. 24. 1-12 = Philo, De opificio mundi 24-27; 29-31; 35-36—PE XIII. 12. 1-16 = Aristobulus fr. 3-4-5 Holladay	249
B. Jewish Authors' Citations as "Jewish" Testimonies	251
The Mosaic Way of Life as Christian Prehistory: PE VIII. 8. 1-55 = Josephus, CA II. 163-228—PE VIII. 9. 1-37 = Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas 128-171—PE VIII. 10. 1-17 = Aristobulus fr. 2 Holladay—PE VIII. 11. 1-18 = Philo, Hypothetica II (Colson IX, pp. 437-443)—PE VIII. 12. 1-19 = Philo, Probus 75-91	254
The "Jews" as a People of Philosophers: PE VIII. 10. 1-17 = Aristobulus fr. 2 Holladay—PE VIII. 11. 1-18 = Philo, Hypothetica II (Colson IX,	

<i>pp.</i> 437–443)— <i>PE VIII.</i> 12. 1–19 = <i>Philo, Probus</i> 75–91— <i>PE VIII.</i> 13. 1–6 = <i>Philo, De opificio mundi</i> 7–12— <i>PE VIII.</i> 14. 1–72 = <i>Philo, De providentia II.</i> 3; 15–33; 99–112	262
C. <i>Jewish Authors' Citations as Greek Testimonies</i>	267
<i>Jewish Authors' Citations as Sources of Non-Jewish</i> <i>Authors' Citations:</i> <i>PE IX.</i> 3. 1–21 = <i>Josephus,</i> <i>Bḡ II.</i> 119–159— <i>PE IX.</i> 11. 1–4 = <i>Josephus,</i> <i>Aḡ I.</i> 93–95— <i>PE IX.</i> 13. 2–5 = <i>Josephus,</i> <i>Aḡ I.</i> 105–108— <i>PE IX.</i> 14. 3–IX. 15 = <i>Josephus</i> <i>Aḡ I.</i> 117–120— <i>PE IX.</i> 40. 1–11 = <i>Josephus,</i> <i>Aḡ X.</i> 221–222 = <i>CA I.</i> 136–137; 146–154— <i>PE</i> <i>IX.</i> 42. 2–3 = <i>Josephus, CA I.</i> 215–218	270
“Minor” <i>Jewish Authors' Citations as 'Greek'</i> <i>Testimonies:</i> <i>PE IX.</i> 17–38 = <i>Alexander Polyhistor,</i> <i>On the Jews</i> = <i>Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1 Holladay; Artapan</i> <i>fr. 1–3 Holladay; Philo the Poet fr. 1–3 Holladay;</i> <i>Demetrius fr. 1–2 Holladay; Theodotus fr. 1 Holladay;</i> <i>Aristeas fr. 1 Holladay; Eupolemus fr. 1–4 Holladay;</i> <i>Ezekiel fr. 1–17 Holladay; Theophilus fr. 1 Holladay</i>	274
D. <i>Jewish Authors' Citations as Testimonies on</i> <i>Christianity</i>	278
<i>Josephus on Jesus: The Case of the Testimonium</i> <i>Flavianum:</i> <i>DE III.</i> 5. 124 b–c = <i>Josephus,</i> <i>Aḡ XVIII.</i> 63–64	279
<i>Josephus on John the Baptist:</i> <i>DE IX.</i> 5. 431a = <i>Josephus, Aḡ XVIII.</i> 116–117	280
<i>Josephus and Philo on the End of Judaism:</i> <i>DE VIII.</i> 2. 397d–398a = <i>Josephus, Aḡ XX.</i> 247–249— <i>DE</i> <i>VIII.</i> 2. 398b = <i>Josephus, Aḡ XVIII.</i> 92–93— <i>DE</i> <i>VIII.</i> 2. 399a = <i>Josephus, Aḡ XVIII.</i> 34–35— <i>DE</i> <i>VIII.</i> 2. 402d = <i>Josephus, Bḡ VI.</i> 299— <i>DE VIII.</i> 2. 402d–403a = <i>Josephus, Aḡ XVIII.</i> 55; <i>Bḡ II.</i> 169— <i>DE VIII.</i> 2. 403a = <i>Philo, Legatio ad Gaium</i> 299	281
3. Levels of Agreement between Eusebius' Discourse and the Jewish Authors' Citations in the <i>Apodeixis</i> : Polyphony, Distancing and “degré zéro”	285
4. Conclusions	287

Conclusion 289

Bibliography 299

1. Primary Sources 299

 A. *Eusebius* 299

 B. *Aristobulus and the “Minor Jewish Authors”* 300

 C. *Philo of Alexandria* 300

 D. *Flavius Josephus* 301

 E. *Pseudo-Aristeas, Letter to Philocrates* 301

 F. *Other Texts* 302

2. Secondary Sources 302

Index 319

 1. Ancient Authors 319

 2. Biblical and Para-Biblical Sources 320

 3. Jewish Authors 321

 4. Christian Authors 324

 5. Modern Authors 334

PREFACE

This book deals with the citations of extra-biblical Jewish authors used by Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*. For practical purposes, the whole work, which comprises both the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio*, will be designated as the *Apodeixis*, which is the title Eusebius himself uses (e.g., *PE* I. 3. 3). The two separate parts of the latter will be referred to as the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio*, their Latin names. In the footnotes, they will be designated as the *PE* and *DE*.

This work was initially written in French. Consequently, several works which were written in English or translated into English are quoted in their French version. In addition, in some cases, translations from Greek texts into English are derived from existing translations, with some modifications.

The articles and books used throughout this work are quoted in full the first time, then only the authors' surnames and the title, often abbreviated, are given.

References to the *Demonstratio* include the number of the book, the number of the chapter, and, for convenience, the numbering used both by Ferrar and Heikel (e.g., 124c).

References to Eusebius' *Commentary on Isaiah* are to the page number and line in the GCS edition. Unless otherwise specified, references to Philo's works are to the texts as presented in the collection 'Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie' (Cerf). As a matter of convenience, references to the fragments of the "minor" Jewish authors are to the edition and translation of Holladay.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a slightly revised version of my dissertation, which I completed in February 2003 at the University of Brussels. Among the many scholars who have been a constant source of inspiration to me, my greatest debt is to my supervisor Michèle Broze, to whom I dedicate this book. I wish to take this opportunity to express my admiration for her as a scholar, a teacher and above all as a person. I am proud to have been her first doctoral student and I hope I have been worthy of the trust she put in me. I also hope that we will have many opportunities to work together in the future and that our friendship will be long-lasting.

I was fortunate enough to produce the first part of my work on Eusebius and the Jewish authors under Professor Martin Goodman's supervision at Oxford. His critical remarks, his patience, support and humour greatly contributed to the progress of my dissertation, from the initial research stages through the writing and beyond. Doing my research under his supervision in the enchanting environment of Oxford was a blessing.

Professors Lambros Couloubaritsis and Baudouin Decharneux were supportive of my work from the start and made constructive suggestions throughout its different stages. Professors William Horbury, Folker Siegert, Gohei Hata, Laurence Rosier and David Runia, as well as Doctors Erica Carotenuto, Alison Salvesen, and Joachim Lacrosse also provided me with precious comments for which I am thankful. All remaining mistakes are, of course, due to my own negligence.

At a later stage, I benefited from the critical remarks of Doctor Annewies van den Hoek during an academic stay at Harvard Divinity School. Her knowledge of early Christian texts, her generosity and friendship all contributed to the completion of the present volume.

The translation of my dissertation from French into English would never have been possible without the generous help of the *Fondation Universitaire de Belgique*, and the assistance of Patrick Lennon who proof-read and corrected my translation with unfailing patience. I am also thankful to Bradley Rice for his helpful contribution.

I wish to express my gratitude to the *Fondation Philippe Wiener-Maurice Ansper* which generously funded three years of my scholarship at Oxford. Likewise, the Belgian *Fonds National de la Recherche*

Scientifique gave me the opportunity to work on my dissertation as carefree as a doctoral student can be. The year of research I spent in the United States was supported financially by both the Belgian American Educational Foundation and the Francqui Foundation, for which support I am most grateful.

This book also benefited from the technical help of Doctor Sylvie Vanséveren. I am also deeply grateful to the anonymous readers of the *Fondation Universitaire* and Brill Publishers for their useful corrections and suggestions, and to Ivo Romein and Louise Schouten for their friendly help and support throughout the publishing process.

Finally I wish to thank my parents as well as all the friends and colleagues who kindly encouraged me and endured my complaints, my fears and my doubts for four years, especially A. Busine and M. Vanhaelen.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AJ</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>ASE</i>	<i>Annali di storia dell'esegesi</i>
<i>BJ</i>	Josephus, <i>Bellum Judaicum</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>CA</i>	Josephus, <i>Contra Apionem</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Classical Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CC</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>CCL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Latinorum</i>
<i>CI</i>	Eusebius, <i>Commentary on Isaiah</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>DCB</i>	<i>Dictionary of Christian Biography</i>
<i>DE</i>	Eusebius, <i>Demonstratio evangelica</i>
<i>DMOA</i>	<i>Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui</i>
<i>Ecl. proph.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Eclogae propheticae</i>
<i>FGrH</i>	<i>Fragmente des griechischer Historiker</i>
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller</i>
<i>GLAJJ</i>	M. Stern, <i>Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism</i>
<i>HE</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>
<i>HJP</i>	Schürer, <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	Judische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LC</i>	Eusebius, <i>Laus Constantini</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell-Scott-Jones
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>MP</i>	Eusebius, <i>De martyribus Palaestinae</i>
<i>OCD</i>	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>

<i>OTP</i>	<i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>PE</i>	Eusebius, <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> (Migne)
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> (Migne)
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Realencyclopädie für Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Pauly-Wissowa)
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RHistEccl</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RScR</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RSLR</i>	<i>Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa</i>
<i>SBL</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>SC</i>	Sources chrétiennes
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta classica Israelica</i>
<i>SPhA</i>	<i>Studia Philonica Annual</i>
<i>StPat</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>StPB</i>	<i>Studia post-biblica</i>
<i>SVigChris</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i> Supplement
<i>TPAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realencyclopädie</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Text und Untersuchungen</i>
<i>VigChris</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VC</i>	Eusebius, <i>Vita Constantini</i>
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

INTRODUCTION

Eusebius of Caesarea has often been called “the Father of Church History”, an honorific title which he gained because of his *Historia ecclesiastica*, the first work of its kind.¹ Moreover, Eusebius inaugurated a rather modern technique of writing history. As the great historian Momigliano claimed: “In the simplicity of its structure and in the matter of its documentation the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius was one of the most authoritative prototypes ever created by ancient thought”.² The key word in this statement is *documentation*, for it is this that made the *Historia ecclesiastica* such an authoritative prototype. Eusebius would become the first to invoke texts as historical documents, whereas hitherto ancient historians had made use of texts for literary purposes. Thus, by quoting documents, Eusebius became a fully-fledged historian, or thereabouts.

In the twofold apologetic work constituted by the *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica*, Eusebius quotes a number of pagan, Christian, and Jewish authors. The present study will be devoted to the bishop’s use of passages from non-biblical Jewish authors. Part of the interest of this research stems from the fact that Eusebius is our principal source not only for numerous fragments of so-called “minor” Jewish authors, but also for fragments from such well-known authors as Philo of Alexandria,³ some of whose works (such as the *Hypothetica*) did not survive in their entirety. In this regard, some scholars have rightly emphasized the importance of the bishop’s role in the transmission of manuscripts by Josephus and Philo.⁴ As regards

¹ I.e., aside from the Luke-Acts, which some regard as the first Christian history.

² A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990, p. 141.

³ There are no direct references to Philo in the texts of Rabbinic Judaism, though some passages may suggest his influence. On this subject, see D. Winston, “Philo’s Nachleben in Judaism”, *SPhA* 6, 1994, pp. 101–110.

⁴ As regards Philo, the relocation of his works to Caesarea was to have a definite impact on the transmission of his writings: Jerome informs us that papyrus manuscripts of Philo’s treatises were carefully copied by Eusebius’ successors Acacius and Euzoius (*Vir. Ill.* 113). This testimony is corroborated by the existence of an eleventh-century codex (Cod. Vind. theol. gr. 29), which includes the lemma: “the bishop Euzoius renewed these as *codices*”. For more detail, see D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early*

the former, Schreckenberg notes that it is thanks to Eusebius that “the early Christian reception of Josephus receive[d] such a strong impetus that for centuries to come he became one of the most influential ‘Christian’ authors”.⁵ It is therefore not surprising that Eusebius is largely responsible for the image that moderns have formed of “Hellenophone Judaism”.⁶

There is also the question as to which Jewish authors I have selected for examination. Indeed, some of the Jewish authors mentioned in the *Apodeixis* are not considered “Jews” at all by Eusebius. For example, apparently failing to recognize the pseudepigraphy of the *Letter to Philocrates*, the bishop regards the author ‘Aristeas’ as Greek. At the same time, Eusebius never comments on the religious background of the so-called “minor” Jewish authors in the *Praeparatio*. Yet the interest of the present investigation derives partly from the fact that the apologist is one of the only authors to make use of passages from these writers under their own names. Therefore, one of the objectives of this study is to understand how some Jewish literature written in Greek could survive—even if only partially—thanks to the pen of a Christian bishop who witnessed the period in which the Roman empire inclined toward Christianity.

It should be noted that I will not treat pseudepigraphic poetry written by Jews, such as Pseudo-Aeschylus⁷ or Pseudo-Orpheus.⁸

Christian Literature. A Survey. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993, p. 21.

⁵ H. Schreckenberg and K. Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity.* Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992, p. 63.

⁶ The term “Hellenistic Judaism” is somewhat imprecise, inasmuch as Philo and Josephus are authors of the Roman period; so is the term “Hellenized Judaism”, since it is now known that during the Hellenistic and Roman periods there was no “non-Hellenized” Judaism. The contraposition between “Palestinian Judaism” and the “Hellenized Judaism” of the Diaspora is artificial and has no *raison d’être*. For more on the Jews and Hellenization, see the recent collection of articles in J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling, *Hellenism in the Land of Israel.* Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 2001. “Greek-speaking Judaism” or “Hellenophone Judaism” may constitute a more suitable terminology.

⁷ For more on this literature, see especially A.-M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, II, Turnhout: Brepols, 2000, pp. 1063–1106.

⁸ This poem, also called the *Testament of Orpheus*, presents numerous literary-critical problems, and may be found in different forms among various authors (Clement, Eusebius, Pseudo-Justin, *Theosophy of Tübingen*). For more detail on this mysterious work, which today is unanimously regarded as a Judeo-Hellenic forgery, see espe-

These authors are quoted by Aristobulus, whose writings only are in turn taken into account by Eusebius. With this exception, I will treat all passages that reproduce material from a Jewish author, whether in direct or indirect speech (i.e., those passages which are linguistically marked by a declarative verb followed by a subordinate clause meant to reproduce the words of the author), either with or without any mention of the author's name. However, I will only deal with these passages when it can be established that Eusebius is aware that he is reproducing—whether directly or through an intermediary source—the material of a given author,⁹ even if he does not believe the author to be Jewish.

The use of texts written by others immediately raises the complex issue of quotation itself. More often than not, the practice of quotation has been examined according to our modern criteria, and scholarship in this domain has frequently been restricted to examining the historical and philological reliability of Eusebius' method and his use of sources. In most instances, scholars have suggested that Eusebius did not make a 'good historian',¹⁰ even if Marrou could respect him as "notre collègue Eusèbe". But it is not entirely fair to view Eusebius' writings through the lens of our conception of history and philology, which tends toward a certain objectivity (although this characterization has been called into question).

cially N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. TU 86. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964; N. Zeegers – Van Der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*. Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4e série, fasc. 47. Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1972, pp. 192–197; C. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos. Beobachtungen zu OF 245 und 247 (Sog. Testament des Orpheus)*. Classica monacensia 7. Tübingen: Narr, 1993; C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Jewish Hellenistic Authors, vol. IV: Orphica*. SBL Texts and Translations 40. Pseudepigrapha Series 14. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996; —, "Pseudo-Orpheus: Tracking a Tradition", in A. J. Malherbe, F. W. Norris, J. W. Thompson (Eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context, Essays in Honour of Everett Ferguson*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 90. Leiden: Brill, 1998, pp. 192–220; Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, II, pp. 1086–1100.

⁹ Indeed, we shall see that when Eusebius quotes Porphyry in *PE* IX. 3, he is aware that Porphyry is himself reproducing material from Flavius Josephus, even if this is not explicitly stated.

¹⁰ See, e.g., R. M. Grant, "The Case against Eusebius, or Did the Father of Church History Write History?", *StPat* 12, 1975, pp. 413–421; —, "Eusebius and Gnostic Origins", in M. Simon (Ed.), *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme, influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*, Paris: de Boccard, 1978, pp. 195–206.

Furthermore, such criticisms are hardly applicable to an analysis of the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*, since it is not appropriate to look for a presumed objectivity in an apologetic work.¹¹ Accordingly, these two treatises have been somewhat neglected by modern scholarship, whose interest has generally been confined to the wealth of literary fragments that they contain. A number of studies have therefore concentrated on Eusebius' fidelity to the text quoted—so much so that the apologist's work has often been limited to that of a mere editor. Needless to say, such an assessment has derogatory overtones.

I would argue that Eusebius' quotation technique is a rhetorical process in its own right. In this respect, Gadamer's textual approach¹² is of interest from a theoretical standpoint. According to him, the meaning of a text is never exhausted by its author's intentions; the interpretation of a text is contextual, and new meanings are created when the text is received in a new cultural and historical context. Following Gadamer, I will analyze Eusebius' citation technique on its own terms by following the internal logic of the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*. This will involve attempting to understand Eusebius' approach by starting with his own words on the quotation technique he chose to defend the Christian cause. That is, we will first consider the meta-discourse on Eusebius' quotation method. Consequently, the method customarily applied to his double apologetic work will be inverted: I will begin with the bishop's point of view rather than the quoted text.

This approach raises a number of difficulties. First, one must ask whether the concept of 'quotation' is actually suitable for the study of ancient texts. Second, if it is appropriate, one must define exactly what the term 'quotation' means. Indeed, it is in no way clear that the usage of this modern term can aptly describe a literary process used by the ancients, for the 'quotation technique' is apparently lacking from the theoretical discussions of the ancients.¹³ Furthermore, the

¹¹ This is true even if Eusebius somehow does try to perform the tasks of a "historian of religions". Yet it is not clear that such an anachronistic idea can at all be applied to Eusebius in the same way that it has been applied to his contemporary Lactantius (in this regard, see J.-Cl. Fredouille, "Lactance historien des religions", *Lactance et son temps, Recherches actuelles (Actes du IV^e colloque d'études historiques et patristiques, Chantilly 21–23 septembre 1976)*. Théologie historique 48. Paris: Beauchesne, 1978, pp. 237–252).

¹² H. Gadamer, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

¹³ Cf. F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, Cambridge:

concept of quotation itself is rather hazy: It may commonly denote phenomena as various as paraphrase or reminiscence.¹⁴ In some ways, translation is also a form of quotation, since it entails quoting a text or part of a text in another language. Similarly, all the endeavours by Jewish authors to ‘rewrite the Bible’ fall under the category of quotation, since they aim to reproduce the content of the Old Testament. Therefore, in order to specify precisely what ‘quotation’ will mean in the present study, we will turn to linguistic theory, and in particular, to the theoretical framework provided by theories of enunciation.

Indeed, a number of recent studies have examined quotation in discussions of reported speech.¹⁵ Rosier’s definition of the latter phenomenon could also be applied to quotation in particular. She defines it as “la mise en rapport de discours dont l’un crée un espace énonciatif particulier tandis que l’autre est mis à distance et attribué à une autre source, de manière univoque ou non”.¹⁶ In the case of quotations found in Eusebius’ work, we are dealing with a univocal attribution of quoted speech. On the other hand, Compagnon insists on the idea of repetition which, according to him, is inherent in the phenomenon of quotation itself.¹⁷

Furthermore, in his *Palimpsestes*, Genette has pointed out that quotation may be thought of as the most explicit case of inter/trans-textuality.¹⁸ The intertextual process appears even at the dawn of Greek literature. In fact, as Pucci has successfully demonstrated, the

Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 100 ff. and A. Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, Paris: Seuil, 1979, pp. 95–96.

¹⁴ On the difference between ‘quotation’ and ‘reminiscence’, see W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O’Neill, *Plutarch’s Quotations*. Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association 19. Baltimore: American Philological Association, 1959, p. viii.

¹⁵ See L. Rosier, *Le discours rapporté: Histoire, théories, pratiques*, Paris-Bruxelles: Duculot, 1999 and L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*. Faits de langue 19. Paris: Seuil, 2002, which includes the article by J.-Ph. Schreiber, “Le vertige de la citation: quelques réflexions sur une forme de discours rapporté en histoire”, pp. 263–278 and the study by G. Mourad and J.-P. Desclès, “Citation textuelle: identification automatique par exploration contextuelle”, pp. 179–189. However, in an article from the same collection, L. Perrin, “Les formes de la citation au style direct, indirect et indirect libre”, pp. 147–157, makes reported speech a particular instance of quotation: “ce que l’on désigne habituellement comme un discours rapporté au style direct, indirect ou indirect libre sera assimilé à une forme de citation” (p. 147).

¹⁶ Rosier, *Le discours rapporté: Histoire, théories, pratiques*, p. 125.

¹⁷ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, *passim*.

¹⁸ Cf. G. Genette, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*, Paris: Seuil, 1982, p. 8.

Iliad and the *Odyssey* are already in dialogue with one another.¹⁹ Consequently, among the ancients this practice does not simply involve literal quotation, but rather integrates all the co-text or context of the quoted work into the quoting work.

The complexity of defining the practice of quotation is further augmented by the fact that it differs according to the type of literature in which it appears. Thus, at present, scholarly quotation differs from journalistic or literary quotation. Likewise, quotation as found in Eusebius' historical work, the *Historia ecclesiastica*, is not the same as that found in the apologetic works, the *Praeparatio evangelica* and the *Demonstratio evangelica*.

In the present study, the term "quotation" will denote those passages linguistically or semiotically marked as the speech of others, which were intended to appear as such to the reader, and which may be found in direct and indirect discourse. Excluded from this study are the phenomena that fall under the rubric of allusion, reminiscence or implicit usage.

One may also ask whether the concept of 'quotation' is not an anachronism resulting from the problematic attempt to apply a modern terminology to a distant period of time. Still, the concept proves suitable to the extent that Eusebius himself offers noteworthy remarks on his own practice of quotation and, as we shall see, even employs a technical vocabulary in praxis.

The study of quotation in ancient literature, whether pagan or Christian, raises further problems. One difficulty is the identification of a quotation. Today the demarcation of a quotation, especially of a quotation placed in direct discourse, is carried out, together with linguistic markers, with the use of typographic marks such as colons, quotation marks or italics.²⁰ But what were the methods employed by ancient authors, at a time when writing was in *scriptio continua*? In order to discern the presence of quotations in ancient literature, it becomes necessary to describe those processes by which the ancients signaled the presence of a quotation.

¹⁹ P. Pucci, *Ulysse Polutropos, Lectures intertextuelles de l'Iliade et l'Odysée*. Traduit par J. Routier-Pucci. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1995. See also the study by M. Broze and Fr. Labrique, "Hélène, le cheval de bois et la peau de l'âne", in M. Broze, L. Couloubaritsis, A. Hypsilanti, P. Mavromoustakos, D. Viviers (Eds.), *Le mythe d'Hélène*, Bruxelles: Ousia, 2003, pp. 137–185.

²⁰ On the typographic marks used for quotation, see Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 40–42 and 246–248, and Rosier, *Le discours rapporté, histoire, théories, pratiques*, p. 66 ff.

The quotation process also inevitably implies reappropriation of the speech of others. The forms of this reappropriation should be specified both for ancient literature in general and for Eusebius' work in particular. Among these practices of reappropriation—though we shall see that there are many others as well—figures the practice that consists in altering the texts of others. We will inevitably come to compare the text quoted by Eusebius with the original when it is extant, or with other quotations of the same passage in Eusebius and other authors. This will not be a matter of philological investigation, at least of the kind that would aim at the establishment of a better text, or of tracking clues revealing Eusebius' infidelity to the source text. In this study, I will speak instead of 'exploitation', by which I mean the cases in which one author uses material from another author to serve his own cause. I will use 'distortion' (without any pejorative connotation) for cases in which the quoting author alters the original intention of the quoted author. I will use 'reappropriation' for situations in which the quoting author subsumes into his own ideology or beliefs those of another author, even when such beliefs originally differed from his own. In fact, it appears that Eusebius' approach to documentary and literary material has frequently been misjudged by modern standards of objectivity.²¹ However, I believe that the talent of an author resides in altering the initial meaning of quoted material. Such an author reinvents the discourse of other people by means of various techniques and, in his own way, engages in that process of *mimesis* so dear to the ancients.

Furthermore, the *Apodeixis* requires that one consider the variety of functions carried out by the quotation technique. Morawski has enumerated the following functions: conservation of cultural continuity; authority; erudition; stimulation-amplification (this function applies to cases in which the quotation does not allow for expression of the viewpoint of others, yet enables the quoting author to reinforce his arguments); and embellishment.²² We shall see how Eusebius incorporates all these functions in his quotation practice.

²¹ D. Mendels, *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity. An Essay on Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans, 1999, pp. 19–20, has rightly emphasized that objectivity was not a priority in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.

²² S. Morawski, "The Basic Function of Quotation", in C. H. van Schoonveld (Ed.), *Sign, Language, Culture*. Janua Linguarum, Series major I. Den Haag: Mouton, 1970, pp. 690–706.

From a methodological point of view, this study will be conducted by moving from the general to the specific. The various chapters constitute layers, as it were, which in the end will form a detailed portrait of how Eusebius has employed quotations of Jewish authors in the *Apodeixis*. It should be noted that this will not involve examining the thoughts of the quoted authors in any detail. Rather, the analysis will be restricted to consideration of the use that Eusebius made of them.

I will begin the present study with a description of quotation in antiquity. This will be followed by an analysis of its practice in Eusebius, with the purpose of describing the tradition in which he was located, and to what extent it differs from that of other authors who preceded him. In this respect, it will prove useful to consider the linguistic devices established by the bishop, and his own comments on his quotation method.

I will then confine the analysis to the study of non-Jewish quotations in the *Apodeixis* by addressing, in the passages of pagan, Christian, and biblical authors, the questions concerning the representation of these authors, the literality of the quotations and their “exploitation”. This will provide a basis enabling assessment of the same parameters for the quotations of Jewish authors, and will serve to draw out their characteristics and particularities in relation to other quotations.

In order to understand the significance of the religious status given to Jewish authors, in the following chapter I will address the terminological question raised by the use of the adjectives “Hebrew” and “Jew”. The study will be guided by Eusebius’ own perspective and discussion as presented in his writings.

In the penultimate chapter, we will come still closer to our topic by analyzing the technical aspect of quoting Jewish authors. This will involve that we raise and answer the following questions: What tradition does Eusebius belong to in the process of using material from these authors? Does he turn to intermediary sources when quoting them? In what way does he refer to them? In what way does he extract the passages by removing them from their context? How precise is he in reproducing these passages? In what manner does he insert these quotations? All this information will enable us to clarify Eusebius’ quotation practice and his strategies for reappropriating excerpts from Jewish authors.

Finally, I will inquire into the meaning that Eusebius imposed on material from Jewish authors: According to which criteria did Eusebius

select these passages? In which way did he use them? How did he reappropriate them? To what extent did he adhere to these discourses? I will try to answer these questions by considering Eusebius' own words on the subject.

In sum, in the course of this study, I will analyze and put into perspective Eusebius' quotation practice in general. At the same time, I will provide a meticulous analysis of his treatment of Jewish testimonies in the *Apodeixis* by prioritizing the search for links between quoted text and quoting text. As Bakhtin has emphasized, quotation is not only "discourse in discourse" but also "discourse on discourse".²³ Therefore, rather than privileging the original meaning of the quoted discourse, I will give priority to Eusebius' own discourse on the quoted discourse. That is, Eusebius' viewpoint will take precedence in our study. This will enable us to grasp how the bishop understood the texts of these authors and how he read them with the eyes of a fourth-century Christian on the eve of the official Christianization of the Roman empire. This will also enable us to understand how he used these texts in this context and, finally, how he carried out their reappropriation in the *Apodeixis* with linguistic, rhetorical and semiotic strategies.

It is my hope that the present study will contribute to our understanding of the quotation process among ancient authors and will also help explain the reasons for which Eusebius is largely responsible for the transmission of various Jewish writings until the present day.

²³ M. Bakhtine – V. N. Volochinov, *Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage*. Traduction de M. Yaguello. Paris: Minuit, 1977, p. 161 use the term for reported speech. It is generally believed that this passage insists on the autonymic dimension of reported speech. Accordingly, we too shall distort this quotation from Bakhtin when we use his words to describe a certain method of quotation: I believe that by quoting the speech of others, Eusebius in fact produces a "speech on the speech" of others.

CHAPTER ONE

SOURCES AND METHOD

1. EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA AND THE *Apodeixis*

Eusebius is often referred to as either the “Father of Church History”,¹ as one of the principal actors of the Council of Nicea,² or as a close associate of the emperor Constantine. The bishop of Caesarea thus emerges as a multifaceted character whose political and religious engagements determined the portrait that was painted of him over the centuries.³ In this study, it is his apologetic work that I would like to consider more particularly. Although there is an abundance of secondary literature on the life and work of Eusebius,⁴ this short presentation will be confined to those biographical elements which had—or could have had—a direct impact on the composition of the *Apodeixis*.

Eusebius lived in Caesarea maritima, which was the capital of Palestine at the time and where the elites and Roman army used to reside.⁵ It is not surprising to discover that the bishop could compose

¹ See R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980); G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories. Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Evagrius*. Théologie historique 46. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

² For more on Eusebius’ role in the Council of Nicea, see C. Lhuibéid, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*, Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981. See also the classic study by R. Williams, *Arius*, London: SCM Press, 2001², pp. 167–174.

³ This portrait was quite often unfavorable. On the internet there is even a website that collects negative remarks made about Eusebius in antiquity: http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/NPNF2-01/Npnf2-01-03.htm#P449_282059.

⁴ For a complete biography of Eusebius and an exhaustive list of his works, see J. B. Lightfoot, “Eusebius”, *DCB* II, pp. 308–355; E. Schwartz, art. Eusebios 24, *RE* VI, 1, col. 1370–1439; F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili, A Study of the Man and His Writings*, Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933; D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, London: Mowbray, 1960; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1981.

⁵ For an extensive survey of the archaeology and history of Caesarea, see L. Levine, *Caesarea Under Roman Rule*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 7. Leiden: Brill, 1975; H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective After Two Millennia*. DMOA 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996. In this volume see especially L. Perrone, “Eusebius of Caesarea as a Christian Writer”, pp. 515–530.

one of the largest apologetic works addressed to Christians, Jews, and pagans in a place where these respective communities encountered each other on a daily basis.

Caesarea also functioned as a centre of Christian culture. It was in this important city that Eusebius became the disciple of Pamphilus, an aristocrat from Beirut who later became priest of Caesarea.⁶ It was Pamphilus who founded, supplied, and maintained the famous library there.⁷ It is also likely that Pamphilus adopted Eusebius, as suggested by the name *Eusebius Pamphili*: “Eusebius, son of Pamphilus”.

Through Pamphilus, Eusebius encountered the writings of Origen. The Alexandrian master’s influence on Eusebius can be felt both in his biblical projects and in his apologetic and theological endeavours.⁸ The result is that, from a theological viewpoint, Eusebius has often been considered a kind of ‘sub-Origen’.⁹

As Barnes has emphasized,¹⁰ although the library of Caesarea was surely supplied with numerous Greek philosophical works,¹¹ its purpose was not the preservation of pagan literature, but rather the promotion of sacred teaching.¹² For this reason Barnes points out that

⁶ Concerning Pamphilus, see *Historia ecclesiastica* (henceforth *HE*) VI. 32. 3; VII. 32. 25–27; VIII. 13. 6; *MP* XI.

⁷ For more information on the library at Caesarea, see A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. SVigChris 67. Boston-Leiden: Brill, 2003.

⁸ Eusebius also wrote, together with Pamphilus, a defence of Origen against accusations of heresy. Only the first of the six books has survived, and that in the Latin translation of Rufinus: see R. Amacker and É. Junod, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Pamphile de Césarée et Rufin d'Aquilée. Apologie pour Origène, I et II, suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée: Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*. SC 464–465. Paris: Cerf, 2002.

⁹ On the theology of Eusebius, see H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij Holland, 1939; J. R. Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993; H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea: eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

¹⁰ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 94.

¹¹ Kalligas has recently suggested that the Platonic works which were available to Eusebius (and used extensively in Books XI–XV of the *Praeparatio*) may derive from the library that Longinus would have taken with him to Palmyra. P. Kalligas, “Traces of Longinus’ Library in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio evangelica*”, *CQ* 51, 2001, pp. 584–598.

¹² For more information on the contents of Eusebius’ library, see A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*.

Eusebius is above all a “biblical scholar”,¹³ and that his apologetic engagement was precipitated by historical events.¹⁴

The apologist was profoundly influenced by his biblical training (we know that he revised Origen’s *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla* in collaboration with Pamphilus), as appears from his attachment to the text in general. Eusebius was undeniably a ‘man of the document’, and the Caesarean library supplied him with the means to be one. With such textual training it should come as no surprise that Eusebius’ career as both historian and apologist is based on the collection of documentary and literary quotations, as seen in his major works (the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Apodeixis*).

According to Kannengiesser, “Far from producing an ideological weapon, aimed at striking against the current imperial propaganda which favoured the traditional cults, Eusebian apologetics intended essentially to serve faith itself, by educating sympathizers of the Christian movement and church people alike”.¹⁵ If this suggestion is confirmed by the audience which Eusebius explicitly assumes in the *Apodeixis* (i.e., a readership of pagans recently converted to Christianity), it appears nevertheless to be unfounded when the *Apodeixis* is analyzed in detail. In this study, I will try to show that the use of numerous cited passages corresponds to an intent to answer points of controversy, and that the quotation technique indeed constitutes an “ideological weapon” in Eusebius’ view.

Prior to the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius had written several other apologetic works: *Against Hierocles*, which was composed in response to anti-Christian attacks by Hierocles, prefect of Bithynia, in his Φιλαλήθης;¹⁶ and also the *General Elementary Introduction*. This work¹⁷ originally comprised ten books, of which only five have survived: Books six to nine

¹³ For Eusebius’ work on the biblical text, see E. Ulrich, “The Old Testament Text of Eusebius: The Heritage of Origen”, in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Studia post-biblica 42. Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 543–562.

¹⁴ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 94 and 164.

¹⁵ C. Kannengiesser, “Eusebius of Caesarea Origenist, *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*”, in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Studia post-biblica 42. Leiden: Brill, 1992, p. 446.

¹⁶ See the notes and textual commentary by M. Forrat and É. des Places, *Eusèbe. Contre Hiérocès*. SC 333. Paris: Cerf, 1986.

¹⁷ For a rather detailed treatment of this work, see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 167–174.

make up the *Eclogae propheticae*. These books offer biblical citations which Eusebius then briefly comments on. The purpose of this work was to demonstrate that the prophecies of the Old Testament are fulfilled only in Christ. As we shall see, some quotations from Flavius Josephus are given here as well. The tenth book of the *Introduction*, entitled the *Second Theophany*, discusses the second coming of Christ and rests on New Testament texts. Moreover, Eusebius had also written a *Contra Porphyry* in twenty-five books, which are no longer extant. It is certain that the *Praeparatio*, which makes significant use of material from Porphyry, is partly influenced by it, in some places.

Other Eusebian writings, the apologetic character of which is not as widely recognized, also contain unmistakable apologetic characteristics, such as the *Commentary on Isaiah*¹⁸ or the *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹⁹ The latter work is relevant to our study in that it shares various points of contact with the *Praeparatio evangelica*. While the *Praeparatio* treats 'Christian religious prehistory', the *Historia* deals with Christian history subsequent to its origins. Furthermore, both the *Praeparatio* and the *Historia* are based on nonbiblical witnesses, especially the testimonies of Philo and Flavius Josephus. The interpretation of passages from these authors in the *Apodeixis* inevitably comes through the *Historia*, in which Eusebius provides a meticulous account of his sources, as well as, for the most important of them (including Josephus and Philo), a biography of the authors, a bibliography, and sometimes even their respective sources.²⁰ However, the *Apodeixis* remains Eusebius' apologetic work *par excellence*. Its impact was to be such that it would be targeted by the emperor Julian.²¹ In his study of Julian's *Paideia*, Bouffartigue described it as "l'ouvrage qui passait alors pour la plus moderne et la plus efficace des défenses et illustrations du christianisme".²²

¹⁸ See the excellent study by J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. See also the text edition by J. Ziegler, Eusebius Werke IX. *Der Jesajakommentar*. GCS. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1975.

¹⁹ See A. J. Droge, "The Apologetic Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*", in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 492–509.

²⁰ For Flavius Josephus and Philo, see *HE* III. 9–10; II. 18.

²¹ J. Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*. Collection des études augustinienes. Série Antiquité-133. Paris: Institut d'études augustinienes, 1992, p. 300 and 385–386, has shown that the *Apodeixis* was "la principale force idéologique dont Julien souhaite contrebattre l'influence", even if the *Contra Galileos* cannot be reduced to its refutation.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 300.

Scholars have rightly recognized the continuity between the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*, which really form two parts of one and the same work. These volumes were meant to be read together, by starting with the first and finishing with the second.²³

Eusebius' purpose in the *Apodeixis* is twofold: In the *Praeparatio*, he responds to Greek accusations that Christians have unreasonably abandoned the religion of their ancestors for a barbarian religion. In the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius responds to Jewish accusations that Christians adopted Jewish scriptures yet rejected their laws and their way of life.²⁴ Some scholars have suggested that Porphyry's attack on Christianity was the impetus for composing the *Apodeixis*.²⁵ More precisely, some suggest that Eusebius intended primarily to refute Porphyry's work *Against the Christians*.²⁶ However, this second proposal has been rejected with good reason:²⁷ The *Apodeixis* is not a new *Against Porphyry*, even if Eusebius could reuse some material taken from this work.²⁸

Moreover, the *Praeparatio* attempts to position Christianity in relation to the pagan and Hebraic past, while the *Demonstratio* attempts more specifically to position Christianity in relation to Judaism. From this standpoint, the *Demonstratio evangelica* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*

²³ See *PE* I. 1. 11–12; I. 6. 6; XV. 1. 1–9. Recent studies have emphasized the unity of the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*. See, e.g., Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 182; A. Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives series 3. Boston-Leiden: Brill, 2000, p. 74; J. Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, *Studien zu Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Patristische Texte und Studien 49. Berlin – New York: Mohr Siebeck, 1999, pp. 29–35.

²⁴ *PE* I. 2. 5–8.

²⁵ See, e.g., J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période pré-nicéenne*. Publications de la section de langues et littératures de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'université de Dakar 10. Dakar, 1961, pp. 56–57, 165–166; J. Sirinelli and É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique*. Introduction générale. Livre I. SC 206, pp. 28–32; Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 250.

²⁶ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 174–179; M. Frede, "Eusebius' Apologetic Writings", in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, S. Price, and C. Rowland (Eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, Christians*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 223–250 (pp. 242–243). Beatrice has argued that Porphyry never wrote a work with this title. For more on the subject, see P. Fr. Beatrice, "Le traité de Porphyre contre les Chrétiens: l'état de la question", *Kernos* 4, 1991, pp. 119–138, and art. Porphyrius, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Band 27, Berlin – New York, 1997, pp. 54–59.

²⁷ See Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 165; Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 273–275; P. Fr. Beatrice, "Le traité de Porphyre contre les Chrétiens: l'état de la question", pp. 119–138.

²⁸ Particularly in the *Demonstratio*, as J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929, has tried to show. Yet this argument has been refuted by Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 264.

(since in the *Historia* Eusebius expounds on the history of Christianity itself) are in a way a continuation of the *Praeparatio*.²⁹

Eusebius describes the audience for which the *Apodeixis* was intended in his general introduction: “those who have just arrived from the nations” (τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνων ἄρτι προσιοῦσιν).³⁰ After progressing to “more advanced instruction” (τῶν κρειττόνων)³¹—i.e., after reading the *Praeparatio*—these recent converts are ready for the *Demonstratio*. Yet Eusebius probably also has in mind sympathetic pagans who were curious about Christianity.³² It has also been suggested that the *Demonstratio* was intended to proselytize members of a Jewish audience,³³ but this suggestion has not generally found favour with the scholarly community,³⁴ and rightly so: It is not clear how Jews of the period could have been sufficiently interested in Christianity to read such a work, nor how Eusebius could have expected as much from them. In any case, the targeted audience most likely comprised pagans or pagans recently converted to Christianity, and certainly included ‘intellectuals’ who cherished Greek culture³⁵ and Platonism in particular.³⁶

Following Barnes, we can say that in addition to being an apologetic treatise, the *Apodeixis* probably also served as a Christian handbook for use in debates with pagans and Jews.³⁷ It appears to have been used as such by Theodoret,³⁸ who certainly made good use of

²⁹ Cf. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 136 ff. For a good review of this work, see M. Harl, “L’histoire de l’humanité racontée par un écrivain chrétien au IV^e siècle”, *REG* 75, 1962, pp. 522–531.

³⁰ *PE* I. 1. 12.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² See *DE* I. pr. 8–9, emphasized by Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 178.

³³ Thus M. Simon, *Verus Israel, Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l’empire romain*, Paris: de Boccard, 1964 and E. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur: platonisme et écriture sainte*. Théologie historique 63. Paris: Beauchesne, 1982, p. 123.

³⁴ See, e.g., Sirinelli in J. Sirinelli and É. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique* I. SC 206, p. 36, n. 4.

³⁵ On the connections between Christian apologetics and Greek culture, see G. Dorival, “Apologetique chrétienne et culture grecque”, in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*. Théologie historique 105. Paris: Beauchesne, 1998, pp. 423–466.

³⁶ Thus Frede, “Eusebius’ Apologetic Writings”, p. 250.

³⁷ See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 182.

³⁸ On Theodoret’s use of documents, see J. Bouffartigue, “Le texte de Théodoret et le texte de ses documents, *L’historiographie de l’Église des premiers siècles*”, in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L’historiographie de l’Église des premiers siècles*, Théologie historique 114, Paris: Beauchesne, 2001, pp. 313–327.

the testimonies given by Eusebius. We may also note that, as Mras has shown,³⁹ Eusebius himself divided his work into chapters with titles, which would have facilitated this kind of use. Indeed, we shall see that the *Apodeixis* really constitutes a library in itself, in which Eusebius collected all those texts which seemed most important for the defence of Christianity. At the time, few Christians would have had access to a library as equipped as the one in Caesarea. For this reason, it is easy to imagine the early Christian interest in having a work like the *Apodeixis*.

As for the composition of the *Apodeixis*, one should note the way in which Mras has reconstructed Eusebius' activity: That is, Eusebius would have read aloud selected passages while an assistant wrote these down together with the bishop's comments.⁴⁰

The composition date of the *Apodeixis* is generally situated between 312–314 and 320–322.⁴¹ This dating is based on various internal criteria relating to persecutions and the history of the Church, on an allusion to the imposture of Theotecnos in V. 2. 10 of the *Praeparatio*, or on another to the defeat of Maximin Daia in V. 27. 5 of the same work. According to Sirinelli and des Places, the *Demonstratio* and *Praeparatio* were composed at the same time.⁴²

The *Praeparatio* comprises fifteen books, all of which are extant. This volume attempts to demonstrate that Christians justifiably abandoned paganism for the oracles of the Hebrews (i.e., the Old Testament), and that this choice was made after mature and rational reflection. The title *Praeparatio* corresponds to the role that Eusebius assigns to it: to prepare the reader for the divine philosophy constituted

³⁹ Viger (Th. Gaisford, L. K. Valckenaer, Fr. Viger, *Eusebii Evangelicae Praeparationis libri XV, recensuit T. Gaisford. Accedunt F. Vigeri versio latina et notae*, and L. K. Valckenaerii *Diatribae de Aristobulo*, Oxford: Oxon., 1843) had argued that Eusebius might have made the divisions himself, but Valckenaer (*Ibid.*), Gaisford (*Ibid.*) and Gifford (*Eusebii evangelicae praeparationis libri XV recensuit, Anglice reddidit, notis et indicibus instruxit*, Oxford: Oxon., 1903) have rejected them as inauthentic. Yet Mras (Eusebius Werke VIII. 1, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982²) has proven their authenticity by pointing out that the titles in question sometimes contained information which could not be found in the text.

⁴⁰ K. Mras, Eusebius Werke VIII. 1. GCS, p. lviii.

⁴¹ See E. Schwartz, art. Eusebios 24, *RE* VI, 1, col. 1390; Mras, Eusebius Werke VIII. 1. GCS, p. liv; Sirinelli and Des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* I. SC 206, pp. 8–15.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15.

by the prophecies of the Hebrews, which are discussed in the *Demonstratio*. The *Praeparatio* is primarily composed of excerpts from Greek pagan authors.⁴³ These extracts vary in length, as do Eusebius' comments on them, based on whether he considers them sufficiently explicit for his demonstration, or not.⁴⁴ The bishop intends to undermine the foundations of paganism, and to some extent of Greek philosophy, by turning against the Greeks their own weapons.⁴⁵ Yet there are also various quotations from Christian authors, including Origen,⁴⁶ Methodius of Olympus (whom Eusebius mistakes for Maximus),⁴⁷ Denys of Alexandria,⁴⁸ Bardesanes,⁴⁹ Julius Africanus,⁵⁰ Tatian⁵¹ and Clement of Alexandria.⁵² Greek-speaking Jewish authors are also represented in the *Praeparatio*, and hold a special place that deserves to be examined in detail.

The structure of the *Praeparatio* is as follows:

Books I–III: Introduction. Discussion of the Origins of Paganism.

Critique of Polytheism.

Books IV–VI: Critique of Civic Religion (Oracles) and Fatalism.

Books VII–IX: Theology and History of “Hebrews” and “Jews”.

Book X: The “Theme of Dependence”: Dependence of Greek Philosophy on the Old Testament.

Books XI–XIII: Agreements and Disagreements between Platonism and Christianity.

Books XIV–XV: Disagreements of the Greek Philosophical Schools amongst Themselves and with Hebrew Oracles.

⁴³ On the texts used by Eusebius, see K. Mras, “Die Stellung der *Praeparatio Evangelica* des Eusebius im Antiken Schrifttum”, *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 93, 1956, pp. 209–217.

⁴⁴ E.g., the long quotations from Oenomaus in Book V appear to have required no comment. For a brief discussion of the material used by Eusebius in the *PE*, see K. Mras, “Die Stellung der *Praeparatio Evangelica* des Eusebius im Antiken Schrifttum”, pp. 209–217.

⁴⁵ *PE* V. 5. 5; VI. 9. 32. The same assertion is already found in Tatian, *Or. ad Graec.* 30.

⁴⁶ *PE* VI. 11; VII. 20.

⁴⁷ *PE* VII. 22.

⁴⁸ *PE* VII. 19; XIV. 23–27.

⁴⁹ *PE* VI. 10.

⁵⁰ *PE* X. 10.

⁵¹ *PE* X. 11.

⁵² *PE* II. 3; IX. 6; IX. 28; X. 2; X. 12; XIII. 13.

The *Demonstratio* originally comprised twenty books, though only the first ten and a few fragments of the fifteenth have been preserved. In it Eusebius considers the relationship between Christianity and Judaism and though he denies wanting to polemicize against the Jews, Eusebius tries throughout this work to demonstrate that the Gospel is superior to the Jewish law, which it rendered obsolete.⁵³ The *Demonstratio* also aims to prove that the prophecies of the Old Testament are fulfilled only in Christ. It is hard to ascertain whether Eusebius intended to address a readership of pagans or Jews, or whether the *Demonstratio* belongs rather to that genre of works written *Contra Iudaeos*.⁵⁴ Some scholars maintain that this work is a treatise which responds to accusations made by Jews, with the possible aim of converting them.⁵⁵ Other scholars maintain that the *Demonstratio* reflects a debate with pagans (and Porphyry in particular), who had reappropriated various arguments that Jews had used in debate with Christians.⁵⁶ This conclusion does not prevent them, however, from anchoring this writing in Christian literature written *Contra Iudaeos*. This interpretation is ambiguous since, as Kofsky has shown, Eusebius only offers contradictory statements on the matter.⁵⁷ Perhaps the most plausible hypothesis is that of Kofsky, who suggests that the *Demonstratio* attempts to respond to both Jews and pagans, whether real or rhetorically constructed.⁵⁸

In the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius is generally satisfied with a quote from the biblical text, only giving a brief comment when an explanation seems necessary.⁵⁹ Only a few secular authors are fortunate enough

⁵³ *DE I*. 1. 8.

⁵⁴ On this problem, see A. Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Jewish-Christian Polemic", in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Eds.), *Contra Iudaeos, Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Jews and Christians*. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1996, pp. 59–84.

⁵⁵ Thus A. B. Hulén, "The Dialogues with the Jews as Sources for the Early Jewish Arguments Against Christianity", *JBL* 51, 1932, pp. 58–70; M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, p. 177; des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur*, p. 123.

⁵⁶ Thus Sirinelli and des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique I*. SC 206, pp. 28–34, and D. Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press – Leiden: Brill, 1982, pp. 74–76; Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 178–179.

⁵⁷ As shown by Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Christian-Jewish Polemic", p. 68 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁵⁹ *DE I*. 1. 9.

to be quoted: Porphyry,⁶⁰ Julius Africanus,⁶¹ Apollonius of Tyana,⁶² Philo⁶³ and Flavius Josephus.⁶⁴

The contents of the *Demonstratio* are divided into books as follows:

Books I–II: Introduction. Replacement of Judaism by Christianity.

Old Testament Prediction of the Coming of Christ.

Book III: Incarnation. Prediction of the Incarnation by Old Testament Prophecies.

Books IV–V: Christology of Eusebius.

Book VI: Prophecies concerning the Presence of God on Earth.

Book VII: Human Birth of Christ.

Book VIII: Time of Christ's Appearance on Earth.

Book IX: Earthly Life of Jesus.

Book X: Passion of the Christ.

2. THE JEWISH AUTHORS QUOTED BY EUSEBIUS

In addition to various pagan and Christian authors, Eusebius also quotes many nonbiblical Jewish writers. Some of these authors are quoted directly, assuming that Eusebius is not omitting to mention a mediating source. Other so-called “minor Jewish authors” are quoted indirectly, via Alexander Polyhistor, a polygraph of the first century B.C.E.⁶⁵ Those Jewish writers whom Eusebius quotes directly

⁶⁰ *DE* III. 3. 105a; III. 6. 134a.

⁶¹ *DE* III. 3. 105a; III. 7. 134a.

⁶² *DE* III. 3. 105b.

⁶³ *DE* VIII. 2. 403a.

⁶⁴ *DE* III. 5. 124b–c; VIII. 2. 397d; VIII. 2. 398b; VIII. 2. 402d; IX. 5. 431a.

⁶⁵ For more on Alexander Polyhistor, see *FGrH* 273; E. Schwartz, art. Alexandros, *RE* I, col. 1449–1452. For Alexander's work *On the Jews*, see Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien, Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*, Breslau: Skutsch, 1874–5, I, pp. 16–35; Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes d'ancien Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 1970, pp. 244–248; J. Strugnell, General Introduction With a Note on Alexander Polyhistor, in J. H. Charlesworth (Ed.), *OTP* II, New-York: Doubleday, 1985, pp. 777–778; E. Schurer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, revised edition by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman, Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987, III. 1, pp. 510–513 (henceforth, *HJP*); G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 144–152; L. Troiani, *Due studi di storiografia e religione antiche*. Biblioteca di Athenaeum 10. Como: New Press, 1988; F. W. Walbank, art. Alexander (II) Polyhistor, *OCD*, p. 35. B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974, pp. 44–52.

are Flavius Josephus, Philo of Alexandria, Pseudo-Aristeas and Aristobulus.⁶⁶ While the first two authors need no introduction,⁶⁷ Aristobulus⁶⁸ and Pseudo-Aristeas should be given a brief one.

Aristobulus (175–150 B.C.E.) is supposed to have dedicated an *Explanation of the Divine Laws*⁶⁹ to Ptolemy Philometor.⁷⁰ Clement describes him as a Peripatetic philosopher who sought to prove that Aristotle was dependent on the prophets and Mosaic law.⁷¹ Like Eusebius, Clement identified him with the Aristobulus mentioned in 2 Maccabees.⁷² Though improbable, Anatolius claimed that Aristobulus was one of the translators of the LXX.⁷³ Origen also mentions Aristobulus, and suggests that he lived before Philo.⁷⁴ Despite all these references to Aristobulus, scholars questioned his very existence until Walter proved it definitively. The evidence we do have suggests that Aristobulus was an apologist who endeavoured to show that the Scriptures both agree with and are the source of Greek thought. He also tried to show that the teaching of the Pentateuch is the true philosophy.⁷⁵ Yet it is perhaps exaggerated to describe Aristobulus as the predecessor of Philo, as is sometimes done. Aristobulus' allegories have neither the length nor scope of Philo's allegories.⁷⁶

The pseudepigraphic *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas to Philocrates* is an apologetic writing dating from the beginning of the second century B.C.E.⁷⁷

⁶⁶ For secondary literature on and editions of these authors, see the next section: *Status Quaestionis*.

⁶⁷ For a biography of Flavius Josephus, see T. Rajak, *Josephus, The Historian and His Society*, London: Duckworth, 1984; M. Hadas-Lebel, *Flavius Josephus*, Paris: Fayard, 1989; and for Philo, see S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: an Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

⁶⁸ On Aristobulus, see N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos, Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*, TU 86. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964 and C. Holladay, *Fragments from Jewish Hellenistic Authors, vol. III: Aristobulus*. SBL Texts and Translations 39. Pseudepigrapha Series 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996. See also D. Winston, "Aristobulus: From Walter to Holladay, Holladay's Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors, Volume III: Aristobulus", *SPhA* 8, 1996, pp. 155–166.

⁶⁹ *PE* VII. 13. 7; VIII. 9. 38.

⁷⁰ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I. 150. 1.

⁷¹ *Str.* I. 72. 4; V. 97. 7.

⁷² *Str.* V. 97. 7; *PE* VIII. 9. 38.

⁷³ Cited in *HE* VII. 32. 16.

⁷⁴ Origen, *CC* IV. 51.

⁷⁵ Cf. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, London: SCM Press, 1974, p. 164 ff.

⁷⁶ Cf. G. R. Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy, A Study of Its Development from the Stoics to Origen*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 83 ff.

⁷⁷ On this text, see the new study by S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homer*

The author introduces himself as a Greek officer of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, one who participated in the task of providing the famous Alexandrian library with a translation of the law of Moses. That is, the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* tells the story of how the LXX was produced. Yet unlike other Jewish writings cited in the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius regards the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* as a pagan document, accepting the author's self-proclaimed identity.

As for those authors quoted by Alexander Polyhistor,⁷⁸ most of them lived between the third century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. It is difficult to gauge any more than approximate dates for most of these writers; a *terminus post quem* is set by their familiarity with the LXX and a *terminus ante quem* by Alexander Polyhistor himself. Very little is known about these authors. It is generally assumed that they were natives of Egypt or Palestine. In some cases, it is difficult to determine whether they were Jews or Samaritans. At any rate, their writings are generally characterized by an attempt to rewrite various biblical episodes in Greek literary genres (tragedy, epic poetry, novel).

According to Clement of Alexandria,⁷⁹ Demetrius the chronographer⁸⁰ authored a work entitled *On the Kings of Judea*. He most likely lived in Ptolemaic territory during or after the last quarter of the third century B.C.E. His work seems to have consisted of a chronology of biblical history. Clement⁸¹ remarks that Eupolemus⁸² (who is thought to have lived in second-century Palestine B.C.E.) also wrote a book called *On the Kings of Judea*. This work is an attempt to extol the heroes and history of Israel. In those parts preserved by Eusebius, Eupolemus discusses Solomon, Moses and various chronological problems. Artapanus' *Judaica*,⁸³ or *On the Jews*,⁸⁴ was composed between

Scholarship in Alexandria. A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas, London-New York: Routledge, 2003.

⁷⁸ For the bibliography, see below, "Status Quaestionis".

⁷⁹ *Str.* I. 141. 1.

⁸⁰ See M. Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 513–516.

⁸¹ *Str.* I. 153. 4.

⁸² See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 517–520. See also U. Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit VI/1*. Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2000, pp. 174–184.

⁸³ *PE* IX. 18. 1. On Artapanus, see Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 521–524 and Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen*, pp. 191–195.

⁸⁴ *Str.* I. 154. 2–3 and *PE* IX. 27. 1; IX. 23. 1.

the mid-third century and second century B.C.E. This work is an example of the "historical novel". More than any other author considered here, Artapanus mixes pagan mythological traditions with biblical traditions. Like Eupolemus, Artapanus tried to glorify the Jewish people by rewriting the stories of Abraham, Joseph and Moses. Aristéas⁸⁵ condensed the tale of Job, whom he identifies with Jobab, the great-grandson of Esau. Ezekiel the Tragedian⁸⁶ composed a tragedy retelling the story of Moses. Both authors appear to be quite faithful to the biblical narrative.⁸⁷ Theodotus,⁸⁸ who may have been Samaritan, wrote an epic featuring Jacob. Pseudo-Eupolemus⁸⁹ may also have been Samaritan. In those fragments preserved by Eusebius, Pseudo-Eupolemus focuses on the figure of Abraham, whom he incorporates into myths of Babylonian, Greek and Jewish origin. The background of Theophilus is unclear:⁹⁰ He could well have been Samaritan or pagan rather than Jewish. In a short excerpt, Theophilus deals with Solomon and the king of Tyre. In the *Praeparatio* Eusebius also preserves, via Alexander Polyhistor, twenty-four hexameters of Philo the Poet.⁹¹ It is not clear whether this Philo should be identified with Philo the elder,⁹² mentioned by Josephus,⁹³ or with the historian Philo, mentioned by Clement.⁹⁴ The Philo quoted by Eusebius touches on the figures of Abraham and Joseph, as well as on the city of Jerusalem. His work appears to have been entitled *On Jerusalem*.⁹⁵

⁸⁵ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, p. 525. This Aristéas should not be confused with Pseudo-Aristéas, who authored the well-known *Letter to Philocrates*.

⁸⁶ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 563–566.

⁸⁷ Excepting Ezekiel's dream of the divine throne. For more on this subject, see C. R. Holladay, "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian", *SBL Seminar Papers* 10, 1976, pp. 447–452; P. W. Van Der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist", in P. W. Van Der Horst (Ed.), *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*, Freiburg – Göttingen, 1990, pp. 63–71.

⁸⁸ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III.1, pp. 561–562.

⁸⁹ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 528–530. B. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus', Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham", *HUCA* 34, 1963, pp. 83–113. See also Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen*, pp. 196–201.

⁹⁰ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, p. 556. See also U. Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen*, pp. 185–186.

⁹¹ See Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 559–560.

⁹² See Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen*, pp. 187–188.

⁹³ Josephus, *CA* I. 218.

⁹⁴ *Str.* I. 141. 3. On this problem and the relevant bibliography, see Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, II, pp. 1192–1193.

⁹⁵ See *PE* IX. 20. 1; 24. 1; 37. 1.

3. *STATUS QUAESTIONIS*

There is an abundance of secondary literature on Greek-language Jewish writings, and there are numerous critical editions of these texts.⁹⁶ Even more extensive is the secondary literature on authors such as Philo of Alexandria,⁹⁷ Flavius Josephus⁹⁸ and Pseudo-Aristeas.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Note the following studies and editions (in addition to those already cited): C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit*, 4 vols., Paris: Ambrosio Firmin-Didot, 1841–1872; J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, II; K. Kuiper, “Le poète juif Ezéchiel”, *REJ* 46, 1903, pp. 48–73, 161–177; P. Dalbert, *Die Theologie der Hellenistisch-Jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus*, Hamburg: Reich, 1954; A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicum et auctorum Iudaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis*, Leiden: Brill, 1970; —, *Introduction aux pseudepigraphes d’Ancien Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 1970; —, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, I–II, Turnhout: Brepols, 2000; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1972, I, pp. 687–716; G. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981; R. Doran, “The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus”, *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 258–263; N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos, Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur*; —, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten*. JSHRZ 3. 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975; —, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker*. JSHRZ 1. 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976; —, “Jüdisch-hellenistischer Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien”, *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 68–120; —, “Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period”, *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol. II: *The Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 385–408; Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*, H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Ediderunt Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Peter Parsons, indices in hoc supplementum necnon in Powellii Collectaneae Alexandrina confecit H.-G. Nesselrath. Texte und Kommentare 11. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983; J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*; L. Bombelli, *I frammenti degli storici giudaico-ellenistici*. Pubblicazioni del D. AR. FLI. CL. ET. 103. Roma: Università di Genova, 1986; C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 4 vols., Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983–1996; H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983; H. W. Attridge, “Historiography”, in M. Stone (Ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. 2. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984, pp. 157–84; Schürer, *HJP* (especially vol. III. 1, revised by M. Goodman); Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*; E. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998; J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans, 2000.

⁹⁷ Only a few major studies can be mentioned here. See H. A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 2 vols., Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1968; S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*; D. T. Runia and R. Radice, *Philo of Alexandria. An Annotated Bibliography, 1937–1986*. SVigChris 8. Leiden: Brill, 1988 and *Philo of Alexandria. An Annotated Bibliography, 1987–1996*. SVigChris 57. Leiden: Brill, 2000. See also the various volumes of *SPhA*, edited by D. T. Runia and G. Sterling.

⁹⁸ For Flavius Josephus, see H. Schreckenberg, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*,

Virtually all these studies concentrate on the content of these writings, which are examined in their own right. However, we possess only fragments of many such Jewish writings, and even these are only known to us through other authors. This is the case with “minor Jewish authors” including Artapanus, Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, Ezekiel the Tragedian, Philo the Poet, Aristobulus and many others. As mentioned above, Eusebius also mediates the works of many of these authors, though these fragments have seldom been studied in light of the literary, philosophical, or theological context¹⁰⁰ into which Eusebius incorporated them. However, in the case of this fragmentary Jewish literature, much of which was only preserved by Eusebius, investigation of the context is particularly essential. Taking the example of quotations in Herodotus, Lenfant¹⁰¹ has shown that one must assess the value of an excerpt by knowing the uses and methods of the author or authors who reproduced it. Thus it is especially important to consider quotations from minor Jewish authors in Book IX of the *Praeparatio*, as well as quotations from Aristobulus and Philo

Leiden: Brill, 1968; —, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus, Supplementband mit Gesamtregister*, Leiden: Brill, 1979; L. H. Feldman, “Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings and His Significance”, *ANRW* II. 21. 2, 1984, pp. 763–862; —, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984; —, *Josephus, a Supplementary Bibliography*, New York: De Gruyter, 1986; L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987; —, *Josephus, the Bible and History*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989; L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison (Eds.), *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 34. Leiden: Brill, 1996. There is now a new translation of the *Antiquities* and *Life* of Josephus: L. H. Feldman, *Josephus. Judean Antiquities* 1–4, Gen. ed. S. Mason, Transl. and Comm. by L. H. Feldman, Leiden: Brill, 2000; S. Mason, *Life of Josephus*, Transl. and Comm. by S. Mason, Leiden: Brill, 2001.

⁹⁹ For Pseudo-Aristeas, see A. Pelletier, *La lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89. Paris: Cerf, 1962; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I, p. 696 ff.; Goodman in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 1, pp. 677–687; M. Harl, G. Dorival, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante, du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Initiations au christianisme ancien. Paris: Cerf, 1988, pp. 39–81. A. M. Denis provides an exhaustive bibliography in his *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, II, pp. 911–946; S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria, A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas*.

¹⁰⁰ In Eusebius’ day, theology and philosophy could hardly be distinguished from one another. See A.-M. Malingrey, *Philosophia. Étude d’un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des Présocratiques au V^e siècle après J.-C.*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1961, p. 194: Sometimes Eusebius uses *θεολογία* when *φιλοσοφία* would be expected.

¹⁰¹ D. Lenfant, “Peut-on se fier aux ‘fragments’ d’historiens?, L’exemple des citations d’Hérodote”, *Ktema* 24, 1999, pp. 103–122.

(such as the Philonic material drawn from the lost *Hypothetica*, or from *De providentia*, which is only preserved in Armenian).

Other modern studies have examined the Christian reception and preservation of certain authors, including Josephus and Philo. But these studies focus on how various Christian authors used the writings of one particular author. Well-known monographs have been written by Runia and Schreckenberg on Philo and Josephus, respectively.¹⁰² Contrary to the aim of the present study, these monographs do not consider the reception of an entire corpus of Jewish authors in a specific writer, and they take little account of Eusebius' *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio evangelica*. Runia acknowledges that "Eusebius' attitude to Philo as a source of philosophical and theological material . . . has not been adequately investigated"¹⁰³ but the large topic he deals with keeps him from filling this gap. Schreckenberg concentrates on the reception of Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* in Origen and Eusebius, but neglects excerpts from the *Contra Apionem* and *Antiquitates* found in the *Praeparatio*. Such criticisms do not apply to Hardwick's study, which touches on every excerpt from Josephus' works present in the Eusebian corpus. While Hardwick's monograph serves as a helpful overview of how material from Josephus was used in early Christian literature, including Eusebius, it may be criticized for being on occasion too descriptive.

Ulrich¹⁰⁴ is the only scholar who has applied to part of his own work a method similar to the one employed in the present study: He has investigated Eusebius' use of materials from Josephus and Philo. Yet Ulrich's analysis constitutes only a brief excursus from his main discussion. Far more attention is given to Eusebius' Christian

¹⁰² D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*;—, *Philo and the Church Fathers. A Collection of Papers*. SVigChris 32. Leiden: Brill, 1995; H. Schreckenberg, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church", in G. Hata and L. H. Feldman (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 315–324;—, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*, Leiden: Brill, 1972;—, "Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines 'Bellum Iudaicum'", *ANRW* II. 21. 2, 1984, pp. 1106–1217; M. E. Hardwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989;—, "Contra Apionem and Christian Apologetics", in L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison (Eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, pp. 369–402. On the *Nachleben* of Josephus, see also E. M. Sanford, "Propaganda and Censorship in the Transmission of Josephus", *TPAPhA* 66, 1935, pp. 127–145.

¹⁰³ Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 223. There are only two pages dealing with Philo's influence on Eusebius in Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, pp. 150–151.

¹⁰⁴ Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, pp. 88–110.

reading of the *Bellum Iudaicum* and *De vita contemplativa* in the *Ecclesiastical History*, which is more important for his exposition than Eusebius' theological and apologetic use of Philo, Josephus and other authors in the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*. When fragments or excerpts from works by Jewish authors are taken into account, Ulrich still neglects the context into which Eusebius introduced them.

This brief review of the *status quaestionis* shows that scholars have given little attention to how Eusebius used quotations in his apologetic works. Of course, the *Historia ecclesiastica* has always been privileged in this respect. Because of its extensive use of historical documents, specialists, following the great historian Momigliano, have taken the *Historia* as inaugurating a modern method of writing history.¹⁰⁵ But the *Apodeixis*, and especially the *Praeparatio*, have not been so privileged. Although many scholars have recognized the importance of these works as sources for fragments of various Jewish authors, few have tried to explain the very practice of quotation itself, or to understand how and why Eusebius made use of some authors more than others. If anything, scholars have generally confined their investigations to examining how literal Eusebius was in his citations.¹⁰⁶ In the present study, I will attempt rather to examine Eusebius' work in its own right.

4. PRESENTATION OF THE MATERIAL

Before proceeding with our analysis of the Jewish quotations in the *Apodeixis*, it should prove helpful to briefly delineate the material covered in this study, and to provide a chart locating the passages that Eusebius handles in his work, with references, when available, to works of the Jewish authors as well.

¹⁰⁵ A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century AD", in A. Momigliano (Ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 79–99; see also D. Gonnet, "L'art de citer dans l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe", in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 181–194; D. Mendels, "The Sources of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius: The Case of Josephus", in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 195–206; B. Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources", *StPat* 4, 1961, pp. 429–441.

¹⁰⁶ E.g., G. Bounoure, "Eusèbe citeur de Diodore", *REG* 95, 1982, pp. 433–439.

Quotations from Jewish authors are found in Books VII, VIII, IX, X, XI and XIII of the *Praeparatio*, and in Books III, VI, VIII and IX of the *Demonstratio*. The first quotations offered are those of Philo and Aristobulus the philosopher, and address the problem of the “second cause” (*PE* VII.13–14). The same topic is resumed in Book XI, and Philo is again cited on this subject.

Other quotations from Philo are offered in Book VII of the *Praeparatio*. One of these illustrates the theme of the creation of humankind in God’s image (*PE* VII. 18), while another illustrates the problem of the creation of matter (*PE* VII. 21).

Book VIII of the *Praeparatio* only contains quotations from Jewish authors. These can be grouped by subject. Chapters 6 to 8 discuss Mosaic law with passages from Philo and Josephus. Chapters 9 and 10 consider how the Law is interpreted allegorically by Jews, through Aristobulus’ and Pseudo-Aristeas’ testimonies. In chapters 11 and 12, Eusebius offers Philo’s account of the Essenes. The same topic is resumed in the third chapter of Book IX, this time by way of Porphyry, who himself relied on Josephus. Chapter 13 of book VIII of the *Praeparatio* is on Philo’s treatment of the world’s creation. Eusebius again cites Philo when the same subject is taken up again in XI.24. In the last chapter of Book VIII, material from Philo again finds a place when Eusebius discusses divine providence among the Jews.

Book IX of the *Praeparatio* deals with the knowledge that Greeks had of “Hebrews”, “Jews” and their history. The cited texts are from Josephus, the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* and the so-called ‘minor’ Jewish authors quoted by Alexander Polyhistor.

Eusebius cites Josephus in *PE* X.7 in order to illustrate how the Greeks were dependent on “barbarians”. Josephus is again made use of in *PE* X.13 to prove the greater antiquity of the Jewish tradition.

Lastly, in Book XIII of the *Praeparatio*, Philo’s prose is used by Eusebius in his criticism of astrolatry. Aristobulus’ testimony is cited to demonstrate Plato’s dependence on the Hebrew tradition (XIII.11).

As for the *Demonstratio*, the important and well-known *Testimonium Flavianum* may be found within the fifth chapter of Book III.

The eighteenth chapter of Book VI contains material from Josephus’ *Antiquities*. When commenting on the prophecy of Zechariah 14:1–10, Eusebius construes it as predicting the end of Judaism and the destruction of Jerusalem. In Zechariah 14:5, there is mention of an earthquake in the days of Uzziah. Eusebius maintains that he could not

find reference to an earthquake in the book of Kings,¹⁰⁷ in which he discovered only that Uzziah suffered from leprosy after being faithless and claiming for himself the sacerdotal privilege of offering sacrifices.¹⁰⁸ Eusebius subsequently adds the testimony of Josephus' *Antiquities*, which connects this event with the earthquake.

Several other quotations from Flavius Josephus appear in the second chapter of Book VIII, in which the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem and its institutions are understood to be signs of the replacement of Judaism by Christianity. The testimony of Philo is added to that of Josephus in support of the latter's account.

Finally, in the fifth chapter of Book IX, Eusebius again quotes Josephus, this time for a testimony concerning John the Baptist.

The following chart provides references for the Jewish authors quoted by Eusebius. These are grouped according to their order of appearance in the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*. This should facilitate the location of passages in the original works and in the *Apodeixis*.

Original Texts of Jewish Authors	Citations of Jewish Authors in the <i>Apodeixis</i>
– Philo, <i>Quaestiones et solutiones</i> II. 62	– <i>PE</i> VII. 13. 1–2
– Philo, <i>De agricultura</i> 51	– <i>PE</i> VII. 13. 3
– Philo, <i>De plantatione</i> 8–10	– <i>PE</i> VII. 13. 4–6
– Aristobulus fr. 5 ^e Holladay	– <i>PE</i> VII. 14. 1
– Philo, <i>De plantatione</i> 18–20	– <i>PE</i> VII. 18. 1–2
– Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 50–51	– <i>PE</i> VII. 21. 1–4
– <i>Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas</i> 9–11	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 2. 1–5
– <i>Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas</i> 28–46	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 2. 5–VIII. 5. 5
– <i>Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas</i> 310–317	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 5. 6–10
– Philo, <i>Hypothetica</i> I (Colson IX, pp. 414–437)	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 6. 1–VIII. 7. 20
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> II. 163–228	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 8. 1–55
– <i>Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas</i> 128–171	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 9. 1–37
– Aristobulus fr. 2 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 10. 1–17
– Philo, <i>Hypothetica</i> II (Colson IX, pp. 437–443)	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 11. 1–18
– Philo, <i>Probus</i> 75–91	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 12. 1–19
– Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 7–12	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 13. 1–6
– Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 3 (Hadas-Lebel)	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 14. 1
– Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 15–33 (Hadas-Lebel)	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 14. 2–42

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 2 Kings 15:5.

¹⁰⁸ This episode is not in Kings, but in 2 Chronicles 26:18.

(cont.)

Original Texts of Jewish Authors	Citations of Jewish Authors in the <i>Apodeixis</i>
– Philo, <i>De providentia</i> II. 99–112 (Hadas-Lebel)	– <i>PE</i> VIII. 14. 43–72
– Josephus, <i>Bη</i> II. 119–159 (= Porphyry, <i>De abst.</i> IV. 11–13)	– <i>PE</i> IX. 3. 1–21
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 197–204 (= Pseudo-Hecataeus <i>FGrH</i> 264 F 21)	– <i>PE</i> IX. 4. 2–9
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 176–181 (= Clearchus fr. 5 Wehrli)	– <i>PE</i> IX. 5. 1–7
– Aristobulus fr. 3a ¹ Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 6. 6–8
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 172–174 (= Choerilus <i>FGrH</i> 696 F 34e)	– <i>PE</i> IX. 9. 1–2
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 93–95	– <i>PE</i> IX. 11. 1–4
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 105–108	– <i>PE</i> IX. 13. 2–5
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 117–120	– <i>PE</i> IX. 14. 3–IX. 15
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 158–161	– <i>PE</i> IX. 16. 2–5
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 165–168	– <i>PE</i> IX. 16. 6–8
– Via Alexander Polyhistor, <i>On the Jews</i> (<i>FGrH</i> 273 F 19a)	
– Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 17. 2–9
– Artapanus fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 18. 1–2
– Philo the Poet fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 20. 1
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> I. 239–241	– <i>PE</i> IX. 20. 2–4
– Via Alexander Polyhistor, <i>On the Jews</i> (<i>FGrH</i> 273 F 19a)	
– Demetrius fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 21. 1–19
– Theodotus fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 22. 1–11
– Artapanus fr. 2 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 23. 1–4
– Philo the Poet fr. 2 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 24. 1
– Aristeas fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 25. 1–4
– Eupolemus fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 26. 1
– Artapanus fr. 3 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 27. 1–37
– Ezekiel fr. 1–5 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 28. 1–4
– Demetrius fr. 2 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 29. 1–3
– Ezekiel fr. 6–17 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 29. 4–16
– Eupolemus fr. 2 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 30. 1–IX. 34. 18
– Theophilus fr. 1 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 34. 19
– Eupolemus fr. 3 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 34. 20
– Philo the Poet fr. 3 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 37. 1–3
– <i>Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas</i> 88–90	– <i>PE</i> IX. 38. 2–3
– Via Alexander Polyhistor, <i>On the Jews</i> (<i>FGrH</i> 273 F 19)	
– Eupolemus fr. 4 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> IX. 39. 2–4
– Josephus, <i>Aη</i> X. 221–222 = <i>CA</i> I. 136–137	– <i>PE</i> IX. 40. 1–2
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 146–154	– <i>PE</i> IX. 40. 3–11
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 215–218	– <i>PE</i> IX. 42. 2–3
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 6–26	– <i>PE</i> X. 7. 1–21
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 73–75	– <i>PE</i> X. 13. 1–2

(cont.)

Original Texts of Jewish Authors	Citations of Jewish Authors in the <i>Apodeixis</i>
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 82–90	– <i>PE</i> X. 13. 3–10
– Josephus, <i>CA</i> I. 103–104	– <i>PE</i> X. 13. 11–12
– Philo, <i>De confusione linguarum</i> 97	– <i>PE</i> XI. 15. 1
– Philo, <i>De confusione linguarum</i> 146–147	– <i>PE</i> XI. 15. 2–4
– Philo, <i>De confusione linguarum</i> 62–63	– <i>PE</i> XI. 15. 5–6
– Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 24–27	– <i>PE</i> XI. 24. 1–6
– Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 29–31	– <i>PE</i> XI. 24. 7–10
– Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i> 35–36	– <i>PE</i> XI. 24. 11–12
– Aristobulus fr. 3 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> XIII. 12. 1–2
– Aristobulus fr. 4 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> XIII. 12. 3–8
– Aristobulus fr. 5 Holladay	– <i>PE</i> XIII. 12. 9–16
– Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus</i> I. 13–17	– <i>PE</i> XIII. 18. 12–15
– Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus</i> I. 20	– <i>PE</i> XIII. 18. 16
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 63–64	– <i>DE</i> III. 5. 124 b–c = <i>HE</i> I. 11. 7–8; <i>Theoph.</i> V. 44
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> IX. 224–225	– <i>DE</i> VI. 18. 291 b–c
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XX. 247–249	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 397d–398a = <i>Ecl. proph.</i> 160. 7–21; <i>HE</i> I. 6. 9
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 92–93	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 398b = <i>Ecl. proph.</i> 160. 25–161; <i>HE</i> I. 6. 10
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 34–35	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 399a = <i>HE</i> I. 10. 4–5
– Josephus, <i>BJ</i> VI. 299	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 402d = <i>HE</i> III. 8. 6; <i>Ecl.</i> <i>proph.</i> 164. 2–6; <i>Chron.</i> p. 175 Helm.
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 55; <i>BJ</i> II. 169	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 402d–403a = <i>Chron.</i> p. 175 Helm
– Philo, <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i> 299	– <i>DE</i> VIII. 2. 403a = <i>HE</i> II. 6. 4
– Josephus, <i>AJ</i> XVIII. 116–117	– <i>DE</i> IX. 5. 431a = <i>HE</i> I. 11. 4

CHAPTER TWO

THE CITATION PROCESS IN GREEK ANTIQUITY AND IN THE *APODEIXIS*

Analysing the citation process requires that we define the concept of ‘citation’ as used in antiquity. This task proves to be a complicated one since, to the best of my knowledge, no comprehensive study on the subject has yet been published. Therefore, I will have to use studies focusing on different authors from different periods.

1. THE CITATION PROCESS IN ANTIQUITY

Ancient authors mostly use the terms μαρτυρέω, παρατίθημι and their cognates in order to designate the citation process in Greek. The concept of “citation”, e.g., is often designated by the terms παράθεσις or μαρτυρία in Diogenes Laertius.¹ According to him, Epicurus’ works, which are ‘citationless’, are said to be ἀπαράθητα.²

However, as I have pointed out, the citation technique does not seem to appear in ancient literary theory: Neither Aristotle, nor Longinus, nor Demetrius (who wrote *On Style*) deal with this question. This omission may be explained, as Young has suggested,³ by the connection made in antiquity between citation and intertextuality. According to Young, only Quintilian mentions the use of citations and allusions. She emphasizes, however, that the passage seems to indicate that the rhetor encourages the imitation of great authors rather than the use of citations and allusions.⁴ Nevertheless, she notes that citations are not only used as ornaments, but that they also confer authority on the arguments which they support.⁵

¹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, VII. 180–181.

² *Ibid.* VII. 181.

³ Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, p. 100 ff. and Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 95–96.

⁴ Quintilian, *Inst. or.* I. 8. 10–12 and II. 7. 3–4, commented upon by Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, pp. 100–101.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Compagnon claims that that which he calls “la préhistoire de la citation”, in the modern sense of this term, starts with Plato. According to him, citations constitute a form of repetition that is critically approached by Plato through the concepts of *mimesis* and *phantasma*.⁶ Direct speech used in literature, especially in Homer, would be a condemnable form of *mimesis*, morally reprehensible in that it is the imitation of an imitation. According to Compagnon, direct speech would only be acceptable in the form of an *anamnesis*. This is why in the Socratic dialogues (in which, paradoxically, direct speech keeps being used), literary citations are presented as a recollection of Socrates’ interlocutor, who is invited by Socrates to retell one or other Homeric passage.⁷ In Plato’s view, any other form of citation would be a simulacrum. Therefore, the concept of truth proves to be central to Plato’s understanding of the notion of citation.

Compagnon continues his analysis by dealing with the concepts of *gnômè* in Aristotle and that of *sententia* in Quintilian. According to him, aphorisms also constitute a particular form of citation.⁸ For Aristotle, *gnômè* is a redundancy that is integrated at the end of a speech or part of a speech in order to repeat or reinforce an argument.⁹ Aristotle also mentions the “testimony” (μαρτυρία) as well as the “witnesses”¹⁰ (μάρτυρες) but he only does so in a legal context.

It is also worth noting that Compagnon draws a distinction, in ancient thought, between “citation de pensée” and “citation de discours”.¹¹ However, it is not relevant for the study of the *Apodeixis* in which only the “citation de discours” is taken into account.

Let us now turn to the manner in which citations are selected, preserved, marked, used and appropriated in the Greek world.

A. The Cutting of Citations

The methodology in the cutting of citations (i.e., the way in which authors cut texts from a practical perspective) may provide us with information about the use of citations in antiquity.

⁶ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 101–127.

⁷ See, e.g., *Rep.* III. 392d–393a and *Ion* 536e–537a.

⁸ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 127–146.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁰ *Rhet.*, 1375 b.

¹¹ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 121–125; 147 ff. This distinction is found, according to the latter, in Plato’s writings, in which they are defined as *anamnèsis* and *mimèsis*.

Basing himself on the studies of Skydsgaard and Münzer,¹² Mejer¹³ in his study on Diogenes Laertius has emphasized that the ancient authors excerpted citations while reading in order to make for themselves a collection of notes called *hypomnemata*.¹⁴ The use of papyrus rolls made it difficult to read and copy passages simultaneously. Therefore, the authors read aloud a passage while a slave copied it, or vice-versa.¹⁵ These excerpts were then transcribed on *volumina* made of papyrus or on *pugillares*. According to Skydsgaard, “when a scholar had selected a subject for study, he would begin—just like today—by reading a fairly up-to-date standard work which he would excerpt. Then he would read other works, of earlier, as well as of more recent, origin; but gradually, as his reading proceeded, he would excerpt less and less, only making notes of what was new or different in the work studied”.¹⁶

In antiquity, writers also used florilegia and gnomological collections. In addition, as Zeegers-Van der Vorst has shown for Athenagoras,¹⁷ they sometimes excerpted passages from philosophical and moral treatises full of poetic citations. These provided them not only with citations, but also, in some cases, with new interpretations.

B. ‘Discriminating’ Citations

The techniques of discrimination of the citations in antiquity raise important questions for modern scholars. Indeed, the different typographic and linguistic markers we use in order to indicate we are citing someone else are not the same as those used in the ancient world. Therefore, it is necessary to raise the question as to how these writers indicated that they were quoting a passage.

First of all, they could choose whether or not they wished to mark the use of a citation. The omission of quotation marks (in the literal sense of this expression) is mostly observed with regard to poetic

¹² E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar*, Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 4. Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1968 and F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1897.

¹³ J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, Hermes 40. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1978, pp. 16–29.

¹⁴ On the *hypomnemata*, see the second chapter of T. Dorandi, *Le stylet et la tablette: dans le secret des auteurs antiques*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000.

¹⁵ On this point, see the interesting passage from Pliny: *Epist.* III. 5.

¹⁶ Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar*, p. 105.

¹⁷ Zeegers-Van Der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, pp. 306–307.

citations. As Labarbe and Stanley have pointed out,¹⁸ some writers do not indicate they are quoting poetry because the rhythm, language and, in some cases, the content of the verses were sufficient to identify the quotation. This is all the more so for Homeric passages which educated people often knew by heart. As for prose writings, it has been pointed out that most neo-Platonists did not mention the origin of the material they reproduced, thereby failing to mark that a citation was given.¹⁹

When quotations were indicated, as is the case today, typographic markers were sometimes used. As early as the Ptolemaic era, signs were put in the margins of the text in the Greek manuscripts on papyrus.²⁰ In other cases, a break in justification on either the right or left side of the text indicated that a citation was given.²¹ In the sixth century, scribes used indentation, different inks or different fonts in order to mark citations. This may be observed, e.g., in a manuscript of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*.²²

Linguistic markers also existed, for which two main methods were used. On the one hand, authors could resort to formulas. For instance, the use of a *verbum loquendi*, as found in Plato: "the poet says" (φησὶν ὁ ποιητής), "[the verses] in which he says" (ἐν οἷς φησὶν), "[as] Homer says" ([ὡς] ἔφη Ὅμηρος), or different grammatical constructions depending on the verb λέγω.²³ In addition, authors could also use adjectives, pronouns or adverbs, such as ὁδί or οὕτως. The citation is sometimes nominalized: "the citation of Homer" (τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου).²⁴ On the other hand, writers could introduce a citation in a more cre-

¹⁸ J. Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres, 1949, pp. 40–41 on Plato's *Crito* 44b; *Symposium* 214b etc. and C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture; Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 274.

¹⁹ H. J. Blumenthal, "Plotinus in Later Platonism", in H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus et al. (Eds.), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought*, London: Variorum, 1981, p. 213.

²⁰ See E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Bulletin Suppl. 46. London: University of London. Institute of Classical Studies, 1987, p. 15, n. 76.

²¹ See E. M. Thomson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912, p. 63. Many thanks to Professor Alain Martin for these references.

²² P. Mc Gurk, "Citation Marks in Early Latin Manuscripts", *Scriptorium* 15, 1961, pp. 3–13.

²³ On citations from Homer in Plato, see Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, pp. 39–40, and for a general discussion on this subject, see Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, pp. 273–274.

²⁴ Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, p. 40.

ative way. It could be either remarkably sophisticated²⁵ or extremely simple: As we have seen, some of them did not even take pains to mark the citations and readers were expected to notice them spontaneously.

C. *The Use of Citations*

Greek-language writers, whether Jewish, Christian or pagan, exploited citations in different ways, which may be classified according to the importance of the citations in the different works.

First of all, a whole work could be built on citations. They became the main structure of the work, the author organizing his thoughts around this matrix. This is the case, e.g., with Heraclitus' *Homeric Allegories*²⁶ or Plutarch's *De E apud Delphos*.²⁷

Yet quotations could only be used as examples, supporting the progress of the writer's reasoning. This is the case with Plato's *Ion*,²⁸ in which Homeric citations contribute to the definition of different τέχναι.²⁹ This also occurs in Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, about which Pordomingo has emphasized that "les citations accomplissent une fonction logique d'autorité et d'argumentation"³⁰ This kind of use is by far the most common.

The excerpts may be used in a positive, negative or neutral perspective. Pseudo-Longinus, e.g., exploits Homer in a positive manner by using quotations as examples of the sublime.³¹ On the contrary,

²⁵ This is generally the case with Plutarch. His care in introducing citations has even served as a criterion to deny the authenticity of the *Consolation to Apollonios* because in this work the citations are arranged in a messy way. On this point, see J. Hani, *Plutarque. Consolation à Apollonios. Études et commentaires* 78. Paris: Klincksieck, 1972, p. 35 ff. and Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 287 ff. On the Christian side, Zeegers-Van der Vorst has shown Theophilus of Antioch's carelessness in introducing citations (Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, pp. 303–307).

²⁶ See Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 281 ff.

²⁷ As J. Boulogne has shown in J. Boulogne, "Le jeu des citations", in J. Boulogne, M. Broze and L. Couloubaritsis: *Les moyens platonistes I. Le De E de Plutarque*, Bruxelles: Ousia (Forthcoming).

²⁸ See Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, pp. 88–136.

²⁹ *Ion* 538c–539d.

³⁰ Fr. Pordomingo, "Les citations poétiques du *De Iside et Osiride*: leur fonction dans le traité", in L. Van der Stock (Ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch, Acta of the IVth International Congress of the International Plutarch Society, Leuven, July 3–6, 1996*. Collection d'études classiques 11. Leuven: Peeters – Namur: Société des Études Classiques, 2000, p. 371.

³¹ See, e.g., *On the Sublime*, IX. 5.

Aristotle uses Herodotus negatively, citing him in order to demonstrate his errors.³² Finally, in the *Ion*, Plato quotes passages from Homer in a neutral way: They are not used on their own terms but only to support Socrates' arguments on another subject.³³

It is worth noting that citations are often used as ornaments without—apparently—having any specific function in the text. However, as Zeegers-Van der Vorst has pointed out in her work on poetic citations in Christian apologies, this kind of use actually enables the author to establish a cultural complicity with the reader.³⁴ This is remindful of Morawski's definition of one of the functions of citation as the "preservation of cultural continuity".³⁵

It should also be noted that the length of citations could vary strikingly in ancient texts. For instance, Plutarch cites thirty-two lines from *Phaedrus* in his *Consolation to Apollonius*.³⁶ On other occasions, a single word may constitute a citation.³⁷

In some cases, several quotations are gathered and presented together, following one another. They are juxtaposed thanks to the conjunction καί.³⁸ This occurs in Plato's *Ion*, in which Homeric citations are juxtaposed.³⁹ In other cases, they are dispersed throughout a work, as, e.g., in Plutarch's *Consolation to Apollonius*.⁴⁰

D. Referring to Cited Works

In antiquity, references to cited passages often lack accuracy. Indeed, at that time there was no practical method of classification such as those used today. Nevertheless, several authors did provide their readers with *capita rerum*, put at the beginning of each book. This enabled readers to locate more easily and more quickly that which was of direct interest to them.⁴¹

³² *De genere animalium* 736a10.

³³ *Ion* 538c ff.

³⁴ Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, p. 312.

³⁵ Morawski, "The Basic Function of Quotation", pp. 690–706.

³⁶ See Hani, *Plutarque. Consolation à Apollonios*, p. 19 and Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 286.

³⁷ Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, p. 287.

³⁸ Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, p. 40 and Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 273.

³⁹ *Ion* 538c–539d.

⁴⁰ *C. Apoll.* 29.

⁴¹ This is the case with Varro: See book I of his *Res rusticae*. See also the preface

When a reference to a text was made in a vague way, mention of the author's name was sometimes considered sufficient.⁴² However, a more precise way of proceeding also existed: The title of the work was sometimes mentioned,⁴³ or the traditional name of an episode was given. This happens in Plato with passages from Homer, for which the *Teichomachia* or *Hippodromia* were announced.⁴⁴ Plato even goes so far as to summarize the verses he quotes in order to enable his readers to remember the passage in question.⁴⁵ The same method is applied by Philodemus of Gadara (75–35 B.C.E.) when he quotes philosophical writings.⁴⁶ Like other authors, Plato and Philodemus provide some indications on the location of the passages they cite when they quote different parts of the same work.⁴⁷ In his study on Philodemus, Delattre has shown that the exact references to the authors and works cited, indicate that “il existe déjà, fort bien constituée, une méthode de travail ‘universitaire’ qui fait que, lorsqu’on affirme quelque chose d’un auteur, on a le devoir de se montrer précis si l’on veut convaincre son lecteur”.⁴⁸

In the case of second-hand quotations, ancient writers rarely mention intermediary sources by name. Johannes Stobaeus, e.g., does not identify the compilation he uses but rather mentions the original source.⁴⁹ This is also the case with Diogenes Laertius.⁵⁰ According

of *Hist. nat.* XXXIII and Columella XI. 3. 65. Pliny mentions both the content of the book and the authors he used. Such a method is also used by Eusebius in his *HE*.

⁴² This is the case with the laudatory epithets sometimes applied by Plato to Homer: See Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, p. 42. Plutarch, in his *Adol. poet. aud.*, is also content with mentioning the names of the cited authors.

⁴³ See, e.g., Philodemus of Gadara's habits as described in D. Delattre, “Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara et des ouvrages qu'il cite”, in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, and S. Déléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte*, pp. 105–126.

⁴⁴ Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, pp. 40–41.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴⁶ Delattre, “Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara”, p. 119.

⁴⁷ Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, p. 42 and D. Delattre, “Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara”, p. 119.

⁴⁸ Delattre, “Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara”, p. 125.

⁴⁹ D. E. Hahm, “The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus”, *ANRW* II. 36. 4, 1990, p. 2976 ff.

⁵⁰ R. Goulet, “Les références chez Diogène Laërce: sources ou autorités?”, in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, and S. Déléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte*, pp. 149–166.

to Goulet's study on Diogenes' referencing technique, this may be explained by the fact that in antiquity references are not used in order to locate a passage but serve to guarantee the authority of an argument.⁵¹

E. *Faithfulness to the Text Cited*

The changes brought by an author to the cited passage vary substantially. They generally consist in the omission or addition of words, in grammatical changes, in the combination of citations, and in the modification of the primary meaning of the quotation. These changes may be deliberate, which means that they are made by the citing author specifically in order to appropriate the content of the citation.⁵² They may also be accidental. If deliberate, the changes result from the author's wish to adjust the citation to his own purposes, to 'modernize' the stylistic expression of a more ancient writer, or to adapt the grammar of the cited text to that of the citing text. It may be noted that deliberate changes do not always stem from the citing author's eagerness to tamper with the primary meaning of a passage, as modern scholars often suspect and harshly condemn.

A passage from Porphyry, cited in the *Praeparatio*, is particularly revealing. It shows the methodology applied to the cited text, even by an author who was eager to preserve the primary meaning of that cited text:

οἷς δὴ καὶ μεταδώσεις μηδὲν ὑφαιρούμενος· ἐπεὶ καὶ γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς μαρτύρομαι ὡς οὐδὲν οὔτε προστέθεικα οὔτε ἀφεῖλον τῶν χρησθέντων νοημάτων, εἰ μὴ που λέξιν ἡμαρτημένην διώρθωσα ἢ πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον μεταβέβληκα ἢ τὸ μέτρον ἐλλείπον ἀνεπλήρωσα ἢ τι τῶν μὴ πρὸς τὴν πρόθεσιν συντεινόντων διέγραψα, ὡς τὸν γε νοῦν ἀκραιφνῆ τῶν ῥηθέντων διετήρησα, εὐλαβούμενος τὴν ἐκ τούτων ἀσέβειαν μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἱεροσυλίας τιμωρὸν ἐπομένην Δίκην.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁵² J. Whittaker has shown that the transcription mistakes of the citations are caused as much by memory faults or neglect on the ancient authors' part as by a deliberate willingness to tamper with the text ("The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation", in Ed. J. N. Grant (Ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts, Papers given at the 23rd Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6-7 November 1987*, New York: AMS Press, 1989, pp. 63-96).

To such you will impart information without any reserve. For I myself call the gods to witness, that I have neither added, nor taken away from the meaning of the responses, except where I have corrected an erroneous phrase, or made a change for greater clearness, or completed the metre where defective, or struck out anything that did not conduce to the purpose; so that I have preserved the sense of what was spoken untouched, guarding against the impiety of such changes, rather than against the avenging justice that follows from the sacrilege.⁵³

This passage emphasizes the prominence of the meaning of the text over its phrasing: The νοῦς is clearly opposed to the λέξις.⁵⁴ Porphyry claims not to have tampered with the νοήματα of the oracles but he does not claim that he has *not* changed the terms and expressions of the cited text.⁵⁵ Yet it should be noted that the respect shown to the meaning of the oracles is due to their sacredness. Similar attitudes are also found among Jewish and Christian authors regarding the modification of the Scriptures. Such changes are even more harshly condemned in the Jewish and Christian traditions.⁵⁶ This was not the case with secular texts, as can be seen from Porphyry's use of citations in his *De abstinentia*.⁵⁷ Porphyry was especially gifted in manipulating texts, although the concept of manipulation hardly applies to antiquity. At any rate, the neo-platonic philosopher was not the only one to do so. Plutarch, who is well known for his extensive use of quotations, does not hesitate to transform the passages he cites by omitting, adding or modifying terms or expressions occurring in the quotation. Not even Plato was spared by him.⁵⁸

⁵³ *De philosophia ex oraculis* I pp. 109–110 Wolff = *PE* IV. 7. 1, translation by E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV*, III (*pars prior*), Oxford, 1903, slightly modified.

⁵⁴ This opposition was emphasized in Plotinus' texts by J. Lacrosse, *La philosophie de Plotin, intellect et discursivité*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003. I wish to thank him for having let me read this work before it was published.

⁵⁵ As has been shown by Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition", p. 69.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Josephus, *AJ* I. 17; X. 218; *CA* I. 42; *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* 310. See also W. C. Van Unnik, "De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon", *VigChris* 3, 1949, pp. 1–36. He notes that this expression is proverbial.

⁵⁷ See the introduction to the *De abstinentia* in J. Bouffartigue and M. Patillon, *Porphyre. De abstinentia* I. Texte édité, traduit et annoté par J. B. et M. P., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977, p. XXV ff.

⁵⁸ On this point, see J. P. Hershbell, "Plutarch's 'De animae procreatione in Timaeo': An Analysis of Structure and Content", *ANRW* II. 36. 1, 1986, pp. 234–247 (esp. p. 240).

However, it should be emphasized that our scholarly criteria of citation are not relevant to the practice of ancient authors. Purpose and methodology differ dramatically. Actually, that which we might consider falsification was viewed by ancient writers as a methodology in explicating the true, authentic meaning of a text. In a sense, in the ancient authors' view, modifying the text cited was meant to express its essence more clearly.⁵⁹

In addition to the distinction between sacred and secular texts, the treatment of prose citations differs from that of poetic citations. Indeed, it was more difficult to modify poetic texts because of the metric rules. Moreover, in many cases, the readership knew them by heart. This was especially the case with Homer. As Stanley has pointed out in a study on Paul,⁶⁰ the status of Homeric poems in Hellenism was to some extent comparable to that of the Scriptures in Judaism and Christianity. Both texts constituted the most authoritative text. Homer had been critically edited in the Hellenistic period and this 'vulgate' was in general faithfully copied by second-century C.E. authors. This observation may probably also apply to Euripides' and Sophocles' tragedies.

However, the poetic text cited by the ancient authors is not always identical to that which has reached us through direct transmission, i.e., in manuscripts. Several explanations other than the responsibility of the citing authors may be suggested. Firstly, the authors often cited passages from memory and therefore made mistakes;⁶¹ secondly, in the case of Homeric quotations, the authors could use a text other than the Alexandrian 'vulgate'; thirdly, most authors excerpted passages from florilegia rather than from the original text;⁶² finally, some differences may be due to the corruptions to which medieval manuscripts were subject.

⁵⁹ On this subject, see my "'Neither Adding nor Omitting Anything': Josephus' Promise not to Modify the Scriptures in Greek and Latin Context", *JJS* 56, 2005, pp. 48–65.

⁶⁰ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, pp. 270–271.

⁶¹ See, e.g., on Plutarch R. Flacelière, J. Irigoin, J. Sirinelli, A. Philippon, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, I, p. lix: "on peut également juger de la fidélité, souvent très relative, de ses (*Plutarque*) citations, réminiscences ou allusions incorporées à son texte. Il apparaît à l'évidence qu'il citait le plus souvent de mémoire".

⁶² This is the case not only with Plutarch, but also with Diogenes Laertius: See Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, pp. 16–28.

As for prose texts, they could be more easily modified thanks to the flexibility of their form. They could easily be summarized, paraphrased and transformed. It is worth noting that the faithfulness to the text also depends on the feelings of the quoting author towards the quoted author. An author such as Strabo, whose faithfulness to the Homeric text has been shown by Stanley, proves to be rather loose in his citations from Herodotus.⁶³ Likewise, Plutarch quotes Herodotus faithfully only in half of the cases⁶⁴ whereas it is well known that he cites Homer faithfully.

The different methodologies in modifying a text may be presented as follows:⁶⁵

Omissions

In some cases, omissions are deliberate. Heraclitus, e.g., in his *Homeric Allegories*, might have omitted certain divine epithets and verses because he feared they would challenge his interpretation of the Homeric poems.⁶⁶ Likewise, Johannes Stobaeus drops some verses in order to turn some citations into universal maxims.⁶⁷ Porphyry omits some lines from Josephus' *Bellum judaicum* in order to bring the portrayal of the Essenes closer to his own philosophical conceptions.⁶⁸

Yet in most cases, omissions enable the citing authors to suppress words or lines that seem to them to be irrelevant or redundant: This is the case with Strabo's Homeric quotations and most citations by Stobaeus. The geographer's and compiler's omissions enable them

⁶³ Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?", pp. 107–108. See also A. Momigliano, "The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography", *History* 43, 1958, pp. 1–13 = *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Rome, 1960, pp. 28–44.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111. This lack of rigour may be due (in part) to Plutarch's contempt for Herodotus. Cf. *De Herodoti malignitate*.

⁶⁵ Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition", p. 71 offers a different classification: modification of word order, additions, omissions, substitutions. Moreover, he points out that addition, omission and modification are mentioned by Josephus (*CA* I. 42) when he deals with Scriptures. Tertullian also said that heretics had modified the Scriptures through addition, omission and substitution (*De praescr. heret.* 38).

⁶⁶ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 283.

⁶⁷ S. Luria, "Entstellungen des Klassikertextes bei Stobaios", *Rheinisches Museum* 78, pp. 81–104; 225–48, taken over by D. E. Hahm, "The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus", *ANRW* II. 36. 4, 1990, pp. 2940–2943.

⁶⁸ For more detail, see M. Patillon, A. Ph. Segonds, and L. Brisson, Porphyre. *De l'abstinence* IV. Texte établi, traduit et annoté par M. P., A. Ph. S. et L. B., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1995. p. 19, n. 165.

to clarify their own discourse and to shed light on some important points.⁶⁹

Word Order Modification

Word order is sometimes changed by the citing author. In many cases, these changes do not really modify the meaning of the excerpt. However, they sometimes do. As Whittaker has emphasized in his work on Alkinoos, some passages in Luke and Plato support this hypothesis.⁷⁰ Luke may have resorted to this technique in order to make his text different from the rest of the synoptic tradition.⁷¹

Lexical Additions and Substitutions

On some occasions, ancient authors make some minor additions to the citations, and, more rarely, substitute a word for another in order to clarify their own discourse. In Heraclitus' *Homeric Allegories*, the addition of a word helps the author preserve the identity of the original referent in a new context.⁷² Yet in some cases, the authors add or substitute a word for another word in order to adjust the content of a passage to their own reasoning. Heraclitus, e.g. does not hesitate to use word substitution in order to demonstrate Homer's piety.⁷³ In his *Lives*, Plutarch modifies a citation from Herodotus in order to grant authority to his own views.⁷⁴ Porphyry adds several words to a citation from Josephus' *Bellum judaicum* (we have seen earlier that he also omits some of them) in order to bring the text closer to his opinions.⁷⁵ On several occasions, Philo of Alexandria might have changed or omitted expressions referring to "gods" in the plural to the benefit of more acceptable monotheistic conceptions.⁷⁶

Finally, it is worth noting that some authors do not hesitate to claim openly that they modified a passage. This is the case with

⁶⁹ See Hahm, "The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus", p. 2945 and Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 277.

⁷⁰ Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition", p. 72 ff.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁷² Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 283, and n. 54.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁷⁴ Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?", pp. 112–113.

⁷⁵ See M. Patillon, A. Ph. Segonds, and L. Brisson, Porphyre. *De abstinentia* IV, p. XXXIII.

⁷⁶ On Philo's quotations from Plato, see D. T. Runia, "The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria", in M. Joyal (Ed.), *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition. Essays Presented to John Whittaker*, Aldershot etc.: Ashgate, 1997, pp. 261–292.

Aristobulus, the Jewish philosopher, whose words deserve to be quoted. After citing Aratus, he says:

Σαφῶς οἶομαι δεδειχθαι διότι διὰ πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ· καθὼς δὲ δεῖ, σεσημάγκαμεν περιαιροῦντες τὸν διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων Δία καὶ Ζῆνα· τὸ γὰρ διανοίας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ θεὸν ἀναπέμπεται, διόπερ οὕτως ἡμῖν εἴρηται.

I think I have shown clearly that God's power goes through everything. We have given the adequate signification by substracting the words 'Zeus' from the poems. Indeed, that which is related to the meaning of these words goes back to God and this is why we have spoken thus.⁷⁷

This clearly demonstrates that in the ancient world interpretation requires deliberate lexical changes: Aristobulus replaced the word 'God' with 'Zeus' in Aratus' poem in order to produce his own reading of the text.⁷⁸ The philosopher intervenes in the text he cites while explicitly asserting that he has not tampered with its meaning. In his own view, he has only established the truth. This enables us to measure the gap between our understanding of a literal citation and that of the ancient authors. While we consider the notion of citation as a guarantee of faithfulness to the discourse of another individual, the ancient authors saw it as the testimony of a truth that must be revealed, even if the source text requires to be modified.

Grammatical Changes

In most cases, grammatical changes aim to adapt the grammatical construction of the citation to the citing author's phrasing.

Combined Citations

Some authors present two citations together as if they made up only one citation. This literary technique may enhance certain effects of

⁷⁷ PE XIII. 12.3–8. My translation.

⁷⁸ On this passage, see N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos*, pp. 101, 110, 140; Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, p. 182, n. 7. The author of the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* 16 also equates God with Zeus. Y. Amir, "Monotheistische Korrekturen heidnischer Texte", in D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (Eds.), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Schreckenberg*. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993, pp. 9–20, has shown that there was in Greek-speaking Judaism a willingness to modify some pagan texts in a monotheistic direction.

the text and thus support the citing author's intentions. Pseudo-Longinus uses this technique in his *On the Sublime* to underline the sublime effects in Homer's poetry.⁷⁹ As Compagnon has pointed out, a similar procedure is also exploited by Paul, especially in the Epistle to the Romans.⁸⁰ Whittaker has also noted that Alkinoos uses it in his *Didaskalikos*, as well as Iamblichus in his *Protrepticus*. In both works, the authors present as a single citation different passages from Plato, or a passage from Plato and a passage from Aristotle.⁸¹

Semantic Changes

On numerous occasions, the primary meaning of citations is altered due to the new context into which they are inserted. Through this process, they receive a new meaning, different from their original one. This is especially striking in the citations given by Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius.⁸² However, these authors should not systematically be held responsible for such changes. As noted above, most of their citations are excerpted from gnomological collections in which they have already lost their primary meaning. Several citations have been ascribed to florilegia thanks to Stobaeus' work. This identification has been made possible by the fact that several quotations are given in the same order both by Stobaeus and other authors. However, even an author such as Athenaeus of Naucratis, who is usually considered as providing first-hand citations,⁸³ exhibits some contempt for the context and the primary meaning of the citations.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 281, referring to Pseudo-Longinus IX. 6 who manipulates Il. XXI. 388 and XX. 61–65.

⁸⁰ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, p. 167. Cf. Rom. 10:19–21 and 3:10–18.

⁸¹ Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition", p. 90 ff.

⁸² Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, p. 19.

⁸³ Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?", p. 113. Athenaeus is also considered trustworthy in his citations by K. Zepernick, "Die Exzerpte des Athenaeus in den Deipnosophisten und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit", *Philologus* 77, 1921, pp. 311–363; P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitome", *CQ* 30, 1980, pp. 477–94 (p. 480 ff.) and D. Ambaglio, "I Deipnosophisti di Ateneo e la Tradizione storica frammentaria", *Athenaeum* 68, 1990, pp. 51–64. On this subject, see the excellent collection of articles in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (Eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000 and more specifically section III about "Athenaeus the Reader and His World". On Athenaeus' faithfulness to the text quoted, see especially Chr. Pelling, "Fun With Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians", in D. Braund and J. Wilkins, *Athenaeus and His World*, Exeter, 2000, pp. 171–190.

⁸⁴ Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?", p. 116.

F. *Conclusion*

This short survey illustrates how difficult it is to draw general conclusions about the citation process in the ancient world. However, several points are worth noting.

First of all, the diversity of the practice of citation should be emphasized. The cutting of the texts, the presentation of the passage, its exploitation and the faithfulness to the text all constitute different methodologies in quoting. Each author personalized his/her technique,⁸⁵ which itself varied according to the authors cited.⁸⁶ The literary genre—i.e., prose or poetry—as well as the authority of the authors cited were all important criteria that determined the way in which a passage was quoted.

It should also be noted that even though neither a specific terminology nor any theory existed in Greek/Latin antiquity to deal with the practice of citation, typological marks in manuscripts indicate that ancient readers/writers were aware that they were dealing with a specific literary technique.

Regarding faithfulness to the text, it seems reasonable to take an intermediary stance between, e.g., Stanley and Lenfant. Whereas the former seems to imply that ancient authors were much more faithful than is generally believed,⁸⁷ the latter suggests that *verbatim* citations did not exist in antiquity.⁸⁸ Actually, the line between the literal citation such as we understand it today and the borrowing of literary material in the form of allusions or reminiscences was unclear because useless.

In addition, modifying the phrasing of the cited passages did not indicate unfaithfulness on the citing author's part, as is sometimes the case for us. Intellectual property is a recent phenomenon which is irrelevant when dealing with ancient texts. As passages from Porphyry and Aristobulus demonstrate, the meaning of the text was not seen as a projection of the phrasing. The former mattered to them much more than the latter. Thus, modifications brought to the text could constitute, as it were, the explication of a certain truth.

⁸⁵ E.g., Athenaeus is more trustworthy than Diodorus Siculus when he cites Herodotus (*Ibid.*, p. 119).

⁸⁶ As Pelling has shown regarding citations from Greek historians by Athenaeus: Pelling, "Fun With Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians", pp. 188–189.

⁸⁷ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, p. 174.

⁸⁸ Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?", p. 119.

2. THE CITATION PROCESS IN THE *Apodeixis*

In an important article on pagan and Christian historiography, Momigliano has suggested that by citing testimonies in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius radically modified the way in which history was written in antiquity. So far, Momigliano argues, historians had worked as rhetors did, rather than as historians in using “a maximum of invented speeches and a minimum of authentic documents”.⁸⁹ More recently, in an article on Eusebius’ citation technique, Gonnet has emphasized the originality of Eusebius in his historical work.⁹⁰ According to him, “par l’utilisation systématique de documents, Eusèbe inaugure jusqu’à un certain point une manière contemporaine de pratiquer l’histoire”.⁹¹

In his major apologetic work, which I designate as the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius also exploits the literary technique of citing. Yet these testimonies are not used as historical documents, as in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, but as argumentative weapons. While in the *Historia*, the testimonies serve to build an historical work, in the *Apodeixis* the excerpts serve as exhibits and are used in the context of a complex argumentation. They enable him to defend his opinions as a Christian impartially (according to him). In most cases, his method consists in citing pagan authors. It is necessary to clearly distinguish between his use of citations in the *Apodeixis* (and especially in the *Praeparatio*) and in the *Historia*, even if in this work the exploitation of citations is inspired by apologetic methods.⁹² Indeed, in the *Historia*, the testimonies are integrated into a chronological frame, according to both imperial and episcopal successions in the great cities of Alexandria, Rome or Antioch.⁹³ By contrast, chronology is not central to the *Praeparatio*. In this work, the citations are not arranged along a clear

⁸⁹ Momigliano, “Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.”, pp. 79–99.

⁹⁰ E.g., Gonnet, “L’acte de citer dans l’*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d’Eusèbe”, pp. 181–194. On Eusebius’ use of sources in his *HE*, see E. Carotenuto, *Tradizione e innovazione nella Historia ecclesiastica di Eusebio di Cesarea*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2001.

⁹¹ Gonnet, “L’acte de citer dans l’*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d’Eusèbe”, p. 181.

⁹² As claimed by Momigliano, “Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.”, pp. 113–119.

⁹³ Gonnet, “L’acte de citer dans l’*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d’Eusèbe”, pp. 182–183. On the same subject, see also Fr. Thélamon, “Écrire l’histoire de l’Église: d’Eusèbe de Césarée à Rufin d’Aquilée”, in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L’historiographie de l’Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 221–222.

chronological line, as in the *Historia*. They interact with each other according to a thematic principle. Eusebius arranges his work as a discursive space in which different authors agree or disagree with one another, under his own favourable or unfavourable arbitration. It may thus be suggested that he abolishes, as it were, the chronological and geographical distance that stands between the cited authors by inviting them to participate in the same debate. Needless to say, this discursive space is submitted to Eusebius' ideological bias. As we will see, the apologist does not refrain from distorting the texts he quotes in favour of his arguments.

Obviously, Eusebius is not the first author to resort to citation. As early as Homer, Greek and later Latin authors referred to, paraphrased and/or cited other authors. However, Eusebius' technique in the *Apodexis* appears closer to our conception of citing (whether scholarly or journalistic), i.e., the faithful and verbatim reproduction of a passage and the clear distinction between the citing text and the cited text.

Eusebius' methodology in citing is applied according to strict rules. The vast majority of citations are given in direct speech; most of them are faithful to the original text, and, perhaps more importantly, they are explicitly intended to be faithful. The author's name, the title of the work and, in some cases, even the number of the book are provided.

Moreover, unlike most authors in antiquity, Eusebius makes his citation method explicit to his readership. We will see that he takes pains to define his technique and that he uses a technical terminology to describe what we call a 'citation'. In his vocabulary, the verbs παρατίθημι⁹⁴ or ἐκτίθημι⁹⁵ designate the action of citing while παράθεσις designates a citation.⁹⁶ The testimonies provided are φωναί⁹⁷ or μαρτυρίαι.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ E.g., *PE* III. 2. 1; III. 11. 17; IV. 2. 14; IV. 16. 11; V. 14. 2; IX. 4. 1; IX. 4. 6; IX. 7. 1; IX. 12. 1; X. 7. 22.

⁹⁵ E.g., *PE* I. 7. 16.

⁹⁶ E.g., *PE* IV. 6 heading.

⁹⁷ E.g., *PE* III. 2. 1; II. 1. 56. Cf. the latin term *vox* in Quintilian and Augustine. According to Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, p. 149, it designates the signifier in contrast to the signified, called *sententia* by Quintilian and *significatus* by Augustine.

⁹⁸ E.g., *PE* X. 2. 16.

Eusebius' rigour in citing makes him different from his fellow authors. One may therefore ask to which tradition his citation technique in the *Apodeixis* belongs.⁹⁹

To Which Tradition Does Eusebius' Citation Technique in the Apodeixis Belong?

When the question is raised as to which tradition Eusebius wishes to locate himself in by citing testimonies in the *Apodeixis*, the Gospels and the Hebrew Bible readily come to mind. The Gospels contain many biblical citations and the Hebrew Bible sometimes also paraphrases itself (e.g., in the Chronicles). As Gonnet has pointed out,¹⁰⁰ a religion of the book such as Christianity leads to citing books. Compagnon notes that among Gospel writers, Matthew confers on citation the role of a formal argument.¹⁰¹ However, the manner in which New Testament writers exploit citation is far from being comparable with Eusebius' citation technique, even though they played a prominent role in building the tradition in which Eusebius' technique may be located.

One might also think of the second-century Christian apologists:¹⁰² Many of them used citations either to attack pagan culture¹⁰³ or to support arguments in favour of their own religion. Justin Martyr, e.g., cites Plato's texts¹⁰⁴ and other philosophical writings, yet he does so very rarely in the form of extensive quotations. Tatian's use of quotations proves to be rather limited.¹⁰⁵ By contrast, Theophilus of Antioch and Athenagoras of Athens make extensive use of citations from Greek literature, and especially Greek poetry.¹⁰⁶ Theophilus, e.g., quotes the Sibyl in order to confirm his account of the Tower

⁹⁹ As we have seen, in the *HE*, he may have innovated.

¹⁰⁰ Gonnet, "L'acte de citer dans l'*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe", pp. 189 and 192.

¹⁰¹ Compagnon, "*La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*", pp. 166–167.

¹⁰² See, e.g., F. Young, "Greek Apologists of the Second Century", in M. Edwards, M. Goodman et al., *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, pp. 81–104. She claims that second-century apologists aimed to justify their rejection of classical literature and culture. Paradoxically, their works are full of citations from classical authors.

¹⁰³ On this topic, see Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., in 1 *Apol.* 60. 1 in which he cites Plato's Timaeus about the cross; see also 1 *Apol.* 44. 8.

¹⁰⁵ See Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, p. 24.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 25–26.

of Babel;¹⁰⁷ he also uses excerpts from Homer, Simonides, Euripides, Menander and others in order to criticize the pagan doctrine of providence.¹⁰⁸ Yet Theophilus' method widely differs from that of Eusebius because he almost only cites poets and is content with paraphrasing prose writers. Eusebius, on the contrary, only quotes writings in prose.

Clement of Alexandria could have exerted an important influence on Eusebius. His *Stromata* are full of allusions, paraphrases and citations from Greek authors.¹⁰⁹ However, Clement proves to be inexact in most cases.¹¹⁰ Moreover, his exploitation of literary passages does not only fulfil apologetic needs, as in Eusebius' work.

As for Origen, whose importance in Eusebius' view is well known, he may have influenced him in his choice of certain writings.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, he probably did not inspire Eusebius' methodology in the *Apodeixis*: He hardly quotes *ipsisissima verba* and, unlike Eusebius, he is far from being a name-dropper.¹¹²

It thus seems that the Christian authors from the first to the third century did not influence Eusebius in a decisive way regarding his citation technique. Yet the emergence, especially in Justin, of the use of scriptural citations as demonstrative tools used in support of the Christian faith may have played a role in Eusebius' methodological choice, especially in the *Demonstratio*. Nevertheless, some other works present even closer correspondences with the *Apodeixis*.

The author whose technique appears to be most similar to that of Eusebius is certainly Flavius Josephus, especially in his *Contra Apionem*.¹¹³ As in the *Praeparatio*, literal quotations in direct speech

¹⁰⁷ *Ad Autolycum* II. 31.

¹⁰⁸ *Ad Autolycum* II. 8. On the Fathers' use of Greek poets, see Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*.

¹⁰⁹ On this topic, see A. Méhat, *Kephalaia; Recherches sur les matériaux des "Stromates" de Clément d'Alexandrie et leur utilisation*, Paris: Seuil, 1966 and A. W. van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods", *VigChris* 50, 1996, pp. 223–243.

¹¹⁰ This has been noted thanks to a comparison between his citations of the minor Jewish authors and Eusebius' citations of the same passages. See Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, p. 17 and Van Den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria".

¹¹¹ See below, Chapter V, "Discovery and Selection of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹¹² See Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 161.

¹¹³ For a detailed analysis of Josephus' *Contra Apionem*, see Feldman and Levison (Eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*.

from Greek texts are given for apologetic purposes. Most cited authors wrote prose writings but poetry is also found, as Choerilus' work shows.¹¹⁴ In my opinion, it is no coincidence if Eusebius appropriated some of Josephus' excerpts in order to elaborate his own defence of Judaism in book IX of the *Praeparatio*.

In addition, there is another tradition, stemming from Hellenism, showing striking correspondences to the Christian apologist's work, namely the philosophical controversies, as found, e.g., in Philodemus of Gadara's writings. Momigliano has already connected the genre of the ecclesiastical history used by Eusebius to the history of the philosophical schools as illustrated by Diogenes Laertius.¹¹⁵ In this context, the notion of "succession" (of bishops in Eusebius and of philosophers in Diogenes) is crucial. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the same influence is to be found in the *Praeparatio*.

In an article on the titles of Philodemus' works,¹¹⁶ Delattre has pointed out the philosopher's concern for exact references when giving a citation: The author's name, the title of the work and the number of the book are clearly presented. The same concern is found throughout Eusebius' *Praeparatio*.¹¹⁷ When seeking an explanation for this accumulation of references in Philodemus, Delattre offers two suggestions:

Firstly, he mentions the philosopher's concern for intellectual integrity, especially when quoting the Epicurean masters, a concern which, Delattre notes, gradually extends to all philosophical literature including enemies of Epicurean philosophy. This, he continues, should perhaps not only be ascribed to the scholarly methods of the period (e.g., it is found in Cicero, but not in Pseudo-Plutarch's doxography). Yet it can hardly be traced back to a period earlier than Philodemus and Cicero (who was perhaps influenced by the former) because of the loss of second-century B.C.E. philosophical literature. Nevertheless, a similar methodology was probably applied by Diogenes of Babylon in his *Commentaries on Music* of which some passages were preserved through Philodemus' quotations.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ CA I. 172–174.

¹¹⁵ Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, p. 140.

¹¹⁶ Delattre, "Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara", pp. 105–126 (especially p. 122 ff.).

¹¹⁷ See below, Chapter V, section "References to the Citations from the Jewish Authors".

¹¹⁸ Delattre, "Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara", pp. 122–123.

Secondly, a willingness to annihilate in practice the accusation of stupidity that was levelled at the Epicureans by their enemies¹¹⁹ is also suggested. According to Delattre, Philodemus' methodology is best understood in a polemical context. It is well known that the Christians faced the same accusations. Eusebius himself mentions enemies who accuse them of accepting "an illogical faith without inquiry" (ἀλογῶ πίστει καὶ ἀνεξετάστῳ).¹²⁰ For Philodemus, as for Eusebius, a possible answer to this criticism lies in the exactness of their bibliographical references and citations. Therefore, it seems relevant to compare both authors' methodology. I would argue that Eusebius' decision to resort to the citation technique in the *Praeparatio* was at least in part influenced by the tradition of philosophical controversies.

This hypothesis may be supported by the fact that in his commentary on Aristotle's *Categories*, Simplicius (530 c.e.) claims that the latter, unlike "more recent" authors, did not use predecessors' testimonies as argumentative tools.¹²¹ Even though Eusebius' method cannot be reduced to that described by Simplicius, it is worth noting that it belonged to a late philosophical tradition. Therefore, it was perhaps not as original as he claimed it to be.¹²² At any rate, his citation technique, I would argue, may be understood as resulting from his eagerness to elevate Christianity to the rank of a great philosophy.¹²³ Thanks to citations, he could demonstrate the impressive knowledge and thoughtfulness of his own 'school'. In this context, the "fonction d'érudition"¹²⁴ exerted by the citations played an important

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

¹²⁰ *PE* I. 1. 11 in which this expression occurs several times. See also I. 2. 4. The cognates of ἐξετάζω are often used by the apologists: The dedicatees of these apologies are told to examine things carefully (e.g., Justin, 1 *Apol.* 2. 1; 3. 1 etc.). These words belong to the semantic sphere of legal discourse.

¹²¹ *On the Physics of Aristotle* 1318. 10–15. This reference comes from H. Baltussen, "Philology or Philosophy? Simplicius on the Use of Quotations", in I. Worthington and J. M. Foley (Eds.), *Epea & Grammata, Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 230. Leiden: Brill, 2002, p. 181.

¹²² *PE* I. 3. 5. The claim that one's work is innovative is a *topos* of Greek historiography. On this subject, see J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

¹²³ That is, if one considers philosophers as scholars. It is worth remembering Plotinus' famous phrase according to which "Longinus is a 'philologist' but not a 'philosopher'" (*Vita Plotini*, XIV. 18–20). On this interesting opposition between φιλόλογος and φιλόσοφος, see J. Pépin, "Philógos/Philósophos (*IP* 14. 18–20)", in J. Pépin et al. (Eds.), *Porphyre, Vie de Plotin*, Paris: Vrin, 1992, pp. 477–501.

¹²⁴ Cf. S. Morawski, "The Basic Function of Quotation", pp. 690–705.

role in addition to that of authority, which will be thoroughly investigated below.

To sum up, Eusebius' methodological choice was influenced by Josephus' technique in his *Contra Apionem*, combined with that of the philosophical controversies. I would therefore argue that the *Apodeixis* and more specifically the *Demonstratio* may be located at the cross-road between Hellenic philosophical traditions and Greek-language Jewish apologetic traditions.

3. EUSEBIUS' CITATION TECHNIQUE IN THE *APODEIXIS*

The quantitative importance of the citations in the *Apodeixis* is enormous. Citations make up 71% of the *Praeparatio*, not including the introductions, summaries and conclusions made by the bishop.¹²⁵ The *Demonstratio* consists almost exclusively of citations. Eusebius quotes neither Latin authors nor official documents,¹²⁶ nor classical authors apart from Plato who is one of the most cited authors in the *Praeparatio*. After Plato, the most ancient and most cited author is Alexander Polyhistor (first century B.C.E.).

The apologist only rarely cites poetry. In most cases, he prefers prose writings, and in particular philosophical prose: Medio-Platonists (especially Numenius and Plutarch) and neo-Platonists are well represented. In addition to Plato, Porphyry is the most cited author in the *Praeparatio*.

In the *Apodeixis*, especially in the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius uses citations according to precise rules. He does not explicitly give them to the reader from the start. They are dispersed throughout his work. In order to analyze them, one has to collect them and study their function in the citation system established by Eusebius. But before doing so, it is necessary to reconsider the status of the citations in Eusebius' work by examining scholarly opinions on the subject.

¹²⁵ See J.-R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens de 170 à 361*. *Analecta gregoriana* 61. Rome: apud aedes univ. Gregorianae, 1954, p. 358.

¹²⁶ On Eusebius' use of official Latin documents, see E. Carotenuto, "Six Constantinian Documents (Eus. *H. E.* 10, 5–7)", *VigChris* 56, 2002, pp. 56–74.

A. *The Citations in the Apodeixis:*
A Rhetorical Technique in Its Own Right

In the past, scholars used to think that Eusebius exploited citations because of his inability to present his own thoughts. Laurin, in his work on Christian apologists, claimed that the bishop “pense vraiment très peu, ou mieux, il se sent mal à l’aise et s’exprime souvent très mal quand il lui faut parler seul”.¹²⁷ Likewise, in her volume in the *Sources chrétiennes*, Zink alluded to his “défiance vis-à-vis de lui-même, une sorte d’humilité excessive le poussant à s’effacer devant les textes, comme s’il se sentait incapable de voler de ses propres ailes”.¹²⁸ Likewise, Moreschini and Norelli claimed in their history of Greek and Latin Christian literature that Eusebius’ main weaknesses are those of a compiler who hardly ever expresses his personal opinion.¹²⁹

In fact, a detailed analysis of the *Apodeixis* indicates that Eusebius thoughtfully and purposefully chose to resort to the citation technique. In his own view, it is a most appropriate methodology that enables him to provide his readers with the most ‘impartial’ account. Even if his bias sometimes leads him to distort the primary meaning of the documents and events he deals with, he nonetheless eagerly claims to be acting rationally. All the more so in a work such as the *Praeparatio* in which he seeks to answer Greek accusations against the irrationality of the Christian faith. He asserts that his extensive use of quotations in the *Praeparatio* is to be explained by his fear to appear complacent (κεχαρισμένα) towards the Christian doctrine.¹³⁰ He also claims to appeal to citations in order to escape any suspicion that he would be lying (τὸ πλάττεσθαι).¹³¹ He prefers not to express himself because, he argues, if he did so, his arguments would be open to attack by those fond of fault-finding (μηδ’ ἀνεπίληπτον . . . τοῖς φλεγκλήμοσι τὸν λόγον).¹³² In sum, “it is not from our own

¹²⁷ Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens*, p. 25.

¹²⁸ O. Zink, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* IV–V. SC 262. Paris: Cerf, 1982, pp. 12–13.

¹²⁹ Cl. Moreschini and E. Norelli, *Histoire de la littérature chrétienne ancienne grecque et latine, 1. De Paul à l’ère de Constantin*, Traduction de M. Rousset, Genève: Labor et Fides, 2000, p. 475.

¹³⁰ *PE* I. 6. 8.

¹³¹ *PE* I. 5. 14.

¹³² *PE* IV. 6. 1.

citations but from Greek citations that we draw the testimonies of our refutations” (ὅτι μὴ ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν παραθεσέων τὰς τῶν ἐλέγχων μαρτυρίας πιστούμεθα).¹³³

Moreover, when dealing with foreign history, he says he prefers to cite the testimonies of native authors in order not to appear to be acting with insufficient care (κατασχεδιάζειν).¹³⁴

In addition, Eusebius claims to cite pagan testimonies in the *Praeparatio* in order to direct their own weapons against them. In other words, he aims to shatter the foundations of paganism by using their own testimonies.¹³⁵ On many occasions, he takes Porphyry as his target. At one point he announces, e.g., that he will refute paganism’s error with a citation from the philosopher, “in order that they [the pagans] be put to shame for being struck by their own darts and arrows” (ὥς ἂν ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων βελῶν καὶ τοξευμάτων καταισχύνοιντο).¹³⁶

In these passages, Eusebius positions himself as the heir to Josephus and Tatian who had themselves claimed this method.¹³⁷ Lactantius also took it over after them.¹³⁸ Yet, in book XIV of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius says that he does not cite the Greek testimonies against them out of hatred for them, but that he does so only to show the superiority of the Hebrew doctrine.¹³⁹ By using Greek citations, Eusebius could also prove that the Christians knew Greek philosophy and that their preference for the Hebrew oracles did not stem from their lack of knowledge.¹⁴⁰

Above all, the bishop claims to appeal to citations because they will enable him to present “an unfailing and inevitable demonstration of the facts exposed” (ἀνελλιπὴς καὶ ἀπαραίτητος ἡ τῶν προκειμένων ἀπόδειξις).¹⁴¹ He thereby hopes to give the exposition of truth (ἡ

¹³³ *PE* IV. 6. heading.

¹³⁴ *PE* VIII. 1. 4. It is worth noting that this term is only used by Eusebius and Flavius Josephus at *BJ* III. 403. 1, where Josephus predicts that Vespasian will become emperor. However, *σχεδιάζειν* also occurs on several occasions in Polybius (XII. 3. 7; XII. 26. 3), which may indicate Eusebius’ willingness to present his argumentation according to the rules of Greek historiography.

¹³⁵ *PE* V. 5. 5; VI. 9. 32.

¹³⁶ *PE* V. 5. 5.

¹³⁷ *CA* I. 4; I. 59; and *Or. ad Graec.* 30.

¹³⁸ *Inst. div.* I. 5. 1–2.

¹³⁹ *PE* XIV. 1. 2.

¹⁴⁰ See *PE* XIV. 10. 6–11.

¹⁴¹ *PE* V. 5. 6.

σύστασις τῆς ἀληθείας) an indisputable confirmation (ἀναμφίλεκτον . . . τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν).¹⁴² His choice of methodology also results from his willingness to present a logical account, as some of his predecessors had done,¹⁴³ since the Christians were accused of giving in to an illogical faith without inquiry (ἄλογῳ πίστει καὶ ἀνεξετάστῳ).¹⁴⁴ This accusation may be found, e.g., among such Platonists as Celsus,¹⁴⁵ Porphyry¹⁴⁶ and Plotinus,¹⁴⁷ who attacked the Christians mainly on account of their blind faith and irrationalism, two weaknesses that set them against the true philosophers.¹⁴⁸ The same accusation was also found in Alexander of Lycopolis, who was contemporaneous with Eusebius (his treatise *Against Manichaean Doctrines* dates from the end of the third century c.e.).¹⁴⁹ The latter criticizes the Christian ‘philosophy’ for its lack of rigour and logic.¹⁵⁰ Galen is of the same opinion.¹⁵¹ Eusebius was certainly sensitive to these attacks, given their importance in the *Praeparatio*. Therefore, the apologist attempts to prove that Christian preference for a barbarian religion results from a “well-thought and proven judgement” (ἐξητασμένη δὲ καὶ βεβασανισμένη κρίσει).¹⁵²

¹⁴² *PE* X. 9. 28.

¹⁴³ J.-N. Guinot, “Foi et raison dans la démarche apologétique d’Eusèbe et de Théodoret”, in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 387–390 has emphasized that the refutation of the irrationality of the Christian faith is a favourite theme of the apologists.

¹⁴⁴ *PE* I. 1. 11.

¹⁴⁵ On this topic, see M. Frede, “Celsus’ attack on the Christians”, in J. Barnes and M. Griffin (Eds.), *Philosophia Togata II. Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 218–240.

¹⁴⁶ See A. Meredith, “Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians”, *ANRW* II. 23. 2, 1980, pp. 1119–1149.

¹⁴⁷ *Enn.* II. 9 (*Against the Gnostics*). Plotinus attacks the absence of argumentative discourses.

¹⁴⁸ J. Dillon, “Self-Definition in Later Platonism”, in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (Eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition (Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World III)*, London: SCM Press, 1982, pp. 69–70.

¹⁴⁹ See P. W. Van der Horst, “‘A Simple Philosophy’, Alexander of Lycopolis on Christianity”, in K. A. Algra, P. W. Van der Horst, D. T. Runia, *Polyhistor, Studies in the History and Historiography of Ancient Philosophy, Presented to Jaap Mansfeld on His Sixtieth Birthday*. *Philosophia antiqua* 72. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 313–323.

¹⁵⁰ See van der Horst, “‘A Simple Philosophy’, Alexander of Lycopolis on Christianity”, pp. 314–315.

¹⁵¹ See the passages cited by S. Benko, “Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the Two First Centuries A.D.”, *ANRW* II. 23. 2, 1980, p. 1098 ff.

¹⁵² *PE* XV. 1. 12.

Consequently, Eusebius' preference for the citation process over personal expression stems from a willingness to present an account of which the authority would be as legitimate and hence as valid as possible.¹⁵³ It is unfair to ascribe it to his alleged intellectual weakness. His decision to appeal to citations stemmed from the idea that in his time and his social, cultural and political context, the "argumentation par autorité" (Oswald Ducrot)¹⁵⁴ constituted a particularly effective kind of demonstration. Ducrot defines this argumentation as "une sorte de raisonnement expérimental. On part d'un fait 'X a dit₁ que P', on se fonde sur l'idée que X ("qui n'est pas un imbécile") a de bonnes chances de ne pas s'être trompé en disant ce qu'il a dit, et on en conclut à la vérité et à la vraisemblance de P. La parole de X, parmi d'autres faits, est ainsi prise pour indice de la vérité de P". The same reasoning underlies the *Apodeixis*. Moreover, as Compagnon has noted, it is impossible to deny a citation because any judgement on it concerns the authenticity of the repetition, not the repeated words.¹⁵⁵ In other words, "La citation masque la question de la vérité de l'énoncé sous celle de l'authenticité de l'énonciation, avec cette conséquence que l'énoncé lui-même est tenu pour vrai".¹⁵⁶ From this viewpoint, the citation process is distant from the philosophical argumentation but is well suited to an apologetic demonstration.

Thus the citation process appears as a rhetorical technique in itself. The resulting legitimacy claimed by Eusebius often conceals a tendentious use of the sources.¹⁵⁷ The opinion that the extensive use of quotations in the *Apodeixis* serves to hide the bishop's compositional or intellectual shortcomings is caused by a problematic neglect, mistrust or lack of knowledge of Eusebius' own assertions on the subject. On the contrary, as Schreiber reminds us in an article on citation in historiography, it is precisely when the speaker (in this case Eusebius) withdraws in order to let another speaker express him- or herself, that his presence is most intensely felt, and that at that

¹⁵³ Aristotle had already said that the agreement in doxography on a point of philosophy constitutes a doctrinal confirmation: cf. *Metaph.* 983b; 988b; *Eth. Nic.* 1098b.

¹⁵⁴ O. Ducrot, *Le Dire et le dit*, Paris: Minuit, 1984, p. 158 ff.

¹⁵⁵ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de citation*, p. 113.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 241–264.

very moment, the power he exerts on the author cited is at its utmost.¹⁵⁸

It is also worth noting that the bishop of Caesarea is a master in dealing with the citation technique. Let us now turn to some of the principles he applies to the texts he cites.

B. *The Weight of Auctoritas in the Apodeixis:*
Horizontal and Vertical Relations

I have noted that the major principle governing Eusebius' use of testimonies in the *Apodeixis* (and especially in the *Praeparatio*) is Ducrot's "argumentation par autorité".¹⁵⁹ Consequently, Eusebius (almost) always takes pains to identify the authors he quotes and often explains the grounds on which this authority is based. However, he does not always feel the need to insist on the reputation of certain authors, especially if they are famous: Plutarch and Plotinus, e.g., require no introduction.

The medieval term *auctoritas* best defines the principle of authority as it is exploited in the *Apodeixis*. One may argue that this word designates a doctor of the Church in the Middle Ages whereas Eusebius cites almost only secular authors in the *Praeparatio*. However, the function of the *auctoritas* proves to be identical in the *Apodeixis* as in medieval theological writings. Indeed, Compagnon defines this term as "une citation nécessairement référée à un auteur", and he adds that "sans cela sa valeur est nulle . . . Toute la puissance de l'*auctoritas* tient à son éponyme, et le mot renvoie à un sujet de l'énonciation plutôt qu'il ne désigne un énoncé".¹⁶⁰

A consequence of the importance of the *auctoritas* in Eusebius lies in the search for agreement (συμφωνία) between the authors cited.¹⁶¹ He does not hesitate to accumulate the testimonies on a certain point

¹⁵⁸ Schreiber, "Le vertige de la citation: quelques réflexions sur une forme de discours rapporté en histoire", in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, p. 271.

¹⁵⁹ Ducrot, *Le Dire et le dit*, p. 158. This section will be developed in more detail in the next chapter through the analysis of pagan, Christian and biblical citations. On authority in philosophical schools, and especially on Plato's authority in the Platonic school, see J.-M. Charrue, *Plotin lecteur de Platon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978; A. Eon, "La notion plotinienne d'exégèse", *Revue internationale de philosophie* 92, 1970, pp. 252-289; Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, pp. 102-105; 115-120; 137-140.

¹⁶⁰ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, p. 218.

¹⁶¹ A similar methodology is applied in the *HE*: See Gustafsson, "Eusebius'

of his argumentation. In some cases, he claims to possess so many testimonies that he must make a selection.¹⁶² Yet it is difficult to know whether he can be taken at his word. Even if it is likely to be a rhetorical technique, in some cases, the list of authors he quotes is impressive. This suggests that on some occasions he had to restrict the number of testimonies available to him because he had to keep the size of the book reasonable. He repeatedly claims to have to stop quoting because a book has become long enough.¹⁶³ In book VI of the *Praeparatio*, he is able to cite Oenomaus, Diogenianus, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Bardesanes and Origen against the doctrine of fatalism.¹⁶⁴ The sources quoted next to one another reinforce each other and increase the apologetic and polemic weight of Eusebius' criticism. According to him, the συμφωνία of the quoted authors guarantees the legitimacy of his argumentation. This agreement is remindful of that which he ascribes to the Hebrews.¹⁶⁵ It is in strong contrast to the διάστασις and διαφωνία of the Greeks, he says, that are especially present among philosophers.¹⁶⁶

The testimonies gathered by Eusebius on a certain topic generally come from different religious sources. The words of a Jewish author can be confirmed by those of a Christian; a passage from a pagan can be associated with that of a Christian or a Jew. In book VI of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., after quoting Oenomaus and the other above pagans, Eusebius cites Origen as a representative of the "sacred literature", since "the testimonies from outside have been sufficiently quoted" (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν αὐτάρκως παρατίθεται);¹⁶⁷ likewise, in book X of the *Praeparatio*, Josephus' testimony is associ-

Principles in Handling His Sources" and Gonnet, "L'acte de citer dans l'*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe", pp. 186–188.

¹⁶² E.g., *PE* IV. 2. 14; IX. 42. 4. It should be noted that Eusebius goes against Plato's *Gorgias*. Indeed the latter denies the legal value of numerous testimonies: cf. *Gorgias* 471e–472a.

¹⁶³ E.g. *PE* VII. 22. 64; IX. 42. 4. On the relations between work composition and book form, see J. Irigoin, "Titres, sous-titres et sommaires dans les œuvres des historiens grecs du I^{er} siècle avant J.-C. au V^e siècle après J.-C.", in J.-C. Fredouille, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petimengin *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, pp. 127–134, who also mentions Eusebius.

¹⁶⁴ *PE* VI. 7–11.

¹⁶⁵ E.g., *PE* XIV. 3.

¹⁶⁶ See, e.g., *PE* I. 7. 16; I. 8. 14; XIV. 2. 1 on "physicists", i.e., pre-Socratics; XIV. 2. 7 etc.

¹⁶⁷ *PE* VI. 10. 49.

ated with that of Diodorus and Clement.¹⁶⁸ In this case, we are dealing with a chain of authors whose authority is based on their *συμφωνία*. The diversity of the sources enhances the authority of this chain.

The relation between the above citations may be defined as *horizontal*: Each citation is ascribed a similar status in the argumentative framework. Their association provides the apologist's reasoning with its strength.

Another kind of relation between the citations in the *Apodeixis* may be defined as *vertical* in virtue of its hierarchical character. This occurs when a passage from a particularly authoritative figure is explicated or interpreted by other authors who are her/his disciple, exegete, or both. Numenius, e.g., is called upon by Eusebius to explicate Plato's words because, he says, he fears accusations of misinterpretation (ἵνα γε μή τις ἡμᾶς παρερμηνεύειν ἡγήσεται τὰς φιλοσόφου φωνάς),¹⁶⁹ or because he sees him as the interpreter of Plato's thought (τὴν τοῦ Πλάτωνος διάνοιαν ἐρμηνεύων).¹⁷⁰ This status enables him to translate it clearly (ἐπὶ τὸ σαφὲς διερμηνεύων).¹⁷¹ Similarly, Plotinus is called on by the bishop to guarantee that Platonic thought is established in an indisputable manner (εἰς ἀναμφίλεκτον παράστασιν τῆς τε τοῦ φιλοσόφου διανοίας).¹⁷²

The same sketch occurs in Eusebius' treatment of Moses and the Scriptures: "Philo the Hebrew translates the meaning of the doctrine more clearly" (τὴν τοῦ δόγματος διάνοιαν Φίλων ὁ Ἑβραῖος λευκότερον ἐρμηνεύων),¹⁷³ he interprets the ancestral texts (τὰ πάτρια διερμηνεύων),¹⁷⁴ making them clearer (διασαφῶν).¹⁷⁵ It should be noted

¹⁶⁸ PE X. 6–8.

¹⁶⁹ PE XI. 9. 8.

¹⁷⁰ PE XI. 21. 7.

¹⁷¹ PE XI. 10. 14. On Numenius and his use by Eusebius, see D. Saffrey, "Les extraits du Περὶ τὰγαθοῦ de Numénios dans le livre XI de la Préparation évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée", *StPat* 13, 1975, pp. 46–51; —, "Un lecteur antique des œuvres de Numénios: Eusèbe de Césarée", in *Forma futuri, Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*, Torino: Bottega d'Erasmio, 1975, pp. 145–153. According to Saffrey, Eusebius had to appropriate Numenius and use him in favour of Christianity because he was considered the most important Platonist of his time. See also E. des Places, "Numénios et Eusèbe de Césarée", *StPat* 13, 1975, pp. 19–28.

¹⁷² PE XI. 16. 3.

¹⁷³ PE XI. 14. 10.

¹⁷⁴ PE XI. 23. 12.

¹⁷⁵ PE XIII. 18. 12.

that the vocabulary used by the bishop to describe Philo's and Numenius' hermeneutical activity is almost identical. For Eusebius, their function as exegetes is strongly similar.

The relation between major authorities such as Plato or the Scriptures may on occasion be described as horizontal. This is the case in books XI and XIII of the *Praeparatio* in which Eusebius links Plato and Moses to prove their agreement. Needless to say, Scriptures remain the ultimate authority. Nevertheless, Plato's philosophy is considered by the bishop as a translation of Scriptures into Greek (ἐρμηνείαν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν).¹⁷⁶ This is remindful of Numenius' famous word "what is Plato except Moses speaking Attic Greek?" that is cited twice in the *Praeparatio*.¹⁷⁷

C. *Citing Authors, Authors Cited:*
A Subtle Play of Authority in the Apodeixis

In the *Apodeixis*, citations are not to be confused with either allusions or literary references, both of which stand in stark opposition to citations. Indeed, the citing author (Eusebius) is clearly distinguished from the cited author by linguistic or meta-textual marks. Thus it seems reasonable to take over Ducrot's distinction between speaker and enunciator, which, though sometimes criticized, is still authoritative. In this study, Eusebius may be defined as the speaker whereas the authors cited are the enunciators. This distinction is important in regard to Eusebius' aims in the *Apodeixis*. By borrowing the discourses of authors who are—or whom Eusebius claims are—prominent, Eusebius appropriates the right to claim even more strongly the same things they do. When Eusebius cites an author whose arguments prove to be beneficial to his demonstration (as happens in most cases), not only is one voice heard, but two, or even, in some cases, three or four. Indeed, it may occur that the enunciator himself¹⁷⁸ cites another enunciator, who himself cites another one. Bakhtin's concept of polyphony¹⁷⁹ is useful in understanding this phenomenon,

¹⁷⁶ *PE* XIII, pr.

¹⁷⁷ *PE* IX. 6. 9; XI. 10. 14.

¹⁷⁸ Eusebius cites no women.

¹⁷⁹ For more detail on the concept of polyphony, as applied by Bakhtin to literature and taken over by Ducrot in his theories of enunciation, see, e.g., Bakhtine, *La poétique de Dostoïevski*, p. 31 ff., in which he defines the Russian writer as the creator of the polyphonic novel.

on condition that some changes be made, such as the acceptance in Eusebius of a multiple practice of the superposition of voices. Indeed, polyphony as defined by Bakhtin may seem difficult to apply to the *Apodeixis* because it supposes “une multiplicité de voix ‘équipollentes’ à l’intérieur d’une seule œuvre”.¹⁸⁰ But in the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius attempts to give the impression that his voice is worth less than that of the cited author. Moreover, in many cases, his voice is not confused with that of the author cited.¹⁸¹ Actually, this proves to be a rhetorical strategy since it is Eusebius himself who controls the citation process. As I have already pointed out, the speaker is most powerful when he pretends to withdraw to let the enunciator speak. However, I would argue that the superposition of voices used in the *Apodeixis* to increase the weight of the arguments is close to Bakhtin’s polyphony. This concept is useful in defining one of the many facets of the bishop’s citation technique. An example of polyphony occurs, e.g., at II. 52 of the *Praeparatio*: In this passage, Eusebius claims to cite Diodorus, who himself cited Euhemerus. In this situation, the names of both authors are mentioned side by side, and Eusebius thus unites the two authors’ voices in a polyphonic process.

Although the voices of the authors cited may be heard simultaneously in Eusebius’ work, in other cases, some passages may be usefully presented as a *mise en abyme* of citations. This *mise en abyme* confers authority either on the author cited or on the citing author. It leads to the hierarchization of the enunciators. In general, the framing discourse seems to have more weight in Eusebius’ view than the framed discourse. Yet there are many exceptions. The indications he provides before and after a citation, or in the title of the chapter including the citation, may be used to measure the authority of the passage. In most cases, the name of the author that appears in the chapter title or in the introduction or conclusion of the citation is in general the dominant authority in Eusebius’ view.

Several examples can serve to illustrate this phenomenon of *mise en abyme*. In book I of the *Praeparatio*, the apologist cites Porphyry, who himself cites Sanchuniathon.¹⁸² Eusebius clearly says that the

¹⁸⁰ Bakhtine, *La poétique de Dostoïevski*, p. 69.

¹⁸¹ Except some Jewish authors. See below, Chapter VI, section “Levels of Agreement between Eusebius’ Discourse and the Jewish Authors’ Citations in the *Apodeixis*”.

¹⁸² J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie, les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*, Paris: Aubier, 1958, pp. 217–220, claims that Sanchuniathon was invented by Philo

latter's authority and antiquity are guaranteed by Porphyry (Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ δηλωθεὶς, ἀλήθειαν ὁμοῦ καὶ παλαιότητα τῷ δὴ θεολόγῳ μαρτυρήσας; and further: δοκιμασθείσης δὲ ὡς ἀληθοῦς ὑπὸ τῆς Πορφυρίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου μαρτυρίας).¹⁸³

In book IX of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius cites Numenius' famous "what is Plato except Moses speaking Attic Greek?"¹⁸⁴ through Clement's *Stromata*. Yet he also cites him independently at XI. 10. 14. In the first case, the bishop locates Numenius' *bon mot* under Clement's authority because it sheds a different light on it. The fact that Clement knew Numenius' passage guaranteed, in Eusebius' view, his authority.¹⁸⁵

Likewise, Josephus appears in book IX of the *Praeparatio* because he quotes so many Greek authors. What matters to Eusebius is to give Josephus' citation of Polyhistor on Abraham (*PE* IX. 20. 3). Polyhistor himself cites another otherwise unknown author, Cleodemus-Malchas. Therefore, in order to present Abraham, Eusebius produces an impressive cascade of authors whose discourses are set in one another, as the following sketch indicates:

Eusebius says that →
 Josephus says that →
 Polyhistor says that →
 Cleodemus says that . . .

This may occasionally lead the reader of the *Apodeixis* to think that the authority of the different authors cited, as well as the manner in which their citations are arranged, are given more importance than the content of the citations. This legitimates the concept of *auctoritas* as defined above and its application to the analysis of the

of Byblos. According to A. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales 89. Leiden: Brill, 1981, p. 51, 263, even if Philo of Byblos had discovered a Phoenician source dating back to c. 1000 B.C.E., he certainly had re-worked it deeply. On this topic, see also R. A. Oden Jr., "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 1978, pp. 115–126. A. Meredith, "Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians", p. 1132, notes that an inscription from the fourteenth century B.C.E. was found in the ancient Ugarit (Rash Shamra) that seems to recount the same facts as those transmitted under Sanchuniathon's name through Eusebius and Philo of Byblos.

¹⁸³ *PE* I. 9. 22.

¹⁸⁴ *PE* IX. 6. 9.

¹⁸⁵ Therefore Coman's suggestion that Eusebius cites Numenius via Clement because at that stage of the composition he did not have Numenius first-hand, must be rejected (J. Coman, "Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe de Césarée dans la Préparation évangélique", *TU* 125, 1981, p. 125).

Apodeixis. This phenomenon is especially striking in book IX of the *Praeparatio* in which the very content of Cleodemus' citation hardly contributes to the apologist's argument. What really matters is to show that the Greek authors had known and mentioned Abraham. The same logic applies to the citations from minor Jewish authors quoted through Alexander Polyhistor.¹⁸⁶

However, Eusebius not only appeals to testimonies that are beneficial to his demonstration. He also cites some of them in order to criticize them. This is especially the case with excerpts from Porphyry.¹⁸⁷ In this context, the citation process works in a very different way. The voices of the speaker and the enunciator are not uttered in unison. They are integrated into a dialogic game that has been tampered with by Eusebius the speaker. Indeed, the citation is fixed by nature whereas Eusebius' discourse is not, since it comes, chronologically, before the citation. Therefore, the latter is able to play his best cards against an already defeated opponent.

D. *Strategies of Concealment and Identification of the Sources in the Apodeixis*

In addition to multiple insertions of citations, Eusebius occasionally conceals the source from which he has taken a passage, or the source from which the author he cites has excerpted a passage. This strategy enables him to emphasize one or other authority. In book IX of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he avoids mentioning that Josephus is the source of Porphyry's account of the Essenes.¹⁸⁸

However, on other occasions, he prefers to emphasize the cited author's source rather than the cited author himself. At. IX. 2. 1 of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he quotes Porphyry who himself explicitly quotes Theophrastus; he emphasizes Theophrastus' testimony over that of Porphyry (who is still mentioned): "Take and read Theophrastus' opinions which are in Porphyry's work *On the Abstinence of Animals*, and are told as follows . . ." (Καὶ δὴ λάβων ἀνάγνωθι τὰ Θεοφράστου ἐν τοῖς Πορφυρίῳ γραφεῖσι Περὶ τῆς τῶν ἐμψύχων ἀποχῆς κείμενα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον).¹⁸⁹ Interestingly, in book I, Eusebius closes a citation

¹⁸⁶ I will return to this issue in Chapters V and VI.

¹⁸⁷ On this topic, see Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 264–275.

¹⁸⁸ *PE* IX. 3.

¹⁸⁹ *PE* IX. 1. 4.

from Porphyry who himself quotes Theophrastus by saying he just quoted Porphyry no less than Theophrastus (Τοσαῦτα καὶ ὁ Πορφύριος, οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ Θεόφραστος).¹⁹⁰

It is worth noting that it is Theophrastus and not Porphyry who appears in the chapter title. Likewise, at II. 2. 52 of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius takes pains to emphasize that the theology presented by Diodorus is that of Euhemerus.

E. *Quantitative Assessment of the Citations in the Apodeixis*

The citations given in the *Apodeixis* vary in length, from a single line up to twenty pages in the Sources chrétiennes.¹⁹¹ Eusebius occasionally claims to aim for brevity.¹⁹² In some cases, this seems to be a rhetorical procedure: At VIII. 13. 7 of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he announces a citation from Philo's *De providentia*. Claiming that the philosopher's arguments may appear too long, he says that he will present them briefly. However, this 'short' presentation takes no less than twenty pages in the Sources chrétiennes edition.

F. *The Commentary on the Citations in the Apodeixis*

Eusebius' commentary on citations may be either extensive or brief, sometimes even lacking. Indeed, some citations deserve, according to him, a lengthy explanation, whereas others are self-explanatory and therefore need no commentary. At XIV. 5–8 of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., the bishop feels no need to comment upon Numenius' clear passages from his *On the Infidelity of the Academy towards Plato*, of which many excerpts are cited. By contrast, he devotes six pages of commentary to two pages from Porphyry.¹⁹³ In the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius claims to restrict his comments as much as possible,¹⁹⁴ although in practice this is not always the case.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁰ PE I. 9. 12.

¹⁹¹ E.g., PE IV. 14. 4 and II. 3. 1–42 respectively. The citations mentioned here are those which have no internal cut.

¹⁹² See, e.g., PE III. 11. 21; IV. 2. 14.

¹⁹³ PE III. 9. 6–10. 26.

¹⁹⁴ DE I. 1. 9.

¹⁹⁵ See, e.g., Eusebius' long commentary on Daniel's prophecies at DE VIII. 2.

G. *Levels of Agreement between Eusebius' Discourse and the Citations in the Apodeixis: Polyphony, Symphony, and Cacophony*

Eusebius' use of citations raises the question as to what extent he agrees with the discourses of the authors he cites. Different 'levels of agreement' coexist in the *Apodeixis*. Indeed, all the authors who appear in this work are not quoted by the apologist with the same level of agreement. When Eusebius cites Porphyry in order to refute his words,¹⁹⁶ e.g., there is no agreement to speak of. This phenomenon may be labelled 'cacophony'. By contrast, when he cites Origen on fatalism,¹⁹⁷ a superposition of the speaker's and the enunciator's voices may be observed. Eusebius seems to absorb, as it were, the discourse of the author cited (Origen), as if he wished to appropriate it completely. The linguistic concept of polyphony may be applied to this phenomenon, without any modifications: In this case, it defines an enunciative situation in which several voices are heard simultaneously and indistinctively. In this example, even though Eusebius clearly indicates that he is quoting Origen, the latter's thoughts have been so deeply appropriated that the speaker's and the enunciator's voices are almost totally confused.

A middle way between the two may be found in the case of those Greek authors whose arguments are beneficial to Eusebius' demonstration but whose primary concerns radically differ from his. For instance, the latter's voice may hardly be confused with that of the Cynic philosopher Oenomaus¹⁹⁸ or with that of the Epicurean Diogenianus,¹⁹⁹ even if he agrees with them on certain points. This enunciative situation may be defined as 'symphonic'. In this 'symphony', the speaker's voice (that of Eusebius) is uttered simultaneously to that of the enunciator (the author cited). Indeed, although the former claims to let the latter speak, his voice is also heard since he agrees with the cited discourse. However, the two voices are not confused: Eusebius clearly indicates that he is not at the same level as the enunciator and he distinguishes himself from him, even if the enunciator enables him to support his arguments.

¹⁹⁶ E.g., *PE* III. 9. 1–5. Many other examples could be given.

¹⁹⁷ *PE* VI. 11. 1–81.

¹⁹⁸ *PE* V. 22–36; VI. 7. 1–42.

¹⁹⁹ *PE* VI. 8. 1–38.

Finally, biblical citations constitute a special case. Indeed, Eusebius' voice is not confused with that of the Scriptures; yet it does not distinguish itself from them either. Actually, it completely vanishes before the sacred text, which constitutes the ultimate authority in his Christian view.

H. *Strategies of Distinction of the Citations in the Apodeixis*

Marking a citation is a major step in the citation process. Eusebius does it in two different ways:

a) He uses linguistic markers. Like most ancient authors, he defines the action of the cited author with a participle or with a verb in a modal form in the third person singular. He mostly uses the verbs γράφω, μαρτυρέω, ιστορέω, λέγω, φημί, φάσκω, διέξιμι, ἐρμηνεύω, διηγέομαι, μνημονεύω in the indicative present, third person singular. Eusebius also addresses his reader—or Theodotus to whom he dedicates his work²⁰⁰—by using an imperative form in the present or in the aorist, second person singular, of the verbs ἀκούω, ἐπακούω, ἀναγινώσκω. At times, these two kinds of formulas are used simultaneously in expressions such as ἄκουε . . . λέγοντος. As Schenkenveld has shown, this expression should be translated by “read” rather than by “listen”.²⁰¹ Eusebius also uses the verb παράκειμαι (“to present”), in the present imperative, third person singular, in order to put an end to a citation.²⁰² In most cases, adverbial phrases such as τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὧδέ πως or οὕτως come right before the citation.

b) Eusebius is content with using the title of the chapter to which the citation belongs in order to mark its beginning. In this case, the citation requires no introduction.²⁰³ This is also the case when a citation is finished: Occasionally, the title of the next chapter marks the end of the citation.²⁰⁴ Yet most often, expressions such as τοσαῦτα, followed by the name of the cited author, serve to indicate that the citation is finished.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁰ See *PE* I. 1. 1 and *DE* I. pr.

²⁰¹ D. Schenkenveld, “Prose usages of Akouein ‘to read’”, *CQ* 42, 1992, pp. 129–141 has shown that this verb, when associated with a participle in the genitive translates ‘to read that which someone has written’. This verb is also repeatedly used by Simplicius to indicate that a citation is given (Baltussen, “Philology or Philosophy?”, p. 185).

²⁰² E.g., *PE* IX. 20. 4.

²⁰³ E.g., *PE* IX. 18; 19; XII. 45; 46; 47 etc.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁵ E.g., *PE* IX. 4. 8; XI. 10. 14 etc.

It is worth noting that Eusebius almost always states when he skips lines/ passages in the text he quotes.²⁰⁶ The formulas he uses to indicate this are few in number. In most cases, one finds expressions such as καὶ ἐπιλέγει/ἐπιφέρει²⁰⁷/προστίθῃσι,²⁰⁸ with or without adverbs or adverbial formulas like καὶ μετὰ βραχέα, καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, καὶ αὐθις, or πάλιν. The latter are sometimes used alone.²⁰⁹ In addition, the cutting process is described with the verb ἐπιτέμνω.²¹⁰

I. *Promises of Faithfulness in the Apodeixis*

Eusebius often makes it clear that he is citing literally. In order to do so, he often uses the expressions πρὸς λέξιν, κατὰ λέξιν, πρὸς ῥῆμα, ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς throughout the *Praeparatio*. Such statements do not appear in the *Demonstratio*, and with good reason: As we will see, Eusebius is less careful in copying faithfully the non-biblical passages he cites, giving preference to paraphrases.

It is not exactly clear how these expressions should be understood. While Eusebius' care for exactness in citing is often emphasized, it is rarely interpreted. Does the bishop insist on his faithfulness in quoting because he aims at 'objectivity'? Such a suggestion may appear as a projection of our 'modern' conception of citation, as it is applied in journalism or scholarship, rather than as a relevant representation of Eusebius' intentions. Questioning the importance of direct speech and faithfulness to the text quoted in Simplicius, Baltussen suggests that this practice reflects the Platonic doctrine of the superiority of orality over writing.²¹¹ According to him, direct speech and faithfulness to the cited text would be used to reproduce the text as if it were uttered orally. This explanation may appear insufficient because Simplicius does not distinguish himself markedly from other ancient authors who were less prone to Platonic influence. In addition, it seems of little relevance to explain Eusebius' methodology, even if the latter also greatly admires Plato. A passage from the *Praeparatio* may explain more clearly Eusebius' intentions: At IV. 7. 1,

²⁰⁶ But there are exceptions: e.g., when he cites Clement's *Stromata* in chapter 12 of book XIII, he skips *Str.* V. 115. 6–116. 3 without telling the readers (*PE* XIII. 13. 42–43).

²⁰⁷ E.g., *PE* X. 13. 2.

²⁰⁸ E.g., *PE* V. 4. 3.

²⁰⁹ E.g., *PE* X. 11. 6; IV. 14. 8; X. 10. 15; V. 7. 2 respectively.

²¹⁰ E.g., *PE* III. 11. 17.

²¹¹ Baltussen, "Philology or Philosophy ?", p. 185 ff.

the bishop cites the promise of Porphyry in which the latter swears to have preserved the meaning (νοῦν, νοημάτων) of the oracles he was going to cite, despite several modifications he considers minor. Eusebius thinks it is useful to quote this passage because in it, Porphyry “swears to tell the truth” (ἀληθεύειν ἐπόμνυται).²¹² This suggests that when he claims to be faithful in citing, he himself wishes to swear, as it were, to tell the truth. By doing so, he seeks to reinforce the strength of his argumentation.

A word should also be said about the expressions ὧδέ πη and ὧδέ πως which Eusebius often uses when introducing a citation. More specifically, it is their translation which raises problems. They are usually translated by “somewhere” and “more or less in this way”, with a nuance of indetermination. In her translation of book XI of the *Praeparatio*, Favrelle states that the formula ὧδέ πη does not indicate an indetermination of location but the lack of exactness of the citation.²¹³ This hypothesis proves, however, to be erroneous: On several occasions, it is followed by πρὸς λέξιν or κατὰ λέξιν.²¹⁴ This is also true about ὧδέ πως.²¹⁵ This expression introduces a faithful citation.²¹⁶ When they are used to introduce a citation, πως and πη seem to lose the nuance of indetermination they sometimes have.²¹⁷

J. References to the Text Cited in the Apodeixis

Eusebius often mentions the title of the cited work as well as the book from which he has taken the cited passage.²¹⁸ Such information may be found either in the note that comes before or after the citation. At times it only occurs in the heading of the chapter including the quotation.²¹⁹

²¹² PE IV. 6. 4.

²¹³ G. Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292. Paris: Cerf, 1982, p. 314, n. 3.

²¹⁴ E.g., PE III. 7. 5.

²¹⁵ E.g., PE III. 2. 7, or at DE III. 6. 134a.

²¹⁶ On this point, see Van Den Hoek, “Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria”, p. 233.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.* and LSJ, *s.v.*

²¹⁸ E.g., PE II. 7. 9 in which book II of Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities* is mentioned; cf. PE IV. 16. 11 where the first book of Philo of Byblos’ *Phoenician History* is cited; PE IX. 3. 1 where Eusebius mentions the fourth book of Porphyry’s *De abstinentia*.

²¹⁹ E.g., PE IX. 18. heading; IX. 24. heading.

Eusebius sometimes summarizes the content of the passage he cites before quoting it.²²⁰ Less frequently, he admits to giving second-hand quotations. This is the case with a citation from Apollonius of Tyana²²¹ which the bishop introduces by saying that “it is said that he [Apollonius] has written . . .” (γράφειν λέγεται). The term λέγεται is likely to indicate that Apollonius is not Eusebius’ direct source.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter I have attempted to clarify the concept of citation in the ancient world in general (especially in contrast to that of modern scholarship), and in the *Apodeixis* in particular. The major difference between a citation as it was understood in antiquity and a citation as it is understood today lies in the freedom ancient authors enjoyed not only in relation to the letter of the text but also in relation to its primary meaning. Unlike modern writers,²²² they did not hesitate to appropriate someone else’s text to establish that which they thought was the correct meaning. No ethical or legal guidance existed to keep them from the hermeneutical richness resulting from such freedom. This does not mean, however, that some authors were not faithful in their citations according to our criteria. Eusebius proves to be a good example of this rather rare trend.

The vocabulary used by Eusebius to introduce or conclude a citation generally mirrors other authors’ habits. However, his rigour in citing, especially in the *Praeparatio*, makes him different from most of his predecessors. It may be suggested that the polemical and apologetic context in which this work was written explains the apologist’s great accuracy. However, Eusebius is a man of his time. By using the citation technique, he locates himself in a certain literary tradition. In consequence, any judgement on his appropriation of texts is irrelevant.

In addition, I have shown that far from being the instrument of a rough, ungifted author, citing proves to be a carefully prepared

²²⁰ E.g., *PE* III. pr. 4–5 where Eusebius summarizes a passage from Plutarch before citing it.

²²¹ *PE* IV. 12. 1.

²²² Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 235–356 has shown that texts become ‘properties’ only from the seventeenth century onwards.

and well-thought strategy. It is based on a subtle play of literary authorities perfectly suited to a logical and impartial demonstration.

In the *Apodeixis*, citations exert different functions defined by Morawski,²²³ such as the functions of “autorité” and “érudition”, as well as the “fonction stimulative-amplificatoire”. But citations also enable the construction of a “cultural continuity” between pagans and Christians. Therefore, the citation process is exploited to the utmost in an apologetic context. It proves to be a formidable tool which enables Eusebius to convince his readers by means of irrefutable proof.

More specifically, I pointed out the importance of the function of authority of citations in Eusebius’ work. The interactions between the different authors cited and the different manners in which they are exploited enable him to found his apologetic demonstration. The enunciators’ authority varies not only according to their reputation in the Greek world but also according to Eusebius’s use of them. I have also noted the importance of the concept of agreement between sources (συμφωνία) on the strength of which a great deal of the apologist’s reasoning depends.

Moreover, I identified the kind of relations that tie the citations together. They were defined as vertical or horizontal, inserted or simple. I also indicated that the manner in which the bishop arranges the citations plays a crucial role in his apologetic and polemical strategy. Occasionally, Eusebius does not hesitate to conceal the source of the cited author, or, on the contrary, to lessen the latter’s authority in favour of his source, depending on his intention. Plays on authority and “mises en abyme” all constitute major features of Eusebius’ use of citations. By exploiting these strategies, Eusebius creates new meanings in passages whose content originally meant something different.

Finally, I presented the vocabulary used by the bishop to describe the citation process, as well as other parameters such as the length of citations or the length of Eusebius’ commentary upon them. I have pointed out that the latter uses a defined set of terms in dealing with citations. I also noted that the length of the passages quoted and of the comments upon them could vary quite strongly.

²²³ See Morawski, “The Basic Function of Quotation”, pp. 690–696. Cf. my Introduction.

More than a list of testimonies, more than a florilegium, the *Apodeixis*, and especially the *Praeparatio*, constitutes an arena, as it were, in which different philosophical and historical authorities meet, confronting or agreeing with one another. Although he claims to remain at a distance, Eusebius often succumbs to the temptation to enter this space of dialogue and controversy. The fact that he himself arranges the citations brings his personal approach to the fore.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CITATIONS OF NON-JEWISH AUTHORS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

1. THE *AUCTORITAS* OF THE CITED AUTHORS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

In this chapter, I will analyze the way in which Eusebius deals with other, non-Jewish authors in the *Apodeixis* in order to compare it with his handling of Jewish authors. First of all, Eusebius distinguishes between the various authorities he uses according to their religious identities. Therefore, it will be necessary to deal with pagan, Jewish and Christian authors separately. I will classify them according to the level of *auctoritas* Eusebius gives them. It is worth noting that his view on this question is reflected more faithfully in the *Demonstratio* than in the *Praeparatio*. Indeed, we have seen that the *Praeparatio* addresses pagans or newly converted Christians. Consequently, in this work, Eusebius positions the pagan authors at the top level of *auctoritas* since their testimonies are more likely to influence the intended readership. Biblical and Jewish authors follow, and Christian authors are located at the bottom of this scale. As Eusebius says, the latter are not supposed to voice their opinions in the *Praeparatio*, since their testimonies would make his proof unreliable and partial. By contrast, the *Demonstratio* is more faithful to his own views. The above scale of *auctoritas* is turned upside down: The biblical citations are seen as the most authoritative, closely followed by the Christian quotations, the Jewish ones, and, finally, the pagan ones, which are very rare. I will follow the scale reflected in the *Praeparatio* since my study focuses more specifically on this work.

A. *Pagan Authors*

The pagan testimonies prove to be crucial, especially in the *Praeparatio* since the legitimacy and accuracy of Eusebius' account depend largely on them. The selected authors are presented in a favourable light because, on the one hand, they guarantee the apologist's demonstration, and on the other, their authority in pagan milieus had to be emphasized in order to be taken into account by pagan readers.

Porphry is the sole exception, since he authored a pamphlet entitled *Against the Christians*. Therefore, Eusebius deals with him ironically, describing him as a “theosopher”,¹ or as being “amazing”.² In addition, the bishop seems to avoid mentioning his name, contenting himself with calling him “the author of the pamphlet against the Christians”.³ It is fairly obvious that he should be included, according to Eusebius, among the “Greek witnesses who claim to be philosophers and have investigated deeply the history of the nations” (οἱ τε τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἀνέχοντες καὶ τὴν ἄλλην τῶν ἐθνῶν ἱστορίαν διηρησνηκότες)⁴ that he willingly uses.

Eusebius often insists on the reputation of the pagan authors and the great esteem in which they were held by their peers in order to add weight to their testimonies. For instance, Apollonius of Tyana (born c. 4 B.C.E.) deserves to be cited in the *Apodeixis* because he is “this Apollonius in person, celebrated by many” (ὁ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ᾠδόμενος αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὁ Τυανεύς Ἀπολλώνιος).⁵ In the same way, Alexander of Aphrodisias (193–211 C.E.) is presented as “a man very famous for his philosophical discourses” (ἄνθρωπος εὖ μάλα διαφανὴς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις);⁶ Diodorus Siculus is described as “the most famous of the most erudite Greeks” (γνωριμώτατος ἄνθρωπος τοῖς Ἑλλήνων λογιστάτοις).⁷ This is also true of Alexander Polyhistor, an author who is “very notorious among the Greeks, who have not superficially taken advantage of his culture” (τοῖς τε μὴ πάρεργον τὸν ἀπὸ παιδείας καρπὸν πεποιημένοις Ἑλλησι γνωριμώτατος).⁸ It is also the case with Atticus, “a famous man among Platonic philosophers” (διαφανὴς ἄνθρωπος τῶν πλατωνικῶν φιλοσόφων),⁹ with Amelius, Plotinus’ disciple, “who became famous among the recent philosophers” (τῶν νέων φιλοσόφων διαφανὴς γεγονώς).¹⁰ Many other examples could be given.

¹ *PE* IV. 9. 7.

² *PE* V. 14. 3.

³ Cf., e.g., *PE* V. 1. 9.

⁴ *PE* I. 6. 8. See also I. 5. 14.

⁵ *PE* IV. 12. 1.

⁶ *PE* VI. 8. 39.

⁷ *PE* I. 6. 9. See also II. pr. 6.

⁸ *PE* IX. 17. 1.

⁹ *PE* XI. 1. 2.

¹⁰ *PE* XI. 18. 26.

In addition to the cited authors' notoriousness, Eusebius also insists on their intellectual capacities and erudition. Alexander Polyhistor, e.g., is defined as πολυμαθής and πολύνους,¹¹ a rather rare adjective which strikingly also occurs in Porphyry's *Vita Plotini* to describe Plotinus' style.¹²

The apologist also emphasizes the exactness of the works produced by the pagan authors. Diodorus Siculus' writing is described in terms of precision (ἀπηκριβωκώς) and Diodorus himself is said to be authoritative among the erudite people (τοῖς φιλολόγοις).¹³ The fact that he used different sources is also mentioned.¹⁴ Likewise, Eusebius proudly underlines the preciseness of all Dionysios of Halicarnassos' books on Roman history (ἀκριβῆ τὴν γραφὴν ἔπασσαν).¹⁵ This insistence on the notion of accuracy needs to be pointed out because it occurs throughout the *Praeparatio* (but rarely in the *Demonstratio*). It reflects Eusebius' eagerness to provide a solid, correct argumentation able to resist the pagan accusation according to which the Christian decision to abandon paganism was irrational.¹⁶ Moreover, it showed Eusebius' determination to follow the rules of Greek historiography.¹⁷ This enabled him to speak a common language both with his adversaries and with those ready to espouse Christianity.

Eusebius also stresses that he appeals to the Greeks in order that they might testify on Greek matters. He says he would rather cite their testimony because Christian testimonies on this subject might not be considered reliable. Yet he also insists on his use of 'native' testimonies when dealing with 'native' history.¹⁸ The Phoenicians, he says, are cited in order to recount Phoenician history, the Egyptians

¹¹ *PE* IX. 17. 1.

¹² *Vita Plotini* XIV. 1.

¹³ *PE* II. pr. 6.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *PE* IV. 16. 14.

¹⁶ *PE* I. 1. 11–12; 2. 1–8; 5. 2; etc. This accusation is found throughout the *Apodeixis*.

¹⁷ The insistence on the concepts of truth and exactness, as well as the rejection of partiality, already occur in Thucydides, *Hist.* I. 22. 1–4; Polybius II. 56. 10–12; Dion. Hal., *Thucydides* 8; Lucian, *How to Write Hist.* 7; 9; 39; 41; 47; 50. Josephus also claims those principles (cf. *Bj* I. 9; *CA* I. 47–50). More than the others, he might have influenced Eusebius.

¹⁸ The use of 'native' authors is usual in Greek historiography and confers authority on the historian: See Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, pp. 283–284.

for Egyptian history, the “Hebrews” and the “Jews” for Hebrew and Jewish matters.¹⁹ The choice of this methodology rests on two traditions. Firstly, the Socratic tradition according to which one should call upon a specialist in order to ask specific questions.²⁰ Secondly, it depends upon Hellenistic historiography in which native authors claim to present their history and cult by basing themselves on native documents.²¹ Therefore, Eusebius wished to establish his demonstration by relying on other authors’ citations whose accounts could not be called into question. Modern scholarship has saluted him for taking these sources into account. Yet a close look at the text shows some reluctance on his part to cite these native authors. Sanchuniathon’s testimony, e.g., which is quoted by Philo of Byblos and Porphyry, seems to be valued *a priori* by the Christian apologist because of his antiquity and also because, he says, he does not resort to misleading allegories.²² Yet his testimony must be legitimated by Porphyry.²³ A similar phenomenon may be observed regarding the Egyptian material: After mentioning Manetho and his translation of Egyptian documents into Greek, Eusebius prefers to cite Diodorus Siculus, because “his work is more famous among the Greeks” (γνωριμώτερας τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν τῆς τούτου γραφῆς).²⁴ As for Chaeremon, who is quoted through Porphyry, his name appears neither in the titles of the chapters nor in the introduction to these chapters in which Eusebius prefers to mention Porphyry.²⁵ Moreover, when in book X of the *Praeparatio* Eusebius cites Josephus, who himself cites Manetho, he emphasizes the Jewish author’s testimony, ignoring the authority of the Egyptian author who is his source.²⁶ Therefore,

¹⁹ *PE* VII. 8. 1 and VIII. 1. 4.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., Plato, *Lys.* 210b, even if, afterwards, Socrates shows that the specialist does not know much about his specialty.

²¹ Cf., e.g., Manetho and Chaeremon for the Egyptians, Berossus for the Chaldeans, Abydenus for the Medes and Assyrians etc. Most of these authors were known and cited by Eusebius in the *PE*.

²² *PE* I. 10. 54–55.

²³ *PE* I. 9. 22 and I. 10. 42.

²⁴ *PE* II. pr. 6.

²⁵ *PE* III. 4. heading. However, Eusebius finally refers to Chaeremon at *PE* III. 9. 15; V. 10. 5.

²⁶ *PE* X. 13. 13, where Eusebius concludes that Josephus has narrated Egyptian history to a great extent. On the fragments of Manetho in Josephus, see P. Schäfer, “Die Manetho-Fragmente bei Josephus und die Anfänge des antiken ‘Antisemitismus’”, in G. W. Most, *Collecting Fragments—Fragmente Sammeln*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997, pp. 186–206.

despite his claims, the bishop proves to be more eager to quote acknowledged Greek testimonies than native testimonies. And when he cites these native authors, he calls upon a Greek authority who is able to legitimate this authority.

The age of the authors cited by Eusebius also matters to him. Indeed, some of them are authoritative in his view because of their antiquity, like Sanchuniathon,²⁷ others because they are recent. In this case, the bishop praises the energy of their discourses. Oenomaus of Gadara, e.g., a Cynic philosopher of the first or second century C.E., and Amelius, the neo-Platonic philosopher are both described as νέοι whose accounts show “the resolution of youth” (νεανικῶ φρονήματι).²⁸ Along the same line, at the end of book IX of the *Praeparatio*,²⁹ Eusebius claims to have numerous testimonies at hand which are both “ancient and recent” (παλαιῶν τε καὶ νέων) on the history of the Hebrews and the Jews. This confirms the importance of the age of the authors cited. It is worth noting that Eusebius does not reject recent writers.

Finally, Plato deserves a specific section because of the tremendous importance Eusebius gives him. Indeed, according to the bishop, he is the “leader” (κορυφαῖος) of the Greek philosophers. He has overcome them all (τοὺς πάντας ὑπερακοντίσας).³⁰ Yet Eusebius’ praise does not prevent him from criticizing some Platonic conceptions in book XIII of the *Praeparatio*. Nevertheless, even in this passage, he carefully emphasizes that he does not aim to discredit him (οὐκ αὐτοῦ διαβολῆς), because, he adds:

ἐπεὶ καὶ σφόδρα ἔγωγε ἄγαμαι τὸν ἄνδρα, ναὶ πάντων Ἑλλήνων φίλον ἡγοῦμαι καὶ τιμῶ, τὰ ἔμοι φίλα καὶ συγγενῇ, εἰ καὶ μὴ τὰ ἴσα διόλου, πεφρονηκότα . . .

I admire this man really a lot, yes, I hold him as my best friend among the Greeks and I honour him; his thoughts are friendly and familiar to me, if not totally similar to mine . . .³¹

However, according to Eusebius, Plato’s philosophy reveals its shortcomings when compared to that of Moses and the prophets. In his

²⁷ PE I. 9. 20.

²⁸ PE V. 18. 6; VI. 6. 74.

²⁹ PE IX. 42. 4.

³⁰ PE XI. pr. 3.

³¹ PE XIII. 18. 17. Translation by E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii evangelicae praeparationis libri XV recensuit, Anglice reddidit, notis et indicibus instruxit*, Oxford, 1903.

opinion, these shortcomings justify the Christians' preference for the barbarian philosophy over the Greek one.³² Therefore, Eusebius' feelings towards Plato are ambiguous but strong: He deeply admires him and is sincerely attached to his Platonic background. Only his love of the Hebrew Scriptures takes precedence over this attachment.

B. *Christian Authors*

The *Apodeixis* contains only a few citations from Christian authors since at the beginning of his twofold work, Eusebius establishes as a rule not to base his argument on Christian literature ("our writings", παρ' ἡμῖν γραμμάτων).³³ Yet, in the *Praeparatio*, he quotes Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Dionysios of Alexandria, Bardesanes, Methodius of Olympos (whom he mistakenly calls Maximus), Julius Africanus and Tatian; in the *Demonstratio*, he only quotes Julius Africanus. Bardesanes, Methodius and Tatian only appear once throughout his work. By contrast, Origen, Dionysios, and Julius Africanus appear in two different places of the *Apodeixis* and Clement in five places. All are cited extensively (i.e., over several pages).³⁴

The manner in which Eusebius presents the Christian authors is not very different from that in which he dealt with the pagans. He also emphasizes their knowledge and intelligence but this time with regard to two different fields, namely the secular sciences and Christianity.³⁵ Citing Julius Africanus, Tatian and Clement, e.g., he announces their testimonies as those of "erudite men" (λόγιοι ἄνδρες), "in no way inferior to educated people" (καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ παιδείας οὐδενὸς δεύτεροι).³⁶ Eusebius also considers Origen one of "the greatest" (τοῖς κρείττοις),³⁷ ascribing his fame to his "zeal towards the knowledge [of the Pagans]" (τὰ τῶνδε μαθήματα φλοτιμίαν).³⁸ Yet he also under-

³² *PE* XI. pr. 5; XIII. 18. 17.

³³ E.g., *PE* I. 6. 8. Coman, "Utilisation de *Stromates* par Eusèbe", p. 120, n. 7, rightly claims that this "we" also includes Josephus, Philo and Aristobulus.

³⁴ On these authors and their use by Eusebius—especially for the complex cases of Dionysios and "Maximus"—see Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*.

³⁵ He does the same thing with some Christian authors in the *HE*: cf. that which he says about Dorotheos, a priest from Antioch (*HE* VII. 32. 2–4), Anatolius (*HE* VII. 32. 6), Stephen (*HE* VII. 32. 22), and Pamphilus, Pierius and Melitius (*HE* VII. 32. 25–28).

³⁶ *PE* X. 9. 26.

³⁷ *PE* VI. 10. 50.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

lines that Julius Africanus, Tatian and Clement are people who “have devoted themselves with no little care to divine things” (τοῖς τε θείοις οὐ παρέργως καθωμιληκότες).³⁹ Likewise, “Maximus” is presented as “famous concerning the study of Christ” (τῆς Χριστοῦ διατριβῆς οὐκ ἀσήμω ἀνδρὶ),⁴⁰ and finally, Origen is described as an “interpreter of the sacred oracles” (τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων . . . τὸν ἐρμηνέα).⁴¹

As we have seen with the pagan authors, Eusebius points out that the Christian writers are careful and precise in their investigations. The accounts of Julius Africanus, Tatian and Clement on the dating of Moses and of the prophets, e.g., show that “they have scrutinized the subject in question with exactness” (τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπόθεσιν ἐπ’ ἀκριβὲς διευκρινήσαντες).⁴² In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius also takes pains to note that Julius Africanus’ *Chronography* is an exact work (ἐπ’ ἀκριβέως).⁴³

Eusebius certainly respected these authors and, more importantly, saw them as his predecessors⁴⁴—at least some of them. He says so openly about Julius Africanus and Tatian when dealing with chronological matters: Both authors are defined as τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν.⁴⁵ He also shows his admiration for Origen and Clement by describing them as “wonderful” (θαυμάσιος or θαυμαστός).⁴⁶

Surprisingly, some authors whom he considers to be heretics in the *Historia ecclesiastica* are cited in the *Praeparatio*. This is the case with Bardesanes, whom the apologist does not even present as a Christian but as a representative of the Chaldean science. In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius had explained that Bardesanes had first espoused the Valentinian doctrine before later rejecting it.⁴⁷ However, he adds, he never completely washed away this heresy. This story

³⁹ PE X. 9. 26.

⁴⁰ PE VII. 21. 5. Eusebius’ comment sounds wrong when one is aware that he misattributed the passage. Maximus is mentioned at HE V. 27. This passage shows that Eusebius hardly knew this author. He mentions him along with other authors whose dates and biographies he does not seem to know.

⁴¹ PE VI. 10. 50.

⁴² PE X. 9. 26.

⁴³ HE VI. 31. 2.

⁴⁴ PE VII. 18. 13 and X. 9. 26.

⁴⁵ PE X. 9. 26.

⁴⁶ PE II. 2. 64; IV. 16. 12; VI. 10. 50. Origen had a profound influence on Eusebius: See Ch. Kannengiesser, “Eusebius of Caesarea Origenist”, in G. Hata and W. H. Attridge *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 435–460.

⁴⁷ HE IV. 30. 3. See Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, p. 89.

does not prevent him from admiring the man and his *On Destiny*, which he describes as “most satisfactory” (ικανώτατος).⁴⁸ In the *Praeparatio*, his testimony is used in the same way as the other Greek authors: Eusebius cites an astrologer (Bardanes) in order to attack astrological fatalism, just as he uses Greek testimonies to shatter the foundations of Hellenism.

The case of Tatian is different, although in the *Historia ecclesiastica* he is also described as a heretic.⁴⁹ Yet in the *Praeparatio*, unlike Bardanes, he is accepted as a Christian in his own right. Having said this, even in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius praises the *Oratio ad Graecos* which is, according to him, “a most beautiful and most useful” work (κάλλιστος καὶ ὠφελιμώτατος).⁵⁰

Needless to say, Clement is never presented as a heretic but as Eusebius’ role model. Eusebius reminds the reader that Clement used to be a pagan before abandoning paganism for Christianity. According to him, Clement experienced everything (πάντων μὲν διὰ πείρας ἐλθὼν ἀνὴρ)⁵¹ before seeing his error, “as if redeemed from his sins through the word of salvation and the teaching of the Gospel” (ὥς ἂν πρὸς τοῦ σωτηρίου λόγου καὶ διὰ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν κακῶν λελυτρωμένος).⁵²

One may therefore be struck by the contrast between Eusebius’ eagerness to quote some of these authors in the *Praeparatio* and the emphasis on his reluctance to cite unorthodox authors, especially in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁵³ This may easily be explained by the fact that he is determined to use any weighty testimony to support his argument.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize again that Eusebius’ presentation of Christian authors is not fundamentally different from that used in the case of pagan authors. He uses the same tools: Their intellectual value and fame are underlined. However, the case of the Christian authors must be distinguished from that of the pagans.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *HE* IV. 29. 1–7.

⁵⁰ *HE* IV. 29. 7.

⁵¹ *PE* II. 2. 64. Reference to the prologue to the *Str.* in which Clement recounts his different philosophical experiences, prior to his conversion to Christianity.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ See Grant’s thoughts on the subject in *Eusebius as Church Historian*, p. 84; Gustafsson, “Eusebius’ Principles in Handling His Sources”, p. 436; Gonnet, “L’acte de citer dans l’*Histoire ecclésiastique* d’Eusèbe”, p. 186.

Indeed, whereas pagan authors already benefited from the credit due to their cultural origin, the Christian authors' authority had to be established in the minds of Eusebius' pagan readers. It is well known that the Christians were accused by their adversaries of being uneducated.⁵⁴ In this context, it is fairly certain that Eusebius wished to counter this criticism by valorizing the Christians' intellectual authority.

Moreover, it seems that when Christian testimonies are cited more than once in the *Praeparatio* (as is the case with Clement and Origen), their presence needs to be justified. Eusebius argues that these authors were deeply connected to the pagan world, Clement because he used to be a pagan, and Origen because he excelled at Greek philosophy and was acknowledged by the Greeks. Thus like the 'native' authors examined earlier, in the *Praeparatio*, the Christian authors also require some kind of legitimation from the pagan world. However, unlike the pagan authors, their authority is not confirmed by a pagan author but by their personal links to pagan culture.

C. *Biblical Authors*

The library of Caesarea was famous for its biblical scholarship. Origen had engaged in the task of collating and revising scriptural texts and Pamphilus and Eusebius had produced texts for distribution and use.⁵⁵ Some scholars have even suggested the existence of a Caesarean text type of the New Testament.⁵⁶ Therefore, Eusebius' method of using scriptural citations in the *Apodeixis* deserves our attention.

First of all, following des Places, it is worth noting that in Eusebius' works, citations from the 'Old Testament' are far more numerous than those from the New Testament.⁵⁷ This is also the case with the *Praeparatio*, although it does not contain many scriptural citations. This is certainly due to the fact that Eusebius was more willing to

⁵⁴ This criticism occurs in several passages of Origen's *CC*: See, e.g., I. 27; III. 18; 44, 50, 55, 74, etc. Cf. my article, "La 'croyance populaire' comme accusation anti-chrétienne par Celse, dans le *Contre Celse* d'Origen", in J. Boulogne (Ed.), *Actes du colloque Croyances populaires. Rites et représentations en Méditerranée orientale* (Lille, 2-4 décembre 2004) (Forthcoming).

⁵⁵ *VC* IV. 36: Constantine had ordered fifty copies of the Bible from Eusebius for the churches of Constantinople.

⁵⁶ See B. M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans, 1963, pp. 42-72.

⁵⁷ Des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur: Platonisme et écriture sainte*, Paris, 1982, pp. 142-151.

cite the testimonies of the “ancient Hebrews” on their own doctrine and history. Genesis, Psalms and Isaiah are particularly well represented. Nevertheless, Eusebius rarely distinguishes the ‘Old’ Testament from the ‘New’, even in name.⁵⁸ Generally speaking, he refers to the Scriptures as “oracles” (τὰ λόγια).⁵⁹

Strikingly, Eusebius presents Moses as an historian whose competence must be established, just as for the Greek authors.⁶⁰ The bishop stresses that the reliability of Moses’ testimony lies in the deep knowledge he had of his ancestors’ history (εὖ τε τὰ πάτρια ἐξεπιστάμενος).⁶¹ This is remindful of Eusebius’ words on the native historians. Eusebius himself makes this parallel clear: Just as he resorted to Phoenicians to study Phoenician history, to Egyptians for the study of Egyptian history, to famous Greek historians for Greek history and to great philosophers for philosophy, he will resort to Moses’ writings for Hebrew history.⁶² Moreover, he is presented as the great theologian (ὁ μέγας θεολόγος), a Hebrew born of Hebrews (Ἑβραῖος ὢν ἐξ Ἑβραίων),⁶³ a prophet (πρόφητης),⁶⁴ a legislator (νομόθετης),⁶⁵ an admirable man (ὁ θαυμάσιος)⁶⁶ and a hierophant (ὁ ιεροφάντης).⁶⁷

After an account of the history and theology according to Moses, Eusebius deals with the prophets,⁶⁸ emphasizing that they are theologians subsequent to Moses (τῶν μετὰ Μωσέα θεολόγων)⁶⁹ and that they received an inspiration similar to that of Moses (οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα προφητῆται ἀκόλουθα καὶ αὐτοὶ θειάζοντες).⁷⁰ He also stresses the fact that, although they came after Moses, they are Hebrews (τῶν δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν Ἑβραίων).⁷¹

⁵⁸ See Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 92–93.

⁵⁹ E.g., *PE* VII. 18. 7.

⁶⁰ See G. Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215. Paris: Cerf, 1975, p. 57 ff. and *PE* VII. 7. 1.

⁶¹ *PE* VII. 7. 1.

⁶² *PE* VII. 8. 1.

⁶³ *PE* VII. 7. 1.

⁶⁴ *PE* VII. 10. 4.

⁶⁵ *PE* VII. 8. 38.

⁶⁶ *PE* VII. 10. 8.

⁶⁷ *PE* VII. 10. 14. See Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, p. 62.

⁶⁸ *PE* VII. 11. 5–8.

⁶⁹ *PE* VII. 11. 9.

⁷⁰ *PE* VII. 11. 5.

⁷¹ *PE* VII. 11. 9.

Eusebius also mentions David as the author of Psalms,⁷² and Solomon as the author of Proverbs.⁷³ On other occasions, he rather refers to “the oracles” (τὰ λόγια).⁷⁴ As to Paul, he is not only presented as Saint Paul but also as a Hebrew theologian, Ἑβραίων θεολόγος.⁷⁵ Likewise, John is a Ἑβραῖος θεολόγος,⁷⁶ a Hebrew born of Hebrews (Ἑβραῖος ὃν ἐξ Ἑβραίων).⁷⁷ This description should come as no surprise to the reader as Eusebius explains:

Ἑβραίων δὲ εἶναι λόγους οὐ μόνον τὰ παρὰ Μωσέϊ λόγια φημι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ Μωσέα θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν, εἴτε προφητῶν εἴτε καὶ ἀποστόλων τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

By Hebrew works, I am not only referring to those of Moses but even the God-loving men after him, be they prophets or our saviour's apostles.⁷⁸

This brief survey of Eusebius' representation of the authors other than Jewish Greek ones in the *Apodeixis* indicates Eusebius' desire to introduce his witnesses in a detailed and biased fashion: The readers' reception of the testimonies is in fact skilfully commanded by Eusebius from the beginning. The important question as to whether he occasionally tampered with the text will be examined in the next section.

2. EUSEBIUS' FAITHFULNESS TO THE CITED TEXT IN THE *APODEIXIS*

Assessing Eusebius' faithfulness to the texts he cites is crucial because many fragments from Greek authors have been transmitted through Eusebius only. The question about the accuracy of these fragments is an old one. Older scholars tended to think that Eusebius was untrustworthy in citing,⁷⁹ an opinion which was due to the mediocre

⁷² E.g., *PE* VII. 12. 13.

⁷³ *PE* VII. 12. 6.

⁷⁴ E.g., *PE* VII. 18. 7.

⁷⁵ *PE* XI. 19. 4.

⁷⁶ *PE* XI. 18. 26.

⁷⁷ *PE* XI. 19. 2.

⁷⁸ *PE* XII. 52. 35. My translation.

⁷⁹ See J. Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum* quoted by Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis* I, p. XXXVII; B. G. Niebuhr, *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, Bonn, 1828–1843, pp. 232, 241, 153 cited in the same work; and J. G. Hüllemann, *Miscellanea philologa*, Leipzig, 1849, I, p. 153. Gifford gives a list of the scholarly opinions on Eusebius' faithfulness to the text quoted: See *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis*, I, pp. XXXVI–XL.

quality of the available editions, as Valckenaer pointed out in 1843.⁸⁰ Later, in his 1867 edition, Dindorf praised Eusebius for his accuracy.⁸¹ He was followed by Freudenthal who demonstrated the bishop's precision in quoting the Jewish Hellenistic authors of book IX of the *Praeparatio*.⁸² Modern scholars generally accept Freudenthal's arguments⁸³ and the quality of Eusebius' citations has not been called into question since, even when evidence was given that the respectable bishop might have tampered with the text, as we shall see in the case of the pagan citations.

However, one must be careful in ascribing textual differences between the medieval manuscripts of a text (direct transmission) and Eusebius' manuscripts in which a text is cited (indirect transmission). Indeed, it is often difficult to determine to what extent a copyist, preceding or following Eusebius, may be held responsible for certain changes. Moreover, as Carriker has reminded us in his study on Eusebius' library, a relation between medieval manuscripts and ancient manuscripts can hardly be established with certainty.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, in some cases, it seems possible to show that Eusebius did make some changes. At any rate, this question cannot be avoided in the context of this work.

A. Citations of Pagan Authors

The excerpts from Plato and Plutarch are the most appropriate samples for a comparison with the original texts since few other authors quoted in the *Praeparatio* have been preserved through direct textual transmission.

⁸⁰ L. C. Valckenaer, in Th. Gaisford, L. K. Valckenaer, Fr. Viger, *Eusebii Evangelicae Praeparationis libri XV, recensuit T. Gaisford. Accedunt F. Vigeri versio latina et notae, et L. K. Valckenaerii Diatribe de Aristobulo*, IV, pp. 343–451 (esp. p. 414).

⁸¹ C. W. Dindorf, *Eusebii opera, G. Dindorfius recognovit*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1867–1871, I, pp. XVIII–XIX.

⁸² Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, pp. 14–16.

⁸³ E.g., P. Henry, *Recherches sur la "Préparation évangélique" d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius*. Bibl. École des Hautes Ét., sciences religieuses 50. Paris: E. Leroux, 1935, pp. 11–26; des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* V–VI. SC 266. Paris: Cerf, 1980, pp. 58–60; Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament*, pp. 242–243; Lhuibéid, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*, p. 99; etc.

⁸⁴ Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 45–47.

Diels showed that Eusebius was deeply honest in his citations from Plutarch.⁸⁵ des Places, who made a careful comparison between the direct and indirect textual transmission of Plato's *Laws* and *Epinomis*, enthusiastically concluded that not only was Eusebius the main witness for Plato's transmission of these texts but also that, in many cases, the medieval manuscripts of the *Praeparatio* outshone those of Plato.⁸⁶ Favrelle, who translated book XI of the *Praeparatio* into French in the Sources chrétiennes, has also claimed that Eusebius is trustworthy in his citations.⁸⁷ In addition, Grant sees Eusebius as the most faithful of the Christian-citing authors of antiquity.⁸⁸ However, despite all her attempts to defend him against the charge of tampering, Favrelle could not deny the apparent theological change made by Eusebius on *Phaedo* 114 c:⁸⁹ Talking about the souls purified by philosophy, Plato's manuscripts read that these souls will live eternally ἄνευ τε σωμάτων (without bodies) whereas Eusebius' manuscripts read ἄνευ τε καμάτων (without sufferings), preserving the dogma of the resurrection of the bodies. To suggest that Eusebius would have used a Christian florilegium is not decisive. Indeed, Eusebius is likely to have known the original reading; Moreover, Clement, whom he read carefully, cites the same passage accurately;⁹⁰ and, in addition, it is Eusebius' habit, when he uses a *florilegium*, to go back to the text itself when he has it.⁹¹ Therefore, his decision to cite the florilegium

⁸⁵ F. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*. Collegit recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit Hermanus Diels, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1879, pp. 5–7.

⁸⁶ See the different studies by des Places: "La tradition indirecte des *Lois*", livres I–VI, *Mélanges Saunier*, Lyon, 1944, pp. 27–40; "La tradition indirecte des *Lois*, livres VII–XII", *StPat* 5, 1962, pp. 473–479; "Les *Lois* et la *Préparation évangélique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée", *Aegyptus* 32, 1952, pp. 223–231; "Deux témoins du texte des *Lois*", *Wiener Studien* 70, 1957, pp. 254–259;—, "La tradition patristique de Platon", *REG* 80, 1967, pp. 385–394. These articles have been collected in his *Études platoniciennes 1929–1979*. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 90. Leiden: Brill, 1981. In his edition, Gifford provides us with four pages on Eusebius' faithfulness to Plato's text in the *PE* (*Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis*, I, pp. XL–XLIII).

⁸⁷ Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, p. 383.

⁸⁸ R. M. Grant, "The Appeal to the Early Fathers", *JTS*, New Series, 11, 1960, pp. 13–24.

⁸⁹ *PE* XI. 38. 6. On this passage, see Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, p. 382 ff., and Henry, *Recherches sur la "Préparation évangélique" d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius*, pp. 23–24.

⁹⁰ *Str.* IV. 37. 3.

⁹¹ Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, p. 383.

rather than the original text may be significant. Favrelle, after unsuccessfully attempting to justify the bishop, is forced to recognize that we are here dealing with a case of “falsification pure et simple d’un texte de Platon dans un passage si juste dans sa lettre que rien ne faisait pressentir la tromperie”.⁹²

There seem to be other passages in which Eusebius might have been directly responsible for tampering with Plato’s text in book XI of the *Praeparatio*. As Favrelle has carefully shown, Plato’s text is modified in several places so as to support his aims and/or beliefs.⁹³ Whereas *Timaeus* 28 c 3–4, e.g., reads ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα, *Praeparatio* reads ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργόν, agreeing with Eusebius’ Christian and middle-Platonic *credo*.⁹⁴ Likewise, at XI. 16. 1, Eusebius’ text reads *Epinomis* 986 c 5 as συναποτελῶν κόσμον ὃν ἔταξε λόγος ὁ πάντων θειότατος (“[the eight powers of the sky] completing the order which the *Logos*, the most divine of all, established”) whereas the *Epinomis* manuscripts read συναποτελῶν κόσμον ὃν ἔταξε λόγος ὁ πάντων θειότατος ὁρατόν (“completing the order which the most divine reason of all appointed to be visible”). This omission gives the sentence a more general perspective and Platonic Reason is understood as the Christian concept of *Logos*.

Moreover, Eusebius sometimes christianizes the text he quotes even when this leads to an absurdity: He does not hesitate to turn an occurrence of θεῶν in the *Odyssey* into βρότων⁹⁵ in a passage where he cites Plato quoting Homer.⁹⁶ This leads to a strange “justice of the mortals who possess the Olymp”.

In addition to such deliberate alterations, the bishop sometimes lacks precision when citing authors. Bounoure illustrated this point in his work on the citations of Diodorus Siculus, claiming that the

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 385.

⁹³ See, e.g., *PE* XI. 29. 4 where two changes occur. For more detail, see Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, pp. 315–316.

⁹⁴ *PE* XI. 29. 4. In his introduction to Alkinoos in the Belles Lettres, J. Whittaker points out that Philo, Plutarch, Numenius, Clement and later on Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria etc. had turned Plato’s words ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα into πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν for theological reasons (see J. Whittaker and P. Louis, Alkinoos. *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon, Introduction*, texte établi et commenté par J. W. et traduit par P. L., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1990 p. XIX).

⁹⁵ des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XII–XIII. SC 307. Paris: Cerf, 1983, p. 231, n. 2.

⁹⁶ *PE* XII. 52. 28 = *Odyssee* XIX. 43.

bishop's—or his secretary's—negligence was due to boredom.⁹⁷ Bidez, analyzing Porphyry's quotations in the *Praeparatio*, reached the conclusion that, generally speaking, Eusebius does not tamper with the texts on purpose—a view which may be challenged in light of Eusebius' above use of Plato—but Bidez also underlined Eusebius'—or his secretary's—carelessness in citing, mentioning breaks in the middle of a sentence, misleading links between the citation and the context of Eusebius' speech, and apparently intentional misunderstandings of citations.⁹⁸ A similar claim was made by Baumgarten about the citation from Philo of Byblos.⁹⁹ Likewise, in their study of Aëtius, Mansfeld and Runia said that Eusebius may occasionally have brought citations from Pseudo-Plutarch closer to his own theological conceptions.¹⁰⁰ These examples remind us that above all, Eusebius is driven in the *Apodeixis* by polemical, not historical, concerns.

To sum up, it is clear that Eusebius was at least *able* to tamper with the text. Since we have lost most of the original texts preserved by Eusebius in the *Praeparatio*, it is very difficult to draw definitive conclusions in other cases. However, it is significant, as Favrelle has pointed out, that a change in the text appears at the most unexpected point, where the text seems irreproachable. This is perhaps what makes Eusebius' interpolations 'efficient': As he displays honesty throughout the rest of his work on textual matters and keeps claiming his willingness to be as objective as possible in the *Apodeixis*, he gets his reader into the habit of trusting him. Changes are even more efficient when they are scattered and discreet.

In addition, we have seen in chapter II¹⁰¹ that in the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius cites a passage from Porphyry and another from Aristobulus in which both authors admit to having tampered with the text they copied (an oracle in Porphyry's case, and a poem from Aratus in Aristobulus' case). Yet Eusebius did not feel the need to comment on these authors' methodology, which may suggest that it was familiar

⁹⁷ G. Bounoure, "Eusèbe citeur de Diodore", pp. 433–439 (esp. p. 437).

⁹⁸ J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*. Univ. de Gand, Fac. Phil. & Lettres 43. Gand: Gand &c., 1913, p. 144.

⁹⁹ Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*, pp. 61–62; 92–93.

¹⁰⁰ J. Mansfeld and D. T. Runia, *Aëtiana; The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer (vol. I: The Sources)*. Philosophia Antiqua 73. Leiden: Brill, 1997, p. 136.

¹⁰¹ See Chapter II, section "Faithfulness to the Text Cited".

to him. In this light, it appears even more useless to judge Eusebius' work in terms of intellectual honesty. Such a concept does not apply to the period in question. As already emphasized, ancient authors felt free to appropriate the texts they cited by changing them as they wished. The case of Eusebius may appear different because he claims to quote texts faithfully. However, one must bear in mind that he did not use quotations to preserve certain passages but that he employed them to support his own rhetorical work.

B. *Citations of Christian Authors*

The citations of the Christian authors are in theory less likely to have been modified since they are in agreement with Eusebius' theological and apologetic thought.

C. *Citations of the Bible*

The literalness of Eusebius' scriptural citations has been the subject of much criticism. Heikel, in his edition of the *Demonstratio*, argued that Eusebius cited Scripture from memory and accused him of negligence.¹⁰² des Places added that on occasion the citations presented variations unknown in other sources and that the first words which served as transitions were sometimes altered.¹⁰³ Wallace-Hadrill contested this view and showed, from a sample of twenty-five citations excerpted from Matthew's Gospel, that the bishop followed the text almost flawlessly.¹⁰⁴

3. EUSEBIUS' USE OF CITATIONS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

Eusebius' use of citations in the *Apodeixis* is largely influenced by his apologetic and polemical motivations. This is notably the case with the citations from pagan authors.

¹⁰² I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke VI, Die Demonstratio Evangelica*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1913, p. XXII ff.

¹⁰³ Des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur: platonisme et écriture sainte*, pp. 142–151.

¹⁰⁴ D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, "An Analysis of Some Quotations from the First Gospel in Eusebius' D. E.," *JTS* 1, 1950, pp. 168–175.

A. Citations of Pagan Authors

Eusebius uses pagan citations mostly to support testimonies against paganism, although most of them did not originally aim at any such criticism. The most obvious case is that of Diodorus Siculus.¹⁰⁵ Scholars have emphasized the importance of Eusebius' role in the Christian diffusion of Diodorus' writings.¹⁰⁶ Eusebius was the first to use his testimony extensively and in an articulate way.¹⁰⁷ Although he also makes use of the information Diodorus provided about oriental chronologies and the close relationship between the Greeks and Egyptian religion,¹⁰⁸ in the *Praeparatio*, the bishop mainly takes advantage of his fundamental testimony on Euhemeristic doctrine.¹⁰⁹ Originally, however, Diodorus' account was obviously never meant to serve anti-pagan purposes. Eusebius actually warps the primary intention of the author's account in which he has found a major argument against polytheism. He turns the Greek Diodorus into a formidable weapon with which to attack paganism.

More striking still, Eusebius manages in another passage to take advantage of passages which were basically attacking Christianity: This is the case at *Praeparatio* V. 1. 10 where Eusebius cites Porphyry.¹¹⁰ Porphyry's claim that Jesus was responsible for a lasting plague in Rome and that the gods had left the city because people preferred worshipping Jesus, is proof, to Eusebius, that Jesus had been able to chase away the demons. He turns an attack against Christianity into a testimony in favour of Jesus and Christianity, distorting the author's

¹⁰⁵ *PE* I. 7. 1–15 = Diodorus I. 6–8, and esp. *PE* II. 1. 1–50 and II. 2. 53–62 = Diodorus, I. 10. ff. and III. 56 ff.

¹⁰⁶ See G. Zecchini, "La conoscenza di Diodoro nel Tardoantico", *Aevum* 61, 1987, pp. 43–52 and P. F. Beatrice, "Diodore de Sicile chez les apologistes", in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 219–235.

¹⁰⁷ The author of the *Cohort. ad Graec.* also used it (10 C 1; 15 B 5; 24 C 4; 24 C 6; 26 E 4) and, like Eusebius, praised Diodorus. However, he used it to a lesser extent than him.

¹⁰⁸ See Beatrice, "Diodore de Sicile chez les apologistes", pp. 224–227.

¹⁰⁹ On this point, see Lactantius, *Inst. div.* I. 13–15; Tertullian, *Apol.* X. 7. who also used this testimony. See also J. Pépin, "Christianisme et mythologie. L'évhémérisme des auteurs chrétiens", in Y. Bonnefoy (Ed.), *Dictionnaire des mythologies et des religions des sociétés traditionnelles et du monde antique*, A.-J., Paris: Flammarion, 1981, pp. 161–171 = J. Pépin, *De la philosophie ancienne à la théologie patristique*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1986, part VII, pp. 1–16 and R. P. C. Hanson, "Christian Attitude to Pagan Religion", *ANRW* II. 23. 2, 1980, pp. 931–938.

¹¹⁰ As Kofsky has shown in his *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 256.

primary intention. Likewise, Goulet has shown that Eusebius probably tampered with a passage from Porphyry on the dating of Moses in order to locate him eight hundred and fifty years before the Trojan war.¹¹¹

This is also the case with Amelius.¹¹² Eusebius considers the testimony of Amelius on the Fourth Gospel as the recognition of the Christian doctrine by a member of Plotinus' school. But Amelius aimed in fact to demonstrate that the truth displayed in the beginning of the Gospel of John had been inspired by the true *Logos*, i.e., the Platonic World-soul.¹¹³ This shows Eusebius' ability to turn citations of his adversaries to his own advantage.

Eusebius also uses pagan testimonies which present a genuinely harsh criticism of a particular point of Greek religion. These testimonies are particularly convenient for the bishop because they are self-explanatory. This kind of citation requires no additional comment. Such is the case with Oenomaus, a Cynic philosopher who severely attacked pagan oracles.¹¹⁴ All Eusebius had to do was help himself, something which he did at length: Pages and pages are devoted to Oenomaus' citations.

Eusebius also makes use of pagan citations to criticize their content, as in the case of Porphyry's citations. The bishop has two ways of dealing with them: Either he attempts to demonstrate the author's self-contradiction by comparing different excerpts from different works,¹¹⁵ or he attacks the author head-on.¹¹⁶ It is worth noting that Eusebius' feelings towards Porphyry are ambivalent: On the one hand, he harshly attacks him as the representative of paganism and on the other, it is obvious that he considers him the greatest authority among pagan writers.¹¹⁷ Interestingly, despite Eusebius' insistence

¹¹¹ R. Goulet, "Porphyre et la datation de Moïse", in *Études sur les vies de philosophes de l'Antiquité tardive, Diogène Laërce, Porphyre de Tyr, Eunapes de Sardes*, Paris: Vrin, 2001, pp. 245–266 = *RHR* 192, 1977, pp. 137–164.

¹¹² *PE* XI. 19. 1–4.

¹¹³ See H. Dörrie, "Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de Saint Jean (Amélius chez Eusèbe, *Prép. év.* 11, 19, 1–4)", in J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Eds.), *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1972, pp. 75–88 and L. Brisson, "Amélius: sa vie, son œuvre, sa doctrine, son style", *ANRW* II. 36. 2, 1987, pp. 840–843.

¹¹⁴ *PE* V. 19–36; VI. 7.

¹¹⁵ E.g., *PE* IV. 10. 1.

¹¹⁶ E.g., *PE* III. 9. 6–14.

¹¹⁷ See R. M. Grant, "Porphyry among the Early Christians", in W. den Boer

on Porphyry's authorship of an anti-Christian treatise,¹¹⁸ the former resorts to citations from the *Contra Christianos* only three times and always to show that the latter gives a laudatory account of the Christians.¹¹⁹

The other authors targeted by the bishop are those cited in books XIV and XV. Book XIV is a *florilegium* which denounces the contradictions of the Greek philosophers¹²⁰ while Book XV is a refutation of the doctrines of Aristotle, the Stoics and the Pre-Socratics.¹²¹ Unlike Plato, they had proved unable to reach any of the truths displayed in Scripture and they all contradicted themselves. Even the Platonic school and its quarrels are attacked, through Numenius' testimony.¹²² This criticism of the Greek διαφωνία may have been intended to show that Christianity was not the one which was torn apart by internal disagreement. At any rate, unlike Porphyry, these authors are not addressed by Eusebius as directly and he rather uses citations from Greek philosophers to emphasize their contradictions: Aristotle, e.g., is criticized through Porphyry, Atticus and Plotinus¹²³ while the Stoic doctrines are attacked through Porphyry or Numenius.¹²⁴

The bishop uses other pagan authors in a positive way. This is notably the case with the great Plato, who plays a prominent role in Eusebius' account of the agreement (συμφωνία) between the Hebrew oracles and some parts of Greek philosophy.¹²⁵ In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius devotes three books to his philosophy (books XI–XIII). According to the apologist, Plato is “the only one among the Greeks to have touched the threshold of truth” (τὸν δὴ μόνον πάντων Ἑλλήνων ἀληθείας προθύρων ψάυσαντα).¹²⁶ Although the philosopher is also cited earlier in the same part of the *Apodeixis*, his role in Eusebius' strategy becomes crucial only from book XI onwards.

et al. (Eds.), *Romanitas and Christianitas*, Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co, 1973, pp. 181–187.

¹¹⁸ *PE* I. 9. 6; I. 9. 20; V. 5. 5; V. 36. 5.

¹¹⁹ As Kofsky has pointed out in his *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 273–274.

¹²⁰ On Eusebius' sources for this chapter, see A. J. Carriker, “Some Uses of Aristocles and Numenius in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*”, *JTS* 47, 1996, pp. 543–549.

¹²¹ *PE* XV. 1. 10–11.

¹²² *PE* XIV. 5. 1–13.

¹²³ *PE* XV. 4. 1–21; 10–11.

¹²⁴ *PE* XV. 16–17.

¹²⁵ *PE* XI, pr. 3.

¹²⁶ *PE* XIII. 14. 3.

The relation between Plato and Eusebius has been well studied by Favrelle, who emphasizes that Eusebius appreciates Plato not only because of the similarity of the latter's thought with that of Moses but also because he clarifies the views expressed obscurely in the Hebrew oracles. To Eusebius, Plato reorganised Hebrew doctrine along logical lines and accordingly made it more understandable.¹²⁷ However, Plato's thought itself required interpreters in order to be clarified and, occasionally, rightfully interpreted.

Eusebius does not systematically explain why he quotes Plato's interpreters (τῶν τὰ αὐτοῦ πρεσβευνόντων),¹²⁸ yet he does so, for instance when quoting Numenius. As he uses Numenius to interpret Plato's concept of being, he specifies that he needs Numenius' testimony because he does not wish to seem to misinterpret (παρηρμενεύειν) Plato's words.¹²⁹ At the end of the excerpt, Eusebius adds that Numenius has clarified Plato's and Moses' thought (ἐπὶ τὸ σαφές διερμηνεύων).¹³⁰ Plotinus is also presented as confirming Plato's thought,¹³¹ as are Plutarch, Amelius and Arius Didymus.¹³² This suggests that Eusebius goes so far as to give Plato's writings a status similar to that of Scripture: Just as the Scriptures are interpreted by Philo or Aristobulus in the *Praeparatio*, so Plato needs to be explained through other authors. Like Scripture, Plato's speech is also obscured in riddles.¹³³ Eusebius even claims that Plato's philosophy is "as it were, a translation [of Moses and the Scriptures] into Greek" (ἐρμηνεῖαν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν).¹³⁴ As a matter of fact, citing Plato's interpreters rather than Plato himself enabled Eusebius to align the

¹²⁷ Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, pp. 240–391. Cf. *PE* XII. 19. 1; XII. 34. 1; XII. 44. 1 where Eusebius asserts it explicitly, and Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, p. 253 ff.

¹²⁸ *PE* XI. 1. 2.

¹²⁹ *PE* XI. 9. 8.

¹³⁰ *PE* XI. 10. 14.

¹³¹ On the relation between Plotinus and Plato, see J. Lacrosse, *L'amour chez Plotin*, Bruxelles: Ousia, 1994, pp. 21–29.

¹³² *PE* XI. 16. 4; XI. 11. 1–15; XI. 23. 3–6.

¹³³ See, e.g., the word ἡνίξατο in *PE* XI. 20. 1. It is worth noting that, according to Plotinus too, Plato's texts are enigmas. See, e.g., *Enn.* IV. 2. 2. However, Charrue, *Plotin lecteur de Platon*, p. 38 makes it clear that the Greek term 'enigma' has nothing to do with sacred literature: "c'est d'abord un terme de rhétorique désignant la contradiction discursive à dépasser pour que les significations partielles incompatibles soient réconciliées en une vision unifiante".

¹³⁴ *PE* XIII. pr.

former's doctrine with his own theology. This is especially the case with his use of Numenius.¹³⁵

At any rate, exploiting Platonic texts was crucial to Eusebius' strategy because he wished to present Christianity to the Greek world not only as a superior form of Platonism¹³⁶ but also as a more ancient and purer wisdom than that of the philosopher. By showing the agreement between Christianity and Platonism and the superiority of the former over the latter, he certainly hoped to attract a certain number of pagan 'intellectuals' who were interested in Christianity but unready to abandon their Platonic background.

However, Eusebius did not espouse all Platonic doctrines. In book XIII of the *Praeparatio*, he attacks Platonic demonology, psychology, astral divinisation, policy towards women and homosexuality and the laws on murder.¹³⁷ According to the bishop, when Plato deviates from Moses' teaching, he proves to be self-contradictory.¹³⁸ He accuses him, e.g., of giving in to idolatry whereas in the *Timaeus* "he claimed that he knew the 'father and demiurge' of this universe" (τὸν πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν εἰδέναι τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς διετείνετο).¹³⁹

B. Citations of Christian Authors

Eusebius' use of Christian authors seems to be quite uniform. Only Clement departs from this arrangement.

In most cases, Eusebius cites Christian witnesses to complete an argument at the end of a book, and he refers to them as predecessors.¹⁴⁰ Strikingly, apart from Clement, the Christian authors never bring any decisive arguments to the fore but rather confirm statements previously made by pagan authors or by Eusebius himself.

¹³⁵ See, e.g., *PE* XI. 18. 1–24 where Numenius is cited on the second cause. On Eusebius' use of Numenius, see H. D. Saffrey, "Les extraits du *Περὶ τὰ γὰ θεοῦ* de Numénios dans le livre XI de la Préparation évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée", pp. 46–51; —, "Un lecteur antique des œuvres de Numénios: Eusèbe de Césarée, *Forma futuri*, *Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*, Torino: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1975, pp. 145–153.

¹³⁶ On the relation between Platonism and Christianity, see A. Hilary-Armstrong, "The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism", in E. P. Sanders (Ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, London: SCM Press, 1980, pp. 74–99.

¹³⁷ *PE* XIII. 14–21.

¹³⁸ *PE* XV. 1. 10.

¹³⁹ *PE* XIII. 14. 3.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. *PE* VII. 18. 13 and X. 9. 26.

This is the case with Bardesanes (although he is not used as a Christian author) and Origen at the end of book VI.¹⁴¹ After numerous citations from Porphyry and other pagan writers, the bishop eventually quotes the two Christian authors to argue against pagan oracles and the doctrine of fatalism.¹⁴² Origen is said to complete the testimonies given by outsiders (τῶν ἑξωθεν).¹⁴³ Likewise, Dionysius of Alexandria's citation is used at the end of book XIV in order to close the debate on Epicurean philosophy.¹⁴⁴ He follows Aristocles and Plato on this subject.

Maximus (in fact Methodius),¹⁴⁵ Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria¹⁴⁶ are extensively cited by Eusebius at the end of book VII to show that matter is not begotten.¹⁴⁷ Schroeder has questioned the reason for the existence of this small treatise on matter which creates a deviation from the rest of book VII.¹⁴⁸ He rightly concludes that the bishop used it to complete the book. As we will see, even if this file has a function in Eusebius' account, he may well have inserted it for the reasons suggested by Schroeder.¹⁴⁹

A similar case may be found in book X of the *Praeparatio*, in which the apologist quotes Tatian, Julius Africanus and Clement on the chronology of Moses.¹⁵⁰ Their citations come after a passage written

¹⁴¹ *PE* VI. 10–11.

¹⁴² On this subject, see D. Amand, *Fatalisme astrologique et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque, Recherches sur la survivance de l'argumentation morale antifataliste de Caméade chez les philosophes grecs et les théologiens chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*, Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1945.

¹⁴³ *PE* VI. 10. 49.

¹⁴⁴ *PE* XIV. 23–27.

¹⁴⁵ On this intricate problem of authentication, see Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, pp. 99–126 and Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 225–231, with all the bibliography. According to him, Eusebius did not use a file but had each book in his library. He claims that Eusebius had Methodius' *De autexusia* (which contains the same passage as that cited by Eusebius), which he would have ascribed to Maximus.

¹⁴⁶ On Dionysius, see *HE* VI. 29. 4; *HE* VII. 26. 1 and Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, p. 86.

¹⁴⁷ *PE* VII. 19–22.

¹⁴⁸ Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, pp. 99–126.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Citations of Jewish Authors Derived from Collections".

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Chron.* p. 7 Helm (R. Helm, Eusebius Werke VII. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1984). On this subject, see W. Adler, "Eusebius' Chronicle", in G. Hata and W. H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 467–491 and Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, which has an appendix on Eusebius' chronology of Moses.

by Eusebius on the same topic. At the end of his own passage, he claims that it was just a summary (ἐπιτόμως)¹⁵¹ requiring additional information. Consequently, he cites other Christian authors.

All these examples show that, apart from Clement's, the Christian testimonies are almost exclusively used at the end of books. Their role is limited to the confirmation of other authors' theses. The extensive length of these citations may suggest that they have not really been 'reworked', as were those from the pagan authors, from which Eusebius carefully selected the most relevant excerpts. In addition, Eusebius announces that he will cite no Christian testimonies¹⁵² whereas in practice he certainly does so. All these arguments make it likely that Eusebius resorts to Christian material when he runs out of pagan texts. The fact that, according to him, each book must reach a certain length¹⁵³ may support this hypothesis. Nevertheless, this does not entail that these Christian citations have no value/function in Eusebius' account. Indeed, he makes good use of them by showing the agreement between Christians and some Greeks on doctrines such as fatalism or the antiquity of the Hebrews.

Special attention must be devoted to Clement of Alexandria because Eusebius' use of his writings differs from that of his other fellow Christians in the *Apodeixis*. The fact that Eusebius sometimes calls him ὁ ἡμέτερος Κλήμης¹⁵⁴ is significant in this respect. Unlike his co-religionists, he is used repeatedly in this work, and his citations, far from being restricted to additional testimonies, provide an important support for Eusebius' arguments. The bishop seems to make relevant use of the Alexandrian philosopher and sometimes restricts his quotations to a minimum, contenting himself with the core of Clement's ideas. At *Praeparatio* X. 2, e.g., he makes many cuts in Clement's text so as to keep only the most important passages because, he says, Clement had developed the argument at length (εἰς πλάτος);¹⁵⁵ he also emphasizes the irrefutability of the evidence given by Clement, as the many occurrences of the terms ἔλεγχος and ἀποδείξεις in the passage show.¹⁵⁶ This suggests that he had read him carefully, and

¹⁵¹ *PE* X. 9. 26.

¹⁵² *PE* I. 6. 8.

¹⁵³ E.g., *PE* IX. 42. 4; VII. 22. 64; XI. 38. 10.

¹⁵⁴ E.g., *PE* IX. 6. 1.

¹⁵⁵ *PE* X. 1. 9.

¹⁵⁶ *PE* X. 1. 1–9.

was able to offer a comprehensive summary of his ideas.¹⁵⁷ Besides, the length of some other quotations also suggests his importance in Eusebius' view.¹⁵⁸

Why did Eusebius use Clement so extensively? Coman suggests several reasons: He showed himself to be knowledgeable on the comparison between Greeks and barbarians; he displayed a universal knowledge; his balanced attitude towards Hellenism as well as his discernment were appreciated by Eusebius; finally, Eusebius could take advantage of his sustained effort to correlate Christian teaching with the Greek philosophical tradition, which was more systematic than any other before him.¹⁵⁹ In addition, one should also note that Clement's authority may also have been guaranteed in Eusebius' view by the fact that the latter used to be a pagan.¹⁶⁰ This might be an important reason for Clement's extensive presence throughout the *Praeparatio*: He was a perfect witness since he was not only knowledgeable about paganism and especially Greek philosophy, having himself been a Greek philosopher, but he had also abandoned Hellenism for Christianity. Clement's religious career may explain why he is used in book IX of the *Praeparatio*,¹⁶¹ in which Eusebius claims to give Greek testimonies on the Jews and the Hebrews: As an ex-pagan, his authority was sufficient to compete with that of any other Greek author. Another reason why Clement is so useful to Eusebius, notably in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, is because he cited many Greek authors and could therefore document Eusebius' argument. This is made clear by the apologist himself.¹⁶² However, it must be pointed out that on one occasion, Eusebius says he fears that his readers will not take into account Clement's testimony because he chose the barbarian philosophy over Greek philosophy. Therefore, he cites Porphyry in order to legitimate his account.¹⁶³

Clement is used by Eusebius in several ways. In book II,¹⁶⁴ the *Protrepticus* provides the bishop with material for the criticism of pagan

¹⁵⁷ See especially *PE* X. 2. 1–15.

¹⁵⁸ E.g., *PE* XIII. 13. 1–65.

¹⁵⁹ Coman, "Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe", pp. 115–134.

¹⁶⁰ As he says at *PE* II. 2. 64 and perhaps implies at X. 2. 16, as suggested by the term προτετιμηκώς.

¹⁶¹ *PE* IX. 6. 1–9 = *Str.* I. 70. 2; I. 71. 1–2; I. 72. 5; I. 150. 1–4.

¹⁶² *PE* II. 5. 6: τοῦ λόγου μάρτυρας αὐτοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἐπαγόμενος.

¹⁶³ *PE* X. 2. 16.

¹⁶⁴ *PE* II. 3. 1–42; 6. 1–10.

mysteries and rites¹⁶⁵ as well as Euhemerism,¹⁶⁶ since Clement claims that pagan temples were nothing other than graves.¹⁶⁷

In book IX,¹⁶⁸ as we have just seen, he provides Eusebius with Greek testimonies on the Jews and the Hebrews.

In book X, Clement's *Stromata* are used to witness the theft committed by the Greeks on the barbarians,¹⁶⁹ a *topos* of early Christian apologetics.¹⁷⁰ As the case had been clearly stated by Clement before Eusebius, the latter had only to copy the passage from Clement. Strikingly, the Alexandrian author's citations come after Eusebius' own account, confirming the bishop's views, which shows how close the latter feels to Clement from an ideological viewpoint.

In book XI, Clement is used together with Philo of Alexandria as an interpreter of the Bible.¹⁷¹ Both are regarded as exegetes of the sacred laws (οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐξηγηταί)¹⁷² and are used to support the thesis of the agreement between Plato and Scripture.

In book XIII,¹⁷³ Clement's long citation on the same theme follows that of Aristobulus, providing Eusebius with one of his major apologetic arguments in the *Praeparatio*. The influence of Clement on Eusebius appears so strong that Coman has suggested that the bishop could have acquired the idea of writing the *Apodeixis* from *Stromata* I, V and VI.¹⁷⁴

All these elements point to the great importance of Clement in the *Praeparatio*, despite the fact that he is a Christian. His role in this work is manifold: He supplies apologetic¹⁷⁵ and theological¹⁷⁶ material, often along with Jewish Greek testimonies, and also serves to

¹⁶⁵ *PE* II. 2–3.

¹⁶⁶ Eusebius cites excerpts from Euhemerus through Diodorus (*PE* II. 2. 53–62). As Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 183, points out, Euhemerism enables Eusebius to fight Greek allegory.

¹⁶⁷ *PE* II. 6. 1–10 = *Protr.* XLIV. 3–XLV. 5.

¹⁶⁸ *PE* IX. 6. 1–9.

¹⁶⁹ *PE* X. 2. 1–15 = *Str.* VI. 4. 3–5. 2 and 6. 1–14 = *Str.* VI. 16. 1; VI. 25. 1–2; VI. 27. 5–29. 2 and I. 75. 2–3; I. 74. 2; I. 74. 3–6; I. 74. 2; I. 75. 4–77. 2.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses: the Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 59. Göteborg: University of Göteborg, 1995.

¹⁷¹ *PE* XI. 25. 1–5 = *Str.* V. 93. 4–94. 5.

¹⁷² *PE* XI. 23. 12.

¹⁷³ *PE* XIII. 13. 1–65.

¹⁷⁴ Coman, "Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe", p. 133.

¹⁷⁵ Books II and X.

¹⁷⁶ Books XI and XIII.

provide the bishop with other Greek testimonies.¹⁷⁷ He proves to be one of the most authoritative authors in the *Praeparatio*. This is indicated by the fact that his citations are scattered throughout the work, that Eusebius had carefully read him, and that he was reckoned prestigious enough to guarantee the authority of Greek testimonies he cites. In chapter IV, we shall attempt to see in further detail how and to what extent the bishop connected him to the Jewish authors.

C. *Biblical Citations*

The use of scriptural citations can be divided into three categories: Those which constitute the core of the *Demonstratio*, those used in book VII of the *Praeparatio* (i.e., in the context of Eusebius' description of the ancient Hebrews), and those used in books XI to XIII of the *Praeparatio* in the context of the comparison between Plato and Scripture.

Eusebius' use of these quotations differs from his use of the pagan, Christian or Jewish citations because he considers them a source of eternal truth. Nevertheless, it must be noted that their level of authority is not the same in the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio*: In the latter, their presence is crucial to the apologist's demonstration in the former, and he confers on them the status they enjoy in his other writings; in the former, their authority is limited because this part of the *Apodeixis* focuses on Greek philosophy and literature. Therefore, the citations of famous Greek authors outshine, as it were, the biblical quotations.

In the *Praeparatio*, a certain number of scriptural citations are dispersed throughout the fifteen books. They mostly serve to support, document and illustrate Eusebius' discourse, whether polemical or not. Some Old Testament citations are used as prophecies of the advent of Christ¹⁷⁸ as well as the emergence of the nations such as the new Israel.¹⁷⁹ This is especially the case in book I, which deals partly with the spread of Christianity. On other occasions, scriptural citations support Eusebius' anti-pagan arguments: They are used, e.g., to support his attack against the Orphic poem about Zeus described as impious or against Egyptian idolatry.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Books II and IX.

¹⁷⁸ See, e.g., the use of Jer. in *PE* I. 3. 15.

¹⁷⁹ See, e.g., the use of Psalms in I. 1. 9.

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., *PE* III. 10. 4–5 and III. 13. 4.

On one occasion at least, a scriptural citation seems to enjoy the same status as a non-scriptural one. As Eusebius evokes human sacrifices among pagans through, among others, the evidence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, he goes on to cite Psalms as proof of the existence of human sacrifices among the “Jews”. Interestingly, he carefully distinguishes the religious nature of the work and the people it evokes: Psalms is a “Hebrew” work (ἡ παρ’ Ἑβραίοις γραφή) whereas the people are “those of circumcision” (τῶν ἐκ περιτομῆς).¹⁸¹

In book VII Eusebius cites Scripture at length, and especially Genesis and Psalms. The use of these citations is different from that of the other books because they are here used in their own terms. They are the testimony of “Hebrew” history and theology.¹⁸² Genesis, e.g., is used to explain the Hebrew conception of God.¹⁸³ The New Testament is hardly cited at all. When it is, it is meant to shed light on the meaning of the Old Testament.¹⁸⁴

In books XI to XIII, the scriptural citations are closely interwoven with those of Plato since Eusebius wants to show the similarity of Scripture and Platonic philosophy. It is only at the end of book XIII that Eusebius shows the contradictions between the two. Eusebius claims that Scripture is not understandable to all readers and therefore needs a commentary.¹⁸⁵ In a certain way, as Favrelle has pointed out,¹⁸⁶ Plato is the commentator, and the scriptural and Platonic citations follow the pattern “Moses having said this, see how Plato repeats it saying this”.

The use of Scripture is rather different in the *Demonstratio*, in which scriptural citations constitute the core of the work. Eusebius seeks to show how the prophecies of the Old Testament have been fulfilled through Jesus and the New Testament. Nevertheless, scholars have rightly insisted that, unlike the *Eclogae propheticæ*, the *Demonstratio* is not exegetical but historical.¹⁸⁷ Laurin has also argued that in the *Demonstratio* Eusebius focuses on Christ himself rather than on the

¹⁸¹ *PE* IV. 16. 20.

¹⁸² See, e.g., *PE* VII. 11. 1–12.

¹⁸³ *PE* VII. 11. 2 = Gen. 1: 3; 2: 3.

¹⁸⁴ E.g., *PE* VII. 12. 19.

¹⁸⁵ *PE* XI. 7. 12.

¹⁸⁶ Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292. Paris: Cerf, 1982, p. 36 ff.

¹⁸⁷ Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 61; Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens*, p. 379; Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, pp. 543–562 and 587.

prophecies and that, as in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, he is concerned with showing the expansion of Christianity.¹⁸⁸

At the beginning of book I of the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius stresses that he will keep his interventions to a minimum, i.e., that he will comment on Scripture only when it demands an explanation. He also emphasizes the fact that he intends his work to be very well focused and not to digress onto unrelated matters.¹⁸⁹ Consequently, some passages are cited without commentary. This attitude stems from Eusebius' conviction that Scripture is self-explanatory. This technique is also found in the *Praeparatio*, but to a lesser extent.

In his exegesis, Eusebius does not content himself with the Septuagint but often resorts to Symmachus, Aquila and Theodotion to support his interpretations when the Septuagint text does not.¹⁹⁰ Eusebius considers the authors of the Septuagint to be "Hebrews" whereas the other translations are "those used by the Jews".¹⁹¹ Nevertheless, it is remarkable that he willingly resorts to them. Although Eusebius admires and recognises the sacred character of the Septuagint because it was the Bible of the Church, he does not hesitate to turn to the text of Aquila whom he sees as the exact transcriber of the Hebrew.¹⁹²

As Kofsky has shown, Eusebius sometimes makes rhetorical use of scriptural citations. At *Demonstratio* VI. 12. 269b, e.g., 1 Kings presents a rhetorical question which invites a negative answer: King Solomon, prophesying the descent of the Son of God to earth, asks, "But will God indeed dwell on the earth?"¹⁹³ Eusebius feels free to interpret it as inviting a positive answer and as announcing the incarnation.

Another feature of Eusebius' treatment of the scriptural citations is the stress he puts on the distinction between the literal interpretation (κατὰ λέξιν/ἱστορίαν) and the interpretation "according to the

¹⁸⁸ Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens*, p. 380.

¹⁸⁹ E.g., *DE* I. 9.

¹⁹⁰ See, e.g., *DE* II. 3. 69 b-c. On Eusebius' use of Theodotion and Aquila, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 87 and Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 249.

¹⁹¹ *DE* V. pr. 211 b.

¹⁹² Although, according to Hollerich, "Eusebius knew virtually no Hebrew" ("Eusebius as Polemical Interpreter of Scripture", in W. H. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, p. 593; see also *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, pp. 79-85 and the bibliography at note 60); see also—, "Eusebius as Polemical Interpreter of Scripture", p. 593.

¹⁹³ 1 Kings 8:26-27.

meaning” (κατὰ διάνοιαν).¹⁹⁴ Κατὰ λέξιν would refer to an historical interpretation of Scripture whereas κατὰ διάνοιαν would allude not to an allegorical reading but rather to the announcement of accomplishments related to divine acts. As Hollerich and Young have pointed out, Eusebius is not eager to explain Scripture according to the Alexandrian allegory.¹⁹⁵ His interpretation is to be compared rather with the future school of Antioch.

4. CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to provide a general overview of Eusebius' use of non-Jewish (non-biblical) citations in the *Apodeixis*. Several features of Eusebius' way of dealing with excerpts deserve to be highlighted.

We saw first of all that Eusebius was eager to present his sources in the best possible light by emphasizing the intellectual esteem in which they were held, the exactness of the accounts cited, and their great diversity, whether old or recent, native or Greek. The bishop insists on the variety of authors he quotes. It became clear also that he does not hesitate to cite Christian testimonies even if in theory he says he will not do so.

We then saw that although Eusebius claims to be faithful in his citations, he occasionally feels free to modify the original text in passages that are theologically crucial. Moreover, his carelessness in citing some passages (e.g., those of Diodorus) should lead scholars to become more careful when using the *Apodeixis* as a source of fragments. It is above all an apologetic work.

Furthermore, we saw that the analysis of the quotations of the pagan authors, who constitute the majority in the *Praeparatio*, are sometimes used to support Eusebius' arguments, and sometimes chosen as targets. The bishop does not hesitate to distort these texts in order to bring them closer to the apologetic purposes of his account. In this manner, he turns them away from their original meaning. Among the Greek authors cited, Plato enjoys a privileged status, close to that of the Scriptures.

¹⁹⁴ As Hollerich has shown in his *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 87 ff. See also Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, p. 129.

¹⁹⁵ Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 95; Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, pp. 121–122.

The Christian citations are always used in agreement with the apologist's discourse but their role seems to be restricted to confirming pagan testimonies. In some cases, they might even serve to fill out the end of an unfinished book. At any rate, Eusebius is concerned with presenting these authors in the same way as the pagan authors, i.e., as erudites whose knowledge guarantees their writings. This is especially the case with Clement of Alexandria, who is extensively used.

The scriptural passages cited in the *Praeparatio* play different roles, such as that of testimonies on the "Hebrew" doctrines, e.g., in the context of the comparison between the Hebrew oracles and Plato or the religious history of the Hebrews. In the *Demonstratio*, they constitute the core of Eusebius' argument. They demonstrate the fulfilment of the prophecies related to Jesus. By referring to the different translations of the Hebrew Bible into Greek and by playing with the interpretations κατὰ λέξιν and κατὰ διάνοιαν, Eusebius manages to interpret the text as he wishes.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE “HEBREWS” AND THE “JEWS” ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS: THE JEWISH AUTHORS’ STATUS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

The relevance of my study on Eusebius’ use of Jewish authors lies in the fact that he does not seem to consider the authors in question (Aristobulus, Flavius Josephus and Philo) as isolated authors. Rather, he explicitly associates them: When introducing their testimonies at the beginning of book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he describes them as “famous men” among the Jews (τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἀνδράσι διαφανῶν);¹ in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he mentions Josephus, Philo, Eupolemus, Aristobulus and Demetrius the chronographer as a group of Jewish writers aiming to show that the Jewish people antedated the Greeks.² Before Eusebius, other Christian authors had represented these authors as a group. The bishop Anatolius, e.g., whom Eusebius cites in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, appeals to the Jews “Philo, Josephus, Musaeus, . . . the two Agathobuloi, nicknamed the masters of Aristobulus the great” in order to confirm his calculation of the date of Easter.³ Even if this testimony raises some problems,⁴ it nonetheless suggests that these Jewish authors were perceived as a group enjoying a religious authority of some importance. Likewise, in his *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, Pseudo-Justin twice mentions Flavius Josephus along with Philo, depicting them as “the wisest Philo and Josephus, who recounted the story of the Jews” (ὁ σοφώτατοι Φίλων τε καὶ Ἰώσηπος, οἱ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἱστορήσαντες).⁵ Therefore, the fact that Eusebius associates these Greek-language Jewish authors is in no way innovatory. Some of his Christian predecessors who saw in them important historical and religious sources had paved the way for him.

¹ *PE* VIII. 5. 11.

² *HE* VI. 13. 7.

³ *HE* VII. 32. 16.

⁴ Cf. my “Trois auteurs juifs de langue grecque oubliés: Mousaios et les deux Agathobules dans le témoignage d’Anatole de Laodicée sur la Pâque”, *REJ* 165, 2006 (Forthcoming).

⁵ *Cohort. ad Graec.* 10 B; 11 B; 14 C.

Let us now analyze the manner in which Eusebius defines this group from a religious point of view and let us examine the historical and theological significance of the labels he attaches to them. This should enable us to understand how the Jews in general and the Jewish authors in particular are rhetorically constructed in the *Apodeixis*.

Eusebius often refers in the *Apodeixis* to the Jewish-Greek authors as “Hebrews:” Josephus, e.g., is a “Hebrew, born of Hebrews” (Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων),⁶ Philo is a “Hebrew interpreting the ancestral texts” (ὁ Ἑβραῖος Φίλων τὰ πάτρια διερμηνεύων),⁷ and Aristobulus a “Hebrew philosopher” (ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλοσοφοῦ).⁸ In some cases, however, Eusebius refers to Jews as Ἰουδαῖοι. It is therefore worth examining whom exactly Eusebius describes as “Hebrew”⁹ and whom he describes as “Jew” as well as the picture of the “Jews” and the “Hebrews” which emerges from his works. This will enable us to better understand the status Eusebius ascribes to the Jewish-Greek authors in the *Apodeixis*, and thus to improve our understanding of the stakes involved in using their citations in his work.

One of the most striking features of Eusebius’ understanding of Judaism is his distinction between the “Jews” and the “Hebrews”, as well as the association he draws between the “Hebrews” and the Christians.¹⁰

The bishop was not the first to make such a distinction.¹¹ Although the terms “Jews” and “Hebrews” are often synonymous in early Christian literature,¹² a specific connotation of the word “Hebrew”

⁶ *DE* VI. 18. 291b probably referring to Paul, *Phil.* 3:5.

⁷ *PE* XI. 23. 12.

⁸ *PE* XIII. 11. 3.

⁹ Quotation marks will be used in every reference to Eusebius’ way of using the terms “Hebrew” or “Jew(ish)”.

¹⁰ On this question, see Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d’Eusèbe de Césarée*, pp. 142–163.

¹¹ For a list of Eusebius’ predecessors, see N. R. M. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 29 ff. On The Church Fathers and their representation of the Jews, see, e.g., S. Krauss, “The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers”, *JQR* 5:122–157; 6:82–99, 225–261, 1892–1894; R. Wilde, *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the Three First Centuries*, Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1949 and K. Hruby, *Juden und Judentum bei den Kirchenvätern*, Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 1971.

¹² See, e.g., Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolyicum* III. 9: τοῖς Ἑβραίοις, τοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καλουμένοις. Clement also omits such a distinction (cf. *Str.* I. 151 ff.). See also Schroeder, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215 p. 51, nn. 2–3.

seems to appear as early as Paul's *Letter to the Philippians*,¹³ where he identifies himself as a "Hebrew, born of the Hebrews". Eusebius will make use of this expression on several other occasions to describe Moses,¹⁴ e.g., or Josephus.¹⁵ This expression is meant to emphasize their deep knowledge of the patriarchs' ancestral tradition.¹⁶ According to Harvey, Paul uses these words to deny any innovation on his part. To be a "Hebrew" would mean to be a traditionalist, "a loyal observer of ancestral ways".¹⁷ The *Gospel of Philip* seems to corroborate this hypothesis: The word "Hebrews", used to designate oneself, would be a claim to be non-innovative. In other cases, this expression would point to "good Jews", like the apostles or the prophets. Melito of Sardis, who was a vehement enemy of Judaism, also seems to have believed that there were once "good Jews" whom he calls "Hebrews".¹⁸ But the most striking example of this opposition is found in Aristides' *Apology*: "Thus Jesus was born of the race of the Hebrews. . . . he himself was crucified by the Jews" (*Iesus igitur de gente Hebraeorum natus est . . . Ipse ab Iudaeis crucifixus est*).¹⁹

The case of Origen must be given careful attention. Indeed, he uses the word "Hebrew" to describe his contemporary Jewish teachers and friends and even the Church.²⁰ By contrast, he uses the word "Jews" rather in a polemical context.²¹ Moreover, he sees Christians as the spiritual heirs to the Hebrews and even applies the term "Hebrew" to Jesus' disciples, following Philo's etymology of the word, according to which "Hebrews" are those who passed from the sensible world to the intelligible world.²² This led De Lange to conclude that "*Ioudaios*, in many mouths, was a sneering expression, even

¹³ *Phil.* 3:5. Paul's treatment of the term "Hebrew" certainly had a strong influence on Eusebius given Paul's influence on his exegetical writings. On this topic, see P. Gorday, "Paul in Eusebius and Other Early Christian Literature", in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 139–165.

¹⁴ *PE* VII. 7. 1.

¹⁵ *DE* VI. 18. 291b.

¹⁶ I will come back to this theme later.

¹⁷ G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew, and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 141–143.

¹⁸ *Peri Pascha* 696. This reference and the following have been retrieved from Harvey.

¹⁹ *Apol.* XV. 2.

²⁰ *Exh. ad mart.* XXXIII. 5.

²¹ E.g., *CC* I. 50.

²² *In Matt.* XI. 5. On this topic, see N. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, p. 30 ff.

perhaps a term of abuse; *Hebraios*, on the other hand, was a liberal's word, leaning over backwards to give no offence".²³

So, from the early days of the Christian tradition onwards,²⁴ one may find evidence that the term "Hebrew" is used to designate 'loyal'/'good' Jews²⁵ and more specifically Jews who still lived in agreement with their biblical ancestors' way of life. Moreover, the opposition between the words Ἑβραῖοι and Ἰουδαῖοι used as 'bad Jews' could be found as early as the Gospel of John.²⁶

According to De Lange, Origen influenced Eusebius significantly in this respect: "Origen has . . . prepared the ground for Eusebius' complete repainting of the traditional picture of Jewish history, which finally redefines *Hebraioi* so it can stand in contrast to *Ioudaioi*".²⁷

Although many scholars seem to have overlooked the distinction drawn by the bishop between "Jews" and "Hebrews",²⁸ this distinction should not be understood as an unequivocal and clear-cut opposition between "bad Jews" and "good Hebrews", as other scholars have assumed.²⁹ In this chapter, our concern will be to moderate such a

²³ De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, pp. 31–32.

²⁴ Actually, this distinction may have appeared in the Jewish tradition: On some inscriptions, in Greek, Latin or Hebrew, the term "Hebrew" already seems to be a claim that one is a pious, conservative Jew. See Harvey, *The True Israel*, pp. 145–146.

²⁵ See Harvey, *The True Israel*, p. 136 ff.

²⁶ See Harvey, *The True Israel*, p. 97; Simon, *Verus Israel*, pp. 207–209.

²⁷ De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, pp. 31–32.

²⁸ Bardy (G. Bardy, Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* I–IV. SC 31. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1952; Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* V–VII SC 41, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1955; Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* VIII–X. SC 55. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1958; Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* VIII–X. SC 73. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1960), in his translation and index of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, mentions under the lemma "Jews" features of the Hebrews and translates indiscriminately "Hebrew" by "Jew"; so does W. J. Ferrar (*The Proof of the Gospel Being the Demonstratio evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Translations of Christian Literature Series 1. London: SPCK, 1920), e.g., in vol. 2, p. 127 for *DE* VIII. 2. 392 d; Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens*, does not even mention this distinction; neither does Gorday ("Paul in Eusebius and Other Early Christian Literature" in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge, *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 139–165), who relates Eusebius' sentence "the first, most ancient, and most primordial of all religions, discovered by Abraham and his followers, the friends of God" (*HE* I. 4. 10) to Judaism; Rokeah (*Jews, Pagans, and Christians in Conflict*, p. 73), dealing with *PE* VII, claims that Eusebius says that "in contrast to all the nations who had been led astray and had become enslaved to corrupt and corrupting daemons, only the Jews had succeeded in receiving the true words of God . . ." whereas book VII deals with the "Hebrew" theology.

²⁹ E.g., Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215. Paris: Cerf, 1975, pp. 50 ff. and 127 ff.; Harvey, *The True Israel*, p. 139 (who mistakenly

view and to explore the significance of Eusebius' use of the terms "Hebrew" and "Jew" in his writings and in the *Apodeixis* in particular. It will therefore be necessary to analyse the way in which these two words are used, whether as adjectives or as nouns.

1. THE "HEBREWS" ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS

A. *Ancient Hebrews*

Eusebius seems to consider the great Hebrews, i.e., the biblical patriarchs, as the Christians' ancestors. This idea is not entirely new. Justin and Origen had already argued that these people, and especially Abraham, had a divine character and were the Christians' ancestors.³⁰ But nowhere does this idea seem to develop into such a coherent historical account as it does in Eusebius.³¹ As Gallagher has pointed out, Eusebius transforms this idea into a myth of Christian origins.³² This myth is obviously a powerful apologetic tool since it enables him to assert the antiquity of the Christian religion, and to contrast its perfection with the errors of the other religious groups (pagans and Jews).³³ By connecting Christianity to the Hebrews, Eusebius and, to a lesser extent, those of his predecessors who accepted the same vision of Christianity as him (e.g., Justin or Origen), could tell their opponents that not only was Christianity an offshoot of a tradition more ancient than that of the Greeks, but also that it was not a divergent branch of Judaism. Christianity belonged, according to them, to that which Boys-Stones has called in his book on

ascribes Eusebius' conception of the "Hebrews" to Origen); J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*, London: The Soncino Press, 1974, pp. 160–162; De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, pp. 31–32; M. Simonetti, "Eusebio tra ebrei e giudei", *ASE* 14, 1997, pp. 121–134; P. Carrar, *Eusebio di Cesarea. Dimostrazione evangelica*, Introduzione, traduzione e note di P. C. Letture cristiane del primo millennio 29. Milano: Paoline, 2000, pp. 41–42, n. 53.

³⁰ Justin, *Dial.* XIX. 1–5; XLVI. 2–4 (see J. S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews. Abraham in Early Christian Controversy*, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991, pp. 163–184); and, e.g., Origen, *CC* IV. 33–34. See E. V. Gallagher, "Eusebius the Apologist: The Evidence of the *Praeparatio* and the *Proof*", *StPat* 26, 1991, p. 253, n. 12.

³¹ As Gallagher, "Eusebius the Apologist", p. 253 and Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, p. 131 have claimed.

³² Gallagher, "Eusebius the Apologist", p. 244.

³³ Cf. Gallagher's argumentation in "Eusebius the Apologist", and Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 100–130.

post-Hellenistic philosophy a “philosophically unified Hebraeo-Christian tradition”.³⁴ This claim seems to have reached its climax in Eusebius’ *Apodeixis*. Moreover, as we shall see, this vindication also enabled Eusebius to justify Christian appropriation of Jewish Scripture and Christian rejection of Mosaic law.

In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius gives a detailed account of the ancient Hebrews. He eagerly describes them as ideal Greek philosophers (although he does not use this term)³⁵ in a Christian garb: According to him, their spirit was purified (νῶ κεκαθαρμένῳ) and the eyes of their soul limpid.³⁶ They were the first to practice rational speculation (λογικῇ θεωρίᾳ)³⁷ and to commit themselves to the study of the universe (φυσιολογία).³⁸ This is how they discovered that the creator was not part of the creation but a superior principle, and found the worship of the one true God.

Likewise, they made a distinction between soul and body and discovered man’s superiority to other animals. They practised a free and unrestrained piety (ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀνειμένον εὐσεβείας τρόπον),³⁹ lived a natural life (βίῳ μὲν τῷ κατὰ φύσιν),⁴⁰ thanks to the impassiveness of their souls (δι’ ἄκραν ψυχῆς ἀπάθειαν).⁴¹ Above all, they had a true knowledge of godly matters (γνώσιν ἀληθῆ τῶν περὶ θεοῦ δογμάτων).⁴² They both loved and were loved by God (φιλόθεοι/θεοφιλεῖς).⁴³ In the *Apodeixis*, they are often termed θεοφιλεῖς, as Philo also called them. All these features, Eusebius says, led God to judge them worthy of theophanies performed by his *Logos*, which gave their conjectures the brightness of truth.⁴⁴

In sum, Eusebius presents the Hebrews as having attained the correct knowledge of humankind, the world and God, as well as ethical perfection. Therefore, they are defined in contrast to pagans and Jews: “these men [the Hebrews] were not involved in the errors of

³⁴ Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, p. 153.

³⁵ Cf. Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, p. 40 ff.

³⁶ *PE* VII. 3. 3. Cf. *PE* I. 6. 2.

³⁷ *PE* VII. 3. 2.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *PE* VII. 6. 4.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *PE* VII. 4. 6.

⁴⁴ *PE* VII. 5. 1.

idolatry; moreover, they were outside the pale of Judaism (Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ δὲ ἔκτος γεγονότες).⁴⁵

Eusebius' opposition between the first pagans and the Hebrews is more fully developed in the *Praeparatio*.⁴⁶ Whereas the pagans were subject to sensuality, worshipped many gods, and led a corrupt animal-like life, the Hebrews conceived of the one true god, led a pious life and distinguished soul from body.⁴⁷ The contrast between Hebrews and pagans is mainly based on the idea that the former managed to get beyond the visible world by understanding the existence of one superior principle, while the latter remained stuck in the visible world and thus devoted themselves to astrolatry.⁴⁸ This suggests that Eusebius was influenced by Philo's criticism against Chaldeanism.⁴⁹

As regards the Jews, Eusebius clearly distinguishes them from the "Hebrews".⁵⁰ He claims that they draw their name from the tribe of Juda whereas the Hebrews are named after Heber, Abraham's ancestor, and/or according to the symbolic interpretation of the word עבר ('to cross') meaning "migrators" (περατικοί).⁵¹ When the bishop introduces the various great men of the Old Testament,⁵² whom he often labels as the "Friends of God", he constantly reminds the reader that these figures were by no means "Jews" but "Hebrews",⁵³ i.e., that they had not reached perfection through the observance of Mosaic law⁵⁴ but through their natural faith. Accordingly, he emphasizes

⁴⁵ *DE* I. 2. 13. Eusebius insists that the patriarchs are neither "Jews" nor Greeks.

⁴⁶ See Schroeder, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, p. 42 ff.

⁴⁷ *PE* VII. 3–4.

⁴⁸ Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 176, has shown Eusebius' ambiguity regarding astrolatry by contrasting his opinion expressed in the *PE* and that in the *DE*, in which divine providence seems to be behind this cult. Sirinelli also explains that Eusebius did not intend to shatter astrolatry completely by fear of seeing its popularity appropriated by an allegorizing Neoplatonism (p. 177).

⁴⁹ See, e.g., *De Abrahamo* 69. On Philo's criticism of Chaldeanism, see B. Decharneux, *L'ange, le devin et le prophète. Chemins de la parole dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie dit "le Juif"*, Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1994.

⁵⁰ On which see Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, pp. 147–149.

⁵¹ *PE* VII. 8. 21. Cf. Gen. 14:13.

⁵² *PE* VII. 8. 1–40.

⁵³ See, e.g., *PE* VII. 8. 20; VII. 6. 4; VII. 6. 1.

⁵⁴ This argument is found in Justin and may have come from Judaism. Indeed, *Jubilees* seems to polemicize against the so-called "argument of the patriarchs." See O. Skarsaune, *The Proof From Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 56. Leiden: Brill, 1987, pp. 324–326.

that whereas the Jews led their lives according to the law of Moses, which involves the observance of the Sabbath, various food restrictions, certain purifications and holidays, the Hebrews of the past enjoyed a natural religion (κατὰ φύσιν), free of any obligation.⁵⁵ This argument was already used by Tertullian.⁵⁶

Circumcision, however, has a different status in Jewish laws because of Abraham, who, in Eusebius' mind, is a crucial figure of Christian history. Yet he is also the first one to have been circumcised. Because Eusebius emphasized that the ancient "Hebrews", unlike the "Jews", did not practise circumcision,⁵⁷ he needed to justify that of Abraham and his household. He thus suggests different explanations: He claims, e.g., that this bodily mark served as a sign of the multitude of his lineage, or as a mark of their race (πάτριον γνώρισμα),⁵⁸ or for reasons which he cannot delve into in the passage.⁵⁹ In the *Demonstratio*, like Paul,⁶⁰ he is concerned with making clear that Abraham had already gained virtue and justice before his circumcision.⁶¹ Therefore, this Jewish rite was neither the sign nor the climax of the patriarch's virtue. It was a mere ethnical mark. These passages reveal Eusebius' desire to shatter the importance of circumcision as a sign of the covenant between God and the "Jewish" people in order to open the Old Testament prophecies to the Gentiles. Nonetheless, this attitude proves to be rather tolerant in contrast with that of other Christians such as Justin. The latter condemns it as a sign of exclusion from the covenant and as a divine punishment.⁶² Eusebius' mildness is thus noteworthy.

Yet he also claims that the true covenant was made with the Christians, but for this he used other means. He quotes Deuteronomy 5:1, e.g., in which Moses tells the people that the covenant on Mount Horeb was made with them, not with their ancestors. Eusebius does not hesitate to interpret this passage as meaning that a superior kind of covenant was made with the ancient Hebrews whose heirs are

⁵⁵ *PE* VII. 6. 4.

⁵⁶ *Adversus Iudaeos* II. 7.

⁵⁷ *PE* VII. 8. 20; *DE* I. 6. 12c.

⁵⁸ Similar reasons are mentioned about Abraham in *DE* I. 6. 13b.

⁵⁹ *PE* VII. 8. 24.

⁶⁰ *Rom.* 4:1–13.

⁶¹ *DE* I. 6. 13d–14b.

⁶² *Dial.* XVI. 2–4.

the Christians.⁶³ Therefore, the 'true' "Hebrews"—and consequently the Christians—hardly required laws to lead a life in accordance with God thanks to their true knowledge of the divine.

In brief, then, in the time of the Hebrews, "Judaism did not exist yet, those we are dealing with were Hebrews by name and custom, but they were not yet Jews and were not called so" (ὁ Ἰουδαϊσμός οὐκ ἦν πω τότε, ἀλλ' Ἑβραῖοι μὲν οἱ δηλούμενοι ὁμοῦ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὑπῆρχον, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ οὐτ' ἤσαν πω οὐτ' ἐχρημάτιζον).⁶⁴

The distinction drawn by Eusebius between "Hebrews" and "Jews" is thus twofold. It is a) a chronological distinction: The Hebrews are the people who lived *before* Moses whereas the Jews lived *after* Moses;⁶⁵ b) a religious-ethical distinction: The Hebrews had a spontaneous intuition of both piety and virtues and did not need any law whereas the Jews were subject to Mosaic law. According to Eusebius and many other Christian authors, there is no connection between, on the one hand, virtue and justice before God, and, on the other, the observance of the Law.

Yet some individuals whom Eusebius should have labelled "Jews" according to his own definition he defines as "Hebrews". Eusebius seems to be aware that he was sometimes inconsistent in this respect. In book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he seems embarrassed when he refers to Aristobulus and Eleazar (the high priest in the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas*) as "Hebrews". He solves the problem by making a distinction "according to race" and "according to time": He says that these authors were "Hebrew by race but flourished chronologically at the time of the Ptolemies" (τὸ μὲν γένος Ἑβραίων ἀνέκαθεν τὸν δὲ χρόνον κατὰ τοὺς Πτολεμαίων χρόνους διαπρεψάντων).⁶⁶

By contrast, Eusebius draws a strong connection between the Hebrews and the Christians⁶⁷ and does not hesitate to ascribe his own Christian theology to them. When dealing with the dogmatic

⁶³ *DE* I. 6. 13d–14a.

⁶⁴ *PE* VII. 6. 1.

⁶⁵ *PE* VII. 6. 4.

⁶⁶ *PE* VIII. 8. 56.

⁶⁷ Which could raise important problems: Eusebius had to justify the cultural differences which existed between these two groups, such as the "Hebrew's" tendency to have large families (cf. *DE* I. 9), the Christian ideal of sexual asceticism, or the differences between their sacrificial practices. See Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, p. 115 ff. On the question of the identification between "Hebrews" and Christians, see Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, pp. 143–145 and 161.

principles of the “Hebrews”,⁶⁸ he mentions, e.g., the second cause (i.e., the second god), or even the concept of the trinity.⁶⁹ He even goes so far as to use Christian testimonies to discuss “Hebrew” concepts such as that of the creation of matter,⁷⁰ although he had previously insisted that he would use “Hebrew” sources to speak about the “Hebrews”.⁷¹ Unlike the *Praeparatio* where the connection between Hebrews and Christians is only suggested, the *Demonstratio* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* assert it clearly: Christianity is in fact “that intermediate law and life led by the ancient friends of God, just men, which our Lord and saviour has renewed” (ἐπὶ τὸν μέσον παριέναι νόμον τε καὶ βίον, τὸν τῶν πάλαι θεοφιλῶν καὶ δικαίων ἀνδρῶν, ὃν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν . . . αὐθις ἀνενεώσατο).⁷²

Strikingly, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, the bishop goes so far as to say that:

Πάντας δὴ ἐκείνους ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνη μεμαρτυρημένους, ἐξ αὐτοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὸν πρῶτον ἀνιοῦσι ἄνθρωπον, ἔργῳ Χριστιανούς, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὀνόματι, προσειπὼν τις οὐκ ἂν ἐκτὸς βάλοι τῆς ἀληθείας.

All those whose justice is witnessed, from Abraham himself to the first man, one would not be wrong to call them Christians in fact if not in name.⁷³

Likewise, in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius does not hesitate to mention a “third” religion besides Greek polytheism and Judaism. This religion would be that of the ancient “Hebrews”, the patriarchs who are the friends of God, and the Christians.⁷⁴ In other passages, the third race is explicitly said to be that of the Christians.⁷⁵ This identification between “Hebrews” and Christians was perhaps legitimated by the pagan world, and especially by Porphyry who (according to Augustine) included Jesus among the “wise Hebrews”.⁷⁶

⁶⁸ *PE* VII. 9. 1–4.

⁶⁹ *PE* VII. 15. 6–7.

⁷⁰ *PE* VII. 19–22.

⁷¹ *PE* VII. 8. 1.

⁷² *DE* I. 2. 14.

⁷³ *HE* I. 4. 6. Transl. by K. Lake and J. E. Oulton, Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. LCL. London: Heinemann, 1926–1932.

⁷⁴ *PE* I. 2. 1–4. The notion of *tertium genus* may be found as early as the Preaching of Peter (in Clement, *Str.* VI. 41. 1); cf. Aristides, *Apol.* 2. By contrast, Tertullian mentions this division but rejects it (*Ad nationes* I. 8).

⁷⁵ *DE* I. 2. 14.

⁷⁶ Augustine, *De civ. Dei* XIX. 23.

Linking the Christians to the Hebrews certainly constituted a device meant to assert the antiquity and unity of the Christian tradition: Christianity was not dependent on Judaism nor had the Christians unrightly appropriated the Jewish Scripture; the Christians were the heirs to the ancient Hebrews. Subsequently, the Christians were, in Eusebius' view, the legitimate owners of the writings related to the life and doctrines of the ancient Hebrews. Hence they were the 'true Israel'.

B. *Post-Mosaic Jews as "Hebrews"*

Eusebius sometimes talks of "Hebrews" when we would expect him to talk of the "Jewish" people. In these passages, he gives an idealised picture of this people and portrays the law of Moses as a great benefit.

According to the *Historia ecclesiastica*,⁷⁷ e.g., "when the whole nation descending from the Hebrews" (ὅλον τε ἔθνος . . . προσανέχον ἐκ τῶν ἀνέκαθεν Ἑβραίων)—not the "Jews"—discovered religion, they were given, through Moses, various symbolic ritual prescriptions. Although, according to Eusebius, these people were not given the meaning of these practical initiations (ἐναργεῖς μυσταγωγίας), it is thanks to the spread of this "fragrant breeze" (πνοῆς εὐώδους), i.e., the law of Moses, that the savage customs of the Gentiles were softened through philosophers and lawmakers. Thanks to the latter, they were made ready to receive the knowledge of the father (ἐπιτηδείους πρὸς παραδοχὴν τῆς τοῦ πατρός).⁷⁸ Therefore, the law of Moses served as a *praeparatio evangelica* for the nations.⁷⁹ It is worth noting that Eusebius here carefully avoids attributing this benefit to the "Jews". He rather refers to the "descendants of the Hebrews", thereby connecting them to their admirable ancestors the Friends of God. Book VIII of the *Demonstratio* closely follows this historical account.⁸⁰

In book IV of the *Demonstratio*,⁸¹ Eusebius gives a description of pre-Christian history similar to that given in the *Historia*. According

⁷⁷ *HE* I. 2. 21–23.

⁷⁸ *HE* I. 2. 23.

⁷⁹ Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 242 emphasizes that "l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* attribuait explicitement à la diffusion de la législation mosaïque les conséquences que la *Préparation évangélique* rattache à la diffusion de l'Évangile".

⁸⁰ *DE* VIII. pr. 363c–365b.

⁸¹ *DE* IV. 10. 161a–162d.

to this passage, the whole of humanity was subjected to evil and the guardian angels were unable to defend the nations against it. Therefore, God sent the law of Moses “as delivering the rudiments at the entry of the life of piety, by means of symbols and worship of a shadowy and bodily character” (ὥς ἐν εἰσαγωγαῖς τοῦ κατὰ εὐσέβειαν βίου παραδιδόνς αὐτοῖς στοιχεῖα διὰ συμβόλων καὶ τινος σκιώδους καὶ σωματικῆς λατρείας).⁸² However, even Mosaic law was not strong enough to rid the world of the excess of wickedness due to the demons, and “even the Hebrew race” (καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Ἑβραίων ἔθνος)⁸³ was going to succumb. Since none of the prophets could change the situation, “the saviour and physician of the universe” came down amongst men. Such is, in outline, Eusebius’ representation of the “Hebrew” people prior to Christ. It is significant that in *Historia* I, *Demonstratio* VIII and *Demonstratio* IV, Eusebius does not refer to the fact that the law of Moses was sent by God to the “Jews” (Ἰουδαῖοι) because they were ill with a Jewish νόσος due to the bad influence of the Egyptians, as he does in book VII of the *Praeparatio* and book I of the *Demonstratio*⁸⁴ (as we shall see).

In *Demonstratio* IV. 10, he even goes so far as to say that polytheism “even” reached the great “Hebrews” whereas in *Praeparatio* VII and *Demonstratio* I, he clearly focuses on the impiety of the Jews. Likewise, whereas in *Demonstratio* I and *Praeparatio* VII, Mosaic law is seen as a remedy for the “Jews” only, in the three above passages, it is presented as directed towards the nations whether as a remedy (*Demonstratio* IV) or as a benefit (*Historia ecclesiastica* I). Although Mosaic law is described in *Demonstratio* IV as less efficient than the teachings of Christ in the healing of humanity, the bishop seems to regard it as a first important attempt to destroy the wickedness which affected nations, thus connecting it directly to Christianity. Therefore, contrary to general scholarly opinion, in some passages of the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius *praises* the law of Moses, especially when “Jews” and “Hebrews” are opposed.

In addition to the people as a whole, Eusebius also labels as “Hebrews” some individuals who came after Moses and who should therefore be defined as “Jews”. These are notably the prophets,⁸⁵ the

⁸² *DE* IV. 10. 162c–d.

⁸³ *DE* IV. 10. 162d.

⁸⁴ Cf. below “Jews Before Christ”.

⁸⁵ E.g., *PE* VII. 11. 9.

Maccabees,⁸⁶ the high priests,⁸⁷ Trypho and the δευτερωταί.⁸⁸ This is also the case with the Greek-language Jewish authors.⁸⁹ Therefore, it is necessary to understand who is a “Hebrew” according to Eusebius in order to understand more clearly the status of the Jewish authors in the *Apodeixis*.

Scholars have explained Eusebius' distinction between “Hebrew” and “Jew” by saying that “Hebrew” in Eusebius would refer, as it were, to “good Jews” whereas “Jew” would designate those the bishop sees as “bad Jews”.⁹⁰ But this explanation is unsatisfactory since more criteria are involved in the choice of term. J. Ulrich has pointed out that Eusebius uses the word “Hebrew” to designate people who are remarkable from a religious and ethical viewpoint.⁹¹ Indeed, the Maccabees, e.g., deserve this label because they fought for godly piety (τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας).⁹² Yet even if Ulrich analyzes with great subtlety the distribution of the terms “Jew” and “Hebrew”, there may be other criteria that make a “Hebrew” out of a “Jew”. These criteria may be discovered by looking at the way in which Eusebius defines the Jews he labels as “Hebrews”.

The prophet Isaiah, described as a “Hebrew”, is characterized by the fact that he foresaw the new covenant established by Jesus.⁹³

⁸⁶ Cf., e.g., *HE* III. 10. 6.

⁸⁷ *DE* V. 2. 217d. However, the high-priests of the days of Christ are obviously defined as belonging to the “Jews”: See, e.g., *DE* VIII. 2. 388a.

⁸⁸ *PE* XI. 5. 3; XII. 1. 4.

⁸⁹ *PE* VII. 13. 7; VIII. 8. 56; XIII. 11. 3; XIV. 12. heading (Aristobulus); VII. 12. 14; VII. 17. 4; VII. 20. 9; XI. 14. 9; XI. 23. 12; XIII. 18. 12; XIII. 18. 17 (Philo); X. 6. 15; X. 12. 31 (Josephus); *DE* III. 5. 124b; VI. 18. 291b; VIII. 2. 392d; VIII. 2. 397d (Josephus).

⁹⁰ See A. Arazy, *The Appellations of the Jews (Ioudaios, Hebraios, Israel) in the Literature from Alexander to Justinian*, diss. New York, 1977, according to whom “(1) any time a positive image of the Jews, contemporary or ancient is to be presented, *Hebraios* is the proper appellation; (2) The appellation *Ioudaios* should be used in pointing out the negative character of the Jews both contemporary and their ancestors” (II, pp. 30–31). For more detail on the use of its terminology in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, see Simonetti, “Eusebio Ara ebrei e giudei”, pp. 121–134: “L’alternanza delle due forme [Jews and Hebrews] non va considerata casuale, come di termini dal medesimo significato e perciò intercambiabili: anche se la distinzione non è sistematica e rigorosa, è evidente che in *HE* Eusebio parla di ebrei in senso positivo o neutro, e comunque mai negativo, mentre quando racconta le sopra ricordate violenze a danno dei cristiani e conseguente punizione providenziale a opera dei romani, egli parla sempre di giudei” (= p. 129).

⁹¹ Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, p. 63.

⁹² *HE* III. 10. 6.

⁹³ E.g., in *DE* I. 4. 8d.

The seventy translators of the Septuagint, whom Eusebius calls “Hebrews”, are praised for their translation, which is the actual Christian reference text⁹⁴ and served as a preparation (εἰς προπαρασκευήν) to Christianity for the nations.⁹⁵ Eusebius even goes so far as to oppose them to the Ἰουδαῖοι, who would otherwise have hidden Scripture from the nations.⁹⁶

Likewise, Trypho, the Jew of Justin’s *Dialogue*, is referred to as a “Hebrew”.⁹⁷ In the *Dialogue*, which shows the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, he recognizes the greatness of Christianity.⁹⁸ The fact that Eusebius defines Trypho as a “Hebrew” is all the more significant since in the same passage he openly refers to Justin’s work as διάλογον δὲ πρὸς Ἰουδαίου.⁹⁹

The δευτερωταί are also called “Hebrews” since they are used to document Eusebius’ comparison between “Hebrew” doctrines and Plato’s.¹⁰⁰ This is all the more surprising since the word δευτερωταί seems to be a technical term used by the Christians to designate the Jewish rabbis.¹⁰¹ Although in other Christian works the word δευτέρωσις refers to the *Mishnah* and the legal parts of the Old Testament,¹⁰² in the *Apodeixis* Eusebius seems to use the word δευτερωταί to refer to midrashic commentators. He mentions the experience and maturity necessary to be a δευτερωτής,¹⁰³ and he claims that the δευτερωταί are those of the Hebrews’ children (παισὶν Ἑβραίων) whose thought is hoary (πολιοῖς τὸ φρόνημα),¹⁰⁴ i.e., mature. He was perhaps influenced

⁹⁴ *DE* V. pr. 211b.

⁹⁵ *PE* VIII. 1. 6.

⁹⁶ *PE* VIII. 1. 7.

⁹⁷ *HE* IV. 18. 6.

⁹⁸ See at the end of the *Dialogue*, esp. CXLII. 1 where Trypho declares: πλέον γάρ εὐρομεν ἢ προσεδοκῶμεν καὶ προσδοκηθῆναι.

⁹⁹ *HE* IV. 18. 6.

¹⁰⁰ *PE* XI–XIII.

¹⁰¹ E.g., Jerome, *In Habac.* II. 9 (*PL* XXV, 1297); *In Es.* XVI. 59 (*CCL* LXXIII A 685).

¹⁰² Jerome, *In Es.* XVI. 59 (*CCL* LXXIII A 685); *In Matt.* XXII. 23 (*CCL* LXXVII, p. 204); *Constit. apost.* I. 6; II. 5; VI. 22; Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXXIII. 9. 4; Augustine, *Contra adv. Leg. et Proph.* II. 1. 2 (*PL* XLII, 637). On this subject, see De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, pp. 34–35; Simon, *Verus Israel*, pp. 88–91; Schürer in *HJP*, I, p. 70, nn. 1 and 23; F. Millar, “The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora Between Paganism and Christianity, A.D. 312–438”, in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak, *The Jews Among the Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 114–115.

¹⁰³ *PE* XI. 5. 3 and XII. 1. 4.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Wisdom 4:9.

by Origen's definition of the δευτερώσεις in the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*.¹⁰⁵ According to him (in Rufinus' translation), the δευτερώσεις are four biblical passages (the beginning of Genesis on the creation of the world, the beginning of Ezekiel on the Cherubim and its end on the building of the Temple, and the Song of Songs) reserved for the end of the *Hebraeos'* education. The Christians would have inherited this custom from them. Although, unlike Origen, Eusebius does not present the δευτερώσεις as a group of biblical passages but rather as scriptural commentaries, he also emphasizes the maturity needed to access these commentaries: According to him, they are called δευτερωταί because they have gone beyond the first teachings πρώτα μαθήματα.¹⁰⁶ Like Origen, he connects this "Hebrew" tradition to the Christian one, which would have inherited it from them.¹⁰⁷ Eusebius describes them as being able to interpret the true meaning of Scripture (ἐρμηνευτὰς ὥσπερ καὶ ἐξηγητὰς ὄντας τῆς τῶν γραφῶν διανοίας),¹⁰⁸ and to make clear through interpretation and clarification the message obscured in riddles (τὰ δι' αἰνιγμῶν ἐπεσκιασμένα . . . δι' ἐρμηνείας καὶ σαφηνείας ἐξέφαινον).¹⁰⁹ Like Origen, he makes clear that they do not pass on their exegesis to all "children of the Hebrews" but only to those who are ready to hear it (μὴ τοῖς πᾶσι, τοῖς γοῦν πρὸς τὴν τούτων ἀκοὴν ἐπιτηδείοις).¹¹⁰ In other words, the δευτερωταί, unlike the "Jews" but like the Christians, endeavour to go beyond the symbols of Mosaic law. Eusebius describes their work as a sort of allegorical reading of the Bible as practised by the Christians. This is probably what makes them worthy of the label "Hebrew" in the *Praeparatio*: Because the exegesis Eusebius ascribes to them is similar to that used by the Christians, they deserve the title of "Hebrew". However, it is worth noting that in other works, more like other Christian authors,¹¹¹ he describes the δευτέρωσις

¹⁰⁵ *In cant.* prol. I. 7.

¹⁰⁶ *PE* XI. 5. 3.

¹⁰⁷ *PE* XII. 1. 4.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *PE* XI. 5. 3.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ See, e.g., Procopius of Gaza, *Comm. in Is.* (PG LXXXVII. 2, 2176 D), who accuses them of ἀλαζονεύεσθαι regarding some biblical interpretations; see also John Damascus, *Haer.* 14. He identifies them as the Jewish scribes and emphasizes that they practise rites they did not learn from the Law (. . . ἔθη φυλάσσοντες ὃ οὐ διὰ νόμου μεμαθήκασιν) as well as virtuous acts and religious observances that are outside this constitution (ἐκτὸς τῆς νομοθεσίας).

as silly (ληρώδης) and fable-like (μυθική),¹¹² and he defines it as “Jewish”.¹¹³ This contradiction may be explained by the fact that in the *Praeparatio*, Judaism is strongly valued in comparison with Greek philosophy. Eusebius needs, as it were, to unify Judaism, Hebrew religion and Christianity to be able to resort to as many means as possible to counter pagan accusations such as that of innovation on the Christian part. For the Greeks, the Christians were related to the Jews.¹¹⁴ Eusebius uses this strategy neither in the *Demonstratio* nor in the *Commentarius in Isaiam* which both deal with the supersession of Judaism by Christianity.

It appears from this short survey that the bishop is inclined to call “Hebrews” people we would expect him to label as “Jews”, i.e., people who came after Moses and kept his law. Eusebius does so either when they are directly or indirectly related to Christianity and its doctrines, or when he wishes to appropriate Jewish individuals for apologetic reasons in a pagan-Christian polemical context.

The so-called “Hebrew” doctrines of the Jewish authors he quotes in his work reflect, in his view, some Christian doctrines. From Eusebius’ viewpoint, these authors anticipate Christian doctrines. Moreover, their texts are easily reinterpreted through a Christian lens. Consequently, they are defined as “Hebrews”.

In addition, Eusebius labels as “Hebrews” Jews who (according to him) have not walked away from the pure and perfect tradition of their ancestors the “friends of God”. He is especially anxious to use this label when he wishes to present them in continuity with the Christians. This is confirmed by the fact that several figures who are traditionally seen as Christians also deserve the title of “Hebrews” in Eusebius’ writings. This is the case, e.g., with Paul and John. The distinction between “Hebrew” and “Jew” proves to be more sophisticated than is usually assumed. It should not be seen as limited to a contrast between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Jews. This division, I would

¹¹² *CI* 11. 13. See also *CI* 146. 2–8. The numbers refer to the pages and the lines in Ziegler, Eusebius Werke IX. GCS.

¹¹³ *DE* VI. 18. 291b and *CI* 146. 2–8 where Eusebius criticizes “the ancients’ tradition” (Matt. 15:2).

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., Suetonius *Vita Caes.* V. 25, who mentions the Jews led by “Chrestus” (although this reference remains problematic); Galen, *De pulsuum differentiis*, II. 4 and III. 3, in which he includes in the same school the disciples of Moses and those of Christ; cf. Origen, *CC passim*.

argue, relies more on Eusebius' desire to appropriate some key figures of Judaism than on a dichotomic vision of the Jews in general.

In the light of this analysis, it is easier to understand why some Jewish authors such as Josephus, Philo or Aristobulus are labelled "Hebrews". They are defined as such because they provide him with crucial information on Christ and Christianity. Philo and Aristobulus are used, at least in part, by Eusebius in books VII, XI and XIII of the *Praeparatio*, because they testify to "Hebrew" doctrines which can easily be brought closer to some Christian doctrines. Likewise, Josephus is named a "Hebrew" due to a) the amount of information on the origins of Christianity with which he provides Eusebius, and b) the agreement Eusebius sees between his testimony and the Gospels.¹¹⁵ I will return to this point in more detail in the last chapter.

Moreover, it is worth noting that in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, in which Eusebius describes the "life according to Moses", he does not label Philo and Josephus as "Hebrews". This indicates that they are only called so when he intends to connect them to Christianity.

2. THE "JEWS" ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS

Although Eusebius' views on Judaism in general are undeniably a crucial issue in his works, the first comprehensive work on this subject was not published until 1999.¹¹⁶ Prior to this, modern accounts of this subject were scattered throughout scholarly literature on Eusebius, Christian anti-Judaism¹¹⁷ and early Christianity. Most scholars focused on Eusebius' polemical attitude towards the Jews.¹¹⁸ By contrast, Ulrich's recent project aims at investigating the Jewish-Christian relations on the ground of Eusebius' writings. More specifically, he attempts to disprove the idea of Eusebius' anti-Judaism.¹¹⁹ In this section, we will attempt to see rather when Eusebius resorts

¹¹⁵ E.g., *HE* I. 5. 3.

¹¹⁶ Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*.

¹¹⁷ For a detailed assessment of secondary literature on anti-Judaism in early Christianity, see M. S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. StPB 46. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

¹¹⁸ See Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, pp. 97–113; Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue*, pp. 160–162.

¹¹⁹ As promoted by, e.g., Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, pp. 160–162.

to the label “Jew” or “Jewish” in order to understand the status of the Jewish-Greek authors. A distinction between the period prior to the coming of Christ and the period after His coming will need to be drawn because following his master Origen, Eusebius himself makes such a distinction.

A. “Jews” before Christ

Most scholarly accounts of Eusebius’ vision of pre-Christian history do not focus on his view of Judaism, but rather on the apologetic purposes of such a vision and on his understanding of world cultural history.¹²⁰ However, while Eusebius clearly defines the pagans’ role, the role given to the “Jews” proves to be more flexible. Therefore, I will not attempt to give a consistent picture of Eusebius’ understanding of Judaism and Jews by compiling elements from his different works. Rather, I will attempt to identify the different descriptions he provides in order to understand how they agree with the internal logic of his writings.

In book VII of the *Praeparatio*¹²¹ and book I of the *Demonstratio*¹²² Eusebius gives a fairly negative picture of the Jews, whom he considers as ill with idolatry, and of the law of Moses, described as a remedy to this illness. This description is only sketched in the *Praeparatio* and is fully explained in the first book of the *Demonstratio*.

In book VII of the *Praeparatio*, the bishop’s report is as follows: Once in Egypt, the Hebrews’ numbers increased and they became the Jewish people (τὸ Ἰουδαίων . . . ἔθνος).¹²³ They took on Egyptian ways and thus strayed from the path of their righteous ancestors. Because of their lack of piety, God gave them, through Moses, a constitution (νόμον) appropriate to the rudeness of their customs (ἀβελτερία). They were indeed like people whose souls were subjected to passion and illness (τὰς ψυχὰς ἐμπαθέσι καὶ νεοσηλευμένοις).¹²⁴

¹²⁰ E.g., Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*; Gallagher, “Eusebius the Apologist”; A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989.

¹²¹ *PE* VII. 8. 37–40.

¹²² *DE* I. 6. 17 a–19d.

¹²³ *PE* VII. 8. 37.

¹²⁴ It should be noted that the description of the “Jews” as opposed to the “Hebrews” in this passage is remindful of the opposition drawn by Eusebius between secular Christians on the one hand, and Christian priests and ascetics on the other. See *DE* I. 8. 29b–d. For a commentary on this passage, see P. Brown, *Le renonce-*

As regards the Law itself, some of its prescriptions were to be taken literally, others were to be understood as symbolic.¹²⁵

This outline, which is only sketched in the *Praeparatio*, is fully developed in book I of the *Demonstratio*, in which he explains what the Jews' adoption of Egyptian customs meant: The Jews had actually fallen into polytheistic superstition. The law of Moses was like a doctor sent to heal them from the Egyptian disease.¹²⁶ The Jews were thereby rescued from their wild and savage life (an expression significantly close to those used in the *Praeparatio* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* to describe the first pagans' life).¹²⁷ Judaism covered an intermediate (μεταξύ) period during which the new covenant was hidden from men, just "as if it were asleep" (ὥσπερ ἐφησυχάζειν).¹²⁸ The law of Moses "came in adventitiously" (παρεισελθών)¹²⁹ between the Hebrew and the Christian periods.

In sum, the Jews are referred to in this record as "Jews" while Mosaic law is seen as a remedy for the Jews only, too weak to follow the path of their brilliant ancestors and ill with the polytheistic disease. Eusebius clearly underlines the inefficiency and imperfection of such a treatment. Eusebius also stresses that Judaism by no means constitutes a relevant link between the Hebrew religion and Christianity. Like Tertullian in his *Adversus Judaeos*, he sees it as an intermediary period between the Hebrew and the Christian eras. We are far from the laudatory descriptions given in *Historia Ecclesiastica* I and *Demonstratio* VIII and IV.¹³⁰ However, despite the negative character of the picture given by Eusebius, he makes it clear that Mosaic law was a "first step towards holiness".¹³¹

By contrast, book VIII of the *Praeparatio* gives a positive account of the "Jews" and of "life according to Moses". It clearly presents

ment à la chair. *Virginité, célibat et continence dans le christianisme primitif*, Traduit de l'anglais par P.-E. Dauzat and C. Jacob, Paris: Gallimard, 1995, p. 258 ff.

¹²⁵ PE VII. 8. 39.

¹²⁶ According to the *Demonstratio*, Christ completes the law of Moses and more specifically its role as a healer (see DE IV. 10. 163d).

¹²⁷ HE I. 2. 19; PE VII. 2. 6.

¹²⁸ DE I. 6. 16d. The lethargy motif will persist as late as the nineteenth century, e.g., in Adolphe Pictet's (1799–1875) *Origines indo-européennes, ou Les Aryas primitifs: Essai de paléontologie linguistique*, Paris: Cherbuliez, 1863.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* Παρεισερχομαι. According to Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v.: "to come in adventitiously".

¹³⁰ See above, "Post-Mosaic Jews as 'Hebrews'".

¹³¹ DE I. 6. 17b.

Judaism as an *exemplum* of morality and piety even if it is made clear that in terms of piety it only comes ‘second best’ to the Hebrew religion.¹³²

Although at the beginning of the book, the bishop insists on the fact that Judaism was only observable for the “Jews” who lived in Judea¹³³ (a claim he frequently made)¹³⁴ and that the Jews would have hidden the Scripture out of jealousy towards the Christians,¹³⁵ he is keen to give a remarkably positive account of Judaism and the Jews through the citations of Pseudo-Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo and Josephus. The mere fact that Eusebius uses these testimonies as authoritative in both “Hebrew” and “Jewish” matters is also significant in this respect. Only Aristobulus is labelled as a “Hebrew” but even in this case, Eusebius seems embarrassed. As we have seen, he hastily adds that chronologically speaking, Aristobulus shone under the Ptolemies.¹³⁶

At any rate, it must be pointed out that in this book of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius feels free to give his readers a laudatory picture of the “Jews”, going so far as to establish a continuity between them and the “Hebrews”, and hence the Christians.

The excerpts from Philo, Josephus, Pseudo-Aristeas and Aristobulus give a thoroughly idealised view of Judaism: Moses is the most brilliant and wisest leader;¹³⁷ Mosaic law is a philosophical model of justice and ethics;¹³⁸ the Jews are a race of philosophers who devote themselves to the study of Scripture and an *exemplum* of φιλανθρωπία.¹³⁹ Eusebius even suggests, through the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* and Aristobulus, that at least some Jews understood the allegories obscur-

¹³² PE VIII. 1. 1.

¹³³ PE VIII. 1. 2.

¹³⁴ See, e.g., DE I. 6. 17d.

¹³⁵ PE VIII. 1. 7.

¹³⁶ PE VIII. 8. 56.

¹³⁷ PE VIII. 6. 1–9 via Philo. On the idealized image of Moses in Greek-language Jewish literature, see, e.g., Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, pp. 374–442; —, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993, pp. 242–285.

¹³⁸ PE VIII. 7–8 via Philo and Josephus. On the idealized image of Mosaic law and of Judaism in Josephus, see Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, pp. 201–232.

¹³⁹ Esp. PE VIII. 7. 19. On the Jewish concept of φιλανθρωπία in this period, see K. Berthelot, *Philanthrōpia Judaica, le débat autour de la “misanthropie” des lois juives dans l'Antiquité*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 76. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2003.

ing the Old Testament whereas in many other passages, he insists on their inability to grasp the true meaning of Scripture.¹⁴⁰

At the end of book VIII, Eusebius goes so far as to use two excerpts from Philo to develop two conceptions he had ascribed to the Hebrews in book VII of the *Praeparatio*,¹⁴¹ i.e., the creation of the world and divine providence.¹⁴² He even claims that the theology of the Jews (here significantly referred to as τῶν νέων in contrast to the ancient Hebrews) agreed with the piety of their ancestors,¹⁴³ i.e., with the Hebrew-Christian theology provided in book VII.

Thus Eusebius' understanding of the "Jews" and of Mosaic prescriptions seem baffling: On the one hand, Eusebius accuses the "Jews" who lived before Christ of having strayed from the path of their ancestors and of having been corrupted by Egyptian superstition (*Praeparatio* VII; *Demonstratio* I); in this context, the law of Moses is perceived as a remedy intended for the Jews alone; on the other hand, he praises Mosaic law in a "Hebrew" context as a source of civilization for the nations; in this case, he presents it as a first remedy against the demons' hold on the world (*Historia ecclesiastica* I, *Demonstratio* IV and VIII), even though he makes it clear that it is still imperfect by comparison with the healing of the Gospel of Christ. In addition, the "Jews" enjoy his benevolence because they are perceived as a people of philosophers and as predecessors of the Christians (*Praeparatio* VIII).

This ambiguity in the treatment of the Jews needs to be clarified. According to Sirinelli, "cette contradiction trahit les incertitudes de sa [Eusebius'] pensée".¹⁴⁴ Another interpretation might also be suggested.

Firstly, analyzing the context in which each conception of the "Jews" and Mosaic law is inserted may be helpful in understanding Eusebius' views. Indeed, he seems to change his presentation of Judaism according to the purposes aimed at in each passage.

Secondly, the distinction drawn by the apologist in several passages of his different works between a "Jewish" elite and the "Jewish" mob also proves helpful in understanding why on some occasions

¹⁴⁰ E.g., their interpretations are described as being "carnal and corporeal" (σάρκινοι καὶ σωματικώτεροι) (*CI* 306. 33).

¹⁴¹ Cf. *PE* VII. 11. 1–13.

¹⁴² *PE* VIII. 13–14, cf. *PE* VII. 10. 1–14.

¹⁴³ *PE* VIII. 12. 21, cf. *PE* VIII. 14. 72.

¹⁴⁴ Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 223, dealing with *HE* I and *DE* I.

Eusebius provides a positive image of them and on other occasions denigrates them. Let us examine each of these explanations.

a) *Context-Based Explanation*

The various passages which describe the law of Moses positively and refer to the Jews as “Hebrews” (*Historia* I, *Demonstratio* IV and VIII) aim in fact at justifying Christ’s late arrival on earth. Eusebius presents Christianity as the apotheosis of a long and ever-progressing process in which “the sons of the Hebrews”, perceived in a continuous relation with the Christians, had a major role to play. Eusebius vindicates the late arrival of Christ¹⁴⁵ by presenting the law of Moses as a necessary but insufficient step towards holiness and the destruction of the demons.

Since in this case he clearly presents pre-Christian history in continuity with Judaism, he refers to the Jews rather as “Hebrews”. Using the label “Hebrews” enables Eusebius to confirm the unity of the Jewish-Christian tradition (*lato sensu*) as well as the Christian right to use the Old Testament without needing to justify the rupture with the Jewish people as a whole. In this, Eusebius’ *Apodeixis* may be seen as the peak of a Christian tradition which defines the Christians as the rightful owners of the Old Testament.

In book I of the *Demonstratio* as well as in book VII of the *Praeparatio*, on the contrary, he emphasizes the discontinuity between the life according to Moses on the one hand, and Hebrew piety and Christianity on the other; he refers to the Jews as “Jews” because he wants to show that Judaism is inferior to Christianity and has therefore rightly been superseded by the latter. Nevertheless, the account given in book VII remains brief: In an apologetic work opposing Christianity and Hellenism, it is out of the question to disparage Judaism¹⁴⁶ too strongly because Christianity was generally considered as its offspring.

As regards book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius insists on the kinship between “Hebrew” and “Jewish” theology, ethics and phi-

¹⁴⁵ The late coming of Christ was used as an anti-Christian argument by the pagans, as was the fact that Christ had appeared in such a remote place as Judea. On Eusebius’ answer, see Kofsky, *Eusebius Against Paganism*, pp. 224–227.

¹⁴⁶ As we have seen, one needs to be careful in using this terminology in order not to warp Eusebius’ thoughts. The latter does not understand the word *Ioudaismos* as we understand Judaism. In his use, it has a clearly negative connotation. Yet it is occasionally easier to use this term to describe his thoughts, as is the case here.

losophy because at this stage of his *Apodeixis*, he is not dealing with Christianity yet. Therefore, in the context of the *Praeparatio*, he would be well advised to use any possible weapon against paganism, including presenting Judaism as a superior kind of piety and philosophy. This may also explain why in book VII of the *Praeparatio* he only gives a very short and negative account of the law of Moses: It would certainly not have been the right moment to undermine the prestige of Judaism of which Christianity was considered the heir. This part of Eusebius' demonstration will be treated more extensively in the *Demonstratio*.

b) *The Distinction Between Elite and Mob*

The contradictory descriptions of Judaism in the *Apodeixis* may also be explained by the fact that he divides the Jewish people into two distinct groups, a distinction which makes clear the agenda behind the bishop's laudatory treatment of the "Jews" in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* as opposed to the other passages in which he provides a critical description of Judaism and the "Jews".

According to the *Praeparatio*,¹⁴⁷ the *Logos* divided the Jews into two "sections" (τιμήματα): On the one hand, the majority (τὴν πληθύν), subjected to the literal meaning of the Law, and on the other, the experts (τῶν ἐν ἔξει), considered as deserving of a more divine philosophy (θειοτέρᾳ δὲ τινι . . . φιλοσοφίᾳ) and practising an allegorical reading of the laws. These are a "race of Jewish philosophers" (φιλοσόφων Ἰουδαίων γένος), which Eusebius identifies as the Essenes.¹⁴⁸ Yet this definition may also, according to Eusebius, be applied to other Jews. In his account of the Septuagint, e.g., Eusebius again suggests a division between one part of the Jews, who were jealous of the Christians and, therefore, would never have had their Scripture translated into Greek, and another group, approved of for their intelligence and ancestral culture (συνέσει καὶ τῇ πατρίῳ παιδείᾳ).¹⁴⁹ They eagerly made a divinely inspired Greek translation of Scripture (ἐκ τῆς θεόθεν οἰκονομηθείσης ἐρμηνείας),¹⁵⁰ thanks to which it became available to the nations.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ *PE* VIII. 10. 18–19.

¹⁴⁸ *PE* VIII. 10. 19 and VIII. 11. 1–18.

¹⁴⁹ *PE* VIII. 1. 6–7.

¹⁵⁰ *PE* VIII. 1. 7.

¹⁵¹ *PE* VIII. 1. 6.

A similar claim is made in books XI and XII of the *Praeparatio*, in which Eusebius asserts that the δευτερωταί shed light on the riddles of the biblical text only for those who were ready to hear it.¹⁵²

The same distinction is made in the *Commentary on Isaiah*, in which Eusebius divides those who will be saved into two factions (τάγματα).¹⁵³ Significantly the word τάγμα also designates “the various classes or orders in Christian body”.¹⁵⁴ The first one includes “Jews” (τῶν . . . παρὰ τῷ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνει) such as the prophets, the patriarchs, the priests, the friends of God, the high priests and numerous pious men and women.¹⁵⁵ The second one includes those from the nations who believed in Christ. What should be pointed out here is that the first group is implicitly opposed to the rest of the “Jews”. Eusebius probably has especially in mind the leaders of the Jews who brought disaster on them by their condemnation of Jesus.¹⁵⁶

All these passages indicate that, although Eusebius considers the majority of the Jews to be subjected to the literal reading of Mosaic law and needed the law to correct their behaviour, he also believes there was a group whose individual members were the direct spiritual heirs of the ancient Hebrews. These people undeniably constituted a direct link between the Friends of God and the Christians. For Eusebius, the Jewish authors were no doubt part of this elite.

This distinction among the “Jews” also enables us to explain why Eusebius so warmly approves that branch of Judaism of the Greek-language Jewish authors quoted in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, while “Jews” in general are clearly rejected in other parts of the *Apodeixis*. In fact only the “life according to Moses” as described by a certain elite to which the Jewish authors belong deserves to be presented in continuity with the “Hebrews” and therefore with the Christians. Yet Pépin’s claim that like some modern scholars, Eusebius distinguishes between “diasporic Hellenistic Judaism” and “Palestinian Judaism”¹⁵⁷ is incorrect. More recent scholarship has shown that such a distinction is irrelevant. Moreover, Eusebius’ acceptance of certain

¹⁵² *PE* XI. 5. 3.

¹⁵³ See Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea’s Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 135; 159.

¹⁵⁴ Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. Cf. *DE* II. 3. 71d.

¹⁵⁵ *CI* 370. 19–31.

¹⁵⁶ *CI* 178. 19–179. 12.

¹⁵⁷ Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, p. 221 ff.

"Jews" as predecessors or even ancestors is a rhetorical means in order to defend Christianity against accusations. For obvious reasons, he selected only authors and groups which he could connect in one way or another to Christianity through similarities.

In addition, it should be emphasized that the opposition between Ἑβραῖοι as a laudatory term and Ἰουδαῖοι as a scornful term is not as clear-cut as some have assumed.¹⁵⁸ On some occasions, e.g., Eusebius uses the word "Hebrew" in a passage where one would expect to find the word "Jew(ish)": At *Praeparatio* I. 2. 5, the "sons of the Hebrews" clearly contrast with the Christians whose sacred texts they would have stolen. In such a polemical context, the word "Jew" was expected and yet Eusebius chooses to use "Hebrew".

In some cases, the term "Jew(ish)" has no negative connotation. On the contrary, it is used in a context of praise. In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, e.g., he defines Josephus as the most famous man (ἐπιδοξότατος) among the Jews (Ἰουδαίων),¹⁵⁹ whereas he is careful to label him as a "Hebrew" in most other passages.

On some occasions, Eusebius does not hesitate to include the patriarchs, the prophets and the "friends of God" into the "Jewish" nation.¹⁶⁰ In this context, he even claims that Josephus and Philo are "relatives" (οἰκεῖοι) of the "Jews".¹⁶¹

The alleged opposition between "Jews" and "Hebrews" is far from being clear at the end of the *Praeparatio*. Indeed, summarizing books VII to IX, Eusebius claims to have dealt with the "Hebrew oracles" (Ἑβραίων λόγια),¹⁶² whereas in the books themselves, he distinguished between book VII, which had to do with the "Hebrews", and book VIII, which tackled the "Jews".

It is worth noting that the citations from the Jewish authors, who are mostly labelled as "Hebrews", are exploited to illustrate both the "Hebrew" doctrines in book VII and those of the "Jews" in book

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Arazy, *The Appellations of the Jews*, II, pp. 30–31 and Simonetti, "Eusebio ara Ebrei e Giudei", p. 129.

¹⁵⁹ *HE* III. 9. 2. In this case, Ἰουδαίων certainly refers to Judaism rather than to Judaea. As in this passage Eusebius deals with the history of Christianity in its relation to Judaism in the time of Jesus, it seems highly unlikely that he means Josephus was the most famous Judaeian.

¹⁶⁰ *CI* 370. 18–23 in which Eusebius describes the patriarchs, the prophets, the priests, the friends of God and the high priests as belonging to the "Jewish" people.

¹⁶¹ *PE* VIII. 10. 19.

¹⁶² *PE* XV. 1. 4.

VIII. This may indicate that the distinction was not so clear in the apologist's mind, or that he blurred it deliberately.

Moreover, on one occasion at least, Josephus draws his authority both from his "Hebrew" identity and from his knowledge of "Jewish" commentaries.¹⁶³

Finally, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius claims that the Therapeutae, whom he identifies as a Christian community,¹⁶⁴ "were, it seems, originally Hebrews, and therefore still observed most of the ancient customs in a distinctly Jewish manner" (ἐξ Ἑβραίων, ὡς ἔοικε, γεγονότας ταύτη τε ἰουδαϊκώτερον τῶν παλαιῶν ἔτι τὰ πλείστα διατηροῦντας ἔθῳ).¹⁶⁵ "Hebrews" and "Jews" are therefore strongly associated in this passage.

A careful analysis of some passages of the *Apodeixis* shows that if the term Ἑβραῖοι is not irredeemably opposed to Ἰουδαῖοι, it clearly contrasts with the expression "those of the circumcision" (οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς). This is surprising since, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, this label may designate those Jews who accepted Christianity and it is even applied to the first bishops of Jerusalem (τῶν ἐκ περιτομῆς ἐπισκόπων).¹⁶⁶ In contrast, in the *Apodeixis*, this expression often defines the Jews as disbelievers.¹⁶⁷ Strikingly, at IV. 16. 20 of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius claims that the texts of the "Hebrews" blame "those of the circumcision" who seek to imitate such practices [human sacrifices] (εἰκότως ἄρα καὶ ἡ παρ' Ἑβραίοις γραφὴ καταμέμφεται τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα ζηλώσασιν τῶν ἐκ περιτομῆς).

As regards the term Ἰουδαϊσμός, it seems to be used derogatorily in most cases. Significantly, this term only occurs twice in the *Praeparatio*,¹⁶⁸ and almost never in Eusebius' other works except in the *Demonstratio*. Strikingly (or not), no occurrence is found in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* where Eusebius deals with the "Jews" and their

¹⁶³ DE VI. 18. 291b.

¹⁶⁴ For more detail on Eusebius' presentation of the Therapeutae, see my "Eusebius of Caesarea's *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*", *HTR* 97, 2004, pp. 305–328.

¹⁶⁵ HE II. 17. 2.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. HE III. 4. 2; III. 35. 1; IV. 5. 3; IV. 6. 4; V. 12. 1. It is also surprising to read in a citation of Eusebius' *Chron.* (*praef.*) given by George Syncellus that Eusebius presents Josephus and Justus of Tiberias as "people of the circumcision" (τῶν τε ἐκ περιτομῆς).

¹⁶⁷ Cf., e.g., PE I. 1. 11 and 13; DE II, pr. 43c; II. 1. 48c etc.

¹⁶⁸ PE I. 5. 12 and VII. 6. heading and table of contents.

customs. By contrast, it is mentioned at least ten times in the *Demonstratio*,¹⁶⁹ e.g., in order to define the concept of Christianity (Χριστιανισμός) in comparison to Judaism (Ἰουδαϊσμός) and Hellenism (Ἑλληνισμός).¹⁷⁰ In this part of the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius draws a stark contrast between the words Ἰουδαϊσμός and Χριστιανισμός. Therefore, one must be careful when using the English word 'Judaism' in this context, because its connotations differ from those ascribed to Ἰουδαϊσμός by Eusebius. In his vocabulary, this word is used in opposition to Christianity.¹⁷¹ Although in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius defines Ἰουδαϊσμός as "the way of life arranged according to the law of Moses" (τὴν κατὰ τὸν Μωσέως νόμον διατεταγμένην πολιτείαν),¹⁷² the expressions ἡ κατὰ Μωσέα πολιτεία, τὸ κατὰ Μωσέα πολίτευμα and νόμος have different nuances.¹⁷³

In the *Demonstratio*, unlike the period prior to the coming of Christ, the portrayal of the "Jews" and "Judaism" in the period after Christ is entirely presented as negative.

B. "Jews" after Christ

To begin with, it is worth noting that for Eusebius, as for many other Christian authors, the very notion of the "life according to Moses" loses its relevance after the coming of Christ and after the destruction of Jerusalem. The bishop mentions the Jewish revolt of 115–117 in Alexandria as well as that of Bar Kochba in 135 in Palestine.¹⁷⁴ These are his last references to Judaism, as if it had definitely died after these events. As an important stage in history, it undeniably belongs to the past: According to Eusebius, the Jewish nation and Judaism seem to extend over the period going from Moses to the disappearance of high priesthood, kingship, and the office of prophet, which announce the presence of Christ.¹⁷⁵ The bishop realizes

¹⁶⁹ See esp. ch. 2 of *DE* I where it occurs several times: *DE* I. 2. 11; 12; 13; 14; and *DE* I. 7. 27d; I. 7. 28b.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. *PE* I. 5. 12.

¹⁷¹ The term Ἰουδαϊσμός appears for the first time in 2 Macc. II. 21. 2 and XIV. 38. 3 and opposes ἑλληνισμός. On this subject, see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, London: SCM Press, 1974, I, p. 2 ff.

¹⁷² *DE* I. 2. 12.

¹⁷³ E.g., *PE* VIII. 8. heading; VIII. 9. heading; *DE* I. 2. 12.

¹⁷⁴ *HE* IV. 2. 1–6 and IV. 6. 1–4.

¹⁷⁵ See *PE* VII. 8. 40; *DE* VIII. 2. See Hollerich, *Eusebius' Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 141.

that Jews still exist and he harshly criticizes those of them who persist in their mistaken loyalty to Judaism, but he no longer considers them as an entity.

In this part of my study, it is necessary not only to investigate the manner in which Eusebius represents the “Jews” and “Judaism”, but also to raise the difficult question of the real contacts he may have had with Caesarean Jews. In his day, Caesarea was a cosmopolitan city where Jews, pagans, and Christians could hardly avoid coming into contact with one another. Hollerich, in his study of Eusebius’ *Commentary on Isaiah*, concludes that when Eusebius claims to have appealed to a “Hebrew” to comment upon a part of Isaiah that had not been treated by Origen, he had probably conversed with rabbis from Caesarea.¹⁷⁶ In other words, a Christian source must be excluded. Moreover, in the *Eclogae propheticae*, the apologist claims to have heard a “Jew” interpreting Isaiah 7:10–17 as a reference to Ezechias;¹⁷⁷ he also claims to have witnessed Jewish attacks on the divinity of Jesus.¹⁷⁸ In addition, Jerome claims that, like Clement and Origen, Eusebius had intellectual contacts with Jews.¹⁷⁹ Yet this claim should be received with caution since Clement does not seem to have dealt much with Jews, a fact which casts doubts on Jerome’s claim about Eusebius. If the nature of Eusebius’ relations with the Caesarean Jews is difficult to assess with certainty,¹⁸⁰ he is likely to have been confronted with them on a daily basis. However, his works do not enable us to know more than that. His description of the Jews and of Judaism is generally informed by literary stereotypes and hardly provides us with any practical evidence.

Nonetheless, the presence of an important Jewish community in Caesarea had noteworthy consequences for Eusebius.¹⁸¹ Indeed, for

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁷ *Ecl. proph.* 178. 21.

¹⁷⁸ *Ecl. Proph.* 215. 29.

¹⁷⁹ Jerome, *Against Rufin*, I. 13. On Origen’s contacts with Jews, see De Lange, *Origen and the Jews* and G. Bardy, “Les traditions juives dans l’œuvre d’Origen”, *RB* 34, 1925, pp. 217–252. On Jerome’s contacts with Jews, see Bardy, “Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux”, pp. 145–164, in which he shows that Jerome borrowed his Jewish interpretations from Christian predecessors and especially from Origen.

¹⁸⁰ A. Kofsky, “Eusebius of Caesarea and the Jewish-Christian Polemic”, in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Eds.), *Contra Iudaeos, Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Jews and Christians. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism* 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1996, pp. 59–84.

¹⁸¹ On this point, see Levine, *Caesarea Under Roman Rule*, pp. 61–106; H. Lapin,

the bishop as for many other Christians, the Jews' persistence in their beliefs and rites repeatedly called into question the historical-theological claims of Christianity. Therefore, Eusebius' silence about contemporaneous Jews comes as no surprise: In an apologetic work, it was out of the question to emphasize their existence. Eusebius thought it shrewder to ignore it while defending the thesis of the supersession of Judaism by Christianity.

Yet the widespread thesis of Eusebius' anti-Judaism¹⁸² was recently called into question by Ulrich.¹⁸³ In a fresh and careful reading of Eusebius' works and especially of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Ulrich rightly emphasizes Eusebius' tolerance towards Judaism in contrast with other Christian authors. According to Ulrich, from a theological viewpoint, the bishop does not see the "Jews" as irrevocably lost but leaves open the possibility for them to enter the kingdom of God if they espouse Christianity.¹⁸⁴ For instance, in his *Demonstratio*, Eusebius insists on the fact that he does not aim to attack the "Jews" but rather that they may greatly benefit from his work.¹⁸⁵ Despite these arguments, however, his judgement remains on the whole negative.

Eusebius' biblical commentaries, such as those on Isaiah and on Psalms, are built on the opposition between Jews and Christians. In his view, history has demonstrated Christianity's superiority over Judaism:¹⁸⁶ The "Jews" have lost their main religious offices, namely

"Jewish and Christian Academies in Roman Palestine: Some Preliminary Observations", in H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective after Two Millennia*. DMOA 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 496–512; and P. M. Blowers, "Origen, the Rabbis, and the Bible: Toward a Picture of Judaism and Christianity in Third-Century Caesarea", in E. Ferguson (Ed.), *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks, and Romans*, New York – London: Garland, 1999, pp. 2–22.

¹⁸² See, e.g., De Lange, art. Antisemitismus IV. Alte Kirche, *TRE*³, 1978, p. 135; M. Godecke, *Geschichte als Mythos, Eusebs "Kirchengeschichte"*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1987, p. 125; G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*, p. 98 ff. For more references, see Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, pp. 1–2, n. 2 ff.

¹⁸³ Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, p. 146 ff. cf. *DE* II. 3. 75c.

¹⁸⁴ Against Carrara, in the introduction to his translation of the *Demonstratio* (*Eusebio di Cesarea. Dimostrazione Evangelica*, Introduzione, traduzione e note di P. C., Letture cristiane del primo millennio 29, Paoline, Milano, 2000, p. 46): Dealing with the Jews in the *DE*, he claims that "Di essi si parla come di una comunità irrimediabilmente ripudiata, esclusa una volta per tutte dal progetto di Dio".

¹⁸⁵ *DE* I. 1. 8.

¹⁸⁶ On this argument, see G. Dorival, "L'argument de la réussite historique du christianisme", in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, Paris, 2001, pp. 37–56. Yet Dorival does not deal with the opposition between the destiny of Judaism and that of Christianity.

the great priesthood, prophecy, kingship; their patriarchs (in the institutional sense) are dumb; they are not even allowed to set foot in Jerusalem; and their Temple has been destroyed. By contrast, the number of Christian converts is growing and Jesus' teaching is conquering the world.¹⁸⁷ The political failure of Judaism, and more specifically the loss of the Temple, is, according to Eusebius, the direct consequence of both their refusal to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah and their rejection of the Gospel.¹⁸⁸ It is worth noting that the argument that the miseries of the Jews proved the error of their cult had already been used by notorious anti-Jewish individuals. Indeed, according to Josephus, Apion had promoted similar views,¹⁸⁹ as well as the pagan opponent presented by Minucius Felix in the *Octavius*.¹⁹⁰ Interestingly, in the *Eclogae propheticae* and the *Praeparatio*, the argument of Christianity's success was also exploited but in a different context, namely in that of the pagan-Christian debate.¹⁹¹

Eusebius does not prove to be original in his criticism against Judaism. He is in line both with his predecessors and with his followers. Nevertheless, his arguments deserve to be pointed out.

First of all, the "Jews" are criticized because of their plot against Christ. In the *Demonstratio*,¹⁹² Eusebius notes that their miseries were a divine punishment due to their attitude towards Christ. He had largely dealt with that topic already in the *Historia ecclesiastica*¹⁹³ in which the miseries of the Jews are one of the main topics.¹⁹⁴ The "Jews" are described as "the murderers of the Lord" (οἱ κυριόκτονοι), a word that Eusebius is one of the first ecclesiastical writers to use.¹⁹⁵ Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that Eusebius makes only one generation of Jews responsible for the murder of Jesus.¹⁹⁶ The murder of James the Just, Jesus' brother, is also seen as a cause of the Jews'

¹⁸⁷ See the references given by Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 101–102, n. 177. This opposition is also established in the *Eclogae propheticae* and the *Second Theophany*.

¹⁸⁸ See, e.g., *HE* II. 6. 8.

¹⁸⁹ See *CA* II. 125 ff.

¹⁹⁰ Minucius Felix, *Octavius* X. 3–4.

¹⁹¹ *PE* I. 4. 9–15.

¹⁹² See, e.g., *DE* I. 1. 6; II. 3. 66a ff.; and through Josephus at VIII. 2. 402a ff.

¹⁹³ See, e.g., *HE* II. 5. 7; 6. 1; 4. 1; III. 5. 1; III. 6; III. 7. 1 etc.

¹⁹⁴ *HE* I. 1. 2.

¹⁹⁵ *HE* II. 1. 1. See Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v.

¹⁹⁶ *HE* III. 5. 3: This very generation itself (τὴν γενεὰν αὐτὴν ἐκείνην) was destroyed by God. See Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*, p. 99: cf. *Theoph.* IV. 17.

misfortunes.¹⁹⁷ Eusebius ascribes this theory to Josephus. But such a claim does not in fact appear in Josephus' works. It only appears in Origen, under Josephus' name. Therefore, Eusebius would have picked it up in his famous predecessor's work.¹⁹⁸

Secondly, Eusebius mentions the Jews' anti-Christian feelings: According to him, they played a significant role in the persecutions.¹⁹⁹ Yet Simon has convincingly argued that Jewish responsibility was only minor.²⁰⁰ Eusebius also accepts Justin's claim that Bar Kochba tortured some Christians.²⁰¹ He also alleges that the "Jews" still curse Christ in their synagogues, mock and scorn him.²⁰²

Moreover, Eusebius attacks the Jews because, although they acknowledge and believe in the prophecies, they still do not believe that they were fulfilled in Christ, claiming that they are addressed to them only.²⁰³ This fact is explained by the popular anti-Jewish argument²⁰⁴ that they misinterpreted the Scriptures;²⁰⁵ consequently, they only paid attention to the prophecies that were agreeable to them;²⁰⁶ their literal exegesis refrained them from understanding the true meaning of the oracles, which was only understandable through an allegorical interpretation.²⁰⁷ This claim proves to be paradoxical since Eusebius tends to focus more on the letter of the text, which he connects to the history of Israel, than on allegory.²⁰⁸

A part of the "Jews" escapes this criticism, namely the "faithful remnant", who include the apostles and the disciples of Christ as

¹⁹⁷ *HE* II. 23. 19. On this topic, there is a vast secondary literature. See, e.g., Hardwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source*; Schreckenberg and K. Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity*, in the section devoted to Eusebius; Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, pp. 97–113; Ulrich, *Euseb und die Juden*, p. 134 ff.

¹⁹⁸ See R. M. Grant, "Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews", pp. 69–86.

¹⁹⁹ *HE* II. 1. 8; III. 5. 2; IV. 15. 26 and IV. 15. 41 about Polycarp. Cf. Justin, I *Apol.* 31. 6, who ascribes the persecution of Christians to Bar Kochba.

²⁰⁰ Simon, *Verus Israel*, pp. 150–152.

²⁰¹ *HE* IV. 8. 4.

²⁰² *DE* IX. 3. 425b.

²⁰³ E.g., *DE* II. 3. 70c.

²⁰⁴ E.g., Justin, *Dialogue*, XI–XIII.

²⁰⁵ On this subject, see M. Simon, "La Bible dans les premières controverses entre juifs et chrétiens", in Cl. Mondésert (Ed.), *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, Paris, 1984, pp. 107–126.

²⁰⁶ *DE* II. 1. 44b–d.

²⁰⁷ *CI* 364. 32–33.

²⁰⁸ As Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 95–97 has shown. He compares Origen's treatment of Psalm 37 (38) with Eusebius' by contrasting the former's freedom in using allegory and the historical character of the latter's interpretation.

well as the “Jews” who accepted Christ’s teachings.²⁰⁹ The positive predictions of the prophets are addressed to them as well as to all those who heeded the proclamation of the Gospel and then preached it to the gentiles.²¹⁰ They are clearly presented in continuity with the “Hebrews”²¹¹ and opposed to the majority of the Jews. The rest of the Jews—the great majority—fully deserved, according to him, their sufferings: Although God had given them forty years to repent after the death of Christ, they persisted in their mistake and so deserved punishment.²¹²

It is worth asking how Eusebius could both condemn the Jews who did not accept Christ as a Messiah and unhesitatingly praise Josephus and Philo whom he knew did not accept Christ’s teachings.²¹³ This may be explained by the fact that he found in their works crucial pieces of information about Jesus and early Christianity: Josephus testifies, perhaps in a laudatory way, to the existence of Christ thanks to the *Testimonium Flavianum*²¹⁴ and Philo provides information about that which Eusebius considers the first Christian community in Egypt, namely the *Therapeutae*.²¹⁵ According to Eusebius,

ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν βίον τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀσκητῶν ὡς ἐνι μάλιστα ἀκριβέστατα ἱστορῶν, γένοιτ’ ἂν ἐκδηλὸς οὐκ εἶδῶς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδεχόμενος ἐκθειάζων τε καὶ σεμνύνων τοὺς κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀποστολικοὺς ἄνδρας.

Moreover, when he [Philo] recounts most precisely the life of our ascetics, it will be plain that he not only knew but welcomed, rever-

²⁰⁹ DE II. 3. 63–80d.

²¹⁰ E.g., DE II. 3. 79c–d and II. 3. 64c.

²¹¹ DE II. 3. 69d–70a.

²¹² HE III. 7. 9.

²¹³ In his CC (I. 47) which Eusebius certainly knew very well, Origen claims that Josephus did not see Christ as the Messiah. As regards Philo, although Eusebius claims that he would have met Peter in Rome, he is aware that the philosopher did not convert to Christianity, despite the legend of *Philo christianus*. On this legend, see J. E. Bruns, “Philo Christianus. The Debris of a Legend”, *HTR* 66, 1973, pp. 141–145, who ascribes its origin to Hegesippus; Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, pp. 3–33, contradicts this hypothesis and suggests the legend originated with Clement of Alexandria, who would have initiated it in his *Hypotyposesis*. In my article on Eusebius and the Therapeutae (“Eusebius’ *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo’s *De vita contemplativa*”, p. 320 n. 91), I suggest that Papias is an alternative candidate. At any rate, Photius, e.g., believed that Philo had converted before apostatizing (*Library* 105).

²¹⁴ On this point, see Chapter V, section “Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors’ Citations”.

²¹⁵ HE II. 16. 2–17. 24. See my “Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo’s *De vita contemplativa*”.

enced and recognized the divine mission of the apostolic men of his days.²¹⁶

In sum, Philo's *De vita contemplativa* constitutes, in the bishop's opinion, a crucial testimony on the first Christian ascetics in Egypt. Moreover, he claims that Philo would have met Peter in Rome,²¹⁷ which makes the Jewish philosopher even more authoritative.

This gave Eusebius and some of his followers²¹⁸ good reason to ascribe a special status and authority to these authors, different from that of their fellow "Jews" of the Christian era. It is worth noting here that Philo and Josephus were the only non-Christian authors mentioned in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. It is therefore of great significance that they were judged worthy of being included in the ecclesiastical tradition set up in this work.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of Eusebius' attitude towards the Jews as presented in the "Hebrews" section and in the "Jews" section of this chapter reveals the deep ambiguity and complexity of his view on the subject. This ambiguity reveals itself on two levels: Firstly, because he gives different—and sometimes contradictory—pictures of the pre-Christian Jews and Judaism, and second, because he is inconsistent in his use of the terms "Hebrews" and "Jews".

These alleged contradictions are due to the fact that Judaism plays a role which varies according to the context. The description is subject to the apologetic purposes of the passage.

By contrast, unlike pre-Christian Judaism, the Judaism of the Christian era is in general harshly criticized by Eusebius, despite the bishop's tolerance by comparison with other Christian writers. At any rate, it should be noted that the opposition drawn by Eusebius

²¹⁶ HE II. 17. 2. Transl. by J. E. L. Oulton and K. Lake (Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. LCL).

²¹⁷ HE II. 17. 1.

²¹⁸ Notably Jerome, who mentions them in his *De viris illustribus* (not. 11 and 13). He explicitly ascribes his inclusion of Philo among the ecclesiastical writers to the fact that he wrote a book on the "first Church of Alexandria" (= the Therapeutae), which he sees as a praise of Christianity. Likewise, in his note on Josephus, Jerome focuses on the fact that Josephus had mentioned Jesus, John, and that he cited the *Testimonium Flavianum*.

between “Hebrew” and “Jew(ish)” in the pre-Christian era is turned, in the Christian era, into an opposition between “Christian” and “Jew(ish)”. This hardly comes as a surprise since, as we have seen, the “Hebrews” are, in the apologist’s opinion, Christians *avant la lettre*. More than that of the Christian era, pre-Christian Judaism becomes the flexible instrument in Eusebius’ apologetic strategy. He feels free to adjust it to his arguments. The terminology relating to this chronological slice of Judaism also varies according to the arguments.

In this chapter, we also saw that if Eusebius undeniably draws a distinction between the terms “Jew(ish)” and “Hebrew”, this distinction is far from being as clear-cut as is generally assumed. The web of signification related to either term is more complicated than a mere opposition between “good Jew” and “bad Jew”; in addition, these words are not mutually exclusive and occasionally cover the same semantic fields.

Labelling as a “Hebrew” an individual who comes after Moses and obeys his law is not a means to conceal his/her Jewishness. It rather indicates that Eusebius sees this individual as the rightful heir to the ancient Hebrews and, consequently, connects him/her to the Christian tradition which claims them as ancestors. By using the label “Hebrew”, Eusebius attempts *in fine* to present the Christians as the bearers and guardians of the Hebrew tradition as told in the Old Testament.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE “TRAVAIL DE LA CITATION” IN THE *APODEIXIS*: THE CASE OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS’ CITATIONS

In his work on citation, Compagnon has defined the “travail de la citation” as the production of the citation, which includes the cutting and pasting thereof. He distinguishes the “sens de la citation” (= the enunciated) from the “acte de citer” (= the enunciation).¹ In this chapter, I will analyze the “travail de la citation” in the case of the Jewish authors cited in the *Apodeixis*. Indeed, it seems necessary to describe the technicalities that rule the citation process in this work for they constitute important preliminaries to the semantic appropriation of these passages. These technical considerations may at times appear rather dull but they are essential to a comprehensive analysis of Eusebius’ treatment of Jewish citations in the *Apodeixis*.

Eusebius’ use of Jewish sources in the *Apodeixis* raises different questions: How did he become acquainted with these testimonies? How precise is he in his references to them? Which tradition is he following in his use of these texts? To what extent does he modify these authors’ texts? Therefore, it will be necessary to extend the notion of “travail de la citation” to these problems. This will enable me to give a complete survey of Eusebius’ practices in dealing with the Jewish authors’ citations in the *Apodeixis*.

1. DISCOVERY AND SELECTION OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS’ CITATIONS

A. *Clement of Alexandria*

Eusebius’ choice of excerpts seems to have been largely influenced by Clement of Alexandria.² His attitude towards the Jewish-Greek authors and his subsequent use of them was also certainly in part the result of Clement’s influence. This was especially the case with the citations from Aristobulus.

¹ Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, pp. 36–39.

² Cf. Coman, “Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe”, pp. 122–123.

Clement mentions Aristobulus four times and calls him “the Peripatetic”.³ As Runia and Holladay have pointed out, it is likely that Eusebius became interested in this author through his reading of Clement.⁴ This is supported by the fact that all the passages quoted by Clement are also found in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio*.⁵ In addition, some information given by the bishop about Aristobulus undeniably came from Clement: At VIII. 9. 38 of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., Eusebius claims that Aristobulus is the man mentioned in the book of the Maccabees.⁶ This information was almost certainly taken from *Stromata* where Clement claims that Aristobulus is the one mentioned by the epitomizer of the story of the Maccabees (οὗ μέμνηται ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομήν).⁷ One might thus safely assume that Eusebius became acquainted with Aristobulus through Clement. But does this mean that the latter was his source? The question is worth asking since, on one occasion, Eusebius cites a fragment from Aristobulus at first through Clement,⁸ and later he does so first-hand.⁹ Coman has deduced from this that “Eusèbe cite Clément ou plutôt Aristobule par l’intermédiaire de Clément, mais dès qu’il a Aristobule même à sa disposition, c’est aussi celui-ci qu’il cite en propres termes”.¹⁰ This does not seem to be the case, however: Indeed, Eusebius does not cite the Jewish philosopher through Clement for want of a better alternative, but because in the specific context of book IX, Clement’s authority is needed for Eusebius’ apologetic purpose which in this book is to show that well-read non-Jewish people such as Clement knew about the “Jews” and the “Hebrews”. Indeed, Eusebius

³ *Str.* I. 72. 4; 150. 1; V. 97. 7; VI. 32. 5. Cf. *PE* VIII. 9. 38; *PE* VIII. 12. heading. Cf. Eusebius, *Chron.* p. 139 Helm (*Aristobulus natione Iudaeus peripateticus philosophus*). According to Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 164 cf. II, n. 375, p. 106, in Hellenistic Alexandria, this label was applied to anyone interested in history, literature or sciences, and not specifically to a member of the Peripatetic school.

⁴ Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers. A Collection of Papers*. SVigChris 32. Leiden: Brill, 1995, p. 64; Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic-Jewish Authors*, vol. III: *Aristobulus*, p. 47.

⁵ *PE* VIII. 10. 1–17 = *Str.* VI. 3. 32. 3–33. 1; *PE* XIII. 12. 1–16 = *Str.* I. 150. 1–3; *Str.* I. 148. 1; *Str.* V. 99. 3; *Str.* VI. 137. 4–142. 1.

⁶ Cf. 2 Macc. I. 10.

⁷ *Str.* V. 97. 7.

⁸ *PE* IX. 6.

⁹ *PE* XIII. 12. 1.

¹⁰ Coman, “Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe”, p. 125. Coman applies this claim to all the authors quoted in the *Praeparatio* (see p. 122).

emphasized that Clement was originally a pagan.¹¹ In my opinion, the twice-given citation from Aristobulus merely illustrates Eusebius' tendency to play with literary authorities in the *Apodeixis*. The bishop does not hesitate to quote his sources either first-hand or under another author's authority, according to his apologetic needs. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, in some cases, Eusebius cites passages from Aristobulus more extensively than Clement did. It thus seems that he first located the passages in Clement, which he then looked up directly in Aristobulus' work.

The case of the minor Jewish authors quoted in book IX of the *Praeparatio* is similar: Eusebius certainly became acquainted with them through Clement, even if he quotes them independently,¹² since he quotes them more extensively and, apparently, more faithfully.¹³ Besides Eusebius, Clement is the only Christian author to cite Demetrius,¹⁴ Artapanus,¹⁵ Pseudo-Hecataeus,¹⁶ Eupolemus¹⁷ and Ezekiel the Tragedian.¹⁸ Reviewing in the *Historia ecclesiastica* the authors used by Clement,¹⁹ Eusebius mentions Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus, Eupolemus and Demetrius as apologetic Jewish writers who had argued for the antiquity of Moses and the Jews. He was apparently referring to *Stromata* I. 140. 1–4 where Demetrius, Philo and Eupolemus were cited for this purpose. It thus seems likely that Eusebius became acquainted with the minor Jewish authors through Clement's writings, and the *Stromata* in particular. It is as if the apologist had drawn the idea of using the Jewish sources from his predecessor whose authority validated his use of the same sources. Subsequently, Eusebius cites the Jewish texts more extensively.

¹¹ *PE* II. 2. 64.

¹² Cf. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, p. 13 and Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 147.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 169, n. 182. Clement, unlike Eusebius, has condensed Artapanus. Eusebius went back to Alexander Polyhistor, from whom he cites other excerpts, including passages from authors who do not appear in Clement.

¹⁴ *Str.* I. 141. 1–2.

¹⁵ *Str.* I. 154. 2.

¹⁶ *Str.* V. 113. 1.

¹⁷ *Str.* I. 141. 4–5.

¹⁸ *Str.* I. 155. 2–156. 2.

¹⁹ *HE* VI. 13. 7.

B. Origen

Origen also played a role in Eusebius' eagerness to cite Aristobulus. At IV. 51 of *Contra Celsum*, he responds to Celsus' attacks against the allegorical interpretation of the Law, which attacks he believes are directed against Philo and perhaps the earlier Aristobulus. He then says: "it seems that he [Celsus] is talking about Philo's writings, or even about older ones such as those of Aristobulus" (ἔοικε δὲ περὶ τῶν Φίλωνος συγγραμμάτων ταῦτα λέγειν ἢ καὶ τῶν ἔτι ἀρχαιοτέρων, ὅποιά ἐστι τὰ Ἀριστοβούλου).²⁰ In order to defend these authors, he then states:

Στοχάζομαι δὲ τὸν Κέλσον μὴ ἀνεγνωκέναι τὰ βιβλία, ἐπεὶ πολλαχοῦ οὕτως ἐπιτετεῦχθαι μοι φαίνεται, ὥστε αἰρεθῆναι ἂν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἑλλήσι φιλοσοφούντας ἀπὸ τῶν λεγομένων· ἐν οἷς οὐ μόνον φράσις ἐξήσκηται ἀλλὰ καὶ νοήματα καὶ δόγματα καὶ ἡ χρῆσις τῶν, ὡς οἴεται, ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν μύθων ὁ Κέλσος.

But I hazard the guess that Celsus has not read the books, for I think that in many places they are so successful that even Greek philosophers would have been won over by what they say. Not only do they have an attractive style, but they also discuss ideas and doctrines, making use of the myths (as Celsus regards them) in the Scripture.²¹

Eusebius certainly let himself be convinced by Origen's words. Moreover, the authority conferred by Origen on Aristobulus and Philo must also have played a role in his choice. The Alexandrian theologian's claim that these Jewish authors were able to convince Greek philosophers may also have counted. Indeed, one of the purposes of the *Apodeixis* was to demonstrate the intellectual value of Christianity to a (newly converted-or not) Greek readership which cared for philosophy, and for Platonic philosophy in particular. Origen's insistence on the strength of the Jewish authors' writings in terms of both style and content certainly influenced Eusebius at a time when he was trying to collect the most convincing texts for his defence of Christianity. In addition, Origen praises Philo in other passages: At *Contra Celsum* VI. 21, he introduces the Jewish philosopher's *De somniis* (without naming Philo) as a book "which deserves the intelligent and sensible scrutiny of the friends of truth" (βιβλίον

²⁰ CC IV. 51.

²¹ Translation by H. Chadwick, Origen. *Contra Celsum*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

ἄξιον φρονίμου καὶ συνετῆς παρὰ τοῖς φλαλήθεσιν ἐξετάσεως).²² Having said this, this textual evidence is not necessary to establish Eusebius' dependency on the Alexandrian tradition which, from Clement onwards, borrowed extensively from Philo.

Origen might also have influenced Eusebius' selection of passages from Josephus. According to Carriker,²³ he would have brought Josephus' writings with him from Alexandria to Caesarea. Although the Jewish historian was used by several Christian authors before Origen,²⁴ he certainly played a role in Eusebius' use of the Josephus material. As several scholars have pointed out, in the *Historia ecclesiastica* Eusebius completed the tendentious use of Josephus which Origen started in his *Contra Celsum*.²⁵ In this work, Origen claims that Josephus sought the causes of the Jews' miseries, and that although he did not consider Christ to be the Messiah, he should have ascribed these miseries to the murder of Christ; he admits, however, that he is not far from the truth when he ascribes them to the death of James the Just.²⁶ This passage is absent in our manuscripts of Josephus. It might well be that Origen confused Josephus and Hegesippus because, in a passage quoted by Eusebius,²⁷ Hegesippus seems to establish a connection between the siege of Jerusalem and James' martyrdom. At any rate, Eusebius did not hesitate to turn Origen's assertion into direct speech, as if it was an excerpt from Josephus.²⁸ In addition, Eusebius, appropriating Origen's hypothesis,

²² Origen also cites Philo's *Quod deterius* in *In Matt.* XV. 3. 30, in which he mentions the συντάξεων αὐτοῦ εὐδοκιμῶν.

²³ Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 158–159.

²⁴ These are, e.g., Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement, Pseudo-Justin, Tertullian. On this subject, see H. Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums* 5. Leiden: Brill, 1972; "Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines 'Bellum Iudaicum,'"—, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church"; Schreckenberg and Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity*; Hardwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source*;—, "Contra Apionem and Christian Apologetics". Yet it remains difficult to determine whether these authors had a direct knowledge of Josephus' works, as Hardwick has claimed.

²⁵ On this point, see Grant, "Eusebius, Josephus, and the Fate of the Jews", pp. 69–86; *Eusebius as Church Historian*, pp. 97–113; Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 122; Schreckenberg, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church", pp. 315–324; Schreckenberg and Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography*, p. 65.

²⁶ *CC* I. 47 cf. *CC* II. 13; *In Matth.* X. 17. 31.

²⁷ *HE* II. 23. 18.

²⁸ *HE* II. 23. 20. On this point, see Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling

claims as fact that the catastrophes undergone by the Jews in the first century C.E. had been caused by the murder of Jesus Christ.²⁹

Moreover, Origen's *Contra Celsum*³⁰ contains in an embryonic form the argument that the existence of John the Baptist was attested by a witness who lived only a little after Jesus and John himself, namely Josephus. Origen even gives the exact reference to the passage in Josephus, i.e., book XVIII of the "*Antiquities of the Jews*",³¹ which Eusebius will make good use of when writing the *Demonstratio*.³²

Finally, Origen also mentioned Josephus' two books *Περὶ ἀρχαιότητος* (known to us as *Against Apion*) as the reference work concerning the antiquity of the Jews.³³ Eusebius will use this work more extensively than any other Christian author before him,³⁴ and it is likely that it is Origen who led him to make use of this work so extensively.

Overall, then, Eusebius' selection of Jewish sources seems to have been mainly influenced by Clement and Origen. In this respect, the bishop proves himself to be the direct heir of the Alexandrian tradition as we know it through these two authors.³⁵ These two notorious predecessors led Eusebius to choose certain sources because in Eusebius' opinion, by mentioning or citing them, they conferred enough authority on them to be cited by Eusebius: It has been established that in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, he prefers to hold on to orthodox sources.³⁶ It is likely that he used a similar approach in the *Apodexis*:

His Sources", p. 437; Grant, "Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews", pp. 75–76; É. Nodet, *Baptême et résurrection, le témoignage de Josephus*. Josephus et son temps 2. Paris: Cerf, 1999, pp. 41–43. Nodet mistakenly ascribes the citation from Josephus to Hegesippus, whereas it is Eusebius who cites Josephus (p. 43, n. 4). The note is from Eusebius who, as usual, seeks to harmonize two different sources. In fact, the pronoun ταῦτα which precedes Josephus' citation (*HE* II. 23. 19) concludes the citation from Hegesippus; contrary to what Nodet claims, it does not introduce the passage from Hegesippus.

²⁹ *HE* II. 6. 8; III. 5. 7; III. 7.

³⁰ *CC* I. 47.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *DE* IX. 5. 431 a–b.

³³ *CC* I. 16; IV. 11.

³⁴ See especially *PE* X. 13. 1–12 where he uses a citation from the *Contra Apionem* in order to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish people, and therefore that of the Christians.

³⁵ On Clement's "alexandrianism", see A. W. Van Den Hoek, "How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background", *The Heythrop Journal* 31, 1990, pp. 179–194.

³⁶ See Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources", p. 436 ff.

Only duly authorized authors, i.e., authors used in the Christian tradition, are granted the privilege of entering the *Apodeixis*.³⁷

The Jewish writers to whom Eusebius had access in his Caesarean library certainly came from Origen's library.³⁸ The latter was deeply acquainted with Philo, at least.³⁹ Like Anatolius (bishop of Laodicea, contemporary with Eusebius) and Clement, he is the only Christian author whose works have reached us to make mention of Aristobulus. As regards Polyhistor's *On the Jews*, it is uncertain whether Origen had a copy. However, it is likely that he brought it with him from Alexandria since Clement seems to have used this work.⁴⁰

The only Jewish work in Greek used in the *Apodeixis* which cannot be traced back to any author in particular is the *Letter to Philocrates* of Pseudo-Aristeas. Although no writer clearly refers to this work before Eusebius, many of them attest to the legend of the Septuagint: This is the case with Josephus,⁴¹ Philo,⁴² Justin,⁴³ Irenaeus,⁴⁴ the author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*,⁴⁵ Clement of Alexandria,⁴⁶ Julius Africanus⁴⁷ and Tertullian.⁴⁸ This legend, if not the *Letter*, was famous in the Christian world in general. Yet only Eusebius, Tertullian and Josephus mention Aristeas' name in the story. Therefore, it may well be that Josephus, more so than the Latin Tertullian, influenced Eusebius' choice, if there was any influence at play in this case. At any rate, it is worth noting with Wendland and Pelletier that the

³⁷ E.g., Diodorus Siculus or Numenius, whom Origen praised in the *Contra Celsum* (IV. 51).

³⁸ As suggested by Runia, "Caesarea maritima and the Survival of Hellenistic-Jewish Literature", in H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea maritima. A Retrospective after two Millennia*, DMOA 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 476–495. On this question, see also Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 155–177. According to him, copies of the works of Josephus, Aristobulus and Philo are likely to have come from Origen's library.

³⁹ See Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, pp. 161–163.

⁴⁰ This opinion is also accepted by Runia, "Caesarea Maritima", p. 494, followed by Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 141.

⁴¹ *AJ* XII. 11–118.

⁴² *De vita Mosis* II. 25–44.

⁴³ *I Apol.* 31. 2–5.

⁴⁴ Irenaeus, *Haer.* III. 21. 1, qtd. at *HE* V. 8. 11.

⁴⁵ *Coh.* 13 D-9 C.

⁴⁶ *Str.* I. 148.

⁴⁷ *Epist. ad Origenem* 79.

⁴⁸ *Apol.* XVIII. 5 ff.

manuscript tradition of the *Letter* seems to go back to a Caesarean copy.⁴⁹

C. *Two Possibilities: Porphyry and Anatolius*

It seems to me that Eusebius' selection of quotations from Josephus, especially in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, may have been influenced by a rather unlikely author, namely the philosopher Porphyry. Indeed, he himself had cited Josephus in his *De abstinentia*.⁵⁰ He seems to have known him quite well since he mentions his three works with their exact number of books.⁵¹ The fact that the great "theosopher", as Eusebius liked to call him sarcastically, uses the authority of the Jewish historian and quotes him, conferred on him an important weight in the context of an apology of Christianity. It thus seems likely that the Tyrian philosopher played a role in Eusebius' selection of the Josephan passages cited in the *Apodeixis*. In addition, the bishop cites a passage from Porphyry in which the latter cites Josephus,⁵² which may support my hypothesis.

As regards Aristobulus, Clement's and Origen's testimonies were not the only ones to legitimate in Eusebius' opinion his use of the philosopher's texts. Indeed, although he is often neglected by modern scholars, Anatolius of Laodicaea,⁵³ who was contemporary with Eusebius, also used Aristobulus' testimony in his work on Easter,⁵⁴ which Eusebius wished to cite.⁵⁵ Anatolius came from Alexandria and remained in Caesarea for several years before becoming the bishop of Laodicaea. He is a further representative of that Alexandrian tradition which was fond of Jewish testimonies. He is also likely to have

⁴⁹ P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis*, Leipzig: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1900, p. vii; Pelletier, *La lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89, p. 9.

⁵⁰ See *De abst.* IV. 11–13 and IV. 17. 2.

⁵¹ *De abst.* IV. 11. 2: ὡς πολλαχού Ἰώσηπος τῶν πραγματειῶν ἀνέγραψεν, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἱστορίας, ἣν δι' ἑπτὰ βιβλίων συνεπλήρωσεν, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας, ἣν διὰ εἴκοσι βιβλίων ἐπραγματεύσατο, καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, εἰσι δὲ δύο τὰ βιβλία.

⁵² *PE* IX. 3. 1–20.

⁵³ For more detail on Anatolius, see R. Goulet, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989, I. 179–183.

⁵⁴ See my "Trois auteurs juifs de langue grecque oubliés: Mousaios et les deux Agathobules dans le témoignage d'Anatole de Laodicée sur la Pâque", *REJ* 164, 2005 (Forthcoming).

⁵⁵ *HE* VII. 32. 14–19.

guaranteed Eusebius' use of Aristobulus. It is worth noting that Eusebius ascribes to him "according to tradition" the creation of the school of Aristotle's succession in Alexandria.⁵⁶ As we have seen, Aristobulus happens to be defined by Clement as a "Peripatetic". Interestingly, Aristobulus was used by Anatolius in a discussion on the date of Easter. Therefore, it is worth asking whether Anatolius was also interested in the Jewish philosopher because of the connection to Peripatetic philosophy. Unfortunately, no certainty can be attained.

2. ABLATION OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS

If we study the sequence of the Jewish authors' citations, it becomes clear that Eusebius excerpted them according to their order of appearance in the original works. This is especially noteworthy in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, in which the bishop turns to Josephus' *Antiquities* on many occasions. From chapters 11 to 16 of book IX, e.g., he quotes in succession *Antiquities* I. 93–95; 105–108; 117–120; 158–161; 165–168, and in chapter 20 he quotes *Antiquities* I. 239–241. The same phenomenon may be observed for Philo's citations in books VII, VIII, IX and XIII of the *Praeparatio*. By contrast, a series of quotations from the *Contra Apionem* seems to have been excerpted in reverse order, i.e., in a reading going from the end to the beginning; Eusebius cites in succession (but not continuously) *Contra Apionem* I. 197–204; 176–181; 172–174.⁵⁷ This is not as odd as it may seem: Van den Hoek has pointed out a similar method in Clement of Alexandria's use of Philo.⁵⁸ In the rest of book IX and in book X, passages from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* are again given in their order of appearance in the original work.⁵⁹ This indicates that Eusebius was working with 'his' Philo or Josephus at hand, unfolding the scroll forwards or backwards according to his needs.

⁵⁶ *HE* VII. 32. 6.

⁵⁷ *PE* IX. 4–5; 9. 1.

⁵⁸ Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, pp. 214–216.

⁵⁹ *PE* IX. 40. 1–10 = *CA* I. 146–154; *PE* IX. 42. 2 = *CA* I. 215–218; *PE* X. 7. 1–21 = *CA* I. 6–26; *PE* X. 13. 1–2 = *CA* I. 73–75; *PE* X. 13. 3–10 = *CA* I. 82–90; *PE* X. 13. 11–12 = *CA* I. 103–104.

3. EUSEBIUS' USE OF SECOND-HAND SOURCES

Before dealing with Eusebius' use of Jewish authors, it is necessary to enquire whether he had any direct knowledge of these writings. It has been shown that in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he does not distinguish between primary and secondary sources.⁶⁰ Modern authors have paid special attention to Eusebius' use of Josephus. Because Eusebius' text of Josephus "refused to fit neatly into one of the families of manuscripts identified by Niese",⁶¹ Gelzer suggested that Eusebius had derived his Josephan material from Julius Africanus.⁶² However, Hardwick has rightly argued that Josephus is too important a witness for Eusebius to be cited at second hand and that there is no reason to believe the material would not have been available to Eusebius.⁶³ Both Eusebius and Julius Africanus are very likely to have possessed a text of Josephus deriving from the same tradition.⁶⁴ However, according to Hardwick, there is no reason to think that the texts of Josephus were not accessible.⁶⁵ I would add that this is all the more true since Origen implies that the *Antiquities* were easy to find: "who wishes" (ὁ βουλόμενος) may read this work.⁶⁶

The same question need not be raised for Eusebius' use of Philo since there is no doubt that the catalogue Eusebius gives us of Philo's writings in the *Historia ecclesiastica*⁶⁷ reflects, at least in part,⁶⁸ the holdings of his library.⁶⁹

As regards the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas, the length of the citations given by Eusebius as well as his faithfulness in citing them⁷⁰ may suggest that Eusebius knew it directly.

This question is not relevant for the minor Jewish authors because they are openly quoted through Alexander Polyhistor.

⁶⁰ See Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources", p. 430 ff.

⁶¹ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 69.

⁶² H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1885, 1: 247–255; 2: 31–37, 46–57, 63 ff.

⁶³ Hardwick, "Contra Apionem and Christian Apologetics", pp. 385–386.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *CC* IV. 11. 19.

⁶⁷ *HE* II. 18. 1–8.

⁶⁸ Runia, "Caesarea maritima and the Survival of Hellenistic-Jewish Literature", p. 523, rightly suggests that Eusebius may have inflated this list in order to increase Philo's prestige.

⁶⁹ Cf. Carraker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 164–177.

⁷⁰ See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

As for Aristobulus, it is likely that Eusebius quotes him directly. Indeed, according to Holladay,⁷¹ a comparison of the material cited by the bishop and that preserved by Clement indicates that Eusebius' text is closer to Aristobulus' original. In addition, Eusebius cites passages from the philosopher that are not found in Clement.

However, the fact that Eusebius possessed these writings does not imply that he did not occasionally appeal to florilegia rather than to the original texts. This question should be raised for different groups of citations.

*A. Citations of Jewish Authors Derived from Collections:
Some Hypotheses*

On one occasion, it is fairly clear that Eusebius resorted to a collection of *testimonia*. In book XI of the *Praeparatio*, as in book VII, Eusebius uses a group of biblical quotations as proof of the "Hebrew" conception of the second cause. Some of these quotations are the same as those used in book VII. These are: Psalms 32 (33):6;⁷² Proverbs 8:12;⁷³ 8:22–25; 8:27;⁷⁴ Wisdom 6:22;⁷⁵ 7:22–26 and 8:1;⁷⁶ Psalms 106 (107):20.⁷⁷ Now, Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, appealed to the same texts when he dealt with the *Logos*.⁷⁸ Therefore, it may be suggested that in this case Eusebius used a collection. Yet these biblical passages are not cited following the same order in book VII, and two of these citations are longer in book XI. In my opinion, this may indicate that Eusebius had indeed a collection of *testimonia* at hand, which he used as an aide-mémoire and as a source of inspiration. If this proves to be correct, it may help us to understand why, e.g., he cites the same passages from Josephus in different writings of his, but in a different manner. I will come back to this shortly.

PE VII. 13 and XI. 15

Firstly, Barthélémy wonders if Eusebius "ne s'appuie pas sur des *testimonia* rassemblés par Origen pour ces controverses [Jewish-Christian

⁷¹ Holladay, *Fragments of the Jewish Hellenistic Authors*, vol. III: *Aristobulus*, p. 45.

⁷² *PE* VII. 12. 4 cf. *PE* XI. 14. 4.

⁷³ *PE* VII. 12. 4 cf. XI. 14. 7 (longer citation in book VII).

⁷⁴ *PE* VII. 12. 5 cf. XI. 14. 7 (longer citation in book VII).

⁷⁵ *PE* VII. 12. 6 cf. XI. 14. 9.

⁷⁶ *PE* VII. 12. 6–7 cf. XI. 14. 10.

⁷⁷ *PE* VII. 12. 9 cf. XI. 14. 5.

⁷⁸ Cf. *Dial.* LXI. 3.

controversies,] lorsqu'il compose la section de sa *Préparation Évangélique* intitulée *περὶ τῆς τοῦ δευτέρου αἰτίου θεολογίας*".⁷⁹ This is, as Barthélémy admits, purely speculative, yet it may be true: On two occasions, Eusebius deals with the problem of the second cause and gives a section the title *περὶ τῆς τοῦ δευτέρου αἰτίου*. It appears firstly at VII. 12 in the context of the Hebrew theology and secondly at XI. 15, in the context of a comparison between Scriptures and Plato. In both cases, Eusebius turns to Philo in order to support his arguments. Although these passages are distant from one another, Eusebius refers to the excerpts cited in book VII at XI. 15. 7.

The fact that he gives this cross-reference may be significant. He acts as if he had cited the first part of a collection of citations on the second cause. In no other passage of the *Apodeixis* does he provide cross-references for the Jewish authors.

Secondly, the citations on the second cause are all very short and carefully cut, whereas in most other cases, Eusebius provides fairly long quotations from the Jewish authors. This may reveal the use of a compilation.

Thirdly, almost all the excerpts from Philo mention the *λόγος* as son of God or second cause. This too may indicate that Eusebius used a compilation of passages on the divine *λόγος*.

Fourthly, at XI. 15. 7, Eusebius claims that he cites Philo's *Quod deterius* whereas he actually cites his *De confusione linguarum*. One may see this as a mere mistake he made but such mistakes are significantly rare in the *Praeparatio*. Only six have been spotted.⁸⁰

Finally, whereas Eusebius generally cites the passages from the Jewish authors according to their order of appearance in the original work (whether in a forward or backward direction),⁸¹ the three excerpts from *De confusione* are cited randomly: first, paragraph 97, then paragraphs 146–147, and finally, paragraphs 62–63.

This is due either to the fact that Eusebius' citation technique is not always consistent, or to mistakes he made. The fact that he resumes his reading of Philo's *De plantatione* at VII. 18, which he had

⁷⁹ D. Barthélémy, "Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le Commentaire allégorique?", in *Philon D'Alexandrie: Actes du colloque national du C. N. R. S. de Lyon 1966 sur Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1967, p. 68.

⁸⁰ As Mras claims in his edition (Eusebius Werke VIII. 1. GCS, p. lv).

⁸¹ Cf. above "Ablation of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

begun to quote at VII. 13, seems to indicate that he had this treatise at hand. Nonetheless, this does not exclude the possibility that he drew these excerpts from a compilation, at least in the case of Philo's *De confusione*.

Barthélémy⁸² has identified the potential compiler as Origen who would have used this compilation in his debates with the rabbis, but this assumption seems ill-founded. Indeed, in his *Contra Celsum*, the Alexandrian theologian denies the Jews the possibility of acknowledging the λόγος as son of God.⁸³ Unless he no longer considered Philo as a Jew (which I doubt), this leads me to think that he did not compile Philo's material in the context of a Jewish-Christian controversy. If Eusebius did use a compilation, he is likely to have made it himself. As we will see, he certainly did so with some Josephan material.

PE VII. 21

According to Schroeder,⁸⁴ the file on matter at the end of book VII of the *Praeparatio* is a "dossier constitué à d'autres fins", which hypothesis rests on two arguments. Firstly, the passage does not follow the logic of book VII, notably because although Eusebius announces a commentary on the "Hebrew doctrine",⁸⁵ he cites, in addition to Philo, Christian authors (Dionysios of Alexandria, Methodius of Olympus and Origen). Secondly, Eusebius' confusion of Maximus with Methodius of Olympus⁸⁶ in book VII of the *Praeparatio* indicates the use of a collection made by Eusebius himself.⁸⁷ The first argument seems weak: As we have seen, Eusebius constantly stresses the continuity between the "Hebrews" and the Christians. The fact that he uses Christian testimonies in the context of "Hebrew" doctrines constitutes a strong apologetic device which is far from unusual in the *Praeparatio*. In this case, the fact that Eusebius mixes "Hebrew" and Christian testimonies suggests to the newly converted pagan or pagans an identity between Hebrews and Christians. Nevertheless, Schroeder's hypothesis seems to be largely correct. He is indeed right

⁸² Barthélémy, "Qui censura le Commentaire allégorique?", p. 68.

⁸³ CC II. 31.

⁸⁴ Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, p. 102.

⁸⁵ PE VII. 8. 41.

⁸⁶ PE VII. 21. 5.

⁸⁷ Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, p. 102.

in saying that these excerpts might have served as padding (especially the last one, excerpted from Methodius) for the end of book VII.⁸⁸ Does this mean he drew these quotations from a file, as Schroeder suggests? The length and number of the citations from Philo's *De providentia* provided in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., make it more likely that he had this work in his library.⁸⁹ Having said this, Eusebius may have created for his own needs a collection on the subject of matter. Some compilations contained very large excerpts, as that of Stobaeus exemplifies. Yet nothing allows us to prove this hypothesis.

PE VIII. 14

Other passages of the *Praeparatio* suggest that Eusebius used a compilation. Books VI, VIII, XII, and XIV, e.g., all end with a lengthy passage on divine providence. At VI. 11. 1–79, Eusebius provides an excerpt from Origen refuting the doctrine of fatalism which is opposed to divine providence; at VIII. 14. 1–72, he cites an even lengthier passage from Philo's *De providentia* on the same topic; at XII. 52. 1–35, a citation from Plato on divine providence is also given; finally, at XIV. 23–27, Dionysos of Alexandria is appealed to in order to defend this concept against the Epicureans, as Origen did in book VI of the *Praeparatio*. It should be noted that in half of the examples, these quotations stem from Christian works, despite Eusebius' claim not to turn to them at the beginning of the *Apodeixis*. This may indicate that these passages served to pad an unfinished scroll;⁹⁰ they may also have been borrowed from a compilation made by Eusebius on the subject.

That Eusebius may have authored some compilations is suggested by the fact that on the one hand, he cites lengthy passages (which may indicate that he possessed the work cited), and on the other, that he sometimes ignores the context from which the quotations have been excerpted. When Eusebius cites Philo on providence at the end of book VIII, e.g., he presents that which we preserved in the form of Alexander's argumentation as the objections of the "atheists"

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ PE VIII. 14. 1–72.

⁹⁰ I agree with Carriker's suggestion that the library of Caesarea mainly contained papyrus scrolls. For a bibliography on the subject, see Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 23–25.

(τὰς τῶν ἀθέων ἀντιθέσεις).⁹¹ Was he unaware of the context in which the citation was inserted, which would indicate that it was derived from a compilation? Or was Eusebius' text of the *De providentia* different from the Armenian version which was transmitted to us? He may also have wished to avoid the unnecessary narrative detail of Alexander's identity. We have no definitive answer but two pieces of evidence may support the hypothesis that Eusebius compiled certain sources. The first one lies in the collection of martyrs' stories Eusebius claims to have made himself.⁹² The second one lies in the following point.

DE VIII. 2. 397d–402d

It seems likely that Eusebius constituted a collection of Josephan *testimonia* which could be used for the Christian cause. From VIII. 2. 397d to 402d of the *Demonstratio*, each citation from Josephus also occurs in his *Eclogae propheticae*.⁹³ Some of them also appear in the *Historia ecclesiastica* or in his *Chronicon*.⁹⁴ In another case, a passage is cited both in the *Praeparatio* and in the *Chronicle*.⁹⁵ Moreover, on several occasions, citations from Josephus are given in a certain order in one of Eusebius' works and are given in the same order in another of his works.⁹⁶

Finally, in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius mistakenly attributes an excerpt from book XX of Josephus' *Antiquities* to book XVIII.⁹⁷ This might be due to the fact that he filed this citation by mistake under the heading "book XVIII of the *Antiquities*" because it was famous for its passages on Christianity. I would argue, therefore, that Eusebius made a collection of quotations from Josephus for his own purposes, which collection he used either for chronological issues or to demonstrate the end of Judaism, whether in an exegetical or historical context.

⁹¹ PE VIII. 13. 7.

⁹² HE IV. 15. 47; V. 21. 5; V. 4. 3; V. 1. 2.

⁹³ Ecl. proph. 160. 7–21; 160. 25–161; 164. 2–6.

⁹⁴ DE VIII. 2. 397 d–398 a = HE I. 6. 9–10 = Ecl. proph. 160. 7–21 = AJ XX. 247–249; DE VIII. 2. 402 d = HE III. 8. 6 = Chron. p. 175 Helm = BJ VI. 299 = Ecl. proph. 164. 2–6; DE IX. 5. 431 a = HE I. 11. 4 = AJ XVIII. 116–117; DE VIII. 2. 402 d–403 a = Chron. p. 175 Helm = Ecl. Proph. 164. 2–6 = AJ XVIII. 55; BJ II. 169.

⁹⁵ PE X. 13. 3–8 = Chron. p. 62. 1; 121. 22 Helm.

⁹⁶ E.g., AJ XX. 247–249 is followed by AJ XVIII. 92–93 in DE VIII. 2. 397 d–398 b, Ecl. proph. 160. 7–161 and HE I. 6. 9–10.

⁹⁷ DE VIII. 2. 397d.

Nevertheless, Eusebius' faithfulness in citing a passage could vary according to the work in which it was cited.⁹⁸ For this reason, Carleton Paget⁹⁹ has suggested that Eusebius had different manuscripts by Josephus at his disposal. But another hypothesis might also be suggested. Indeed, it seems that these differences may be explained with some confidence by Eusebius' changing purposes in his different writings.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, as we have seen, it may well be that on one occasion Eusebius used a Josephan text he copied from a collection, and on another went back to the manuscripts. I would discard the possibility that he quoted these citations from memory. It is hard to imagine that Eusebius would have known by heart historical works in prose that belonged neither to Scripture (in his own view) nor to the school programme.¹⁰¹

If Eusebius did indeed use compilations, I think he made them himself in the course of his readings, in conformity with the ancient practice as presented earlier in this work.¹⁰² Cadiou's suggestion that Eusebius is behind the constitution of a chain on Psalms founded on Origen's work¹⁰³ may reinforce the hypothesis that Eusebius was a compiler.

B. *Pagan Authors Cited through Jewish Authors*

As we have seen, Eusebius occasionally cited some Jewish authors at second hand. But he also cited pagan authors through Jewish authors. Although it appears to have so far gone unnoticed,¹⁰⁴ in

⁹⁸ See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

⁹⁹ J. Carleton Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity", *JTS* 52, 2001, p. 566.

¹⁰⁰ See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹⁰¹ Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition", p. 64, n. 2, has presented a similar argument against the French editors of Cyril of Alexandria, P. Burguière and P. Évieux (Cyrille d'Alexandrie. *Contre Julien*. SC 322. Paris: Cerf, 1985): The latter ascribe the imperfections of a citation from Porphyry to the fact that Cyril quoted the passage from memory. Whittaker, on the contrary, thinks that the length of the passage and the nature of a text such as the *De abstinentia* make this hypothesis unlikely. I agree with these arguments and think that they may also be applied to the quotations Eusebius gives from Josephus.

¹⁰² See Chapter II, subsection "The Cutting of Citations".

¹⁰³ R. Cadiou, "La bibliothèque de Césarée et la formation des chaînes", *RS&R* 16, 1936, pp. 474–483.

¹⁰⁴ Ulrich, *Eusebius und die Juden*, p. 107 thinks that Eusebius is designating Josephus when he says at *PE* IX. 9. 2 Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καὶ οὗτος. However, nowhere does Eusebius mention Josephus' name. Likewise, Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source* never suggests that some citations provided by Eusebius are in fact derived from

book IX of the *Praeparatio* Eusebius often appeals to Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. Indeed, the introductions and conclusions provided by Eusebius before and after some citations show striking linguistic similarities with those provided by Josephus. Moreover, the cutting of these citations is exactly the same. This is the case with a citation from Pseudo-Hecataeus:¹⁰⁵

CA I. 183	PE IX. 4. 1
Ἐκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἱκανώτατος Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ . . .	Ἐκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἱκανώτατος ἰδίαν βίβλον . . .
CA I. 200	PE IX. 4. 6
Ἔτι γε μὴν ὅτι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνεστρατεύσαντο καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς διαδόχοις αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηκεν. Οἷς δ' αὐτὸς παρατυχεῖν φησιν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς Ἰουδαίου κατὰ τὴν στρατείαν γενομένοις, ταῦτα παραθήσομαι.	Ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ὑποβὰς ὅτι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνεστρατεύσαντο καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς διαδόχοις αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηκεν. Οἷς δ' αὐτὸς παρατυχεῖν φησιν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς Ἰουδαίου κατὰ τὴν στρατείαν γενομένοις, ταῦτα παραθήσομαι.

This is also the case with a citation from Clearchus:

CA I. 176 ff.	PE IX. 5 ff.
Κλέαρχος γάρ, ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους ὦν μαθητῆς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσόφων οὐδενὸς δεύτερος, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ ὕπνου βιβλίῳ φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλην τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ περὶ τίνος ἀνδρὸς Ἰουδαίου ταῦτα ἰστορεῖν αὐτῷ τε τὸν λόγον Ἀριστοτέλει περιτίθησι. Ἔστι δὲ οὕτω γεγραμμένον . . .	Καὶ Κλέαρχος δὲ ὁ περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ ὕπνου βιβλίῳ Ἀριστοτέλει τῷ φιλοσόφῳ τοιόνδε τινὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀνατίθησι λόγον, ὥδε πρὸς ῥῆμα γράφων . . .

Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. Only Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, p. 6 noted this point, but only as regards Theophrastus, and he did not delve into this question.

¹⁰⁵ I am using this label because of the uncertainty as to whether or not these fragments are from the real Hecataeus. Cf., e.g., B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, "On the Jews", Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*, Berkeley: University of California Press,

Eusebius' introduction and conclusion to Choerilus' quotation are strikingly similar to those by Josephus:

<i>CA</i> I. 172	<i>PE</i> IX. 9. 1
Καὶ Χοιρίλος δὲ ἀρχαιότερος γενόμενος ποιητῆς μέμνηται τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν ὅτι συνεστρατεύεται Ξέρξῃ τῷ Περσῶν βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα.	Τοῦ δὲ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους καὶ Χοιρίλος ἀρχαῖος γενόμενος ποιητῆς, μέμνηται καὶ ὡς συνεστράτευσαν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ξέρξῃ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα.
<i>CA</i> I. 174	<i>PE</i> IX. 9. 2
Δῆλον οὖν ἐστίν, ὡς οἶμαι, πᾶσιν ἡμῶν αὐτὸν μεμνήσθαι, τῷ καὶ τὰ Σόλυμα ὄρη ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ εἶναι χώρα, ἃ κατοικοῦμεν, καὶ τὴν Ἀσφαλτίτιν λεγόμενῃν λίμνην. Αὕτη γὰρ πασῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ [λίμνη] πλατυτέρα καὶ μείζων καθέστηκεν.	Δῆλον δ' ἐστὶν ὅτι περὶ Ἰουδαίων αὐτῷ ταῦτ' εἴρηται ἐκ τοῦ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐν τοῖς παρ' Ἑλλήσι Σολύμοις ὀνομαζομένοις ὄρεσι κεῖσθαι, πλησίον δὲ εἶναι τὴν Ἀσφαλτίτιν λίμνην, πλατυτάτην οὖσαν κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ μείζονα πασῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ λιμνῶν.

In most cases, Eusebius shortens Josephus' words for the sake of brevity. Yet these changes are worth noting because they reveal the authors' distinct intentions. In his conclusion to Choerilus' citation, e.g., Eusebius changes Josephus' "Solymian Mounts" (Σόλυμα ὄρη) into "Jerusalem" for obvious reasons: The name of the holy city had more weight than the obscure Σόλυμα ὄρη in the apologetic context of the passage. Indeed, this citation served to show that the Greek Choerilus was acquainted with the Jews.

4. STRATEGIES OF DISCRIMINATION OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS

Selection is a most important step in excerpting. When the original text is still available to us, checking where Eusebius starts and ends his citations may be helpful in understanding his intentions. The

1996; M. Pucci Ben Zeev, "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974–1990)", *JStJ* 24, 1993, pp. 215–234; N. Walter, "Pseudo-Hekataios I and II", in N. Walter, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit I/2, Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1976.

question whether he makes an accurate, well-considered choice in the texts he reads or else selects passages randomly is also relevant. Moreover, cutting a text may involve a semantic warping of a text's original meaning. These parameters thus require full consideration in a study of Eusebius' citation technique.

A. Carefully Cut Jewish Authors' Citations

Eusebius repeatedly appears to have carefully cut citations for the sake of brevity.

PE VII. 13. 1–2 = Philo, *Quaestiones in Genesim* II. 62

When he cites Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*¹⁰⁶ in a passage where he deals with the λόγος as second God, Eusebius does not cite the whole *solutio* as transmitted to us in the Armenian version.¹⁰⁷ He starts with the *quaestio* but omits the last sentence of the *solutio*, possibly because he deemed it unnecessary: It was somehow redundant and did not focus exactly on the matter at hand, since it dealt with the revenge of "those who are masters of themselves and well born".¹⁰⁸

PE VII. 13. 3 = Philo, *De agricultura* 51

Likewise, when he cites Philo's *De agricultura*,¹⁰⁹ Eusebius carefully cuts the short passage which deals precisely with the λόγος by editing out the last sentence of paragraph 51. This passage presents Ex. 23:20. Eusebius, or his anthology, prunes the beginning of the citation, possibly for the sake of brevity: Whereas Philo's text includes a lengthy enumeration of the elements of the universe, in the *Praeparatio*, this enumeration has been replaced with the words Ταῦτα δὴ πάντα. This change does not make Philo's text very clear. The expression τὰ πάντα, meaning "the universe", would have been a better choice. Yet Eusebius' approach is interesting since it enables us to catch him reading or dictating while still dealing with Philo's text; at that stage, he still knows perfectly what this locution refers to.

¹⁰⁶ PE VII. 13. 1–2 = *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim* II. 62 (preserved by Eusebius and by an Armenian version of the sixth century from Constantinople).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Ch. Mercier, *Philon d'Alexandrie. Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 34^A, Paris: Cerf 1979–1984.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ PE VII. 13. 3 = *agric.* 51.

PE VII. 14. 1 = *Aristobulus fr. 5^e Holladay*

Although we do not have the original text from which Aristobulus' citation is excerpted at *Praeparatio* VII. 14. 1, the introductory and concluding formulas indicate that Eusebius has carefully cut the passage. Indeed, at XIII. 12. 9–15 of the *Praeparatio*, he cites a more extensive passage from Aristobulus which includes the citation in question. This passage from book XIII has to do with the seventh day. Aristobulus' apologetic attempt aims to show the Greeks the sacredness of this day. The citation given in book VII of the *Praeparatio* which deals with Wisdom has been, so to speak, surgically excerpted from this context. In book VII, the Jewish philosopher's words only concern Wisdom.

Needless to say, these citations on the second cause may have been taken from a florilegium. Yet this does not really matter if, as I have argued, Eusebius is the author of this collection.

Other citations on other subjects also show Eusebius' precision in cutting texts.

PE VIII. 2. 1–4; VIII. 2. 5–5. 5; VIII. 5. 6–5. 10; VIII. 9. 1–38 = *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* 9–11; 28–46; 310–317; 128–171 *Respectively*
The three citations from the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* given in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* seem to have been cut with great care. The first one covers precisely the passage dealing with Demetrius of Phaleron's project to have the Hebrew Scriptures translated into Greek. Eusebius skips the passage on the liberation of the Jewish prisoners in Egypt which was unnecessary to the summary of the *Letter* which he intended: In his approach, the *Letter* is meant to explain how the Scripture reached the nations;¹¹⁰ it certainly does not aim to explain how Jewish prisoners were freed thanks to this translation. The second citation begins precisely where Pseudo-Aristeas introduces Demetrius' report. Yet, Eusebius stops quoting before the list of the translators' names,¹¹¹ possibly for the sake of brevity. Finally, the third citation appears to have been cut less carefully: Unexpectedly, it does not start with the completion of the translation at paragraph 308, but it ends just before the translators' departure, which lends

¹¹⁰ PE VIII. 1. 6–7.

¹¹¹ *Letter* 47–50.

the citation a unity of content. The excerpt from the *Letter* cited at VIII. 9. 1–38 is also well circumscribed. It starts where Pseudo-Aristeas relates Eleazar the high priest's apology of the Law, and ends with the apology in question.¹¹²

PE VIII. 12. 1–19 = *Philo*, *Probus* 75–91

The example of Philo's *Quod omnis probus liber sit* also indicates Eusebius' care in cutting the texts he quotes. The limits of the citation are the same as those of the passage in which Philo deals with the Essenes. Other relevant examples may be taken into consideration.

PE VIII. 13. 1–6 = *Philo*, *De opificio mundi* 7–12

The cutting of Philo's *De opificio mundi*¹¹³ follows the logic of Philo's text, in which the citation forms a semantic unity. It starts after the introduction, where Philo asserts that the world was created and ruled by God, and ends where his account of the creation begins. As on other occasions,¹¹⁴ Eusebius starts quoting Philo where the latter criticizes a Greek concept. Indeed, the passage in question starts with an attack on those who declared the world unbegotten and eternal.

PE VIII. 14. 1–72 = *Philo*, *De providentia* II. 3; 15–33; 99–112

The way Eusebius cut the lengthy citation from Philo's *De providentia*¹¹⁵ is also worth examining. The first part¹¹⁶ starts after the narrative introduction. In this introduction, the two main characters, Philo and his apostate nephew Alexander, are introduced; they are said to have met in the street and decide to resume the conversation they had the day before.¹¹⁷ Eusebius starts quoting when Alexander makes his first objection, questioning how the existence of a divine providence can be sustained in a world where the wicked enjoy prosperity and the righteous suffer misery. Let us note that Eusebius again starts his quotation with a passage in which Philo mentions an outsider's objection.¹¹⁸

¹¹² *Letter* 128–171.

¹¹³ PE VIII. 13. 1–6 = *Opif.* 7–12.

¹¹⁴ This is also the case at VII. 18. 1.

¹¹⁵ PE VIII. 14. 1–72 = *Prov.* II. 3; 15–33; 99–112.

¹¹⁶ *Prov.* II. 3.

¹¹⁷ *Prov.* II. 1–2.

¹¹⁸ Cf. PE VIII. 13. 1; VII. 18. 1.

In keeping with his desire for brevity, Eusebius stops quoting in the middle of a sentence and omits the rest of Alexander's answer. The latter was only developing his argument through examples (the tyrants' happiness: Polycrates and Dionysios; the suffering of the just: Socrates, Zenon and Anaxarchos).¹¹⁹ He only resumes his citation ten paragraphs further, when Philo starts answering. The separation between the two passages is clearly marked by Eusebius and shows that he has carefully thought about where to cut the citation:

Ταῦτα εἰς ἀνασκευὴν καὶ μυρία ἄλλα πλείω τούτων εἰπὼν ἐξῆς ἐπιλύεται τὰς ἀντιθέσεις διὰ τούτων:

After this attack and numerous other supplementary considerations, he [Philo] thus solves successive objections.¹²⁰

Eusebius then gives a second excerpt but he omits the beginning of Philo's answer to Alexander in which the philosopher mentions the wise men who used to be rich (Anaxagoreas and Democritus).¹²¹ This omission may be due to Philo's own reservations about "words which play against me and about which nothing should be said".¹²² Therefore, Eusebius starts quoting from II. 15, where the Alexandrian philosopher deals with the main topic, namely "the wicked is not happy";¹²³ he stops citing precisely where Alexander's second objection starts.¹²⁴ Eusebius resumes his citation of Philo's *De providentia* after fifty-five paragraphs. One may ask why he skipped such a long section of the text. Is it due to the content of Philo's treatise or to Eusebius' concern for brevity? To answer this question, let us examine the passage omitted by the bishop.

From paragraph 34 to 39, Alexander tells Philo that the poets (Hesiod and Homer) received their inspiration from the Muses, despite their blasphemies against the gods. Philo replies that he is wrong in that these poems do not blaspheme but require an allegorical interpretation in order to be interpreted properly.¹²⁵ As regards the theogian poets (Empedocles, Parmenides and Xenophanes), they did

¹¹⁹ *Prov.* II. 5–11.

¹²⁰ *PE* VIII. 14. 2. My translation.

¹²¹ *Prov.* II. 12–14.

¹²² *Prov.* II. 14: *proferens quae mihi contraria sunt, et quae melius tacere.*

¹²³ *Prov.* II. 15–33 = *PE* VIII. 14. 2–42.

¹²⁴ *Prov.* II. 34.

¹²⁵ *Prov.* II. 40–42.

not receive their inspiration from the Muses because it was not appropriate for them to become like gods.¹²⁶

This passage is followed by a lengthy cosmological account, of which Eusebius cited two paragraphs earlier in the *Praeparatio*.¹²⁷ This cosmological part contains the following themes: the role of providence in the case of uncreated matter and in the case of created matter;¹²⁸ the quantity of matter used in the creation of the world;¹²⁹ the incorporeals (emptiness, time, location) and the shape of the world;¹³⁰ the distribution of the elements on earth and the reason for the sea's existence;¹³¹ heavenly phenomena;¹³² natural and climatic phenomena, diseases;¹³³ the role of animals and plants and their relation to humankind.¹³⁴

Eusebius makes it clear that he skipped passages from the text.¹³⁵ He resumes the quotation at the passage where Philo answers the question about the relation between humankind and the animals and plants. Nevertheless, he skips the short introduction to this answer, most possibly for the sake of brevity.¹³⁶ Likewise, he stops quoting Philo where the latter gives the real conclusion of his treatise (rather than the narrative conclusion):¹³⁷

Ταῦτ' ἀναγκαίως λέλεκται πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ διαπορηθέντων, ἱκανὴν πίστιν ἐργάσασθαι δυνάμενα τοῖς μὴ φλονεῖκως ἔχουσι περὶ τοῦ τὸν θεὸν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι πραγμάτων.

That's what had to be said in answer to the last questions you raised, and which might efficiently convince one who is not enclined to quibble that God does take care of human matters.¹³⁸

¹²⁶ *Prov.* II. 42–44.

¹²⁷ *PE* VII. 21. 1–4 = *Prov.* II. 50–51.

¹²⁸ *Prov.* II. 45–49.

¹²⁹ *Prov.* II. 50–51, cited at *PE* VII. 21. 1–4.

¹³⁰ *Prov.* II. 52–58.

¹³¹ *Prov.* II. 59–68.

¹³² *Prov.* II. 69–86.

¹³³ *Prov.* II. 87–90.

¹³⁴ *Prov.* II. 91–97. The superiority of humankind over the other animals and plants is a *topos* in Jewish and Christian literature: See the commentary by M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 1. La Genèse*. Paris: Cerf, 1986, p. 97.

¹³⁵ *PE* VIII. 14. 43: “after other considerations, he (*Philo*) says again” (Καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα πάλιν φησίν·).

¹³⁶ *Prov.* II. 98.

¹³⁷ Cf. the note in Hadas-Lebel, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De providentia*, p. 351, n. 1.

¹³⁸ *PE* VIII. 14. 72 = *Prov.* II. 112.

He omits the last short sentence of the paragraph because it opens up the rest of the dialogue. He did not consider it necessary (and rightly so) to quote the last exchanges between Philo and his nephew,¹³⁹ because they do not add anything new to the demonstration but only conclude the narrative framework of the treatise.

The cutting of these three quotations thus follows a certain logic. The reason for Eusebius' omission of the lengthy cosmological account can be explained as follows: He has already dealt with the important cosmological issues in book VII of the *Praeparatio*,¹⁴⁰ in addition, in the previous Philonic citation, which dealt with the creation of matter and the world, he had already cited a cosmological passage from *De providentia*.¹⁴¹

As regards the passage on the poets, it seems obvious that the bishop preferred not to quote a text in which Philo "the Hebrew" wholeheartedly defended Greek poetry, presented himself as an admiror of the Greek philosophers, and claimed the importance of the allegorical interpretation of Greek poems. In the *Praeparatio* itself¹⁴² Eusebius had tackled the allegorical reading of the pagan myths. It is worth noting that the presence of this passage in Philo's treatise has served as an argument against the authenticity of the dialogue. Indeed, in other treatises, Philo attacks the allegorical interpretation of the poets and of their myths which he opposes to the biblical narrative.¹⁴³

PE IX. 3–5; IX. 9; IX. 11. 1–4; IX. 13–16; X. 7 = *Josephus*, BJ II. 119–159 (= *Porphyrus*); CA I. 197–204 (= *Ps.-Hecataeus*); 176–181 (= *Clearchus*); 172–174 (= *Choerilus*); AJ I. 93–95; 105–108; 117–120; 158–161; 165–168; 239–241; X. 221–222 (= CA I. 136–137); CA 146–154; 215–218; 6–26 *Respectively*

The numerous citations from Josephus (whether Eusebius openly attributes them to him or not) given in books IX and X of the *Praeparatio* have generally been cut with care. These citations enable Eusebius to assert that authors outside the Jewish-Christian world

¹³⁹ *Prov.* II. 113–116.

¹⁴⁰ *PE* VII. 21. 1–4.

¹⁴¹ *PE* VIII. 13. 1–6.

¹⁴² See especially books II and III.

¹⁴³ *Decal.* 55 and 156. Cf. Hadas-Lebel, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De providentia*, pp. 26–27 of her introduction.

mentioned the "Jews" and "Hebrews" in a laudatory fashion,¹⁴⁴ and to claim the antiquity of Moses and the "Hebrews". His citations from Greek authors, unacknowledged borrowings from Josephus, constitute a good example of his carefulness in cutting texts.¹⁴⁵ Indeed, in this case, he has carefully and extensively cited the Greek authors quoted by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*. At IX. 16, e.g., he starts quoting Josephus where the latter leaves out the biblical narrative for the citations of Berossus and Nicolaus of Damascus; he stops quoting where the citation of Nicolaus finishes. Eusebius skips paragraphs 162–164 and a part of paragraph 165 which deals with Pharaoh's desire for Sarah; he only resumes the citation where Josephus mentions the contacts between Abraham and the Egyptian priests and the excellent reputation he enjoyed. The citation ends on the rebuilding of a chain of knowledge starting with Abraham, and passed on to the Greeks through the Egyptians and the Phoenicians. This choice indicates that Eusebius carefully chose the most relevant passages and omitted the rest.

PE X. 13. 1–22 = *Josephus*, CA I. 73–75; 82–90; 103–104

The same conclusion may be drawn after an analysis of the citations from the *Contra Apionem* cited at X. 13. In this passage, Eusebius aims to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jews. He starts by citing Josephus after the latter explained that the Oriental authors testified to the antiquity of his people and introduces Manetho's testimony. He interrupts the passage where the Egyptian author becomes bitterly critical of the Hyksos, whom Josephus, and with him Eusebius, identifies as Hebrews. He also omits the list of the Hyksos kings but mentions that Josephus gives the list of the Egyptian reigns.¹⁴⁶ Eusebius resumes the quotation where Manetho, in Josephus' text, names the people in question "Hyksos" and mentions their origin and their conflict with the Egyptians until their arrival in Jerusalem. This gives the passage a remarkable unity. The bishop only goes back to Josephus' text to give Josephus' conclusions on Manetho's: The

¹⁴⁴ PE IX. 4. 2–5; 7–8; IX. 5. 2–6; IX. 9. 1; IX. 11. 1–4; IX. 13. 2–5; IX. 15. 3; IX. 20. 2–4; IX. 42. 2–3.

¹⁴⁵ PE IX. 4. 2–5 and PE IX. 4. 7–8 (Hecataeus); IX. 5. 2–7 (Clearchus); IX. 9. 1 (Choerilus).

¹⁴⁶ PE X. 13. 11.

Hebrews settled in Jerusalem more than three centuries before Danaos reached Argos and left Egypt a thousand years before the Trojan war. Both Danaos and the Trojan war were seen as chronological points of reference used to date Greek civilization.

Eusebius thus carefully chose the excerpts from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* which he gives in the *Praeparatio*. His methodology in cutting passages from Josephus reveals not only his care for brevity (cf. his omission of the list of Egyptian kings), but also the differences between his strategy and that of Josephus. He omits, e.g., Apion's slanders about the "Hyksos-Hebrews" possibly because he fears that these anti-Jewish attacks would fall on the Christians. This would have stained the idealized image of Christianity he was attempting to construct in the *Praeparatio*.¹⁴⁷ By contrast, Josephus does not hesitate to report Manetho's attacks. He seems to be concerned only with demonstrating the great antiquity of the Jews. Actually, the Egyptian author's anti-Judaism¹⁴⁸ proves to be, in his opinion, a guarantee of the truth of his account.¹⁴⁹ Eusebius was content with citing the passages essential to his demonstration. He does not seem to have seen these anti-Jewish attacks as dispassionately as Josephus.

PE IX. 16-37; 39 = *Jewish Authors Cited through Alexander Polyhistor*

The case of the minor Jewish authors is not as interesting as those examined previously because they are cited through Alexander Polyhistor. Nevertheless, Eusebius seems to have chosen consistent groups of citations because these citations often start with the name

¹⁴⁷ On the Christian attempt to glorify Judaism as a means to legitimize Christianity, notably through the demonstration of its antiquity, see L. H. Feldman, "Origen's *Contra Celsum* and Josephus' *Contra Apionem*: The Issue of Jewish Origins", *VigChr* 44, 1990, pp. 105-135 and pp. 196-197.

¹⁴⁸ Scholars disagree as to whether Manetho was indeed anti-Jewish or if this impression was created by a Pseudo-Manetho who would have reworked Manetho's account, or even by Josephus himself. For more details on this intricate problem, see L. Troiani, "Sui frammenti di Manetone nel primo libro del *Contra Apionem* di Flavio Giuseppe", *Studi Classici e Orientali* 24, 1975, pp. 97-126, J. D. Gauger, "Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen", *JSt* 13, 1982, pp. 28-35, C. Aziza, "L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV^e s. av. J.-C.-I^{er} s. ap. J.-C.)", *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 41-65, M. Pucci Ben Zeev, "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974-1990)", pp. 215-234, R. Laqueur, art. Manethon, *RE* XIV. 1, cols. 1060-1061.

¹⁴⁹ *CA* I. 70.

of the author cited and end with that which appears to be the end of the narrative.¹⁵⁰

PE XI. 24. 1–12 = *Philo*, *De opificio mundi* 24–27; 29–31; 35–36 Eusebius' methodology in selecting passages from Philo's *De opificio mundi* at XI. 24¹⁵¹ is worth examining. The first quotation starts after Philo's account of the goodness of God (*Opif.* 23). It comes as no surprise that Eusebius omits this passage. In a section of the *Praeparatio* devoted to the 'ideas' according to the "Hebrews", he prefers to focus on a Philonic passage dealing specifically with the λόγος. This is why he selected a passage which explains the role of the λόγος in the creation and in relation to God. This excerpt includes Philo's exegesis of the "beginning" (Gen. 1:1); it is interrupted when Philo explains why heaven was created in the first place, before describing it as the home of "the visible and sensible divinities" (θεῶν ἐμφανῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν . . . οἶκος).¹⁵² Eusebius' method is logical: He includes Philo's passage on the a-temporality of the beginning of the creation because this theory was deeply connected to the theme of the λόγος as the place of the simultaneously created realities. This theme will be taken up in patristic exegesis.¹⁵³ Eusebius stops quoting where Philo justifies the creation firstly of heaven because it is unnecessary for his demonstration. He resumes Philo's text where the latter describes the creation of the intelligibles ("the incorporeal heaven", "the invisible earth", "the idea of air and emptiness", "the uncorporeal essence of water and wind", and "the essence of light"). He also includes the mention of the intelligible light as the image of the λόγος, which was crucial from a Christian perspective; he stops quoting exactly when this account ends. Eusebius then omits Philo's account of the reasons for the creation of morning and evening. He resumes his citation where Philo deals with the creation of the sensible world. He only keeps the passage on the creation of the firmament because, as the first sensible creation, it was sufficient to illustrate the opposition between the sensible and the intelligible creations.

¹⁵⁰ See, e.g., PE IX. 27. 1–36; IX. 30–34; etc.

¹⁵¹ PE XI. 24. 1–6; 24. 7–10; 24. 11–12 = *De opificio mundi* 24–27; 29–31; 35–36.

¹⁵² *Opif.* 27. I shall come back to this shortly.

¹⁵³ Cf. M. Alexandre, *Le Commencement du livre, Genèse I–IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1988, p. 68.

It is worth noting that Eusebius clearly marked the separation between the three passages from Philo's *De opificio*. His methodology in cutting the text is well thought through, as it enables him to show the "Hebrews'" conception of the ideas as briefly as possible. Yet one might argue that other passages could have been used as satisfactorily as the ones he chose;¹⁵⁴ indeed, but unlike those selected by Eusebius, the other passages do not leave as much room for concepts like the *λόγος*, or wind and light, which enjoyed such a remarkable destiny in the Christian tradition. This may indicate that Eusebius selected the passages not only according to the agreement between Philonic and Platonic thought, but also according to the echoes of Philo's thought in the Christian tradition (whether incidental or not).

PE XIII. 18. 12–16 = Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I. 13–17; 20

The quotation from Philo's *De specialibus legibus* seems to have been cut for the sake of brevity. Indeed, Eusebius interrupts the passage he is quoting (I. 13–17) at the end of paragraph 17; he only starts quoting again at paragraph 20 (and he points out the interruption),¹⁵⁵ probably because paragraphs 18–19 were redundant compared to the previous passage. In both places, Philo was dealing with the superiority of the intelligible world over the sensible one. Yet there may be other reasons for this choice, as we will see.¹⁵⁶

DE VI. 18. 291 b–c = Josephus, AJ IX. 224–225

In the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius also seems to have cut texts for the sake of brevity. In book VI, e.g., he chooses the very passage dealing with leprosy and the earthquake because they are necessary to his explanation; but he omits the description of Uzziah's misdeed and his banishment because they are not needed for his demonstration.¹⁵⁷

DE VIII. 2. 399 a = Josephus, AJ XVIII. 34–35

Likewise, in book VIII,¹⁵⁸ Eusebius attempts to show the degradation of the high priesthood and through it that of Judaism; as a result, he omits Josephus' section on the governors and starts where he provides the list of the succession of the high priests. He stops

¹⁵⁴ E.g., *Opif.* 15–16; 19–21 ff.

¹⁵⁵ PE XIII. 18. 16.

¹⁵⁶ See the end of this section.

¹⁵⁷ AJ IX. 223; 226 ff.

¹⁵⁸ DE VIII. 2. 399 a = AJ XVIII. 34–35.

quoting when Josephus resumes his enumeration of the governors.¹⁵⁹ The same carefulness may be observed in the next Josephan citation.¹⁶⁰ In this passage, the Jewish historian explains that some priests who had entered the Temple at night had heard voices recommending them to leave. Eusebius carefully cut the passage, thus retaining the narrative's unity.

In sum, in most cases, the bishop of Caesarea has selected and cut the Jewish authors' passages in a relevant and thoroughly thoughtful manner, even when they are lengthy.¹⁶¹

B. *Jewish Authors' Citations Which Were Cut Incoherently*

It should be said that in some cases, Eusebius seems to have cut the citations with little or no care. It is worth asking whether this has any effect on the meaning of the citations.

PE VII. 18. 1–2 = *Philo*, *De plantatione* 8–10

Eusebius starts citing Philo's *De plantatione* 8–10 at VII. 18. 1–2 of the *Praeparatio*, and ends the citation in the middle of a sentence, roughly where Philo resumes his account of the physical position of men or women (who stare at the sky). There seems to be no specific reason for this cut.

PE VII. 21. 1–4 = *Philo*, *De providentia* II. 50–51

Likewise, at VII. 21 of the *Praeparatio*, he breaks off his quotation from Philo's *De providentia* shortly before the end of Philo's answer. Yet this cut does not seem to modify the content of the citation in any significant way.¹⁶²

PE VIII. 8. 1–55 = *Josephus*, *CA* II. 163–228

When citing the long passage from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* on the law of Moses, Eusebius again stops quoting in the middle of a sentence,¹⁶³ but this cut seems to have been done only for the sake of brevity.

¹⁵⁹ *AJ* XVIII. 35.

¹⁶⁰ *DE* VIII. 2. 402 d; 403 a = *Bj* VI. 299.

¹⁶¹ See, e.g., the citation from Philo's *De providentia* at *Praeparatio* VIII. 14. 1–72.

¹⁶² The end of the sentence is known thanks to Georgides Monachus, a compiler of ca. the ninth or eleventh century, cf. Hadas-Lebel, *Philon d'Alexandrie. De providentia*, p. 281, n. 1.

¹⁶³ *PE* VIII. 8. 55: Eusebius stops at προῦδομεν whereas Josephus carries on further in chapter 228.

C. *Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion*

In some cases, Eusebius' methodology in cutting texts led to important semantic changes. It enabled him to distort and appropriate the content of the citations.

PE VII. 21. 1–4 = *Philo*, *De providentia* II. 50–51

At VII. 21. 1–4 of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius gives his readers a text which corresponds to paragraphs 50–51 of book II of the Armenian translation of Philo's *De providentia*: "However, concerning the quantity of substance, if [it?] was ever really begotten . . ." (Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ποσοῦ τῆς οὐσίας, εἰ δὴ γέγονεν ὄντως . . .; Latin transl. of the Armenian: *de quantitate autem materiae specialiter factae* . . .).

Some modern commentators have questioned whether in Philo's view the subject of γέγονεν was the substance¹⁶⁴ or the world. Indeed, in paragraph 48, Philo suggests the hypothesis of an uncreated universe and of uncreated matter (*materies*). One may ask therefore whether the beginning of paragraph 50 constitutes the second hypothesis (i.e., the world was created) or if Philo only deals with the question of the substance. By choosing to start the quotation with this sentence, Eusebius interprets, or wants his readers to interpret, γέγονεν as referring to the substance, understood as matter. Actually, the presence of this excerpt only makes sense if it is seen as dealing with the substance, as the title of the chapter indicates ("That Matter is not unbegotten").¹⁶⁵ Some scholars have called this interpretation into question, however, and claim that Philo is referring to the world.¹⁶⁶ The Latin translation of the Armenian agrees with Eusebius by making *materies* the subject of *factae*. Yet it is not trustworthy.¹⁶⁷

At any rate, the cutting of the citation emphasizes the difference between Philo's and Eusebius' perspectives:¹⁶⁸ The former focuses on

¹⁶⁴ Philo uses the term οὐσία. According to Eusebius, the Greeks identify it with the Aristotelian term ὕλη (PE VII. 18. 12). On these two notions, see L. Couloubaritis, *Aux origines de la philosophie européenne, de la pensée archaïque au néoplatonisme*, Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2003, p. 422 ff.

¹⁶⁵ PE VII. 19. heading.

¹⁶⁶ É. Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: Vrin, 1950, p. 81 followed by Hadas-Lebel, *Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 35, p. 279, n. 1. Nonetheless, she accepts that Eusebius' reading might be correct due to paragraph 46.

¹⁶⁷ Hadas-Lebel, *Philon d'Alexandrie. De providentia*, p. 22.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Schroeder, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215, pp. 106–107.

the issue of providence, and considers the possibility of its existence both in a created and in an uncreated world, whether with created or uncreated matter. This issue remains secondary in his opinion. By contrast, Eusebius is only interested in this text as proof of the creation of matter; the question of divine providence does not really matter to him in this context. Thanks to the citation technique, through which a passage is isolated from its original context, the bishop discreetly manages to warp the initial meaning of the citation.

PE XI. 15. 1 = *Philo*, *De confusione* 97

Likewise, at XI. 15. 1 of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius quotes paragraph 97 of Philo's *De confusione linguarum*. He seems to have cut the excerpt in order to omit one sentence because it does not conform to his theological concepts. In this passage, Philo establishes a hierarchy of the Being, the λόγος and the world. Eusebius ends the quotation after the mention of the λόγος. The omission of the world may be explained by the fact that in Eusebius' Christian mind, the third level of the hierarchy is not the world, as stated by Philo, but the holy spirit. As we will see,¹⁶⁹ Eusebius largely made use of Philo because he wished to transmit the message of the Gospel through a "Hebrew". Therefore, it was sensible to cut out the "world" and to stop the quotation at the mention of the "holiest λόγος" (ἱερώτατον λόγον). This gave the impression that the "Hebrews" had the same theology as the Christians. Eusebius hardly dealt with the holy spirit in the *PE*.¹⁷⁰ In general, his theological system is mainly articulated around "the first cause" and "the second cause". This may explain his omission of the third level mentioned by Philo.

PE XI. 24. 1–6 = *Philo*, *De opificio mundi* 24–27

Likewise, Eusebius cuts off the citation from Philo's *De opificio mundi* (*PE* XI. 24. 6) in the middle of paragraph 27, i.e., just before the philosopher's commentary on the creation of heaven, in which heaven was defined as the "home of the intelligible and sensible gods" (θεῶν

¹⁶⁹ See Chapter VI, subsection "Jewish Authors' Citations as Intermediary between Jewish-Christian and Greek Thought".

¹⁷⁰ On Eusebius' theological conceptions, see H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, p. 86 ff. and H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea: eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

ἐμφανῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν . . . οἶκος). As we will see, the same phenomenon may be observed in another excerpt¹⁷¹ of the *Praeparatio*. Indeed, a similar expression from Philo's *De specialibus legibus* is pruned, probably for the same reason: In Eusebius' opinion, it was not appropriate for Philo the "Hebrew" to mention a plurality of gods, especially in the context of an apologetic comparison between Moses and Plato.¹⁷² Apparently, Philo had no problem with the biblical expression "Lord God of the gods" (Deut. 10:17).

The *Demonstratio* also shows that excerpting passages from their context enables Eusebius to modify the cited authors' thoughts and to appropriate these texts in an apologetic perspective.

DE VIII. 2. 397 d–398 a = *Josephus*, AJ XX. 247–249

The same phenomenon occurs at VIII. 2. 397d–398a where Eusebius quotes Josephus' *Antiquities* XX. 247–249. Josephus claims that Herod, followed by Archelaus and the Romans, stopped selecting the high priests among the Hasmoneans. According to the bishop, this proves the disappearance of the legal priesthood, which confirms Daniel's prophecy (Dan 9:26). In other words, Josephus' citation demonstrates that the end of Judaism had come. However, Josephus went on to say (XX. 251) that after Herod and Archelaus, the high priests began to rule, founding an ἀριστοκρατία. This information was omitted by Eusebius because it contradicted the image of an agonizing Judaism ready to make room for the Gospel.

DE VIII. 2. 398 b = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 92–93

At *Demonstratio* VIII. 2. 398 b, Eusebius quotes a passage from Josephus' *Antiquities* in order to illustrate the decline of the institutions of the Temple, and this gives him the opportunity to distort the original meaning of the passage. Indeed, Josephus explains that Vitellius gave back to the priests the privilege of keeping their garment themselves. This privilege had been suppressed by Herod, Archelaus and the Romans. Eusebius only cites the passage dealing with Herod, Archelaus and the Romans in order to present it as

¹⁷¹ PE XIII. 18. 16.

¹⁷² Yet the Christians occasionally proved to be less scrupulous than expected, despite the fact that the apologists' claims about their monotheism were rather strong. On this point, see P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 and below, Chapter V, section "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

proof of the destruction of the Jewish institutions, and therefore, as a sign of the end of Judaism. He deliberately omits the fact that Vitellius corrected this situation, “in virtue of our ancestral custom” (ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ πατρίῳ)¹⁷³ because it would have invalidated his argument against Judaism.

DE VIII. 2. 402 d = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 55 =

BJ. II. 169—DE VIII. 2. 403 a = *Philo*, *Legatio ad Gaium* 299

Similarly, Eusebius cites Josephus and Philo¹⁷⁴ on the standards brought by Pilate to Jerusalem¹⁷⁵ in order to show that certain signs had announced the fall of the Temple. According to his historical views, these events announced the imminent end of Judaism, as well as its replacement by Christianity. Yet this christianizing reading of the Jewish texts was only made possible by the omission of the end of the story as told by Josephus and Philo. Indeed, according to them, the Jews succeeded in getting rid of the standards.¹⁷⁶ Josephus recounts that Pilate finally abandoned his project “amazed by the strength of their [the Jews’] willingness to keep their laws” (θαυμάσας τὸ ἐχρὸν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν νόμων).¹⁷⁷ Philo argues that the Jews sent a letter to Tiberius, who was infuriated by Pilate’s deed. Consequently, he commanded him to have the standards sent to Caesarea maritima. The emperor’s honour (ἡ τιμή) was thus preserved, as well as the ancient custom (ἀρχαία συνήθεια) of the city of Jerusalem.¹⁷⁸

It is clear that excerpting the quotations from their primary context enabled Eusebius to distort the meaning of the Jewish authors’ narrative. According to them, the Pilate episode illustrates the divine reward granted to the Jews for their courage and their attachment to the Law.¹⁷⁹ By contrast, by cutting the citation, Eusebius turns a

¹⁷³ AJ XVIII. 95.

¹⁷⁴ I will show further that the speech in *oratio obliqua* ascribed to Philo is in fact taken from Flavius Josephus.

¹⁷⁵ DE VIII. 2. 402 d = BJ II. 169 ff.—AJ XVIII. 55 ff.; DE VIII. 2. 403 a = Philon, *Legatio ad Caïum* 299 ff.

¹⁷⁶ Josephus mentions standards. In *Leg.* (299 ff.), Philo mentions shields bearing neither inscriptions nor anything forbidden.

¹⁷⁷ AJ XVIII. 59.

¹⁷⁸ *Legat.* 305.

¹⁷⁹ This is especially the case in the *Legatio*: The title given to this work in manuscripts, *On Virtues*, could have designated God’s virtues, who “ultimately saves or rewards his people” (F. H. Colson, Philo X, LCL, London: Heinemann – Cambridge

Jewish narrative of salvation into a Christian narrative of the destruction of Judaism. Strikingly, when he uses the same story in the *Historia ecclesiastica*,¹⁸⁰ he goes so far as to claim that this event was a divine punishment sent to the Jews.¹⁸¹

DE IX. 5. 431 a-b = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 116-117

In book IX of the *Demonstratio*,¹⁸² Eusebius again quotes Josephus on John the Baptist, cutting the passage in the middle of a sentence, thus omitting Josephus' declaration that baptism was preceded by a preliminary purification of the soul because it did not wash away the sins (μη ἐπὶ τινων ἀμαρτάδων παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκεκαθάρμένης).¹⁸³ As Grant has pointed out,¹⁸⁴ Eusebius may have cut this passage because it contradicted the Gospels. According to Luke and Mark,¹⁸⁵ baptism brought repentance of one's sins. However, the passage is cited in full in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹⁸⁶ This is due to the fact that in the latter work, which focused on John's death, it was more difficult to drop it.

5. THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS

Besides cutting text, arranging the Jewish citations in a certain order could also be used as a means to appropriate them. In most cases, the Jewish authors' citations tend to be associated with other Jewish citations, or with Christian citations, or with pagan citations. This tendency may be explained by Eusebius' wish to demonstrate the *συμφωνία* between different authors to support his argument. He

(Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1962, p. XV, following Reiter's suggestion). J. Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, pp. 860-861 also claims that in the *Legatio* and *In Flaccum*, "Philo intends to describe not only how the Jews were persecuted, but also what a dreadful end was prepared for their persecutors by the avenging hand of God". Moreover, Philo deals with divine providence at the beginning of his treatise (*Legat.* 3 ff.).

¹⁸⁰ *HE* II. 6. 4.

¹⁸¹ *HE* II. 5. 6.

¹⁸² DE IX. 5. 431 a-b = *AJ* XVIII. 116-117.

¹⁸³ *AJ* XVIII. 117.

¹⁸⁴ Grant, "Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews", pp. 72-73.

¹⁸⁵ Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3.

¹⁸⁶ *HE* I. 11. 1.

applies the same methodology in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, in which he associates New Testament testimonies with Josephus' or Philo's testimonies.¹⁸⁷

A. Association of Jewish Citations

Several citations of Jewish authors are grouped in books VII and VIII of the *Praeparatio*, as well as in book VIII of the *Demonstratio*.

In books VII and VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius tends to present two Jewish testimonies on the same subject: Various citations from Philo on the λόγος¹⁸⁸ are associated with a citation from Aristobulus on the *Sophia* in order to exemplify the existence of the doctrine of the second cause among the "Hebrews";¹⁸⁹ in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, a citation from Philo's *Hypothetica* on "the pious constitution according to Moses"¹⁹⁰ is associated with a passage from Josephus on the same topic, because the latter "recounts similar facts" (ὅμοια δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἰώσηπος ἱστορεῖ);¹⁹¹ Aristobulus and Pseudo-Aristeas both testify to the Jewish allegorical reading of the Law;¹⁹² they are authorized to do so by virtue of their identity as "Hebrews" of the Ptolemaic era;¹⁹³ in the *Demonstratio*,¹⁹⁴ Josephus' narrative on the standards introduced by Pilate into the Temple is followed by a citation from Philo on the same story because the philosopher "witnesses the same events in accordance with him [Josephus]" (αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Φίλων συμμαρτυρεῖ . . .).¹⁹⁵

Eusebius repeatedly gathers different quotations from the same Jewish author. This occurs in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* in which he gives two citations from Philo on the Essenes.¹⁹⁶ Why Eusebius

¹⁸⁷ E.g., *HE* I. 10–11 where he cites Josephus' testimony on the high priests in the time of Jesus and on John the Baptist and Christ (the famous *Testimonium Flavianum*). On Eusebius' harmonization of Jewish and New Testament testimonies, see Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources", p. 437, Gonnet, "L'acte de citer chez Eusèbe", p. 188, and especially Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, pp. 75–90.

¹⁸⁸ *PE* VII. 13. 1–6.

¹⁸⁹ *PE* VII. 13. 6.

¹⁹⁰ *PE* VIII. 7. heading.

¹⁹¹ *PE* VIII. 7. 21.

¹⁹² *PE* VIII. 9 and 10.

¹⁹³ *PE* VIII. 8. 56.

¹⁹⁴ *DE* VIII. 2. 402 d and *DE* VIII. 2. 403 a.

¹⁹⁵ *DE* VIII. 2. 403 a.

¹⁹⁶ *PE* VIII. 11–12.

omitted Josephus' crucial testimony on this Jewish sect¹⁹⁷ needs to be investigated.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, the agreement between two Jewish authors would have reinforced Eusebius' reasoning. That he knew Josephus' treatment of the Essenes is out of the question both because he most certainly had the entire Josephan corpus at his disposal and because he quotes a passage from Porphyry, who himself explicitly quotes Josephus. The answer to this question, I would argue, lies in this Porphyrian passage. In book IX of the *Praeparatio*,¹⁹⁹ the bishop cites a passage from Porphyry's *De abstinentia* which deals with the Essenes. Interestingly, Eusebius omits the neo-Platonist's reference to Josephus, which he gives just before citing the Jewish historian.²⁰⁰ This omission enables Eusebius to claim that famous Greeks had mentioned the Jews. As Séguier de Saint Brisson pointed out a long time ago,²⁰¹ to admit that the Greek philosopher had derived his information from a Jew would have undermined Eusebius' demonstration. Accordingly, he cut out Porphyry's reference to Josephus and contented himself with Philo's testimony in book VIII.

Further on, a citation from Philo's *De opificio mundi* is associated with an excerpt from *De providentia*. Both deal with the creation and with divine providence to illustrate "the wise Jews' thought . . . on theology or on eloquence" (τῆς διανοίας τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφῶν . . . ἐν τῇ θεολογίᾳ καὶ τῇ περὶ λόγους ἀρετῇ).²⁰²

Finally, in the *Demonstratio*, different passages from Josephus are gathered in order to illustrate the decline of the Temple and the end of Judaism. The two citations from the Jewish historian constitute, in Eusebius' view, a criticism of Herod Antipas' (4 B.C.E.–39 C.E.) and Archelaus' (4 B.C.E.–6 C.E.) policies²⁰³ towards the high priesthood. In the first passage, Josephus reproaches them for not having chosen the high priests among the Hasmonians after Aristobulus. In

¹⁹⁷ BJ II. 119–160.

¹⁹⁸ On the portrayal of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus, see P. Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus", in Fr. H. Cryer and Th. L. Thompson (Eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. JSOT. S 290. Copenhagen International Seminar 6. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998, pp. 32–68.

¹⁹⁹ PE IX. 3. 1–21.

²⁰⁰ *De abst.* IV. 2. 2.

²⁰¹ See his translation of the *Praeparatio*, published in Paris (1846).

²⁰² PE VIII. 12. 22.

²⁰³ On the reign of these two individuals, see P. Schäfer, *Histoire des Juifs dans l'antiquité*. Traduit par P. Schulte, Paris: Cerf, 1989, pp. 125–128.

the second one, he blames them for keeping the high-priest garments in an attempt to avoid a rebellion and for handing them to the Romans. The third citation includes a list of the high priests who succeeded one another over a brief period. In the fourth citation, Josephus recounts that some priests who had entered the Temple at night, had felt an earthquake and heard a voice saying "let us depart from here". The last passage deals with Pilate's profanation of the Temple.

B. *Citations of Jewish Authors Associated with Citations of
Christian Authors*

Jewish citations are sometimes associated with Christian citations. Philo's testimony on matter in book VII of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., is inserted into a collection of Christian testimonies by Dionysius of Alexandria, Maximus (in fact Methodius) and Origen;²⁰⁴ it serves to illustrate the opinions of Eusebius' predecessors on the creation of matter (τῶν δὲ πρόσθεν ἡμῶν τὸ δόγμα διηκριβωκότων);²⁰⁵ in book X, a citation from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* is surrounded by Christian citations from Julius Africanus, Tatian, and Clement of Alexandria²⁰⁶ in order to prove the antiquity of Moses and the prophets. The bishop claims to appeal to Josephus' testimony because "the present matter has been dealt with by the children of the Hebrews themselves before them" (ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐσπονδόσθη καὶ αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων παισὶν ἢ προκειμένη πραγματεία);²⁰⁷ in book XI of the *Praeparatio*, a testimony from Philo's *De opificio mundi* is presented with an excerpt from Clement's *Stromata* in order to define the concept of 'ideas' in the creation of the world according to Moses.²⁰⁸ Clement's text is used by Eusebius "because Clement agrees with him [Philo]" (συνόδει δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης).²⁰⁹ In addition, Clement's text is in fact an adaptation of Philo's text;²¹⁰ The chain of influence is thus, as it were, reconstructed by Eusebius. Finally, in book XIII

²⁰⁴ *PE* VII. 19–21.

²⁰⁵ *PE* VII. 18. 13.

²⁰⁶ *PE* X. 10–13.

²⁰⁷ *PE* X. 12. 31.

²⁰⁸ *PE* XI. 24–25.

²⁰⁹ *PE* XI. 24. 12.

²¹⁰ Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis*, pp. 196–197.

of the *Praeparatio*, Aristobulus' testimony is associated with that of Clement. Both illustrate the theme of the Greeks' dependence on Hebrew philosophy.²¹¹ Clement's citation follows that of Aristobulus. As we have observed in Clement's citations on the ideas, Clement actually borrowed some of his thoughts on the 'dependency theme' from Aristobulus.²¹²

Eusebius also tends to associate Josephus and the New Testament, especially in the *Demonstratio*, which may be compared from this point of view with the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Eclogae prophetae*.²¹³ This is the case at VIII. 2. 398d–399a where Eusebius connects Luke 3:1 to *Antiquities* XVIII. 34–35. These two passages relate that from Herod onwards, the election of the high priests was made in an anarchic and illegal manner. Likewise, at *Demonstratio* IX. 5. 430d–431a, Eusebius parallels Luke's and Matthew's testimonies on John the Baptist to that of Josephus.²¹⁴ Again, these associations clearly enabled Eusebius to construct a unified Hebrew-Christian tradition.

C. Citation of a Jewish Author Associated with a Pagan Author and a Christian Author

On one occasion, a Jewish testimony is linked with both a pagan testimony and a Christian testimony: In book X of the *Praeparatio*, Clement's testimony on the theme of the theft of the Greeks is followed by that of Josephus because "it seems good to me [Eusebius] to attach to it the excerpts from Josephus' writing" (δοκῶ μοι εὖ ἔχειν ἐπισυνάψαι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωσήπου τοῦ Ἑβραίου γραφῆς . . .);²¹⁵ Josephus' citation is itself followed by a passage from Diodorus Siculus, who could "seal" the latter's words (εἶη δ' ὅν τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπισφράγισμα καὶ ἡ Διοδώρου μαρτυρία).²¹⁶

²¹¹ *PE* XIII. 12–13. On this theme in Eusebius, see Ridings, *The Attic Moses*, pp. 141–196. According to him, the dependency theme is crucial in the *Praeparatio* since it answers one of the most important questions raised in this work, i.e., why did the Christians abandon Greek philosophy in favour of barbarian oracles? Moreover, he points out that Eusebius occasionally uses a very pejorative terminology to describe this dependency (ἀποσυλλάω, συλλάω, σκευωρέομαι).

²¹² *PE* XIII. 13. 34 gives the citations provided by Aristobulus at *PE* XIII. 12. 13–16; *PE* XIII. 13. 51 gives the citation offered by Aristobulus at XIII. 12. 5.

²¹³ See the analysis of Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, pp. 75–94.

²¹⁴ *AJ* XVIII. 116–117.

²¹⁵ *PE* X. 6. 15.

²¹⁶ *PE* X. 7. 22.

Thus it appears clear from this short survey that the citations of the Jewish authors are valuable testimonies in Eusebius' opinion for two reasons. First of all, they enable him to deal with a large range of apologetic, theological and historical subjects which can support his arguments. Secondly, they enable him to establish a dialogue between the different cultural spheres present in the *Apodeixis*. Nevertheless, in most cases, Eusebius has gathered the Jewish citations together with the Christian ones. Clement's role is remarkable in this respect since he is cited next to Philo, Josephus and Aristobulus. This comes as no surprise since, as I have pointed out, Clement himself both cited, and was directly influenced by, these Jewish authors.²¹⁷ Hence it was easy for Eusebius to present these testimonies as being in agreement.

Yet some of Philo's citations are used in an isolated manner in order both to clarify some biblical verses and to confront them with some passages from Plato. At *Praeparatio* XI. 15. 1–6, e.g., three passages from Philo's *De confusione* are used on their own. They serve to show the existence of the doctrine of a 'second cause' among the "Hebrews", with which Plato is supposed to agree in his *Epinomis* and his *Letters*.²¹⁸ Likewise, at XIII. 18. 12–16 in the same work, a citation from Philo is given in order to prove that Plato made a mistake by deifying the stars. This isolated use of Philonic citations may indicate his position as a privileged representative of the "Hebrews": His testimony is self-sufficient, even in the context of a comparison between Plato and Scripture.

6. REFERENCES TO THE CITATIONS FROM THE JEWISH AUTHORS

I now propose to analyze Eusebius' methodology in referring to the Jewish authors' works he cites in the *Apodeixis*. This will enable me to assess his attitude towards these sources as well as his level of precision in his citations. In most cases, he provides fairly precise references to the works he quotes, especially so in the *Praeparatio*: As I have already emphasized, Eusebius repeatedly gives the author's

²¹⁷ For Philo, see Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromata*; as regards Aristobulus, we have seen that Clement borrowed poetic passages from the Alexandrian philosopher.

²¹⁸ *PE* XI. 16. 1–2.

name, the title of the work cited, and the number of the book from which the citation is taken. Less frequently, a summary of either the book or the passage is given before the quotation.

Before turning to this issue, let us examine the form in which Eusebius seems to have read the Jewish works.

A. *In Which Form Did Eusebius Read the Jewish Authors' Works?*

Several works by Jewish authors quoted by Eusebius seem to have had a form different from that in which they have reached us. Philo is a case in point, but this comes as no surprise given his abundant literary production and Eusebius' extensive use of him. Moreover, the list of Philo's works given by Eusebius in the *Historia ecclesiastica*²¹⁹ enables us to assess this problem more precisely than for any of the other Jewish authors.

Philo's *De plantatione* and *De agricultura*,²²⁰ e.g., which have reached us as two different treatises, constitute, according to Eusebius, one single work named *Περὶ γεωργίας*²²¹ containing two books.²²²

Likewise, whereas the Armenian tradition has provided us with two books of Philo's *De providentia*, Eusebius seems to have known only the second one of the *Περὶ προνοίας*.²²³ He sees it as one of Philo's *μονόβιβλα*²²⁴ (works that have only one book). However, Wendland²²⁵ has suggested that he might have known the content of 'our' first book of the *De providentia*. Indeed, he seems to have been influenced by it in book VI of the *Praeparatio*, in which he attacks the doctrine of fatalism.²²⁶

It is also odd that Eusebius mistakenly ascribes excerpts from Philo's *De confusione linguarum*²²⁷ to his *Quod deterius* (*Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι*), whereas he does not mention this work in his *Historia ecclesiastica*.²²⁸ This oddity may be explained by

²¹⁹ *HE* II. 18. 1–8.

²²⁰ On the division of Philo's writings made by Philo himself, see J. E. Royse, Philo's Division of His Works into Books, *SPhA* 13, 2001, pp. 59–85.

²²¹ *PE* VII. 13. 3 and VII. 17. 4.

²²² *HE* II. 18. 2. Cf. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 166–167.

²²³ *PE* VIII. 13. 7.

²²⁴ *HE* II. 18. 6. Cf. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 168–169.

²²⁵ P. Wendland, *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung*, Berlin, 1892, p. 40.

²²⁶ *PE* VI. 6.

²²⁷ *PE* XI. 15. 7.

²²⁸ This title is not to be found in *HE* II. 18.

the fact that this work was in fact considered as book six or seven of the Allegorical Interpretation (ἡ νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας),²²⁹ depending on whether Philo's *De opificio mundi* is placed at the head of the Interpretation or not.

The same justification appears relevant in explaining the absence of Philo's *De opificio mundi* from Eusebius' catalogue of Philo's works: When the bishop refers to this work,²³⁰ he calls it "the first of the books on the Law" (ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν εἰς τὸν νόμον),²³¹ thus indicating that he considers it as the first book of the Allegorical Interpretation. Some scholars have claimed that Philo himself was at the origin of this classification,²³² yet others prefer to associate this work with the Exposition of the Law rather than with the Interpretation.²³³

Philo's *Hypothetica* is also problematic.²³⁴ In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius includes a work entitled ὁ Περὶ Ἰουδαίων αὐτῷ συνταχθεὶς λόγος, also named Περὶ Ἰουδαίων (= *De Judaeis*)²³⁵ as a μονόβιβλον into his catalogue. In the *Praeparatio*, he also cites a work by Philo entitled *Hypothetica*, which, he implies, contained more than one book.²³⁶ In addition, in the same work, he quotes from a Ὑπερ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία,²³⁷ also named *Pro Judaeis apologia*. If one accepts that Philo's *De Judaeis* cannot be identified as the *Hypothetica* because they did not have the same number of books,²³⁸ then the *Apologia* is

²²⁹ As is indicated by John Damascenus' *Sacra parallela*: See Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, p. 834.

²³⁰ *PE* VIII. 12. 22.

²³¹ Philo's works are now designated under their Latin names. On the origin of these Latin titles, see M. Alexandre, "Du grec au latin: les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie", in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, pp. 255–286.

²³² See Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, pp. 844–846 and V. Nikiprowetzky, *Le commentaire de l'Écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie*. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 11. Leiden: Brill, 1977, pp. 199–200.

²³³ Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, p. 832 and 844–845 and Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 173.

²³⁴ On this work, see G. B. Motzo, *Ricerche sulla letteratura e la storia giudaico-ellenistica*, Roma: Centro Editoriale Internazionale, 1977, pp. 581–598.

²³⁵ *HE* II. 18. 6.

²³⁶ *PE* VIII. 5. 11 where Eusebius claims to cite "the first book", which he would not say if there were only one.

²³⁷ *PE* VIII. 10. 19.

²³⁸ Yet there are two possible explanations for this difference: a) Eusebius purchased the other volume(s) of the *De Judaeis* after finishing the *HE* and before starting the *PE* (as suggested by Sterling, "Philo and the Logic of Apologetics: An Analysis of the *Hypothetica*", *SBL seminar papers* 29, 1990, p. 414), b) Eusebius knew there was more than one book in the *Hypothetica*, but while compiling his catalogue,

either the *De Judaëis* or the *Hypothetica*, but the *Hypothetica* are not the *De Judaëis*. This intricate problem has not yet been solved. I am inclined to think, however, that the *Hypothetica* and the *Apologia* are one and the same.

Indeed, at *Praeparatio* VIII. 5. 11, when Eusebius introduces the citation from the *Hypothetica*, he presents this work as “the *Hypothetica*, where, defending the Jews against their accusers, he [Philo] says” (Ὑποθετικῶν, ἔνθα τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων, ὡς πρὸς κατηγοροὺς αὐτῶν, ποιούμενος λόγον ταῦτα φησιν). Further on, when he resumes his citations from Philo at VIII. 10. 19, Eusebius announces an excerpt from the *Apologia*, which he designates as the Ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία. Given the similarity of these terms to those used at VIII. 5. 11, it seems logical to identify the *Hypothetica* with the *Apologia*. It should be remembered that in antiquity, the titles of literary works were not as stable as they are today.²³⁹ Similarly, one may even imagine that *De Judaëis* is an alternative title for the same work.²⁴⁰ The fact that Pseudo-Aristeas’ and Aristobulus’ works bear different titles at different places may support this hypothesis.²⁴¹ However, some scholars are sceptical about identifying Philo’s *Hypothetica* with the *Apologia*. They argue that the difference of tone and subject between the excerpts of each work cited by Eusebius makes it unlikely.²⁴² Yet given that these are only excerpts, it is difficult to judge how far they could have been from each other. Moreover, it is rather odd to assume that a single work cannot have different subjects and use different tones.

Philo’s *Legatio ad Gaium* is an even more intricate and debated

mentioned by mistake the only book he had (cf. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 169, n. 70).

²³⁹ On this subject, see J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, and S. Deléani, *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*.

²⁴⁰ Provided that one accepts that Eusebius made a mistake in describing *De Judaëis* as a *monobiblos*, cf. note 238.

²⁴¹ *PE* VIII. 2. heading: Περὶ τῆς ἑρμηνείας τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις γραφῶν; *PE* IX. 38. 1 Περὶ τῆς ἑρμηνείας τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις νόμου. The titles given by Eusebius to Aristobulus’ work vary even more. This indicates the instability of titles at that time: *Chron.* p. 139 Helm: *Explanationum in Moysen commentarios*; *PE* VII. 13. 7: τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων . . . ἑρμηνείαν; *PE* XIII. 12. heading: ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου Βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ προσπεφωνημένων; *HE* VII. 32. 16 where Eusebius cites Anatolius: βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωυσέως νόμου.

²⁴² L. Troiani, “Osservazioni sopra l’apologia di Filone: gli Hypothetica”, *Athenaeum* 56, 1978, p. 308, n. 11; Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 170 according to whom *De Judaëis* and *Apologia* are identical.

case.²⁴³ In his *Demonstratio*,²⁴⁴ the bishop ascribes to Philo a passage for which he provides no reference and which could belong to the *Legatio ad Gaium*. He connects it to Josephus' narrative on the standards introduced by Pilate into the Temple. There are, however, important differences²⁴⁵ between this citation and the only episode of the *Legatio* as it has reached us and to which it could be associated. Moreover, Josephus' narrative also differs from the episode as narrated by Philo in 'our' *Legatio*. This raises the questions a) whether we are dealing with one single historical event or not; b) whether Eusebius possessed a passage we no longer have. Some scholars have chosen the second possibility. Therefore, either Eusebius would have known 'our' *Legatio* in a different form, or he had another work by Philo which did not reach us.

According to Schürer, followed by Smallwood,²⁴⁶ Eusebius' references are to a work by Philo that is no longer extant. This passage would have agreed with Josephus' version of the same event. Nevertheless, Smallwood does not exclude the possibility that there was only one single episode. Eusebius would have neglected the variations between Philo's and Josephus' accounts. He would thus have provided an erroneous version of the Philonic passage.²⁴⁷

Following others,²⁴⁸ Colson claimed that Josephus and Philo present two variant versions of a single episode. According to him, Eusebius is likely to have made a mistake in copying Philo's passage. He rejects the possibility that the bishop referred to a passage no longer extant.²⁴⁹

²⁴³ Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, pp. 859–863; F. H. Colson, Philo X, LCL, London: Heinemann – New York: Putnam, 1962, p. XVI–XXVI; E. M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, Leiden: Brill, 1970, pp. 36–43; A. Pelletier, Philon d'Alexandrie. In *Flaccum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 31. Paris: Cerf, 1972, pp. 18–21; C. Kraus Reggiani, "I rapporti tra l'impero romano e il mondo ebraico al tempo di Caligula secondo la "Legatio ad Gaium" di Filone Alessandrino", *ANRW* II. 21. 1, 1984, pp. 555–559; 571–576.

²⁴⁴ *DE* VIII. 2. 403 a.

²⁴⁵ I will examine this question in further detail when I deal with the changes brought by Eusebius to the Jewish citations: See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

²⁴⁶ Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 302; and—, "Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same Events", in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, p. 127.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁸ Dahl and Grätz in the nineteenth century: See the references given by Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 36 ff.

²⁴⁹ Colson, Philo X, LCL, pp. XIX–XX.

If the hypothesis according to which Eusebius refers to a passage now lost proved to be correct, the question remains as to what it was precisely. Several suggestions have been made. I apologize to readers if these reasonings may seem long but I need to deal with them in order to establish that Eusebius is referring to *Legatio* 299 as we have it. Indeed, I will attempt to show that he actually tampered with Philo's account in the *Demonstratio* in order to appropriate it.²⁵⁰ But before doing so, we need to turn first to Eusebius' references to the *Legatio*.

The Christian apologist provides six relevant references to *Legatio*:²⁵¹

- 1) In the *Historia ecclesiastica* (II. 5. 1), he declares that Philo has recounted the Jews' (mis)adventures under Gaius in five books; he seems to summarize the contents of the *Legatio* as it has reached us (he mentions Gaius' craziness, the miseries of the Jews, the failure of Philo's embassy), claiming that the Alexandrian philosopher has written all this "together" (ὁμοῦ).
- 2) At II. 5. 6 of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he gives a literal citation from Josephus. He then claims that Philo wrote a work entitled *Embassy* (πρεσβεία), in which he relates exactly his own role in this embassy. He then recounts that according to Philo, Sejanus wished to exterminate the Jews (in terms that recall *Legatio* 160), Pilate committed a sacrilege against the Temple of Jerusalem, and Gaius harmed the Jews. This is where he gives a literal citation from *Legatio* 346.²⁵²
- 3) After Philo's quotation,²⁵³ Eusebius adds that the philosophers narrated other calamities that happened to the Jews under Gaius, in Alexandria, "in the second book of those which he entitled *On Virtues*" (ἐν δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι ὃν ἐπέγραψεν Περὶ ἀρετῶν).²⁵⁴
- 4) At II. 18. 8 of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius relates that Philo describes the princes' impieties mockingly and ironically in his *On Virtues*.

²⁵⁰ See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

²⁵¹ This brief account is based on the discussion reported by Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 36 ff. and Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, p. 859 ff.

²⁵² *HE* II. 6. 2.

²⁵³ *HE* II. 6. 3.

²⁵⁴ The reading ὃν ἐπέγραψεν given in two manuscripts seems better than the reading ᾧ ἐπέγραψεν of the other manuscripts because it agrees with Eusebius' claim that Gaius' miseries were reported by Philo in a work in five books.

- 5) In the *Chronicle*, the bishop claims that Philo described Sejanus' anti-Jewish actions in the second book of the *Legatio* (*in libro Legationis secundo*).²⁵⁵
- 6) In the same work, the apologist also says that Philo narrated the attack against the Alexandrians in a book entitled *Flaccus* (*in eo libro, qui Flaccus inscribitur*).²⁵⁶

According to Smallwood,²⁵⁷ these passages indicate that Philo's *In Flaccum* and *Legatio* are two different writings;²⁵⁸ Philo would have written a work on the miseries of the Jews under Gaius entitled either *Embassy* or *On Virtues*. 'Our' *Legatio* would make up either a part or all of it. The other main hypotheses are as follows:

Schürer,²⁵⁹ recently followed by Carriker,²⁶⁰ thought that Philo's *In Flaccum* and *Legatio* made up books III and IV respectively of a treatise in five books entitled *On Virtues*.

This hypothesis was rejected by the scholarly community firstly because of the existing distinction between *In Flaccum* and *Legatio*, secondly because the mention of a "second" work at II. 6. 3 of the *Historia ecclesiastica* is discordant with the position as a third book that Schürer ascribes to *In Flaccum*.

Massebieau and Cohn²⁶¹ rejected the suggestion that Philo's *In Flaccum* and *Legatio* are part of the same work. They distinguish on the one hand the *In Flaccum*, which would include the part on Sejanus at its beginning (missing from 'our' *In Flaccum*), and on the other hand, five books entitled either *On Virtues* or *Embassy* which would correspond to 'our' *Legatio*. Both scholars believe in the existence of several other lacunae in this work in addition to the so-called "palinode",

²⁵⁵ *Chron.* p. 176 Helm.

²⁵⁶ *Chron.* p. 177 Helm.

²⁵⁷ Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, pp. 38–39.

²⁵⁸ John Damascenus, Photius, and the manuscripts support this hypothesis (See Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 38 and Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, p. 863).

²⁵⁹ Morris in Schürer, *HJP*, III. 2, pp. 859–862.

²⁶⁰ Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 172. This scholar concludes that there was one work entitled *On Virtues* or *Embassy*, which included *Flaccus*, *Legatio*, the *Palinode* of the *Legatio*, and that Eusebius knew the particular name of each part of this work.

²⁶¹ L. Massebieau, *Le classement des œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: Bibliothèque des Hautes Études (Sciences Religieuses), 1889, pp. 72–78; L. Cohn, *Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos.* Philologus Suppl. Bd. 7. Leipzig, 1899, pp. 421–424.

announced by Philo but no longer extant. Several specialists have accepted this hypothesis.²⁶²

Unlike his predecessors, Colson²⁶³ rejects the suggestion that a work or a part of the *Legatio* dealing with the Jews' miseries under Sejanus was lost to us. According to him, besides the section on Sejanus which opened Philo's *In Flaccum*²⁶⁴ and the "palinode" missing in 'our' *Legatio*, the references to Sejanus and Pilate provided by Eusebius at II. 5. 6–7 of the *Historia ecclesiastica* correspond to that which can be found in 'our' *Legatio*. Colson also rejects the idea that 'our' *Legatio* has lacunae. In his opinion, the *Legatio* is a pamphlet rather than an historical account; accordingly, the presence of sudden transitions (mentioned by those who spoke in favour of the presence of lacunae) is far from unusual. He maintains that 'our' *Legatio* covered the five books mentioned by Eusebius.

Finally, Pelletier²⁶⁵ suggests that the forms of 'our' *In Flaccum* and *Legatio* are the result of late compilations, arranged around the figure of persecutors.

Colson's hypothesis seems to me to be the most satisfactory because there is no reason to suppose that Philo's references to the Jews' miseries under Sejanus and Pilate do not correspond to 'our' *Legatio*. Indeed, the expression τὸ ἔθνος ἀναρπάσαι θέλοντος ("wishing to extirpate the [Jewish] people" = *Legatio* 160) corresponds to Eusebius' formula ἄρδην τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἀπολέσθαι σπουδῇν εἰσαγοχέναι ("displayed his zeal in order to destroy the whole [Jewish] people").²⁶⁶ The terms ἄρδην ἀπολέσθαι used by Eusebius are semantically close to Philo's ἀναρπάσαι, both translating the idea of an upward extirpation. Moreover, Eusebius' σπουδῇν εἰσαγοχέναι seems to correspond to Philo's θέλοντος, even though Eusebius' expression appears stronger.

In addition to these elements, I will later attempt to show that Eusebius had good reason to refrain from faithfully copying the pas-

²⁶² Juster, Goodenough, Reiter and Box. See Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaum*, p. 42.

²⁶³ Colson, Philo X, LCL, pp. XVI–XXVI.

²⁶⁴ The beginning of this work suggests that Philo wrote another treatise or another passage on the persecutions under Sejanus. Cf. *Flacc.* 1.

²⁶⁵ A. Pelletier, *Philon d'Alexandrie. Legatio ad Gaum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 32. 1972, Paris: Cerf, p. 21.

²⁶⁶ *HE* II. 5. 7.

sage from the *Legatio* dealing with Pilate's sacrilege²⁶⁷ and to omit any clear reference to it. Therefore, I would follow Colson's suggestion that the text of the *Legatio* used by Eusebius corresponds roughly to ours.

Finally, going back to the general problem of Eusebius' references to the Jewish works, it is worth pointing out that two books of Josephus usually labelled as *Contra Apionem* were in fact called by Origen and Eusebius *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος* (*On the Antiquity of the Jews*).²⁶⁸ Yet Porphyry has *πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας* as a title for this work.²⁶⁹ The *Jewish Antiquities* are called *Ἀρχαιολογία* by all of them.

B. *Exact References to the Jewish Authors' Texts*

In general, Eusebius provides fairly precise references to the Jewish authors' writings which he cites: He gives the author's name and the title and the number of the book if the work has more than one. These 'lemmas' are generally given before the citation, but they may also follow the citation.²⁷⁰

In books VII and VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius provides precise references to the Jewish authors' works: At VII. 13. 3, he says that he excerpted Philo's passage from "the first book of the *Quaestiones et Solutiones*" (τοῦ πρώτου . . . τῶν Φίλωνος Ζητημάτων καὶ Λύσεων); at VII. 13. 3, he also mentions Philo's *De agricultura* (ἐν τῷ Περὶ γεωργίας), and later, at VII. 13. 4, he mentions the second book of this treatise (ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ). When he cites this work again at VII. 17. 4, he merely says that Philo's interpretation "adds to that which has already been cited from him" (ταῖς ἐκτεθείσαις αὐτοῦ φωναῖς ἔτι καὶ τάδε), which constitutes a reference in itself. At VII. 20. 9, he announces a citation from Philo's *De providentia* (ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς προνοίας).

The same precision is found in book VIII: At VIII. 1. 8, Eusebius announces a citation from Pseudo-Aristeas (γράφει δὲ ταῦτα Ἀρισταίος), giving the title of the treatise in the heading: *Περὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν*

²⁶⁷ See below "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

²⁶⁸ Origen, *CC* I. 16; *HE* III. 9. 4; *PE* VIII. 7. 21; IX. 42. 1; X. 6. 15; X. 13. heading.

²⁶⁹ Porphyry, *De abst.* IV. 11.

²⁷⁰ Cf. *PE* VII. 13. 3; XI. 15. 7.

παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις γραφῶν, which title seems to have varied. Indeed, on another occasion, the bishop entitles this work *Περὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμου*.²⁷¹ He does not mention it at VIII. 9, probably because he already presented it at the beginning of the book. At VIII. 5. 11, Eusebius provides a complete lemma to introduce a quotation from the *Hypothetica* (ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος ὃν ἐπέγραψε ὑποθετικῶν); at VIII. 7. 21, he also refers to the second book of Josephus' *Contra Apionem* (δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι ὃν πεποιήται *Περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος*). At VIII. 10. 19, Eusebius mentions the *Apology for the Jews* (ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογίας) and at VIII. 11. 19 Philo's *Quod omnis probus liber sit* (*Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι*); further on, at VIII. 12. 22, he cites Philo's first book *On the Law* (τοῦ πρώτου τῶν *Εἰς τὸν νόμον*), which corresponds to the *De opificio*. Finally, at VIII. 13. 7, Eusebius introduces a citation from Philo's *De providentia* (*Περὶ προνοίας*).

Other precise lemmas occur in other parts of the *Apodeixis*: At *Praeparatio* IX. 10. 7, IX. 20. 2, and IX. 40 (in the chapter heading), Eusebius mentions the first book of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας). Although he cites this work on other occasions in book IX, he does not give the number of the book from which the excerpts from the *Jewish Antiquities* are drawn, even when the title is given several times.²⁷²

However, in book X of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius precisely locates two passages from Josephus: Firstly, at X. 6. 15, even if he omits the number of the book of the *Contra Apionem* from which the quotation comes, he takes pains to mention that this work has two books; secondly, at X. 13 (heading), he gives the complete lemma of the citation. Likewise, at XI. 15. 7, he (mistakenly) ascribes a quotation from Philo to the *Quod deterius* (*Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι*). At XIII. 12 (heading), Eusebius says his quotation from Aristobulus has been excerpted from the philosopher's studies addressed to King Ptolemy (ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ προσπεφωνημένων).

In most cases of the *Praeparatio*, then, Eusebius is fairly precise in his references to the Jewish writings he cites. Only two citations from Philo (XI. 24. 1–12 and XIII. 12) are given without any lemma, yet

²⁷¹ *PE* IX. 38. 1.

²⁷² *PE* IX. 15. heading; IX. 13. heading; IX. 11. heading.

this does not keep him from citing the philosopher's text faithfully in book XIII.²⁷³

In book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, more than in any other book in which Jewish writers are cited, Eusebius takes pains to summarize the content of the quotation. At times he even gives details on the work itself or on the author of the quotation: At VIII. 5.11, e.g., where he announces a quotation from the *Hypothetica*, the bishop informs readers that the passage deals with the Jews' departure from Egypt, in which Philo "speaks in favour of the Jews against their accusers" (ἐνθα τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ὡς πρὸς κατηγοροὺς αὐτῶν). Likewise, at VIII. 13. 7, Eusebius presents Philo's *De providentia* saying that the philosopher defends the idea of a divine providence ruling the universe, adding information about the structure of the citation: Firstly, Philo gives the atheists' objections, then he answers them in succession. Finally, at VIII. 8. 56 and VIII. 9. 38, Eusebius thinks it necessary to provide readers with chronological and biographical elements concerning Aristobulus and Eleazar, the high priest of Pseudo-Aristeas' *Letter*.

In book X of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius also summarizes the content of a quotation from Josephus before giving it; after mentioning the title of Josephus' work (*On the Antiquity of the Jews*), he presents the main points on which he intends to draw his reader's attention: Josephus, he says, demonstrates that the Greeks are a recent people, who were dependent upon the barbarians, and who contradicted each other in their writings.²⁷⁴

C. *Vague or Erroneous References to the Jewish Authors' Citations*

In contrast to the *Praeparatio*, the *Demonstratio* gives less precise references. Out of eight citations (seven from Josephus and one from Philo), Eusebius only provides three precise references, of which one is erroneous. The two correct references are to book XVIII of Josephus' *Antiquities*,²⁷⁵ unsurprisingly, these passages deal with Jesus (famously entitled *Testimonium Flavianum*) and John the Baptist. Book XVIII of Josephus' *Antiquities* undeniably played a prominent role in Christian historiography as conceived by Eusebius. Indeed, it enables

²⁷³ *PE* XIII. 18. 12.

²⁷⁴ *PE* X. 6. 15.

²⁷⁵ *DE* III. 5. 124b and IX. 5. 431a.

him to confirm the New Testament narrative with an extra-biblical testimony. Even Origen, who rarely gives any bibliographical reference, mentions book XVIII in his *Contra Celsum*²⁷⁶ when dealing with John the Baptist. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Eusebius takes pains to give a precise lemma only for those citations related to Jesus and John. His attitude regarding these passages contrasts with his careless attitude regarding the other citations in the *Demonstratio*. Overall, he proves to be rather careless in the *Demonstratio* by comparison with his carefulness in the *Praeparatio*. His lack of precision in the *Demonstratio* is all the more striking since, when he uses the same excerpts in the *Historia ecclesiastica* or in the *Eclogae propheticae*, he offers precise references.²⁷⁷

It is also worth noting that Eusebius gives three erroneous references in the *Apodeixis*: Firstly, in the table of contents of book IX of the *Praeparatio*, chapter 42, he claims to cite the first book of Josephus' Ἀρχαιολογία (= *Jewish Antiquities*) when he is in fact citing a passage from the Ἀρχαιοτής (= *Contra Apionem*), which mistake does not occur in the chapter heading. Secondly, at XI. 15. 7 of the *Praeparatio*, he announces a citation from Philo's *Quod deterius* which is in fact drawn from the latter's *De confusione*. Thirdly, in the *Demonstratio* (VIII. 2. 397d), he refers to book XVIII of Josephus' *Antiquities* when he is actually citing book XX. The confusion may be due to the fact that this passage is followed by a citation from book XVIII; the mistake might otherwise be ascribed to his use of a florilegium.²⁷⁸

D. Examples of Cross-References

Eusebius sometimes also refers to passages within the *Apodeixis*. At XI. 15. 7 of the *Praeparatio*, after citing Philo on the second cause, he sends those of his readers who are fond of knowledge (φιλομαθεῖς) back to book VII of the *Praeparatio*:

²⁷⁶ CC I. 47.

²⁷⁷ E.g., at HE I. 10. 4 (pointing back to the exact reference given at I. 9. 2) = DE VIII. 2. 399a, or Ecl. proph. 160. 22–24 = DE VIII. 2. 398b. Yet Eusebius provides the reference to Bῆ VI. 299 = DE VIII. 2. 402d in HE III. 8, but neither in Chron. p. 175 Helm nor in the Ecl. proph. 164. 2.

²⁷⁸ See above "Citations of Jewish Authors Derived from Collections". Eusebius may have filed a passage from book XX under a section 'Antiquities book XVIII', or he may have jumped from one section to another without realizing it.

Ἡδὴ δέ μοι καὶ ἄλλοτε τὰ τῆς τῶν παλαιῶν Ἑβραίων εὐσεβείας δόγματα παρατιθεμένῳ ἐν τοῖς τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Προπαρασκευῆς καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου αἰτίου διείληπται αὐταρκῶς, ἐφ' ἃ καὶ νῦν τοὺς φλομαθεῖς ἀναπέμνω.

Since I have already cited the doctrines of piety of the ancient Hebrews somewhere else in the *Preparation for the Gospel*, those which deal with the second cause have been sufficiently developed; I will now send the lovers of knowledge back to them.²⁷⁹

This passage may help us understand the manner in which readers were supposed to find their way in the immensity of the *Praeparatio*. The bishop does not provide the number of the book/chapter to which he refers; he is content with mentioning “the doctrines of piety of the ancient Hebrews” (τῆς τῶν παλαιῶν Ἑβραίων εὐσεβείας δόγματα), and more precisely, those which deal with the “second cause” (τοῦ δευτέρου αἰτίου). This might well serve as a reference because the table of contents of book VII (which, as we have seen, was designed by Eusebius himself) contains a section ι “on the doctrinal theories of the Hebrews” (περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις δογματικῶν θεωρημάτων); this section includes a sub-section on the second cause. Indeed, sub-section ιδ' “on the theology of the second cause” (περὶ τῆς τοῦ δευτέρου αἰτίου θεολογίας) is easy to find.

Eusebius occasionally sends his readers to the Jewish writings themselves. At IX. 42. 4 of the *Praeparatio*, he sends the same φλομαθεῖς back to Josephus' *Contra Apionem*.

In conclusion, I would argue that the Jewish authors come across as privileged witnesses in the *Praeparatio*. Eusebius read their works carefully and referred to them in a precise way, as he often does with other authors in the *Praeparatio*. As Goulet has shown for Diogenes Laertius' citations,²⁸⁰ this method enables Eusebius to reinforce the authority of the citations. By contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, he is clearly less careful in referring to the Jewish works. This may be due to his greater concern with biblical testimonies.

²⁷⁹ My translation.

²⁸⁰ Goulet, “Les références chez Diogène Laërce: sources ou autorités?”, p. 51.

7. FAITHFULNESS TO THE TEXT OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS

In this study I wish neither to restrict my work to a philological analysis of Eusebius' faithfulness in his citations nor to condemn him for tampering with the text of the quotations. However, it is necessary to examine whether and where he might have modified the text he cites because this will help us better understand his methodology in appropriating the Jewish authors' texts. As I have already emphasized, there is no point in judging Eusebius in terms of intellectual honesty. Such a concept is anachronistic and does not apply to antiquity. I will rather attempt to show that he may occasionally have made changes by either adding something or omitting words in order either to adapt the content of the citations to his readers or to support his own apologetic and polemical undertaking. In sum, my analysis will consider the textual changes made by Eusebius as a creative means to integrate the citations into his own reasoning.

The Jewish authors almost provide the only extra-biblical material cited in the *Demonstratio*,²⁸¹ and this is especially true of Josephus. It appears at once that the Jewish citations are treated differently in the *Praeparatio* and in the *Demonstratio*. Whereas the *Praeparatio* only gives citations in *oratio recta*, the *Demonstratio* gives two paraphrases in *oratio obliqua* out of six passages. The use of *oratio obliqua* in the *Demonstratio* can be explained by comparing it with the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Indeed, the context in which the Jewish citations are used in the *Demonstratio* is more similar to that of the *Historia ecclesiastica* than that of the *Praeparatio*. In most cases, when Jewish testimonies are used in the *Demonstratio*, they are used as historical testimonies to demonstrate the fall from grace of Judaism and to illustrate their agreement with the New Testament. For this reason, several Jewish citations in the *Demonstratio* are also found in a similar context in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Now in this work, Eusebius uses both *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*. Therefore, in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius seems to follow the method of the *Historia ecclesiastica* rather than that of the *Praeparatio*.

In addition to citing, Eusebius also borrows historical information from Josephus and contents himself with mentioning his name,²⁸² which never happens in the *Praeparatio*.

²⁸¹ Yet there are quotations from Porphyry and Apollonius of Tyana at *DE* III. 3. 105a-d; III. 7. 134a-d; and of Julius Africanus at *DE* VIII. 2. 389b-391a.

²⁸² *DE* VIII. 2. 394a referring to *AJ* XX. 238-244 and XVIII. 301; *DE* IX. 3.

Moreover, whereas in the *Praeparatio* Eusebius claims to cite faithfully the Jewish authors on five occasions (πρὸς λέξιιν;²⁸³ αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι),²⁸⁴ in the *Demonstratio*, he never makes such a claim, and rightly so. If one compares Josephus' citations in the *Demonstratio* with the same ones in the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Eclogae prophetae*, one notices that the citations are systematically more faithful in the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Eclogae*. Eusebius seems to be aware of that: When he gives an exact citation²⁸⁵ in both writings, he almost always claims to cite literally.²⁸⁶ In general, the *Eclogae* offer the most faithful citations and the most precise references. By contrast, in the *Historia ecclesiastica* the bishop occasionally contents himself with summarizing or paraphrasing the passages without giving a precise reference to them.²⁸⁷

A. *Status Quaestionis*

It is well known that Eusebius generally enjoys an excellent reputation among the moderns in terms of faithfulness to the quoted text, despite the changes in his quotations from Plato.²⁸⁸ Henry has compared Philo's citations in the *Praeparatio* with the text of the manuscripts. He enthusiastically concludes that Eusebius is remarkably faithful to the source text.²⁸⁹ Likewise, Schreckenberg and Hardwick

424c referring to *AJ* I. 124; *DE* X. 1. 470b on Josephus' account of the miseries of the Jews (*BJ* passim).

²⁸³ *PE* VII. 13. 4–6 where Eusebius cites Philo, *Plant.* 8–10; *PE* VIII. 1. 8, where he cites the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas 9–11 ff.; *PE* X. 6. 15 where he cites Josephus, *CA* I. 6–26; *PE* XIII. 18. 12 where he cites Philo, *Spec.* I. 13–17; 20.

²⁸⁴ *PE* XI. 23. 12 where he cites Philo, *Opif.* 24–27 ff.

²⁸⁵ By “exact” or “literal” citations, I mean citations that do not present any major difference by comparison with the original text, and I deliberately ignore slight adaptations the quoting author may have made in order to adjust the citation grammatically to his own speech; e.g., Eusebius copies Οὐαλέριος Γράτος . . . παύσας . . . (*DE* VIII. 2. 399a) instead of . . . Οὐαλέριος Γράτος·ὃς παύσας . . . (*AJ* XVIII. 34) because he starts quoting Josephus in the middle of Josephus' sentence; I consider such cases to be minor corrections which need not be treated in this analysis.

²⁸⁶ See *Ecl. proph.* 160. 5 where Eusebius twice claims to cite Josephus κατὰ λέξιν; *HE* I. 11. 4, where he says he cites him συλλαβαῖς αὐταῖς. Cf. *DE* VIII. 2. 397d; 402d; 431a.

²⁸⁷ *HE* I. 6. 9–11; cf. *DE* VIII. 2. 397d–398b = *AJ* XX. 247–249 and *DE* VIII. 2. 398b = *AJ* XVIII. 92–93.

²⁸⁸ See Chapter III, section “Eusebius' Faithfulness to the Cited Text in the *Apodeixis*”, subsection “Citations of Pagan Authors”.

²⁸⁹ P. Henry, *Recherches sur la “Préparation évangélique” d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius*, pp. 11–26.

claim that Eusebius cites Josephus rather faithfully.²⁹⁰ Freudenthal, followed among others by Sterling,²⁹¹ argues that Eusebius was trustworthy in his citations and that he would not make significant changes that would alter the meaning of the text cited.²⁹² A long time ago, Freudenthal also showed that the bishop was more careful than Clement in quoting Alexander Polyhistor when the latter himself cites the minor Jewish authors in book IX of the *Praeparatio*: A comparison between the citations made by the two Christian authors reveals, e.g., that Clement shortened Artapanus' passage on Moses, whereas Eusebius seems to cite it rather faithfully.²⁹³ Likewise, Coman has demonstrated that Eusebius is more faithful than Clement in quoting Aristobulus.²⁹⁴ Pelletier's comparison between Pseudo-Aristeas' *Letter* as it was transmitted to us through manuscripts and quotations from it in the *Praeparatio* is also relevant, as it tends to show Eusebius' relative faithfulness to the text.²⁹⁵

Consequently, many modern editors have used the text of his manuscripts to correct the readings of those of some Jewish authors. Such is the case, e.g., with Josephus' *Contra Apionem* whose main manuscript, the eleventh-century *Laurentianus* (*L*), is "un manuscrit très fautif, rempli de coquilles, de bourdes, d'omissions de toute sorte".²⁹⁶ Given the poor quality of the Latin translation, preference is generally given to Eusebius' readings, despite the fact that his text is also already corrupt.²⁹⁷

The same occurs with some readings of Philo's text: Cohn and Reiter, e.g., claim that Eusebius' manuscripts of Philo's *Quod omnis probus liber sit* reflect the text of better yet no longer extant *codices*.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁰ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 69 claims that Eusebius is "generally faithful to his source, paraphrasing only seldom"; Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*, p. 85 claims: "Eusebius zitiert Josephus im allgemeinen wörtlich oder fast wörtlich".

²⁹¹ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 142.

²⁹² Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, pp. 3–16 and especially 9 and 11.

²⁹³ See Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, p. 13 and Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 169, n. 182; see also Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes d'ancien Testament*, p. 243.

²⁹⁴ Coman, *Utilisation des Stromates de Clément par Eusèbe*, p. 123.

²⁹⁵ Pelletier, *La lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89, pp. 22–41.

²⁹⁶ Th. Reinach and L. Blum, *Flavius Josèphe. Contre Apion*. Texte établi et annoté par Th. R. et traduit par L. B., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1930, p. viiii.

²⁹⁷ Reinach and Blum, *Flavius Josèphe. Contre Apion*, p. xi.

²⁹⁸ Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, VI, Berlin, 1915, pp. II–III: "Eusebii

The tradition followed by Eusebius is indeed much more ancient than the medieval manuscripts of Philo. Thus, when Eusebius' text agrees with either the Armenian version or the Latin version, or both, editors follow Eusebius rather than Philo's manuscripts. Likewise, according to Pelletier, the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas can very often be corrected thanks to Eusebius' tradition.²⁹⁹

The trust granted to Eusebius' manuscripts remains surprising since, in the case of the books of the *Praeparatio* that include Jewish citations, modern editors only have manuscripts of the second class, the most ancient of which (B) dates back to the thirteenth century. It is often considered inaccurate and replete with lacunae.³⁰⁰

However, Harl has rightly pointed out that, even though the text of patristic citations of non-extant works is often better than that of direct transmission, one should not assume that Church Fathers did not tamper with the text. One should refrain from systematically adopting their text without justification, which Cohn and Wendland occasionally did.³⁰¹ Therefore, one should not systematically accept their readings. Indeed, although most scholars trust Eusebius' citations, a close look also reveals that his manuscripts sometimes give unfaithful readings, either by changing or adding words. Wendland, in his *Prolegomena*, asserts that the Eusebian text of the *De agricultura*, *De plantatione* and *De confusione linguarum*, quoted in books XI and VII of the *Praeparatio*, sometimes present corruptions of their own.³⁰² As for Philo's *De opificio mundi*, Cohn adds that Eusebius sometimes displays a deliberately corrupted Philonic text or a text copied carelessly.³⁰³ Unfortunately, though Cohn and Wendland recognize the possibility that Eusebius' text might have been altered intentionally, they never fully explain such cases.

In addition, Pelletier, in his edition of Pseudo-Aristeas' *Letter to Philocrates*, has also shown that Eusebius' quotation of the *Letter* often revealed his Christian identity. At VIII. 9. 27 of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., Eusebius adds the words καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων καὶ οἰκήσεων διὰ τὸ

textus ad codicum meliorum (inprimis codicis M) memoriam proxime accedit, ut non paulum valeat ad eam confirmandam".

²⁹⁹ Pelletier, *La lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89, p. 23.

³⁰⁰ On this subject, see Mras, *Eusebius Werke* VIII. 1. GCS, pp. XIII–LI.

³⁰¹ M. Harl, *Philon d'Alexandrie, Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 15. Paris: Cerf, 1966, pp. 158–159.

³⁰² Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, I, pp. X–XI.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*

σκεπάζεσθαι (“and to the cities and houses for protection”) to Pseudo-Aristeas’ allegorical explanation of the Law about the λογία (i.e., the *mezuzot*) placed on the doors and gates of the Jews (ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν καὶ θυρῶν). By extending the use of *mezuzot* to cities and houses, Eusebius adapts the text to the Christian *realia* of his own time. According to Pelletier, “on dirait d’un byzantin parlant de la croix, signe protecteur des cités et des demeures chrétiennes”.³⁰⁴ Although Pelletier’s interpretation may be mistaken, the addition made by Eusebius is worth noting. Pelletier also claims that “d’une façon générale, à comparer le texte d’Aristée avec la citation qu’en fait Eusèbe, on sent d’une part un Juif alexandrin qui écrit dans la langue de son temps, d’autre part un homme d’Église soucieux de monnayer ce document à l’usage du public païen”.³⁰⁵

One must thus be cautious in dealing with Eusebius’ faithfulness to the Jewish texts. Indeed, he occasionally seems to have felt free to modify these texts, though slightly.

B. *Examples of Textual Changes in the Historia ecclesiastica*

Before looking into those cases which could raise doubts as to Eusebius’ accuracy in citing, let us bear in mind that in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he sometimes felt free to modify the text he cited,³⁰⁶ or to change its meaning through other means.

Hardwick³⁰⁷ reminds us that in *Historia ecclesiastica* II. 10. 6, the bishop changed Josephus’ narrative of Agrippa’s death³⁰⁸ in order to adapt it to Luke-Acts (12:19–23): Whereas Josephus claims that a rope (τὸν βουβῶνα) announced Agrippa’s death, Eusebius turned it into an angel (ἄγγελον), as told in *Acts*. It is worth noting that this change occurs in a passage which he claims to cite word for word (αὐτοῖς γράμμασι), which is presented in *oratio recta*, and which is referred to in a precise way.

Likewise, we have seen that in a passage ascribed to Josephus which does not occur in our Josephan corpus, the death of James the Just

³⁰⁴ Pelletier, *La lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89, pp. 35–36.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

³⁰⁶ Josephus’ citations have been studied by E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke* II. 3, *Die Kirchengeschichte*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999, pp. cliii–clxxxvii.

³⁰⁷ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 122.

³⁰⁸ *AJ* XIX. 343–351.

is said to have triggered the siege of Jerusalem.³⁰⁹ Hardwick suggests that there once was a corpus of traditions related to James that was used by Origen, Hegesippus and Eusebius.³¹⁰ Others believe that Eusebius has turned the passage on James in Origen in *oratio recta* into an *oratio obliqua*,³¹¹ a convincing hypothesis considering both Origen's influence on Eusebius as well as the linguistic similarities of both passages.

In addition, Mason mentions two other cases in which Eusebius misinterpreted Josephus' words:³¹² Firstly, the bishop ascribes to Josephus the claim that the Jews' miseries started at the time of Pilate and the crime against Christ (*HE* II. 6. 3); secondly, he seems to situate the fall of Jerusalem at Easter, on the day of Jesus' crucifixion (*HE* III. 5. 6), which is incorrect. These examples indicate that Eusebius may occasionally have modified the text of the Jewish authors according to his apologetic purposes. There are other examples of distortions of the cited text in the *Apodeixis*. However, the changes in this work not only concern historical episodes, but also philosophical and theological issues (the distinction between the two does not really apply to antiquity). There follow some significant examples.

C. *Textual Changes in the Praeparatio*

PE VII. 13. 1–2 = Philo, Quaestiones in Genesim II. 62

At VII. 13. 1–2, Eusebius quotes a passage from Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesim* (II. 62). Our only other Greek witness for this passage is an Armenian translation of this text, made in the fifth or sixth century in Constantinople.³¹³ Eusebius' quotation contains the expression "second god" (δεύτερος θεός), as does the Armenian translation:

³⁰⁹ *HE* II. 23. 20.

³¹⁰ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, pp. 84; 122.

³¹¹ H. Chadwick, Origen. *Contra Celsum*, p. 43, n. 2; Grant, "Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews", p. 105; Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992, p. 16; Z. Baras, "The *Testimonium Flavianum* and the Martyrdom of James", in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 338–348; K. A. Olson, "Eusebius and the *Testimonium Flavianum*", *CBQ* 61, 1999, pp. 318–319 also accepts this hypothesis.

³¹² S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, pp. 16–17.

³¹³ Ch. Mercier, Philon d'Alexandrie. *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*. Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34^A, pp. 26–27.

θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πατέρα τῶν ὅλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεόν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου λόγος.

For nothing mortal could be represented in the image of the highest god and father of the universe but in the image of the second god, who is his *Logos*.

Eusebius' manuscripts B and G read θεόν after δεύτερον and manuscript O might also yield this reading although a small hole prevents us from being sure about this.³¹⁴ This formula has made some scholars suspicious because it is closer to Eusebius' own subordinationist credo than to Philo's philosophy. Since the same expression only occurs in the same work by Philo at II. 86 of the Armenian version, some commentators have identified them as Christian interpolations.³¹⁵ This hypothesis, though speculative, seems to be well founded. Indeed, the "second god" frequently appears in Eusebius' theology.³¹⁶ Its absence in Philo's other treatises suggests that in this case Eusebius also intervened in the text. The only other passage which comes close to the *Quaestiones in Genesim* comes from the *Legum Allegoriae*. In this text, God is defined as "the first" (ὁ πρῶτος), but the λόγος is not labelled δεύτερος: "for this must be God [the λόγος] for us the imperfect folk, but as for the wise and perfect, the first is their (god)" (οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἂν εἴη θεός, τῶν δὲ σοφῶν καὶ τελείων ὁ πρῶτος).³¹⁷ Therefore, as in the case of the *De plantatione*, I would argue that Eusebius did tamper with the text. Yet one should bear in mind that such an attitude was not reprehensible in antiquity. As we have seen, authors felt free to 'correct' that which they considered the truth in the text.³¹⁸

PE VII. 13. 3 = Philo, *De agricultura* 51

A slight difference between the manuscripts of Philo's *De agricultura* and those of Eusebius' *Praeparatio* deserves our attention. Here is the passage in Eusebius:

³¹⁴ Cf. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparatio*, IV, p. 237, under 323a 3.

³¹⁵ E.g., M. Harl, *Philon d'Alexandrie. Quis heres*, p. 159, n. 2.

³¹⁶ On the expression "second God" or other similar formulas, see, e.g., PE VII. 12. heading; PE VII. 12. 11; PE XI. 14–16. heading; DE V. 4. 226c.

³¹⁷ *Leg. all.* III. 208. Translation by Colson, Philo I, LCL.

³¹⁸ See the passage from Porphyry examined in Chapter II of this work (subsection "Faithfulness to the Text Cited") (*De philosophia ex oraculis* I pp. 109–110 Wolff = PE IV. 7. 1), which clearly shows that the meaning of the text (νόμος, νόημα) matters much more than its letter.

Ταῦτα δὴ πάντα ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ βασιλεὺς θεὸς ἄγει κατὰ δίκην, νόμον προστησάμενος τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ὃς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης οἶα τις μεγάλου βασιλέως ὑπαρχος, διαδέξεται.

All these things are led by God their shepherd and king in accordance with right, and He set over them his true *Logos* [who is] his first-born son, and who shall take upon him its government like some minister of the Great king.³¹⁹

Whereas the reading κατὰ δίκην, νόμον in Eusebius was chosen by Cohn and Wendland for their edition of Philo, the manuscripts of Philo's *De agricultura* (51) read κατὰ δίκην καὶ νόμον. Although this change has gone unnoticed, it seems to suggest a reading quite different from that of Philo: Whereas the latter merely claims that God leads the universe "according to justice and law", which is a usual claim in his writings,³²⁰ Eusebius turns the λόγος into the law of the universe, by omitting the καί. Before Eusebius, other Christian authors gave the λόγος a similar role. This is the case with Irenaeus, Clement and Justin.³²¹ Yet it is unsure whether or not the text written by Philo was the same as that given by Eusebius. Indeed, other Philonic passages suggest that the Mosaic law is identical to the λόγος. According to Wolfson, the Alexandrian philosopher took this claim literally.³²² Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the interpretation is different: For Philo, the *Logos* is the (Mosaic) Law, whereas for Eusebius Christ is the Law.

PE VII. 13. 4–6 = *Philo*, *De plantatione* 8–10

In the *Praeparatio*, a textual problem concerning the Jewish authors' quotations lies in a citation from Philo's *De plantatione* given in book VII.³²³ All Philo's manuscripts read νόμος at paragraph 8 of *De plantatione*, whereas those of the *Praeparatio* read λόγος. This occurs on two separate occasions. Cohn and Wendland have followed Eusebius' reading. Before discussing this choice, let us turn to the text itself:

³¹⁹ PE VII. 13. 3. My translation.

³²⁰ Cf. *Opif.* 71; *Cher.* 29; *Post.* 101; *Gig.* 45 and 64; *Immut.* 159; *Agr.* 78; *Migr.* 146; *Congr.* 116; *Somn.* II. 99 ff. and 289; *Spec.* IV. 176; *Legat.* 3 (references borrowed from Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, p. 39, n. 102).

³²¹ *Dial.* XLIII. 1; *Ir., Adv. Haer.* III. 16. 3; III. 10. 15; IV. 34. 4; *Str.* VII. 3. 16.

³²² Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1968, I, p. 190.

³²³ PE VII. 13. 4 = *Plant.* 8–10.

Τὰς δυσωπίας οὖν εἴ τις ἀποδιδράσκειν βούλεται τὰς ἐν τοῖς διαπορηθεῖσι, λεγέτω μετὰ παρηρησίας ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν ὕλαις κραταιὸν οὕτως ὡς τὸν κόσμον ἀχθοφορεῖν ἰσχύσαι. Λόγος δ' ὁ αἰδῖος θεοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου τὸ ὀχυρώτατον καὶ βεβαιότατον ἔρεισμα τῶν ὅλων ἐστίν. Οὗτος ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων ἐπὶ τὰ μέσα ταθεῖς δολιχεύει τὸν φύσεως ἀήττητον δρόμον, συνάγων τὰ μέρη πάντα καὶ σφίγγων· δεσμὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄρρηκτον τοῦ παντὸς ὁ γεννήσας ἐποίει πατήρ. Εἰκότως οὖν οὐδὲ γῆ πᾶσα διαλυθήσεται πρὸς παντὸς ὕδατος, ὅπερ αὐτῆς οἱ κόλποι κεχωρήκασι, οὐδ' ὑπὸ ἀέρος σβεσθήσεται πῦρ οὐδ' ἔμπαλιν ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀήρ ἀναφλεχθήσεται, τοῦ θείου λόγου μεθόριον τάττοντος αὐτὸν φωνῆεν στοιχείων ἀφώνων, ἵνα τὸ ὅλον ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγγράμμου μουσικῆς³²⁴ συνηγήσῃ, τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων ἀπειλὰς πειθοῖ τῇ συνωδῷ μεσιτεύοντός τε καὶ διαιτῶντος.

Let anyone then, who would fain escape the confusion of face, which we all feel when we have to leave problems unsolved, say plainly that no material thing is so strong as to be able to bear the burden of the world; and that the everlasting *Logos* of the eternal God is the very sure and staunch prop of the whole. He it is, who extending Himself from the midst to its utmost bounds and from its extremities to the midst again, keeps up through all its length nature's unvanquished course, combining and compacting all its parts. For the father who begat him constituted him as a bond of the universe that nothing can break. Good reason, then, have we to be sure that all the earth shall not be dissolved by all the water which has gathered within its hollows; nor fire be quenched by air; nor, on the other hand, air be ignited by fire. The divine *Logos* stations himself to keep these elements apart, like a vocal between voiceless elements of speech, that the universe may send forth a harmony like that of a music of letters.³²⁵ He mediates between the opponents amid their threatenings, and reconciles them by winning ways to peace and concord.³²⁶

In 1935, Goodenough chose the reading of the Philonic manuscripts:³²⁷ According to him, the word νόμος (when designating the law of God and nature) is certainly interchangeable with λόγος and there are numerous occurrences in the Philonic corpus where λόγος is used where νόμος would be expected. Contrary to Cohn and Wendland, he thus favours the reading νόμος. Λόγος would be, according to him, a Christian interpolation. His hypothesis was shared by Daniélou.³²⁸

³²⁴ Philo's mss. read ἐγγραμμάτων μουσικῆς.

³²⁵ Cf. Porphyry, *Abst.* III. 3. 4.

³²⁶ Translation by Colson, LCL Philo III, modified according to Eusebius' text.

³²⁷ E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968, pp. 56–57.

³²⁸ J. Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, Tournai: Desclée/Cerf, 1958, pp. 216–219.

Yet thirty years later, Barthélémy opposed this hypothesis, grounding his argument on a careful enquiry presented at the 1966 Philonic colloquium. He sought to show (among other things) that in some of Philo's manuscripts (especially U and F), a) some LXX citations had been changed in order to bring them nearer to Aquila's translation; b) the word λόγος had been replaced by the term νόμος, notably in the passage I am dealing with; c) the expression "as Moses said" had been replaced by others such as "as holy Scripture says"; d) on one occasion (*Agric.* 51), a reference to the λόγος as "first-born son" was replaced by "the archangel whose name it is not necessary to mention".³²⁹ He deduced from this that these emendations had been made by a Jewish revisor who would have sneaked into the *scriptorium* of Caesarea in Origen's day.³³⁰ The latter's contacts with the rabbinic world are, indeed, well known.³³¹ Regarding the passage in question, Barthélémy makes a relevant comparison between the content of the passage and the praise of the Torah at the beginning of *Midrash Tanhuma*, which would confirm a Jewish interest in Philo in rabbinic circles. Contrary to what Barthélémy claims, however, nothing proves that the Philonic λόγος influenced the writer of the *Midrash Tanhuma* in the passage on Torah: It rather seems to suggest that Philo's original text contained the term νόμος, which was used as such by the Jewish writers/compiler of the *Midrash Tanhuma*, that is if any direct influence occurred. Moreover, the historical scenario suggested by Barthélémy is rather dubious: One can hardly imagine how a Jew could possibly have had the opportunity to tamper with the text of the library of Caesarea. Actually, the only tangible evidence lies in the Philonic manuscripts, which all read νόμος, whereas the Eusebian ones read λόγος. Yet too much weight cannot be put on this argument. Indeed, in other passages, Philo ascribes to the term λόγος the ability to unify the *cosmos*, as is the

³²⁹ Barthélémy, "Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le Commentaire allégorique?", pp. 45–80.

³³⁰ K. Hainse-Eitzen, *Guardian of Letters, Literacy, Power and the Transmitter of Early Christian Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 has recently shown that there could not have been such a thing as a *scriptorium* (*stricto sensu*) in Caesarea at the time of Origen. This invalidates, in part, Barthélémy's historical reconstruction.

³³¹ Cf. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*. That being said, De Lange's conclusions on the close contacts between Origen and the rabbis have been called into question by, e.g., J. Mc Guckin, "Origen on the Jews", in E. Ferguson (Ed.), *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks, and Romans*, New York – London: Garland, 1999, pp. 23–35.

case with our passage. Indeed, the idea that the λόγος is the δεσμός of the universe also occurs in Philo's *De fuga et inventione* and *Quis heres*.³³² Runia claims that in most Philonic texts, the divine activity consisting in binding (cf. the word δεσμός in *De plantatione* 9) is attributed to the λόγος or to the divine powers.³³³ In addition, although this argument has not been brought into the discussion, Clement of Alexandria had also exploited (although implicitly) this Philonic passage in order to describe "the song of the λόγος" in his *Protrepticus*.³³⁴ Therefore, the text read by Clement seems to have contained the reading λόγος. Consequently, it seems likely that Philo's original text read λόγος. Likewise, it seems more logical to argue that Eusebius turned to this text because it dealt with the λόγος, rather than in order to modify its terms. The question as to whether Barthélémy's explanation for the presence of the term νόμος in Philo's manuscripts is correct is a matter of debate. One should bear in mind that both words, λόγος and νόμος, are graphically and phonetically close, and as a consequence, they may be easily confused.

PE VIII. 13. 2 = Philo, *De opificio mundi* 8

Eusebius also seems to have omitted part of Philo's *De opificio mundi* at VIII. 13. 2 of the *Praeparatio*. In this passage, he deals with a well-known and controversial excerpt from Philo's treatise, namely paragraph 8. The question raised by the specialists is whether Philo deals

³³² The key texts are *Fug.* 20, 112; *Heres* 38, 188.

³³³ D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Philosophia Antiqua 44. Leiden: Brill, 1986, p. 239. On the binding activity of the *Logos*, Runia cites Philo's *Her.* 188; *Fug.* 122; *QE* II. 89–90; 118. On Philo's Powers, Runia refers back to *Conf.* 166; *Migr.* 181. On this subject, see also Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 85, according to whom the idea of the *Logos* as binding the universe is borrowed from the Stoics (cf. the Stoic notion of ἔξις). See also Harl, *Philon d'Alexandrie. Quis heres*, pp. 71–72. This passage from Philo's *De plant.* is also discussed in U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums* 2. Leiden: Brill, 1968, pp. 53–68. She speaks in favour of a Posidonian influence. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, pp. 240–241, disagrees with this suggestion and concludes that Philo's abundant use of the image of binding can hardly be traced back to any origin.

³³⁴ See Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromata*, p. 210; M. Van Winden, "Quotations From Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus*", *VigChris* 32, 1978, pp. 208–213; and Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 145.

with a passive cause beside the active cause under the influence of a Stoic model.³³⁵ Philo's text reads as follows:

ἔγνω διότι ἀναγκαιότατόν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς οὖσι τὸ μὲν εἶναι δραστήριον αἴτιον, τὸ δὲ παθητόν· καὶ ὅτι τὸ μὲν δραστήριον ὁ τῶν ὅλων νοῦς ἐστιν

He [Moses] recognized that there must be in the beings on the one hand, the active cause, and, on the other, the passive [cause?], and that the active cause is the soul of the universe.³³⁶

[The text in italics was omitted by Eusebius.]

According to specialists in Philo, the difficulty lies in the term παθητόν: Should it be considered as defining the word αἴτιον, or as a substantivized adjective merely designating a passive object? Arnaldez, Weiss and Früchtel³³⁷ chose the first solution, whereas Cohn, Whittaker and Runia³³⁸ opted for the second. I would tend to follow their opinion since in other passages Philo denies any causality to a passive matter.³³⁹

At any rate, the passage certainly is ambiguous and this ambiguity might have disturbed Eusebius himself. By omitting αἴτιον, τὸ δὲ παθητόν· καὶ ὅτι τὸ μὲν δραστήριον, I would argue, Eusebius made a significant change in Philo's message. Yet Mras thought it necessary to add this part to Eusebius' text; des Places and Schroeder³⁴⁰ did the same, probably because they all thought that the omission

³³⁵ On Philo's use of Plato's *Timaeus*, see Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*.

³³⁶ My translation.

³³⁷ See the references provided by Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, p. 104; R. Arnaldez, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De opificio mundi*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 1. Paris: Cerf, 1961; H.-F. Weiss, *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinensischen Judentums*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1966, p. 42; U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandria*, p. 12.

³³⁸ Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, p. 104;—, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 1. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 2001, pp. 115–116; Whittaker, Philo IV, LCL, p. 11. G. J. Reydam-Schils, *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonic Readings of Plato's "Timaeus"*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1999, pp. 148–149, although she does not really take sides on this issue. For more details, see Runia, "Philo of Alexandria and the end of Hellenistic Theology", in A. Laks and D. Frede, *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, Its Background and Its Aftermath*. Philosophia Antiqua. Leiden: Brill, 2001, pp. 281–316.

³³⁹ Runia in his *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* refers to *Fug.* 133.

³⁴⁰ Schroeder and des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VIII–X, SC 369. Paris: Cerf, 1991.

was due to a ‘saut du même au même’. Although this interpretation makes perfect sense, I believe that the consequences of this omission are too important to be due to mere neglect on Eusebius’ part; I think that the omission of this formula depends on Eusebius’ theological agenda and that the reading of the manuscripts should therefore be preserved. What I suggest is that Eusebius understood (or was afraid that others would understand) the passage as referring to both an active and a passive cause.

Indeed, in this passage, Eusebius was dealing with God and the creation of the world. By subtracting the words mentioned above, Eusebius suppressed that which he may have understood as Philo’s mention of a passive cause. In Eusebius’ text, Philo the “Hebrew” only deals with God as active cause and soul of the universe. Indeed, Eusebius’ omission transforms the passage as follows: “He [Moses] recognized that there must be in the beings an active [principle], which is the purest mind of the universe” (. . . ἔγω διότι ἀναγκαιότατόν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς οὖσι τὸ μὲν εἶναι δραστήριον ὃ τῶν ὅλων νοῦς ἐστιν εἰλικρινέστατος). This was a better reading in Eusebius’ mind because the doctrine of the creation *ex nihilo* did not agree with that of an active and a passive cause. Therefore, the bishop preferred to omit that which could be understood as the passive cause because he refused to present matter as a passive cause coexisting with God in the creation process. As Chapot has pointed out,³⁴¹ the adjective παθητός “correspond à l’attribut de passivité habituelle appliqué à la matière pour expliquer qu’elle puisse prendre plusieurs formes”. In this context, it comes as no surprise that Eusebius omitted this part of the passage. Only the *Logos* had a role to play in the creation, and in the *Laus Constantini*, Eusebius explicitly denies any role to matter in the creation process, to the profit of the *Logos*.³⁴²

Basil of Caesarea may confirm this hypothesis in his *Homelies on the hexaemeron*, in which he rejects Philo’s passage because he refuses to acknowledge the meeting, during the creation, of the “active power of God” (δραστική τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις) and the “passive nature of matter” (ἡ παθητικὴ φύσις τῆς ὕλης).³⁴³

³⁴¹ F. Chapot, “Les apologistes grecs et la création du monde. À propos d’Aristide, Apologie 4, 1 et 15, 1”, in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, p. 203, n. 16.

³⁴² *LC* XI. 11–12.

³⁴³ *Hom. in Hex.* II. 3. 14d.

The fact that further in this paragraph Eusebius ends up mentioning τὸ δὲ παθητικόν does not weaken my argument. Indeed, at that place in the passage, this word was isolated from the word αἴτιον and consequently could not be interpreted as referring to the passive cause. On the contrary, it agrees with the word κόσμον. The definition of the world as παθητικόν was not problematic, especially if the mention of a 'cause' had been omitted earlier in the passage.

Were this hypothesis to be correct, it would indicate the level of sophistication of Eusebius' method in tampering with the text, fooling even the best philologists who edited his text.

PE VIII. 14. 1 = Philo, De providentia II. 3

As Hadas-Lebel has noted in her translation of Philo's *De providentia*,³⁴⁴ Eusebius omitted from a passage of this treatise³⁴⁵ an Homeric citation which presents Zeus as "the father of the gods and of humankind". Philo's use of this verse, which could have challenged his monotheistic faith, may result from his knowledge of Deuteronomy 10: 17: "for the Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords".³⁴⁶ Eusebius, by contrast, refuses to compromise in citing these words in his grand apology.

PE XIII. 18. 15 = Philo, De specialibus legibus I. 17

When Eusebius cites Philo at XIII. 18 of the *Praeparatio* in order to deal with the "Hebrews'" refusal of astrolatry, he stops quoting³⁴⁷ where the Alexandrian philosopher starts comparing sensation, subjected to the intellect, and the stars, subjected to the supreme God. Eusebius cuts Philo's sentence, 'forgetting' the last part of paragraph 17. In this passage, Philo declared that the stars "were content with the second position" (ἀγαπήσαντες εἰ δευτερείων ἐφίξονται). This omission may stem from his embarrassment at turning sensible beings into "second ones". Indeed, in Eusebius' Christian Platonic system, the second position goes to the λόγος.³⁴⁸ As he says, the second substance

³⁴⁴ Hadas-Lebel, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De providentia*, p. 34.

³⁴⁵ In PE VIII. 14.

³⁴⁶ See also Exodus 15: 11; Ps. 86: 8 etc. and the note in S. Daniel, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De specialibus legibus I-II*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 24. Paris: Cerf, 1975, p. 20, n. 2.

³⁴⁷ *Spec.* I. 17 included.

³⁴⁸ Cf. the terms "second cause", "second essence", "second power", "second" etc. at PE VII. 12. heading; VII. 12. 11; PE XI. 14. heading; PE XI. 14. 18 (heading); PE VII. 12. 2; PE VII. 15. 5; DE V. 4. 9.

δευτερευούσης (“is second to”) God.³⁴⁹ Philo himself had contributed to the establishment of the conception of the λόγος as “second god” at *Praeparatio* VII. 13. 1, where Eusebius cites the *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*.

In addition, Eusebius may have rejected this passage because Philo admits that if the stars should not be thought of as self-ruling gods (θεοὺς οὐκ αὐτοκρατεῖς), they are nonetheless “governors” (ὑπάρχων).³⁵⁰ Philo’s rejection of astrolatry was perhaps not as strong as Eusebius wished.³⁵¹

PE XIII. 18. 16 = De specialibus legibus I. 20

At XIII. 18. 16 of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius may have modified a citation from Philo’s *De Specialibus legibus* I. 20. Indeed, once again he seems to have omitted from the text that which could be interpreted as revealing polytheism. Although this difference between the text of Philo’s manuscripts and those of Eusebius has gone unnoticed, I believe it should be given some attention. Indeed, after copying the words οὐ μόνον θεός, the term which follows in Philo’s text does not occur in Eusebius:

ὥστε ὑπερβάντες τῷ λογισμῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ὁρατὴν οὐσίαν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀειδοῦς καὶ ἀοράτου καὶ μόνῃ διανοίᾳ καταληπτοῦ τιμὴν ἴωμεν, ὃς οὐ μόνον θεὸς θεῶν ἐστὶ νοητῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν.

So having transcended by reason the entire visible essence, let us go on to the dignity of Him who is formless and invisible and can be apprehended by thought alone, who is not only the God of both the intelligible and sensible.³⁵²

As elsewhere, Eusebius may have been embarrassed by an expression which implied the existence of several gods depending upon the supreme God, although, pretty much like the *Chaldean Oracles* and Numenius, he feels free to claim the existence of a second God.³⁵³

³⁴⁹ PE VII. 15. 5.

³⁵⁰ Spec. I. 19.

³⁵¹ On astrolatry in the PE, see Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d’Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 171 ff. who suggests that Eusebius’s opinion on the subject remains nuanced.

³⁵² Spec. I. 20. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis*, modified according to Eusebius’ text.

³⁵³ Plato’s *Epistle* II mentions three gods. Needless to say, it was abundantly exploited by the Christians, including Eusebius. The history of the exegesis of this *Epistle* is recounted by H. D. Saffrey *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne* II, édition, tra-

By the mere omission of the word θεῶν, he avoids showing that a "Hebrew" had mentioned a multiplicity of gods, thereby giving the citation a more monotheistic turn.³⁵⁴ This was certainly more appropriate to his overall purpose, namely, to show Plato's mistake regarding the deification of stars. Philo's "God of intelligible and sensible gods" was turned into a simple "God of intelligible and sensible things".

In addition, another element shows that the bishop refuses to concede anything to astrolatry in this passage: When citing Deuteronomy 4: 19 ("Nor must you raise your eyes to the heavens and look up to the sun, the moon and the stars, all the hosts of heaven, and be led on to bow down to them and worship them; the Lord your God has assigned these for the worship of the various peoples under heaven"), he omits the last part of the verse, in which God is said to have ascribed the stars to "all the nations below heaven".³⁵⁵

However, one cannot help noticing that Eusebius left in a sentence claiming that those who deify the stars were mistaken in considering them as the "only gods" (μόνους εἶναι τούτους θεούς).³⁵⁶ Perhaps Eusebius saw this as a claim of the truth of monotheism, but it could also be understood as implying the existence of other gods. If the latter is correct, it may mean that Eusebius was slightly reluctant to completely deny any truth to a cult which enjoyed great popularity among pagans. Frede has pointed out that, for doctrinal reasons, the Christians could not deny the existence of several

duction et notes de H. D. S., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1974 (Introduction).

³⁵⁴ Yet it is well known that the Hebrew Bible itself occasionally exhibits some polytheistic elements (see, e.g., Dt. 4:19; 10:17; Ps. 49:1), and even the plural *Elohim*. The strict opposition between pagan polytheism and Jewish/Christian monotheism is a construction of the Christian apologists, as Athanassiadi and Frede, *Pagan Monotheism*, pp. 1–20 have shown. These two authors criticize the idea of a radical opposition between pagan polytheism and Christian monotheism in ancient thought; just as Greek polytheism could be presented as a form of monotheism or henotheism, early Christianity was not, they argue, deprived of polytheistic elements.

³⁵⁵ The rabbis also seem to have been embarrassed when interpreting this verse: See C. Dogniez and M. Harl (*La Bible d'Alexandrie, le Deutéronome*, Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et notes par C. D. et M. H., Paris: Cerf, 1992 pp. 138–139), who tell us that this verse is cited "dans les traditions rabbiniques comme l'un des passages qui auraient été modifiés par les traducteurs à cause du roi Ptolémée, pour préciser la fonction des astres".

³⁵⁶ *Spec.* I. 16 = *PE* XIII. 18. 14.

gods.³⁵⁷ Nonetheless, this does not prevent Eusebius from reinforcing the monotheistic content of some “Hebrew” passages, whether biblical or secular. In doing so, he positioned himself in an important apologetic tradition which opposed, since the second century c.e., Christian monotheism and pagan polytheism.

Eusebius also seems to have manipulated the meaning of certain texts otherwise than by excerpting the passage. For instance, he occasionally omitted certain terms or sentences from the quotation itself when they were embarrassing.

D. *Textual Changes in the Demonstratio*

We have now reached the *Demonstratio*, which has several delicate textual problems. Indeed, in addition to comparing the text cited to that transmitted by the manuscripts of the original work, I will have to compare the text cited in the *Demonstratio* with other quotations from the same text made by Eusebius in some of his other works. When variant readings can be pointed out, it will generally be worth examining them closely because they may shed light on Eusebius’ intentions.

DE III. 5. 124 b-c = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 63–64
(*Testimonium Flavianum*)

The most important textual problem of the Eusebian corpus undeniably lies in the famous *Testimonium Flavianum*, i.e., his quotations of the Josephan passages mentioning Jesus. This is not the place to offer a full analysis of this question, since entire monographs have been devoted to it.³⁵⁸ Nevertheless, I will present the problem and attempt to define Eusebius’ role in this context.

³⁵⁷ M. Frede, “Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy”, in M. Frede and P. Athanassiadi, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, p. 58.

³⁵⁸ On this topic, see recently A. Whealey, “Josephus on Jesus: Evidence From the First Millenium”, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 51, 1995, pp. 291–296;—, *Josephus on Jesus; The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Late Antiquity to Modern Times*. Studies in Biblical Literature 36. New York-Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003;—, *The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Antiquity to the Present*. Retrieved from www.earlychristianwritings.com/Josephus.html. See also S. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum: examen historique, considérations historiographiques*, Paris: Cerf, 2002 which focuses specifically on French historiography and scholarship; P. Winter in Schürer, *HJP*, I, pp. 428–430; Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship*, pp. 679–703;—, “The *Testimonium Flavianum*: The State of the Question”, in R. F. Berkey and S. A. Edwards

All the manuscripts from Josephus' *Antiquities* briefly mention Jesus at XVIII. 63–64. The first author to mention and cite the famous *Testimonium* is none other than Eusebius, who inserts it in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, his *Demonstratio evangelica* and his *Theophany*. Most scholars now accept that the *Testimonium* in Josephus' manuscripts is partly an interpolation.³⁵⁹ Yet some still consider it a forgery.³⁶⁰ Olson, e.g., has recently suggested that Eusebius might have been the author of the entire passage. I disagree with this hypothesis, since the creation of a whole passage appears too remote from Eusebius' common practice. One can hardly deny that he occasionally felt free to modify some texts, that he took advantage of the *oratio recta/oratio obliqua* process in order to serve his purposes, or that he warped the meaning of events reported by some Jewish authors. However, it would be unfair to attribute to him the composition of a forgery. If Eusebius chose the citation technique in the *Praeparatio* and in the *Historia*, he is likely to have done so out of a sincere wish to legitimize his own discourse, even though his criteria in terms of 'objectivity' (a word which bears little significance in antiquity) differ from ours. The notion of impartiality which Eusebius claims on several occasions in his *Apodeixis* appears more relevant in defining his methodology. In this context, it is difficult to imagine that he would go so far as to himself write a forgery. Moreover, although ancient writers do not share the same standards of 'faithfulness' as us when they cite texts, they nonetheless condemn certain textual modifications, and the writing of forgeries in particular.³⁶¹ Eusebius attacks Tatian, e.g., for

Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur, New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982, pp. 181–185; Olson, "Eusebius and the *Testimonium Flavianum*", pp. 305–322 and J. C. Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity", pp. 539–624.

³⁵⁹ E.g., Feldman in his translation of *AJ XVIII–XX*, Josephus IX, LCL, pp. 48–51; J. P. Meier, "Jesus in Josephus: A Modest Proposal", *CBQ* 52, 1990, pp. 76–103; —, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, New York: Doubleday, 1991, pp. 56–88; Winter in Schürer, *HJP*, I, pp. 428–441.

³⁶⁰ E.g., T. Rajak, *Josephus, The Historian and His Society*, pp. 67, 131, n. 73; J. Neville-Birdsall, "The Continuing Enigma of Josephus' Testimony about Jesus", *BJRL* 67, 1984–1985, pp. 609–622; P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance*. JSPE.S 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 222–223.

³⁶¹ See, e.g., the accusation according to which Hecataeus' *On the Jews* was a forgery by Herennius Philo (*CC* I. 15), on which see B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, "On the Jews", Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. A significant case lies in Origen's works. In particular, his *De principiis* was

changing the apostle's words in the *Diatessaron*,³⁶² through another author, he also accuses some heretics of tampering with the Scriptures.³⁶³ Needless to say, the status of the Bible was different from that of Josephus' works. Eusebius himself occasionally changed the texts of his quotations. Yet these examples show that tampering with a text remained a matter of concern for Eusebius.

In the case of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, a lack of sufficient evidence keeps us from fully understanding the composition of this passage. It is most likely that only a part of the passage was interpolated. But it seems unlikely that Eusebius made up the whole passage on Jesus. Here are some reasons why not.

Firstly, it seems to me that the scholars who ascribe the writing of the *Testimonium* to Eusebius do so because they misinterpret the latter's purposes. It has often been claimed that Eusebius used the *Testimonium* as proof of Jesus' messiahship,³⁶⁴ which led to the idea that he had himself written this testimony. But I would argue that this view is mistaken, considering that Eusebius' purpose is very different: In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he uses this passage to counter the *Acts of Pilate*, an anti-Christian pseudepigraph which Maximinus Daia had spread in the schools of the Empire.³⁶⁵ The *Testimonium* was thus used in a pagan-Christian polemical context, and not in a Jewish-Christian one. In the *Demonstratio*, the *Testimonium* serves to show that Jesus' popularity amongst Jews and Greeks was proof of the veracity of his miracles.³⁶⁶ Again, Eusebius' goals are not those

often subject to changes: See *Epist. ad amic. Alexandr.* in Rufinus, *De adulter. libror. Origenis* (PG XVII, 625). Yet Jerome does not hesitate to justify the omissions and additions he made when translating Origen's writings (see *Epist.* LXI. 2). On pseudepigraphy and ancient literary forgeries, see, e.g., G. Bardy, "Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne", *RHistEccl* 32, 1936, pp. 5–23 and 275–302; R. M. Grant, "The Appeal to the Early Fathers", *JTS* New Series 11, 1960, pp. 13–24; W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum; ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I. 2. München: Beck, 1971; M. Hengel, "Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'Literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur", *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique—Fondation Hardt* 18, 1972, pp. 231–309.

³⁶² *HE* IV. 29. 6.

³⁶³ *HE* V. 28. 15–18. This is remindful of Justin's accusation against the Jews. According to him, they would have cut passages on Jesus from the Scriptures (*Dial.* LXXI. 1 ff. and LXXXIV. 2).

³⁶⁴ E.g., Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 86.

³⁶⁵ Cf. *HE* I. 9. 3; I. 11. 9; IX. 5. 1; IX. 7. 1.

³⁶⁶ On the narrative use of miracles in the Christian apologetic tradition and in

that are generally ascribed to him by students of the *Testimonium*. Now that his purposes in using this passage have been clarified, it appears more clearly that Eusebius can hardly be guilty of forging the *Testimonium*. As we have seen, he did not need to do so. As Whealey has pointed out, the *Testimonium* became an anti-Jewish weapon only from Pseudo-Hegesippus' Latin version of the *Testimonium* onwards, which version dates back to the end of the fourth century.³⁶⁷ Moreover, it is unlikely that Eusebius would have been eager to ascribe to Josephus words that suit a Christian so well. In fact, Josephus was important to Eusebius because he was not a Christian. Therefore, he did not need to turn him into a Christian by forging the *Testimonium*. If Josephus did indeed mention Jesus' name, as he seems to have done in *Antiquities* XX. 200 where he deals with "James, the brother of Jesus who is called Christ", this was sufficient to support Eusebius' demonstration. He did not need more than this.

Olson (who defends the thesis that Eusebius forged the *Testimonium*) also argued that "it is perhaps incredible that Josephus should have written a passage so useful to Eusebius' apologetics",³⁶⁸ implying that Eusebius made it up. But in fact, the bishop seems to have made a rather restricted use of a passage from which he could have drawn much more in terms of apologetics. As Nodet and Bardet have argued,³⁶⁹ had Eusebius forged the *Testimonium*, he would certainly have inserted it in the *War* (where there is no mention of Jesus) rather than in the *Antiquities*, because it would have better suited his purposes. Indeed, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he cites the *War* rather than the *Antiquities* in order to present the miseries of the Jews under Pilate as a consequence of the murder of Jesus; he does not cite the *Antiquities* because in this work, these miseries are reported *before* Jesus' death. Therefore, it would have been much more useful to include the *Testimonium* in the *War*. This seems to further confirm that Eusebius did not forge the *Testimonium*.

Eusebius' *Demonstratio*, see G. W. H. Lampe, "Miracles and Early Christian Apologetics", in C. F. D. Moule, *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965, pp. 205–218.

³⁶⁷ See, e.g., Whealey, *The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Antiquity to the Present*, p. 2 retrieved from www.earlychristianwritings.com/Josephus.html

³⁶⁸ Olson, "Eusebius and the *Testimonium Flavianum*", p. 309.

³⁶⁹ É. Nodet, "Jésus et Jean Baptiste selon Josephus", *RB* 92, 1985, pp. 321–348 and 497–524 (340); Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum*, p. 85.

Finally, it is well known that Origen twice claims that Josephus did not acknowledge Jesus' messiahship.³⁷⁰ Eusebius was deeply influenced by Origen in terms of both his doctrine and his use of Josephus. He certainly knew these passages. Therefore, it seems highly unlikely that he would have forged a text contradicting Origen's claims so blatantly.

All these facts lead me to conclude that Eusebius did not forge Josephus' testimony on Jesus, although he certainly contributed to spreading it in the Christian world.

The variant readings of the citation as it is given in three of Eusebius' works deserve a brief analysis. The text presented in the *Theophany*, which is extant in Syriac only,³⁷¹ is closest to the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Several differences may be noted between the text of Josephus' *Antiquities*, in the *Demonstratio* and in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.³⁷² I will only pay attention to the most significant ones.

Firstly, only manuscript A of the *Historia ecclesiastica* reads Ἰησοῦς τις ("a certain Jesus"), in accordance with Josephus' text.³⁷³ This may indicate that copyists, and not Eusebius, did away with nuances which appeared irrelevant in a Christian context.

Secondly, a major variant reading appears in the *Demonstratio*, in contrast with the text of the *Theophany* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The *Demonstratio* reads τάληθῇ σεβομένων ("reverencing the truth") instead of τῶν ἡδονῇ τάληθῇ δεχομένων ("accepting the truth with pleasure"), which is the reading of Josephus' text. According to Carleton Paget, the first reading would soften the negative character of the second one. Indeed, in the Josephan corpus, the formula ἡδονῇ δέχομαι is pejorative.³⁷⁴ These variant readings, Carleton Paget

³⁷⁰ In *Matt.* X. 17. and *CC I.* 47.

³⁷¹ A German translation of this text may be found in H. Gressmann, *Eusebius Werke III. 2, Der Theophanie*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1904.

³⁷² *DE III.* 5. 124b-c; *HE I.* 11. 4-5; *AJ XVIII.* 63-64. See especially Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 85, n. 37; E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke II. 3*. GCS, pp. clxxxvi-clxxxvii; R. Eisler, *Ihsous Basileus ou Basileusas*, 3 vols. Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 9. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929-1930, pp. 38-41, taken up and substantiated by J. C. Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity", pp. 565-566.

³⁷³ Some have argued that a Christian scribe would not have added such an indefinite adjective and that this is an original reading (e.g., Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity", p. 565) but, as Bardet has argued, this is far from being certain (Cf. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum*, p. 91).

³⁷⁴ Carleton Paget, "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity", p. 566.

suggests, do not indicate that Eusebius would have tampered with the text, but rather that he had several manuscripts presenting different degrees of assimilation.³⁷⁵ Yet since the point is to show that both Greeks and Jews followed Jesus, I find it hard to believe that this textual variant reading results from a mere coincidence. If, as I believe, Eusebius had made a collection of Josephan passages for himself, it is difficult to understand why these quotations differ. I would suggest that Eusebius sought to reinforce the status of Jesus' followers. By substituting *τάληθῇ σεβομένων* for *τῶν ἡδονῇ τάληθῇ δεχομένων*, he implied that the followers did not accept the truth passively, but that they actively revered the truth.

DE VIII. 2. 397d–398a = *Josephus*, AJ XX. 247–249—DE VIII. 2. 398b = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 92–93

Eusebius also seems to have adjusted a citation by omitting or adding certain words and formulas. When discussing the deterioration of the practices and institutions attached to the Temple, e.g., he gives two citations from Josephus in *oratio recta* in order to prove the fulfilment of Daniel 9: 20–27.³⁷⁶ In the first case, he inserts words that clarify some data in Josephus' text, thereby helping his readers understand the context. For example, he adds οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ καλούμενοι Μακκαβαῖοι³⁷⁷ ("those were the so-called Maccabees") after the words Ἀσamonαίου γένους ("of Hasmonean descent"). The term "Maccabees" may have been clearer than "Hasmoneans" to his Christian readers.

In other places, he omits certain words, probably for the sake of brevity. Hyrcanus, e.g., is said to be τοῦ ὑπὸ Πάρθων ληφθέντος ("caught by the Parthians") in Josephus but Eusebius has omitted this piece of information.³⁷⁸

Interestingly, whereas Josephus explains that Herod appointed as high priests men who were not from prominent families but only of priestly descent (μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων), Eusebius claims that they were of Hebrew descent (μόνον ἐξ Ἑβραίων ὄντας). Eusebius' eagerness to shatter the Jewish institutions after the death of Jesus may easily explain this change: He was unwilling to acknowledge that these

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁷⁶ DE VIII. 2. 397d–398a = AJ XX. 247–249; DE VIII. 2. 398b = AJ XVIII. 92–93.

³⁷⁷ DE VIII. 2. 397d.

³⁷⁸ Cf. Josephus, AJ XX. 248 and Eusebius, DE VIII. 2. 397d.

men were still of priestly descent, i.e., not complete nobodies. Eusebius thus exaggerates Herod's misdeed.

The second citation from Josephus also reveals an omission due to Eusebius' care for brevity. For instance, he omits the words Ἀντωνίου φίλος ὢν ("being Antony's friend"). In Josephus, they explained the origin of the name Antonia which Herod had given to a part of the esplanade of the Temple.³⁷⁹

Heikel has pointed out that these two citations, which are not very precise in the *Demonstratio*, are much more faithfully copied in Eusebius' *Eclogae prophetae*.³⁸⁰ By contrast, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*,³⁸¹ Eusebius is content with vaguely summarizing these two episodes. According to Hardwick, the citations given in the *Demonstratio* are derived from Julius Africanus,³⁸² yet this seems highly unlikely. As we have seen (and as Hardwick himself has argued), Eusebius knew Josephus too well and needed him too much to rely on second-hand sources. I think he only adjusted the Josephan text he copied either from a manuscript of Josephus or from a collection of Josephan excerpts he made for his own use.

DE VIII. 2. 399 a = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 34–35

Another citation from Josephus' *Antiquities* (XVIII. 34–35) is given in the *Demonstratio* at VIII. 2. 399 a. Eusebius uses it in order to show that in Jesus' time, the succession of high priests occurred in an illegal and chaotic fashion.³⁸³ This was meant to prove that the prophecy of Daniel 9: 20–27 was fulfilled at that time. The corruption of certain proper nouns notwithstanding, Eusebius copied Josephus' excerpts very faithfully. Nevertheless, it is significant that ἱερῶσασθαι was turned into ἀρχιερωθῆναι.³⁸⁴ I would argue that the

³⁷⁹ AJ XVIII. 92.

³⁸⁰ Heikel, *Eusebius Werke* VI. GCS, *ap. crit.*

³⁸¹ HE I. 6. 9–10.

³⁸² Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 76. Hardwick does not refer to the *Eclogae prophetae* but only mentions them in a footnote dealing with the hypothesis that Eusebius would have drawn his citations of Josephus from Julius Africanus. The passage of Hardwick's monograph is unclear and does not indicate from where he draws this hypothesis.

³⁸³ As Hadwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source*, p. 76 has pointed out, it is odd that Eusebius only questions the legitimacy of the high priesthood from Herod on, and not from the time of the Hasmoneans, as one may have expected. This is obviously due to his apologetic purpose.

³⁸⁴ AJ XVIII. 34 = DE VIII. 2. 399a.

bishop made this change to emphasize the issue of high priesthood with which he was dealing in this passage. This modification is of no major consequence since Josephus too is in fact dealing with this problem. Yet oddly enough, it is not included in the *Historia ecclesiastica* where the same passage is quoted.³⁸⁵ This slight difference may be explained by the context in which the quotation is used. In the *Demonstratio*, the passage illustrates the decline of the high priesthood, which is interpreted by Eusebius as a sign of the impending end of Judaism. By contrast, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, it serves to measure the duration of Jesus' teaching. In this context, there was no need for Eusebius to reinforce the allusions to the high priesthood.

In some other cases, Eusebius adds words to the text he quotes in order to clarify certain details for his readers. In his citation from Josephus, e.g., he adds the words Ῥωμαίων στρατηγός ("a Roman general") after the name Valerius Gratus.

DE VIII. 2. 402 d = *Josephus*, BJ VI. 299

At VIII. 2. 402 d of the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius cites an excerpt from Josephus' *War* (VI. 299) in *oratio obliqua*. This work tells of an earthquake shaking the Temple and of a voice saying to the priests "let us depart from here". This quotation does not present any major differences by comparison with Josephus' text. Yet it is striking that the Jewish historian situates this event "inside the Temple" (εἰς τὸ ἕνδον ἱερὸν), whereas Eusebius omits the term ἕνδον. This omission, I would argue, is not as insignificant as it may appear, since it aims to give Josephus' story a broader impact by dealing with the Temple as a whole. Nonetheless, this change may not be ascribed to the apologist with absolute certainty. Indeed, it has been shown that his text of the *War* is not related to any of the manuscripts of Josephus used by Niese.³⁸⁶ Moreover, those manuscripts with a text closest to his are the *deteriores*.³⁸⁷ A text closer to that of Josephus is given in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, but neither does the term ἕνδον occur along ἱερὸν. Yet Eusebius may have been influenced by Origen in his handling of this quotation. As Mizugaki has pointed out,³⁸⁸ the great

³⁸⁵ HE I. 10. 4–5.

³⁸⁶ B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera, edidit et apparatu critico instruxit* B. N., Berlin: apud Weidmannos, 1885–1895. See also Hardwick, *Josephus as an historical Source*, p. 69.

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁸ W. Mizugaki, "Origen and Josephus", in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, p. 330.

theologian also omits this word from the quotation of Josephus he gives in his *Commentary on Lamentations*.³⁸⁹

Finally, it is also worth noting that Eusebius also adjusted his text to a Christian readership. Whereas Josephus' text, e.g., reads "on a festival called Pentecost" (κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἢ πεντηκοστὴ καλεῖται), Eusebius' text reads "on the day of Pentecost" (κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς). This is probably due to the fact that unlike Josephus, who was targeting a pagan readership,³⁹⁰ Eusebius was targeting an audience which was supposed to be familiar with this festival.

DE VIII. 2. 402d–403a = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 55 ff.; BJ II. 169 ff. and *Philo*, Legatio ad Gaium 299

An intricate problem occurs at *Demonstratio* VIII. 2. 402d–403a, in which Eusebius deals with the fulfilment of the prophecy given in Daniel 9: 20–27.³⁹¹ He appeals to the testimony of Josephus on the sacrilege committed by Pilate in the Temple of Jerusalem. It is followed by an excerpt from Philo on the same subject. These two passages are supposed to support Eusebius' theological-historical interpretation. According to him, these events, as reported by Philo and Josephus, constitute premonitory signs of the abolition of Judaism, of which the Temple and institutions were symbols.

It should first be noted that unlike other passages from Philo and Josephus given in the *Apodeixis*, these ones are not real quotations, but paraphrastic summaries presented in *oratio obliqua* of two passages from Josephus (*Antiquities* XVIII. 55 ff. and *BJ* II. 169 ff.) and perhaps also from Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* (299 ff.).

The first problem of textual criticism lies in Eusebius' presentation of the contents of the Jewish passages. According to him, Philo and Josephus recounted that Pilate dedicated images (εἰκόνας)³⁹² or standards (σημαῖας)³⁹³ in the Temple (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν according to Josephus;³⁹⁴ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ according to Philo).³⁹⁵ But neither the *Antiquities*

³⁸⁹ *Lam.* 109.

³⁹⁰ Josephus claims that he translated the *War* into Greek (probably from Aramaic) for "all the subjects of the Empire" (*BJ* I. 3). Indeed, he targeted a non-Jewish readership, although, as several scholars have argued, it is likely that many Jews also read it.

³⁹¹ On this whole problem, see my "The Reception of Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* in Eusebius of Caesarea's Works", *SPH* 16, 2004, pp. 30–49, with more bibliography.

³⁹² DE VIII. 2. 403a 1, attributed to Josephus.

³⁹³ DE VIII. 2. 403a 6, attributed to Philo.

³⁹⁴ DE VIII. 2. 403a 1.

³⁹⁵ DE VIII. 2. 403a 6.

nor the *War* mention the Temple. Both writings mention Jerusalem (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα³⁹⁶ or ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις).³⁹⁷ Moreover, if one admits that Eusebius refers to Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* in this passage when he appeals to Philo,³⁹⁸ one will note that neither does Philo mention Jerusalem, but Herod's palace in the holy city (ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἱερόπολιν Ἡρώδου βασιλείοις).³⁹⁹ When I examined the problem of the form in which Eusebius knew Philo's *Legatio*, I pointed out that Colson and, to a lesser extent, Smallwood, ascribed this difference to a mistake made by Eusebius.⁴⁰⁰ Grant suggested it was due to Eusebius' dependency upon Origen's *In Matthaeum*.⁴⁰¹ In this commentary, Origen confuses the Pilate episode with Caligula's decision to erect a statue in the Temple. Accordingly, he declares that Pilate's sacrilege took place ἐν τῷ ναῷ.⁴⁰² Pelletier, in his translation of the *Legatio*, suggests that both Origen and Eusebius transposed this event to the Temple because they could no longer perceive the sacred character of the city of Jerusalem as a whole.⁴⁰³ Finally, Hardwick claimed that either Eusebius "embellished" Josephus' narrative by adding to it a tradition known by Philo, or that he cited Josephus at second hand, or that he used a material unknown to us which would have contaminated the Josephan material.⁴⁰⁴ Hardwick's hypotheses must be rejected on two accounts, firstly because, as I will show, it is far more likely that the Josephan material contaminated the Philonic material, and secondly because it is unnecessary to appeal to an intermediary source for Philo's citation, since it is only a vague paraphrase taking over the vocabulary used by Josephus.

Likewise, claiming a mere mistake or misunderstanding on Eusebius' part is unsatisfactory because the latter had good reason to locate Pilate's misdeed in the Temple. Indeed, in that part of the *Demonstratio* in which he inserts Josephus' and Philo's paraphrases, he deals precisely with the decline of the Temple and of its institutions. After showing the collapse of the legitimacy of the high priesthood (notably

³⁹⁶ B⁷ II. 169.

³⁹⁷ A⁷ XVIII. 55.

³⁹⁸ See above, "References to the Citations from the Jewish Authors". This hypothesis was defended by Colson.

³⁹⁹ *Legat.* 299.

⁴⁰⁰ Colson, Philo X, LCL, pp. XIX-XX; Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 302.

⁴⁰¹ Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, p. 97.

⁴⁰² *In Matth.* XVII. 25.

⁴⁰³ Pelletier, *La lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89, p. 376.

⁴⁰⁴ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 81.

through Josephus' testimony),⁴⁰⁵ he wishes to claim that the end of the old covenant is also indicated by the lack of legitimacy of the libations and sacrifices in the Temple. He sees this as a confirmation of the fulfilment of Daniel 9: 24–27.⁴⁰⁶ Eusebius has thus purposefully located Pilate's deed in the Temple. By doing so he was reinforcing the idea of a genuine deconsecration of the emblem of Judaism, and justifying it theologically as due to God's will. On the ruins of the Temple, the new covenant of God and the Nations could be erected. The distortion Eusebius imposed on the text is rather obvious. The bishop was well aware that Josephus had situated the Pilate episode in Jerusalem⁴⁰⁷ and not specifically in the Temple since he quotes the same passage literally (and claims to do so: cf. αὐταῖς συλλαβαῖς)⁴⁰⁸ in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁴⁰⁹ The question as to why he felt free to quote the passage faithfully in the *Historia ecclesiastica* but not in the *Demonstratio* can easily be answered. In the *Historia*, Josephus' passage exemplifies the miseries undergone by the Jews for their crime against Jesus. As a consequence, a reference to the Temple itself was not essential and Josephus' text did not need to be tampered with. By contrast, the Temple was the focus of the passage in the *Demonstratio*. In this context, Eusebius had to locate the event reported by Philo and Josephus in it.

Moreover, Walker has pointed out that Eusebius distinguishes Jerusalem, to which he denies the quality of "city of God", from the Temple, which he sees as divine in the pre-Christian period.⁴¹⁰ This may also strengthen my explanation for Eusebius' modification of Philo's and Josephus' texts.

In addition, Origen's influence, as Grant has suggested, should not be discarded. It might have contributed to the working out of the theological-historical scheme set up by Eusebius. I would therefore argue that we are here dealing with a deliberate distortion of Jewish texts by the Caesarean apologist. The unusual use of *oratio obliqua* is significant. It was easier to modify the Jewish citations by

⁴⁰⁵ *DE* VIII. 2. 399a.

⁴⁰⁶ *DE* VIII. 2. 402a–d.

⁴⁰⁷ *Bj* II. 169–170.

⁴⁰⁸ *HE* II. 6. 4.

⁴⁰⁹ *HE* II. 6. 4.

⁴¹⁰ P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 381.

paraphrasing them, since paraphrase indeed allows more flexibility than direct quotation.

A second textual problem arises in Philo's citation of the Pilate episode. Indeed, it is worth asking whether in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius paraphrases either *Legatio* 299 ff. as it was preserved in our manuscripts or a passage lost to us. Indeed, Eusebius' paraphrase is rather different from 'our' *Legatio* 299. In Eusebius, the passage reads as follows:

τὰς σημαίας φάσκων τὰς βασιλικὰς τὸν Πιλάτον νύκτωρ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀναθεῖναι ἀρχὴν τε στάσεων καὶ συμφορῶν ἐπαλλήλων ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις συμπεσεῖν.

Claiming [Philo] that Pilate had consecrated by night royal standards in the Temple and that following this, rebellions and common disasters had befallen the Jews.⁴¹¹

By contrast, Philo's *Legatio* 299 reads as follows:

οὗτος οὐκ ἐπὶ τιμῇ Τιβερίου μάλλον ἢ ἔνεκα τοῦ λυπῆσαι τὸ πλῆθος ἀνατίθησι ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἱερόπολιν Ἡρώδου βασιλείοις ἐπιχρύσους ἀσπίδας μήτε μορφήν ἐχούσας μήτε ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀπηγορευμένων, ἕξω τινὸς ἐπιγραφῆς ἀναγκαίας, ἢ δύο ταῦτα ἐμήνυε, τὸν τε ἀναθέντα καὶ ὑπὲρ οὗ ἡ ἀνάθεσις.

With the intention of annoying the people [the Jews] rather than honouring Tiberius, he [Pilate] consecrates in the palace of Herod in the holy city golden shields which bore neither figure, nor anything forbidden, except a necessary inscription mentioning these two things: the dedicator and the dedicatee.⁴¹²

This comparison reveals the following: Philo does not mention standards but shields; nor does he say that the dedication was operated at night; and, as we have seen, nor does he locate this event in the Temple but in Herod's palace.

In fact, contrary to Hardwick's hypothesis, the Philonic excerpt has not contaminated that of Josephus, quite the contrary: The terms *σημαίας* and *νύκτωρ*⁴¹³ which Eusebius ascribes to Philo are in fact those used by Josephus.⁴¹⁴ Moreover, Philo does not mention the moment when the event took place; in addition, he deals with golden shields (*ἐπιχρύσους ἀσπίδας*), not with standards. Consequently, the

⁴¹¹ *DE* VIII. 2. 403a. My translation.

⁴¹² *Legat.* 299. Translation by Smallwood, modified.

⁴¹³ *DE* VIII. 2. 403a 6, attributed to Philo.

⁴¹⁴ *AJ* XVIII. 55 and *Bj* II. 169.

problem should be formulated as follows: Did Eusebius paraphrase a passage unknown to us, or did he confuse Philo's and Josephus' testimonies? Colson chooses the second solution,⁴¹⁵ while Smallwood opts for the first one.⁴¹⁶ In any case, modern scholars think Eusebius only made a mistake. However, it seems to me that Eusebius may have intentionally attributed to Philo formulas used by Josephus. In my opinion, the passage from the Alexandrian philosopher which he refers to is chapter 299 of 'our' *Legatio*, and for this I would suggest the following explanation.

Chapter 299 of Philo's *Legatio* was certainly crucial to Eusebius because firstly, a non-Christian author reporting events that had happened in the time of Pilate (i.e., in the time of Jesus) could not be ignored by the apologist; secondly, the fact that the same author (Philo) confirmed the occurrence of events that indicated, according to Eusebius, the deconsecration of the Temple and therefore the end of the old covenant, would certainly not have been omitted by Eusebius; thirdly, Philo's testimony supported the narrative of his co-religionist Josephus: Eusebius clearly emphasizes that Philo's testimony "confirms" (συμμαρτυρεῖ) that of Josephus.⁴¹⁷ We know that Eusebius was eager to harmonize his sources, even if this meant ignoring their differences,⁴¹⁸ or, if necessary, tampering with the text. Philo's text in *Legatio* 299 was neither explicit enough,⁴¹⁹ nor powerful enough

⁴¹⁵ Colson, Philo X, LCL, pp. XIX–XX; Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaum*, p. 302.

⁴¹⁶ Smallwood, "Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same events", p. 127.

⁴¹⁷ *DE* VIII. 2. 403a.

⁴¹⁸ One such example may be found in Eusebius' use of the Josephan material: As Bardy, Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* VIII–X. SC 55. Paris: Cerf, 1958, p. 35, n. 3 has pointed out, in the *Historia ecclesiastica* (I. 10. 4–5), Eusebius harmonizes the testimonies of Luke 3: 1 and Josephus (*4J* XVIII. 34–35) in order to show that Jesus' teaching lasted four years; he reaches this date thanks to the priesthood of Ananus and Caiphas. However, in Luke, their priesthood occurs simultaneously, whereas Josephus mentions the quick succession of a certain number of high priests starting with Ananus and ending with Caiphas. The same texts are also used in the *Demonstratio* (VIII. 2. 398d–399a) but for other purposes.

⁴¹⁹ Today scholars still ponder the meaning of a sacrilege in the Temple. Indeed, Philo claims that the shields brought by Pilate into the city of Jerusalem (not even in the Temple) were aniconic and bore nothing forbidden. Feldman pointed out that "there is no special law concerning images applicable to Jerusalem; yet the Jews must have felt the violation more keenly because of the holiness of the city" (see Josephus IX, LCL, pp. 43–45). D. R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Philo on Pontius Pilate", *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 3, 1983, p. 33 has convincingly suggested that Philo and Josephus deal with the same event but that Philo modified the account for

from an apologetic point of view to suit Eusebius' purposes. Indeed, the philosopher's insistence on the fact that the shields bore "neither figure, nor anything forbidden" (μήτε μορφήν ἐχούσας μήτε ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀπηγορευμένων)⁴²⁰ undeniably weakened the argument of a Christian apologist such as Eusebius: The pagans or the newly converted Christians whom he addressed were certainly well aware of the Jewish ban relating to images;⁴²¹ but how could they understand the sacrilegious character of Pilate's deed as reported by Philo? This, I would argue, may explain Eusebius' decision to ascribe Josephus' words to Philo. Josephus' account of the same event was by far both more explicit and more convincing.

In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius also claims that Philo recounted that Pilate committed "something forbidden among the Jews" (τι παρὰ τὸ Ἰουδαίοις ἐξόν).⁴²² I believe that here too he is referring to Philo's *Legatio* 299, rather than to a lost passage/work, as argued by Smallwood.⁴²³ I cannot deny that the expression he uses to describe the episode seems to conflict with that of Philo, according to whom the shields bore "nothing forbidden". Yet I would argue that in this case too Eusebius was content with a vague summary of *Legatio* 299 in order to adjust it to his demonstration of the miseries of the Jews. It looks as if in this vague summary, Eusebius retained the only information that mattered to him in Philo's account, namely that a profanation had taken place. The rest of the account was omitted because it weakens that which appeared to him as Philo's main argument.

Eusebius thus seems to have distorted some of the Jewish texts quoted in book VIII of the *Demonstratio*. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that when doing so, he gave the text in *oratio obliqua* rather than in *oratio recta*. In addition, he provides no bibliographical reference to the passages he copied. Significantly, whereas in his *Chronicon*,⁴²⁴ he cites the two passages from Josephus that are also reproduced in

apologetic reasons. This would explain its odd character. According to Schwartz, Philo was reluctant to acknowledge in front of Caligula (who wished to have his statue erected in the Temple) that there was a precedent in the placing of the image of an emperor in Jerusalem. This is why he insisted on the fact that the shields were aniconic and bore nothing forbidden.

⁴²⁰ *Legat.* 299.

⁴²¹ See, e.g., Tacitus, *Hist.* V. 5. 4; Strabo, *Geog.* XVI. 2. 35.

⁴²² *HE* II. 5. 7.

⁴²³ Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, p. 302. Colson, on the contrary, suggests the same hypothesis as mine (Philo X, LCL, p. XX).

⁴²⁴ *Chron.* p. 175 Helm.

the *Demonstratio* before that of Philo, he does not quote Philo. These elements enable us to foresee, so to speak, the changes in the *Demonstratio*. Therefore, when Eusebius claims to cite a text faithfully, when he quotes it in *oratio recta* and gives a precise reference to the original text, it seems that he can generally be trusted.

DE IX. 5. 431 *a-b* = *Josephus*, AJ XVIII. 116–117

A final textual problem needs to be analyzed. At IX. 5. 431a–b of the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius cites Josephus' *Antiquities* (XVIII. 116–117). As Hardwick has pointed out, Josephus' original text reads that "Herod's army" (τὸν Ἡρώδου στρατόν) was destroyed because of the murder of John the Baptist. Yet in Eusebius' citation of Josephus, it is the "Jewish army" (τὸν Ἰουδαίων στρατόν) which was defeated,⁴²⁵ not Herod's. This change, which Hardwick neglects to explain, is not coincidental. By stressing that this army was that of the Jews in general, Eusebius once again suggests the end of Judaism and the replacement of the Jews by the Christians in the city of God. As in other cases, Eusebius faithfully cites the same excerpt from Josephus in the *Historia ecclesiastica*,⁴²⁶ mentioning Herod's army, as Josephus did. This indicates once again that he deliberately modified the text in the *Demonstratio* for apologetic and theological reasons.

8. CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of the "travail de la citation" for the Jewish authors' texts in the *Apodeixis* enables me to bring out several important points.

First of all, it confirms that in turning to the Jewish authors' writings, Eusebius positions his work in the tradition of the Christian Alexandrian tradition as exemplified by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. His choice of sources and methodology in exploiting them in the *Apodeixis* appear as the final outcome of a process sketched by his predecessors. In addition, Eusebius' treatment of these texts occasionally proves to be original. This is notably the case with his use both of the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas and of some Philonic treatises of a purely philosophical nature.⁴²⁷

⁴²⁵ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 79, n. 23.

⁴²⁶ *HE* I. 11. 4–6.

⁴²⁷ This point has been emphasized by Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 337.

Secondly, I pointed out Eusebius' carefulness in dealing with the Jewish material. In most cases, he takes great pains to provide exact references to the cited passages; likewise, the manner in which he cuts them indicates that he did pay attention to their content. It is likely, though it cannot be claimed with certainty, that he used florilegia of Jewish texts. This hypothesis does not preclude the possibility that he himself authored these collections, in which case the analysis of his method in cutting texts remains relevant. At any rate, it seems likely that he excerpted and then gathered some passages from Josephus' *Antiquities* (especially books XVIII and XX) and *War* dealing with the days of Jesus.

Thirdly, the assessment of Eusebius' faithfulness in citing reveals that he occasionally modified the text cited, mainly for theological and apologetic reasons. These changes proved to be infrequent but this makes their impact all the more powerful. Yet despite such examples, it seems unlikely that Eusebius himself was able to produce a forgery such as the famous *Testimonium Flavianum*: If Eusebius implemented a certain number of techniques in order to distort the original meaning of the cited passages, the creation of forgeries does not belong to his citation method.

Moreover, on many occasions, the semantic warping of the excerpts seems to result from Eusebius' methodology in cutting texts. Once isolated from its context, he could appropriate it and change its meaning. The distortions operated by Eusebius on the quotations reveal his creativity. By using different techniques, he skilfully manages to make a new meaning emerge from these texts.

An important difference between the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio* has appeared in the course of this chapter. Indeed, the bishop proves to be much more careful in dealing with his quotations in the *Praeparatio* than in the *Demonstratio*. This may be noted regarding the faithfulness to the text quoted as well as regarding the exactness of the references he gives. In this respect it is striking that in the *Demonstratio*, he feels free to quote texts in *oratio obliqua* whereas he almost never does this in the *Praeparatio*. This difference is probably due to the fact that when dealing with Christianity itself, he does not hesitate to modify the texts if needed. However, he gives his readers indications as to whether he is citing literally or not. He achieves this by making it explicit when he cites faithfully and by using *oratio recta* or *obliqua*. In the *Demonstratio*, he never pretends to cite a passage faithfully if he does not do so. Likewise, when the

same passage is quoted in the *Demonstratio* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*, and Eusebius claims to cite the passage faithfully in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, it generally proves to be true.

Finally, this chapter also revealed that Eusebius' textual changes generally aim to adjust the content of the text cited to his theological views (this is especially the case in the *Praeparatio*); on other occasions, they aim to adapt the text to his supposed readership (as often happens in the *Demonstratio*).

CHAPTER SIX

EUSEBIUS' USE OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

Having reviewed the citation practice in antiquity, Eusebius' technique in citing both Jewish and non-Jewish texts, and the status of the "Hebrews" and "Jews" in his work, let us turn to the question of his use of Jewish citations in the *Apodeixis*.

In this chapter, I will attempt to determine the function of the citations in Eusebius' argumentation, as well as their status. I will also seek to assess to what extent Eusebius distances himself from, or, on the contrary, espouses the voices and speech of the Jewish authors.

1. FUNCTION OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS IN THE *APODEIXIS*

It is important to analyze the reasons which led Eusebius to select certain passages in order to understand the function of the Jewish citations in his work. The apologist seems to have chosen these citations according to three criteria: a) Either these passages echoed Christian and Greek theological terminology; b) or they presented apologetic features and arguments that could easily be appropriated in favour of Christianity; c) or they provided historical information on the origins of Christianity. Each of these criteria requires further examination.

A. *Jewish Authors' Citations as Intermediary between Jewish-Christian and Greek Thought: The Case of Philo's and Aristobulus' Texts*

In many cases, Eusebius cites passages from the Jewish authors because they contain Greek philosophical vocabulary that enables him to explain or comment upon biblical or Christian theological notions. Needless to say, these authors (and Philo in particular) had operated a crucial synthesis between the Bible and Greek philosophy well before the Christians. This is largely the reason why Eusebius finds them useful. Indeed, the excerpts from Philo and Aristobulus constituted first-class instruments in order to "prepare" the newly

(or not yet) converted Greeks to accept the superiority of the Hebrew oracles, and thus of Christianity, over Greek philosophy in general and Platonic philosophy in particular. The citations in question are those which deal with the “Hebrew” doctrines in books VII and XI of the *Praeparatio*. The ones which concern the *Logos* illustrate this point quite well.

Indeed, thanks to its polysemy, the term ‘*Logos*’ itself could be understood as much as a reference to Johannine christology as an allusion to Platonic or Stoic philosophy.¹ The citations from Philo on the *Logos*² enable Eusebius to present that which could be called a ‘Hebrew pre-christology’ in philosophical terms that were understandable to a readership steeped in Platonism and especially in middle-Platonism. Ricken has shown that Eusebius was less influenced by neo-Platonism, as Berkhof thought,³ than by middle-Platonism and more specifically by Numenius.⁴

In Eusebius’ opinion, the Philonic passages on the *Logos* certainly anticipated Christianity. This anticipation was ideal in order to prepare his readership for the specifically Christian doctrines presented in the *Demonstratio*. The theological passages in Philo enabled him to both claim the antiquity of these doctrines (since Philo is represented as a “Hebrew who holds a precise knowledge of the ancestral doctrines from his fathers”),⁵ and to familiarize a non-Christian Greek audience fond of philosophy with these notions. In this context, Philo

¹ On the influence of Platonism on Christianity regarding the *Logos*, the secondary literature is enormous. See, e.g., J. Dillon, “Logos and Trinity: Patterns of Platonist Influence on Early Christianity”, in G. Vesey (Ed.), *The Philosophy in Christianity*. Supplement to ‘Philosophy’ Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Series 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 1–13. Dillon shows that the Plotinian triad was less useful to the Christians than the Porphyrian version of it.

² On the *Logos* in Philo, see Decharneux, *L’ange, le devin, le prophète*, pp. 15–21 and Couloubaritsis, *Aux origines de la philosophie européenne, de la pensée archaïque au néoplatonisme*, pp. 580–585; —, *Histoire de la philosophie ancienne et médiévale, figures illustres*, Paris: Grasset, 1998, pp. 568–580.

³ H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, p. 65 ff.

⁴ F. Ricken, “Die Logoslehre des Eusebius von Cäsarea und der Mittelplatonismus”, *Theologie und Philosophie* 42, 1967, pp. 341–358; see also Saffrey, “Les extraits du Περὶ τὰ γὰθοῦ de Numénios dans le livre XI de la Préparation évangélique d’Eusèbe de Césarée”; —, “Un lecteur antique des œuvres de Numénios: Eusèbe de Césarée”. Dillon, “Logos and Trinity: Patterns of Platonist Influence on Early Christianity”, pp. 5–7, also suggests that Numenius’ dyad was somehow relevant for the theology of, e.g., Origen.

⁵ *PE* VII. 12. 14.

was an ideal intermediary thanks to whom Eusebius could relate not Judaism and Christianity, as one might have expected, but Christianity and Hellenism. Indeed, Eusebius sees Philo as a predecessor. In the *Praeparatio*, he is implicitly considered a representative of Christianity.

Eusebius' methodology in dealing with the Philonic *Logos* becomes clearer when compared to that of Isidorus of Pelusion (ca. 365–435). Isidorus explicitly praises the Alexandrian philosopher, defining him as a “zealous Jew”, because he would have come into conflict with his own tradition by acknowledging the reference to the divine *Logos* in Genesis 9:6.⁶ Both Eusebius and Isidorus refer to the Philonic passage with the same purpose in mind, i.e., to demonstrate the truth of the Christian doctrine of the *Logos* through its presence in the Old Testament. Yet they do so in a very different manner: For Isidorus, Philo's testimony draws its demonstrative strength from the fact that he is a Jew, i.e., an outsider who is opposed to Christian dogmas by nature. On the contrary, in Eusebius, the importance of Philo's testimony stems from the fact that he is part and parcel of the Christian tradition, being a “Hebrew”.

In fact, Philo and the other Jewish authors cited in the *Apodeixis* are more than predecessors. In this work, and especially in the *Praeparatio*, they are literally used as spokesmen on behalf of Christianity. The case of the citations from Philo is particularly interesting. Indeed, the Christian doctrines defined through them seem to constitute the *topoi* of Eusebius' apologetic argumentation. When in the *Laus Constantini*, e.g., the bishop approaches the Christian doctrines,⁷ he starts by dealing with the creation of the world; he insists that the Creator must be venerated more than the *cosmos* which He created. This, he says, is the mistake of those who transferred the cult of the Creator to His creature.⁸ The same idea recurs in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* through Philo's words.⁹ Likewise, in books VII and XI, Eusebius chooses Philo to inform readers about the first-born *Logos* of God,

⁶ *Epist.* II. 143. Cf. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 206. Runia does not make clear that Isidorus is here alluding to our passage of the *Quaest. in Gen.*

⁷ *LC* XI. 7 ff. For the text, see I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke I, Tricennatsrede an Constantin*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1902. A French annotated translation and commentary was recently published by P. Maraval, *Eusèbe de Césarée, La théologie politique de l'Empire chrétien. Louanges de Constantin (Triakontaétérkos)*, Introduction, traductions et notes par P. M., Paris: Cerf, 2001.

⁸ Cf. *Rom.* 1:25; *Wisdom* 13–15.

⁹ *PE* VIII. 13. 1–6.

the intermediary between the Father and the *cosmos*.¹⁰ More specifically, as Maraval has pointed out,¹¹ in the *Laus Constantini*, the description of the *Logos*, which is presented as harmonizing the *cosmos*, is very close to the passage from Philo's *De agricultura* cited by Eusebius at VII. 13. 5 of the *Praeparatio*. For instance, Eusebius uses the expression "unbreakable bond" (δεσμὸν . . . ἄρρηκτον) to describe the *Logos*, which, as when he attacks astrolatry and encourages his readers to adore only the one God, he does through Philo.¹²

In addition, the manner in which these citations are inserted into the *Praeparatio* confirms that they are used in order to enable him to connect Hellenism to Christianity. For instance, Eusebius appeals to Philo in book XI in which he compares Moses' and Plato's philosophy on the second cause; claiming agreement between the Platonists and the "Hebrews" on the existence of a second cause, he begins with a citation from the Scriptures, then he quotes Philo (*De confusione linguarum*), Plato (*Epinomis* and *Letters*), Plotinus (*Ennead* V), Numenius (*On Good*) and finally Amelius ("On the theology of John our evangelist"),¹³ respectively. A theological chain is thus built up, as it were, which starts with the "Hebrews" (the Scriptures and Philo) and ends with middle- and neo-Platonists. This chain of authority serves to legitimize the Christian doctrine of the second cause from a Platonic point of view. Moreover, it enables the bishop to implicitly claim the superiority of the Christian doctrine by presenting it as rooted in ancient "Hebrew" beliefs. Its antiquity gives it its superiority, especially by comparison with Platonism, which, as he had already demonstrated,¹⁴ came much later.

The weight of Eusebius' argument also lies in the fact that it emphasized the continuity between the best Greek philosophy (that of Plato) and the "Hebrew" doctrines inherited by the Christians. This reasoning enabled Eusebius to subordinate Platonism to Christianity. This was especially clever because it could help him undermine the reluctance of non-Christians who were not ready to leave behind their attachment to Platonic philosophy. In sum, Eusebius'

¹⁰ Cf. *LC* XI. 12 ff.

¹¹ Maraval, *La théologie politique de l'Empire chrétien*, p. 156, n. 1.

¹² *PE* XIII. 18. 12–16.

¹³ *PE* XI. 15–19.

¹⁴ See, e.g., *PE* X. 7–14.

message could be summarized as follows: The Gospel of Christ is nothing but a superior form of Platonism. Aristobulus' citations were of great importance from this viewpoint because he clearly claimed Plato's dependency upon the Scriptures.¹⁵

Yet it is worth noting that Eusebius' attempt to trace the doctrine of the *Logos* back to the Hebrews via Philo seems to have had no effect on the emperor Julian. The latter completely ignores this argument in that part of his *Contra Galilaeos* in which he deals with the Christian doctrine of the *Logos*.¹⁶ He cites several biblical verses which demonstrate the absence of the doctrine of a second God, and neither does he mention Eusebius' argument, despite his knowledge of the *Apodeixis*.

In addition, Eusebius also appropriates the theme of the "man in the image", which is one of the favourite of the Alexandrian school,¹⁷ as well as that of the double creation of the world. In the *Praeparatio*, the double creation illustrates the theme of the Ideas (in the Platonic meaning of this term) amongst the "Hebrews". Before Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria had also taken over Philo's exegesis of the creation as presented in the *De opificio mundi*. This is why Eusebius cites him next to Philo in the *Praeparatio*.¹⁸ Obviously, the bishop did not emphasize that his Christian predecessor borrowed from Philo. He preferred to see it as an incidental agreement between them.

Besides Philo, other Jewish authors also played the role of spokesman of Christianity. As I have pointed out, the Jewish authors' testimonies in the *Apodeixis* on the antiquity of the Hebrews, on the dependency theme, or on any other subject increasing the status of Judaism actually serve to support the cause of Christianity. In the *Praeparatio*, where Eusebius does not directly or implicitly deal with Christianity as such, the Jewish authors' citations enable him to anticipate on his defence of the Gospel. Indeed, as predecessors of the Christians (in Eusebius' opinion), the Jewish authors could fill this role in an ideal way.

¹⁵ See *PE* IX. 6. 6-8 and XIII. 12. 1-2.

¹⁶ *Contra Galileos* 261e-276e.

¹⁷ Cf. H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origen*. Théologie 34. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1956.

¹⁸ *PE* XI. 24-25.

Similarly, at *Praeparatio* XI. 24, Eusebius attempts to show the agreement between Plato and Moses on the Ideas. He grounds his argument on the creation by God of an intelligible world, in the image of which the sensible world was made. The starting point of Eusebius' reflection is Plato's *Timaeus* 29a7–b2 and 30c9–d1.¹⁹ Plato's citation is then explicited through Arius Didymus' *On Plato's Opinions*,²⁰ while Philo's is followed by a quotation from Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*.²¹ This points to Philo's role as intermediary, whose citation enables Eusebius to connect Plato to Clement. Yet, as I already emphasized, in the passage selected by the bishop, Clement borrows his exegesis from Philo. Eusebius, however, is content with mentioning an agreement (συνῳδει)²² between Clement and Philo on the double creation of both an intelligible and a sensible world.

Even when the Jewish authors' citations are not directly linked to one another, an echo, as it were, is created in the *Praeparatio* between the Jewish quotations and the Greek ones. The citation from Philo on the creation of the world at VIII. 13, e.g., seems to echo that of Atticus on the same subject in book XV.²³ Both authors criticize those who exalt the creation more than its Creator;²⁴ in the same passage, both authors claim that divine providence—the existence of which is undeniable—inevitably induces that the world was created.²⁵

¹⁹ *PE* XI. 23. 1. Whereas Eusebius presents this citation as a whole, in Plato it consists in fact of two passages which are separated by several pages. For further detail, see Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, pp. 330–332.

²⁰ *PE* XI. 23. 3. On Eusebius' use of Arius Didymus, see Favrelle, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292, pp. 270–271: According to her, Eusebius saw Arius Didymus as a “vieux professeur consciencieux”. He does not cite him as a philosopher but only to clarify a specific point of Platonic doctrine.

²¹ *Str.* V. 93. 4–94. 5.

²² *PE* XI. 24. 12.

²³ On the ancient discussion as to whether the world was created or not, see, e.g., J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964, pp. 79–101.

²⁴ *PE* VIII. 13. 1 and XV. 6. 16.

²⁵ Atticus, seeking to prove that Plato supported the view that the world was begotten, offers a strange explanation. Contradicting the Peripatetics, he asserts that although Plato considered at first that the world was unbegotten, the crucial importance of the doctrine of divine providence led him to give up its unbegotten character. Indeed, he did not wish to support the idea of an unbegotten world because it would have deprived the world of divine providence (ἵνα μὴ ἀποστερήσῃ τὸν κόσμον τῆς προνοίας ἀφεῖλε τὸ ἀγέννητον αὐτοῦ) (*PE* XV. 6. 2). On the conceptions of providence during the imperial period, see M. Dragona-Monachou, “Divine Providence in the Philosophy of the Empire”, *ANRW* II. 36. 7, 1994, pp. 4417–4490.

The same applies to Philo's citation on divine providence. Atticus' citation on the same subject seems to echo that of Philo.²⁶

A close look at the vocabulary used in the Jewish authors' passages (those of Philo in particular) also seems to indicate that they were selected because of the occurrence therein of terms and concepts common both to the Jewish-Christian tradition and to Greek philosophy. This is the case with the word *Logos*, also defined as God's first-born son, as well as with the term εἰκόν and its cognates. It appears from Philo's citations in the *Praeparatio* that Eusebius was careful to select passages dealing with the theme of the image, even when he does not deal specifically with the theme of the creation of man.²⁷ When presenting the doctrine of the *Logos* in book VII, e.g., the first passage he quotes (from Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin*) has to do with the theme of the image.²⁸ Likewise, the creation of man is also treated through the Philonic conception of man created in the image of the *Logos*.²⁹ Significantly enough, when Eusebius explains the "Hebrews'" conception of the creation of man, he selects a Philonic passage in which man is presented as image of the image, i.e., image of the *Logos*, rather than a passage mentioning the creation of man in God's image.³⁰ This is due to the fact that, in his opinion, the *Logos* as second cause is part and parcel of the "Hebrews'" theology and anthropology.

Likewise, when in book XI of the *Praeparatio* he returns to the question of the second cause, the two Philonic excerpts he chooses also include the theme of the *Logos* as image of God.³¹ In chapter 24 of book XI, the theme of the image is obviously at the core of his treatment of the "Hebrews'" doctrine of the creation of both a sensible and an intelligible world. The theme of the εἰκόν conveniently suits the apologist's purpose because it enables the meeting of the crucial passage from Genesis on the creation of man (Genesis

²⁶ *PE* VIII. 14. 1–72 and XV. 5. 1–14.

²⁷ On this theme in Philo, see J. Giblet, *L'homme image de Dieu dans les commentaires littéraires de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Universitas Catholica Lovanienses, Sylloge excerptorum e dissertationibus ad gradum doctoris in sacra theologia vel in Iure canonico consequendum conscriptis XVII, fasc. 5. Louvain, 1949.

²⁸ *PE* VII. 13. 1–2.

²⁹ *PE* VII. 18. 1–2.

³⁰ Cf. *Opif.* 69.

³¹ *PE* XI. 15. 1–6.

1:26–27) with Plato's *Timaeus*.³² It is worth noting that it is the first time that Genesis and the *Timaeus* are explicitly associated by a Christian author in the *Praeparatio*. This association is sealed by Philo's testimony, who was the first author to operate such a synthesis.

Likewise, in some Philonic material quoted by Eusebius, the middle-Platonic vocabulary belonging to the semantic sphere of the seal and of likeness enables the bishop to connect 'Hebraism' and (medio-) Platonism: Terms or expressions such as τύπος,³³ χαραχθῆναι,³⁴ ἀρχέτυπος σφραγίς,³⁵ παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα,³⁶ ἐξομοιωθῆναι,³⁷ παράδειγμα,³⁸ μίμημα³⁹ may all be seen as allusions to Plato's *Timaeus* and more specifically to its middle-Platonic interpretation. The use of such Philonic passages was a strategic move since it enabled Eusebius' Platonic readership to accept Philo's biblical exegesis. By doing so, the bishop certainly hoped to confirm the faith of the newly converted and perhaps to convince some Greeks. Crucially, this indicates that Eusebius' use of philosophical-theological Philonic passages took place in a strongly apologetic context. When dealing directly with Christian theology in the *Demonstratio*, Philo's passages will not be needed and will, therefore, not be quoted either.

To go back to Philo and the *Timaeus*, the role of the intertextual process should be emphasized. It certainly played an important role in the function of the Jewish passages gathered and quoted in the *Praeparatio*: Philo's philosophical passages could be read as much in reference to Plato's *Timaeus* as in reference to the prologue of John or to some of Paul's Epistles. Indeed, Philo's idea that the *Logos* was called "man according to the image" (ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος) is remindful of Colossians I. 15 and its subsequent Patristic exegesis.⁴⁰

³² *Tim.* 29b 2; 33c 2; 37d 7; 52c 2; 64e 5; 70d 4; 92c 7.

³³ *PE* VII. 13. 2.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *PE* XI. 24. 3.

³⁶ *PE* XI. 15. 6.

³⁷ *PE* VII. 13. 2.

³⁸ *PE* XI. 24. 3; 8; 12.

³⁹ *PE* XI. 24. 3.

⁴⁰ Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Origen and Athanasius are, from this viewpoint, Philo's heirs. See Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, p. 182 for the references to the texts. On Philo's and Paul's use of the theme of the image, see J. Jervell, *Imago dei. Gen. I, 26 im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den Paulinischen Briefen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960, pp. 52–70 and 171–255.

In this context, the label 'son of God' which Philo⁴¹ gives to the *Logos* was undeniably remindful, from a Christian perspective, of Colossians 1:15. Yet the Epistle uses the word *πρωτότοκος* whereas Philo uses *πρωτόγονος*. In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius himself follows Philo in using *πρωτόγονος* rather than *πρωτότοκος*.⁴² In the course of the *Praeparatio*, the bishop cites almost all the Philonic passages that mention the *Logos* as first-born of God.⁴³ Only the *De Somniis* (I. 215), which mentions "the first-born son of God, the divine *Logos*" (ὁ αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος) is not quoted by Eusebius. This may be due to the fact that Philo uses the expression in a metaphor dealing with the Temple and the high priest, two distinctly "Jewish" elements which were not desirable in Eusebius' apologetic work in favour of Christianity.

Eusebius' Christian appropriation of the Philonic doctrine of the *Logos* is noteworthy. Indeed, Bréhier pointed out a long time ago "l'absence presque complète de détails sur le rapport du *Logos* à l'être suprême"⁴⁴ in Philo. Couloubaritsis has suggested that one of the methods chosen by Philo to clarify the relationship between God and the *Logos* is his use of, in Couloubaritsis' terms, the "schème de la parenté".⁴⁵ This "scheme of family kinship" is, as he has shown, ubiquitous in the ancient practice of myths. In other words, Philo

⁴¹ *Agric.* 51 = *PE* VII. 13. 3. See also the *Logos* as son of God in Philo's *Plant.* 8–10 = *PE* VII. 13. 4–6. On this, see Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, I, 177–182; L. Couloubaritsis, "Transfiguration du Logos, Philosophies non-chrétiennes et christianisme", *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 116, 1984, pp. 9–44 and; B. Decharneux, "Le Logos premier-né de Dieu dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie," in J. Gayon and J.-J. Wunenberger (Eds.), *Le paradigme de la filiation*, Paris: L'harmattan, 1995, pp. 361–370;—, "Les chemins de la parole dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie," in C. Levy (Ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie et le langage de la philosophie*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1998, pp. 313–326.

⁴² *PE* VII. 12. 10.

⁴³ *Confus.* 63 = *PE* XI. 15. 6; *Confus.* 146 = *PE* XI. 15. 2.

⁴⁴ Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 117.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Couloubaritsis, *Mythe et Philosophie chez Parménide*, Bruxelles: Ousia, 1990;—, "De la généalogie à la genèseologie," in J.-F. Mattéi (Ed.), *La naissance de la raison en Grèce: actes du congrès de Nice, Mai 1987*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990, pp. 83–96;—, "Transfigurations du paradigme de la parenté," pp. 169–186;—, "Genèse et structure dans le mythe hésiodique des races," in F. Blaise, P. Judet de la Combe and Ph. Rousseau (Eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*. Cahiers de Philologie: Apparat critique 17. Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996, pp. 479–518;—, *Histoire de la philosophie ancienne et médiévale*, 1998;—, *Aux origines de la philosophie européenne, passim* and for Philo, see p. 582.

uses the Father-Son relation as a means to explain the connection between God and the *Logos*. By contrast, Eusebius reinterprets the Philonic concept of *Logos* “son of God” or “first-born son of God” in a distinctly Christian fashion: In Christianity, the *Logos* was incarnated and Eusebius understands the Philonic *Logos* in this sense. Yet, as Decharneux has recalled,⁴⁶ Philonic thought and Christian thought are, in this respect, clearly different. Indeed, the notion of incarnated Word is absolutely foreign to the Alexandrian philosopher’s reflections. Therefore, by quoting Philo’s texts on the *Logos*, Eusebius, in his appropriation of Philo, operates a very strong distortion of the Philonic doctrine of the *Logos*.

Likewise, a passage from Aristobulus⁴⁷ also has interesting Christian resonances. According to him, “the same [?] applies to the *Sophia* for all light comes from her”. This, he adds, explains why Peripatetics claimed that it served as a torch. Therefore, Aristobulus implicitly links the *Sophia* to Genesis 1:3 (which recounts the creation of light). In addition, his passage may be read intertextually with several verses of the Christian Scripture because, as second God, the *Sophia* could be assimilated to the *Logos*. This is the case with the prologue of the Fourth Gospel (1:4–5), in which the Word is represented as light. Aristobulus’ claims may also be read intertextually with the second Epistle to the Corinthians (4:6) which addresses the theme of Christ-Light. In this respect, Alexandre reminds us that “la référence au Verbe, ‘lumière véritable’ sera constante” in the Church Fathers.⁴⁸ Therefore, Aristobulus’ quotation also served to link Greek philosophy to the Christian Scriptures.

Finally, the Jewish quotations also enable Eusebius to connect Greek philosophy to the Jewish-Christian tradition, not from a non-theological point of view, but rather from a logical point of view. Just like Eusebius, several Jewish authors had attempted to demonstrate that their faith was philosophically justified. As Sterling has suggested in an article on Philo’s *Hypothetica*, e.g., in this work, Philo wished to defend Judaism by appealing not to the Scriptures but to

⁴⁶ E.g., in “Le Logos premier-né de Dieu dans l’œuvre de Philon d’Alexandrie”.

⁴⁷ *PE* VII. 14. 1.

⁴⁸ Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, p. 91. One may cite, e.g., Theophilus of Antioch who presents the Word as a Lamp during the creation of the world (*Ad Aut.* II. 13).

reason, and to Stoic principles in particular.⁴⁹ This was also Eusebius' purpose in the *Praeparatio*, namely to show the rationality of the Jewish-Christian tradition. Therefore, in order to reach his goal, Eusebius could quote some of these Jewish authors' passages, in which this approach was implemented. In this kind of context too, the Jewish quotations helped him bridge the gap between Jewish-Christian and Greek cultures.

B. *Jewish Authors' Citations as a Source of Apologetic and Polemical Themes: The Cases of Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus, Pseudo-Aristeas and the "Minor" Jewish Authors*

The decisive influence of Hellenistic and Roman Jewish apologetics on Christian apologetics is well known.⁵⁰ Eusebius was also influenced by Jewish apologetic writings. Moreover, he certainly selected passages from these works because of their apologetic nature. By quoting these excerpts, he simply appropriated the Jewish authors' words. He did not even need to bring any further changes to them in order to Christianize them. Josephus' demonstration of the antiquity of the Jewish people,⁵¹ e.g., could be used directly to prove the antiquity of their Christian heirs. The identification of the Hyksos, mentioned by Manetho, as Hebrews in order to prove the latter's antiquity was an idea borrowed from Josephus,⁵² which Eusebius had already fully exploited in his *Chronicle*.⁵³ In this respect, Tatian had certainly paved the way for him.⁵⁴

Likewise, some apologetic themes such as the dependency of the Greek poets and philosophers upon the Scriptures,⁵⁵ which had been developed notably by Aristobulus, are taken over by Eusebius from him in the *Praeparatio*. By quoting Aristobulus' relevant passages, he was feeding his own defence of Christianity.

⁴⁹ Sterling, "Philo and the Logic of Apologetics", pp. 418–422.

⁵⁰ See Alexandre, "Apologétique judéo-hellénistique et premières apologies chrétiennes", in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 1–40.

⁵¹ *PE* X. 13. 1–12.

⁵² *CA* I. 82–90.

⁵³ See Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, pp. 80–82.

⁵⁴ *Or. ad Graec.* 35–41.

⁵⁵ *PE* XIII. 12. 11–16 and IX. 6–8 through Clement.

Surprisingly, when dealing with the Jewish practice of allegory, Eusebius does not quote Philo, the Jewish master of allegory *par excellence*, as one might have expected. Instead, he prefers to give a lengthy passage from the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas on the same subject.⁵⁶ This apparent paradox may be explained by the apologetic character of this passage, which really constitutes an apology in favour of the Jewish Law and a harsh criticism of polytheism. Eusebius would thus rather cite an apologetic plea for Judaism under the pretext of presenting an account of the Jewish allegory than quote 'pure' allegory in Philonic fashion.

Likewise, it is not surprising that Eusebius chose Josephus' passage from the *Contra Apionem* in which the latter fiercely attacks Greek historiography, emphasizing its inferiority by comparison with Oriental historiography.⁵⁷

In addition, Eusebius does not use the Jewish authors' excerpts cited in book IX of the *Praeparatio* only as intermediary sources, as Hardwick has emphasized.⁵⁸ Indeed, when Eusebius quotes Josephus' *Contra Apionem* and *Antiquities*, he also aims to appropriate the apologetic approach set out by Josephus.⁵⁹ The latter attempts to legitimize the biblical narrative and the antiquity of his people, as does Eusebius. Moreover, in book XI of the *Praeparatio*, the bishop seems to have substantially improved the methodology used by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*. One of Josephus' apologetic techniques was to provide quotations from Greek authors on the Jews.⁶⁰ Eusebius adopts this method in book IX in which he quotes many of the passages given by Josephus. Yet he adds many excerpts from Alexander Polyhistor that mention the Hebrews and the Jews. In doing so, he reinforces the Josephan argument that numerous Greeks knew and admired the Hebrews and Jews.

In addition to quoting apologetic passages from the Jewish authors, it is noteworthy that on many occasions Eusebius starts quoting them precisely when they criticize Hellenism or paganism.⁶¹

⁵⁶ See especially *PE* VIII. 9. 7–10.

⁵⁷ *PE* X. 7. 1–21.

⁵⁸ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, pp. 98–100.

⁵⁹ On this subject, see A. Kasher, "Polemic and Apologetic Methods of Writing in *Contra Apionem*", *Josephus' Contra Apionem*, in L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison, *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, pp. 143–186.

⁶⁰ See my "La pratique de la citation dans le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josephus", *Ktema* 30, 2005 (Forthcoming).

⁶¹ *PE* VII. 18. 1; VIII. 10. 1; VIII. 13. 1; VIII. 14. 1; XIII. 18. 12; X. 7. 1.

Finally, it is no coincidence if in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius quotes at length from Philo's and Josephus' highly apologetic portrayal of Moses and the Law.⁶² Philo's excerpt from the *Hypothetica* which deals with Moses and Exodus is particularly significant in this respect: It openly answers Greek criticism of Moses, according to which the latter was a charlatan and a sorcerer.⁶³ Eusebius does not hesitate to present this passage as a Jewish defence against their accusers.⁶⁴

It appears, then, that the apologist of Caesarea deliberately chose Jewish texts that initially intended both to give an idealized image of the Law and of Moses, and to defend them against pagan attacks. Such passages could conveniently be reused to support Christian apologetics because Christianity was conceived by Eusebius (at least in the *Praeparatio*) and by the pagans⁶⁵ as the heir to the Mosaic regime.

C. *Jewish Authors' Citations as a Source for Christian History*

In the *Demonstratio*, some Jewish citations⁶⁶ were selected because they provide crucial information on Jesus and John the Baptist. Other passages⁶⁷ were also chosen because they provide information on Christianity albeit in a more indirect fashion and from a more theological point of view. As I have pointed out, these excerpts serve to demonstrate that historical signs had announced the end of the old covenant and the emergence of the new covenant.

The function of these citations in the *Demonstratio* is therefore closer to that which they have in the *Historia ecclesiastica* than in the *Praeparatio*, even though they are exploited at a theological rather than a historical level. In the next section, I will delve into this question more deeply.

⁶² *PE* VIII. 8–9.

⁶³ *PE* VIII. 6. 2. The same criticism appears in Origen's *CC* I. 26. Josephus also mentions these attacks in his *CA* (II. 145; II. 161). On pagan views of Moses, see J. G. Gager, *Moses in Graeco-Roman Paganism*. SBL Monograph Series 16. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972. Gohei Hata has pointed out that, even in the *AJ*, his portrayal of Moses is built so as to answer anti-Jewish attacks: See Hata, "The Story of Moses Interpreted within the Context of Anti-Semitism", in H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*. *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 180–197.

⁶⁴ *PE* VIII. 5. 11.

⁶⁵ See, e.g., especially Celsus' claims in Origen's *CC* I *passim*.

⁶⁶ *DE* IX. 5. 431 a = Josephus, *AJ* XVIII. 116–117 and *DE* III. 5. 124 b–c = Josephus, *AJ* XVIII. 63–64.

⁶⁷ *DE* VI. 18. 291b–c = Josephus, *AJ* IX. 224–225; *DE* VIII. 2. 397d–398a = Josephus, *AJ* XX. 247–249; *DE* VIII. 2. 398b = Josephus, *AJ* XVIII. 92–93; *DE* VIII. 2. 399a = Josephus, *AJ* XVIII. 34–35; *DE* VIII. 2. 402d = Josephus, *BJ* VI. 299; *DE* VIII. 2. 403a = Josephus, *AJ* XVIII. 55 ff. and *BJ* II. 169 ff.; *DE* VIII. 2. 403a = Philo, *Legat.* 299 ff.

2. EXPLOITATION OF THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS IN THE *APODELIXIS*

At the start of this work, I emphasized the importance of the quoted authors' authority in the *Praeparatio*. As regards the Jewish authors' citations, the question of their status is intricately linked to that of how they are used. Eusebius' decision to use them either as "Hebrew" or as "Jewish" testimony, e.g., plays an important role in Eusebius' appropriation of these passages. It also happens, as in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, that some authors are given no status at all. This is notably the case with Flavius Josephus and the "minor" Jewish authors cited through Alexander Polyhistor. This is because in this context the Jewish authors make way for the Greek authors they cite or by whom they are cited. Although in the *Historia ecclesiastica* Eusebius mentions Demetrius the Chronographer and Eupolemus along with Josephus as defenders of Judaism's antiquity, he only presents them as sources used by Clement of Alexandria in his *Stromata*.⁶⁸

It should also be noted that Eusebius sees Pseudo-Aristeas, the author of the *Letter*, neither as a "Hebrew" nor as a "Jewish" writer. Indeed, he accepts the fiction of this work and acknowledges the pagan Aristeas as its author.⁶⁹

In chapter IV, we saw that Eusebius often presented the Jewish authors as "Hebrews". It is now time to determine what this label covers and in what way it conditions Eusebius' use of the Jewish authors.

A. Jewish Authors' Citations as "Hebrew" Testimonies

"Hebrew" Authors as Carriers of the "Hebrew" Tradition:

PE VII. 13. 1–6 = Philo, QG II. 62; De agricultura 51; Plantatione 8–10 Respectively—PE VII. 14. 1 = Aristobulus fr. 5e Holladay—PE VII. 18. 1–2 = Plantatione 18–20—PE XIII. 12. 1–16 = Aristobulus fr. 3–4–5 Holladay

Throughout the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius emphasizes the ancestral culture enjoyed by the Jewish authors. Aristobulus' testimony, e.g., guarantees

⁶⁸ *HE VI. 1. 7.*

⁶⁹ This is also the case with Tertullian. The latter emphasizes the role of both the non-Jews Ptolemy and Aristeas, and of Menedemus the philosopher (cf. *Letter* 199–201; Tertullian, *Apolog.* XVII. 5–9).

the ancestral character of the doctrine of the second cause (κυροῖ τὸ δόγμα ὡς πάτριον);⁷⁰ likewise, the Seventy translators of the Pentateuch "have provided proof of their ancestral culture" (τῇ πατρίῳ παιδείᾳ δεδοκιμασμένων).⁷¹ In this context, Eusebius also claims to appeal to Philo the "Hebrew" about the doctrine of the *Logos* for fear of being accused of sophistry (σοφίζεσθαι).⁷² Surprisingly, in the *Praeparatio*, the treatment of Moses is similar to that of the Jewish authors: Just as they are seen as the guardians of the "Hebrew" wisdom defined as τὰ πάτρια, Moses' testimony is presented as that of a specialist in ancestral matters [i.e., of the Hebrews] (εἰ τε τὰ πάτρια ἐξεπιστάμενος).⁷³

In the *Apodeixis*, the word πάτριος does not refer to a "Jewish" tradition with which Eusebius associates the Jewish authors. On the contrary, it designates the "Hebrew" tradition as analyzed in chapter IV, i.e., as a philosophically idealized representation of the biblical Patriarchs' life and piety. Eusebius considers the Jewish authors whom he cites (apart from those cited through Polyhistor, as I will show) as the legitimate heirs of this tradition.

As we have seen, the bishop distinguishes between the "Jewish" majority and a small "Jewish" elite. This elite is in his view in continuity with the ancient Hebrews from a philosophical and religious viewpoint. There is no doubt that in the *Apodeixis*, he includes the Jewish authors in this elite. Thanks to his representation of these authors and their status as "Hebrews," he seems to suggest that they belong to the happy few who are entrusted with the sacred and pure knowledge of the biblical patriarchs.

One of the ways in which Eusebius expresses this conviction is by conferring on them the title of "Hebrew" "philosopher" or "sage". Aristobulus, e.g., is described as the "Hebrew philosopher" (τοῦ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλοσόφου),⁷⁴ or as a "Hebrew sage" (Ἑβραίων σοφὸς ἀνὴρ).⁷⁵

⁷⁰ PE VII. 13. 7.

⁷¹ PE VIII. 1. 7.

⁷² PE VII. 12. 14.

⁷³ PE VII. 7. 1.

⁷⁴ PE XIII. 11. 3.

⁷⁵ PE VII. 13. 7.

Eusebius' representation of the Jewish authors as the true "Hebrew" holders of the patriarchs' wisdom and piety determines his use of their texts in many passages of the *Praeparatio*. In book VII, e.g., he cites Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesin*, *De agricultura*, and *De plantatione*, as well as a passage from Aristobulus, in order to prove that the "Hebrews" believed in a "second cause". His implicit but firm intention was to demonstrate that some Christian doctrines were not innovatory but fed rather on ancient and venerable "Hebrew" doctrines. This claim was made possible by Jewish testimonies such as those of Philo and Aristobulus who seemed to anticipate on the Christian doctrine. Therefore, Eusebius insists on these authors' authority as "Hebrews" in order to show the legitimacy of the Christian beliefs that were, according to him, based on those of their "Hebrew" ancestors.

This raises the question as to whether Eusebius was deliberately manipulating his readers by presenting as "Hebrew" some testimonies he knew were "Jewish". In other words, is the title "Hebrew" he gives to the Jewish authors only a sophistry serving to legitimize some Christian doctrines? This seems unlikely. In fact, Eusebius was probably sincerely impressed by the fact that some of Philo's and Aristobulus' passages so exactly reflected some aspects of Christianity. Since neither was a Christian, this could only mean that they were "Hebrews", just like the Christians' ancestors. Moreover, Eusebius followed a Christian Alexandrian tradition which, since Clement, had been influenced by Philo and extensively used his texts. Nonetheless, it remains significant that Eusebius ascribes the notion of a second cause to Philo and Aristobulus as "Hebrews" rather than to the same authors as "Jews", as he presents them in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*.

In this context, the preparatory function of the Jewish authors' citations in the *Praeparatio* is particularly important: It is only after the initiation to the "Hebrew" doctrine of the *Logos* in the *Praeparatio* that the reader, either pagan or newly converted, is ready for the Christian teaching on Jesus in the *Demonstratio*.

Likewise, Philo's excerpt from the *De plantatione* on man "created in God's image"⁷⁶ enables Eusebius to show that, according to the "Hebrews," part of the human being is neither carnal nor corporeal but intelligible and rational, since it was created in God's image.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ PE VII. 18. 1–2.

⁷⁷ PE VII. 17. 3.

The interpretation of Genesis 1:26–27 as a reference to the human soul was already that of the Christian Alexandrian school,⁷⁸ in which Eusebius deserves a place in many respects. For instance, Clement and Origen applied this verse to the soul.⁷⁹ In addition, like Philo, Tatian, in his *Oratio ad Graecos*, linked the theme of ‘man in the image of God’ to the πνεῦμα.⁸⁰ Therefore, thanks to his authority as a “Hebrew” expert, Philo’s testimonies enabled Eusebius a) to legitimize a certain Christian anthropology, b) to confirm the continuity between “Hebrew” theology and Christian theology, and c) to imply the superiority of Christianity over paganism thanks to the antiquity of the “Hebrew” tradition.

Another example of this kind of use of the Jewish texts can be found in Philo’s passage on the begetting of matter. This theme was also dealt with by Eusebius in the context of the “Hebrew” doctrines. It constituted a distinctly Christian problem which had not been raised by the Jewish authors. The magnitude of the problem from the second and third century onward⁸¹ is illustrated by the fact that both Theophilus of Antioch and Tertullian each wrote a treatise entitled *Against Hermogenes*. Hermogenes supported the idea of a pre-existent matter of which God would only have arranged a part.⁸² Eusebius knew Theophilus’ work on the subject and he mentions it in his *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁸³ By contrast, as modern scholars have pointed out,⁸⁴ Philo’s opinion on the creation of matter is at best ambiguous. In his time, the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* was still in

⁷⁸ See Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, p. 184.

⁷⁹ Cf. “The Jewish Authors’ Citations as “Hebrew” Testimonies” on *Praeparatio* VII. 13. 1–2.

⁸⁰ *Or. ad Graec.* 7, 12, and 15. On the interpretation of this passage, see R. Mc L. Wilson, “The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. I, 26,” *StPat* 6, 1957, pp. 420–437.

⁸¹ On the philosophical problem of matter, see G. May, *Creatio ex nihilo: The Creation out of Nothing in early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994; M. Van Winden, *Calcidius on Matter: His Doctrine and Sources. A Chapter in the History of Platonism*. Philosophia antiqua 9. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

⁸² For further detail on this controversy, see E. Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 181–191.

⁸³ *HE* IV. 24.

⁸⁴ See, e.g., Hadas-Lebel, Philon d’Alexandrie. *De providentia*, p. 68; Harl, Philon d’Alexandrie. *Quis heres*, p. 63; Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, p. 78; Dillon, *The Middle Platonists*, London: Duckworth, 1996, p. 158; Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, p. 289 and S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian*

the process of formation in Judaism.⁸⁵ Yet for Eusebius, there could be no doubt that Philo agreed with Origen, Dionysius and Maximus (whom he mistakes for Methodius) whom he cites next to them. The bishop erroneously deduces from Philo's claim that God had perfectly calculated the quantity of matter necessary for the creation of the world that he spoke in favour of the creation of matter. This deduction is a real distortion of Philo's words. At any rate, it enables Eusebius to associate Philo's testimony with the Christian authors' citations because, in his view, the "Hebrew" doctrines as formulated by Philo merge into one and the same with those of his (Eusebius') co-religionists.

"Hebrew" Authors as Biblical Exegetes:

PE VII. 13. 1–6 = Philo, QG II. 62; De agricultura 51; Plantatione 8–10—PE VII. 14. 1 = Aristobulus fr. 5e Holladay—PE VII. 18. 1–2 = Plantatione 18–20—PE XI. 15.1–6 = Philo, De confusione linguarum 97; 146–147; 62–63—PE XI. 24. 1–12 = Philo, De opificio mundi 24–27; 29–31; 35–36—PE XIII. 12. 1–16 = Aristobulus fr. 3–4–5 Holladay—PE XIII. 18. 12–16 = Philo, De specialibus legibus I. 13–17; 20—DE VI. 18. 291b–c = Josephus, AJ IX. 224–225

The Jewish authors' "Hebrew" identity also gives them, in Eusebius' view, a certain authority as regards biblical hermeneutics. This enables him to use some of their passages as authorities in terms of the interpretation of the Scriptures.

His presentation of Philo is significant in this respect. Eusebius describes him as "eloquent" (πολύς . . . τῷ λόγῳ), "having vast thoughts" (πλατὺς ταῖς διανοίαις), "sublime and elevated in the contemplation of the divine Scriptures" (ὑψηλός τε ὦν καὶ μετέωρος ἐν ταῖς εἰς τὰς θείας γραφὰς θεωρίαις); he adds that he wrote a varied and multifarious comment on the sacred words (ποικίλην καὶ πολύτροπον τῶν ἱερῶν

Platonism and Gnosticism, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971, pp. 194–195, n. 3 both oppose Wolfson, according to whom Philo believed in creation *ex nihilo* (H. A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy*, I, p. 300 ff.). For a more general view of this debate, see Runia, *Philo of Alexandria on the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, pp. 152–153 and 171–173.

⁸⁵ Hadas-Lebel, *Philon d'Alexandrie. De providentia*, p. 70, refers to *Wisdom* (11: 17), which conceives of a formless and pre-existent matter and 2 *Macc.* (VII. 28), in which creation was made ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. See also Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, pp. 77–78.

λόγων πεποιήται ὑφήγησιν).⁸⁶ Likewise, when he claims that the second cause was part and parcel of the “Hebrews’” theology, Eusebius appeals to Philo, “a Hebrew interpreter of the meaning of Scripture” (ἐρμηνέα . . . τῆς ἐν τῇ γραφῇ διανοίας Ἑβραίων ἀνδρά), “who holds from his fathers an exact understanding of the traditions and who learnt the doctrine from masters” (τὰ οἰκεῖα πατρόθεν ἀκριβοῦντα καὶ παρὰ διδασκάλων τὸ δόγμα μεμαθηκότα).⁸⁷

Philo’s and Aristobulus’ “Hebrew” authority is necessary to Eusebius’ commentary on Scripture because it legitimates his interpretation. In particular, the bishop uses Philo “the Hebrew” as a biblical hermeneut. His use of Philo’s status as a “Hebrew” is remindful of that of the δευτερωταί. Like them, “Philo the Hebrew interprets more clearly the meaning of the doctrine” (τὴν δὲ τοῦ δόγματος διάνοιαν Φίλων ὁ Ἑβραῖος λευκότερον ἐρμηνεύων),⁸⁸ he and Clement of Alexandria “clarify the meaning of Moses’ writings” (τὴν ἐν τοῖς Μωσέως γράμμασι διάνοιαν σαφηνίζουσι).⁸⁹

Eusebius cites Philo’s commentaries on the Bible rather than any other because, as we have seen, it echoes Christian doctrine and thereby reinforces its legitimacy. The most significant passage in this respect is found at VII. 12. 14 of the *Praeparatio*. In order to demonstrate the presence of the divine *Logos* at the Father’s side, Eusebius quotes several biblical proof-texts before quoting the Jewish authors: Excerpts from Job,⁹⁰ Psalms,⁹¹ Proverbs,⁹² Genesis⁹³ and Wisdom of Solomon⁹⁴ are given to show that the Hebrews believed in a second

⁸⁶ *HE* II. 18. 1. These two adjectives are applied to Ulysses by Homer. What does it tell us about Eusebius’ view of Philo’s exegesis? He may mean that Philo tackles the interpretation of the Scriptures from different viewpoints (allegorical, literal), and that he does so in a clever way.

⁸⁷ *PE* VII. 12. 14.

⁸⁸ *PE* XI. 14. 10.

⁸⁹ *PE* XI. 23. 12.

⁹⁰ Job 28:12–13 and 22–23. Eusebius holds that Job lived before Moses (cf. *PE* VII. 8. 30): As in the rabbinic tradition, Job is considered contemporary with the patriarchs. Cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols., Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University, 1998 (orig. 1909–1938), II, p. 225.

⁹¹ Ps 32 (33): 6; 106 (107): 20; 147: 20; 32 (33): 9.

⁹² Prov 8:12 and 15; 8:22–31. Prov 8:22–31 is often used as a proof-text demonstrating the existence of Christ; it is also used in debates on his nature. Cf. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, p. 37 ff.

⁹³ Gen 1:26.

⁹⁴ Wisdom 6:22; 7:22–26; 8:1.

God. Only one New Testament text is mentioned, namely the prologue to the Fourth Gospel.⁹⁵ Eusebius justifies its presence amongst “Hebrew” passages by claiming that it “clarifies” (διασαφει) the theology of the ancestral prophetic doctrine (πάτριον, i.e., from the Hebrews), which was “renewed” (ἀνανεομένη)⁹⁶ by the evangelical teachings. However, Eusebius fears that his interpretation might appear biased to his readers. Indeed, they could not take for granted that these biblical proof-texts did indeed refer to the *Logos* first-born son of God. Therefore, he quotes Philo the “Hebrew,” “in order that one might not think that I am playing subtle tricks” (ἵνα δὲ μὴ σοφίζεσθαι με ταῦτα νομίσης). It is worth noting that the verb σοφίζεσθαι also occurs in Origen’s *Contra Celsum* in the same context. Indeed at II. 31, quoting Celsus, Origen claims that “after this, he [Celsus] accuses the Christians of playing subtle tricks when they say that the son of God is his own *Logos*” (Μετὰ ταῦτα Χριστιανοὶ ἐγκαλεῖ ὡς σοφίζομένοις ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι αὐτολόγον).

The Greek philosopher does not attack the Christians because they acknowledge the *Logos* as son of God, which would have been acceptable to a Platonist like Celsus; they are criticized because they present this *Logos* as the victim of an execution, which was unacceptable to a Greek philosopher. Oddly enough, Origen claims that “amongst the many Jews and renowned sages” (πολλοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ σοφοῖς γε ἐπαγγελλομένοις)⁹⁷ he met, none of them accepted the belief that the *Logos* was the son of God. This is his argument against Celsus who makes ‘his’ Jew say: “If thus the *Logos* is for you the son of God, we too approve of that” (Ὡς εἴ γε ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὑμῖν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπαινοῦμεν).⁹⁸

It is clear that the Palestinian doctors to which Origen refers have very different ideas from the Greek Jew staged by Celsus. Nevertheless, it is baffling that Origen, who knows Philo so well (he probably brought his works to Caesarea)⁹⁹ fails to note, whether deliberately

⁹⁵ John 1:1–4 = *PE* VII. 12. 9.

⁹⁶ *PE* VII. 12. 9.

⁹⁷ *CC* II. 31.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ See Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, pp. 157–83.

or not, that Philo occasionally presented the *Logos* as the son of God. Unless his status as a predecessor¹⁰⁰ in Origen somehow turned him into a Christian. In the first book of the *Contra Celsum*, Origen, going against Celsus, had already denied that a Jew may proclaim the coming of the "son of God".¹⁰¹ According to him, a Jew would rather have mentioned "God's anointed".¹⁰² Origen completely denies any doctrine of the son of God among the Jews and in the Old Testament. Therefore, Eusebius' approach goes against that of his master. According to Eusebius, a certain Jewish elite, deserving to be labelled "Hebrew" as legitimate ancestors, believed in a *Logos* son of God. The Christians, he argues, are their rightful heirs. Therefore, the Johannine *Logos* is, as it were, legitimated through Philo and Aristobulus. Indeed, a passage from Aristobulus is provided by the bishop in the chapter on the second God amongst the "Hebrews". This passage deals with the *Sophia*. Aristobulus claims that according to Solomon, *Sophia* existed before heaven and earth. This is undoubtedly a reference to Proverbs 8:22.¹⁰³ Philo was the first to establish an equivalence between the *Logos* and *Sophia*;¹⁰⁴ he was followed by Clement of Alexandria, Justin and Theophilus of Antioch.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, Aristobulus' excerpt is used by Eusebius as another "Hebrew" testimony on the second God, and is linked to the quotations from Philo on the *Logos*.

Going back to the verb σοφίζεσθαι used by both Origen and Eusebius, from a scholarly point of view, Eusebius was indeed σοφίζεσθαι in claiming that the doctrine of a second cause belonged

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 161–163.

¹⁰¹ Origen's claims seem to invalidate Barthélémy's hypothesis ("Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le Commentaire allégorique?," p. 68). According to the latter, the Philonic passages mentioning the *Logos* as son of God which are cited in Eusebius' *Praeparatio* come from a collection of *testimonia* arranged by Origen in order to be used in Jewish-Christian debates. If, according to Origen, no Jew ever believed in the *Logos* son of God, it is unlikely that he would have used Philo's texts to tell Jews that a Jew like Philo accepted that the *Logos* was the son of God. At any rate, it is worth noting that a pagan like Celsus was aware that some Jews knew a doctrine of the *Logos*.

¹⁰² *CC* I. 49.

¹⁰³ This important text will be exploited extensively in the Arian controversy: Cf. Williams, *Arius*, p. 107 ff.

¹⁰⁴ On this subject, see Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism*, pp. 208–209.

¹⁰⁵ Clement, *Str.* V. 89. 4; VII. 7. 4; Justin, *Dial.* LXI; Theophilus, *Ad Autolycom* II. 10.

to those of the “Hebrew” friends of God, the patriarchs of the Old Testament. The fact that Philo and Aristobulus¹⁰⁶ had presented such doctrines did not prove that the Patriarchs believed in a second cause. But as a bishop, Eusebius read in these Jewish texts the confirmation of the truth of the Gospel.

In the *Praeparatio* (VII. 18), a passage from Philo is also used to show the “Hebrew” interpretation of Genesis 1:26–27 and 2:7 which both deal with the creation of man.¹⁰⁷ Eusebius introduces the quotation by announcing the interpretation of “Philo the Hebrew” (ὁ Ἑβραῖος ἐρμηνεύει Φίλων).¹⁰⁸ The Jewish philosopher applies his commentary on “man created in God’s image” to the rational soul (τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς).¹⁰⁹ He explains the biblical verses in middle-Platonic terms, using, e.g., the metaphor of the seal of God and that of the *Logos* as its imprint. Once again, reading this Jewish interpretation through a Christian lens, Eusebius finds in it not only a satisfactory philosophical interpretation, but also, as it were, a justification of the Christian *Logos*. Indeed, according to Philo, the human soul is made in the image of the *Logos*.¹¹⁰ The Philonic interpretation which related the “likeness” of Genesis to the soul and interpreted the “image” as the image of the *Logos* was appropriated by Clement and Origen.¹¹¹ Therefore, by quoting this passage from Philo, Eusebius had a “Hebrew” confirmation of the truth of the doctrine of the Christian *Logos*. It conveniently echoed the doctrine as it was occasionally presented by the Alexandrian Christian school. A nice continuity between the “Hebrews” and the Christians could thereby be drawn.

In books XI and XIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius quotes some biblical verses after which he cites excerpts from Philo’s *De confusione linguarum*, *De opificio mundi*, and *De specialibus legibus* in order to explicate the biblical verses. In book XI, the theme of the second cause

¹⁰⁶ Cited at *PE* VII. 13–14.

¹⁰⁷ On the complex issue of Philo’s interpretation of the creation of human beings, see Th. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man, Philo and the History of Interpretation*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 14. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983 and R. Mc L. Wilson, “The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. I, 26”, *StPat* 6, 1957, pp. 420–437.

¹⁰⁸ *PE* VII. 17. 4.

¹⁰⁹ *PE* VII. 18. 1.

¹¹⁰ *PE* VII. 18. 2.

¹¹¹ See the references given by Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre*, p. 182 ff.

is again addressed through Philo. Yet this time it is inserted in the context of a comparison between Moses and Plato. Eusebius attempts to demonstrate that like the "Hebrew oracles", Plato mentions a second cause.¹¹² As in book VII, Eusebius uses a group of biblical quotations as testimonies of the "Hebrew" conception of the second cause.¹¹³ In addition, he also appeals to other biblical testimonies. He quotes, e.g., Genesis 19:24 ("Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrrha brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven"); Psalms 109 (110):1 ("The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand"); Proverbs 3:19 ("The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth"); Wisdom 7:21 ("and all such things are either secret or manifest, them I know. For Wisdom, which is the worker of all things taught me"). The quotation from Philo comes next. Eusebius justifies its presence by saying that Philo the "Hebrew" translates more clearly the meaning of this doctrine (τὴν δὲ τοῦ δόγματος διάνοιαν . . . λευκότερον ἐρμηνεύων).¹¹⁴ In these passages, Philo presents the *Logos* as the image of God and/or as the son of God and first-born son of God. Although he does not specify this point, it is obvious that Eusebius is attempting to relate the Philonic *Logos* to Christ. This strategy, I would argue, constitutes an important stage in the Christian appropriation of Philo. So far, many other Christian authors had exploited Philo's doctrine of the *Logos* (notably Clement and Origen), but none of them had named Philo in such a context. Eusebius was the first to openly assert the connection between Christianity and Philo, albeit still in a rather discreet fashion.

When dealing with the doctrine of the Ideas amongst the "Hebrews" and in Plato, Eusebius also appeals to Philo. After citing Genesis 1:26–27 and Psalms 38 (39):7 on the "man in the image", he cites Philo's *De opificio mundi*. Philo is introduced next to Clement of Alexandria, both being described as the "exegetes of the sacred laws" (οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐξηγηταί). Eusebius adds that "the Hebrew Philo interprets the ancestral texts" (ὁ Ἑβραῖος Φίλων τὰ πάτρια διερμηνεύων).¹¹⁵ In Philo's passage, the intelligible city is defined as "nothing else than the architect's reasoning, who is already thinking about

¹¹² PE XI. 14–19.

¹¹³ See Chapter V, subsection "Citations of Jewish Authors Derived from Collections: Some Hypotheses".

¹¹⁴ PE XI. 14. 10.

¹¹⁵ PE XI. 23. 12.

founding the intelligible city” (Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ νοητὴ πόλις ἕτερόν τί ἐστιν ἢ ὁ τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος λογισμὸς ἥδη τὴν νοητὴν πόλιν κτίζειν διανοομένου).¹¹⁶ By means of an analogy with the creation of man in “God’s image”, Philo suggests an equation between the intelligible world (νοητόν . . . κόσμον) defined as the archetypal seal (ἀρχέτυπος σφραγίς) and as the “model” (παράδειγμα), or as “the archetypal idea of the ideas” (ἀρχέτυπος ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν) and the *Logos* of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγος).¹¹⁷ It is followed by Philo’s refusal to understand “in the beginning” (Gen. 1:1) in a temporal sense, and then by his commentary on the creation of the “incorporeal essence” (ἀσώματον οὐσίαν) of the Tenebrae, water, spirit, and “invisible and intelligible light” (ἀόρατον καὶ νοητόν φῶς), “image of the divine *Logos*” (θείου λόγου . . . εἰκών).¹¹⁸ Finally, in the last excerpt, Philo defines the first day not as the first one according to time but as a day “one” (καὶ ἡμέραν οὐχὶ πρώτην, ἀλλὰ μίαν).¹¹⁹ This day one is the locus of the creation of the intelligible world. He opposes the sensible and corporeal heaven (αἰσθητόν καὶ σωματοειδῆ) to the intelligible and incorporeal heaven (τῷ νοητῷ καὶ ἀσωμάτῳ).¹²⁰

Undoubtedly, Eusebius read this middle-Platonic interpretation of Genesis through the lens of Christian theology, and in particular through that elaborated by Clement and Origen, who themselves had borrowed from Philo. The place given to the *Logos* of God in Philo’s account certainly favoured such an appropriation. Consequently, Philo’s interpretation of Genesis in the *De opificio mundi* was used by the bishop as a “Hebrew” document, not to say a Christian document. It enabled him to retrieve on behalf of Christianity a number of Platonic doctrines (such as the Ideas) which had already been reshaped by Philo: This is notably the case with the intelligible city and the concept of image.

Similarly, Eusebius claims further in the text that “Philo, the expert in Hebrew matters interprets these words, clarifying them extensively” (ἐρμηνεύει δὲ ταῦτα διασαφῶν εἰς πλάτος ὁ τὰ Ἑβραίων πεπεισμένος Φίλων).¹²¹ The words in question are those of Deuteronomy

¹¹⁶ PE XI. 24. 1.

¹¹⁷ PE XI. 24. 3.

¹¹⁸ PE XI. 24. 9–10.

¹¹⁹ PE XI. 24. 11.

¹²⁰ PE XI. 24. 12.

¹²¹ PE XIII. 18. 12.

4:19,¹²² which deals with the ban on astrolatry. Yet in this passage Philo does not deny the stars some authority in the creation process.¹²³ Using different terms belonging to both the semantic sphere of politics (ἄρχοντας, ὑπάρχους, ἐπιστάσιαν, πρυτανεύοντος)¹²⁴ and to the Platonic metaphor of the yoke, he defines them as coming second in the divine hierarchy. Thus, with this passage, Eusebius manages to combine the astral philosophy of Plato's *Timaeus* with Jewish-Christian thought.¹²⁵ He avoids disavowing completely a cult as popular as that of the stars because, according to Sirinelli, he feared that this cult would be appropriated by an allegorizing Neoplatonism.¹²⁶ In this context, the citation from Philo enables Eusebius to manoeuvre subtly by claiming the truth and superiority of the 'Hebrew-Christian' credo without condemning a crucial aspect of the pagan religion. Nevertheless, the bishop ends the citation with a criticism of paganism and Greek philosophy, saying: "These are the really pure and divine teachings of the Hebrew piety, that we preferred to a demented philosophy" (Ταῦτα τῆς Ἑβραίων εὐσεβείας τὰ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀκήρατά τε καὶ θεῖα μαθήματα πρὸ τῆς τετυφωμένης φιλοσοφίας τετιμήκαμεν).¹²⁷

In addition to Philo, in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, the "Hebrew" figures of Aristobulus and Eleazar, the high priest of the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas, also enable Eusebius to present an allegorical reading of the Pentateuch.¹²⁸ Apparently, he considers them as being the most representative Hebrew figures of this genre since he thinks that their testimony is "sufficient" (ἐπαρκεῖν) to illustrate the allegorical genre. It should be noted that they are the only ones to be described as "Hebrews" in book VIII. Indeed, this book deals with Judaism and the "Jews".¹²⁹ This seems to indicate that, in Eusebius' view, allegory belongs to the "Hebrews" (and therefore to the Christians)

¹²² PE XIII. 12. 11.

¹²³ In some passages, Philo does not hesitate to define them as "gods", notably in *Spec.* I. 16. In addition, like the Hebrew Bible, the philosopher is not reluctant to mention "the gods": Cf. *Spec.* I. 20; 307; II. 165; *Decal.* 41; *Flacc.* 123 (cf. Daniel, Philon d'Alexandrie. *De specialibus legibus*, p. 20, n. 2).

¹²⁴ PE XIII. 18. 12–13.

¹²⁵ Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 176.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ PE XIII. 18. 17.

¹²⁸ PE VIII. 9–10.

¹²⁹ PE VIII. 8. 56.

rather than to the “Jews”, a view which makes perfect sense in a Christian apologetic work.

Finally, it should be noted that in the *Demonstratio*, Josephus’ authority as a biblical exegete comes from his status as a “Hebrew born of Hebrews”.¹³⁰ That being said, unlike the other Jewish exegetes’ writings, his work is used in a ‘purely’ historical context. Eusebius says he appeals to him because he could not find anything in the Bible about an earthquake in the time of Uzziah.

Therefore, defining the Jewish authors of the *Apodeixis* as “Hebrews” enables Eusebius to increase their authority both as sages and as Bible interpreters. In doing so, he evidently also increases the apologetic weight of their citations. Yet one would be mistaken in thinking that the bishop attempts to deny them their “Jewish” identity. As I have pointed out,¹³¹ the opposition between “Hebrew” and “Jew” is not as clear-cut as is sometimes believed. This is also true in the case of the Jewish authors. The distinctly “Jewish” character of these writers also played a role—albeit to a lesser extent—in Eusebius’ construction and perception of their authority.

In the *Demonstratio*,¹³² e.g., Josephus’ “precise knowledge of the exoteric Jewish *deuteroiseis*” (τὰς ἑξωθεν Ἰουδαϊκὰς δευτερώσεις ἀπηκριβωκώς)¹³³ guarantees the validity of Eusebius’ interpretation of Scripture. The argument goes as follows: In book XVIII or VIII of the *Demonstratio* Eusebius deals with the coming of Christ and of His Passion. In the course of his account, he quotes Zechariah 14: 1–10, which passage mentions the closing of the mountains, “as they were closed in the time of the earthquake under Uzziah King of Juda”. Eusebius interprets this verse as referring to the law of Moses. Inquiring on the historical aspect of this passage, he claims not to have found anything in the book of Kings.¹³⁴ All he found, he continues, is that Uzziah being mentally upset dared to offer a sacrifice to God; as a consequence, he became leprous.¹³⁵ Eusebius then turns to Josephus whose account has to do with the King’s leprosy and sin. Interestingly, he presents Josephus and builds his authority by insisting not only

¹³⁰ *DE* VI. 18. 291b.

¹³¹ Cf. Chapter IV, subsection “Jews’ before Christ”.

¹³² *DE* VI. 18. 291b.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ Cf. 2 Kings 15:5.

¹³⁵ Cf. 2 Chronicles 26:18.

on the fact that he is a "Hebrew born of Hebrews" but also on the historian's knowledge of the "Jewish" commentaries. This unexpected association reveals that Eusebius does not systematically deny the Jewish authors' Jewishness. Moreover, it is not incompatible with their 'Hebraism'. This indicates that Jewish interpretations of the Bible are authoritative in Eusebius' opinion, especially as regards the literal, historical meaning of the Bible. In his *Commentary on Isaiah*, he also refers to Jewish masters.¹³⁶ This feature of his work again shows Origen's influence on his method, whose contacts with the Jewish world are well known.

"Hebrew" Authors as Predecessors of the Christians:

PE VII. 21. 1-4 = Philo, *De providentia* II. 50-51—PE X. 13. 1-12 = Josephus, *CA* I. 73-75; 82-90; 103-104—PE XI. 24. 1-12 = Philo, *De opificio mundi* 24-27; 29-31; 35-36—PE XIII. 12. 1-16 = Aristobulus fr. 3-4-5 Holladay

As I have pointed out, in the *Apodeixis*, the label "Hebrew" serves to link the Christians to the patriarchs of the Old Testament. Therefore, by defining the Jewish authors of the *Apodeixis* as "Hebrews", Eusebius brings them closer to the Christians. Likewise, by including Philo and Josephus in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he includes them, as it were, amongst "those, in each generation, who testified to the divine *Logos*" (ὅσοι τε κατὰ γενεὰν ἐκάστην ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τὸν θεῖον ἐπρέσβευσαν λόγον).¹³⁷ In other words, Eusebius is the first Christian author to explicitly include these Jewish writers in the ecclesiastical tradition. Yet he does not turn them into Christians. By defining them as "Hebrews", he manages to use their texts to support the Christian cause without denying them their real origin.

In the *Praeparatio* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*, the bishop emphasizes the Jewish authors' role in Christianity. Philo is presented as being "very remarkable" (ἐπισημότατος) "amongst our people" (τῶν ἡμετέρων),¹³⁸ i.e., amongst Christians. Likewise, passages from Philo and Aristobulus are used to found Eusebius' Christian appropriation of

¹³⁶ See Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 145 ff. and 70 ff.

¹³⁷ HE I. 1. 1.

¹³⁸ HE II. 4. 2.

the “Hebrew” religion.¹³⁹ Moreover, on one occasion, Aristobulus is described as “our predecessor amongst the Hebrews” (ὁ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐξ Ἑβραίων);¹⁴⁰ Josephus’ testimony on the antiquity of the “Hebrew” people is cited by Eusebius because “before our people” this theme “was treated by the children of the Hebrews” (ἐπεὶ πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐσπουδάσθη καὶ αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων παισίν).¹⁴¹

In addition, Philo, Josephus and Aristobulus were often quoted next to Clement of Alexandria because the latter confirms their testimonies: He emphasizes, e.g., that “Clement also agrees with him [Philo]” συνάδει δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης.¹⁴² Eusebius occasionally emphasizes the relation between Clement and the Jewish authors. He apparently finds it noteworthy that in his *Stromata* Clement should mention Philo, Aristobulus, Josephus, Demetrius and Eupolemus, because they demonstrated (ἀποδειξάντων) the antiquity of the Jews.¹⁴³ Tellingly, they are mentioned next to Cassian and Tatian,¹⁴⁴ whose chronological testimony is also extensively quoted in the *Praeparatio*.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, in book XIII of the *Praeparatio*, a quotation from Aristobulus is given before Clement’s testimony on the subject of Plato’s testimony on the Hebrews.¹⁴⁶ Finally, a citation from Philo is inserted between Christian excerpts (from Origen and Maximus, who is in fact Methodius)¹⁴⁷ to prove that matter is not unbegotten.

These examples indicate that the Jewish authors are, in Eusebius’ view, part and parcel of the Christian tradition: More than that, like the Hebrews of the Old Testament, they are the Christians’ predecessors. As Runia has shown,¹⁴⁸ Origen also considered a Jewish author like Philo as a predecessor.

¹³⁹ This is the case at *PE* VII. 13–14 where both authors are called on to defend the existence of a “Hebrew” second cause.

¹⁴⁰ *PE* XIII. 12. heading.

¹⁴¹ *PE* X. 12. 31.

¹⁴² *PE* XI. 24. 12. See also XIII. 12. 16 (Aristobulus) and X. 12. 31.

¹⁴³ *HE* VI. 1. 7 referring to *Str.* I. 72. 4–22. 150. 3.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. *Str.* I. 101. 1–2.

¹⁴⁵ *PE* X. 11. 1–35.

¹⁴⁶ *PE* XIII. 12. 1–16.

¹⁴⁷ *PE* VII. 21. 1–4.

¹⁴⁸ In the section of his *Philo in Early Christian Literature* devoted to Origen (pp. 161–163), Runia has shown that Origen often referred to an anonymous predecessor who is none other than Philo.

At any rate, this may explain why Eusebius naturally inserts Josephus' chronological testimony into a group of Christian quotations: According to him, this matter "had been dealt with by the children of the Hebrews before us" (πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων).¹⁴⁹ Likewise, in book XIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius claims that he must (δεῖν) cite those who before him dealt with the question of the agreement between Plato and the "Hebrews," i.e., Aristobulus and Clement.¹⁵⁰

These two passages clearly show that in the *Apodeixis*, the Jewish authors enjoy a status other than that of the pagan authors. Eusebius appeals to the pagan authors because of their cultural, religious and philosophical knowledge of their own tradition. By contrast, the Jewish authors, especially in the *Praeparatio*, are useful to him because they are seen as predecessors. Importantly, they are not only seen as predecessors in terms of theological and philosophical doctrines but also in terms of apologetics and historiography.¹⁵¹ The Jewish authors are also cited in the *Apodeixis* because Eusebius sees himself as the heir to a tradition which goes back, via Clement and Origen, to Aristobulus, Philo and Josephus.

B. *Jewish Authors' Citations as "Jewish" Testimonies*¹⁵²

In book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius makes clear that he appeals to the Jewish authors as Jews, although he does not use this term as commonly as he uses the word "Hebrew" in the other books. Yet on three occasions at least he defines them as "Jews." At VIII. 12. 22, introducing quotations from Philo's *De opificio mundi* and *De providentia*, Eusebius mentions "the Jewish sages' thoughts" (τὰ τῆς διανοίας τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις σοφῶν). Likewise, at III. 9. 2 of the *Historia ecclesiastica*,

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., *PE* X. 12. 31.

¹⁵⁰ *PE* XIII. 11. 3.

¹⁵¹ Josephus' influence on Eusebius in terms of historiography has been underlined by Momigliano, *Pagan and Christian Historiography*, p. 91, followed by R. Cameron, "Alternate Beginnings—Different Ends: Eusebius, Thomas and the Construction of Christian Origins", in L. Bormann, K. del Tredici, A. Standhartinger (Eds.), *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 74. Leiden: Brill, 1994, p. 505.

¹⁵² Although Eusebius generally avoids using the terms "Jew", "Jewish" and "Judaism" in book VIII, I will have to use them because they are convenient. I will use quotation marks only when reproducing Eusebius' use of these words. In other words, when used without quotation marks, these terms reflect my own terminology.

Eusebius presents Josephus as “the most famous of the Jews”¹⁵³ (ἐπιδοξότατος . . . Ἰουδαίων). In the same work, he also presents Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus, Demetrius and Eupolemus as “Jewish writers” (Ἰουδαίων συγγραφέων).¹⁵⁴

Moreover, in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, although one might have expected Eusebius to cut off these Jewish authors from their Hebrew roots, the bishop emphasizes “the agreement between the youths’ doctrines with their ancestors in theology and piety” (τὰ τῆς τῶν νέων θεολογίας σύμφωνα ταῖς τῶν προπατόρων εὐσεβείαις).¹⁵⁵ In addition, Eusebius does not hesitate to present Philo’s *Hypothetica* as a work in which Philo “speaks in favour of the Jews against their accusers” (ὕπὲρ Ἰουδαίων, ὡς πρὸς κατηγορούς).¹⁵⁶ He also says that Philo summarizes the way of life based on the laws of Moses for “the Jewish people” (τῷ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνει),¹⁵⁷ and that Josephus and Philo are kin (οἰκεῖον) to the “Jewish philosophers”, the Essenes.¹⁵⁸ In addition, when he announces two excerpts from Philo at the end of book VIII,¹⁵⁹ he claims to examine the thought of “the Jewish sages” (τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων σοφῶν).

This brief analysis confirms that Eusebius’ distinction between “Hebrew” and “Jew” is not as clear-cut as one would expect. His understanding of these two identities varies considerably according to context. Moreover, these two notions are not mutually exclusive, but rather overlap on occasion, as the example of the Jewish authors seems to indicate.

However, by presenting the Jewish writers cited in the *Apodeixis* as the rightful heirs to the ancient Hebrews’ wisdom and piety, who are considered as models of virtue, Eusebius finds an effective means of reconstructing the different stages of true piety. According to him, Christianity is the final outcome of this long process.

In order to understand Eusebius’ use of the Jewish authors in chapter VIII, it is necessary to insist on the fact that in this apologetic

¹⁵³ As I have argued in the previous chapter, this adjective may only designate “Jews” in this context.

¹⁵⁴ *HE* VI. 13. 7.

¹⁵⁵ *PE* VIII. 12. 21.

¹⁵⁶ *PE* VIII. 5. 11.

¹⁵⁷ *PE* VIII. 6. 10.

¹⁵⁸ *PE* VIII. 10. 19.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

context Eusebius believes that only a certain kind of Judaism belongs to Christian 'prehistory'. Indeed, the bishop considers the Jewish authors as "Hebrews", i.e., as the Christians' ancestors. Likewise, we have seen that book VIII presents certain "Jews" as being in a direct line with their "Hebrew" ancestors and therefore also with the Christians. Such a scheme may appear contradictory to other passages on Judaism, especially in the *Demonstratio*, yet it was made necessary by the apologetic purpose of the *Praeparatio*: In this work, Eusebius faced the pagan attacks of Celsus and Porphyry, who criticized the novelty of Christianity; therefore, by emphasizing the continuity between Judaism and Christianity, apologists of Christianity such as Eusebius could neutralize these attacks. Similar apologetic constraints had led Origen to follow the same reasoning in his *Contra Celsum*.¹⁶⁰ In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius construes 'Hebraism' and Judaism as two linear stages leading to Christianity. The construction of a religious and political prehistory of Christianity also required the reconstruction of a "Jewish" past which could serve as the ancestor of Christianity.

As we saw in chapter III of this work, Eusebius lingers in several of his writings on the history of the "Hebrews", which becomes the foundation myth of Christianity. In the *Praeparatio*, he also includes in Christian prehistory a part of those who lived the "life according to Moses". This is quite a remarkable fact. Interestingly, the word 'Judaism' (Ἰουδαϊσμός) never occurs in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*.¹⁶¹ It only appears in book VII, where it is used pejoratively.¹⁶² This absence may be explained by the fact that Eusebius always uses it pejoratively. I will come back to this point shortly, but for the moment, I wish to analyze Eusebius' portrayal of the "Jews" in book VIII through the Jewish authors' citations. This will help us better understand that which is founded by these quotations in the *Apodeixis*.

As I have pointed out, the Judaism (i.e., that which we call Judaism) and the "Jews" which Eusebius presents in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* are those to which he wishes to connect Christianity and the Christians,

¹⁶⁰ See Feldman, "Origen's *Contra Celsum* and Josephus' *Contra Apionem*: The Issue of Jewish Origins", pp. 105–135.

¹⁶¹ In contradistinction to *PE* I. 5. 12; VII. 6. heading; VII. 6. 1.

¹⁶² *PE* VII. 6. 1.

otherwise he would not take pains to praise them in his apologetic masterpiece. Both the Greeks and the Christians were aware that the religion of Jesus was rooted in Judaism. Therefore, Eusebius could not omit this episode of Christian prehistory. Nonetheless, this Judaism is not presented through the Old Testament, which recounts the life of the “Hebrews”, even if the latter come after Moses. Instead, the piety on which the bishop confers the title of ‘ancestor of Christianity’ is a certain part of Greek-speaking Judaism as exemplified by Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus or Eleazar, the high priest of the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas. The mere fact that Eusebius begins his account of the “life according to Moses” with the narrative of the translation of the Hebrew bible into Greek is significant. Ushering in a long tradition, Eusebius asserts that the Jewish history in which Christianity was born starts in Alexandria with the Septuagint, which, as is well known, will become the Christian Bible.¹⁶³ Eusebius explicitly presents the Septuagint as a “preparation for the Gospel” for the nations.¹⁶⁴ Therefore, it should be emphasized that Eusebius gives an idealized description not of Judaism in general but of the Judaism on which Christianity depends. This Judaism can be traced back to the Septuagint. As we will see, Eusebius’ choice of authors to represent this Judaism also indicates the tradition in which he wishes to inscribe Christianity.

Eusebius’ reconstruction of the “Jewish” prehistory of Christianity is articulated around several themes, all of which are exploited through the Jewish authors’ citations. Eusebius first deals with Exodus, then with the law of Moses and with its allegorical interpretation. Then come the Essenes and, finally, the doctrines of creation and divine providence. All the quotations in this book are grouped in pairs.

The Mosaic Way of Life as Christian Prehistory:

PE VIII. 8. 1–55 = Josephus, CA II. 163–228—PE VIII. 9. 1–37 = Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas 128–171—PE VIII. 10. 1–17 = Aristobulus fr. 2 Holladay—PE VIII. 11. 1–18 = Philo, Hypothetica II (Colson IX, pp. 437–443)—PE VIII. 12. 1–19 = Philo, Probus 75–91

Eusebius’ construction of a religious and political prehistory of Christianity in the *Praeparatio* deals with different areas. Through the

¹⁶³ See, e.g., M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture, Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, London – New York: T. & T. Clark, 2002.

¹⁶⁴ *PE VIII. 1. 6.*

Jewish authors' citations, Eusebius aims to provide an outline of the 'pre-Christian' history, political constitution, exegesis and theological-philosophical doctrines. This approach enables him to claim the antiquity of Christianity (through that of Judaism). Moreover, some citations also enable him to locate this pre-Christian past vis-à-vis Greek philosophy and religion.

In the following analysis, I will attempt to shed light on this process. Bearing this aim in mind, I will attempt to define Eusebius' intentions in citing the Jewish authors on the "life according to Moses". Since in this book Eusebius himself hardly speaks, I will focus on the content of the passages he selected in order to interpret his approach and purposes.

One of Eusebius' major aims in his reconstruction of a Christian prehistory lies in his presentation of a certain "Jewish" elite as a people of philosophers. Needless to say, this was in no way innovative. From the Hellenistic age onwards, many Greek-speaking authors of Oriental background aimed to portray their own people as philosophers.¹⁶⁵ This was also the case with the Jews.¹⁶⁶ The Greeks themselves had occasionally described the latter as philosophers.¹⁶⁷ Therefore, Eusebius is clearly keeping within a long tradition. Moreover, he applies to the "Jews" the same approach he had applied to the "Hebrews". Both are portrayed as models of Greek wisdom. However, in contrast to his treatment of the "Hebrews", he only uses Jewish authors' citations in order to describe those who lived the "life according to Moses" as philosophers. One may wonder to what extent Eusebius deliberately remains in the background when dealing with the latter. Did he fear that he would reinforce the status of contemporary Judaism if he openly praised pre-Christian Judaism? Perhaps. It would

¹⁶⁵ On these authors, see Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*.

¹⁶⁶ See, e.g., the fragment from Artapanus at *PE* IX. 27. 1–37 in which Moses is presented as the inventor of philosophy.

¹⁶⁷ See, e.g., Theophrastus' fragment from his *On Piety* (M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Jerusalem: Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974 (henceforth *GLAJJ*), I, 4; Megasthenes in his *Indika* (Stern, *GLAJJ* I, 15); Clearchos of Soli, *On Sleep* (Stern, *GLAJJ* I, 15) and Hermippus of Smyrna, *On Pythagoras* (Stern, *GLAJJ* I, 25). Secondary literature on the subject includes Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, pp. 255–261; P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron Kreiton: Der Alterbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*. Wunt II/39. Tübingen: Mohr, 1990, pp. 73–75.

have been dangerous to defend it personally because this could have legitimized the criticism that the Christians had unjustly deserted the Jewish way of life. Eusebius may have considered it more sensible to provide a florilegium in order to avoid getting too much involved. Therefore, his interventions in book VIII (but also in book IX in which he lets the “Greeks” speak) of the *Praeparatio* are restricted to a minimum. Nevertheless, it may also be that these texts were self-explanatory and needed no additional comment in his eyes.

Josephus’ and Philo’s citations were especially convenient in the construction of an idealized image of the Jews and Judaism. Thanks to their testimonies, the Mosaic way of life could be transformed into a philosophy and a legislation¹⁶⁸ in a Greek garb that could be directly reused in an Christian apology. From this viewpoint, Philo’s and Josephus’ citations in book VIII deserve to be studied closely.

In the first Philonic passage chosen by Eusebius,¹⁶⁹ the harsh condemnation of those who transgress the Law by harming their neighbour is emphasized: Whoever commits adultery, rape, a sacrilege and other misdeeds will be subjected to the death penalty. The idea that God watches everything (ἐπόπτης) and avenges any injustice ends the passage. Eusebius is likely to have selected this excerpt to emphasize the high level of moral conduct among the Jews due to their legislation.

The second excerpt from Philo¹⁷⁰ starts with the idea that the Jews not only scrupulously obey the Law as an exercise in self-control (πρὸς ἀσκήσεως . . . ἐγκρατείας)¹⁷¹ but also submit to the will of their

¹⁶⁸ Whether Philo’s and Josephus’ passages on the Law depend upon a common source or are independent remains an open question. See, e.g., G. P. Carras, “Dependence or Common Tradition in Philo *Hypothetica* VIII 6. 10 and Josephus *Contra Apionem* 2. 190–219,” *SPhA* 5, 1993, pp. 24–47, who supports the hypothesis of a common source; recently, C. Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*. Arbeiten zu Geschichte des antiken Judentums und Christentums 40. Leiden: Brill, 1997, pp. 100–118 suggested that it is impossible either to confirm or deny Josephus’ reliance on Philo. By contrast, K. Berthelot, *Philanthrôpia Judaica, le débat autour de la “misanthropie” des lois juives dans l’Antiquité*, pp. 368–376, convincingly argues in favour of Josephus’ dependency upon Philo.

¹⁶⁹ *PE* VIII. 7. 1–8.

¹⁷⁰ *PE* VIII. 7. 10–20.

¹⁷¹ *PE* VIII. 7. 11.

legislator, i.e., Moses, who aimed to make all the Jewish people experts in ancestral laws and customs (τῶν πατρίων νόμων καὶ ἐθῶν ἐμπείρως ἔχειν).¹⁷²

In the same excerpt, the Sabbath, whose name is never pronounced by Philo, is described as a day of reunion and of collective teaching during which the Jews listen to the laws “in a decent and orderly fashion” (σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ κόσμῳ).¹⁷³ Therefore, everyone is aware of the laws. After a reading of the Law and its commentary by priests or elders, they walk away, being “experts in the holy laws and far advanced regarding piety” (τῶν τε νόμων τῶν ἱερῶν ἐμπείρως ἔχοντες καὶ πολλὸν δὴ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἐπιδεδωκότες).¹⁷⁴ It is remarkable that Eusebius considerably modifies this point of view by dividing the Jewish people into “the experts” and “the majority.”¹⁷⁵

In the next section, Philo deals with the Jewish practice of fallowing the land at the end of the seventh year. This law constitutes, according to the philosopher, a sign of the Jews' humanity (τῆς δὲ φιλανθρωπίας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦτο μέγα ὡς ἀληθῶς σημεῖον).¹⁷⁶ Therefore, these quotations from Philo's *Hypothetica* help Eusebius shape the portrait of Moses' followers as a people of experts in law, the application of which leads to φιλανθρωπία and εὐσέβεια.

The excerpt from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* proves to be even more laudatory.¹⁷⁷ According to him, Mosaic law is the most perfect

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ *PE* VIII. 7. 12.

¹⁷⁴ *PE* VIII. 7. 13.

¹⁷⁵ *PE* VIII. 10. 18.

¹⁷⁶ *PE* VIII. 7. 19.

¹⁷⁷ S. Mason considers that Josephus' purpose in the *Contra Apionem* is to present Judaism as the ultimate philosophy in order to encourage proselytism (“The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy”, L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison, *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*, pp. 187–228). This hypothesis was recently criticized by G. Haaland, according to whom Josephus attempts to establish a distinction between Mosaic law and Greek philosophy (“Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience, Toward an Understanding of *Contra Apionem*”, in J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert, *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münsteraner judaistische Studien 4. Münster: Lit Münster, 1999, pp. 282–306). Mason's argument seems to me more convincing in that Josephus clearly situates Mosaic law in a Greek philosophical context, e.g., through literary allusions to Plato's political philosophy (cf. *CA* II. 164).

constitution because it is founded on divine authority. Josephus creates the word *θεοκρατία* in order to define the Jewish constitution, “at the risk of violating the language” (*βιασάμενος τὸν λόγον*).¹⁷⁸ He goes on to say that Moses is the only legislator not to separate the practice from the legal prescriptions, which cover almost all aspects of everyday life.¹⁷⁹ Through Josephus, the weekly reunion of the Jews is mentioned, during which reunion the Jews listen to and learn the Law by heart. This, according to Josephus, emphasizes the other peoples’ ignorance of the Law in contrast with the Jews, who all master it: “we have them, as it were, engraved in our souls” (*ἔχομεν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὥσπερ ἐγκεχαράγμενους*).¹⁸⁰ Such a declaration leads to the claim that the Jews do not transgress their laws because they do not have the excuse of ignorance.¹⁸¹ Josephus underlines the unity of Jewish theology which leads to harmony (*ὁμόνοιαν*) and agreement (*συμφωνίαν*)¹⁸² amongst the Jews. Eusebius did not select this passage by chance. Indeed, like other apologists, he was eager to present Christianity as a unified monolithic faith, in contrast with Greek philosophy, which was subject to inner conflicts.¹⁸³ Therefore, by appropriating Josephus’ claim about the unity of Judaism, he could imply the unity of Christianity. Moreover, Josephus’ insistence on the absolute and ancestral respect of Mosaic law, which remained unchanged over the centuries, was helpful to Eusebius: Christianity could therefore claim to be rooted in a very ancient tradition of moral perfection.

Further on, Josephus claims that Moses selected the high priests not according to their wealth but according to their powers of persuasion and their temperance (*πειθοῖ τε καὶ σωφροσύνη*).¹⁸⁴ In making this claim, he unconsciously contributes to the mythical construction of the roots of Christianity after a Greek fashion. Equally important

¹⁷⁸ *PE* VIII. 8. 3. See Y. Amir, “*Θεοκρατία* as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus’ Presentation of Moses’ *Politeia*”, *SCI* 8–9, 1985–1989, pp. 83–105;—, “Josephus’ and the Mosaic Constitution”, in H. G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffmann, B. Uffenheimer (Eds.), *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. Jso. Suppl. 171. Sheffield: Jso Press, 1994, pp. 13–27.

¹⁷⁹ *PE* VIII. 8. 10.

¹⁸⁰ *PE* VIII. 8. 11–13.

¹⁸¹ *PE* VIII. 8. 11.

¹⁸² *PE* VIII. 8. 14.

¹⁸³ Cf. *PE* XIV–XV. On the pagan–Christian debate over sects and heresies, see Boys-Stones *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, pp. 151–175.

¹⁸⁴ *PE* VIII. 8. 20.

are the Josephan claims that the laws governing everyday life aim at piety (εὐσέβειαν)¹⁸⁵ and the Jewish people “were prepared for piety” (κατεσκευασμένου πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν).¹⁸⁶ Eusebius espoused this view and in his detailed explanation of the Jewish Law, he defines the cult of the divine as the practice of virtue (ἀσκούντας ἀρετήν),¹⁸⁷ in other words, as philosophy. Further on, Josephus explains certain laws of purity by means of the movements of the soul.¹⁸⁸ He argues that in everything Moses “was zealous in teaching us civility and philanthropy” (ἡμερότητα καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν διδάσκειν ἡμᾶς ἐσπούδασεν).¹⁸⁹ Like the word φιλανθρωπία, in the passage from the *Contra Apionem* selected by Eusebius, the term ἐπιείκεια (reasonableness, equity) and its cognates appear several times in order to define the Jews and their Law.¹⁹⁰ According to Josephus, Mosaic legislation can only trigger an astonishment full of admiration (θαυμάσαι);¹⁹¹ Moses has best arranged the laws and reached “the most just faith to God” (τῆς δικαιοσύνης περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πίστεως).¹⁹²

It is clear from Eusebius' choice of Philo's and Josephus' passages that unlike some predecessors, he fully understood the apologetic usefulness of the Jewish Hellenized/romanized representations of the Mosaic way of life. More specifically, as Hardwick has rightly pointed out, by appropriating Josephus' representation of Moses in the *Contra Apionem*, Eusebius, more than Clement or Pseudo-Justin, introduces into Christian literature the strongly Hellenized representation of Moses as “ultimate philosopher”¹⁹³ and, I would add, legislator. Significantly, he chose to describe him through the Jewish authors as a wise Greek philosopher and legislator rather than as a prophetic figure, which he could have done through Philonic excerpts from the *De vita Mosis*. The fact that, despite its popularity in Christian circles, he did not cite Philo's *De vita Mosis* in book VIII, must be of some significance. This, I would argue, is due to the fact that in

¹⁸⁵ PE VIII. 8. 16.

¹⁸⁶ PE VIII. 8. 22.

¹⁸⁷ PE VIII. 8. 27.

¹⁸⁸ PE VIII. 8. 36.

¹⁸⁹ PE VIII. 8. 47.

¹⁹⁰ PE VIII. 8. 43; 46; 48.

¹⁹¹ PE VIII. 8. 51.

¹⁹² PE VIII. 8. 1.

¹⁹³ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, pp. 119–120.

these chapters of book VIII, he does not deal with Moses but with “the life according to Moses”. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, it was necessary to his purpose that Moses the prophet remain a “Hebrew” figure predicting the coming of Christ. Consequently, through Josephus and Philo, Eusebius prefers to describe him as a political philosopher with a political and legal constitution able to outshine the Greeks’ legislations.

Nonetheless, Eusebius does not restrict his description of the Law to a political model. It is also presented as the best way (at that time, i.e., before Christ) to reach moral perfection. In other words, applying the law of Moses meant practising virtue. As we have seen, the passages chosen by the bishop highlight philanthropy, justice and piety as the basic values of Judaism.¹⁹⁴ These values make Mosaic law a perfect system.

Such is in outline the meaning Eusebius seems to have ascribed to these quotations in the *Praeparatio*. By using them, he turns the roots of Christianity into a model of perfection, surpassed only by Christianity, as he shows in the *Demonstratio*. A passage from this work speaks volumes in this respect: It draws a parallel between the figures of Moses and Jesus.¹⁹⁵ This parallel suggests that in the *Praeparatio*, the figure of Moses anticipates and serves, so to speak, as a preparation for Jesus in the *Demonstratio*. In other words, to accept Eusebius’ portrayal of Moses in the *Praeparatio* is to prepare oneself to accept Christ in the *Demonstratio*. Likewise, Philo’s criticism against the portrayal of Moses as sorcerer in the *Praeparatio* somehow helps Eusebius to reject the portrayal of Jesus as sorcerer in the *Demonstratio*. In addition, the importance of the figure of Moses in Eusebius’ thought is also illustrated by his comparison between the lawgiver and Constantine in the *Vita Constantini*.¹⁹⁶ Eusebius’ presentation of Moses through Josephus and Philo was important

¹⁹⁴ See especially *PE* VIII. 6. 7; VIII. 7. 19.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. J. E. Bruns, “The ‘Agreement of Moses and Jesus’ in the *Demonstratio evangelica* of Eusebius”, *VigChris* 31, 1977, pp. 117–125 and M. Hollerich, “Religion and Politics in the Writings of Eusebius: Reassessing the First Court Theologian”, *Church History* 59, 1990, pp. 318–321. At *HE* VI. 19. 10 Eusebius cites a work entitled *On the Harmony of Moses and Jesus*. He was certainly influenced by this work.

¹⁹⁶ *VC* I. 12; 20; 38. See M. Hollerich, “The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Life of Constantine*”, *StPat* 19, 1989, pp. 80–95, and the

both because Moses played a central role in Eusebius' writings and because he was a well-known figure in the pagan world.¹⁹⁷

The idea that respecting the Mosaic laws induced moral perfection also occurs in the citation from Pseudo-Aristeas on the allegories of the casherut laws. This excerpt also helps Eusebius found his picture of Christian prehistory on an idealized form of Judaism. This Judaism is presented as a perfect philosophy and Moses as the greatest philosopher. Eusebius was eager to appropriate Pseudo-Aristeas' portrayal of Moses, where he is described as "a sage prepared by God for the knowledge of the universe" (σοφός . . . καὶ ὑπὸ θεοῦ κατεσκευασμένος εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῶν ἀπάντων).¹⁹⁸ According to this author, the ritual prescriptions of Judaism are a barrier surrounding the Jewish people in order for the pious Jewish people not to be polluted by their contacts with idolaters;¹⁹⁹ they do not really concern animal species but aim at "holy reflections and an extraordinary moral perfection for the love of justice" (πρὸς ἀγνὴν ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ τρόπων ἐξάρετον ἐξαρτισμὸν δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκεν).²⁰⁰ The dietary laws constitute signs that must keep Jews in the practice of justice.²⁰¹ Pseudo-Aristeas adds that these rules aimed at "the truth and the expression of the right reason" (πρὸς δ' ἀλήθειαν καὶ σημείωσιν ὀρθοῦ λόγου);²⁰² he goes on to say that the Law forbids one from harming anyone either in words or in acts.²⁰³ Therefore, this passage also enabled Eusebius to build an idealized image of the Jewish people as philosophers. It reinforces his claims that the Christian tradition is rational and well thought out. It somehow gives the impression that Eusebius was at least as much interested in its account of allegory as in its apologetic description of the Jewish Law. Thanks to Pseudo-Aristeas, Josephus and Philo, Judaism is turned into a utopia which Eusebius presents as the roots of Christianity.

commentary and bibliography given by A. Cameron and S. G. Hall, Eusebius. *Life of Constantine*, Translated with an Introduction and Commentary by A. Cameron and S. G. Hall, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999, pp. 34–39.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Gager, *Moses in Graeco-Roman Paganism*.

¹⁹⁸ *PE* VIII. 9. 11.

¹⁹⁹ *PE* VIII. 9. 11; 13.

²⁰⁰ *PE* VIII. 9. 15.

²⁰¹ The term δικαιοσύνη occurs seven times in this passage: *PE* VIII. 9. 4; 15; 17; 21; 27; 34.

²⁰² *PE* VIII. 9. 29.

²⁰³ *PE* VIII. 9. 33.

Eusebius' use of these passages on Mosaic law from these three Jewish authors deserves careful attention because in quoting them, Eusebius exhibits some originality, in contrast with the rest of the Christian tradition. Indeed, most Christian authors either seem to have avoided the question of the relevance of the Jewish laws, or else they spiritualized them, claiming that, like Christ, they fulfilled the Law on a daily basis.²⁰⁴ As Rutgers has pointed out, most Christians do not discuss Mosaic laws individually whereas the legal material is predominant in contemporary Jewish writings.²⁰⁵ Yet in his presentation of the Jews, Eusebius did not omit the importance of Jewish legalism, albeit spiritualized. Through Jewish authors such as Philo and Josephus, he provides a detailed picture of the Jewish laws, and through Pseudo-Aristeas and Aristobulus, he also provides an outline of the Jewish interpretations of the laws by certain Greek-speaking Jews. Although he also deals with the spiritualization of the Law in the *Demonstratio*, it is worth noting that he took pains to quote these Jewish passages. However, one must be cautious in interpreting Eusebius' intentions. Indeed, by recounting the "life according to Moses", even in an idealized manner, he also somehow historicized it; and by historicizing the Law he definitely made it lose its topicality. Judaism and its legalism were only relevant, in Eusebius' opinion, as Christianity's prehistory. But this was a long time ago. By including the "life according to Moses" in his wide picture of the 'history of religions' (as anachronistic as this expression may be), the bishop definitely disqualifies Judaism as the rival religion and puts it in the background.

The "Jews" as a People of Philosophers:

PE VIII. 10. 1–17 = Aristobulus fr. 2 Holladay—PE VIII. 11. 1–18 = Philo, Hypothesica II (Colson IX, pp. 437–443)—PE VIII. 12. 1–19 = Philo, Probus 75–91—PE VIII. 13. 1–6 = Philo, De opificio mundi 7–12—PE VIII. 14. 1–72 = Philo, De providentia II. 3; 15–33; 99–112
 The quotation from Aristobulus on the allegory of the limbs of God enables Eusebius to suggest that the sacred text of the 'Hebrew-Christian' tradition could be, like certain Greek texts, philosophically

²⁰⁴ As noted by L. V. Rutgers, *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 20. Leuven: Peeters, 1998, p. 249.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

interpreted through allegory; as Aristobulus' quotation indicated, the "Hebrews" and the "Jews" had long used this method. This claim also contributed to the construction of the "Jews" as a people of philosophers, since allegory was a method practised by the Greek philosophers. Moreover, the fact that the Christians' ancestors also used this method legitimized the Christians' use of the allegorical method on the Scriptures. Indeed, Platonists such as Clesus and Porphyry denied the Christians the right to use allegorical interpretations on the Bible.²⁰⁶

Eusebius' eagerness to describe the "Jewish" ancestors of the Christians as a people of philosophers is especially striking in his use of Philo's passages on the Essenes. One of the most important elements in Eusebius' introduction to these quotations is his claim that the Jewish people should be divided into an elite and the mob. According to him, the *Logos* himself made this division.²⁰⁷ There is no doubt that he traces the Christians back to the small elite, which he also identifies as the Essenes. However, as I have pointed out, the quotations from Philo and Josephus in book VIII made clear that the whole Jewish nation was a nation of philosophers, perfectly aware of the laws.²⁰⁸ Josephus even opposed the Greek philosophers who "philosophize as a small group" (πρὸς ὀλίγους φιλοσοφῶντες)²⁰⁹ without daring to reveal their true beliefs, and Moses who provided his contemporaries and their descendants with the true faith in God. The idea of a separation between the elite and the mob in terms of the teaching of philosophy and religion was in no way innovative. Since the classical ages, many 'barbarian' peoples were represented as having an elite cast of priests-philosophers (e.g., the Persian magi, the Indian gymnosophists, etc.).²¹⁰ His predecessors Clement and Origen had applied such a distinction to the Egyptians.²¹¹ Eusebius calls this elite a "race of Jewish philosophers" (φιλοσόφων Ἰουδαίων

²⁰⁶ See *HE* VI. 19. 2 and Hanson, "Christian Attitude to Pagan Religion", p. 924 and Meredith, "Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians", p. 1131.

²⁰⁷ *PE* VIII. 10. 18–19.

²⁰⁸ For Philo, see *PE* VIII. 7. 11.

²⁰⁹ *PE* VIII. 8. 6.

²¹⁰ At the time of writing, M. Broze, A. Busine and myself are preparing a paper on this theme ("Les catalogues de peuples sages aux premiers siècles de notre ère") for the CIERGA conference to be held in Brussels, in September 2005.

²¹¹ *Str.* V. 41. 1; *CC* I. 12.

γένος).²¹² The passages on the Essenes selected by Eusebius insist, like the other Jewish excerpts, on their “zeal for virtue and philanthropy” (ζῆλον ἀρετῆς καὶ φιλανθρωπίας).²¹³ Philo represents the Essenes as a people who “neither let themselves be overtaken by the corporeal flux nor led by the passions” (μηκέθ’ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἐπιρροῆς κατακλυζόμενοι μηδ’ ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν ἀγόμενοι); moreover, they enjoy the “only true freedom” (μόνην ὄντως ἐλευθερίαν).²¹⁴ In the second passage, Philo claims that the Essenes show that Syria is “not barren in virtue” (καλοκαγαθίας οὐκ ἄγονος);²¹⁵ the name Essene would come from the term “holiness” (ὁσιότης);²¹⁶ the Essenes “serve God to the utmost” (μάλιστα θεραπευνταὶ θεοῦ).²¹⁷ Philo also says that in matters of philosophy, the Essenes have left behind logics, which is useless to virtue, and physics, which is too elevated for human beings (except for the reflection on the existence of God and the birth of the universe), and devoted themselves exclusively to ethics.²¹⁸ Eusebius himself also deals with these themes when dealing with the “Hebrews” and the “Jews” in the *Praeparatio*. Strikingly, in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, he will mention the “philosophy” of the “Hebrews” and the “Jews”,²¹⁹ as well as their “collective practice of ethics” (τὰ τῆς ἠθικῆς αὐτοῖς . . . συνασκήσεως).²²⁰

As in the quotations from Josephus’ *Contra Apionem* and from Philo’s *Hypothetica* which come before this citation, Philo presents the Sabbath as a time of reunion and study. Philo also explained that the most experienced of the Essenes interpreted the difficult passages of the Scripture and that everything was “philosophically reflected upon through symbols” (διὰ συμβόλων . . . φιλοσοφεῖται).²²¹ This was important to Eusebius because it was remindful of the Christian practice of allegory. Amongst the different topics they studied, Philo includes piety, holiness, justice, the science of Good, of Evil, and of

²¹² PE VIII. 10. 19.

²¹³ PE VIII. 11. 2.

²¹⁴ PE VIII. 11. 3.

²¹⁵ PE VIII. 12. 1.

²¹⁶ PE VIII. 12. 2.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

²¹⁸ PE VIII. 12. 9.

²¹⁹ PE IX. 1. 2–3.

²²⁰ PE IX. 1. 4.

²²¹ PE VIII. 12. 10. Cf. *De vita Mosis* I. 23.

that which is indifferent; he declares that their criteria are the love of God, of virtue, and of humankind (τῷ τε φιλοθέῳ καὶ φιλαρέτῳ καὶ φιλανθρώπῳ).²²² In sum, the Essenes are, according to Philo and therefore also to Eusebius, “athletes of virtue” (ἀθλητὰς ἀρετῆς); Essenism is a φιλοσοφία.²²³ Eusebius concludes this part of the book which deals with the Law, its allegorical reading and the Essenes with the following words: “As much for the philosophical asceticism amongst the Jews as well as for their way of life” (τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς φιλοσόφου παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἀσκήσεως τε καὶ πολιτείας διὰ τῶνδε προκείμεθω).²²⁴ Again, this confirms Eusebius' eagerness to present the elite form of Judaism as the highest form of philosophy, implying the superiority of Christian origins over Greek philosophy.

Eusebius' interest in the Essenes raises the problem of Eusebius' use of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*.²²⁵ Indeed, in the *Historia ecclesiastica*,²²⁶ Eusebius attempts to prove that the Therapeutae are in fact the first members of the Christian community in Egypt. This claim apparently failed to win unanimous support since Eusebius appears to defend this hypothesis against critics.²²⁷ Needless to say, the Philonic description of the Therapeutae is very similar to that of the Essenes, notably because of the ascetic character of these communities and the allegorical reading of their sacred texts.²²⁸ Therefore, one may ask why Eusebius chose to openly include the Therapeutae in Christianity whereas he did not do so with the Essenes. Indeed, most of the criteria which lead him to identify the Therapeutae as Christians also define the Essenes.²²⁹ Indeed, some features of the Therapeutae

²²² PE VIII. 12. 11.

²²³ PE VIII. 12. 16.

²²⁴ PE VIII. 12. 20.

²²⁵ Secondary literature on Philo's *De contemplativa* is huge. See the synthesis made by J. Riaud, “Les Thérapeutes d'Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu'aux découvertes de Qumran”, *ANRW* II. 20. 2, 1987, pp. 1189–1295 and the recent monograph by J. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo's “Therapeutae” Reconsidered*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

²²⁶ HE II. 17. 1–24.

²²⁷ HE II. 17. 18. On Eusebius' appropriation of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*, see my “Eusebius of Caesarea's *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*”, pp. 305–28.

²²⁸ HE II. 17. 10–11.

²²⁹ See M. Simon, *Les sectes juives au temps de Jésus*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960, p. 107 ff. and F. Daumas and P. Miquel, *Philon d'Alexandrie, De vita contemplativa. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 29. Paris: Cerf, 1963, pp. 55–58.

are strikingly remindful of the Christians in Eusebius' opinion, such as, e.g., the portrayal of the virgin Therapeutrides, or the hierarchy of the sect, in which Eusebius recognized the ecclesiastical hierarchy.²³⁰ Yet I believe the main reason why he did not turn the Essenes into real Christians lies in Porphyry's use of Josephus' citation on the Essenes in the *De abstinentia*;²³¹ indeed, the bishop's 'best enemy' dealt with the Essenes as "Jews" and he explicitly cited Josephus' text. This certainly made any radical appropriation difficult. Consequently, Eusebius omitted Porphyry's references to Josephus, contenting himself with saying that Porphyry was "likely" to have been inspired by "ancient readings" (ἐκ παλαιῶν, ὡς εἰκός, ἀναγνωσμάτων),²³² an expression which can only be an allusion to Josephus. At any rate, Eusebius' appropriation of the Therapeutae was determining for them since it guaranteed them a long afterlife in the Christian tradition.

At the end of book VIII of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius provides two further philosophical citations from Philo to illustrate the thinking of "the Jewish sages" (τῶν σοφῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίους).²³³ The themes dealt with are the creation of the world and divine providence.²³⁴ This choice reflects Eusebius' willingness to show the main two doctrines of the Jewish philosophers. It implies that the Christians' ancestors really did have a philosophy worthy of that name and were not illiterate barbarians. Eusebius selected Philo's excerpts for obvious reasons: He explained the Scriptures with Greek philosophical concepts and terminology. Although the first quotation is defined by Eusebius as dealing with God and the creation of the world, a large part of it is also devoted to proving the existence of divine providence. These subjects were chosen carefully, showing that the "Jewish sages" were far from being atheistic, as some had accused them of being. In his apology of Judaism, Josephus had done the same in a passage quoted by Eusebius. In this passage, he opposes the Jewish conception of God and those who reject the existence of divine nature and of providence.²³⁵ When he introduces the last citation from Philo on

²³⁰ *HE* II. 17. 19–22.

²³¹ *De abst.* IV. 11–13.

²³² *PE* IX. 3. 22.

²³³ *PE* VIII. 12. 22.

²³⁴ On Philo's conception of providence, see P. Frick, *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 77. Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.

²³⁵ *PE* VIII. 8. 15.

providence, Eusebius claims to oppose the atheists.²³⁶ Moreover, like his other ones, Philo's citations on divine providence confirm the idea that Moses is the philosopher *par excellence*. According to the Alexandrian philosopher, "Moses reached the summit of philosophy and was taught the numerous complexities of nature by oracles" (Μωσῆς δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐπ' αὐτὴν φθάσας ἀκρότητα καὶ χρησιμοῖς τὰ πολλὰ καὶ συνεκτικώτατα τῶν τῆς φύσεως ἀναδιδαχθεῖς).²³⁷

To sum up, Eusebius makes use of the Jewish authors' citations in book VIII in order to locate the "life according to Moses" in the broader picture of the biased 'history of religions' he gives in the *Apodeixis*. Thanks to the testimonies of Philo, Aristobulus, Josephus and Eleazar (the high priest of the *Letter* of Pseudo-Aristeas), he manages to represent Judaism in an idealistic way as a most philosophical way of life in a Greek garb.

Yet this representation, idealized as it may be, should not conceal Eusebius' underlying message: This Jewish form of philosophy belongs to a bygone past; the heir to this philosophy is not the post-Christian Judaism contemporary of Eusebius, but Christianity. This is why Eusebius did not fear to lead his readers to Judaism. His message was clear enough: The path to follow was that of the Gospel.

C. *Jewish Authors' Citations as Greek Testimonies*

As we saw, Eusebius clearly insists on the fact that the Jewish authors belong to the Jewish-Christian tradition (*lato sensu*), e.g., by appealing to the concept of 'Hebraism' to establish a direct connection between Judaism and Christianity. Yet on occasion he also underlines the connection between the Jewish authors and the Greco-Roman pagan world. As he did with Origen,²³⁸ Eusebius emphasizes the reputation of Philo, Aristobulus and Josephus amongst the pagans. He presents Philo, e.g., as "a most distinguished man not only amongst our own but also amongst those who come from the outside" (ἀνὴρ οὐ μόνον τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξωθεν ὁρμωμένων παιδείας ἐπιστημότατος), and also as being "originally a Hebrew by race not inferior in anything to those in power in Alexandria" (τὸ

²³⁶ PE VIII. 13. 7.

²³⁷ PE VIII. 13. 2.

²³⁸ PE VI. 10. 49.

μὲν οὖν γένος ἀνέκαθεν Ἑβραῖος ἦν, τῶν δ' ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐν τέλει διαφανῶν οὐδενὸς χείρων).²³⁹

Likewise, Josephus was, according to Eusebius, admired by both his own people (τοῖς ὁμοεθνήσιν) and by the Romans; the latter, he goes on to say, built a statue for him and judged his works worthy of being gathered in a library (βιβλιοθήκης ἀξιοθῆναι).²⁴⁰ This may be an allusion to Josephus' *Autobiography*, in which the latter claims that Titus commanded that his books on the Jewish war be published (δημοσιῶσαι).²⁴¹ At any rate, Eusebius relates the same information on Philo. The bishop recounts that, under Claudius, the Alexandrian philosopher read his own work *On virtues* "in the middle of the Roman senate" (ἐπὶ πάσης . . . τῆς Ῥωμαίων συγκλήτου); he was so much admired that his writings were judged worthy of being put in the libraries (τῆς ἐν βιβλιοθήκαις ἀναθέσεως . . . καταξιοθῆναι).²⁴² This expression is significant in that it is remindful of that used by Pseudo-Aristeas in his *Letter* (and of Josephus' paraphrase of this work) to deal with the fate of the Septuagint: According to him, the books of the Law are worthy of the King's library (ἄξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ βιβλιοθήκης).²⁴³ Eusebius reproduces this information at *Praeparatio* VIII. 1. 8 (. . . τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν γραφῶν διὰ σπουδῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γεγόμενα τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν βιβλιοθηκῶν ἡξιώθη).

Moreover, like Origen, Philo is said to be versed as much in ancestral and divine knowledge (τὰ θεῖα καὶ πάτρια μαθήματα) as in philosophy and the liberal arts of the outside culture (περὶ τὰ φιλόσοφα δὲ καὶ ἐλευθέρια τῆς ἑξώθεν παιδείας).²⁴⁴ The bishop also claims that Philo outshone anyone in Platonic and Pythagorean philosophy.²⁴⁵ This claim may stem from the "Pythagorean" label given to Philo by Clement of Alexandria.²⁴⁶ Eusebius further describes Philo as "a man held in high repute in every respect . . . and an expert in

²³⁹ *HE* II. 4. 2.

²⁴⁰ *HE* III. 9. 2.

²⁴¹ *Vita* 364.

²⁴² *HE* II. 18. 8.

²⁴³ *Letter* 10. Cf. *AJ* XII. 14.

²⁴⁴ *HE* II. 4. 3.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁶ *Str.* I. 72. 4; II. 100. 3. Cf. Runia, "Why does Clement of Alexandria call Philo 'the Pythagorean'?", in D. Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers*, p. 71 ff. According to Runia, Clement did not try to conceal Philo's Jewishness, which was obvious

philosophy" (ἄνὴρ τὰ πάντα ἔνδοξος . . . καὶ φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἄπειρος).²⁴⁷ This formulation certainly constitutes an echo of Josephus' *Antiquities*, in which the same words are used to describe Philo.²⁴⁸

Regarding Aristobulus, Eusebius insists on the fact that in addition to his ancestral (πατρίῳ) philosophy, he had also devoted himself to Aristotle's philosophy.²⁴⁹ This information is also certainly drawn from Clement of Alexandria, who calls Aristobulus "the Peripatetic".²⁵⁰

Therefore, as with the other authors cited in the *Apodēixis*, and especially with the Christian authors, Eusebius was eager to claim the intellectual reputation of the Jewish authors in the Greco-Roman world, as well as their Greek culture. Gustafsson explains this tendency to emphasize the renown of the quoted authors by the fact that Eusebius considers the lack of opposition to an author as an important criterion of source selection.²⁵¹ Yet other explanations, which do not exclude the previous one, are also worth examining: By representing the Jewish authors in this light, Eusebius wished to confer on them a Greek/pagan authority in order to increase the weight of their testimony in an apologetic (and occasionally polemic) work targeting the pagans. In addition, in showing that the Christians' ancestors were culturally approved by the Greeks due to their dual background, Eusebius may have hoped that the same would go for the Christians. Moreover, the dual background of these authors let the readers suppose that espousing the Jewish-Christian faith did not involve the rejection of one's Greek education.

The fact that the Jewish authors are defined as 'bicultural' also enables Eusebius to increase the apologetic weight of their testimonies. When Aristobulus and Josephus, e.g., are quoted on the theme of the dependency of the Greeks upon the barbarians and

given what he wrote. Through this label he sought to underline the Platonic orientation of Philo's thought in order to valorize him in the eyes of a pagan readership.

²⁴⁷ *HE* II. 5. 4.

²⁴⁸ *AJ* XVIII. 259–260.

²⁴⁹ *PE* VIII. 9. 38. Moreover, links have been made between the passages from Aristobulus with the *De mundo* attributed to Aristotle: On this subject see R. Radice, *La filosofia di Aristobulo e i suoi nessi con il 'De mundo' attribuito ad Aristotele*. Pubblicazioni del centro di ricerche di metafisica. Collana Temi metafisica e problemi del pensiero antico 33. Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1994.

²⁵⁰ *Str.* I. 72. 4.

²⁵¹ Gustafsson, Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources, p. 436.

upon the “Hebrews” in particular,²⁵² or when Josephus’ testimony is cited in order to prove both the antiquity of Moses and the prophets²⁵³ and the superiority of the Orientals over the Greeks in terms of historiography,²⁵⁴ the dual identity of these authors reinforces the legitimacy of their accounts. They are specialists not only in their own “Hebrew”, “Jewish” or barbarian culture but also in Greek culture, and are thus most capable of discussing the position of their own civilization vis-à-vis the Hellenistic one, a point which dramatically increases their authority.

In addition, this dual identity certainly justifies Eusebius’ use of a certain number of Jewish testimonies in the framework of an enquiry on Greek opinions of the “Jews” and the “Hebrews” in book IX of the *Praeparatio*. Eusebius’ exploitation of these Jewish quotations occurs through a subtle game of literary dependency. On several occasions, e.g., Josephus’ testimony is used because he himself quotes or mentions an extensive number of non-Jewish non-Christian authors who dealt with Jewish history.

Jewish Authors’ Citations as Sources of Non-Jewish Authors’ Citations:

PE IX. 3. 1–21 = Josephus, BJ II. 119–159—PE IX. 11. 1–4 = Josephus, AJ I. 93–95—PE IX. 13. 2–5 = Josephus, AJ I. 105–108—PE IX. 14. 3–IX. 15 = Josephus AJ I. 117–120—PE IX. 40. 1–11 = Josephus, AJ X. 221–222 = CA I. 136–137; 146–154—PE IX. 42. 2–3 = Josephus, CA I. 215–218

In many passages from Josephus quoted by Eusebius, an extensive number of non-Jewish authors are mentioned. In the passage dealing with the flood, e.g., Josephus mentions Berossus, Hieronymos the Egyptian, Mnaseas and Nicolaus of Damascus.²⁵⁵ Likewise, Manetho,²⁵⁶ Berossus, Molon, Hestiaeus and Hieronymus on the one hand, and, on the other, Hesiod, Hecataeus, Hellanicus, Acousilaus, Ephoros

²⁵² *PE X. 7. 1–21* and *PE XIII. 12. 1–16*.

²⁵³ *PE X. 13. 1–12*.

²⁵⁴ *PE X. 7. 1–21*.

²⁵⁵ In *PE IX. 11. 1–4*. On this author see the monograph by B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962. On Josephus’ use of Nicolaus, see, e.g., D. S. Williams, “On Josephus’ Use of Nicolaus of Damascus: A Stylometric Analysis of BJ 1. 225–273 and AJ 14. 280–369”, *SCI* 12, 1993, pp. 176–187.

²⁵⁶ On this author, see Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition* pp. 117–136 and the bibliography given on p. 117, n. 72.

and Nicolaus are cited in order to confirm the old age reached by the patriarchs.²⁵⁷ The testimonies of the Sibyl and Hestiaeus are also used in the chapter on the Tower of Babel.²⁵⁸ In the next chapter, which deals with Abraham, the names of Berossus (who is briefly quoted) and Hecataeus occur, as well as a quotation from Nicolaus.²⁵⁹ Finally, in an excerpt from Josephus on Nabuchadnezzar and the Babylonian exile,²⁶⁰ Josephus again cites Berossus, and further on,²⁶¹ he provides an important list of "all those who mentioned the Jewish people" (περὶ τῶν μνημονεύσαντων τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους).²⁶²

In this context, Josephus serves as an intermediary source. Eusebius introduces him neither as a "Hebrew" nor as a "Jew", putting his religious belonging in the background. Moreover, in the headings, Eusebius wrote "how many authors from the outside"²⁶³ mentioned such and such event. This strongly contrasts with Eusebius' attitude in the rest of the *Apodeixis*. Does this mean that the Jewish historian's authority as an enunciator is occulted to the advantage of the pagan authors he mentions? This does not seem to be the case for in the headings, Eusebius is also careful to refer to the title of Josephus' work,²⁶⁴ namely the *Antiquities*.

It is also noteworthy that when Josephus mentions Berossus in a passage quoted by Eusebius, the latter openly admits that he quotes Berossus through Josephus.²⁶⁵ This is not the case at the beginning of book IX when he cites Choerilus, Hecataeus or Clearchus. Moreover, he does not stop quoting when Berossus' citation is over but

²⁵⁷ In *PE* IX. 13. 1–12.

²⁵⁸ In *PE* IX. 15. There has been a harsh debate on this excerpt from the Jewish Sibyl over whether it reflected Babylonian sources or Genesis 11: See e.g. P. Schnabel, *Berossus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*, Leipzig: B. G. Turner, 1923; A. Peretti, *La Sibilla babilonese nella propaganda ellenistica* (Florence: Nuova Italia, 1946); V. Nikiprowetzky, "La Sibylle juive et le troisième livre des pseudo-oracles sibyllins depuis Charles Alexandre", *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 496–515; J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBL Dissertation Series 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1974; "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition", *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 421–459. On Josephus' re-writing of Genesis 11:1–9, see my "Josephus' Appropriation of the Tower of Babel Episode", *JSS* (Forthcoming).

²⁵⁹ In *PE* IX. 16. 2–4.

²⁶⁰ In *PE* IX. 40. 1–4.

²⁶¹ In *PE* IX. 42. 2–3.

²⁶² *PE* IX. 42. heading.

²⁶³ See, e.g., *PE* IX. 16. heading.

²⁶⁴ Cf. *PE* IX. 11. heading; 13. heading; 15. heading.

²⁶⁵ *PE* IX. 40. heading.

after Josephus himself confirmed that Berossus' passage agreed with the Scriptures.²⁶⁶ Therefore, it seems that Josephus has enough authority in Eusebius' opinion to be quoted in his own right in book IX, without being completely concealed by the authors "from the outside". Eusebius may have felt free to include Josephus amongst the latter because he saw him as a fully-fledged member of first-century, educated Roman society. In addition, Eusebius knew that he was cited by Porphyry, a most authoritative Greek philosopher.²⁶⁷ As I have pointed out, he also proudly claimed that the Jewish historian's works had been put in a Roman library and that a statue in his honour had been erected close by.²⁶⁸

In book IX of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius seems to 'play' with Josephus' authority, emphasizing it on some occasions, concealing it on others, or making it dependent on the authority of other authors. At the beginning of the book,²⁶⁹ e.g., he omits to mention that he used the *Contra Apionem* as an intermediary source for the excerpts from Clearchus, Choerilus and Pseudo-Hecataeus. He rightly finds it more useful not to mention that he used a Jewish source in the part of the books where he claims to use only Greek testimonies on the Jews and the Hebrews. Since most of these testimonies are laudatory, admitting that they came from Josephus would have spoilt it all. Therefore, in this case, the Greek background of Josephus is insufficient in Eusebius' opinion.

Likewise, he preferred not to mention that Porphyry's source on the Essenes²⁷⁰ was none other than Josephus, a fact that Porphyry himself openly admitted in his *De abstinentia*.²⁷¹ This omission enabled Eusebius to turn the arch-enemy of Christianity into an admirer of the Christians' ancestors.

In contrast to book IX in which Josephus is used as an intermediary source for non-Jewish testimonies, in book X of the *Praeparatio*, Josephus' authority outshines that of non-Jewish authors. In chapter 13, which deals with the antiquity of Moses and the prophets, Eusebius

²⁶⁶ *PE* IX. 40. 11.

²⁶⁷ *De abst.* IV. 11–13.

²⁶⁸ *HE* III. 9. 2.

²⁶⁹ *PE* IX. 4; 5; 9.

²⁷⁰ *PE* IX. 3. 1–21.

²⁷¹ See C. Burchard, "Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus, Bericht über die Essener Bell. 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Eusebius, Niketas Choniates und

quotes Josephus who cites Manetho. In this case Josephus' testimony is emphasized in contrast to that of Manetho which Eusebius undermines. Indeed, in this passage, Josephus is used as a predecessor of the Christians in terms of chronology; consequently, Manetho's name appears neither in the introduction to the citation nor in the heading of the chapter. Moreover, at the end of the quotation, Eusebius declares: "The extracts from Egyptian history have been recorded thus somewhat at large by Josephus" Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς ἱστορίας ταύτης πη τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ κατὰ πλάτος ἀνιστόρηται.²⁷² This clearly indicates that Manetho made way for Josephus.

It is worth noting that in the *Apodeixis*, the bishop does not cite all the non-Jewish authors mentioned or cited by Josephus, whether in the *Contra Apionem* or in the *Antiquities*. For instance, he omits Menander of Ephesus' testimony on the enigmas exchanged by Solomon and Hirom King of Tyr and on the drought under Achab;²⁷³ he also omits Dios' testimony on Solomon and Hirom.²⁷⁴

A number of elements may explain these omissions. Firstly, regarding Solomon, Eusebius already had important testimonies such as the extensive citation from Eupolemus,²⁷⁵ who is cited through Alexander Polyhistor; it was all the more useful that it was supposed to reproduce genuine documents, i.e., letters exchanged by Solomon and different Oriental kings. Moreover, these letters emphasized the benevolence of these kings towards the Jewish king and his people. In addition, Eusebius also had Theophilus' testimony²⁷⁶ on the relation between Solomon and the King of Tyr, which he also knew through Alexander Polyhistor.

Secondly, Menander's testimony on the drought under Achab may have seemed less interesting to Eusebius because it did not stage any well-known event of the Hebrew Bible. Amongst non-Jewish authors, only Menander dealt with this episode. Moreover, this excerpt only

anderen", in O. Betz, Kl. Haacker and M. Hengel (Eds.), *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Festschrift O. Michel*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974, pp. 77–96. Hippolytus would not be as good a witness of Josephus' text as Porphyry, despite the changes made by the latter.

²⁷² PE X. 13. 13. Translation by Gifford.

²⁷³ AJ VIII. 144–149; CA I. 116–120 and AJ VIII. 324.

²⁷⁴ AJ VIII. 147–149; CA I. 113–115.

²⁷⁵ PE IX. 30. 1–IX. 34. 18.

²⁷⁶ PE IX. 34. 19.

occurs in book VIII of Josephus' *Antiquities* whereas in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius seems to use almost exclusively the first book of the *Antiquities*.

At any rate, these observations confirm Eusebius' claim that he had more testimonies on the Jews and Hebrews at his disposal, even though he probably exaggerates when he mentions a huge crowd of witnesses.²⁷⁷

"Minor" Jewish Authors' Citations as 'Greek' Testimonies:

PE IX. 17–38 = Alexander Polyhistor, On the Jews = Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1 Holladay; Artapan fr. 1–3 Holladay; Philo the Poet fr. 1–3 Holladay; Demetrius fr. 1–2 Holladay; Theodotus fr. 1 Holladay; Aristas fr. 1 Holladay; Eupolemus fr. 1–4 Holladay; Ezekiel fr. 1–17 Holladay; Theophilus fr. 1 Holladay

Strikingly, Eusebius never clarifies the religious identity of the minor Jewish authors who are extensively used in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, nor does he seem to pay any attention to it either. He is, rather, more interested in the fact that it is through them that Alexander Polyhistor knew biblical history. On this occasion, he presents him as an erudite man whose works had a determining influence on Greek culture.²⁷⁸

The question arises as to whether Eusebius believed that these authors were indeed Greek. Indeed, in chapter 42 of book IX of the *Praeparatio*, he cites Josephus' famous passage from the *Contra Apionem*²⁷⁹ in which the Jewish historian presents some of these minor Jewish authors as Greek historians having testified to the antiquity of the Jews, i.e., "Demetrius of Phaleron", "Philo the Elder" and "Eupolemus"; the first two names were probably confused with Demetrius the Chronographer²⁸⁰ and Philo the Poet.²⁸¹ This also raises the question as to whether Josephus really believed these authors

²⁷⁷ *PE IX. 42. 4.*

²⁷⁸ *PE IX. 17. 1.*

²⁷⁹ *CA I. 215–218.*

²⁸⁰ As suggested by Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 264.

²⁸¹ Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, II, p. 1192 holds that Philo the Poet and Philo the Elder are one and the same but that they are not to be identified with Philo the Historian mentioned by Clement (*Str. I. 141. 3*). On this question see also Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Vol. II: Poets*, pp. 216–217. The question remains open.

were not Jewish, and to what extent Eusebius accepted his opinion.²⁸² According to Sterling, Josephus knew they were Jewish but he presented them as Greeks because he only knew them indirectly through Alexander Polyhistor; moreover, he probably did not wish to mention other Jews' writings because it could have undermined his own historiographical achievements. By contrast, Feldman²⁸³ seems to think that Josephus really saw these authors as pagans. He criticizes Sterling by arguing that nowhere does Josephus claim to be the first one to write a Jewish history. Yet Josephus did not need to openly claim to be the first one. He could have thought so and consequently attempted to undermine the testimonies of his predecessors. At any rate, if Sterling, as I believe, is right, we need to ask to what extent Eusebius accepts Josephus' apparent opinion.

It does not seem to be the case in the *Historia ecclesiastica* where Eusebius mentions Demetrius and Eupolemus as "Jewish" authors used as sources by Clement of Alexandria.²⁸⁴ By contrast, in the *Praeparatio*, he never labels them as "Jews" or "Hebrews", although it might have been useful for him to claim that such a renowned Greek as Alexander Polyhistor knew and quoted Jewish authors. But Alexander had mixed Jewish and non-Jewish testimonies in his work on the Jews.²⁸⁵ In the *Apodeixis*, Eusebius seems to have preferred to ignore these authors' Jewishness. Did he think it was even more useful to imply that these testimonies were from Greek authors who knew biblical history very well? I think that in the *Praeparatio*, he decided to follow Josephus whose passage on these authors he quotes. Although he knew for sure that some of them were Jews, I would argue that he was deliberately ambiguous towards these authors and intentionally preserved the ambiguity of their status in his apologetic work, and this for apologetic reasons: he wished to present as many "Greek" testimonies as possible in book IX. Since these authors were not famous enough to be quoted on their own, he presented their passages through Polyhistor.

²⁸² Cf. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, pp. 282–284, and Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*, pp. 20–21, n. 7.

²⁸³ Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, p. 207.

²⁸⁴ *HE* VI. 13. 7.

²⁸⁵ See, e.g., the excerpts from Timochares and from the "Syrian measurer" which are cited along with those from Artapanus and Demetrius.

One may also ask to what extent Eusebius carefully read the content of the minor Jewish authors' citations and to what extent he expected his readers to do so. Some scholars have claimed that both Eusebius and Clement of Alexandria preserved these fragments because "they saw in them apologists of an earlier era"²⁸⁶ or that "certamente il valore delle testimonianze di un Eupolemo, di un Artapano, di un Demetrio-tutti autori citati nel *Peri Ioudaion* per Eusebio doveva essere enorme".²⁸⁷ However, this analysis reveals that Eusebius found no interest in citing these authors on their own. If he saw them as Jews, he did not find them worthy of being cited in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*; if he considered them as Greeks, he did not find their testimonies important enough to be quoted individually in their own terms in book IX. By contrast, he intends to show that Alexander Polyhistor was aware of Jewish history. Consequently, in almost every citation, he indicates that he is citing Polyhistor. He almost never claims that the citation has been drawn from one of the minor authors.²⁸⁸ Even when Eusebius only mentions the name of the Jewish author in the heading of the chapter, he also says that he is quoting Polyhistor. In chapter 28 of book IX, e.g., he mentions Ezekiel the Tragedian (whose Jewishness could hardly be concealed given his name) in the heading. In chapter 29, he mentions Demetrius in the heading but he says that he cites him through "the same author", i.e., Alexander Polyhistor. Moreover, and quite significantly, he takes pains to cite the editorial notes which Polyhistor inserted between the different excerpts of the Jewish authors. In most cases, Eusebius makes it clear either before or after the citation that the citations from the minor Jewish authors come from Alexander Polyhistor;²⁸⁹ he often denies the minor Jewish authors their authority by ascribing it to Polyhistor: At *Praeparatio* IX. 17, e.g., Eusebius announces Polyhistor's account of Abraham (τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀβραάμ

²⁸⁶ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition* p. 223. See also P. W. Van Der Horst, *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 14. Freiburg: Universitäts Verlag-Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990, p. 213; Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans, and Christians in Conflict*, p. 172. Droge, *Homer or Moses?* also considers that the excerpts of the Jewish authors cited through Polyhistor are used, like those of Josephus, Philo, Aristobulus and Pseudo-Aristeus, in order to show that Hebrew theology is superior to that of the Greeks.

²⁸⁷ Troiani, *Due studi di storiografia e religione antiche*, p. 17.

²⁸⁸ Except in chapters 26, 22, 20.

²⁸⁹ Cf. *PE* IX. 17. 1; 19. 4; 20. 2; 20. 3; 21. 1; 25. 4; 37. 3; 39. 1.

...ἱστορεῖ²⁹⁰ whereas he actually provides an excerpt from Eupolemus.

However, in the table of contents which he authored, the bishop mostly mentions the individual names of these Jewish authors.²⁹¹ Yet this cannot be taken as evidence of their importance because the table of contents, just as today,²⁹² was meant to help the readers locate a passage. It was more helpful to arrange the structure of the text under different names than to provide twenty chapters under the same name (Polyhistor). Moreover, it looks like after mentioning Polyhistor in the two first sections (IX. 17–18 in the table) next to the name of the author quoted by the latter, Eusebius was too bored to repeat his name: Indeed, in the third section (IX. 19 in the table), he is content to mention ὁμοίως to designate Polyhistor, and in the following sections, he omits even this adverb.

At any rate, despite Eusebius' clarifications, his use of Polyhistor and of his quotations of the "minor" Jewish authors is confusing. To some extent, it looks as if a 'discursive opacity' was created by the bishop, which leaves the reader confused. Is Polyhistor speaking or one of the authors he cites? I believe that this discursive opacity may have been intended to reinforce his apologetic use of the Jewish authors. It gave the impression that numerous Greek authors had dealt with biblical history.

Eusebius' attitude towards the minor Jewish authors strikingly contrasts with that of his predecessor Clement of Alexandria. Unlike Eusebius, Clement does not claim to cite them through Alexander Polyhistor, even though the latter was his source.²⁹³ Moreover, he paid attention to the content of the excerpts: Passages from Eupolemus, Ezekiel the Tragedian and Artapanus, along with those from Philo's *De vita Mosi*, serve to provide a novelistic account of the life of Moses he provided in the *Stromata*.²⁹⁴ Likewise, Clement appeals to both Demetrius the Chronographer and Eupolemus in order to prove the antiquity of the Jewish people.²⁹⁵ By contrast, when Eusebius

²⁹⁰ *PE* IX. 17. 1.

²⁹¹ Except at *PE* IX. 17–19 in the table.

²⁹² Cf. Petitmengin, "'capitula' païens et intertexte," in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, p. 501.

²⁹³ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 147.

²⁹⁴ *Str.* I. 153. 4–156. 2.

²⁹⁵ *Str.* I. 141. 1–4.

deals with the antiquity of the Jews in book X of the *Praeparatio*, he only cites Josephus and Christian authors. Despite Clement's influence, he omits the testimony of these authors. Yet he had many opportunities to do so. For instance, he could have used Artapanus' testimony on Moses in which he makes him the inventor of philosophy²⁹⁶ in his section on the dependency theme in book X of the *Praeparatio*.²⁹⁷ In the same context, he could have used Eupolemus' claim that Moses was the source from which the Greeks got wisdom and the alphabet through the Phoenicians.²⁹⁸ This seems to indicate that unlike Clement, Eusebius did not consider these authors as predecessors worthy of being cited under their individual names. He found greater interest in the fact that their texts were cited by Alexander Polyhistor. He used this argument in order to show that Greek 'intellectuals' such as Polyhistor knew the Jews and the Hebrews through these authors. This undeniably gave the Christians, who were the heirs to the Hebrews and certain Jews, considerable prestige.

Through his eagerness to emphasize that the Hebrew/Jewish history and people had been acknowledged by the Greeks, Eusebius made himself the heir to Josephus, and, to a certain extent, he made a part of the *Praeparatio* an offshoot of the *Contra Apionem*. Yet their intentions varied. Josephus used all sorts of testimonies, including disparaging ones,²⁹⁹ to prove the antiquity of the Jews. Eusebius, by contrast, only selected testimonies that were laudatory or neutral towards the Hebrews/Jews;³⁰⁰ he intended to demonstrate that their tradition, which he presented as the roots of Christianity, was held in high esteem by those who occasionally attacked it.

D. *Jewish Authors' Citations as Testimonies on Christianity*

In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius does not linger on New Testament texts. He delves into Christianity in the *Demonstratio*. In this work, almost all extra-biblical citations are from Josephus. They are exploited in a distinctly Christian context in order to confirm either the information

²⁹⁶ *PE* IX. 27. 1–37.

²⁹⁷ *PE* X. 2. 1–16.

²⁹⁸ *PE* IX. 26.

²⁹⁹ See, e.g., Manetho's testimony in *CA* I. 73 ff. and Agatharchides at I. 209–211.

³⁰⁰ He explicitly says so at *PE* IX. 10. 6.

found in the New Testament on Jesus and John the Baptist or the supersession of Judaism by Christianity. Therefore, Eusebius' use of the Jewish authors in the *Demonstratio* is radically different from that in the *Praeparatio*.

In the *Demonstratio*, most of the Jewish citations are from Josephus. They serve to illuminate the meaning of Gabriel's prophecy in Daniel 9:20–27. In addition, the famous *Testimonium Flavianum* as well as Josephus' testimony on John the Baptist are used on their own.

Before analyzing the manner in which Eusebius uses these passages, it should be pointed out that they are almost always used at the end of a chapter. This may indicate that they serve to fill out the end of a book and that in the *Demonstratio* their use was limited to confirming other Christian or "Hebrew" testimonies.

Josephus on Jesus: The Case of the Testimonium Flavianum:

DE III. 5. 124b–c = Josephus, AJ XVIII. 63–64

In the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius does not use the *Testimonium Flavianum* in the same way he did in his *Historia ecclesiastica*.³⁰¹ In the latter, he links it to Josephus' testimony on John the Baptist in order to counter the claims made in the *Acts of Pilate*, which are no longer extant. In the *Demonstratio*, these two citations are used independently. Josephus' testimony on Jesus occurs at III. 5. 124b–c, in a chapter where Eusebius opposes those who do not believe in Jesus' miracles.³⁰² Therefore, it is clear that in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius does not aim to prove that Josephus the "Hebrew" acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah; he is rather interested in the fact that Josephus presents Jesus as a "miracle-worker" (παράδοξων ἔργων ποιητής) whose marvels had convinced many Jews and Greeks.³⁰³ This is also the case in the Theophany in which he uses the same passage.³⁰⁴ One may wonder why in a work aiming to prove (among other things) the supersession of Judaism by Christianity the bishop does not use

³⁰¹ *HE* I. 11. 7–8.

³⁰² As is shown by the title Eusebius gives to this chapter heading in the table of contents. On Eusebius' defence against these accusations, see F. W. Norris, "Eusebius on Jesus as a Deceiver and Sorcerer", in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 523–540.

³⁰³ *DE* III. 5. 124b.

³⁰⁴ See the German translation by Gressmann, *Eusebius Werke* III. 2. GCS, p. 250.

Josephus' testimony in a debate on the Messiah's identity. Even in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, there is no proof that Eusebius uses Josephus' passages on Jesus and John the Baptist in this context, despite Hardwick's opinion.³⁰⁵ I would argue that on this occasion, Eusebius may have been wary of the *Testimonium* because of Origen. Indeed, Origen's influence on Eusebius is common knowledge, an influence which was exerted as much on a theological as on an apologetic level.³⁰⁶ He was certainly intrigued by the fact that his "wonderful" master claimed in his *Contra Celsum* that Josephus did not accept Christ as the Messiah,³⁰⁷ and this may well explain Eusebius' caution. As so often, he was seeking the approval of his predecessors before quoting or exploiting a text in a certain way.

Josephus on John the Baptist:

DE IX. 5. 431a = Josephus, AJ XVIII. 116–117

The citation on John the Baptist is included in a context similar to that of the *Testimonium*: After saying that people rushed up to "the purification of the soul announced through him" (συνέτρεχον . . . ἐπὶ τὴν δι' αὐτοῦ κηρυττομένην τῆς ψυχῆς κάθαρσιν), Eusebius finishes the chapter with Josephus' quotation.³⁰⁸ He introduces the quotation by saying that the Jewish historian "evokes his [John's] story" (μύμνηται δὲ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἱστορίας). The first part of the quotation deals with the defeat of Herod's army and its relation to John's death; the second part deals with his work and with baptism. As Hardwick has pointed out, Eusebius was not embarrassed by the differences between the canonical Gospels and Josephus on John the Baptist's death. Whereas the Gospels saw his death as the result of his comments upon Herod's adultery, Josephus saw it as the result of a despotic leader's fear of the Baptist's popularity.³⁰⁹ Eusebius did not seem to

³⁰⁵ Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 86.

³⁰⁶ Heikel has shown in his edition of the *Demonstratio* (Eusebius Werke VI. GCS) that Eusebius took over some of Origen's arguments III. 1–7 (13 times). Carrara also claims Eusebius' dependency upon Origen's *Contra Celsum* in the *Demonstratio* (*Demonstrazione evangelica*, p. 48). This opinion is widely accepted by the scholarly community. See Ch. Kannengiesser, "Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist", pp. 435–466.

³⁰⁷ *CC I*, 47.

³⁰⁸ *DE IX. 5. 431a*.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 79. Cf. *AJ XVIII. 117–119*. On the differences between the text of Josephus and that of the NT on John the Baptist, see É. Nodet, *Baptême et résurrection*, pp. 83–107.

mind, perhaps also because Josephus' citation was not provided in the context of an agreement between Josephus' narrative and the Gospels.

At any rate, as I have already pointed out,³¹⁰ Eusebius was careful to stop quoting Josephus before he clearly disagrees with the Gospels. His citation is clearly used as a confirmatory testimony.

Josephus and Philo on the End of Judaism:

DE VIII. 2. 397d–398a = Josephus, Aĵ XX. 247–249—DE VIII. 2. 398b = Josephus, Aĵ XVIII. 92–93—DE VIII. 2. 399a = Josephus, Aĵ XVIII. 34–35—DE VIII. 2. 402d = Josephus, Bĵ VI. 299—DE VIII. 2. 402d–403a = Josephus, Aĵ XVIII. 55; Bĵ II. 169—DE VIII. 2. 403a = Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 299

All other citations from Josephus as well as one paraphrase from Philo are used in the context of Eusebius' interpretation of Daniel 9:20–27, a passage that was abundantly commented by the Christians.³¹¹ Eusebius' commentary aims to show that Daniel's prophecy was fulfilled in the time of Christ; the replacement of the old covenant by the new covenant was announced by the inexorable decay of the Temple and of its institutions. Philo's and more specifically Josephus' citations support this theory.

The first citation³¹² relates the election of high priests amongst non-Hasmonean families by Herod, his son Archelaus, and then by the Romans. The second one³¹³ deals with the custom imposed by Herod, according to which the high priest's garments were kept by Herod (and then by his son, and then by the Romans) instead of being kept by the high priest. According to Eusebius, these two texts confirm the prophecy of Daniel 9:26, which announces the

³¹⁰ Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion".

³¹¹ On the Christian exegesis of Daniel in the three first centuries and especially in Clement of Alexandria, see R. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une exégèse, Daniel dans l'Église ancienne des trois premiers siècles*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986. Jerome, in his *Comm. in Dan.* (PL XXV, 544 ff.), gives a list of his predecessors in the exegesis of the seven weeks mentioned in Daniel, namely Jude, Hippolytus and Julius Africanus. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée*, p. 459 gives these interpretations: Whereas Jude and Hippolytus see in verses 20–27 an allusion to the antichrist, Julius Africanus gives a distinctly historical interpretation. According to him, it refers to the Parousia.

³¹² *DE VIII. 2. 397–398a = Aĵ XX. 247–9.*

³¹³ *DE VIII. 2. 398b = Aĵ XVIII. 92–93.*

disappearance of both the unction and a judgement on the unction. Yet I have pointed out that Eusebius distorts the original meaning of the two quotations by removing them from their context: Josephus goes on to say that Vitellius reintroduced the Jewish custom according to which the high priest kept his garments.³¹⁴ Moreover, Josephus also explained that after Herod and Archelaus, the high priests ruled once again. Obviously, this contradicted Eusebius' depiction of the inexorable decay of the high priesthood and therefore of Judaism.

In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius also associates these two citations from Josephus in order to demonstrate the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy.³¹⁵ Yet he is content with paraphrasing them. They are also included in the *Eclogae prophetae*³¹⁶ in which they are used in the same manner.

Eusebius cites another passage from Josephus' *Antiquities*³¹⁷ in which the latter enumerates the high priests selected by Valerius Gratus. This testimony serves to confirm (Ἰώσηπος ἐπιμαρτυρῶν) Luke 3:1. According to this verse, in the time of Pilate, there were two high priests simultaneously. In Eusebius' opinion, this testimony is crucial and he declares that he "had to cite it" (ἀναγκαίως παρεθέμην)³¹⁸ because it undeniably confirms his interpretation of Daniel 9:26 (ταῦτα ἀναγκαίως παρεθέμην διὰ τὸ "ἐξολοθρευθήσεται χρίσμα, καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ", ὃ καὶ ἡγοῦμαι ἀναμφίλεκτον τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἔχειν). Therefore, the function of this citation is once again to confirm the Gospel's account.

It should be noted that Josephus' citation is also used in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, albeit in a different context.³¹⁹ In this work, it helps Eusebius date Jesus' teachings. In this case, Eusebius misinterpreted Luke's testimony:³²⁰ He deduces from it that Jesus started teaching from Ananus until Caiphas. But Luke does not mention any succession of high priests between Ananus and Caiphas, whereas Josephus

³¹⁴ See Chapter V, section "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

³¹⁵ *HE* I. 6. 9–11.

³¹⁶ *Ecl. proph.* 160. 7–121.

³¹⁷ *DE* VIII. 2. 399a = *AJ* XVIII. 34–35.

³¹⁸ *DE* VIII. 2. 399b.

³¹⁹ *HE* I. 10. 4–5.

³²⁰ Cf. G. Bardy, Eusèbe. *Histoire ecclésiastique* I. SC 31, p. 35, n. 3.

does.³²¹ Eusebius thus distorted the Gospel's data in order to make them agree with Josephus.³²²

Although I have already discussed at length the citations from Josephus and Philo at VIII. 2. 402d–403a,³²³ it is necessary to return to them briefly. Eusebius quotes Josephus' account of the earthquake shaking the Temple and of the voices saying "let us depart from here" heard by the priests. He also adds Josephus' version of the sacrilege committed by Pilate in the Temple. Once again, these testimonies are used to prove the end of the Jewish institutions' legitimacy. Eusebius sees the events related by Josephus as signs of the end of the old covenant.

Interestingly, whereas Josephus' and Philo's testimonies on Pilate are subjected to a semantic distortion in the *Demonstratio*, Josephus' testimony on the supernatural phenomena that occurred in the Temple at Pentecost was directly reusable by Eusebius. Indeed for both Josephus and Eusebius this event constituted an omen of the disaster to come, i.e., the destruction of both the Temple and of Jerusalem. For both authors, this destruction could only be interpreted theologically as a divine punishment. However, the causes of this catastrophe and its theological significance were interpreted in a different way by the Jewish and the Christian apologist. The bishop ascribes these events to the Jews' rejection and murder of Jesus. By contrast, Josephus attributes them to the Jewish rebellion against Rome, which was in his view commanded by divine providence. He thus sees the Jewish rebellion as a breaking of the Law.³²⁴ According to Eusebius, the signs announcing the disaster that are reported by Josephus are the beginning of a long series of miseries for the Jews. These miseries reached their peak in the "abomination of desolation" announced to Daniel by Gabriel,³²⁵ i.e., the destruction of the Temple by the

³²¹ Even if one may answer that Eusebius could have deduced this from Luke 3:2, since Caiaphas, mentioned besides Ananus, was a high priest around the end of Jesus' life.

³²² Hardwick's claim in *Josephus as an Historical Source*, p. 77 that in the *HE* Eusebius acknowledges that Luke mentions the simultaneous high priesthood of Ananus and Caiaphas is erroneous. Eusebius merely attempted to reconcile these two testimonies.

³²³ See Chapter V, section "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

³²⁴ Cf. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, pp. 20–21 and 107.

³²⁵ Daniel 9:27.

Romans. Eusebius adds that this desolation (ἐρημία)³²⁶ continues in his day and may continue until the end of time. He is revolted by the Jews' blindness who reject his interpretation of Daniel.³²⁷ In his view, this attitude is a metaphor of their rejection of Christ as the messiah. It is hard to determine whether these Jewish opponents are real or rhetorically constructed, but at any rate it is significant in that it shows that the bishop sometimes used Josephus' testimony in a polemical context against contemporary Jews.

The passages excerpted from Josephus, and to a lesser extent those from Philo, played a crucial role in Eusebius' interpretation of Daniel 9:24–27. The bishop's use of these testimonies is essentially historicist. Thanks to them, he aims to ruin the foundations of Judaism through the history of the Temple which symbolizes it. This metonymic use of the Temple is common in Christian literature *adversus Iudaeos*. This strategy testifies to the metaphoric importance of the Temple in the Christians' opinion. As Lieu³²⁸ and Stroumsa³²⁹ have pointed out, somewhat later, the emperor Julian's project to rebuild the Temple aimed to shatter one of the pillars of Christian identity, i.e., the destruction of the Temple. Eusebius' approach is definitely in keeping with this tradition. To a large extent, he bases his attack on Judaism on a theological-historical demonstration of the inexorable character of the fall of the Jewish Temple. In this he goes against Josephus who argued that the fall of the Temple could have been avoided if the rebellious factions had stopped revolting. Moreover, by tampering with the original meaning of the Jewish citations through semantic distortions, textual cuts or textual modifications, Eusebius manages to provide his readers with an image of a declining Judaism in the days of Jesus. According to this picture, it is only the Jews who refuse to admit reality. As I have pointed out, for the first time in the *Apodeixis*, the Jewish authors' citations are used directly as weapons against those Jews contemporary with Eusebius, in contrast with the ones used in the *Praeparatio*, which serve as intermediaries

³²⁶ DE VIII. 2. 403b. Cf. Daniel 9:27: βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως.

³²⁷ DE VIII. 2. 403c ff.

³²⁸ J. Lieu, "History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism", in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak (Eds.), *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, London: Routledge, 1992, p. 84.

³²⁹ G. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity", in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Eds.), *Contra Iudaeos, Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Jews and Christians*, 1996, p. 20.

between Christianity and Hellenism. In the context which I have just analyzed, the impact of the Jewish citations proves to be much more polemical once Eusebius deals directly with Christianity.

3. LEVELS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EUSEBIUS' DISCOURSE AND THE JEWISH AUTHORS' CITATIONS IN THE *APODELIXIS*: POLYPHONY, DISTANCING AND "DEGRÉ ZÉRO"

Having analyzed Eusebius' methodology in appropriating the Jewish authors' citations, it is necessary to question the concept of appropriation itself by asking to what extent Eusebius did adhere to the Jewish authors' discourses he quotes.

In chapter II, I noted that the level of agreement between Eusebius and the texts he quotes could vary from cacophony to polyphony. In the case of the Jewish authors' citations, there seems to be no cacophony: No passage is used for the purpose of being criticized, as was the case, e.g., with the quotations from Porphyry or Plato. Yet there are different levels of agreement between Eusebius and the Jewish authors' discourses:

a) In the *Praeparatio*, whenever the Jewish authors are labelled as "Hebrews" and are used in a theological-philosophical context, Eusebius not only lets them speak but also, as it were, speaks through them. Indeed, I have explained how the "Hebrews" become, in the *Praeparatio*, the spokesmen of Eusebius' Christianity; the text cited is entirely appropriated by the Christian apologist. In other words, the discourse of the "Hebrew" author is absorbed by Eusebius in a process that could be defined as polyphonic and symphonic: The voices of the enunciator and of the speaker are merged into a single voice. Listening to Philo means listening to Eusebius. This phenomenon is especially striking in the case of Philo's and Aristobulus' citations on the *Logos* and *Sophia* in book VII,³³⁰ to the extent that some scholars occasionally use the passages cited by Eusebius as representing the latter's thoughts.³³¹ This is also valid for the citations

³³⁰ PE VII. 13–14.

³³¹ E.g., R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988, p. 48, nn. 96–97. Maraval, *Eusèbe de Césarée, La théologie politique de l'Empire chrétien; Louanges de Constantin (Triakon-taëtérkos)*, p. 156.

from Philo on divine providence and the creation in book VIII,³³² and for those on the Ideas and the second cause in book XI.³³³

This is also the case with the citations that are more openly apologetic or polemical, such as those from Josephus on the Greeks' knowledge of the Hebrews/Jews,³³⁴ on Greek historiography,³³⁵ or on the antiquity of the Jews³³⁶ as well as that of Aristobulus on the dependency theme.³³⁷ These authors' discourses are, so to speak, extensions of Eusebius' own discourse.

b) By contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, even though Josephus is sometimes described as a "Hebrew", the bishop distances himself somewhat from the Jewish historian's discourse because in this work he deals directly with Christianity. Therefore, even if in the *Praeparatio* "Hebrew" is equated with "Christian", this is not exactly the case in the *Demonstratio*. The situation is different in each part of the *Apodeixis* because in the *Praeparatio* the Jewish quotations have to do with ideas and concepts (the second cause, Moses' antiquity, etc.); by contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, they have to do with historical events (Jesus' life, John the Baptist's death, the destruction of the Temple, etc.). For this reason, in the *Demonstratio*, the Jewish citations can be used as valid testimonies only if there is a clear distinction between citing author and cited author on a discursive level. In other words, it is because the Jewish authors are not Christians in their own right that their testimonies are useful. This explains why their voices are not absorbed by Eusebius' voice.

The same phenomenon may be observed in the case of the Jewish citations given in book VIII of the *Praeparatio* on the "life according to Moses". Eusebius distances himself somewhat from them on a discursive level because they are used as "Jewish" testimonies. He lets the Jewish authors speak but their voices are not confused with his. Although these citations also feed Eusebius' apology, in the *Praeparatio* they are not absorbed as much as the "Hebrew" testimonies can be.

c) As regards the so-called minor Jewish authors, the distance that separates them from Eusebius on a discursive level is greatest. Except

³³² PE VIII. 13–14.

³³³ PE XI. 15. 1–6; 24. 1–12.

³³⁴ PE IX. 11. 1–4; 13. 2–5; 15; 16. 2–8; 40. 1–11; 42. 2–3 and IX. 20. 2–4.

³³⁵ PE X. 7. 1–21.

³³⁶ PE X. 13.

³³⁷ PE XIII. 12. 1–16.

when they are mentioned in the headings or in the table of contents, they never occur in Eusebius' discourses in book IX of the *Praeparatio*. In other words, in this case, there seems to be no relation between citing discourse and cited discourse. This is what I would call the "degré zéro" of Eusebius' adherence to the Jewish authors' discourses. Only Polyhistor, through whom the minor Jewish authors are cited, has a place in the relation to Eusebius' discourse.

Finally, the "degré zéro" label may also be applied to the citations from Jewish authors whose Jewish authorship Eusebius conceals. It may define, e.g., the relation between Eusebius and Josephus as quoted by Porphyry on the Essenes, or between Eusebius and Choerilus, Clearchus and Hecataeus as quoted by Josephus. In these examples, Eusebius has omitted Josephus' authorship. Consequently there can be no discursive relation between Josephus (whether citing or cited) and Eusebius.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Eusebius uses the Jewish authors' citations in the *Apodeixis* for three purposes: In the *Praeparatio*, these citations essentially serve on the one hand as intermediaries between Greek philosophy and the Scriptures, and on the other, as a source of apologetic material that can be used for the Christian cause. In the *Demonstratio*, they provide the bishop with historical testimonies on the beginnings of Christianity, and more specifically with historical-theological proof of the replacement of Judaism by Christianity in the context of the interpretation of Daniel 9:20–27.

The function of intermediary is fulfilled by the Jewish authors' citations through their use of a vocabulary that is common to the Scriptures and Greek philosophy. It is also operated through the arrangements of the Jewish citations which are associated with Christian or pagan authors' citations. The intertextual process also plays an important role because it enables the reader to read the Jewish texts in reference both to Greek philosophical writings (e.g., Plato's *Timaeus*) and to the Bible, whether the 'Old' or the 'New' Testament.

Moreover, even when Eusebius claims that he will examine one or other aspect of "Hebrew" or "Jewish" thought, he is careful to choose strongly apologetic passages that can reinforce his defence of Christianity. By contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, the Jewish passages are openly used from a Christian perspective.

This analysis has also shown that the differences in Eusebius' use of the Jewish material in the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio* are due to the fact that in the former Christianity is not dealt with directly. In this context, the Jewish authors become the spokesmen of the Christian cause; their citations enable Eusebius to reconstruct an idealized prehistory of Christianity in which both the "Jews" and the "Hebrews" have a role to play. By contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, Eusebius uses the Jewish citations partly against Judaism. Their treatment in this work is more similar to the use Eusebius makes of them in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Therefore, paradoxically, the way in which the Jewish citations are exploited in the two parts of the *Apodeixis* is somehow antithetic.

In addition, in the *Demonstratio*, some of Josephus' citations are used in a pagan-Christian polemical context in order to defend the New Testament accounts of Jesus and John the Baptist against pagan attacks (e.g., the Acts of Pilate).

This study has also shown that Eusebius' methodology in dealing with the Jewish authors' citations is largely dependent upon the status he gives them. I have shown that the meaning given to the different excerpts varied according to the representation of the Jewish authors as "Hebrews", as "Jews", as sources of Greek testimonies or as sources of Christian history. The identity of the Jewish authors as constructed by Eusebius appears to be varied and enables him to exploit their testimonies as effectively as possible.

On a discursive level, the status of these authors also plays an important role. We saw, for instance, that the "Hebrew" theological and philosophical testimonies of the *Praeparatio* were completely appropriated by Eusebius whose voice was entirely merged with theirs. By contrast, the level of agreement between the bishop's discourse and the other Jewish citations is lesser, even when the Jewish authors are defined as "Hebrews". This indicates that, even when he subordinates their testimonies to Christianity, he maintains a certain distance between them and himself. I also pointed out that the level of agreement between Eusebius's discourse and that of the minor Jewish authors and some other citations could reach a "degré zéro". Finally, we saw that there is no case of rejection of the Jewish authors' discourses in the *Apodeixis*.

CONCLUSION

As the Father of ecclesiastical history and as a crucial source for ancient works no longer extant, Eusebius mostly owes his reputation to his recording of the words and deeds of others. Through my study, I hope to have shown that he deserves to be judged in a more nuanced way. Indeed, my analysis has demonstrated that he deliberately chose to make use of the citation technique, which he skilfully exploited. Thanks to his methodology, he managed to adjust a large number of texts to his apologetic undertaking, texts that were originally foreign to his reflection on Christianity. Therefore, in the light of his mastering of a unique literary and rhetorical technique, it seems to me that Eusebius deserves to be considered as a unique author.

All the more so since he undeniably shows signs of originality in his approach to the citations, especially in his treatment of the Jewish authors' citations. Indeed, in contrast to his Christian predecessors, especially the Alexandrian ones, Eusebius mentions and cites Jewish authors explicitly, thereby integrating them into the Christian tradition. Unlike Clement or Origen, he gives them a specific status and a specific role in Christianity, and it is thanks to this that their texts and fragments will be copied time and time again over the centuries. In addition, through Eusebius' use of their citations, they became prestigious sources in the Christian world, which prestige will ensure them the interest which guaranteed them a Christian posterity.

A comparison between Eusebius' use of non-Jewish sources¹ in the *Apodeixis* and his use of extra-biblical Jewish sources² has shown that the bishop exploits them in a similar way: In both cases, he is careful in referring to them, and uses the same methodology in order to appropriate the content of the citations. Yet I have pointed out that their status is very different. In the *Praeparatio*, the Jewish authors appear as the spokesmen of Christianity; in the *Demonstratio*, the Jewish

¹ Cf. Chapter II, "The Citation Process in Greek Antiquity and in the *Apodeixis*".

² Cf. Chapter V, "The "travail de la citation" in the *Apodeixis*".

citations contribute to illustrate part of Eusebius' thesis on Christian history.

There follow the strategies Eusebius used in order to appropriate the Jewish texts he quotes in the *Apodeixis*.

a) *Representing the Jewish Authors*

As I explained in chapter IV, Eusebius offers different descriptions of the Jewish authors which enable him to adjust their words to his Christian apologetic perspective. It is mainly by labelling them as "Hebrews" that he manages to subordinate them to the Christian cause. Indeed, by giving them the same title as those he claimed as the Christians' direct ancestors (the ancient Hebrews), he turned them, as it were, into Christian representatives or Christians *avant la lettre*. For instance, some passages from Philo or Aristobulus on the *Logos* and *Sophia* were clearly albeit implicitly interpreted as a proto-Christian theology.

Eusebius' insistence on these authors' deep knowledge of the "ancestral" facts and doctrines also contributes to the portrayal of the Jewish authors as proto-Christians. By defining them as "Hebrews," Eusebius not only suggests a new reading of these authors but he also engages his readers to do so.

b) *Cutting Texts*

As we saw in chapter VI, Eusebius' methodology in cutting the selected passages enables him to give the cited text the orientation he wishes. This is especially the case with Josephus' quotations on the Temple and the high priesthood in the *Demonstratio*. By isolating the excerpts from their original contexts, the Christian apologist gives them a new meaning which supports his demonstration. The different narratives recounted by Josephus are interrupted. By omitting the beginning and the end of the stories told by the Jewish historian, Eusebius changes these narratives. We have seen, for instance, that by taking an excerpt from Philo's *De providentia* out of its context, Eusebius gives his readers the impression that Philo claimed that matter was created. Yet nothing, *a priori*, allows such an interpretation of Philo's text.³

³ PE VII. 21. 1–4. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion".

Generally speaking, Eusebius tends in the *Demonstratio* to omit the happy ending of certain painful events which the Jews lived through and which were recounted by Josephus or Philo: The bishop interrupts Josephus' narrative on Vitellius before the Jewish historian can tell us that the emperor gave back control of the priestly garments to the Jews;⁴ thanks to Josephus' testimony, he also claims that from Herod onwards the high priests were not selected through the Hasmoneans but he omits to say that according to Josephus, the high priests later ruled and founded an aristocracy. Finally, when he relates through Philo's and Josephus' quotations⁵ the episode of the standards brought into the Temple by Pilate, he is careful not to say that the Jews finally won over Pilate either thanks to the emperor's support (according to Philo's version) or thanks to their obstinacy in keeping the Law (Josephus's version). In addition, it has also been emphasized that when Josephus' testimony on John the Baptist disagrees with the Gospels, Eusebius stops quoting before the problematic passage.⁶

Moreover, I pointed out that Eusebius at times omits expressions or words that do not conform to his theological views. The most striking example is that of the word *θεῶν* which Eusebius removed from an excerpt from Philo because of the polytheistic overtones it gave to the "Hebrew" philosopher's discourse.⁷ Likewise, he may have attempted to rid a citation from Philo's *De opificio mundi*⁸ of an expression that implied the pre-existence of matter.

c) *Tampering with the Text*

The most common way to modify the original meaning of a text is to tamper with the text. These changes may be made by adding, omitting or changing words. As we saw, Eusebius occasionally changes words in the *Historia ecclesiastica* in order to suggest agreement between

⁴ *DE VIII.* 2. 398b. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion".

⁵ *DE VIII.* 2. 402d; *DE VIII.* 2. 403a. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion".

⁶ *DE IX.* 5. 431a–b. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Cutting Citations as a Means of Semantic Distortion".

⁷ *PE XIII.* 18. 16.

⁸ *PE VIII.* 13. 2.

Josephus' text and the Gospels. In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, he went so far as to turn a passage from Josephus given by Origen in *oratio obliqua* into a passage in *oratio recta*.⁹ In the *Apodeixis*, such changes are rare but occur at crucial passages. In the *Praeparatio*, for instance, such changes are meant to alter the theological perspective of the text and mark the Christian appropriation operated by Eusebius. This is especially striking in the "second god" he may have added in Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*,¹⁰ or even in the omission of the idea of a matter co-existing with God in the philosopher's *opificio mundi*.¹¹ Such changes are also made by Eusebius in order to reinforce the monotheism of certain passages like Philo's citation on astrolatry¹² or Philo's citation of the "Gods" in a passage from Homer.¹³

In the *Demonstratio*, the bishop makes slight modifications in order to insist on the themes he is dealing with, or words are added or omitted in order to adapt the text to his intended readership. He only loosely paraphrases Jewish texts when he cites Philo and Josephus in *oratio obliqua*.¹⁴ I also emphasized that he occasionally adds words, as when he deals with the "Temple" in Philo's and Josephus' accounts of the sacrilege committed by Pilate in Jerusalem. In the same passage, I showed that he does not hesitate to ascribe to Philo words that actually belong to Josephus in order to feed his polemical purposes. As regards the *Testimonium Flavianum*, there is no definite solution yet but I have argued that Eusebius is unlikely to have forged the whole piece.

It might well be that Eusebius tampered even more with the texts he quotes, yet this is difficult to determine, for two reasons: First of all, many of these texts have not reached us through direct transmission. Therefore we cannot compare the manuscripts of these texts with Eusebius' quotations. Secondly, several works whose manuscripts

⁹ Cf. Chapter VI, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹⁰ Philo, *QG* II. 62 = *PE* VII. 13. 1–2. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹¹ *Opif.* 7–12 = *PE* VIII. 13. 1–6. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹² Philo, *Leg.* I. 13–17 = *PE* XIII. 18. 12–15. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹³ *PE* XII. 52. 28 = *Odyssee* XIX. 43. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

¹⁴ *DE* VIII. 2. 403a 1, ascribed to Josephus and *DE* VIII. 2. 403a 6, ascribed to Philo. Cf. Chapter V, subsection "Faithfulness to the Text of the Jewish Authors' Citations".

presented poor texts were corrected in the modern editions in the light of the manuscripts of the *Apodeixis*. Therefore, the original readings are difficult to recover.

This analysis has shown that in the *Apodeixis*, the textual changes constitute a method in order to appropriate the cited texts. The fact that Eusebius makes use of this method only rarely and rather discreetly actually reinforces their efficiency. Yet Eusebius should not be condemned for being unfaithful to the texts. Under the influence of Gadamer's works,¹⁵ I would argue that changing the original text is part of the natural process through which a text is offered a new meaning and new life after it was written. Moreover, one should not forget that most of the Jewish authors I am dealing with largely owe their survival to the distortions made by Eusebius both on the *noûs* and the *lexis* of their texts.

d) *Concealing or Emphasizing the Cited Authors*

I have tried to show that Eusebius repeatedly manages to optimize his use of the Jewish authors' excerpts by either concealing or emphasizing their authority. In the *Apodeixis*, when an author cites another author, the discourses are hierarchized.¹⁶ This hierarchization leads to a subordination of the cited author to the citing author.¹⁷ Yet in some instances Eusebius does not hesitate to turn this situation upside down for apologetic purposes. As I have shown, Josephus in particular is subject to this process, because he is the only Jewish author who both cites and is cited by other authors. His identity both as a citing and a cited author can be concealed by Eusebius. When the latter quotes Porphyry's account of the Essenes in book IX of the *Praeparatio*, e.g., he omits to say that the Greek philosopher openly derives his information from Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum*. Eusebius starts quoting Porphyry just after the latter mentions Josephus as his source. Likewise, Josephus' testimony on the Essenes is not included with that of Philo in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*. This is because it has more weight when cited by Porphyry, the famous Greek philosopher,

¹⁵ Gadamer, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*.

¹⁶ This hierarchy of the cited authors' voices has also been noted for the *Historia ecclesiastica* by D. Mendels, *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity. An Essay on Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK), 1999, pp. 170–171.

¹⁷ As pointed out by Bres and Verine about reported speech in "Le bruissement des voix dans le discours," in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, p. 166.

than by Josephus, especially because Eusebius wished to demonstrate the high esteem in which the Hebrews/Jews were held by the Greeks.¹⁸

Moreover, I have shown that Eusebius hid the fact that he derived his citations of Hecataeus, Choerilus and Clearchus from Josephus.¹⁹ Once again, it made more sense to the bishop to pretend he was citing Greek testimonies directly rather than to admit he derived them from a Jewish source. Indeed, book IX of the *Praeparatio* was dedicated to the testimonies of “those from the outside” on the Jews/Hebrews. The citations from Hecataeus, Choerilus and Clearchus would have lost their apologetic weight had Eusebius revealed their origin.

Yet one may wonder about Eusebius’ silence because further on in the same book, he does not hesitate to cite Josephus openly, even as a source for other authors.²⁰ I would suggest he was less embarrassed to mention Josephus in the second part of book IX, which dealt with “Hebrew” and “Jewish” history, because he saw him as an expert in this field. By contrast, he may have avoided mentioning his name in the first chapters of the book because they dealt with Greek praise for the “Hebrews” and “Jews”. In this part, he prefers to cite Porphyry, Clearchus, Hecataeus and Choerilus.

On the contrary, Eusebius emphasizes Josephus’ authority from the outset on several occasions in book IX, even when his citation is used as an intermediary source for non-Jewish texts. This is the case at IX. 20. 3 of the *Praeparatio* where Josephus quotes Alexander Polyhistor who himself cites Cleodemus-Malchas. Only Josephus’ name appears in the introduction to the citation. The same phenomenon may be observed at IX. 11; 13; 15; 16; 40; and 42. In this case, Josephus appears as the authority *par excellence* on questions of biblical history and on Greek knowledge of his own people. Only the heading of chapter 40 mentions the name of the author quoted by Josephus, namely Berossus.

I also pointed out that the same authors can sometimes come first, sometimes second in Eusebius’ hierarchy, featuring two levels of authority. When the bishop claims to cite Clement of Alexandria in

¹⁸ Which he explicitly says at *PE* IX. 10. 6.

¹⁹ *PE* IX. 4. 2–9; 5. 1–7; 9. 1–2.

²⁰ He openly cites Berossus through Josephus at *PE* IX. 40. 1–11 (= *CA* I. 146–153).

book IX of the *Praeparatio*,²¹ e.g., he does not care to specify that the latter is quoting Aristobulus. In this case, Aristobulus stands on the second level of authority. His authority is not concealed but outshone by Clement's authority. By contrast, in book XIII of the *Praeparatio*,²² Aristobulus is on the first level of authority. This oscillation of the Jewish philosopher's authority also exemplifies one of Eusebius' techniques of appropriation of the cited texts. It occasionally lacks clarity: It becomes uneasy to determine who Eusebius intends to present as the speaker. The case of the minor Jewish authors is significant in this respect even if, most often, the bishop seems to indicate through editorial notes and headings that Polyhistor is speaking. Nonetheless, from chapter 26 to chapter 37 of book IX of the *Praeparatio*, the citations are less clearly marked out. A discursive opacity is created which leaves the reader confused. It is worth asking whether Eusebius deliberately creates this confusion in order to suggest that some Greek authors wrote directly on biblical subjects and were not content with citing other authors on the same subject. Against this suggestion, I would propose the following arguments: As we have seen, Eusebius clearly states in the *Historia ecclesiastica*²³ that Eupolemus and Demetrius were Jewish writers; in addition, given the blunt character of the composition of a book like book IX of the *Praeparatio*, which almost only contains citations, Eusebius may have omitted references to Polyhistor in his editorial notes and headings out of negligence and tiredness after book IX. Yet given his apologetic purposes it remains likely that he did it deliberately.

e) *Organization of the Citations*

I also showed that the association of Jewish and non-Jewish citations also constitutes a technique to appropriate the cited texts. By connecting the quotations from Clement of Alexandria and Philo,²⁴ or by jointly presenting Aristobulus' and Clement's citations,²⁵ or those of Philo and Josephus alongside those of different Christian authors,²⁶ Eusebius

²¹ *PE* IX. 6. 6–8.

²² *PE* XIII. 12. 1–16.

²³ *HE* VI. 13. 7.

²⁴ *PE* XI. 24–25.

²⁵ *PE* XIII. 12–13.

²⁶ *PE* VII. 19–22 and X. 9–14.

could, as it were, recuperate the Jewish testimonies in favour of his defence of Christianity. I also noted that in the case of the pairs Philo-Clement and Aristobulus-Clement, Eusebius (deliberately?) fails to point out the dependency of Clement's discourse upon these authors. As usual, he prefers to emphasize their agreement.

f) *Semantic Distortions*

We also saw that Eusebius sometimes appropriates a citation merely by interpreting it, i.e., by giving it a new meaning. In a citation given by Eusebius, e.g., Josephus mentions supernatural phenomena that occurred in the Temple during the Jewish war;²⁷ Eusebius interprets the events recounted in this text as signs announcing the end of Judaism and its replacement by Christianity, whereas Josephus only saw these as announcing the destruction of the Temple.

The same applies to Eusebius' interpretation of the sacrilege committed by Pilate in Jerusalem. Whereas both Philo and Josephus saw this act as the sign of the governor's impiety, Eusebius interprets it as a sign of the end of Judaism.

Such a process is not only observable in the *Demonstratio*: In the *Praeparatio*, it is obvious that when Eusebius cites Philo and Aristobulus on the *Logos* and *Sophia*, these passages reach the readers through a Christian lens. As I have emphasized, even though Eusebius does not comment upon them extensively, the simple fact that he quotes them changes their original intention and meaning.

Even when Eusebius cites Josephus and Aristobulus on the Jews' antiquity or the dependency theme, the text is inevitably distorted. Indeed, these excerpts no longer serve the Jewish cause but the Christian cause which was totally foreign to them.

As regards the religious identity of the Jewish authors, I showed that the Jewish people are not subject to a total rejection by Eusebius as is the case with other Christian authors. By means of the Jewish testimonies, the bishop accepts the relation that connects the Jews to the Christians but he modifies its impact thanks to an original strategy: The Jewish ancestors of the Christians become "Hebrews". Yet this is not always true. As I tried to demonstrate, the distinction between "Hebrews" and "Jews" is not as clear-cut as is commonly believed.

²⁷ B⁷ VI. 299 = DE VIII. 2. 402d.

In the *Apodeixis*, another way of connecting “Jews” and Christians lies in Eusebius’ appropriation of the Jewish authors’ citations on the law of Moses and on “Jewish” philosophy. This occurs especially in book VIII of the *Praeparatio*. In this book, the excerpts from Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus and Eleazar the high priest of the *Letter of Aristaeas* all enable the bishop to define the foundations of Christianity from a historical, political and theological point of view. This definition of the Christian foundations through the Jewish citations is supposed to provide Christianity the legitimacy it lacked in the opinion of the Greeks. Eusebius’ message could be summarized as follows: The Christians do indeed descend from the Jews, and this entitles them to use their Scriptures, but they descend from the elite branch of Judaism, of which the Jewish authors are representative. Neither apostates nor bastards, Christians deserve consideration; converting to their faith should be seen as an additional step towards piety that they cannot make through Platonic philosophy. In sum, this reasoning invalidates Porphyry’s attack on the Christians.

Turning to the *Demonstratio*, one may be struck by the absence of philosophical Jewish citations. For instance, although Eusebius develops the Christian concept of Christ-*Logos*, Philo is not cited, in contrast to the *Praeparatio*. This absence does not come as a surprise: Once Eusebius tackles the theology and status of Christianity, he no longer needs to appeal to the “Hebrew” authors. The Scriptures are sufficient. This suggests that in the *Praeparatio*, the Jewish authors are indeed used as intermediaries between Christianity and Hellenism. This is why they disappear from the *Demonstratio*.

In addition, it has been noted that in the *Praeparatio*, the Jewish citations contribute to defend the Jewish-Christian (*lato sensu*) point of view against paganism. By contrast, in the *Demonstratio*, as in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, these citations enable Eusebius to attack Judaism. They enable him to prove that God has taken away the divine πολιτεία (an expression which designates both the elected people and its political structure) from the Jews in order to give it to the Christians. This approach strongly contrasts to that of the *Praeparatio* in which both the “Hebrew” and the “Jewish” (elite) communities are described as such through the Jewish quotations. This may be explained by the fact that in the *Praeparatio* Eusebius’ strategy consists in implicitly associating the Christians with the Jews against the pagans, whereas in the *Demonstratio* he adopts an exclusively Christian point of view, opposing both the Jews and the pagans. From this perspective,

some Jewish citations feed his defence of Jesus and John the Baptist against pagan accusations.

Therefore, Eusebius' use of the Jewish authors' texts proves to be both sophisticated and varied. The strategy he develops in the *Praeparatio* and that which he applies in the *Demonstratio* are opposed due to the chronological period they deal with. The *Praeparatio* approaches the cults which belong to the past in Eusebius' view, whereas the *Demonstratio* approaches Christianity itself, as opposed to its prehistory. The Jewish authors are present in both writings and indeed in both periods, which make them essential witnesses.

In sum, thanks to the Jewish citations, the apologist of Caesarea provides an original picture of pre-Christian Judaism which differs quite sensibly from that usually given by his predecessors. But let us beware: Suspicion should prevail; Eusebius' *tour de force* lies in his successful combination of a glorification of the Jewish prehistory of Christianity through the Jewish authors, and the location in long bygone days of the "life according to Moses".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Eusebius

- K. Mras, Eusebius Werke VIII. 1. Die *Praeparatio Evangelica*. GCS. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- , Eusebius Werke VIII. 2. Die *Praeparatio Evangelica*. GCS. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- J. Sirinelli and É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique*. I. SC 206. Paris: Cerf, 1974.
- É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* II–III. SC 228. Paris: Cerf, 1976.
- O. Zink, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* IV–V. SC 262. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* V–VI. SC 266. Paris: Cerf, 1980.
- G. Schroeder, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VII. SC 215. Paris: Cerf, 1975.
- G. Schroeder and É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* VIII–X, SC 369. Paris: Cerf, 1991.
- G. Favre, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XI. SC 292. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XII–XIII. SC 307. Paris: Cerf, 1983.
- É. des Places, Eusèbe de Césarée. *La Préparation évangélique* XIV–XV. SC 338. Paris: Cerf, 1987.
- E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii evangelicae praeparationis libri XV recensuit, Anglice reddidit, notis et indicibus instruxit*. Oxford, 1903.
- Th. Gaisford, L. K. Valckenaer, Fr. Viger, *Eusebii Evangelicae Praeparationis libri XV, recensuit T. Gaisford. Accedunt F. Vigeri versio latina et notae, et L. K. Valckenaerii Diatribe de Aristobulo*. Oxford, 1843.
- I. A. Heikel, Eusebius Werke VI. Die *Demonstratio Evangelica*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1913.
- W. J. Ferrar, *The Proof of the Gospel Being the Demonstratio evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Translations of Christian Literature Series 1. London: SPCK, 1920.
- P. Carrara, *Eusebio di Cesarea. Dimostrazione Evangelica*. Introduzione, traduzione e note di P. C. Letture chrétiennes du premier millénaire 29. Milano: Paoline, 2000.
- E. Schwartz and Th. Mommsen, Eusebius Werke II. I. Die *Kirchengeschichte*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- , Eusebius Werke II. 2. Die *Kirchengeschichte*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- , Eusebius Werke III. 2. Die *Kirchengeschichte*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- G. Bardy, Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* I–IV. SC 31. Paris: Cerf, 1952.
- , Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* V–VII. SC 41. Paris: Cerf, 1955.
- , Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* VIII–X. SC 55. Paris: Cerf, 1958.
- , Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique* VIII–X. SC 73. Paris: Cerf, 1960.

- J. E. L. Oulton and K. Lake, Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. LCL. London: Heinemann, 2 vols., 1926–1932.
- R. Amacker and É. Junod, Eusèbe de Césarée, Pamphile de Césarée et Rufin d'Aquilée. *Apologie pour Origène, I et II, suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée: Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*. SC 464–465. Paris: Cerf, 2002.
- A. Cameron and S. G. Hall, Eusebius. *Life of Constantine*, Translated with Introduction and Commentary by A. Cameron and S. G. Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- C. W. Dindorf, *Eusebii opera, G. Dindorfius recognovit*. Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig, 1867–1871.
- Th. Gaisford, Eusebius of Caesarea. *Eclogae propheticæ*. Oxford, 1842.
- H. Gressmann, Eusebius Werke III. 2, *Die Theophanie*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1904.
- I. A. Heikel, Eusebius Werke I, *Tricennatsrede an Constantin*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1902.
- R. Helm, Eusebius Werke VII. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1984.
- P. Maraval, Eusèbe de Césarée, *La théologie politique de l'Empire chrétien. Louanges de Constantin (Trakontaëtirikos)*, Introduction, traductions et notes par P. M., Paris: Cerf, 2001.
- M. Forrat and É. des Places, Eusèbe. *Contre Hiérocès*. SC 333. Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- J. Ziegler, Eusebius Werke IX. *Der Jesajakommentar*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975.

B. Aristobulus and the "Minor Jewish Authors"

- L. Bombelli, *I frammenti degli storici giudaico-ellenistici*. Pubblicazioni del D. AR. FLI. CL. ET. 103. Roma: Università di Genova, 1986.
- A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicum et auctorum Judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, vol. I: Historians*. SBL Texts and Translations 20. Pseudepigrapha Series 10, Chico (Calif.), 1989.
- , *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, vol. II: Poets*. SBL Texts and Translations 30. Pseudepigrapha Series 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983.
- , *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, vol. III: Aristobulus*. SBL Texts and Translations 39. Pseudepigrapha Series 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- , *Fragments From Jewish Hellenistic Authors, vol. IV: Orphica*. SBL Texts and Translations 40. Pseudepigrapha Series 14. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Ediderunt Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Peter Parsons, indices in hoc supplementum necnon in Powellii Collectaneae Alexandrina confecit H.-G. Nesselrath. Texte und Kommentare 11. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983.
- C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum. Collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit*, 4 vols., Paris: Ambrosio Firmin-Didot, 1841–1872 (cited as fr. Müller).
- B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971–1985 (cited as fr. Snell).
- N. Walter, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten*. JSHRZ 3. 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975.
- , *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker*. JSHRZ 1. 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976.

C. Philo of Alexandria

- L. Cohn and P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Berlin, 1896–1915 (6 vols.).
- F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo of Alexandria. *Works*. LCL Philo I–X. London: Heinemann-Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- R. Marcus, Philo of Alexandria. *Questions and Answers on Exodus*. LCL Philo Supplement II. London: Heinemann-Cambridge (Mass.), 1953.

- R. Arnaldez, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De opificio mundi*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 1. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- J. Pouilloux, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De agricultura*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 9. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- , Philon d'Alexandrie, *De plantatione*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 10. Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- J. Kahn, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De confusione linguarum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 13. Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- M. Harl, Philon d'Alexandrie, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 15. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- R. Arnaldez, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De mutatione nominum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 18. Paris: Cerf, 1964.
- R. Arnaldez, Cl. Mondésert, J. Pouilloux, P. Savinel, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De vita Mosi* I–II. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 22. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- S. Daniel, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De specialibus legibus* I–II. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 24. Paris: Cerf, 1975.
- M. Petit, Philon d'Alexandrie, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 28. Paris: Cerf, 1974.
- F. Dumas and P. Miquel, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De vita contemplativa*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 29. Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- A. Pelletier, Philon d'Alexandrie, *In Flaccum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 31. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- , Philon d'Alexandrie, *Legatio ad Gaïum*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 32. Paris: Cerf, 1972.
- M. Hadas-Lebel, Philon d'Alexandrie, *De providentia*. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 35. Paris: Cerf, 1973.
- Ch. Mercier, Philon d'Alexandrie, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim* I–II. Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34^{A–B}. Paris: Cerf, 1979–1984.

D. *Flavius Josephus*

- B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera, edidit et apparatu critico instruxit* B. N., Berlin: apud Weidmannos, 1885–1895.
- H. St. Thackeray and L. H. Feldman, Josephus. *Works*. LCL Philo I–X. London: Heinemann-Cambridge (Mass): Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- , Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* XX. Josephus X LCL. London – Cambridge (Mass.), 1981.
- L. H. Feldman, Josephus. *Judean Antiquities* 1–4. Translation and Commentary by L. H. Feldman. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- S. Mason, Josephus. *Life of Josephus*, Translation and Commentary by S. Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- A. Pelletier, Flavius Josèphe, *Guerre des Juifs* I. Texte établi et traduit par A. P., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1975.
- , Flavius Josèphe, *Guerre des Juifs* II–III. Texte établi et traduit par A. P., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1980.
- , Flavius Josèphe, *Guerre des Juifs* IV–V. Texte établi et traduit par A. P., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1982.
- Th. Reinach and L. Blum, Flavius Josèphe. *Contre Apion*. Texte établi, traduit et annoté par Th. R. et traduit par L. B., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1930.

E. *Pseudo-Aristeas*, Letter to Philocrates

- A. Pelletier, *La lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89. Paris: Cerf, 1962.

F. *Other Texts*

- Alkinoos: J. Whittaker and P. Louis, Alkinoos. *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon, Introduction*, texte établi et commenté par J. W. et traduit par P. L., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1990.
- Aristides and Athenagoras: J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.
- Cyril of Alexandria: P. Burguière and P. Évieux, Cyrille d'Alexandrie. *Contre Julien*. SC 322. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- Historians (Fragments): F. Jacoby *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden: Brill, 1954–1969.
- Origen: H. Chadwick, Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- M. Borret, Origen. *Contre Celse*. SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227. Paris: Cerf, 1967–1976.
- M. Marcovich, *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos; Theophili Antiocheni Ad Autolyicum*. Patristische Texte und Studien 43–44. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: J. H. Charlesworth (Ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I–II*. New-York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Peripatetics (Fragments): F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*. Basel: Schwabe, 1974 (cited fr. Wehrli).
- Plutarch: R. Flacelière and J. Irigoin, J. Sirinelli, A. Philippopn, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, I, Introduction générale par R. Fl. et J. I., Textes établis et traduits par J. S. et A. Ph., Collection des Universités de France, Paris, 1987.
- F. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*. Collegit recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit Hermanus Diels. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1879.
- Porphry: J. Bouffartigue and M. Patillon, *Porphyre. De abstinentia I*. Texte édité, traduit et annoté par J. B. and M. P., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1977.
- M. Patillon, A. Ph. Segonds, and L. Brisson, Porphyre. *De abstinentia IV*. Texte établi, traduit et annoté par M. P., A. Ph. S. et L. B., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1995.
- G. Wolff, Porphyrus. *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda: Librorum reliquiae*. Hildesheim: G. Olm, 1962 (orig. 1856) (cited as fr. Wolff).
- A. Smith *Porphyrus philosophi fragmenta*, Ed. A. S. (Fragmenta arabica D. Wasserstein interpretante), BT, Stuttgart – Leipzig, 1993 (cited as fr. Smith).
- Septuagint: M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 1. La Genèse*. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et notes par M. H., Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- C. Dogniez and M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Le Deutéronome*. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et notes par C. D. et M. H., Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- Johannes Stobaeus: C. Wachsmuth, *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo priores qui inscribi solent eclogae physicae et ethicae*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1958.

2. SECONDARY SOURCES

- W. Adler, "Eusebius' Chronicle," in G. Hata and W. H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 467–491.
- M. Alexandre, *Le commencement du livre. Genèse I–IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1988.
- , "Du grec au latin: les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie," in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, S. Déléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, pp. 255–286.
- , "Apologétique judéo-hellénistique et premières apologies chrétiennes," in B. Pouderon and J. Dore (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 1–40.

- D. Amand, *Fatalisme astrologique et liberté dans l'Antiquité grecque, Recherches sur la survivance de l'argumentation morale antifataliste de Carnéade chez les philosophes grecs et les théologiens chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1945.
- D. Ambaglio, "I Deipnosofisti di Ateneo e la Tradizione storica frammentaria," *Athenaeum* 68, 1990, pp. 51–64.
- Y. Amir, "Θεοκρατία as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus' Presentation of Moses' *Politeia*," *SCI* 8–9, 1985–1989, pp. 83–105.
- , "Monotheistische Korrekturen heidnischer Texte," in D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (Eds.), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Schreckenberg*. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993, pp. 9–20.
- , "Josephus' and the Mosaic Constitution," in H. G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffmann, B. Uffenheimer (Eds.), *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. JSOT.Suppl. 171. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994, pp. 13–27.
- A. Arazy, *The Appellations of the Jews (Ioudaios, Hebraios, Israel) in the Literature From Alexander to Justinian*, diss. New York, 1977.
- P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede, *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- H. W. Attridge, "Historiography," in M. Stone (Ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. 2. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984, pp. 157–184.
- , and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Studia post-biblica 42. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Cl. Aziza, "L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV^e s. av. J.-C. – I^{er} s. ap. J.-C.)," *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 41–65.
- M. Bakhtine, *La poétique de Dostoïevski*. Traduction de I. Kolitcheff. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
- M. Bakhtine – V. N. Volochinov, *Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage*. Traduction de M. Yaguello. Paris: Minuit, 1977.
- H. Baltussen, "Philology or Philosophy? Simplicius on the Use of Quotations," in I. Worthington and J. M. Foley (Eds.), *Epea & Grammata, Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 230. Leiden: Brill, 2002, pp. 173–189.
- Z. Baras, "The *Testimonium Flavianum* and the Martyrdom of James," in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 338–348.
- S. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum: examen historique, considérations historiographiques*. Paris: Cerf, 2002.
- G. Bardy, "Les traditions juives dans l'œuvre d'Origen," *Revue biblique* 34, 1925, pp. 217–252.
- , "Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux," *Revue bénédictine* 46, 1934, pp. 145–164.
- , "Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne," *RHistEccl* 32, 1936, pp. 5–23 et 275–302.
- B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, "On the Jews", Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1981.
- D. Barthélémy, "Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le Commentaire allégorique?," in *Philon d'Alexandrie: Actes du colloque national du C. N. R. S. de Lyon 1966 sur Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1967, pp. 45–80.
- A. I. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician Edition of Philo of Byblos: a Commentary*. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales 89. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- P. F. Beatrice, "Le traité de Porphyre contre les Chrétiens: l'état de la question," *Kernos* 4, 1991, pp. 119–138.

- , "Diodore de Sicile chez les apologistes," in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 219–235.
- , art. Porphyrius, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Band 27, Berlin – New York, 1997, pp. 54–59.
- S. Benko, "Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the Two First Centuries A.D.," *ANRW II* 23. 2, 1980, pp. 1055–1118.
- H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*. Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij Holland, 1939.
- K. Berthelot, *Philanthrôpia Judaica, le débat autour de la « misanthropie » des lois juives dans l'Antiquité*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 76. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003.
- J. Bidez *Vie de Porphyre*. Univ. de Gand, Fac. Phil. & Lettres 43. Gand: Gand &c., 1913.
- P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance*, JSPE.S 2, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- , "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," in Fr. H. Cryer and Th. L. Thompson (Eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. JSOT. S 290. Copenhagen International Seminar 6. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998, pp. 32–68.
- P. M. Blowers, "Origen, the Rabbis, and the Bible: Toward a Picture of Judaism and Christianity in Third-Century Caesarea," in E. Ferguson (Ed.), *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. New York – London: Garland, 1999, pp. 2–22.
- H. J. Blumenthal, "Plotinus in Later Platonism," in H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus et al. (Eds.), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought*. London: Variorum, 1981, pp. 212–222.
- R. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une exégèse, Daniel dans l'Église ancienne des trois premiers siècles*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
- J. Bouffartigue, *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*, Collection des études augustinienes. Série Antiquité 133. Paris: Institut d'études augustinienes, 1992.
- , "Le texte de Théodoret et le texte de ses documents," in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 313–327.
- J. Boulogne, "Le jeu des citations," in J. Boulogne, M. Broze and L. Couloubaritsis: *Les moyens platonistes I. Le De E de Plutarque*, Bruxelles: Ousia (Forthcoming).
- G. Bounoure, "Eusèbe citateur de Diodore," *REG* 95, 1982, pp. 433–439.
- G. R. Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy, A Study of Its Development from the Stoics to Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- D. Braund and J. Wilkins (Eds.), *Athenaeus and His World, Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000.
- É. Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Vrin, 1950.
- J. Bres and B. Verine, "Le bruissement des voix dans le discours rapporté," in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, pp. 159–170.
- L. Brisson, "Amélius: sa vie, son œuvre, sa doctrine, son style," *ANRW II* 36. 2, 1987, pp. 840–843.
- P. Brown *Le renoncement à la chair. Virginité, célibat et continence dans le christianisme primitif*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.
- M. Broze and Fr. Labrique, "Hélène, le cheval de bois et la peau de l'âne," in M. Broze, L. Couloubaritsis, A. Hypsilanti, P. Mavromoustakos, D. Viviers (Eds.), *Le mythe d'Hélène*. Bruxelles: Ousia, 2003, pp. 137–185.
- J. E. Bruns, "Philo Christianus. The Debris of a Legend," *HTR* 66, 1973, pp. 141–145.
- , "The 'Agreement of Moses and Jesus' in the *Demonstratio evangelica* of Eusebius," *VigChris* 31, 1977, pp. 117–125.
- P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitome," *CQ* 30, 1980, pp. 477–494.
- C. Burchard, "Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus, Bericht über die Essener Bell. 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Eusebius, Niketas Choniates und anderen,"

- in O. Betz, K. Haacher and M. Hengel (Eds.), *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Festschrift O. Michel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974, pp. 77–96.
- R. Cadiou “La bibliothèque de Césarée et la formation des chaînes,” *RScR* 16, 1936, pp. 474–483.
- R. Cameron, “Alternate Beginnings – Different Ends: Eusebius, Thomas and the Construction of Christian Origins,” in: L. Bormann, K. del Tredici, A. Standhartinger (Eds.), *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 74. Leiden: Brill, 1994, pp. 501–525.
- J. Carleton Paget, “Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity,” *JTS* 52, 2001, pp. 539–624.
- E. Carotenuto, *Tradizione e innovazione nella Historia ecclesiastica di Eusebio di Cesarea*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2001.
- , “Six Constantinian Documents (Eus. *H. E.* 10, 5–7),” *VigChris* 56, 2002, pp. 56–74.
- G. P. Carras, “Dependence or Common Tradition in Philo *Hypothetica* VIII 6. 10 and Josephus *Contra Apionem* 2. 190–219,” *SPhA* 5, 1993, pp. 24–47.
- A. J. Carriker, “Some Uses of Aristocles and Numenius in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*,” *JTS* 47, 1996, pp. 543–549.
- , “Seven Unidentified Sources in Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*,” *Nova Doctrina vetusque: Essays on Early Christianity in Honor of Frederic W. Schlatter*, Eds. S. J. D. Kries and C. Tkacz, American University Series VII, Theology and Religion 207, Peter Lang, New York, 1999, pp. 79–92.
- , *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. SVigChris 67. Boston-Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- F. Chapot, “Les apologistes grecs et la création du monde. À propos d’Aristide, Apologie 4, 1 et 15, 1,” in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 199–218.
- J.-M. Charrue, *Plotin lecteur de Platon*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978.
- G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories. Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Evagrius*. Théologie historique 46. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.
- L. Cohn, *Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos*. Philologus Suppl. Bd. 7. Leipzig, 1899.
- J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBL Dissertation Series 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1974.
- , *Between Athens and Jerusalem, Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans 2000.
- , and G. E. Sterling, *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2001.
- J. Coman, “Utilisation des *Stromata* de Clément par Eusèbe de Césarée dans la Préparation évangélique,” *TU* 125, 1981, pp. 115–134.
- A. Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*. Paris: Seuil, 1979.
- L. Couloubaritsis “Transfiguration du *Logos*, Philosophies non-chrétiennes et christianisme,” *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 116, 1984, pp. 9–44.
- , *Mythe et Philosophie chez Parménide*. Bruxelles: Ousia, 1990.
- , “De la généalogie à la genèseologie,” in J.-F. Mattéi (Ed.), *La naissance de la raison en Grèce: actes du congrès de Nice, Mai 1987*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990, pp. 83–96.
- , “Genèse et structure dans le mythe hésiodique des races,” in F. Blaise, P. Judet de la Combe and Ph. Rousseau (Eds.), *Le métier du mythe. Lectures d’Hésiode*. Cahiers de Philologie: Apparat critique 17. Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996, pp. 479–518.
- , *Aux origines de la philosophie européenne, de la pensée archaïque au néoplatonisme*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2003.

- , *Histoire de la philosophie ancienne et médiévale, figures illustres*. Paris: Grasset, 1998.
- H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origen*. Théologie 34. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1956.
- P. Dalbert, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus*. Hamburg: Reich, 1954.
- J. Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*. Tournai: Desclée/Cerf, 1958.
- B. Decharneux, *L'ange, le devin et le prophète. Chemins de la parole dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie dit "le Juif"*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1994.
- , "Le *Logos* premier-né de Dieu dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie," in J. Gayon and J.-J. Wunenberger (Eds.), *Le paradigme de la filiation*. Paris: L'harmattan, 1995, pp. 169–186.
- , "Les chemins de la parole dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie," in C. Levy (Ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie et le langage de la philosophie*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998, pp. 313–326.
- N. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- , art. *Antisemitismus* IV. Alte Kirche, *TRE*³, 1978.
- D. Delattre, "Les titres des œuvres philosophiques de l'épicurien Philodème de Gadara et des ouvrages qu'il cite," in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, and S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte*, pp. 105–126.
- A.-M. Denis *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- , *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- É. des Places, "La tradition indirecte des *Lois*," livres I–VI, in *Mélanges Saunier*, Lyon, 1944, pp. 27–40.
- , "Deux témoins du texte des *Lois*," *Wiener Studien* 70, 1957, pp. 254–9.
- , "La tradition indirecte des *Lois*, livres VII–XII," *StPat* 5, 1962, pp. 473–9.
- , "La tradition patristique de Platon," *REG* 80, 1967, pp. 385–394.
- , "Numénus et Eusèbe de Césarée," *StPat* 13, 1975, pp. 19–28.
- , *Études platoniciennes 1929–1979. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain* 90. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- , "Les *Lois* et la Préparation évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée," in É. des Places, *Études platoniciennes*, pp. 220–228 = *Aegyptus* 32, 1952, pp. 223–231.
- , *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur: platonisme et écriture sainte*. Théologie historique 63. Paris: Beauchesne, 1982.
- , "La *P.E.* d'Eusèbe de Césarée a-t-elle eu deux éditions?," *Orpheus* 4, 1983, pp. 108–112.
- J. Dillon, "Self-Definition in Later Platonism," in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (Eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. Vol. III: *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World*, pp. 60–75.
- , "Logos and Trinity: Patterns of Platonist Influence on Early Christianity," in G. Vesey (Ed.), *The Philosophy in Christianity*. Supplement to 'Philosophy' Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Series 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 1–13.
- , *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. London: Duckworth, 1996.
- R. Doran, "The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus," *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 258–263.
- T. Dorandi, *Le stylet et la tablette: dans le secret des auteurs antiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000.
- G. Dorival, "Apologétique chrétienne et culture grecque," in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 423–466.
- , "L'argument de la réussite historique du christianisme," in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, Paris, 2001, pp. 37–56.

- H. Dörrie, "Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de Saint Jean (Amélius chez Eusèbe, *Prép. év.* 11, 19, 1-4)," in J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Eds.), *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972, pp. 75-88.
- M. Dragona-Monachou "Divine Providence in the Philosophy of the Empire," *ANRW II* 36. 7, 1994, pp. 4417-4490.
- A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989.
- , "The Apologetic Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*," in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 492-509.
- M. J. Edwards, M. Goodman, S. Price and C. Rowland, *Apologetics in the Roman Empire, Pagans, Jews, Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- O. Ducrot, *Le Dire et le dit*. Paris: Minuit, 1984.
- R. Eisler, *Ihsous Basileus Ou Basileusas*, 2 vols. Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 9. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929-1930.
- A. Eon, "La notion plotinienne d'exégèse," *Revue internationale de philosophie* 92, 1970, pp. 252-289.
- L. H. Feldman, "The *Testimonium Flavianum*: The State of the Question," in R. F. Berkey and S. A. Edwards *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982, pp. 181-185.
- , "Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings and His Significance," *ANRW II* 21. 2, 1984, pp. 763-862.
- , *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984.
- , *Josephus, a Supplementary Bibliography*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- , "Pro-Jewish Intimations in Anti-Jewish Remarks Cited in Josephus' *Against Apion*," *JQR* 78, 1987-1988, pp. 187-251.
- , "Origen's *Contra Celsum* and Josephus' *Contra Apionem*: the Issue of Jewish Origins," *VigChris* 44, 1990, pp. 105-135.
- , *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- , *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California, 1998.
- , and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- , and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, the Bible and History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- , and J. R. Levison (Eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili, A Study of the Man and His Writings*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933.
- P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- M. Frede, "Celsus' attack on the Christians," in J. Barnes and M. Griffin (Eds.), *Philosophia Togata II. Plato and Aristotle at Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 218-240.
- , "Eusebius' Apologetic Writings," in M. Edwards, M. Goodman, S. Price, and C. Rowland (Eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, Christians*. pp. 223-250.
- J.-Cl. Fredouille, "Lactance historien des religions," *Lactance et son temps, Recherches actuelles (Actes du IV^e colloque d'études historiques et patristiques, Chantilly 21-23 septembre 1976)*. Théologie historique 48. Paris: Beauchesne, 1978, pp. 237-252.
- , Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, and S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques, Actes du colloque international de Chantilly 13-15 décembre 1994*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série antiquité 152. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997, pp. 105-126.
- J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien, 1-2, Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Breslau: Skutsch, 1874-1875.

- P. Frick, *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 77. Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.
- U. Früchtel, *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien*, Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 2. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- H. Gadamer, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- J. G. Gager, *Moses in Graeco-Roman Paganism*. SBL Monograph Series 16. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- E. V. Gallagher, "Eusebius the Apologist: the Evidence of the *Praeparatio* and the *Proof*," *StPat* 26, 1991, pp. 251–260.
- J. D. Gauger, "Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen," *JStJ* 13, 1982, pp. 28–35.
- H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantische Chronographie*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1885.
- C. Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*. Arbeiten zu Geschichte des antiken Judentums und Christentums 40. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- G. Genette, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- J. Gilet, *L'homme image de Dieu dans les commentaires littéraires de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Sylloge excerptorum e dissertationibus ad gradum doctoris in sacra theologia vel in iure canonico consequendum conscriptis XVII, fasc. 5. Louvain, 1949.
- L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University, 1998 (orig. 1909–1938).
- M. Godecke, *Geschichte als Mythos, Eusebs "Kirchengeschichte"*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1987.
- D. Gonnet, "L'art de citer dans l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe," in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Eglise des premiers siècles*, pp. 181–194.
- E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968.
- P. Gorday, "Paul in Eusebius and Other Early Christian Literature," in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge, *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 139–165.
- R. Goulet, "Porphyre et la datation de Moïse," in R. Goulet, *Études sur les vies de philosophes de l'Antiquité tardive, Diogène Laërce, Porphyre de Tyr, Eunapes de Sardes*. Paris: Vrin, 2001, pp. 245–266 = *RHR* 192, 1977, pp. 137–164.
- , *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989–.
- , "Les références chez Diogène Laërce: sources ou autorités?," Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte*, pp. 149–166 = *Études sur les vies de philosophes de l'Antiquité tardive, Diogène Laërce, Porphyre de Tyr, Eunapes de Sardes*. Paris, 2001, pp. 79–96.
- R. M. Grant, "The Appeal to the Early Fathers," *JTS* New Series 11, 1960, pp. 13–24.
- , "Porphyry among the Early Christians," in W. den Boer et al. (Eds.), *Romanitas and Christianitas*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co, 1973, pp. 181–187.
- , "The Case against Eusebius, or Did the Father of Church History Write History?," *StPat* 12, 1975, pp. 413–421.
- , "Eusebius and Gnostic Origins," in M. Simon (Ed.), *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme, influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris: de Boccard, 1978, pp. 195–206.
- , "Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews," *SBL Seminar Papers* 17, 1979, pp. 69–86.
- , *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.
- E. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- J.-N. Guinot, "Foi et raison dans la démarche apologetique d'Eusèbe et de Théodoret," in B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, pp. 383–402.

- B. Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources," *StPat* 4, 1961, pp. 429–441.
- G. Haaland, "Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience, Toward an Understanding of *Contra Apionem*," in J. U. Kalms und F. Siegert, *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998*. Münsteraner judaistische Studien 4. Münster: LIT Münster, 1999, pp. 282–306.
- M. Hadas-Lebel, *Flavius Josephé, Le Juif de Rome*. Paris: Fayard, 1989.
- K. Hainse-Eitzen, *Guardian of Letters, Literacy, Power and the Transmitter of Early Chritian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- D. E. Hahm, "The Ethical Doxography of Arius Didymus," *ANRW* II. 36. 4, 1990, pp. 2935–3055.
- J. Hani, Plutarque. *Consolation à Apollonios*. Études et commentaires 78. Paris: Klincksieck, 1972.
- R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- , "Christian Attitude to Pagan Religion," *ANRW* II. 23. 2, 1980, pp. 910–973.
- M. E. Hardwick, *Josephus as a Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- , "Contra Apionem and Christian Apologetics," in L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison, *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, pp. 369–402.
- M. Harl, "L'histoire de l'humanité racontée par un écrivain chrétien au IV^e siècle," *REG* 75, 1962, pp. 522–531.
- , G. Dorival, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante, du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Initiations au christianisme ancien. Paris: Cerf, 1988.
- G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew, and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- G. Hata, "The Story of Moses Interpreted within the Context of Anti-Semitism," in H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 180–197.
- W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations*. Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association 19. Baltimore: American Philological Association, 1959.
- M. Hengel, "Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'Literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur," *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 18: Fondation Hardt*, 1972, pp. 231–309.
- , *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- , *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture, Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. London-New York: T. & T. Clark, 2002.
- P. Henry, *Recherches sur la "Préparation évangélique" d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius*. Bibl. École des Hautes Ét., sciences religieuses 50. Paris: E. Leroux, 1935.
- J. P. Hershbell, "Plutarch's 'De animae procreatione in Timaeo': An Analysis of Structure and Content," *ANRW* II. 36. 1, 1986, pp. 234–247.
- A. Hilary-Armstrong, "The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism," in E. P. Sanders (Ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol. I: *The Shaping of Christianity in the second and Third Centuries*, pp. 74–99.
- C. R. Holladay, "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBL Seminar Papers* 10, 1976, pp. 447–452.
- , "Pseudo-Orpheus: Tracking a Tradition," in A. J. Malherbe, F. W. Norris, J. W. Thompson (Eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context, Essays in Honour of Everett Ferguson*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 90. Leiden: Brill, 1998, pp. 192–220.
- M. J. Hollerich, "Eusebius as a Polemical Interpreter of Scripture," in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 562–596.
- , "The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Life of Constantine*," *StPat* 19, 1989, pp. 80–95.

- , *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- , "Religion and Politics in the Writings of Eusebius: Reassessing the First Court Theologian," *Church History* 59, 1990, pp. 309–325 = "Religion and Politics in the Writings of Eusebius: Reassessing the First Court Theologian," in E. Ferguson (Ed.), *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. New York – London: Garland, 1999, pp. 309–325.
- S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria, A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas*. London – New York: Routledge, 2003.
- K. Hruby, *Juden und Judentum bei den Kirchenvätern*. Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 1971.
- A. B. Hulen, "The Dialogues with the Jews as Sources for the Early Jewish Arguments Against Christianity," *JBL* 51, 1932, pp. 58–70.
- S. Inowlocki, "Trois auteurs juifs de langue grecque oubliés: Mousaios et les deux Agathoboules dans le témoignage d'Anatole de Laodicée sur la Pâque," *REJ* 163, 2006 (Forthcoming).
- , "La pratique de la citation dans le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josephus," *Ktema* 30, 2005 (Forthcoming).
- , "Josephus' Appropriation of the Tower of Babel Episode," *JSJ* (Forthcoming).
- , "'Neither Adding nor Omitting Anything': Josephus' Promise not to Modify the Scriptures in Greek and Latin Context," *JJS* 56, 2005, pp. 48–65.
- , "Eusebius' *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*," *HTR* 97, 2004, pp. 305–328.
- , "The Reception of Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* in Eusebius of Caesarea's Works," *SPhA* 16, 2004, pp. 30–49.
- J. Irigoin, "Titres, sous-titres et sommaires dans les œuvres des historiens grecs du I^{er} siècle avant J.-C. au V^e siècle après J.-C.," in J.-C. Fredouille, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, pp. 127–134.
- H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- J. Jervell, *Imago dei. Gen. 1, 26 im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- P. Kalligas, "Traces of Longinus' Library in Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica*," *CQ* 51, 2001, pp. 584–598.
- C. Kannengiesser, "Eusebius of Caesarea Origenist, *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*," in H. W. Attridge and G. Hata (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 435–460.
- A. Kasher, "Polemic and Apologetic Methods of Writing in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*," in L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison, *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, pp. 143–186.
- A. Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Jewish-Christian Polemic," in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Eds.), *Contra Iudaeos, Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Jews and Christians*. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1996, pp. 59–84.
- , *Eusebius Against Paganism*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives series 3. Boston-Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- C. Kraus Reggiani, "I rapporti tra l'impero romano e il mondo ebraico al tempo di Caligula secondo la "Legatio ad Gaium" di Filone Alessandrino," *ANRW* II. 21. 1, 1984, pp. 554–586.
- S. Krauss, "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers," *JQR* 5:122–157; 6:82–99, 225–261, 1892–1894.
- K. Kuiper, "Le poète juif Ezéchiel," *REJ* 46, 1903, pp. 48–73, 161–177.
- J. Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*. Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres, 1949.
- J. Lacrosse, *L'amour chez Plotin*. Bruxelles: OUSIA, 1994.
- , *La philosophie de Plotin, intellect et discursivité*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003.

- G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- , "Miracles and Early Christian Apologetics," in C. F. D. Moule, *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965, pp. 205–218.
- H. Lapin, "Jewish and Christian Academies in Roman Palestine: Some Preliminary Observations," in H. Raban and K. G. Holm (Eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, pp. 496–512.
- J.-R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtres des apologistes chrétiens de 270 à 361*. Analecta gregorianae 61. Rome: apud aedes univ. Gregorianae, 1954.
- D. Lenfant, "Peut-on se fier aux 'fragments' d'historiens?, L'exemple des citations d'Hérodote," *Kléma* 24, 1999, pp. 103–122.
- L. Levine, *Caesarea Under Roman Rule*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 7. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- C. Lhuibéid, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981.
- J. Lieu, "History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism," in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak (Eds.), *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 79–96.
- S. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: a Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- J. R. Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- G. May, *Creatio ex nihilo: The Creation out of Nothing in early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994.
- J. Mc Guckin, "Origen on the Jews," in E. Ferguson (Ed.), *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. New York – London: Garland, 1999, pp. 23–35.
- B. M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans, 1963.
- R. Laqueur, 'Manethon', *RE* XIV. 1, 1928, cols. 1060–1061.
- A.-M. Malingrey, *Philosophia. Étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des Présocratiques au Ve siècle après J.-C.*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1961.
- J. Mansfeld and D. T. Runia, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer (vol. I: The Sources)*. *Philosophia Antiqua* 73. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.
- , "The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy," L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison (Eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*, pp. 187–228.
- L. Massebieau, *Le classement des œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Bibliothèque des Hautes Études (Sciences Religieuses), 1889.
- P. Mc Gurk, "Citation Marks in Early Latin Manuscripts," *Scriptorium* 15, 1961, pp. 3–13.
- R. Mc L. Wilson, "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. I, 26," *StPat* 6, 1957, pp. 420–437.
- A. Méhat, *Kephalaia; Recherches sur les matériaux des "Stromates" de Clément d'Alexandrie et leur utilisation*. Paris: Seuil, 1966.
- J. P. Meier, "Jesus in Josephus: A Modest Proposal," *CBQ* 52, 1990, pp. 76–103.
- , *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. New York: Doubleday, 1991, pp. 56–88.
- J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*. Hermes Einzelschriften 40. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1978.
- D. Mendels, *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity, An Essay on Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge (UK): Eerdmans, 1999.

- , "The Sources of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius: The Case of Josephus," in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 195–206.
- A. Meredith, "Porphyry and Julian Against the Christians," *ANRW* II. 23. 2, 1980, pp. 1119–1149.
- F. Millar, "The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora Between Paganism and Christianity, A.D. 312–438," in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak, *The Jews Among the Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 97–123.
- U. Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit VI/1. Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2000.
- W. Mizugaki, "Origen and Josephus," in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 325–337.
- A. Momigliano, "The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography," *History* 43, 1958, pp. 1–13 = *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Rome, 1960, pp. 28–44.
- , *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- , "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.," in A. Momigliano (Ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 79–99 = *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977, pp. 107–126.
- , *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- , *Sagesse barbares, Les limites de l'hellénisation*. Traduit de l'anglais par M.-Cl. Roussel. Éditions Folio Histoire, 1991.
- S. Morawski, "The Basic Function of Quotation," in C. H. van Schoonveld (Ed.), *Sign, Language, Culture*. Janua Linguarum, Series major I. Den Haag: Mouton, 1970, pp. 690–706.
- Cl. Moreschini and E. Norelli, *Histoire de la littérature chrétienne ancienne grecque et latine, 1. De Paul à l'ère de Constantin*. Traduction de M. Rousset. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2000.
- G. B. Motzo, *Ricerche sulla letteratura e la storia giudaico-ellenistica*. Roma: Centro Editoriale Internazionale, 1977.
- G. Mourand and J.-P. Desclès, "Citation textuelle: identification automatique par exploration contextuelle," in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, pp. 179–189.
- K. Mras, "Die Stellung der *Præparatio Evangelica* des Eusebius im Antiken Schrifttum," *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 93, 1956, pp. 209–217.
- F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1897.
- J. Neville-Birdsall, "The Continuing Enigma of Josephus' Testimony about Jesus," *B7RL* 67, 1984–1985, pp. 609–622.
- G. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: a Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- V. Nikiprowetzky, *Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie*. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 11. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- , "La Sibylle juive et le troisième livre des pseudo-oracles sibyllins depuis Charles Alexandre," *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 496–515.
- É. Nodet, "Jésus et Jean Baptiste selon Josephus," *RB* 92, 1985, pp. 321–348 and 497–524.
- , *Baptême et résurrection, le témoignage de Josephus*. Josephus et son temps 2. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- F. W. Norris, "Eusebius on Jesus as a Deceiver and Sorcerer," in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 523–540.

- R. A. Oden Jr., "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 1978, pp. 115–126.
- K. A. Olson, "Eusebius and the *Testimonium Flavianum*," *CBQ* 61, 1999, pp. 305–322.
- E. Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*. London: The Soncino Press, 1934.
- C. Pelling, "Fun With Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians," in D. Braund and J. Wilkins, *Athenaeus and His World*, Exeter, 2000, pp. 171–190.
- J. Pépin, "Le 'challenge' Homère-Moïse aux premiers siècles chrétiens," *RScR* 29, 1955, pp. 104–122.
- , *Mythe et allégorie, les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Paris: Aubier, 1958.
- , *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.
- , "Christianisme et mythologie. L'évhémérisme des auteurs chrétiens," in Y. Bonnefoy (Ed.), *Dictionnaire des mythologies et des religions des sociétés traditionnelles et du monde antique*, A.-J., Paris: Flammarion, 1981, pp. 161–171 = J. Pépin, *De la philosophie ancienne à la théologie patristique*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1986, part VII, pp. 1–16.
- , "Philógos/Philósophos (VP 14. 18–20)," in J. Pépin et al. (Eds.), *Porphyre, Vie de Plotin*, Paris: Vrin, 1992, pp. 477–501.
- L. Perrin, "Les formes de la citation au style direct, indirect et indirect libre," in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, pp. 147–157.
- L. Perrone, "Eusebius of Caesarea as a Christian Writer," in H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective after two Millenia*. DMOA 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 515–530.
- P. Petitmengin, "'capitula' païens et intertexte," in J.-Cl. Fredouille, Ph. Hoffmann, P. Petitmengin, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, S. Deléani (Eds.), *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, pp. 491–509.
- P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron Kreiton: Der Alterbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*. WUNT II/39. Tübingen: Mohr, 1990.
- Fr. Pordomingo, "Les citations poétiques du *De Iside et Osiride*: leur fonction dans le traité," in L. Van der Stock (Ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch, Acta of the IVth International Congress of the International Plutarch Society, Leuven, July 3–6, 1996*. Collection d'études classiques 11. Leuven: Peeters – Namur: Société des Études Classiques, 2000, pp. 355–374.
- B. Pouderon and J. Doré (Eds.), *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*. Théologie historique 105. Paris: Beauchesne, 1998.
- and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*. Théologie historique 114. Paris: Beauchesne, 2001.
- P. Pucci, *Ulysse Polutropos, Lectures intertextuelles de l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Traduit par J. Routier-Pucci. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1995.
- M. Pucci-Ben Zeev, "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus and Manetho's accounts of Jews and Judaism—Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research," *JSS* 24, 1993, pp. 215–234.
- H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective After Two Millenia*. DMOA 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- R. Radice, *La filosofia di Aristobulo e i suoi nessi con il 'De mundo' attribuito ad Aristotele*. Pubblicazioni del centro di ricerche di metafisica. Collana Temi metafisica e problemi del pensiero antico 33. Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1994.
- T. Rajak, *Josephus, The Historian and His Society*. London: Duckworth, 1984.
- G. J. Reydam-Schils, *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonic Readings of Plato's "Timaeus"*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

- J. Riaud, "Les Thérapeutes d'Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu'aux découvertes de Qumran," *ANRW* II. 20. 2, 1987, pp. 1189–1295.
- F. Ricken, "Die Logoslehre des Eusebius von Cäsarea und der Mittelplatonismus," *Theologie und Philosophie* 42, 1967, pp. 341–358.
- D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses: the Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 59. Göteborg: University of Göteborg, 1995.
- C. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos. Beobachtungen zu OF 245 und 247 (Sog. Testament des Orpheus)*. Classica monacensia 7. Tübingen, 1993.
- D. Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans, and Christians in Conflict*. Jerusalem: Magness Press – Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- L. Rosier, *Le discours rapporté: Histoire, théories, pratiques*. Paris-Bruxelles: Duculot, 1999.
- , (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*. Faits de langue 19. Paris: Ophrys, 2002.
- J. E. Royse, "Philo's Division of His Works into Books," *SPhA* 13, 2001, pp. 59–85.
- D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Philosophia Antiqua 44. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- , *Philo in Early Christian Literature. A Survey*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- , *Philo and the Church Fathers. A Collection of Papers*. SVigChris 32. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- , "Philo and the Christian beginnings," *SPhA* 7, 1995, pp. 143–160.
- , "Caesarea maritima and the Survival of Hellenistic-Jewish Literature," in H. Raban and K. G. Holum (Eds.), *Caesarea maritima. A Retrospective after two Millennia*, pp. 476–495.
- , "The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria," in M. Joyal (Ed.), *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition. Essays Presented to John Whitaker*, Aldershot etc.: Ashgate, 1997, pp. 261–292.
- , *Philo of Alexandria On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 1. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 2001.
- and R. Radice *Philo of Alexandria. An Annotated Bibliography, 1937–1986*. SVigChris 8. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- , and R. Radice *Philo of Alexandria. An Annotated Bibliography, 1987–1996*. SVigChris 57. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- , "Philo of Alexandria and the end of Hellenistic Theology," in A. Laks and D. Frede, *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, Its Background and Its Aftermath*. Philosophia Antiqua. Leiden: Brill, 2001, pp. 281–316.
- L. V. Rutgers, *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 20. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- H. D. Saffrey *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne* II. Edition, traduction et notes de H. D. S., Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1974.
- , "Les extraits du Περὶ τὰγαθοῦ de Numénios dans le livre XI de la Préparation évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée," *StPat* 13, 1975, pp. 46–51.
- , "Un lecteur antique des œuvres de Numénios: Eusèbe de Césarée," in *Forma futuri, Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1975, pp. 145–153.
- E. P. Sanders, *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol. I: *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- , Vol. II: *Aspects of Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- , Vol. III: *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World*. London: SCM Press, 1982.
- S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: an Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- E. M. Sanford, "Propaganda and Censorship in the Transmission of Josephus," *TPAPhA* 66, 1935, pp. 127–145.
- P. Schäfer, *Histoire des Juifs dans l'antiquité*. Traduit par P. Schulte. Paris: Cerf, 1989.
- , "Die Manetho-Fragmente bei Josephus und die Anfänge des antiken

- "Antisemitismus", in G. Most, *Collecting Fragments—Fragmente Sammeln*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997, pp. 186–206.
- D. Schenkenveld, "Prose usages of Akoucin 'to read'," *CQ* 42, 1992, pp. 129–141.
- P. Schnabel, *Berosus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*. Leipzig: B. G. Turner, 1923.
- H. Schrekenberg, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 1. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- , *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus, Supplementband mit Gesamtregister*. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 14. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- , *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Arbeiten zu Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 5. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- , "Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines 'Bellum Iudaicum'," *ANRW* II. 21. 2, 1984, pp. 1106–1217.
- , *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XIII, Theologie 172. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994.
- , "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church," in G. Hata and L. H. Feldman (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 315–324.
- , and K. Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3. 2. Assen: Van Gorcum – Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- J.-P. Schreiber, "Le vertige de la citation: quelques réflexions sur une forme de discours rapporté en histoire," in L. Rosier (Ed.), *Le discours rapporté*, pp. 263–278.
- E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Revised edition by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987.
- E. Schwartz, art. "Eusebios 24", *RE* VI, 1, col. 1370–1439.
- , art. "Alexandros von Milet", *RE* I, 2, col. 1449–1452.
- D. R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Philo on Pontius Pilate," *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 3, 1983, pp. 26–45.
- J. S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews. Abraham in Early Christian Controversy*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- M. Simon, *Les sectes juives au temps de Jésus*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.
- , *Verus Israel, Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain*. Paris: de Boccard, 1964.
- , "La Bible dans les premières controverses entre juifs et chrétiens," in Cl. Mondésert (Ed.), *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, Paris, 1984, pp. 107–126.
- M. Simonetti, "Eusebio Ara Ebrei e Giudei," *ASE* 14, 1997, pp. 121–134.
- J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période pré-nicéenne*. Publications de la section de langues et littératures de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'université de Dakar 10. Dakar, 1961.
- O. Skarsaune, *The Proof From Prophecy, A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 56. Leiden: Brill, 1987, pp. 324–326.
- E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar*. Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 4. Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1968.
- E. M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- , "Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same Events," in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (Eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 114–129.
- W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum; ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I. 2. München: Beck, 1971.
- C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture, Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- G. E. Sterling, "Philo and the Logic of Apologetics: An Analysis of the *Hypothetica*," *SBL seminar papers* 29, 1990, pp. 412–430.
- , *Historiography and Self-Definition, Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- "“Thus are Israel”: Jewish Self-Definition in Alexandria,” *SPhA* 7, 1995, pp. 1–18.
- M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols., Jerusalem: Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974.
- J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- G. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity," in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Eds.), *Contra Iudaeos, Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Jews and Christians*. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1996, pp. 1–26.
- J. Strugnell, "General Introduction, with a Note on Alexander Polyhistor," *OTP*, II, pp. 777–779.
- H. Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätstheologie und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea: eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- J. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo's "Therapeutae" Reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- M. S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. StPB 46. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- F. Thélamon, "Écrire l'histoire de l'Église: d'Eusèbe de Césarée à Rufin d'Aquilée," in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (Eds.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, pp. 207–236.
- E. M. Thomson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912.
- Th. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man, Philo and the History of Interpretation*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 14. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.
- L. Troiani, "Sui frammenti di Manetone nel primo libro del *Contra Apionem* di Flavio Giuseppe," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 24, 1975, pp. 97–126.
- , "Osservazioni sopra l'apologia di Filone: gli *Hypothetica*," *Athenaeum* 56, 1978, pp. 304–314.
- , *Due studi di storiografia e religione antiche*. Biblioteca di Athenaeum 10. Como: New Press, 1988.
- E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Bulletin Suppl. 46. London: University of London. Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- E. Ulrich, "The Old Testament Text of Eusebius: The Heritage of Origen," in G. Hata and H. W. Attridge (Eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, pp. 543–562.
- J. Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden, Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*. Patristische Texte und Studien 49. Berlin – New York: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- A. Van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromata: an Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*. SVigChris 3. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- , "How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background," *The Heythrop Journal* 31. 2, 1990, pp. 179–194.
- , "Philo in the Alexandrian Tradition," *SPhA* 6, 1994, pp. 96–99.
- , "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods," *VigChris* 50, 1996, pp. 223–243.
- , "Philo and Origen: a Descriptive Catalogue of Their Relationship," *SPhA* 12, 2000, pp. 44–121.
- P. W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 14. Freiburg: Universitäts Verlag – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990, pp. 63–71.

- , “‘A Simple Philosophy’, Alexander of Lycopolis on Christianity,” in K. A. Algra, P. W. van der Horst, D. T. Runia, *Polyhistor, Studies in the History and Historiography of Ancient Philosophy, Presented to Jaap Mansfeld on His Sixtieth Birthday*. Philosophia antiqua 72. Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 313–323.
- W. C. van Unnik, “De la règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l’histoire du canon,” *VigChris* 3, 1949, pp. 1–36.
- M. Van Winden, *Calcidius on Matter: His Doctrine and Sources. A Chapter in the History of Platonism*. Philosophia antiqua 9. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- , “Quotations From Philo in Clement of Alexandria’s Protrepticus,” *VigChris* 32, 1978, pp. 208–213.
- B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.
- , “‘Pseudo-Eupolemus’, Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” *HuCa* 34, 1963, pp. 83–113.
- , *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974.
- F. W. Walbank, Art. Alexander (II) Polyhistor, *OCD*, p. 35.
- D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, “An Analysis of some quotations from the First Gospel in Eusebius’ D. E.,” *JTS* 50, 1950, pp. 168–175.
- , *Eusebius of Caesarea*. London: Mowbray, 1960.
- P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudographischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. TU 86. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964.
- , “Jüdisch-hellenistischer Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien,” *ANRW* II. 20. 1, 1987, pp. 68–120.
- , “Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period,” *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol. II: *The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 385–408.
- H.-F. Weiss *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinensischen Judentums*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1966.
- P. Wenland, *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung*. Berlin, 1892.
- , *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis*. Leipzig: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1900.
- A. Whealey, “Josephus on Jesus: Evidence From the First Millenium,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 51, 1995, pp. 291–296.
- , *Josephus on Jesus; The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Late Antiquity to Modern Times*. Studies in Biblical Literature 36. New York – Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003.
- , “The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Antiquity to the Present.” retrieved from www.earlychristianwritings.com/Josephus.html
- J. Whittaker, “The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation,” in Ed. J. N. Grant (Ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts, Papers given at the 23rd Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6–7 November 1987*, New York: AMS Press, 1989, pp. 63–96.
- R. Wilde, *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the Three First Centuries*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1949.
- R. Wilken, “Philo in the Fourth Century,” *SPhA* 6, 1994, pp. 100–102.
- D. S. Williams, “On Josephus’ use of Nicolaus of Damascus: a Stylometric Analysis of BJ 1. 225–273 and AJ 14. 280–369,” *SCI* 12, 1993, pp. 176–187.
- R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Londres: SCM Press, 2001.
- D. Winston, “Aristobulus: From Walter to Holladay, Holladay’s Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors, Volume III: Aristobulus,” *SPhA* 8, 1996, pp. 155–166.
- , “Philo’s Nachleben in Judaism,” *SPhA* 6, 1994, pp. 101–110.
- H. A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 2 vols, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1968.

- F. Young, "Greek Apologists of the Second Century," in M. Edwards, M. Goodman et al., *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, pp. 81–104.
——, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- G. Zecchini, "La conoscenza di Diodoro nel Tardoantico," *Aevum* 61, 1987, pp. 43–52.
- N. Zeegers-Van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*. Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4e série. Fasc. 47. Louvain, 1972.
- K. Zepernick, "Die Exzerpte des Athenaeus in den Deipnosophisten und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit," *Philologus* 77, 1921, pp. 311–363.

INDEX LOCORUM

A. Ancient Authors

ARISTOTLE		PSEUDO-LONGINUS	
<i>Rhetoric</i>		<i>On the Sublime</i> IX. 5	37
1375b	34		
<i>De genere animalium</i>		LUCIAN	
736a10	38	<i>How to Write History</i>	
		7	77
		9	77
<i>Metaphysics</i>		39	77
983b	58	41	77
988b	58	47	77
		50	77
<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>		PLATO	
1098b	58	<i>Crito</i>	
		44b	36
COLUMELLA		<i>Epinomis</i>	
<i>De re rustica</i>		986 c 5	88
XI. 3. 65	39		
DIODORUS SICULUS		<i>Gorgias</i>	
I. 6–8	91	471e–472a	60
I. 10	91		
III. 56	91	<i>Ion</i>	
		536e–537a	34
DIODEGENES LAERTIUS		538c–539d	37, 38
<i>Lives of the Philosophers</i>			
VII. 180–181	33	<i>Lysis</i> 210b	78
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS		<i>Republic</i> III. 392d–393a	34
<i>Thucydides</i>			
8	77	<i>Symposium</i>	
GALEN		214b	36
<i>De pulsuum differentiis</i>			
II. 4	120	<i>Timaeus</i>	
III. 3	120	28 c 3–4	88
HOMER		29 b 2	230
<i>Iliad</i>		33 c 2	230
XX. 61–65	46	37 d 7	230
XXI. 388	46	52 c 2	230
		64 e 5	230
<i>Odyssey</i>		70 d 4	230
XIX. 43	88, 292	92 c 7	230
JULIAN		PLINY THE ELDER	
<i>Contra Galilaeos</i>		<i>Historia Naturalis</i>	
261e–276e	227	XXXIII	39

PLINY THE YOUNGER		IV. 11	185
<i>Epistles</i>		IV. 11–13	146, 266, 272
III. 5	35	IV. 11. 2	146
		IV. 17. 2	146
PLOTINUS		Quintilian	
<i>Enneads</i>		<i>Institutio oratoria</i>	
II. 9	57	I. 8–10–12	33
IV. 2. 2	94	II. 7. 3–4	33
PLUTARCH		STRABO	
<i>Consolation to Apollonius</i>		<i>Geography</i>	
29	38	XVI. 2. 35	219
POLYBIUS		SUETONIUS	
II. 56. 10–12	77	<i>Vitae Caesarum</i>	
XII. 3. 7	56	V. 25	120
XII. 26. 3	56		
PORPHYRY		TACITUS	
<i>Vita Plotini</i>		<i>Historiae</i>	
XIV. 18–20	53	V. 5. 4	219
XIV. 1	77		
		Thucydides	
<i>De abstinentia</i>		I. 22. 1–4	77
III. 3. 4	198		
IV. 2. 2	174		

B. Biblical and Para-Biblical Sources

<i>Genesis</i>		9: 24–27	216, 284
1: 1	165, 246	9: 26	170
1: 3	101, 232	9: 27	283
1: 26	241		
1: 26–27	230, 239, 244,	<i>Zechariah</i>	
	245	14: 1–10	28, 248
2: 3	101	14: 5	28
2: 7	244		
9: 6	225	<i>Psalms</i>	
14: 13	111	32 (33): 6	149, 241
19: 24	245	32 (33): 9	241
		38 (39): 7	245
<i>Exodus</i> 15: 11	203	49: 1	205
		86: 8	203
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		106 (107): 20	149, 241
4: 19	205, 247	109 (110): 1	245
10: 17	170, 203, 205	147:20	241
1 <i>Kings</i> 8: 26–27	102	<i>Proverbs</i>	
		3: 19	245
2 <i>Kings</i>		8: 12	149, 241
15: 5	29, 248	8: 15	241
		8: 22–25	149
<i>Daniel</i>		8: 22–31	241
9: 20–27	212, 214, 279,	8: 27	149
	287		

<i>Lamentations</i>		<i>Romans</i>	
109	214	4: 1-13	112
		1: 25	225
<i>Job</i>		<i>Colossians</i>	
28: 12-13	241	1: 15	231
28: 22-23	241		
<i>2 Chronicles</i>		<i>Corinthians</i>	
26:18	248	4: 6	232
<i>Mark</i> 1: 4	172	<i>2 Maccabees</i>	
		I. 10	140
<i>Luke</i>		II. 21. 2	131
3: 1	176, 218	VII. 28	240
3: 2	283	XIV. 38. 3	131
3: 3	172		
		<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
<i>John</i>		4: 9	118
1: 1-4	242	6: 22	149, 241
1: 4-5	232	7: 21	245
		7: 22-26	149, 241
PAUL		8: 1	149, 241
<i>Philippians</i>		11: 17	240
3: 5	106, 107	13-15	225

C. *Jewish Authors*

ARISTEAS		DEMETRIUS THE CHRONOGRAPHER	
Fr. 1 Holladay	274	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
		Fr. 2 Holladay	274
PSEUDO-ARISTEAS			
<i>Letter</i>		EUPOLEMUS	
9-11	158, 191	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
10	268	Fr. 2 Holladay	274
28-46	158	Fr. 3 Holladay	274
47-50	158	Fr. 4 Holladay	274
128-171	158, 159, 254		
199-201	236	PSEUDO-EUPOLEMUS	
310	41	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
310-317	158		
ARISTOBULUS		EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN	
Fr. 2 Holladay	254, 262	Fr. 1-17 Holladay	274
Fr. 3 Holladay	236, 240, 249		
Fr. 4. Holladay	236, 240, 249	JOSEPHUS	
Fr. 5 Holladay	236, 240, 249	<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>	
Fr. 5e Holladay	158, 236, 240	I. 17	41
		I. 93-95	147, 162, 270
		I. 105-108	147, 162, 270
		I. 117-120	147, 162, 270
ARTAPANUS		I. 124	191
Fr. 1 Holladay	274	I. 158-161	147, 162
Fr. 2 Holladay	274	I. 162-164	163
Fr. 3 Holladay	274	I. 165-168	147, 162
		I. 239-241	147, 162

VIII. 144-149	273	I. 47-50	77
VIII. 147-149	273	I. 59	56
VIII. 324	273	I. 70	164
IX. 223	166	I. 73-75	147, 163, 249
IX. 224-225	166, 235	I. 82-90	147, 163, 233,
IX. 226	166		249
X. 221-222	162, 270	I. 103-104	147, 163, 249
XII. 11-118	145	I. 113-115	273
XVIII. 34	191	I. 116-120	273
XVIII. 34-35	166, 176, 212,	I. 136-137	162, 270
	218, 235, 281,	I. 146-154	147, 162, 270,
	282		294
XVIII. 35	167	I. 172	156
XVIII. 55	153, 171, 214,	I. 172-174	52, 147, 162
	215, 217, 235,	I. 174	156
	281	I. 176-181	147, 155, 162
XVIII. 59	171	I. 183	155
XVIII. 63-64	206, 210, 235,	I. 197-204	147, 162
	279	I. 200	155
XVIII. 92	212	I. 209-211	278
XVIII. 92-93	170, 191, 211,	I. 215-218	147, 162, 270,
	235, 281		274
XVIII. 95	171	I. 218	14, 23
XVIII. 116-117	153, 172, 176,	II. 125	134
	220, 235, 280	II. 145	235
XVIII. 117	172	II. 161	235
XVIII. 117-119	280	II. 163-228	167, 254
XVIII. 259-260	269	II. 164	257
XVIII. 301	190		
XIX. 343-351	194	<i>Vita</i>	
XX. 200	209	364	268
XX. 238-244	190		
XX. 247-249	153, 170, 191,	PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA	
	211, 235, 281	<i>De Abrahamo</i>	
XX. 248	211	69	111
XX. 251	170		
<i>Bellum Judaicum</i>		<i>De agricultura</i>	
I. 3	214	51	157, 196, 197,
I. 9	77		199, 231, 236,
II. 119-160	162, 174, 270	78	240
II. 169	153, 171, 214,		197
	215, 217, 235,	<i>De cherubim</i>	
	281	29	197
III. 403. 1	56		
VI. 299	153, 167, 188,	<i>De confusione linguarum</i>	
	213, 235, 281,	62-63	240
	296	63	231
		97	169, 240
<i>Contra Apionem</i>		146	231
I. 4	56	146-147	240
I. 6-26	147, 162, 191	166	200
I. 42	41, 43		

<i>De congressu</i>		II. 50–51	161, 167, 168,
116	197		249
		II. 52–58	161
<i>De decalogo</i>		II. 59–68	161
41	247	II. 69–86	161
55	162	II. 86	196
156	162	II. 87–90	161
		II. 91–97	161
<i>De fuga et inventione</i>		II. 98	161
20	200	II. 99–112	159, 262
112	200	II. 112	161
		II. 113–116	162
<i>De gigantibus</i>		<i>De somniis</i>	
45	197	I. 215	231
64	197	II. 99	197
		II. 289	197
<i>De migratione Abrahami</i>		<i>De specialibus legibus</i>	
146	197	I. 13–17	166, 191
181	200	I. 16	205, 247
		I. 17	203
<i>De opificio mundi</i>		I. 19	204
7–12	159, 262, 292	I. 20	166, 191, 204,
8	200		247
15–16	166	I. 307	247
19–21	166	II. 165	247
23	165	IV. 176	197
24–27	165, 169, 191,		
	240, 249	<i>De vita Mosis</i>	
27	165	I. 23	264
29–31	165, 240, 249	II. 25–44	145
35–36	165, 240, 249		
69	229	<i>Flaccus</i>	
71	197	1	184
<i>De plantatione</i>		123	247
8–10	167, 191, 197,		
	231, 236, 240	<i>Hypothetica</i>	
9	200	II = Colson IX, pp. 437–443	
18–20	236	254, 262	
<i>De providentia</i>		<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>	
II. 1–2	159	3	172, 197
II. 3	159, 203, 262	160	182
II. 5–11	160	299	171, 214, 215,
II. 12–14	160		217, 218, 219,
II. 14	160		235, 281
II. 15	160	305	171
II. 15–33	159, 160, 262	346	182
II. 34	160		
II. 34–39	160	<i>Legum allegoriae</i>	
II. 40–42	160	I. 13–17	292
II. 42–44	161	III. 208	196
II. 45–49	161		
II. 50	168		

<i>Probus</i>		<i>Quod probus</i>	
75-91	159	75-91	254, 262
<i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim</i>		PHILO THE POET	
II. 62	157, 195, 236,	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
	240, 292	Fr. 2 Holladay	274
		Fr. 3 Holladay	274
<i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum</i>		THEODOTUS	
II. 89-90	200	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
II. 118	200		
<i>Quis heres</i>		THEOPHILUS	
188	200	Fr. 1 Holladay	274
<i>Quod Deus sit immutabilis</i>			
159	197		

D. Christian Authors

ARISTIDES		I. 141. 4-5	141
<i>Apology</i>		I. 148	145
II	114	I. 148. 1	140
XV. 2	107	I. 150. 1	21, 140
		I. 150. 1-4	98, 140
		I. 153. 4	22
AUGUSTINE		I. 153. 4-156. 2	277
<i>De civitate Dei</i> XIX. 23	114	I. 154. 2	141
		I. 154. 2-3	22
<i>Contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum</i>		I. 155. 2-156. 2	141
II. 1. 2	118	II. 100. 3	268
		IV. 37. 3	87
BASIL OF CAESAREA		V. 41. 1	263
<i>Homiliae in Hexameron</i>		V. 89. 4	243
II. 3. 14d	202	V. 93. 4-94. 5	99, 228
		V. 97. 7	21, 140
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA		V. 99. 3	140
Protrepticus		V. 113. 1	141
XLIV. 3-XLV. 5	99	V. 115. 6-116. 3	69
		VI. 3. 32-3. 33	140
<i>Stromata</i>		VI. 4. 3-5. 2	99
I. 70. 2	98	VI. 6. 1-14	99
I. 71. 1-2	98	VI. 16. 1	99
I. 72. 4	21, 140, 268,	VI. 25. 1-2	99
	269	VI. 27. 5-29. 2	99
I. 72. 5	98	VI. 32. 5	140
I. 74. 2	99	VI. 41. 1	114
I. 74. 3-6	99	VI. 137. 4-142. 1	140
I. 75. 2-3	99	VII. 3. 16	197
I. 75. 4-77. 2. 1-2	99	VII. 7. 4	243
I. 101. 1-2	250		
I. 140. 1-4	141		
I. 141. 1	22	<i>Constitutiones apostolorum</i>	
I. 141. 1-2	141	I. 6	118
I. 141. 1-4	277	II. 5	118
I. 141. 3	23	VI. 22	118

EPIPHANIUS		III. 11. 17	49, 69
<i>Adversus haereses</i>		III. 11. 21	66
XXXIII. 9. 4	118	III. 13. 4	100
		IV. 2. 14	49, 60, 66
EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA		IV. 6. heading	49, 56
<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>		IV. 6. 1	55
I. 1. 1	68	IV. 6. 4	70
I. 1. 7-15	91	IV. 7. 1	41, 196
I. 1. 9	100	IV. 9. 7	76
I. 1. 11	53, 57, 130	IV. 10. 1	92
I. 1. 11-12	15, 77	IV. 12. 1	71, 76
I. 1. 12	16	IV. 14. 4	66
I. 1. 13	130	IV. 14. 8	69
I. 2. 1-4	114	IV. 16. 11	49, 70
I. 2. 1-8	77	IV. 16. 12	81
I. 2. 4	53	IV. 16. 14	77
I. 2. 5	129	IV. 16. 20	101, 130
I. 3. 5	53	V. 1. 9	76
I. 3. 15	100	V. 1. 10	91
I. 4. 9-15	134	V. 2. 10	17
I. 5. 2	77	V. 4. 3	69
I. 5. 12	130, 131, 253	V. 5. 5	18, 56, 93
I. 5. 14	55, 76	V. 5. 6	56
I. 6. 2	110	V. 7. 2	69
I. 6. 6	15	V. 10. 5	78
I. 6. 8	55, 76, 80, 97	V. 14. 2	49
I. 6. 9	76	V. 14. 3	76
I. 7. 1-15	91	V. 18. 6	79
I. 7. 16	49, 60	V. 19-36	92
I. 8. 14	60	V. 22-36	67
I. 9. 6	93	V. 27. 5	17
I. 9. 12	66	V. 36. 5	93
I. 9. 20	79, 93	VI. 6	178
I. 9. 22	64, 78	VI. 6. 74	79
I. 10. 42	78	VI. 7	92
I. 10. 54-55	78	VI. 7-11	60
II, prologue 6	76, 77, 78	VI. 7. 1-42	67
II. 1. 56	49	VI. 8. 1-38	67
II. 2-3	99	VI. 8. 39	76
II. 2. 53-62	91, 99	VI. 9. 32	18, 56
II. 2. 64	81, 82, 98, 141	VI. 10	18
II. 3. 1-42	18, 66, 98	VI. 10-11	96
II. 5. 6	98	VI. 10. 49	60, 96, 267
II. 6. 1-10	98, 99	VI. 10. 50	80, 81
II. 7. 9	70	VI. 11. 1-79	152
III, prologue 4-5	71	VI. 11. 1-81	18, 67
III. 2. 1	49	VI. 32. 5	140
III. 2. 7	70	VII. 2. 6	123
III. 4. heading	78	VII. 3. 2	110
III. 7. 5	70	VII. 3. 3	110
III. 9. 1-5	67	VII. 3-4	111
III. 9. 6-10. 26	66	VII. 4. 6	110
III. 9. 6-14	92	VII. 5. 1	110
III. 9. 15	78	VII. 6. heading	130, 253
III. 10. 4-5	100	VII. 6. table	130

VII. 6. 1	111, 113, 253	VII. 14. 1	158, 232, 236, 240
VII. 6. 4	111, 112, 113	VII. 15. 5	203, 204
VII. 7. 1	84, 107, 237	VII. 15. 6-7	114
VII. 8. 1	78, 84, 114	VII. 17. 3	238
VII. 8. 1-40	111	VII. 17. 4	117, 178, 185, 244
VII. 8. 20	111, 112	VII. 18	150, 244
VII. 8. 21	111	VII. 18. 1	159, 234, 244
VII. 8. 24	112	VII. 18. 1-2	167, 229, 236, 238, 240
VII. 8. 30	241	VII. 18. 2	244
VII. 8. 37	122	VII. 18. 7	84, 85
VII. 8. 37-40	122	VII. 18. 12	168
VII. 8. 38	84	VII. 18. 13	81, 95, 175
VII. 8. 39	123	VII. 19. heading	168
VII. 8. 40	131	VII. 19	18
VII. 8. 41	151	VII. 19-21	175
VII. 9. 1-4	114	VII. 19-22	96, 114, 295
VII. 10. 1-14	125	VII. 20	18
VII. 10. 4	84	VII. 20. 9	117, 185
VII. 10. 8	84	VII. 21. 1-4	161, 162, 167, 168, 250, 290
VII. 10. 14	84	VII. 21. 5	81, 151
VII. 11. 1-12	101, 125	VII. 22	18
VII. 11. 2	101	VII. 22. 64	60, 97
VII. 11. 5-8	84	VIII. 1. 1	124
VII. 11. 5	84	VIII. 1. 2	124
VII. 11. 9	84, 116	VIII. 1. 4	56, 78
VII. 12. heading	196, 203	VIII. 1. 6	118, 127
VII. 12	150	VIII. 1. 6-7	127, 158
VII. 12. 2	203	VIII. 1. 7	118, 124, 127
VII. 12. 4	149	VIII. 1. 8	185, 191, 268
VII. 12. 5	149	VIII. 2. heading	180
VII. 12. 6	85, 149	VIII. 2. 1-4	158
VII. 12. 6-7	149	VIII. 2. 5-5. 5	158
VII. 12. 9	149, 242	VIII. 5. 6-5. 10	158
VII. 12. 10	231	VIII. 5. 11	105, 179, 180, 186, 187, 235, 252
VII. 12. 11	196, 203	VIII. 6. 1-9	124
VII. 12. 19	101	VIII. 6. 2	235
VII. 12. 13	85	VIII. 6. 7.	260
VII. 12. 14	117, 224, 237, 241	VIII. 6. 10	252
VII. 13	151	VIII. 7. heading	173
VII. 13-14	244, 250, 285	VIII. 7-8	124
VII. 13. 1	204	VIII. 7. 1-8	256
VII. 13. 1-2	157, 195, 229, 292	VIII. 7. 10-20	256
VII. 13. 1-6	173, 236, 240	VIII. 7. 11	256, 263
VII. 13. 2	230	VIII. 7. 12	257
VII. 13. 3	157, 178, 185, 196, 197, 231	VIII. 7. 13	257
VII. 13. 4	185, 197	VIII. 7. 19	124, 257, 260
VII. 13. 4-6	191, 197, 231	VIII. 7. 21	173, 185, 186
VII. 13. 5	226	VIII. 8. heading	131
VII. 13. 6	173		
VII. 13. 7	21, 117, 180, 236, 237		

VIII. 8-9	235	VIII. 12. 1-19	159, 254, 262
VIII. 8. 1	259	VIII. 12. 2	264
VIII. 8. 1-55	167, 254	VIII. 12. 9	264
VIII. 8. 3	258	VIII. 12. 10	264
VIII. 8. 6	263	VIII. 12. 11	265
VIII. 8. 10	258	VIII. 12. 16	265
VIII. 8. 11	258	VIII. 12. 20	265
VIII. 8. 11-13	258	VIII. 12. 21	125, 252
VIII. 8. 14	258	VIII. 12. 22	174, 179, 186, 251, 266
VIII. 8. 15	266		125, 286
VIII. 8. 16	259	VIII. 13-14	
VIII. 8. 20	258	VIII. 13-16	225
VIII. 8. 22	259	VIII. 13. 1	159, 234
VIII. 8. 27	259	VIII. 13. 1-6	159, 162, 292
VIII. 8. 36	259	VIII. 13. 2	200, 267, 291
VIII. 8. 43	259	VIII. 13. 7	178, 186, 187, 267
VIII. 8. 46	259		
VIII. 8. 47	259	VIII. 14. 1	203, 234
VIII. 8. 48	259	VIII. 14. 1-72	152, 159, 229, 262
VIII. 8. 51	259		
VIII. 8. 55	167	VIII. 14. 2	160
VIII. 8. 56	113, 117, 124, 173, 187, 247	VIII. 14. 2-42	160
		VIII. 14. 43	161
VIII. 9. heading	131	VIII. 14. 1-72	167
VIII. 9	186	VIII. 14. 72	125, 161
VIII. 9-10	173, 247	IX. 1. 2-3	264
VIII. 9. 1-38	158, 159, 254	IX. 1. 4	65, 264
VIII. 9. 4	261	IX. 3-5	162
VIII. 9. 7-10	234	IX. 3	3, 65
VIII. 9. 11	261	IX. 3. 1	70
VIII. 9. 13	261	IX. 3. 1-21	146, 174, 270, 272
VIII. 9. 15	261		
VIII. 9. 17	261	IX. 3. 22	266
VIII. 9. 21	261	IX. 4	272
VIII. 9. 27	193, 261	IX. 4-5	147
VIII. 9. 29	261	IX. 4. 1	49, 155
VIII. 9. 33	261	IX. 4. 2-5	163
VIII. 9. 34	261	IX. 4. 2-9	294
VIII. 9. 38	21, 140, 187, 269	IX. 4. 6	49, 155
		IX. 4. 7-8	163
VIII. 10. 1	234	IX. 4. 8	68
VIII. 10. 1-17	140, 254, 262	IX. 5	155, 272
VIII. 10. 18	257	IX. 5. 1-7	163, 294
VIII. 10. 18-19	127, 263	IX. 6	18
VIII. 10. 19	127, 129, 179, 180, 186, 252, 264	IX. 6-8	233, 295
		IX. 6. 1	97
VIII. 11-12	173	IX. 6. 1-9	98, 99
VIII. 11. 1-18	127, 254, 262	IX. 6. 6-8	227, 295
VIII. 11. 2	264	IX. 6. 9	62, 64
VIII. 11. 3	264	IX. 7. 1	49
VIII. 11. 19	186	IX. 9	162, 272
VIII. 12. heading	140	IX. 9. 1	147, 156, 163, 293
VIII. 12. 1	264	IX. 9. 2	154, 156, 294

- | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| IX. 10. 6 | 278, 294 | IX. 42. heading | 271 |
| IX. 10. 7 | 186 | IX. 42. table | 188 |
| IX. 11. heading | 186, 271 | IX. 42. 1 | 185 |
| IX. 11. 1-4 | 162, 270, 286 | IX. 42. 2 | 147 |
| IX. 12. 1 | 49 | IX. 42. 2-3 | 163, 270, 271, 286 |
| IX. 13. heading | 186, 271 | IX. 42. 4 | 60, 79, 97, 189, 274 |
| IX. 13. 1-12 | 271 | X. 1. 1-9 | 97 |
| IX. 13-16 | 162 | X. 1. 9 | 97 |
| IX. 13. 2-5 | 163, 270, 286 | X. 2 | 18 |
| IX. 14. 3 | 270 | X. 2. 1-15 | 98, 99 |
| IX. 15. heading | 186, 271 | X. 2. 1-16 | 278 |
| IX. 15 | 271, 286 | X. 2. 16 | 49, 98 |
| IX. 15. 3 | 163 | X. 6-8 | 61 |
| IX. 16. heading | 271 | X. 6. 15 | 117, 176, 185, 186, 187, 191 |
| IX. 16-37 | 164 | X. 7 | 162 |
| IX. 16. 2-4 | 271 | X. 7. 1 | 234 |
| IX. 16. 2-8 | 286 | X. 7-14 | 226 |
| IX. 17 | 276 | X. 7. 1-21 | 147, 234, 270, 286 |
| IX. 17. 1 | 76, 77, 274, 276, 277 | X. 7. 22 | 49, 176 |
| IX. 17-38 | 274 | X. 9-14 | 295 |
| IX. 18-19 | 68 | X. 9. 26 | 80, 81, 95, 97 |
| IX. 18. heading | 70 | X. 9. 28 | 57 |
| IX. 18. 1 | 22 | X. 10 | 18 |
| IX. 19. 4 | 276 | X. 10-13 | 175 |
| IX. 20 | 276 | X. 10. 15 | 69 |
| IX. 20. 1 | 23 | X. 11 | 18 |
| IX. 20. 2 | 186, 276 | X. 11. 6 | 69 |
| IX. 20. 2-4 | 163, 286 | X. 12 | 18 |
| IX. 20. 3 | 276 | X. 12. 31 | 117, 175, 250, 251 |
| IX. 20. 4 | 68 | X. 13. heading | 185, 186 |
| IX. 21. 1 | 276 | X. 13 | 163, 286 |
| IX. 22 | 276 | X. 13. 1-12 | 144, 233, 270 |
| IX. 23. 1 | 22 | X. 13. 1-22 | 163 |
| IX. 24. heading | 70 | X. 13. 1-2 | 147 |
| IX. 24. 1 | 23 | X. 13. 2 | 69 |
| IX. 25. 4 | 276 | X. 13. 3-8 | 153 |
| IX. 26 | 276 | X. 13. 3-10 | 147 |
| IX. 27. 1 | 22 | X. 13. 11 | 163 |
| IX. 27. 1-37 | 165, 255, 278 | X. 13. 11-12 | 147 |
| IX. 28 | 18, 276 | X. 13. 13 | 78, 273 |
| IX. 30-34 | 165 | XI, prologue 3 | 79, 93 |
| IX. 30. 1-34. 18 | 273 | XI, prologue 5 | 80 |
| IX. 34. 19 | 273 | XI. 1. 2 | 76, 94 |
| IX. 37. 1 | 23 | XI. 5. 3 | 117, 118, 119, 128 |
| IX. 37. 3 | 276 | XI. 7. 12 | 101 |
| IX. 38. 1 | 180, 186 | XI. 9. 8 | 61, 94 |
| IX. 39 | 164 | XI. 10. 14 | 61, 62, 68, 94 |
| IX. 39. 1 | 276 | XI. 11. 1-15 | 94 |
| IX. 40. heading | 186, 271 | | |
| IX. 40. 1-4 | 271 | | |
| IX. 40. 1-10 | 147, 270, 286, 294 | | |
| IX. 40. 11 | 272 | | |

XI. 14-19	245	XII. 45-47	68
XI. 14. heading	196, 203	XII. 52. 1-35	152
XI. 14. 4	149	XII. 52. 28	88, 292
XI. 14. 5	149	XII. 52. 35	85
XI. 14. 7	149	XIII, prologue	62, 94
XI. 14. 9	117, 149	XIII. 11. 3	106, 117, 237, 251
XI. 14. 10	61, 241, 245	XIII. 12. heading	180, 186, 250
XI. 14. 18	203	XIII. 12-13	176, 295
XI. 15-19	226	XIII. 12	69, 186
XI. 15. 1	169	XIII. 12.1	140
XI. 15. 1-6	177, 229, 240, 286	XIII. 12. 1-2	227
XI. 15. 2	231	XIII. 12. 1-16	236, 240, 270, 286, 295
XI. 15. 6	230, 231	XIII. 12. 5	176
XI. 15. 7	150, 178, 185, 186, 188	XIII. 12. 9-15	158
XI. 16. 1-2	177	XIII. 12. 11	247
XI. 16. 3	61	XIII. 12. 11-16	233
XI. 16. 4	94	XIII. 12. 13-16	176
XI. 18. 1-24	95	XIII. 12. 16	250
XI. 18. 26	76, 85	XIII. 13	18
XI. 19. 1-4	92	XIII. 13. 1-65	98, 99
XI. 19. 2	85	XIII. 13. 34	176
XI. 19. 4	85	XIII. 13. 42-43	69
XI. 20. 1	94	XIII. 13. 51	176
XI. 21. 7	61	XIII. 14-21	95
XI. 23. 1	228	XIII. 14. 3	93, 95
XI. 23. 3	228	XIII. 18. 12	61, 117, 187, 191, 234, 246
XI. 23. 3-6	94	XIII. 18. 12-13	247
XI. 23. 12	61, 99, 106, 117, 191, 241, 245	XIII. 18. 12-16	166, 177, 226, 240, 292
XI. 24	228	XIII. 18. 14	205
XI. 24-25	175, 227, 295	XIII. 18. 15	203
XI. 24. 1	246	XIII. 18. 16	166, 170, 204, 291
XI. 24. 1-6	165, 169	XIII. 18. 17	79, 80, 117, 247
XI. 24. 1-12	165, 186, 240, 286	XIV-XV	258
XI. 24. 3	230, 246	XIV. 1. 2	56
XI. 24. 6	169	XIV. 2. 1	60
XI. 24. 7-10	165	XIV. 2. 7	60
XI. 24. 9-10	246	XIV. 3	60
XI. 24. 8	230	XIV. 5. 1-13	93
XI. 24. 11-12	165, 246	XIV. 10. 6-11	56
XI. 24. 12	175, 228, 230, 250	XIV. 12. heading	117
XI. 25. 1-5	99	XIV. 23-27	18, 96, 152
XI. 29. 4	88	XV. 1. 1-9	15
XI. 38. 6	87	XV. 1. 4	129
XI. 38. 10	97	XV. 1. 10	95
XII. 1. 4	117, 118, 119	XV. 1. 10-11	93
XII. 19. 1	94	XV. 1. 12	57
XII. 34. 1	94	XV. 4. 1-21	93
XII. 44. 1	94	XV. 4. 10-11	93

XV. 5. 1–14	229	V. 2. 217d	117
XV. 6. 2	228	V. 4. 9	203
XV. 6. 16	228	V. 4. 226c	196
XV. 16–17	93	VI. 12. 269b	102
		VI. 18. 291b	106, 107, 117, 120, 130, 248
<i>Demonstratio evangelica</i>		VI. 18. 291b–c	166, 235, 240
I, prologue	68	VIII, prologue	
I, prologue 8–9	16	363c–365b	115
I. 1. 6	134	VIII. 2	66, 131
I. 1. 8	19, 133	VIII. 2. 388a	117
I. 1. 9	19, 66	VIII. 2. 389b–391a	190
I. 2. 11–14	131	VIII. 2. 392d	117
I. 2. 12	131	VIII. 2. 394a	190
I. 2. 13	111	VIII. 2. 397d	20, 117, 153, 188, 191, 211
I. 2. 14	114	VIII. 2. 397d–398a	153, 170, 211, 235, 281
I. 4. 8d	117	VIII. 2. 397d–398b	191
I. 6. 13b	112	VIII. 2. 398b	20, 170, 188, 191, 211, 235, 281, 291
I. 6. 12c	112	VIII. 2. 398d–399a	176, 218
I. 6. 13d–14a	113	VIII. 2. 399a	166, 188, 191, 212, 216, 235, 281, 282
I. 6. 13d–14b	112	VIII. 2. 399b	282
I. 6. 16d	123	VIII. 2. 402a	134
I. 6. 17a–19d	122	VIII. 2. 402a–d	216
I. 6. 17b	123	VIII. 2. 402d	20, 153, 167, 171, 173, 191, 213, 235, 281, 283, 291, 296
I. 6. 17d	124	VIII. 2. 402d–403a	153, 171, 214, 281
I. 7. 27d	131	VIII. 2. 403a	20, 171, 173, 181, 214, 217, 218, 235, 281, 291, 292
I. 7. 28b	131	VIII. 2. 403b	284
I. 8. 29b–d	122	VIII. 2. 403c	284
I. 9	102, 113	IX. 3. 424c	191
II, prologue 43c	130	IX. 3. 425b	135
II. 1. 44b–d	135	IX. 5. 430d–431a	176
II. 1. 48c	130	IX. 5. 431a	20, 153, 187, 191, 235, 280
II. 3. 63a–80d	136	IX. 5. 431a–b	144, 172, 220, 291
II. 3. 64c	136	X. 1. 470b	191
II. 3. 66a	134		
II. 3. 69b–c	102	<i>Chronicon</i>	
II. 3. 69d–70a	136	p. 7 Helm	96
II. 3. 70c	135	p. 62 Helm	153
II. 3. 71d	128		
II. 3. 79c–d	136		
III. 3. 105a	20		
III. 3. 105a–d	190		
III. 3. 105b	20		
III. 5. 124b	117, 187, 279		
III. 5. 124b–c	20, 206, 210, 235, 279		
III. 6. 134a	20, 70		
III. 7. 134a	20		
III. 7. 134a–d	190		
IV. 10. 161a–162d	115		
IV. 10. 162c–d	116		
IV. 10. 162d	116		
IV. 10. 163d	123		
V, prologue 211b	102, 118		

p. 121 Helm	153	II. 5. 6	171, 182, 184,
p. 139 Helm	140, 180		195
p. 175 Helm	153, 188, 219	II. 5. 7	134, 184, 219
p. 176 Helm	183	II. 6. 1	134
p. 177 Helm	183	II. 6. 2	182
<i>Commentary on Isaiah</i>		II. 6. 3	182, 195
11. 13	120	II. 6. 4	172, 216
146. 2-8	120	II. 6. 8	134, 144
178. 19-179. 12	128	II. 16. 2-17. 24	136
306. 33	125	II. 17. 1-24	265
364. 32-33	135	II. 17. 1	137
370. 18-23	129	II. 17. 2	130, 137
370. 19-31	128	II. 17. 10-11	265
		II. 17. 18	265
<i>Eclogae propheticae</i>		II. 17. 19-22	266
160. 5	191	II. 18	14, 178
160. 7-121	153, 282	II. 18. 1	241
160. 7-161	153	II. 18. 1-8	178
160. 22-24	188	II. 18. 2	178
160. 25-161	153	II. 18. 6	178, 179
164. 2	188	II. 18. 8	182, 268
164. 2-6	153	II. 23. 20	195
178. 21	132	II. 23. 18	143
215. 29	132	II. 23. 19	135, 144
		II. 23. 20	143, 195
<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>		III. 4. 2	130
I. 1. 1	249	III. 5. 1	134
I. 1. 2	134	III. 5. 2	135
I. 2. 19	123	III. 5. 3	134
I. 2. 21-23	115	III. 5. 7	144
I. 2. 23	115	III. 6. 1	134
I. 4. 6	114	III. 7	144
I. 5. 3	121	III. 7. 1	134
I. 6. 9-10	153	III. 7. 9	136
I. 6. 9-11	191, 282	III. 8. 6	153
I. 9. 2	188	III. 9-10	14
I. 9. 3	208	III. 9. 2	129, 251, 268
I. 10-11	173	III. 9. 4	185
I. 10. 4	188	III. 10. 6	117
I. 10. 4-5	213, 218, 282	III. 35. 1	130
I. 11. 1	172	IV. 2. 1-6	131
I. 11. 4	153, 191	IV. 5. 3	130
I. 11. 4-5	210	IV. 6. 1-4	131
I. 11. 4-6	220	IV. 6. 4	130
I. 11. 7-8	279	IV. 8. 4	135
I. 11. 9	208	IV. 15. 26	135
II. 1. 1	134	IV. 15. 41	135
II. 1. 8	135	IV. 15. 47	153
II. 4. 1	134	IV. 18. 6	118
II. 4. 2	249, 268	IV. 24	239
II. 4. 3	268	IV. 29. 1-7	82
II. 5. 1	182	IV. 29. 6	208
II. 5. 4	269	IV. 29. 7	82
		IV. 30. 3	81

V. 1. 2	153	JEROME	
V. 4. 3	153	<i>De viris illustribus</i>	
V. 8. 11	145	11	137
V. 12. 1	130	13	137
V. 21. 5	153	113	1
V. 27	81		
V. 28. 15-18	208	In Habacuc II. 9	118
VI. 1. 7	236, 250		
VI. 13. 7	105, 141, 252,	<i>In Daniele</i>	
	275, 295	PL XXV. 544	281
VI. 19. 2	263		
VI. 19. 10	260	<i>In Esaiam</i> XVI. 59	118
VI. 29. 4	96		
VI. 31. 2	81	<i>In Matthaeum</i>	
VI. 32. 3	12	XXII. 23	118
VII. 26. 1	96		
VII. 32. 6	147	<i>Against Rufin</i> I. 13	132
VII. 32. 14-19	146		
VII. 32. 16	21, 105, 180	JOHN DAMASCENUS	
VII. 32. 2-4	80	<i>De Haeresibus</i> 14	119
VII. 32. 22	80		
VII. 32. 25-27	12	JULIUS AFRICANUS	
VII. 32. 25-28	80	<i>Epistula ad Origenem</i>	
VIII. 13. 6	12	79	145
IX. 5. 1	208		
IX. 7. 1	208	JUSTIN	
		1 <i>Apology</i>	
<i>De Martyribus Palestinae</i>		2. 1	53
XI	12	3. 1	53
		31. 2-5	145
<i>Theophany</i>		31. 6	135
IV. 17	134	44. 8	50
		60. 1	50
<i>Vita Constantini</i>			
I. 12	260	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>	
I. 20	260	XI-XIII	135
I. 38	260	XVI. 2-4	112
IV. 36	83	XIX. 1-5	109
		XLI. 3	149
<i>Laus Constantini</i>		XLIII. 1	197
XI. 7	225	XLVI. 2-4	109
XI. 11-12	202	LXI	243
XI. 12	226	LXXI. 1	208
		LXXXIV. 2	208
IRENAEUS		CXLII. 1	118
<i>Adversus haereses</i>			
III. 10. 15	197	PSEUDO-JUSTIN	
III. 16. 3	197	<i>Cohortatio ad Graecos</i>	
III. 21. 1	145	9 C	145
IV. 34. 4	197	10 B	105
		10 C 1	91
ISIDORUS OF PELUSION		11 B	105
Epistle II. 143	225	13 D	145

14 C	105	<i>In Lamentationes</i>	
15 B 5	91	109	214
24 C 4	91		
24 C 6	91	<i>In Matthaeum</i>	
26 E 4	91	X. 17. 31	143, 210
		XI. 5	107
LACTANTIUS		XV. 3. 30	143
<i>Institutiones divinae</i>		XVII. 25	215
I. 5. 1-2	56		
I. 13-15	91	PHOTIUS	
		<i>Library</i> 105	136
MELITO OF SARDIS			
<i>Peri Pascha</i> 696	107	PROCOPIUS OF GAZA	
		<i>In Isaiam</i>	
MINUCIUS FELIX		PG LXXXVII. 2	
<i>Octavius</i> X. 3-4	134	2176 D	119
ORIGEN		TATIAN	
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		<i>Oratio ad Graecos</i>	
I. 12	263	7	239
I. 15	207	12	239
I. 16	144, 185	15	239
I. 26	235	30	18, 56
I. 27	83	35-41	233
I. 47	136, 143, 144, 188, 210, 280		
I. 49	243	TERTULLIAN	
I. 50	107	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> II. 7	112
II. 13	143		
II. 31	151, 242	<i>Ad nationes</i>	
III. 18	83	I. 8	114
III. 44	83		
III. 50	83	<i>Apologia</i>	
III. 55	83	X. 7	91
III. 74	83	XVII. 5-9	236
IV. 11	144	XVIII. 5	145
IV. 11. 19	148		
IV. 33-34	109	<i>De prescriptione hereticorum</i>	
IV. 51	21, 142, 145	38	43
<i>Epistles</i>		THEOPHILUS	
LXI. 2		<i>Ad Autolycum</i>	
		II. 8	51
<i>Exhortatio ad martyrium</i>		II. 10	243
XXXIII. 5	107	II. 13	232
		II. 31	51
<i>In Canticum canticorum</i>		III. 9	106
Prologue I. 7	119		

MODERN AUTHORS

- Adler 96
Alexandre 165, 179, 230, 232, 233,
239, 240, 244
Amacker 12
Amand 96
Ambaglio 46
Amir 45, 258
Arazy 117, 129
Arnaldez 201
Athaniassidi 170, 205
Attridge 24
Aziza 164
- Bakhtin 9, 62, 63
Baltussen 53, 69
Baras 195
Bardet 206, 209, 210
Bardy 108, 132, 208, 218, 282
Bar-Kochva 155, 207
Barnes 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 134, 135
Barthélémy 150, 151, 199, 243
Baumgarten 64, 89
Beatrice 15, 91
Benko 57
Berkhof 12, 169, 224
Berthelot 124, 256
Bilde 174, 207
Bidez 89
Blowers 133
Blumenthal 36
Bodenmann 281
Bombelli 24
Borret 242
Bouffartigue 14, 16, 41
Boulogne 37
Bounoure 27, 89
Boys-Stones 21, 59, 110, 258
Braunt 46
Bréhier 168, 231
Bres 293
Brisson 92
Brown 122
Broze 6
Bruns 136, 260
Brunt 46
Burchard 272
- Cadiou 154
Cameron 251, 261
Carleton Paget 154, 207, 210
Carotenuto 48, 54
Carrar 109
Carras 256
Carrara 133, 280
Carriker 12, 80, 86, 93, 96, 143, 145,
148, 152, 178, 183
Chadwick 142, 195, 242
Chapot 202
Charlesworth 24
Charrue 59
Chesnut 133, 134
Cohn 192, 193
Collins 2, 24, 271
Colson 180, 183, 215, 218, 219
Coman 64, 80, 99, 139, 140, 192
Compagnon 5, 6, 34, 46, 49, 50,
58, 59, 71, 139
Couloubaritsis 168, 224, 231
Crouzel 227
- Dalbert 24
Daniélou 198
Daniel 203
Daumas 265
Decharneux 111, 224, 231
De Lange 106, 107, 108, 109, 118,
132, 133, 199
Delattre 39, 52
Denis 2, 3, 20, 23, 24, 25, 86, 274
Desclès 5
des Places 13, 15, 16, 19, 83, 86, 87,
88, 89, 201
Diels 87
Dillon 57, 224, 239
Dindorf 86
Dogniez 205
Doran 24
Dorandi 35
Dorival 16, 25, 133
Dörrie 92
Dragona-Monachou 228
Droge 14, 122, 276
Ducrot 58, 59

- Eisler 210
 Eon 59
 Favrelle 70, 87, 88, 94, 101, 228
 Feldman 25, 51, 124, 164, 206, 207, 218, 253, 275
 Ferrar 108
 Flacelière 42
 Foakes-Jackson 11
 Forrat 13
 Fraser 24
 Frede 15, 16, 57, 170, 205, 206
 Fredouille 4, 180
 Freudenthal 20, 24, 51, 86, 141, 155, 192
 Frick 266
 Früchtel 201
 Gadamer 4, 293
 Gaisford 17
 Gager 261
 Gallagher 109
 Gauger 164
 Gelzer 148
 Genette 5
 Gerber 256
 Giblet 229
 Gifford 17, 85, 196, 204
 Godecke 133
 Gonnet 27, 48, 50, 60, 82, 173
 Goodenough 198
 Goodman 22, 23, 24, 25
 Gorday 107, 108
 Goulet 39, 92, 146, 189
 Grant 3, 11, 81, 82, 87, 92, 96, 121, 135, 143, 144, 172, 195, 208, 215
 Gressmann 279
 Gruen 24
 Guinot 56
 Gustafsson 27, 59, 82, 143, 144, 148, 173, 269
 Haaland 257
 Hadas-Lebel 21, 161, 162, 167, 168, 239, 240
 Hahm 39, 43, 44
 Hainse-Etzen 199
 Hall 261
 Hani 37, 38
 Hanson 91, 285
 Hard
 Hardwick 135, 143, 148, 154, 176, 192, 194, 210, 212, 215, 220, 234, 259, 283
 Harl 16, 25, 161, 193, 196, 205, 239
 Harvey 107, 108
 Hata 25
 Heikel 90, 225, 280
 Helmbold 5
 Hengel 21, 131, 140, 208, 255
 Henry 86, 87, 191
 Hershbelle 41
 Hilary-Armstrong 95
 Holladay 3, 21, 23, 24, 149, 274
 Hollerich 14, 101, 102, 103, 128, 131, 249, 260
 Holum 11
 Honigman 21, 25
 Hruby 106
 Hulen 19
 Hullemann 85
 Inowlocki 42, 83, 105, 130, 136, 146, 214, 234, 265, 271
 Irigoien 60
 Jacobson 24
 Jervell 230
 Junod 12
 Kalligas 12
 Kannengiesser 13, 81, 280
 Kasher 234
 Kofsky 15, 19, 58, 65, 91, 93, 101, 102, 109, 113, 122, 126, 132
 Krauss 106
 Krauss Reggiani 180
 Kuiper 24
 Labarbe 36, 37, 38, 39
 Lampe 209
 Lapin 132
 Laqueur 164
 Laurin 54, 55, 101, 102, 108
 Lenfant 25, 43, 44, 46, 47
 Levine 11, 132
 Levison 25, 51
 Lhuibéid 11, 86
 Lieu 284
 Lightfoot 11
 Lilla 239, 243
 Lloyd-Jones 24

- Luria 43
 Lyman 12

 Malingrey 25
 Mansfeld 89
 Maraval 225, 226, 285
 Marincola 53, 77
 Massebiau 183
 Mason 25, 195, 257, 283
 May 239
 Mc Guckin 199
 Mc Gurk 36
 Mc L. Wilson 239, 244
 Méhat 51
 Meier 207
 Mejer 35, 42, 46
 Mendels 7, 27, 293
 Mercier 157, 195
 Meredith 57, 64
 Metzger 83
 Millar 118
 Miquel 265
 Mittmann-Richert 22, 23
 Mizugaki 213
 Momigliano 1, 26, 43, 48, 52, 251, 255
 Moreschini 55
 Morawski 7, 38, 53, 71
 Morris 172, 179, 180, 183
 Mourad 5
 Mras 17, 18, 150, 193
 Müller 24
 Munnich 25
 Münzer 35

 Neville Birdsall 207
 Nickelsburg 24
 Niebuhr 85
 Niese 213
 Nikiprowetzky 179, 271
 Nodet 144, 209, 280
 Norelli 55
 Norris 279

 Oden, 64
 Olson 195, 206, 209
 O'Neill 5
 Osborn 239

 Parkes 109, 121
 Parsons 24
 Patillon 41, 43, 44
 Pelletier 25, 180, 184, 192, 193, 194, 215

 Pelling 46, 47
 Pépin 53, 63, 91, 128, 228
 Peretti
 Perrin 5
 Perrone 11
 Petimengin 277
 Pictet 123
 Pillhofer 255
 Pordomingo 37
 Pucci 6
 Pucci-Ben Zeev 156, 164

 Raban 11
 Radice 24, 269
 Rajak 21, 207
 Reinach 192
 Reydams-Schils 201
 Riaud 265
 Ricken 224
 Ridings 99, 176
 Riedweg 3
 Rokeah 19, 108, 276
 Rosier 5, 6
 Royse 178
 Runia 1, 24, 26, 44, 51, 89, 140, 145, 148, 200, 201, 220, 225, 239, 240, 242, 243, 250, 268
 Rutgers 263

 Saffrey 61, 95, 204, 224
 Sandmel 24
 Sanford 26
 Scaliger 85
 Schäfer 78, 174
 Schenkenveld 68
 Schnabel 271
 Schreckenbergs 2, 24, 26, 143, 192
 Schreiber 5, 59
 Schroeder 84, 96, 106, 108, 110, 151, 168, 201
 Schürer 24, 25, 118
 Schwartz (E.) 11, 17, 20, 194, 210
 Schwartz (D.) 218
 Séguier de Saint-Brisson 174
 Siker 109
 Simon 16, 19, 118, 135, 265
 Simonetti 109, 117, 129
 Sirinelli 15, 16, 96, 99, 106, 111, 113, 125, 204, 233, 247, 281
 Skarsaune 111
 Skydsgaard 35
 Smallwood 180, 182, 183, 184, 218, 219
 Speyer 208

- Stanley 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47
 Sterling 2, 20, 141, 179, 192, 233, 255, 270, 274, 275, 276, 277
 Stevenson 15
 Stroumsa 284
 Strugnell 20
 Strutwolf 12, 169

 Taylor 121, 265
 Thomson 36
 Tobin 244
 Troiani 20, 164, 180, 276
 Turner 36

 Ulrich 13, 15, 26, 84, 117, 121, 133, 154

 Van den Hoek 51, 70, 144, 175, 177, 200
 van der Horst 23, 57, 276
 Van Unnik 41
 Van Winden 239
 Verine 293
 Viger 17
 Valckenaer 17, 86

 Wacholder 20, 24, 270
 Walbank 20
 Walker 216
 Wallace-Hadrill 11, 84, 90, 102

 Walter 3, 21, 24, 45, 156
 Weiss 201
 Wendland 146, 178, 193
 Whealey 206, 209
 Whittaker 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 88, 154, 201
 Wilde 106
 Wilkins 46
 Williams (R.) 11, 243,
 Williams (D. S.) 270
 Winston 1, 21
 Winter 206
 Wolfson 24, 197, 231, 240

 Young 4, 33, 50, 103

 Zecchini 91
 Zeegers-Van Der Vorst 3, 35, 37, 38, 45, 50, 51
 Zepernick 46
 Ziegler 14
 Zink 55

ANCIENT JUDAISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

(Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums
und des Urchristentums)

MARTIN HENGEL *Tübingen*

PIETER W. VAN DER HORST *Utrecht* · MARTIN GOODMAN *Oxford*

DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ *Jerusalem* · CILLIERS BREYTENBACH *Berlin*

FRIEDRICH AVEMARIE *Marburg* · SETH SCHWARTZ *New York*

- 56 L. Triebel. *Jenseitshoffnung in Wort und Stein*. Nefesch und pyramidales Grabmal als Phänomene antiken jüdischen Bestattungswesens im Kontext der Nachbarkulturen. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12924 3
- 57 C. Breytenbach & J. Schröter. *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung*. Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13892 7
- 58 S. Weingarten. *The Saint's Saints*. Hagiography and Geography in Jerome. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14387 4
- 59 A. Hilhorst & G.H. van Kooten (eds.). *The Wisdom of Egypt*. Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14425 0
- 60 S. Chepey. *Nazirites in Late Second Temple Judaism*. A Survey of Ancient Jewish Writings, the New Testament, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Writings from Late Antiquity. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14465 X
- 61 R.T. Beckwith. *Calendar, Chronology and Worship*. Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14603 2
- 62 L. Grushcow. *Writing the Wayward Wife*. Rabbinic Interpretations of Sotah. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14628 8
- 63 T. Landau. *Out-Heroding Herod*. Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14923 6
- 64 S. Inowlocki. *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*. His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context. 2006. ISBN -13: 978 90 04 14990 8,
ISBN-10: 90 04 14990 2
- 65 D. Milson. *Art and Architecture of the Synagogue in Late Antique Palestine*. In the Shadow of the Church. 2006. ISBN -13: 978 90 04 15186 4,
ISBN-10: 90 04 15186 9