

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Husitská teologická fakulta

Pravdivost díla *Historia Ecclesiastica*
napsaného Eusebiem Cézarejským

**The hidden truth of *Historia Ecclesiastica*
written by Eusebius of Caesarea**

Diplomová práce

prof. ThDr. Jan Blahoslav Lášek, Dr.h.c.

Bc. Petra Brychtová

Praha, 2016

Poděkování

Ráda bych touto cestou vyjádřila poděkování vedoucímu práce prof. ThDr. Janu Blahoslavi Láškovi, Dr.h.c. za jeho cenné rady a podporu při vedení mé diplomové práce. Rovněž bych ráda poděkovala Mgr. Ireně Tománkové za konzultace a vedení po stránce jazykové.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že diplomovou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně, za použití pramenů a literatury, přičemž všechny použité prameny a literatura byla řádně citována. Práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Práce bude obhájena v červnu 2016 na Husitské teologické fakultě v Praze

Bc. Petra Brychtová

Anotace

Diplomová práce zkoumá jednotlivé kapitoly knihy *Církevní Dějiny* napsané Eusebiem Cézarejským, jež je označován jako “otec církevních dějin”, přesto kniha obsahuje velké množství nejasností, rozporů, nepřesností a její celkový obsah vyznívá jako snaha o apologii raději nežli seriózní historické dílo. V diplomové práci vycházím z velkého množství pramenných zdrojů od respektovaných učenců v oblasti teologie rané církve a historie. Cílem práce je důkladně prozkoumat jednotlivé kapitoly, které vykazují největší množství problematických částí stejně tak jako závěr, zda Eusebius se pokoušel cíleně “ohnout” pravdu ve své upřímné víře či zda jeho cílem bylo sepsat obranu křesťanství, která se pouze tváří jako seriózní historické dílo.

Annotation

The master thesis focus on a particular chapter of *Historia Ecclesiastica* written by Eusebius of Caesarea, who is renowned as “father of church history” although the book contains a number of serious mistakes, interpolations, discrepancies and exaggerations. In its complexity could be perceived as an apologetic writing rather than historical writing. I used a great amount of sources by respected scholars in my master thesis while its aim is research of particular chapters which demonstrate the most controversies. In the conclusion I expect the biggest challenge will be to uncover the text without apologetic nuance and to find mistakes arising from quotations of Eusebius by other Christian authorities.

Klíčová slova

Historia Ecclesiastica, Eusebius Cézarejský, “otec církevních dějin”, text, chyba, interpolace, rozpor, vyvrácení, lež, přehánění, věcnost, pravda

The Key words

Historia Ecclesiastica, Eusebius of Caesarea, “father of church history”, text, mistake, interpolation, discrepancy, disproof, lie, exaggeration, veracity, truth

Content

<u>1 Introduction</u>	<u>8</u>
1.1 The goal of thesis	8
1.2 Assumptions of my thesis	9
1.3 Sources used for preparatory work and actual writing of thesis	9
1.3.1 The Primary sources	9
1.3.2 The Secondary sources	10
1.4 The structure of thesis - Chapter selection	11
1.5 Methods used during research and actual writing of thesis	11
1.6 The importance and the expected contribution of thesis	12
<u>2 The life of Eusebius</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>3 The works of Eusebius</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>4 The First book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>27</u>
4.1 The Prologue (HE 1.1)	27
4.2 The most ancient was always the best (HE 1.1 – HE 1.4)	30
<u>5 The Second book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>33</u>
5.1 Herod Agrippa I. (HE 2.10)	33
5.2 Heretical genealogy started by Simon (HE 2.13)	34
5.3 Herod Agrippa II., King of the Jews (HE 2.20)	35
5.4 The martyrdom of James (HE 2.25)	37
<u>6 The Third book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>40</u>
6.1 Married apostles (HE 3.31)	41
6.2 Johannine authorship: John the Apostle or John the Elder? (HE 3.40)	42
<u>7 The Fourth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>46</u>
7.1 The rescript referring to the Christians by Antonine emperors (HE 4.19)	46
<u>8 The Fifth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>49</u>
8.1 Blandina (HE 5.2)	49

8.2 The victory of Marcus Aurelius over the Marcomanni and Quadi (Germans and Sarmatians) (HE 5.7)	49
8.3 Robert M. Grant: Eusebius' picture of the Antonine emperors (HE 5.7)	52
<u>9 The Sixth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>56</u>
9.1 The Alexandrian school and Origen (HE 6.3)	57
9.2 The Alexandrian Christian philosophical erudition was brought to Caesarea (HE 6.19)	58
9.3 The Hexapla (HE 6.16)	60
9.4 The question of authorship the <i>Commentary on Hebrew</i> (HE 6.14)	62
<u>10 The Eighth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>64</u>
10.1 Eusebius began writing differently (HE 8.1)	64
10.2 A deep ulcerous fistula of Galerius (HE 8.16)	65
<u>11 The Ninth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>68</u>
11.1 Miracle at the Milvian Bridge (HE 9.9)	69
<u>12 The Tenth book of <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></u>	<u>72</u>
12.1 Victorious emperor filled with love for humanity (HE 10.9)	72
<u>13 Conclusion</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>14 Bibliography</u>	<u>81</u>
14.1 The Primary sources	81
14.2 The Secondary sources	81
<u>15 Summary</u>	<u>86</u>

1 Introduction

1.1 The goal of thesis

First I would like to define the aim of my thesis as exploration and process of finding the truth which is hidden in *Historia Ecclesiastica*. To express myself more clearly, there are numerous controversies about some chapters of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, therefore my aim is to explore statements and opinions of respected scholars who are interested in Eusebius of Caesarea and his theology, his writings and more generally, in the era of the Early church.

Secondly, scholars of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries brought some fresh skepticism, which provided space for considerations and new evaluations of the accuracy of *Ecclesiastical History*.

Thirdly I believe there is would be an urgent need to revise the Czech translation of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, since I was able to find only two translations of the book, the first one by Jan Kocín z Kocínětu in the sixteenth century, the other one by Jan Novák. The latter, was published by Ústřední církevní nakladatelství in 1988. The translation by Novák is the one which I used intensively while I was preparing and working on my thesis as well. Therefore, my last goal is to prove there is an urgent need to revise the translation by Jan Novák or (and even better) to make a brand new translation by Czech current scholars who master the ancient Greek.

Finally, the title of my thesis refers to looking for the hidden truth of *Historia Ecclesiastica* written by Eusebius of Caesarea. I am going to seek controversial texts and chapters, and conclusions on them, made by renowned scholars in order to assess to the veracity of *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

1.2 Assumptions of my thesis

I assume that I will come across a number of abridgement, interpolations, divergences, conflicting facts and grave mistakes while I compare different sources on particular chapters of *Historia Ecclesiastica* written by Eusebius. Therefore, I expect the biggest challenge will be to uncover the text without apologetic nuance and to find mistakes arising from quotations of Eusebius by other Christian authorities. I expect to learn a lot about Eusebius while reading *Ecclesiastical History*, because the book tells us much about the subject but about the author as well.

To be honest, another assumption consists in the expectation to find very critical attitudes among scholars toward Eusebius. At the very beginning, while I was doing research, I came across a number of articles claiming that Eusebius is a liar; therefore it will not be easy to compare different statements by different scholars who approached *Historia Ecclesiastica* very differently.

Thirdly I assume to find a huge amount of corruptions (of various nature) in the Czech translation by Novák as well as a lack of secondary sources on Eusebius account translated into Czech language, moreover I assume there will be a lack of scholarly studies on *Historia Ecclesiastica* by Czech scholars.

1.3 Sources used for preparatory work and actual writing of thesis

1.3.1 The Primary sources

As I indicated earlier, the primary sources I used included *Církevní dějiny* by Jan Novák and *The Church History of Eusebius* written by Paul Maier. The translation by Maier is one of the most respected writings on *Historia Ecclesiastica* also thanks to helpful commentaries at the beginning of every chapter, which helps me to make a picture of specific historical relations behind the story narrated by Eusebius.

The translation and commentary by A. C. McGiffert in *Eusebius: The History of the Church* was tremendous support. This primary source, which I compared with the Czech translation and translation by Maier, was firstly published by A. C. McGiffert in 1904. The

translation was accompanied by historical notes which furnished the only valuable supplement to the second editions of *Historia Ecclesiastica* published by Valesius at 1659 at Paris. This translation by McGiffert is one of the key writings on account of Eusebius.

1.3.2 The Secondary sources

The detailed summary of the contents of Eusebius' library compiled by Andrew Carriker in his writing *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea* proved very helpful. This secondary source listed all of the 288 works as the minimum books which could Eusebius found at the library.

A New Eusebius by J. Stevenson was considerable significance. Stevenson gathered an enormous amount of documents which illustrated the history of the Church until 337 AD. Of particular importance were chapters, where Stevenson quoted the passages from Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and accompanied them by plenty of note describing the background in which was story narrated by Eusebius. I will use this book to compare part of my thesis which dealing with the Fourth and the Fifth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica*.¹

The complete list of sources I used, could be found at the end of my thesis in chapter called *Bibliography*, divided on two parts; *Primary* and *Secondary sources*.

¹ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 43.

1.4 The structure of thesis - Chapter selection

I will follow the same chapter numbering as used in the Czech translation by Novák. The purpose of using the numbering according to Novák is quite simple; I do not want to cause any misunderstanding which might easily happen since different scholars used different numbering of chapters of *Historia Ecclesiastica* in their translation. When I was preparing for my thesis I wanted to possess the writing of *Historia Ecclesiastica* and this is the reason why I followed the translation by Novák, his book was cheaper to purchase than more accredited translation by Maier. Nonetheless I used Maier's translation as well, which was available in the library of University of Helsinki.

I will focus only on chapters containing seriously interpolated text. The *Historia Ecclesiastica*, of course comprises plenty of texts without mistakes, however, I do not intend to explore these chapters.

1.5 Methods used during research and actual writing of thesis

Taking into account unflattering quotes on veracity of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I would like to identify methods which will be important for my thesis: the reflection and the search of literature, because only by using those together with comparison of secondary sources with the primary ones I can conclude and achieve my goal.

The search of literature was the very primary method I used. All of the sources which I gathered for my thesis were found and studied in the library of the University of Helsinki. I benefited greatly from the sources available in this library, which I was able to use during my studies at the Theological faculty of the University of Helsinki in Finland, in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

Evaluation of sources was significant to my research and preparatory work, because as I assumed, I came across many scholars who looked down on Eusebius of Caesarea, who thought he was a liar, even though their critics should be evaluated and compared independently as *Historia Ecclesiastica* itself; there are two sides of the same coin. Of same importance was the evaluation of particular approach of every scholar and their

particular statements. The process of evaluation was fundamental to my thesis in many ways. On the other hand, I do not want to get a narrow view, therefore, I will consider the particular statements in their entirety and complexity.

The consideration was another method which I used in research and during actual writing as well. During process of consideration I took into account my own opinion when the evaluation process finished. There is an area, where the consideration was especially important; the “real-life” effect, which was the method often used by Eusebius when he was trying to emphasize the background to his own life. To be specific, martyrdom is a topic, where one has to consider the “real-life” effect. Eusebius wrote about martyrdom as an eyewitness, this caused the mistakes in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, however I will explore if they were intentional or rather exaggerations and overstatement. Therefore I used the consideration method to focus on the veracity under the statements with “real-life” effect.

The time grid used in *Ecclesiastical History* served as method as well, when Eusebius arranged events in accordance with the emperors and the bishops, who occupied the great sees. Even though the arrangement of bishops was certainly for apologetic purposes, it provides a very convenient time frame to my thesis too; therefore I have been following the chronological arrangement based on method of Eusebius.

1.6 The importance and the expected contribution of thesis

The expected contribution of my thesis is various, but my biggest effort is to draw attention to the lack of sources on Eusebius of Caesarea in Czech language which is directly caused by the lack of scholarly works on this topic among Czech scholars and translators, which could publish in Czech language *Historia Ecclesiastica* written by Eusebius. As far as I know there is no current scholar who would be interested in corruptions of Eusebius writing, therefore my intention is to open a discussion about the veracity of *Historia Ecclesiastica* by Eusebius.

Finally the contribution which I also expect, is to find an answer to the question of the hidden truth of *Historia Ecclesiastica* written by Eusebius of Caesarea, to conclude if

he was just a liar who followed apologetic contributions or rather too much passionate about his role of the “father of church history”? Were his mistakes intentional or rather mistakes caused by carelessness? The answer will be the contribution of my master thesis.

2 The life of Eusebius

Who was Eusebius of Caesarea? He was the history re-thinker, while history started changing by Constantine's coming to power as the emperor; Eusebius was the most learned man and the most famous living writer in the Church at his time although in the West, Jerome called Eusebius as "*the chief of Arians*". In the East, Gelasius of Cyzicus called him "*strict lover of truth*" and anonymous Latin writer called Eusebius "*the key of the Scriptures and the guardian of the New Testament*"². All of those contradictory designations pointing to his importance but for my subject, the most important epithet is "*the first thoroughly untruthful historian of Antiquity*" how Eusebius was called by Burckhardt.³ To introduce life of Eusebius correctly is necessary to mention all of three events which shaped his life and work. The first one was meeting with Pamphilus, the second one was toleration of Christianity which relates with the third great event, Eusebius encounter with the Emperor Constantine.⁴

Eusebius was born in Caesarea, the city of Palestine which was built by Herod the Great on Mediterranean coast, near from Jaffa. The city is well known from life of Paulus, from *New Testament*. The New Testament talks about the city as Roman capital of Judea. When was Jerusalem destroyed, Caesarea was the most important city in that area. We do not know many facts from his life but the date of his birth is usually dated between years 260 and 264.⁵ According to Maier, Eusebius was born in 260.⁶ According to Novák, who

² DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 31.

³ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 26.

⁴ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. In: AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 267.

⁵ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 4.

⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 10-11.

translated The Church history into Czech, Eusebius was born around year 263.⁷ We do not know if he was born as Christian, but we certainly know he was not born as Jew.⁸

Eusebius was quite common name in his time anyway this bishop of Caesarea was also called Eusebius Pamphili. This second name of Eusebius, Pamphili designated priest Pamphilus, who was native of Phoenicia. Before Pamphilus settled down in Caesarea, he lived at Alexandria in Egypt. In Caesarea Pamphilus met Eusebius in school, where tradition by Origen was held and Pamphilus wrote extensive work devoted to Origen there. Eusebius started his life-work there too, as pupil of Pamphilus, moreover they became friends and during the time they started to work together. In those years Eusebius was influenced by Pamphilus and tradition of Origen because Origen was inspiring person for Eusebius. He wrote *The Apology for Origen*, despite of Origen's attackers, he wrote his allegorizing theology⁹ moreover his concept of *logos* would have occupied a central position in Eusebius substantiation for Constantine's victory.¹⁰ In the *Church History* Eusebius wrote about Origen as man, who brought up during persecution of the emperor Severus. In year 215 the emperor Caracalla persecuted scholars, so Origen came to Caesarea, settled down and found catechesis school. There studied young Eusebius with his teacher and friend Pamphilus.

Eusebius wrote the biography of Pamphilus. The main and probably only one source for this work was his personal knowledge. Pamphilus died as martyr in reign of the emperor Maximian probably in year 309.¹¹ According to Defferari, Pamphilus suffered by martyrdom and died at 310, during the one of the worst persecution of the Church started

⁷ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1.vyd. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988.

⁸ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 4.

⁹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history. A new translation and commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 18.

¹⁰ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. In: MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 80.

¹¹ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1.vyd. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988.

by Diocletian but soon after, the general amnesty and restoration came. In this time we know about Eusebius presence in Tyre and Thebai because he was describing terrifying eyewitnesses on martyrs with deep emotions. It is highly possible that Eusebius was in prison between 307 and 310 while *The Apology for Origen* was written.¹² After martyrdom of Pamphilus Eusebius visited Egypt and if he was imprisoned in his life, was it during his visit thus general amnesty could released him.

After the end of persecution restoration came, and Eusebius was ordained to the priesthood in Caesarea, probably in succession of Agapius, who was the last bishop. This happened soon after Constantine victory at Milvian Bridge at 312. He remained as bishop of Caesarea more than twenty five years. In that time there were growing imperial patronage of the Church¹³ but still the atmosphere was full of threaten, until Constantine and Licinius went to war with each other, when Licinius was finally defeated in 323.¹⁴

Constantine became solo emperor, which makes Eusebius satisfied because he saw Constantine as new Moses, who was picked by God to lead people from suffering into freedom. The language of biblical typology is not coincidence but there are also many features from Hellenestic kingship theory and the notion about ruler as a shepherd.¹⁵ Eusebius described Constantine as a new model of a Christian emperor which required a new sort of literary and historical presentation.¹⁶ For him Constantine was powerful protector of the Church and in Eusebius's panegyric he omitted everything which did not

¹² DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 6.

¹³ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 266.

¹⁴ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 7.

¹⁵ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 79.

¹⁶ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 72.

fit into one-colored picture of the emperor.¹⁷ Thus Eusebius named himself as Constantine's reporter according to Cameron.¹⁸ Whether it was or was not an intention going to be aim of my subject.

Establishment of Christianity during his episcopacy quite soon caused theological struggle, the Arian controversy in the East about year 318. Eusebius explicitly rejected two main Arian statements; "was a time when the Son of God was not" and the "he was produced out of nothing".

The council of Nicaea was requested by the emperor Constantine in 325 and it supposed to solve the Arian controversy. The interesting fact is that Eusebius probably had never met Constantine before the Council¹⁹ but he had an important role during the Council. There are some speculations why Eusebius had such an important role and why he was the leader of Council. He was a very close to the emperor and he was sitting next to the emperor, on his right side, moreover Eusebius took the picture of opening scene in his *Life of Constantine*.

The main subject of the Council was the Creed which was used in Caesarean church and which was used by him, Eusebius.²⁰ The emperor was satisfied with orthodoxy of this Creed, but the very important change occurred in it, the word *homoousion*, of the same substance. The insertion gave also an explanation of this meaning and clarification; "of the substance of the Father", "begotten, not made" and "of the same substance". But it was not only one alternation. The condemnation of Arians was appended too even though the Council did not bring the controversy to the end.

¹⁷ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 26.

¹⁸ CAMERON, Averil. *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History*. In: MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 77.

¹⁹ CAMERON, Averil. *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History*. In: MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 73.

²⁰ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 10.

Eusebius had been constantly refusing of heretics and continuously struggling against others but those are not my aims. What is important is the fact that Eusebius never intentionally or openly supported Arianism, he never opposed Nicene Creed but anti-Sabellianism partly influenced him.²¹

The *tricennalia* of Constantine was the magnificent ceremonial, the celebration of his reign for thirty years during which basilica on site of Calvary was dedicated. Eusebius wrote panegyric for that occasion, the *Oration of the Tricennalia* where he used powerful language especially about Constantine service to the Church and question of Eusebius's distortion raised again.²²

Constantine died on 22nd May 337 and Eusebius composed *Life of Constantine*, another panegyric speech on the great emperor, at the end of his own life and other problem occurs. The scholars dispute about Eusebian authorship, because of similarities between *Tricennalia Oration* and *Life of Constantine* while Cameron accepted it.²³ Two or three years after death of Constantine, Eusebius followed his admired emperor. There are no more details known about his last days, moreover there are different evidences which points to his death in 339 or 340.²⁴ According to Louth, Eusebius died 30th May 339.²⁵ Eusebius life was described in biography by his pupil Acacius who was also Eusebius successor as bishop of Caesarea after his death. Unfortunately his biography has disappeared.²⁶ According to Sozomen, Acacius was very close friend to Eusebius and he also inherited all of his books so we could assume that his biography was complete and

²¹ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 15.

²² CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. In: MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 74.

²³ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. In: MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 75.

²⁴ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 16.

²⁵ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. In: AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 266.

²⁶ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 31.

accurate.²⁷ The evidences which preserved were written by early Church historians as Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret and his contemporaries as were Jerome and Athanasius. Eusebius as world chronicler laid extend notion of church history in three crucial centuries from Christ to Constantine, which allows to Gelasius, Jerome, Rufinus, Socrates and Sozomen took up where Eusebius left off.²⁸

Eusebius established the model for the writing of church history thus he earned the title Father of Christian history.²⁹

²⁷ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 31.

²⁸ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 273.

²⁹ ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 585.

3 The works of Eusebius

The books written by our author was divided into different groups and clustered thematically while I have adhered scheme by Deferrari.³⁰ Among historical works could be named *Life of Pamphilus*, a collection of *Ancient Martyrdom*, *On the Martyrs of Palestine*, *Chronicle*, *Church History* and *Life of Constantine*. The *Life of Pamphilus* and the collection of *Ancient Martyrdom* are lost.

The writing which was probably wrote before persecution in 303 called *Chronicle*. The first book contend short histories, for instance of the Chaldeans, of the Assyrians, of the Hebrews, of the Egyptians, of the Romans or of the Greeks, and Eusebius also outlined from where it was taken. For example history of Hebrews was taken from the *Old Testament*, Josephus and Clement of Alexandria. The second book dealt with universal history.³¹ The model for Eusebius was Julius Africanus, whose work Eusebius put into chronology. He was especially caring about details and by his good judgment he was rescuing valuable historical material.

The second historical work, which is more important, is ten books of *Church History*. According to Adler, the essential accuracy of Eusebius description of Christian historiography before the fourth century, in the prologue, gave us his sources as Sozomen, Clement, Hegesippus (*Hypomnemata*) and Julius Africanus.³² Eusebius quoted Dionysius and Gaius³³ because citation of non-Christian sources was an effective form of argumentation.³⁴ Julius Africanus was counted too, because he is the earliest known Christian chronographer, according to Frend.³⁵ Moreover Norris named Lactantius also.³⁶

³⁰ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 16.

³¹ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 20.

³² ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 586.

³³ BARNES, D. Timothy. *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman history*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010. ISBN: 978-3-16-150226-2. Page 24.

³⁴ ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 596.

³⁵ MITCHELL, Margaret M. and Frances M. YOUNG. *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Origins to Constantine*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81239-9. Page 512.

Historia Ecclesiastica is the first full-length narrative history written from Christian point of view with leading motifs – the unity of the Church. It gave us an account of martyrdom in the first three centuries. Thanks to its author, the martyrdom during times of persecution is far better documented thus he became father of historiography. The books VI, VII and VIII mention lots of martyrdoms. The persecution under Diocletian and Galerius was expounded in books VIII and IX. These books relate to the persecution from prospective of Palestine.

Eusebius used diverse documentary material, one of his principal source were *Acts of Apostles* for very early period of the Church. *Acts* and the *Church History* share common features, for instance both assumed that Christianity is natural state and both have optimistic prospects.³⁷ Christian historiography was continued with early histories and had the roots in apologetic.³⁸ What is interesting for me is Deferrari's claim about absolutely no indication whether this work was written in suggestion anyone else. The *Church History* as we know it today is not original form, partly because amount of important events which happened so fast, thus he had to change the text many times. According to Schwartz, there were four editions³⁹ and Adler mentioned possibly five editions.⁴⁰

A collection of *Ancient Martyrdom* described persecution during Diocletian survived with two editions while the shorter one is always edited with the *Church History*.⁴¹

Particularly important was his collection *On the Martyrs of Palestine* about he said he had made it (*HE* 4.15.47).⁴² Eusebius experienced suffering of his friends so the

³⁶ CASSIDAY, Augustine and Frederic W. NORRIS. *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c. 600*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81244-3. Page 71.

³⁷ ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 586-587.

³⁸ CASSIDAY, Augustine and Frederic W. NORRIS. *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c. 600*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81244-3. Page 331.

³⁹ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 23.

⁴⁰ ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 594

⁴¹ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 24.

persecution became dominant theme throughout his work.⁴³ From *On the Martyrs of Palestine* we know about lost biography of Pamphilus. We expect the only one source for Eusebius was his personal knowledge of his teacher.

The *Life of Constantine* is viewed as panegyric speech to deeds of the emperor. There is no doubt regarding authenticity of this eulogy according to Deferrari. Eusebius did not intend to write history in this work even though he was completely condemned by Burckhardt.⁴⁴ The language and imagery of the *Life* is rather classical than specially Christian and political overtone is less important according to Cameron.⁴⁵ On the other hand the *Life* contained a new theoretical basis for Constantine's rule although he proposed to leave out the military activities and Constantine's secular legislation. Eusebius, as committed believer, simply demonstrated religious truths (God's choice of Constantine) by proofs and signs (the church buildings and holy places).⁴⁶ Again Eusebius went back to physical description of persecutions which was ended by the emperor who also replaced bloody sacrifice by piety and showed himself as "utterly dedicated to God". Again, there is strongly apologetic overtone and the *Life* was designed to persuade the specific place of the emperor in God's plan.

As supplements to this work was written the speech on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the emperor's reign and a speech of the emperor to the assembly of saints while its authenticity was questioned by Heikel.⁴⁷ Also, the distortion of the *Tricennalian Oration* and the *Life* was questioned by Cameron too. According to him, there are so many

⁴² LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 271.

⁴³ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 76.

⁴⁴ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 26.

⁴⁵ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 79.

⁴⁶ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 80-82.

⁴⁷ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 26.

similarities in phraseology and in argumentation that he assumes works were basically Eusebian but edited by later revisions. In conclusion the most scholars accept Eusebian authorship anyway, even though the credibility and factuality cannot be fully accepted.⁴⁸ That is why Maier placed works as the *Tricennialian Oration* and the *Oration on the Savior Sepulchre* between panegyric orations⁴⁹ rather than historical writings or among homilies as Deferrari did.

However the *Tricennialian Oration* was delivered to Constantinople to the emperor in 336. Eusebius used a lot of imaginary from Hellenistic kingship theory because his audience had to be struck by words. Speech was philosophical with plenty of quotations from Homer.⁵⁰

In Eusebius exegetical works he was commenting nearly all the books of the *Old* and the *New Testament* although the great deal have been lost. He was concerned about historical meaning of the text than we would expect from devoted Origenist.⁵¹ His theology is free from the imperial ideology. In *Gospel Canons* he showed his biblical scholarship. *Onomasticon*, treatise on names and places of the Holy Land, was compiled for the empress Helena in 326, assumed Louth.⁵² Unfortunately, only fragments survived from many works, as in case *Gospel Questions*. The *Commentary on Isaias* was found almost complete in the margin of Florentine biblical manuscript in 1934. Among others Eusebius

⁴⁸ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 74.

⁴⁹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 15.

⁵⁰ CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Mogmiliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983. Page 79.

⁵¹ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 267.

⁵² LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 268.

exegetical works represent *General Elementary Introduction*⁵³ which on the other hand Maier placed among doctrinal works because of messianic parts from the *Old Testament*.⁵⁴

Eusebius main apologetic work designated *General Theological Introduction*, or *Prophetic Selection* which contained messianic parts from the prophets. Another great work is the fifteen books of *Preparation for the Gospel* which made a claim about his apologetic method, extensive and careful documentation. It is one of our main sources for the views of ancient philosophers (Plato and others), whose works would have been lost otherwise.⁵⁵ For Maier, the most important point is superiority of monotheistic Christianity which Eusebius showed against pagan polytheism of Greeks.⁵⁶ The *Proof of the Gospel* dealt with Jewish objections against Christianity. Downfall of the Jewish state and the coming of Christ were predicted by prophets. The second part of book dealt with the resurrection, the ascension, the coming of the Spirit and the foundation of the Church. The book *Theophany* or *Divine Manifestation* survived in early Syriac translation and it belonged to period when Constantine was solo ruler⁵⁷ Eusebius defended God's manifestation in Christ.⁵⁸ The works wrote specifically against pagans are *Against Hierocles* and *Against Porphyry* which was the answer to Porphyry's *Against Christians*. According to Maier, the major works are *Praeparation Ecclesiastica* and *Demonstatio Ecclesiastica* which dealt with life of the Church rather than with its doctrine.⁵⁹

⁵³ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 18.

⁵⁴ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 14.

⁵⁵ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. In: AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 268.

⁵⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 13.

⁵⁷ LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. In: AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5. Page 269.

⁵⁸ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 13.

⁵⁹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 13.

Dogmatic writing *The Apology for Origen*, as I mentioned before, needed to be written together with his mentor Pamphilus against attackers of Origen's allegorizing theology but only the first book survived in Latin translation made by Rufinus.⁶⁰ Eusebius also wrote two works against Sabellian Bishop of Ancyra, *Against Marcellus* and *On the Theology of the Church*.⁶¹

In an extensive Eusebius's correspondence scholars found a plenty of indispensable thoughts as for instance theological controversy of his time, the Arianism. I could name letters *To Alexander of Alexandria*, *To Euphrasion*, *To the Empress Constantia* and *To the Church of Caesarea*.⁶²

Historical, exegetic, apologetic and dogmatic writings are supported by his letters, homilies, orations and biblical dictionaries together to create collection on which Eusebius worked hard and it shows us how prolific writer he was. The most complete edition of his writings *Patrologia Graeca* published in Paris in 1857 contained six large volumes according to Maier. Eusebius probably did not strive to obtain stylistic excellence although he had strong rhetoric skills.⁶³ His writings had wide and varied character on one hand but on the other, all of those have mark of apologetic literature. His character as an apologist may be traced to change between Hellenism and epoch of Christianity and he was the first who grasped the concept of a Christian literature with ancient methods of cataloguing and fixing dates. In comparison, according to Adler, Christian interest in chronology was not rooted in apologetics but "in an understanding of time as expansion of the divine will".⁶⁴

⁶⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 14.

⁶¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 14.

⁶² DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 18-19.

⁶³ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 28.

⁶⁴ ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. In: HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6. Page 589.

After his death the Church mostly appreciate him, as I mentioned before, Gelasius of Cyzicus, for instance while the West part of Empire, especially Jerome depreciated him. After all, Eusebius's service for Christian literature prevailed against attackers, for example, popes Gelasius and Pelagius II shielded his reputation.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0. Page 30.

4 The First book of *Ecclesiastical History*

4.1 The Prologue (HE 1.1)

The general plan of *Historia Ecclesiastica* is clear and lucid while in the Prologue were outline all of main themes, with which Eusebius dealt later in the book, the succession – diadoche, ecclesiastical leadership, heresies, the calamities of Jewish race and martyrdom of Christians. The construction of *Historia Ecclesiastica* is supported by chronology of Roman Emperors accompanied by bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem and this is the reason why the first mentioned topic in the Prologue are lines of succession of apostolic sees. It was matter of top priority as it could be observed from its position in the Prologue.

According to Lake, the dates which were given in cases of Rome and Alexandria were exact, while Eusebius had followed the lists collected by Hippolytus, Africanus and Hegesippus.⁶⁶ Halton suggested that Eusebius relied upon Hegesippus more heavily and this approach was encouraged by the quotations from the *Historia Ecclesiastica* where Eusebius cited Hegesippus,⁶⁷ for instance Eusebius mentioned: "...*Hegesippus is a particularly valuable source for the apostolic age.*"⁶⁸ Moreover Halton claimed that Eusebius was a close disciple of Hegesippus through the First book until the Fourth. On the other hand McGiffert argued that Hegesippus although he was nearest the idea of church history before Eusebius, his writings were little more than fragmentary memoirs or collection of disconnected reminiscences.⁶⁹

As Gustafsson claimed in his writing *On Eusebius' handling of his sources*, the correct apostolic tradition became guiding principle for Eusebius in handling his authorities in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*.⁷⁰ There is agreement with Lake, who outlined the

⁶⁶ LAKE, Kirsopp. *Eusebius; The Ecclesiastical History with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Page 34.

⁶⁷ HALTON, T. Hegesippus in Eusebius. In: LIVINGSTONE, A. Elizabeth. *Studia Patristica vol. XVII, part 2*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. Chapter by T. Halton, 688-693. Page 688.

⁶⁸ HE 4.12

⁶⁹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 97.

⁷⁰ HALTON, T. Hegesippus in Eusebius. In: LIVINGSTONE, A. Elizabeth. *Studia Patristica vol. XVII, part 2*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. Chapter by T. Halton, 688-693. Page 688.

biggest goal of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was to introduce “Christian succession” (*diadoche*), the line from the apostles of four great thrones but also the whole intellectual, spiritual and institutional life of the Church, which had only one teaching from the beginning which had been preserved by the diadoche and heresy was the attempt of the Devil to change it.⁷¹ Because of that Eusebius told in the very first sentence: “*It is my purpose to write an account of the successions of the holy apostles as well as of the times which have elapsed from the days of our Saviour to our own.*”⁷²

The second topic in the Prologue focused on the outstanding leadership in the most important sees and Halton indicated that ecclesiastical leadership and diadoche are closely intertwined.⁷³ As I will show in my thesis later, Eusebius’s pleading words had huge impact on readership, moreover this quotation highlights the relation between diadoche and leadership of particular sees (translated by McGiffert): “*From afar they raise their voices like torches, and they cry out, as from some lofty and conspicuous watch-tower, admonishing us where to walk and how to direct the course of our work steadily and safely.*”⁷⁴ Even though the Czech translation by Novák applied this quotation only to Eusebius’s own work on writing of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which seems to absolutely wrong, from the translation by McGiffert⁷⁵ is visible apologetic tone. The message by Eusebius is clear to me: If I would live according to words of leaders of the Church, my life would have been safe and steady.

Actually all the ambassadors of the divine word could be expected in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* while mentioned by Eusebius. According to Lake, to trace all of the writers and to give a complete description of them would be to write a handbook to early Christian

⁷¹ LAKE, Kirsopp. *Eusebius; The Ecclesiastical History with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Page 34.

⁷² HE 1.1.1

⁷³ HALTON, T. Hegesippus in Eusebius. In: LIVINGSTONE, A. Elizabeth. *Studia Patristica vol. XVII, part 2*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. Chapter by T. Halton, 688-693. Page 689.

⁷⁴ HE 1.1.4

⁷⁵ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 97.

literature⁷⁶ on the other hand equally interesting is attempt to trace a variety expression which were used by Eusebius when he described the Episcopal succession of the important churches, as it was submitted by Ferguson. According to him, most of them were theologically colorless as declaration of receiving the episcopate or the ministry of a given church but he outlined the motifs associated with ordination in the ancient Church as well as enthronement language, a solemn seating, allotment of ministry in the Church or entrustment while trust were given into the hand of a person.⁷⁷ While one understand the difference in these expressions it could be very helpful to understand the meaning behind the words of Eusebius which he devoted to the ambassadors of divine word.

Thirdly, the Prologue promised to deal with the beginnings of heresies, while Eusebius gave the names and dates of those, who wandered from the “truth” because of passion for novelty and love for innovations. To more explore this huge topic of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was very helpful to me writing by Mendels *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity*, where he dealt with the *Historia Ecclesiastica* as efficient medium by Eusebius to promote Christianity, moreover he defined it as “media historiography” when insisted on following same rulers as modern journalists do. The composition is not linear, but rather there is arrangement by topics while its follows chronological order. Thus according to Mendels, Church operated with heresies theme from the very start as a colossal media machine.⁷⁸

The media channel recognized by Eusebius was that of heresy, because heresies had a significant “market” value, because heresies were establishing communication and media networks which competed with orthodoxy while they made a lot of noise in public (sensational exchange of letters, theatrical disputes). Although Eusebius’s strategy was

⁷⁶ LAKE, Kirsopp. *Eusebius; The Ecclesiastical History with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Page 35.

⁷⁷ FERGUSON, Everett. Eusebius and Ordination. **In:** *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 1962, vol. 13 (April). London: William Clowes and sons Limited, 1962. Page 139.

⁷⁸ MENDELS, Doron. The Sources of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; The case of Josephus. **In:** PODERON, Bernard and Yves-Marie DUVAL. *L’Historiographie De L’Église; Des Premiers Siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne, 2001. Chapter by D. Mendels, 195-205. ISBN: 2-7010-1413-1. Page 196.

very clever because avoided the publicity for heresies which could help to gain further converts, therefore Eusebius consistently refrained from providing any details on account of particular heresy and its theology. Rather heresy was attacking on secondary grounds.⁷⁹

According to Bauer, both orthodox and heresy pursued by means of literature, by letters and also by personal contact to extend their influence at home as well as abroad. The orthodox party used anti-heretical devices to demonstrate (in contrast to heresies) how the church was established through the apostles a sure line of contact with the Lord himself, which it never needed to break.⁸⁰ The conviction of Eusebius was that heretical Christendom and orthodoxy always must have been clearly distinguished. As I will show in my thesis, the silence of Eusebius belonged to the strongest weapons of him, which is confirmed by Bauer⁸¹ as well as by Mendels.⁸² Secondly Eusebius was able to show rich anti-heretical literature already at the second century while he insisted on skepticism which such literature immediately provoked.

The aim of Eusebius was to present all of the churchmen as close to the generation of apostles as possible, moreover he pushed their writings as far back as it was possible to connect those churchmen with apostolic age meanwhile the chronology of the heretics was seemingly more recent. Why he did so? Because the most ancient was always the best!

4.2 The most ancient was always the best (HE 1.1 – HE 1.4)

The particular interpretation of history provided structural framework for the *Ecclesiastical History*, which Eusebius constructed on apologetic base. As Arthur Droge underlined, Eusebius was not only historian but also apologist, who protected the truth of his religion before pagans, Jews and heretics. Moreover for him, the truth of Christianity

⁷⁹ MENDELS, Doron. The Sources of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; The case of Josephus. **In:** PODERON, Bernard and Yves-Marie DUVAL. *L'Historiographie De L'Église; Des Premiers Siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne, 2001. Chapter by D. Mendels, 195-205. ISBN: 2-7010-1413-1. Page 198.

⁸⁰ BAUER, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. ISBN: 0-8006-0055-X. Page 35.

⁸¹ BAUER, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. ISBN: 0-8006-0055-X. Page 190.

⁸² MENDELS, Doron. The Sources of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; The case of Josephus. **In:** PODERON, Bernard and Yves-Marie DUVAL. *L'Historiographie De L'Église; Des Premiers Siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne, 2001. Chapter by D. Mendels, 195-205. ISBN: 2-7010-1413-1. Page 198.

was closely related to the history.⁸³ Thus the preface or rather the whole First book of *Ecclesiastical History* defended Christianity from charges made by attackers that it was recent religion.

According to Droge, general conviction of that age, shared by pagans same as Christians was that nothing could be new and true in same time.⁸⁴ The most often objections were against Christ and his recent appearance in history, thus Eusebius spent the preface by answering those objections while he analyzed the history of culture and explained some preparations. Interestingly, according to Grant, Eusebius was presenting the civilization as a preparation for Christianity, therefore Eusebius interest was not in any original golden age, but rather he was focused on proving of gradual progress and development of mankind.⁸⁵

According to Foakes-Jackson, the First book of *Ecclesiastical History* is explaining the purpose and illustrating the method of the whole work because of the most damaging charge made against the Christian religion at that time, which was novelty. Thus to answered this we can reveal Eusebius apologetic character while his object was to rebut the charge of innovation of Christianity.⁸⁶

Droge carefully considered theology of Eusebius contained in his preface, which is very sophisticated and coherently supported significance of Christianity. Although I do not have enough space for detail analysis I must outline at least one clever apologetic argument of Eusebius. Since he believed in gradual progress of humanity thus Garden of Eden had to be in the beginning and the fall indicated inception of human history, this implied primitive

⁸³ DROGE, Arthur J. The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 492.

⁸⁴ DROGE, Arthur J. The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 492.

⁸⁵ GRANT, M. Robert. Civilization As a Preparation For Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius. **In:** GEORGE, Timothy and F. Forrester CHURCH. *Continuity And Discontinuity in Church History*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1979. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 62-70. ISBN: 90-04-05879-6. Page 62.

⁸⁶ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 62.

humanity (mythological history of pagans) was not a Golden Age for Eusebius.⁸⁷ Simplified, the interpretation of development provided Eusebius means of defense against Celsus and Porphyry, who maligned “late or recent” appearance of Christ.

What we should not fail to observe as Foakes-Jackson notes is the fact that Eusebius used only scriptural proofs; specifically he had taken his information mainly from the New Testament and Josephus’ *War (Bellum Iudaicum)* and *Antiquities (Antiquitates Iudaeorum)* and the lost *Chronology* of Julius Africanus. Thus there is no reason to expect that Eusebius’ historical work is interesting reading, but its value lies in illustration of Eusebius use of the books which he was consulting.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ DROGE, Arthur J. *The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History*. In: ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, © 1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 497.

⁸⁸ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 64.

5 The Second book of Ecclesiastical History

The Second book of *Ecclesiastical History* could be classified according to sources as follows; at first the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament, secondly Philo and Josephus and finally are works of other writers. Among non-scriptural writings Eusebius followed the *Embassy* of Philo Judaeus and Josephus the *War* and the *Antiquities*.

5.1 Herod Agrippa I. (HE 2.10)

The interesting citation from Josephus, according to Foakes-Jackson is the story of the death of Herod the King as he was called in Acts 12:19, but Josephus called him Agrippa. Especially in the last paragraph of this chapter is focused on conformity between Josephus and the Acts of Apostles and he stressed there is no difference between the names since background proved same king.⁸⁹ McGiffert explained that Luke in the Acts always used the name Herod as family name instead of Josephus who used Agrippa as given name, anyway he is known to us as Herod Agrippa I.⁹⁰ It looks like Eusebius himself had proposed doubts in this chapter even though a deceptive tale still to come:

Fertile subject of discussion among scholars was Eusebius transformation the owl into an angel, while he was admiring astonishing story in divine Scripture (Acts 12:19-24) which was supported by 19th book of Josephus *Antiquities* (the text quoted by Eusebius).

According to Maier in *Antiquities* 19:346 Josephus stated that Agrippa saw not an angle but an owl perching on a rope over his head and he interpreted this as a message of evil (based on story about Agrippa's imprisonment). Because of using the term the owl in meaning of a messenger by Josephus, Eusebius slipped on his part, the failure of quotation.⁹¹ Maier presents a simple explanation: the Greek translation of the word "messenger" is *angelos*, the same term used for an angel, moreover he states the mistake

⁸⁹ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 68.

⁹⁰ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 166.

⁹¹ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 67.

was subject of much scholarly comments, for instance extensive notes in translation by McGiffert.

According to McGiffert, this omission made by Eusebius caused the gravest charges against him, mostly accusing him of “willful perversion of the texts of Josephus with the intention of producing a confirmation of the narrative of the Acts in which the angel of God is spoken of, but in which no mention is made of an owl”.⁹² This severe accusation has eroded honesty of Eusebius even though Lightfoot while kept defending his honesty gave satisfactory explanation: the honest way how Eusebius dealt with numerous quotations of Josephus elsewhere could be sufficient prove of unjust charge, moreover the bird was mention previously in the *Antiquities* 18:6-7.⁹³

The similar conclusion brought Foakes-Jackson; Eusebius quoted as from Josephus what he found elsewhere without careful examination of his authority this implies rather question of Eusebius accuracy rather than his integrity.⁹⁴

The most interesting point for me is that Czech text of *Ecclesiastical History* translated by Novák does not say even note about this failure.⁹⁵

5.2 Heretical genealogy started by Simon (HE 2.13)

I have tried to describe Eusebius’s effort to distinguish Christianity from paganism and Judaism in the First book of *Ecclesiastical History*; in this chapter I would continue by describing his attempts to distinguish Christianity from heresy in same way. Eusebius constructed unbroken line from Christ to his own days by recording the successions of the sacred apostles and same pattern he used for heretical genealogies. Heresy began with a certain Samaritan named Simon, whom Eusebius wrongly identifies with Simon Magus, who is mentioned in *Acts* 8:8-24. Eusebius build on Justin and Irenaeus, but only Eusebius

⁹² MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 164.

⁹³ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 164.

⁹⁴ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 68.

⁹⁵ NOVÁK, Jan. *Čirkevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1.vyd. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 30.

made a connection between Simon of Acts with Simon Magnus, thus Samaritan named Simon (HE 2.13) was identified incorrectly.⁹⁶ By this story Eusebius constructed another one genealogy of heretical teachers whereas heresy derived from its founder Simon Magus whose function was “historical anti-Christ”. The incorrect connection was found by Eusebius anchored in *Acts of Apostles*⁹⁷ (HE 2.13).

On the other hand Foakes-Jackson underlines, that authors as Justin Martyr or Irenaeus, whose testimony (excerpt from the *Adversus Haereses*) and story (excerpt from the *First Apology*) Eusebius used, are known to us by their extant works. According to Foakes-Jackson, it is clear that Eusebius used largely what Church possessed from the first.⁹⁸

5.3 Herod Agrippa II., King of the Jews (HE 2.20)

The twentieth chapter in the second book belongs to the shortest although Eusebius here fell into the inexcusable mistake while he claimed that emperor Claudius appointed Agrippa II as King of the Jews and Felix as procurator of the whole country of Samaria, Galilee and Peraea. From the beginning he reported the Jewish celebration of the Day of Passover which took place at Jerusalem in the year 48 AD but unfortunately it turned into turmoil and calamity eventually. According to Josephus, as Eusebius outlined, 30 000 of Jews were crowded around the temple and many of those were being trampled.

First of all it seems to me in this chapter was not any need to connect an account of appointment of Herod Agrippa II, the son of Herod Agrippa I, even though the use of the Roman emperor as time grid works as tool for Eusebius. According to Maier, the chronology structured most of the *Ecclesiastical History*⁹⁹ but in the Second book it brings

⁹⁶ DROGE, Arthur J. *The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History*. In: ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 504.

⁹⁷ DROGE, Arthur J. *The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History*. In: ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 505.

⁹⁸ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 70.

⁹⁹ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 89.

interpolations quite often. Foakes-Jackson literally reproduced a conclusion made by McGiffert thus he agreed on McGiffert 's view that treatment of Josephus was uncritical and unskillful¹⁰⁰ when Eusebius tried to quote the *Antiquities* 20:5. "Eusebius simply sum up in one sentence what filled half a page in Josephus":

Herod Agrippa II was given the kingdom after death of his father in 44 AD by the emperor Claudius, in the approximately same time when Fadus was sent as procurator (Felix showed as procurator in 52 AD). Five years later Agrippa was given the Chalcis Kingdom where he succeeded rulership of his uncle. In 53 AD he was transferred to the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysinias with the title of King but he never was King of Jews in same meaning as his father was, because Judea remained a Roman province and he ruled over northeastern part of Palestine only. Anyway he had right of appointing and removing the high priest, the right granted by Claudius to his uncle while he was ruling over Chalcis.

101

Thus McGiffert judged that Eusebius evidently wrongly supposed that Judea was not included in Roman Empire in that time, moreover Herod Agrippa II ruled over a few cities of Galilee and Peraea.¹⁰²

The other point, which interested me in this chapter was made by Maier, when he highlighted often-expressed theme for Eusebius: *God's vengeance overtook the Jews for crucifying Jesus, their "crime against Christ"*¹⁰³ although I would not sum this up I have to admit this message is clear in whole ten books of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Similar account could be found in chapter HE 2.25.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 69.

¹⁰¹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 189.

¹⁰² MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 189.

¹⁰³ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 90.

¹⁰⁴ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1.vyd. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 39.

5.4 The martyrdom of James (HE 2.25)

This chapter focused on martyrdom of James in the *Ecclesiastical History* is partly viewed as interpolated already from 1887 when Benedict Niese wondered if quotation from Josephus (which was used by Eusebius) was not forged, as Carriker outlined.¹⁰⁵ The reproduced quotation should be followed: “*These things happened to the Jews as retribution for James the Just, who was a brother of Jesus who was called Christ, for the Jews killed him despite his great righteousness.*”¹⁰⁶ This part from Josephus’ *Antiquities*, Book 20th, should be explaining the fall of Jerusalem as a direct result of the Jews’ execution of James. According to Carriker (and other scholars), this text did not appear to belong to the part discussing of James’ death in the 20th Book of *Antiquities*.

Moreover Carriker outlined that Josephus had not ever stated that James’ martyrdom caused the fall of Jerusalem although what is even more interesting that Origen in *Contra Celsum* attributed the very same explanation of the fall of Jerusalem to Josephus as well.¹⁰⁷ Even though scholars did not agree on explanation, how death of James had become connected to the fall of Jerusalem, part of them judge that it was attempt of Origen to correct Josephus’ explanation of the fall of Jerusalem meanwhile amplified the treatment of Josephus on the death of James (e.g. martyrdom) or it could be use of interpolated text already by Origen, therefore Eusebius quoted it.

According to Grant’ *Eusebius as Church Historian*, Origen used a Christianized text of Josephus¹⁰⁸ which is opinion in agreement with Ulrich. The *Eusebius as Church Historian* belongs to the crucial books for my thesis although I was not able to find the copy of it. Fortunately this book is often quoted in the texts which are available to me, partly due to plenty of opinions caused controversies among scholars. However Carriker

¹⁰⁵ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 159.

¹⁰⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 83.

¹⁰⁷ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 159.

¹⁰⁸ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 160.

denoted the altered (Christianized) text was interpolated after Origen but before Eusebius.¹⁰⁹

On the other hand Lawlor and Oulton suggested that Origen and Eusebius used a common source, which could be a collection of extracts¹¹⁰ but still this would implied that Eusebius did not obtain the copy directly of the 20th Book of *Antiquities* or he did not explore the book enough as it seems to me.

According to McGiffert, who also firmly stated that this passage was not found in Josephus texts, but is given by Origen's *Contra Celsum* (I.47), he is absolutely sure that Eusebius did not invent it, rather he copied the interpolation from Origen therefore he did not agree on Jachmann's conclusion, blaming Eusebius of "willful deception".¹¹¹ McGiffert perceived the core of the problem, Eusebius great confidence in Origen, his unbounded admiration for him and his uncritical acceptance of quotation from Origen's texts although Eusebius was not able to find the copy of the mentioned text.

If one would take McGiffert conclusion into account, it is not possible to accept Carriker's opinion on interpolation, especially hint of Carriker about curiosity of the same interpolation which occurs in Origen's *Contra Celsum*.¹¹² Rather one should consider an unprecedented acceptance of Origen's texts by Eusebius therefore I would suggest a state of doubt and uncertainty when Eusebius processed the writings of Origen. What makes situation even complicated is extent used of Josephus in the Second book of *Ecclesiastical History*, thus did really Eusebius need to turn to Origen?

Finally, I would like to outline the note of Baras, who proposed the "historiosophical" reasons for interpolating text of Josephus by Eusebius as Carriker outlined. The term "historiosophical" closely relates to the term "second sophistic" which

¹⁰⁹ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 161.

¹¹⁰ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 160.

¹¹¹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 201.

¹¹² CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 159.

is widely used by Corke-Webster¹¹³ who devotes a lot of space in his chapter to explain this term: “...modern scholarship has encouraged a reading of literary Greek culture of the imperial period as the identity negotiations of provincial Greek elites struggling with their newfound subordination in the Roman Empire.” This includes Origen same as Eusebius who were both geographically and socially members of local Greek elite, thus their writings could be read in this light.

Pre-Constantinian Christian texts, especially those which concerning martyrdom (in this case martyrdom of James) should be also read in the light of second sophistic literature, as Corke-Webster proposed. The martyrdom was symbol of resistance, thus these texts rejected the potential happy life under the Roman Empire and served as model for would-be martyrs and served as the symbolic refecton of current reality and domination of Roman Empire, moreover Corke-Webster insisted on better understanding both Origen and Eusebius when one will bear this on mind. Although this opinion is very complicated it brings more aspects into significant features of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*.

¹¹³ CORKE-WEBSTER, James. Mothers and Martyrdom: Familial Piety and the Model of the Maccabees in Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Ecclesiastical History*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 3, 51-82. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 69.

6 The Third book of Ecclesiastical History

This book is longer and fuller than the Second one although more confusing since very different subjects could be found under the different headings. The very first topic named in order of importance is the Episcopal Succession, unsurprisingly.

According to Foakes-Jackson, who offered same explanation as other scholars, Eusebius saw the biggest importance in proving continuity of Christian Church, to present it as old and well-standing institution.¹¹⁴

On the other hand I am able to see another point, which is completely genuine for me. The line of perpetually continuity of Episcopal Succession (succession of the great sees) could be viewed as counterpart of the regular succession of emperors, which were expressed similarly. Moreover I have already showed that emperors work as tool of time grid.

In the Third book there are at least ten chapters, which are mostly very short and their purpose is mainly to give us the Episcopal succession; at Rome (chapter 2, 13, 15, 35), at Alexandria (chapter 14, 21), at Antioch (chapter 22, and 37) and at Jerusalem (chapter 23, 33 and 36). Foakes-Jackson brought to mind although Eusebius outlined the bishops of Rome very carefully he knows almost any extra information about them, their see or about Church. On the other hand is clear he realized importance of the Roman see, moreover without him we would not have any information about Popes as Anicetus and Victor (HE 5).¹¹⁵

In all of enumerated chapters bishops were named but there are two exceptions, Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, where Eusebius described more.

¹¹⁴ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 73.

¹¹⁵ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 86.

6.1 Married apostles (HE 3.31)

In this part Eusebius was cited Clement of Alexandria, the *Miscellanies*. Obviously this chapter continuous after HE 3.30 and there is a reason, why he deals with marriage of the apostles. At first Clement described a sect led by deacon Nicolaus, according to McGiffert's translation with notes of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, while he showed his good common sense which allowed to him to approve marriage in general and to avoid of extreme asceticism (leading to monasticism later) although he was rather an exception among Fathers.¹¹⁶ Clement supposed to be describing marriage of the apostles to denounce the Nicolaus' sect. Thus in next chapter (HE 3.31) Eusebius stated he outlined Clement because of those who rejected marriage moreover counted those apostles who were married. This part of *Historia Ecclesiastica* had become viewed as very provocative.

According to Clement, Paul addressed part of his letters to his wife even though Eusebius did not specify that part. At first Maier proposed the *Epistle to the Philippians* 4:3 and he outlined that the Greek word *suzuge*, literally "yokefellow", could be translated either "wife" or "comrade". Maier also claimed it is unknown whether Paul was married.¹¹⁷

According to Backus, who paraphrased Calvin's commentary on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* 9:5 (which could be following quotation of Clement in Eusebius' chapter) who claimed that Paul could surely said so as an unmarried man also. However Calvin did not interpret this passage against marriage of clergy, oppositely he concluded it reports about marriage generally.¹¹⁸

The same conclusion outlined McGiffert when he reminded the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* 7:8 as an evidence of completely opposite statement of Paul about his wife even though this part could be explained as if he was widower also, according to

¹¹⁶ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 289.

¹¹⁷ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 118.

¹¹⁸ BACKUS, Irena. Calvin's Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An analysis. *In: The Sixteenth Century Journal*. The Journal of Early Modern Studies. 1991, vol. 22, No.3. Page 427.

McGiffert.¹¹⁹ In his notes to translation of *Historia Ecclesiastica* he illuminated a background; He insisted on Clement who was the only one Father being claimed that Paul was married and this was solely based on his exegetical work. Eventually he counted those who Paul's marriage denied (Tertullian, Hilary, Epiphanius and Jerome).

Finally it seems to me that Clement based on his own exegetical work came to a conclusion that Paul was married, thus Eusebius cited his *Miscellanies* against the followers of sects mentioned in previous chapter HE 3.30, the sect led by Nicolaus and other one led by Matthias. My own conclusion would be Eusebius's effort to fight against heresy not to hunt for wives of the apostles.

6.2 Johannine authorship: John the Apostle or John the Elder? (HE 3.40)

Eusebius quoted the famous fragment of Papias (dealing with the beginnings of gospel composition and link of connection with the Apostles) to put the record straight what was written by Irenaeus, who was defending the Fourth Gospel and who depended on a written source, the work of Papias, *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord*¹²⁰ (e.g. the famous fragment of Papias). For us the most important quotation was done by Irenaeus while he designated Papias as a “*man of the earliest period, a hearer of John and companion of Polycarp*”.¹²¹ Eusebius was examining misinterpretation made by Irenaeus while he cited Papius' fragment, and he admitted the name John was outlined twice, thus Johannine authorship could had been questioned. The case of the *Revelation* was crucial, as Bacon claimed, “*If it was written by the Apostle John it must be admitted as canonical, but otherwise cannot even be classed with the disputed books*”.

Eusebius had strong bias in favor of Dionysius of Alexandria, great objector against heretics, who was maintaining the *Revelation* differed in style and standpoint from the

¹¹⁹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius. The History of the Church*. Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 290.

¹²⁰ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 127. Maier called the work of Papias as *The Sayings of the Lord Interpreted*.

¹²¹ BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. *In: Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 2.

Gospel and the *First Epistle* (the “undisputed” Johannine writings).¹²² This connection supports the fact that Eusebius had been getting back to Dionysius again in the Seventh book (HE 7.25) moreover Maier stated that Dionysius was the second one to whom Eusebius devoted most space in *Historia Ecclesiastica*.¹²³ Also Stevenson was focused on this chapter in sense of documents which illustrated this topic further, which helps me to get orientated in this complicated issue dealing with Dionysius approach.¹²⁴ According to Foakes-Jackson, the immediacy of the reign of Christ for a thousand years (nowadays we would call it a Millenarianism) was spread in Egypt in the third century, where Nepos’ view of the second coming of Christ in a book on the *Revelation* prevailed. By Nepos was published a book which name was *Confutatio Allegoristarum* (the *Refutation of the Allegorists*), but Dionysius of Alexandria went to his district to convinced him and his followers of their error. Eusebius devoted to this topic chapter 24th and 25th in the Seventh book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* (HE 7.24-25)¹²⁵ moreover Foakes-Jackson called this episode as the greatest of ecclesiastical miracles and we would see example of the Higher Criticism.¹²⁶

Eusebius was influenced in Dionysius reasoning and argumentation against the *Apocalypse of John* and he was quoting his theory with approval. Eusebius considered the theory of Revelation as the work of “another John in Asia”.¹²⁷ Although there was weakness in Dionysius theory which has to be mentioned, he was not able to point any other John in Asia, than the Apostle but hallelujah! It is here, Eusebius came with great discovery while he found desired evidence in the Papias fragment. Papias indeed refer to

¹²² BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 3.

¹²³ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 285.

¹²⁴ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 271.

¹²⁵ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 97.

¹²⁶ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 98.

¹²⁷ BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 4.

another John besides the Apostle, who was called the Elder. Eusebius based his argumentation as follows: “*that it was the second (the Elder), if one will not admit that it was the first (the Apostle), who saw the Revelation, which is ascribed by name to John.*”¹²⁸ Moreover Eusebius admitted that Papias was not hearer of Aristion and the Elder John (or the Apostles), but just gave their traditions into his writings.

First of all, there is Irenaeus erroneous placing of Papias as a successor of Apostles and disciples of Apostles in Asia. Eusebius made thorough research of the work Papias and he was able to find the place of Papias, not at the second but at the third remove from apostolic authority. Papias was not even hearer of disciples of Apostles. Why then does Eusebius not pursuit to correct the error of Irenaeus?¹²⁹ According to Benjamin Bacon, who suggested admission that Papias was not even a hearer of the second John (the Elder) would conflict with the authenticity of the Gospel and the inauthenticity of the Apocalypse too. The more questions and more answers could be found in the Syriac version of Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica*, as Bacon kept on comparison by Greek (Eusebius version) and Syriac version of the Papias Fragment. Also the collision of Papias friendship with Polycarp should be examined since Eusebius outlined wrong date of Polycarp’ death, but this will be questioned elsewhere.

According to Foakes-Jackson, who did not pay too much attention to this chapter, he included it among the most interested chapters in the Third book. The testimony of Papias and “his acquaintance, if not with the Apostle John, at least with apostolic men, is of inestimable value”.¹³⁰

Next question which aroused, who then were the Elders? There was a group in the original mother church and home of the Apostles, the self-evident authorities in interpreting the Lord’s commandments. Aristion could be unknown member of Palestinian

¹²⁸ BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 5.

¹²⁹ BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 8.

¹³⁰ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 77.

group, John the Elder was probably identical with Jerusalem elder of that name, whose death is placed by Epiphanius in 117 A.D. (HE 4.6).¹³¹ In the same generations were daughters of Philip. Bacon made indications to prove that the Elders in this case were no more Apostles than were Papias' own teachers. Papias included two elements of this oral gospel: reports of Apostles' sayings and teachings of their own immediate followers, called "words of the Elders".¹³²

Finally, it seems to me that Eusebius bent the truth while he was digging the answers. Although it would be very interesting to exam this particular issue thoroughly, unfortunately I do not have enough abilities and space for more detailed research in my thesis. Let me simplified this small part of history as Eusebius perceived it: according to Dionysius, the Revelation differs from the Gospel but they could not afford to jeopardize authenticity of the Gospel and the Revelation, that is why Eusebius traced down two different person both named John and wrote: "...it is likely that the second saw the Revelation bearing the name of John-unless anyone prefer the first."¹³³ Thus Eusebius introduced history which satisfied everyone.

¹³¹ BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908.

Page 19

¹³² BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Volume XXVII, part 1. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Page 22.

¹³³ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN 0-8254-3328-2. Page 127.

7 The Fourth book of Ecclesiastical History

7.1 The rescript referring to the Christians by Antonine emperors (HE 4.19)

This letter Eusebius quoted in Justin's *Apology* supposed to be written by Antoninus Pius addressed to the Commonalty of Asia, was seen as spurious by Maier, because of an overtone of Christian apologetic in some phrases: "*But you [Commonalty of Asia] hound them [Christians] into trouble by accusing them of atheism and thereby add to their resolve to choose apparent death rather than life for sake of their own god [God]. They, then, become the conquerors [martyrs] when they sacrifice their lives rather than obey your commands.*"¹³⁴ Maier did not suppose that letter was invented by Eusebius, rather than uncritically used by him from unknown sources even though Maier outlined that other scholars deem it as genuine though interpolated document.

According to Foakes-Jackson, the rescript was placed in the reign of Antoninus Pius, but is quoted as emanating from Marcus Aurelius, thus for him the rescript is "*almost certainly forgery*".¹³⁵ Eusebius statements about Antonine emperors are very confusing already from chapter 17 until chapter 22, although Maier outlined clearly: Antoninus Pius, who ruled 138-161 was replaced by his two adoptive sons who ruled jointly, Marcus Aurelius (161-180) and Lucius Verus (161-169),¹³⁶ on the other hand Stevenson did not even mention Lucius Verus.¹³⁷ But could be the rescript written by Marcus Aurelius quoted in Justin's *Apology* if generally accepted date of Justin death is 165?

Fortunately, very detailed analysis made by McGiffert shed more light on this issue; At first he insisted on completely contradiction of this rescript to the relation of State toward Christianity during the second century, moreover a language and a sentiment make it impossible to call it genuine, thus he found rescript as a forgery, which was made in the second century.

¹³⁴ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 145.

¹³⁵ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 80.

¹³⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 146.

¹³⁷ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D.* 337. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 411.

Secondly, McGiffert judged it was just an accident that the rescript was found in Justin's *Apology* as it did not belong there. He explained it was simply appended to the rescript of Hadrian (HE 4.13) by later copyist. He also outlined the very detailed background, which provides an explanation of ascription to Marcus Pius or to Marcus Aurelius¹³⁸ unfortunately I do not have enough space in my thesis for it.

Thirdly, the most striking contradiction of the rescript McGiffert perceived the statement: "*They [Christians] repose greater trust in their god [God], whereas you neglect yours and the worship of the Immortal.*" For him is impossible that such an orthodox worshiper of Roman gods as Antoninus Pius would call the Christian God as *Immortal* in distinction from the gods of the Romans.¹³⁹ Maier agreed on that, while he stated that Antoninus Pius favorable attitude toward Christians looks significantly inconsistent with the deaths of some prominent Christian martyrs¹⁴⁰ for instance Telesphorus to whom Eusebius devoted chapter 14 (HE 4.14).

Finally, The climax of the forged rescript McGiffert perceived in very last sentence: "*But if anyone persists in taking action against one of these people [Christians], the accused shall be acquitted of the charge even if it is clear that he is one, and the accuser shall be liable to penalty.*" McGiffert briefly and pointedly outlined this part really goes further than Constantine,¹⁴¹ which made me laugh.

The following chapter HE 4.20 says that Melito, bishop of Sardis confirmed the rescript but Maier refuted this sentence and claimed it is unknown how Melito could confirm it.¹⁴² Eusebius outlined this confirmation should be apparent from Melito's *Defense*, which was sent to emperor Lucius Verus. McGiffert again is very skeptical and presumed if Melito had known favorable edict as it was this rescript, he would paid special

¹³⁸ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 348.

¹³⁹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 349.

¹⁴⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 145.

¹⁴¹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 350.

¹⁴² MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 145.

attention to it. Thus according to McGiffert, Melito's testimony is really against genuineness of this edict¹⁴³ even though Eusebius outlined the excerpt from Melito for opposite purpose.

It seems to me that Eusebius did not pay enough attention to his sources in this case, thus he produced forgery in his truly passion to find evidences which would help the process of establishing the Church. Again, we could find the apologetic overtone, which is getting worse the final picture of *Ecclesiastical History* in sense of its reliability. But still Eusebius is for me passionate apologist rather than pragmatic storyteller. According to Carriker, Eusebius was simply confused about identities of the various emperors named Antoninus, therefore the mistakes what he made about dates and emperors was not the only one.¹⁴⁴ Noteworthy Bardesanes was incorrectly placed under the reign of Marcus Aurelius at HE 4.38.

Thus in this chapter I would agree with Maier review supported by Carriker, who suggested it was just Eusebius' confusion, which caused mistakes although McGiffert condemnation ("*this really goes further than Constantine*") inspired me. Unfortunately I do not possess the writing *Eusebius as Church Historian* by R. M. Grant which contains a chapter dealing with confusion of Eusebius about Bardesanes, consequently a various scholarly conclusions could not be complete, because R. M. Grant belongs among the greatest critiques of Eusebius reliability as far as I know.

¹⁴³ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 350.

¹⁴⁴ CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9. Page 264.

8 The Fifth book of *Ecclesiastical History*

8.1 Blandina (HE 5.2)

As I have already demonstrated, Eusebius main purpose was to show great triumph of Christianity over the paganism same as the heresy. This triumph was characterized by the emperor Constantine and by cooperation of church and state. The era of Christian values came into the scene and one of the Eusebius's tools was institution of martyrdom. It gave opportunity how to commemorate Christian men and women so I could name couple of martyr accounts which supposed to serve as an apologetic function.¹⁴⁵ The beginning of the Fifth book shows evident reading between the lines and reveals Eusebius's apologetic aim while he demonstrated his interest in story about Blandina (HE 5.2). This tale it is not only significant achievement of noble Christian whose suffering and death supposed to be impetus to conversion for pagans while they reflected torture, but also the valor of Blandina sent a strong message to Christian men as well. If "weaker" woman could remain firm in the faith in spite of pain, Christian males were encouraged to show their loyalties in a pagan environment even harder.¹⁴⁶ Blandina was able to survive all of the forms of torture and still confessed her Christian commitment, even the wild beasts did not attacked her. Eusebius described Blandina's unbelievable endurance and also wonderment of pagan tormentors, that she was remarkably solid in her opinions and all of this gave only one apologetic message.

8.2 The victory of Marcus Aurelius over the Marcomanni and Quadi (Germans and Sarmatians) (HE 5.7)

The account of actual occurrence took place in Hungary in 174 AD while the Roman army lead by the emperor Marcus Aurelius was extremely thirsty. I will only briefly outline what Eusebius described; the Melitene legion (which was called Melitene

¹⁴⁵ CLARK, Elizabeth. Eusebius on Women in Early Church History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 9, 256-268. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 258.

¹⁴⁶ CLARK, Elizabeth. Eusebius on Women in Early Church History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 9, 256-268. ISBN: 9004096884. Page 260.

because of a city in Eastern Cappadocian, part presently called Armenia and city called Malatya) was praying when sudden violent thunderstorm started. It relived Roman army from being thirsty moreover it frightened barbarians thus Roman army won the battle eventually.

According Foakes-Jackson, the victory due to the storm is an undoubted fact which was well attested as any event in ancient history¹⁴⁷ even though we are able to find some inconsistencies in Eusebius account, let me outline those;

First of all the previous chapter (HE 5.6) Eusebius mentioned Marcus Aurelius although he concluded that chapter by words “*Such were the events that took place under Antoninus*” then he was opening the chapter HE 5.7 by words “*Word has it that when his brother, ...*” while is obvious Eusebius keep describing the account of Marcus Aurelius. I have already presented the Eusebius’ confusion by the Antonines. Moreover Maier stated Eusebius wrongly implies that the Antoninus mentioned in HE 5.6 instead Lucius Verus, but the emperor in the chapter HE 5.7 continues to be Marcus Aurelius¹⁴⁸ which is confirmed as historical fact.

Another issue follows soon, when Eusebius outlined that story was told also by writers outside Christianity and by Christian authors as well, even though Eusebius did not specify those heathen writers, McGiffert provided detailed examination.

Quite naturally it was considered as miraculous occasion, thus Dio Cassius ascribed the wonder to the Egyptian magician Arnuphis, Capitolinus ascribed it to the prayer of Marcus Aurelius and the emperor himself let made the coins on which Jupiter was attacking the German tribes with thunderbolts.¹⁴⁹ McGiffert continued by enumeration pre-Eusebian Christian accounts of this occasion while he reported appearance of it in the forged edict of

¹⁴⁷ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 83.

¹⁴⁸ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 180.

¹⁴⁹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 432.

Marcus Aurelius, in the *Apology* of Apolinarius and the *Apologeticum* (the *Apology*) of Tertullian.¹⁵⁰

Eusebius outlined his own opinion on accounts of both parts about the wonder, as always, but it seems to me that his pressure on the reader now is more urging than usual, the reader should have be able to recognize, whose account is more valid: “*The pagan authors have recorded the astonishing phenomenon, though without acknowledging it as the result of Christian prayers, but our own writers, as lovers of truth, have described the episode in a simple, straightforward.*” In my reading between the lines I could discern clear message stating the Christian authors follow the facts in comparison of pagan authors who believes in supernatural power.

Thirdly, the previous paragraph sounds ridiculous in conclusion when we considered the interpolation highlighted by McGiffert; Claudius Apolinarius, bishop of Hierapolis is very far from the truth in his statement considering the name of the legion. Eusebius stated that according to Apolinarius, the legion received the name from the emperor based on this wonder “*the Thundering Legion*”. But Maier disagree on this statement because of legion called *the Legion XII Fulminata* (or “*the Thundering Twelve*”) which was sent already by Titus to guard a crossing of Euphrates at Melitene in Cappadocia in 70 AD even though Maier judged the error was made rather by Apolinarius than by Eusebius.¹⁵¹ Disagreement is even more difficult because McGiffert believed in Eusebius mistake caused by too quick examination of the passage in Apolinarius.¹⁵² Foakes-Jackson concluded this chapter by sentence that the origin of the legion name is more or less apocryphal, but the victory due to the storm is an undoubted fact.¹⁵³

Finally, same pattern which is often used by Eusebius could be found in this chapter too. There is historicity of Eusebius’ accounts on one side while the misleading

¹⁵⁰ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 433.

¹⁵¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 180.

¹⁵² MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 433.

¹⁵³ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 83.

words on the other. In favor of the defense of Christianity Eusebius did not hesitate to seek the truth which would be willing to accept until the end of times.

8.3 Robert M. Grant: Eusebius' picture of the Antonine emperors (HE 5.7)

Unfortunately, Grant insisted on Eusebius' neglect and falsification of historical information for his apologetic purpose, I am going to focus now on topic of Antonine emperors as related to Christianity. I feel an obligation to outline the main points of Grant's chapter dealing with Eusebius intentional reinterpretation and misinterpretation of the Antonine emperors, called *Eusebius and His Church History*¹⁵⁴ although Grant's view on Eusebius seems to me on the edge of scholarly consensus. Thus I would prefer the view of Maier and McGiffert which I have mentioned above (simplified: according to them the errors were not made intentionally).

When Eusebius quoted from Tertullian's *Apologeticum* (the *Apology*), who had spoken of a pro-Christian letter written by Marcus Aurelius, according to Grant, Eusebius claimed that Tertullian in this letter praised the emperors Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, Pius and Verus for not enforcing the laws against Christians, but Eusebius did not mention the name of Verus.¹⁵⁵ Moreover Grant claimed that Eusebius did not mention Verus intentionally, because he had not fitted into his theory of Antonine attitudes.

First of all it seems to me very interesting that in Maier's translation of the *Ecclesiastical History* there is really any mention about Verus in quotation from

¹⁵⁴ GRANT, M. Robert. *Eusebius and His Church History*. In: REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4.

¹⁵⁵ GRANT, M. Robert. *Eusebius and His Church History*. In: REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 243.

Tertullian¹⁵⁶ but in Czech translation by Novák, is Verus mentioned although in different order (Trajan, Vespasian, Pius, Verus and Hadrian).¹⁵⁷

Secondly Grant admitted that for some scholars Eusebius's confusing picture of the Antonines is due to simple error, as I indicated above, but Grant judged what possibly had started as error led to complex revision of the history of the later second century; Grant continued by taking into account the martyrdom of Polycarp.¹⁵⁸

He quoted "some modern scholars who supposed" that Polycarp was martyred in 167 which would conflicted with Eusebius testimony, because he devoted chapter 23 from the Fourth book of the *Ecclesiastical History* to martyrdom of Polycarp under the reign of Lucius Verus¹⁵⁹ (HE 4.23). If we consider the joint rulership of Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius after death of Antoninus Pius (from 161 to 169 AD¹⁶⁰) we conclude that Polycarp was cannot be martyred under the Antoninus Pius, which is what Grant highlighted: In Eusebius's view Antoninus Pius (who ruled 138-161) was no persecutor, thus he insisted on wrong date of Polycarp's death, even though Maier outlined the date of Polycarp's martyrdom 156 AD¹⁶¹, Stevenson agreed on date 156, which happened under the Antoninus Pius.¹⁶²

Grant offered us theory that Eusebius intentionally falsified the date of Polycarp's martyrdom because of not fitting into his scheme that Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius as well, were no persecutors.

¹⁵⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 181.

¹⁵⁷ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1. vydání. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 90.

¹⁵⁸ GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. In: REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 243.

¹⁵⁹ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1. vydání. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 71.

¹⁶⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 146.

¹⁶¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 145.

¹⁶² STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 411.

Thirdly, Grant claimed that Eusebius had supported picture of Lucius Verus as persecutor already at the *Preface* of the Fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical History*, where Eusebius ascribes Gallican martyrdoms to Lucius Verus due to show that he was persecutor (HE 5.2), see also HE 4.23.

According to Grant “it was Tertullian who was responsible for misleading Eusebius. His was the theory, anticipated by Melito, that bad emperors persecuted Christians, while good ones did not.” As the sources Grant outlined Tertullian’s *Apologeticum* 5 (the *Apology*).¹⁶³ Thus according to Grant’s opinion, Eusebius had needed precedent for good emperors so he used Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. In the contrary Eusebius (as Grant judged) used Lucius Verus as bad emperor, who persecuted Christians and indicated the Polycarp and Gallican martyrs suffered under Lucius Verus thus he falsified his account.¹⁶⁴

Fourthly, Grant did not hesitate to claim, that Eusebius began to work on his theory already when he wrote *Chronicle* (where we can find the references to Tertullian’s *Apologeticum*). Eusebius had placed the deaths of Polycarp, Pionius and the Gallicans under the reign of Lucius Verus, but had not noticed the relation of Gallicans to bishop Eleutherus (the martyrs wrote letter to Eleutherus). According to Grant, this proved Eusebius falsification because Eleutherus was bishop only one year -177 AD.¹⁶⁵ Again, couple problems aroused:

A) According to Stevenson, Eleutherus was bishop from 175 to 189 AD.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. **In:** REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 247.

¹⁶⁴ GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. **In:** REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 244.

¹⁶⁵ GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. **In:** REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 247.

¹⁶⁶ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 411.

- B) According to Maier, Lucius Verus died in 169 AD.¹⁶⁷
- C) In conclusion, Lucius Verus could not be responsible for deaths of Gallican martyrs if we take into account preconditions above (as it was written in HE 5.2).
- D) Grant eventually stated “*there is no reason to assign the martyrdom of Polycarp to the period 161-169*”¹⁶⁸, the period which marked the joint rulership of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Thus I would follow the date of Polycarp’s death in 156 AD as Maier and Stevenson indicated. Compare HE 4.23.

Finally, I described topic relates with Antonine emperors and how it could be tangled and difficult to understand. Moreover the opinion of scholars on this issue varies a lot and it is hard to decide for one version. Rather I have tried to demonstrate misinterpretation of Eusebius which could be easily viewed as entirely and intentionally purpose to change the history as it had fitted to him or one can perceived it as butterfly effect; the small error not even made by Eusebius could cause picture of historian with complete lack of credibility as is Eusebius perceived by Robert M. Grant. As I have written above, I perceive Grant’s view on Eusebius on the edge of scholarly consensus although it provides me an important point of view on credibility of the *Ecclesiastical History*.

¹⁶⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 146.

¹⁶⁸ GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. **In:** REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. McKenzie. *Understanding the Sacred Text*. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings. Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4. Page 245.

9 The Sixth book of *Ecclesiastical History*

In the Sixth book of *Ecclesiastical History* Eusebius interrupted the narrative biographical events of the life of Origen, moreover he devoted much more space to Origen than anyone else in the *Ecclesiastical History*. This is radical and significant departure from the structure of other books from the *Ecclesiastical History*. Although this biographical framing fits into the chronological structure of the Sixth book, it is singular appearance in Eusebius' work. The biography of Origen and its emergence from general historical overview underlined the importance of Origen as a figure to Eusebius. The reason, why Eusebius changed formulaic presentation in the Sixth book of *Ecclesiastical History* is double;

Firstly, Origen was under the doctrinal attack, thus Eusebius together with Pamphilus composed the *Apology for Origen*, which extended also to the *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁶⁹

Secondly, there was a huge desire to establish a lineage of teaching at Caesarea and connection to Eusebius' own teaching circle¹⁷⁰ because Origen did have direct meaning for Eusebius' own context. Pamphilus and Eusebius were restorers of tradition of Origen at Caesarea even though the closest physical teaching connection is through Pierus at Alexandria.¹⁷¹ The depiction of Eusebius of the Alexandrian school reflects a desire to establish a lineage of teaching at Caesarea.

9.1 The Alexandrian school and Origen (HE 6.3)

¹⁶⁹ HE 6.23

¹⁷⁰ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 83.

¹⁷¹ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 84.

Eusebius was sincerely committed to the theory of apostolic succession, which linked the bishops of the major sees in unbroken chains leading back to Christ¹⁷² and he traced bishops of Alexandria back to Mark (disciple of the apostle Peter). But according to Grafton and Williams, the first bishop of Alexandria was Demetrius (189-232)¹⁷³ who came to power when Origen was a boy. According to Walter Bauer, Alexandria had no bishops before Demetrius but rather college of presbyters.¹⁷⁴ While bishop supposed to controlled Christian schools, Origen was only eighteen years old when Demetrius appointed him as a head of the catechetical school at Alexandria (AD 204) according to Eusebius. Moreover he later claimed that Demetrius was almost begging for appointment of Origen¹⁷⁵. Although Eusebius description of development in the school thanks to Origen was rather vague¹⁷⁶ his point was written clearly: Teaching of Origen was set in period of Demetrius's Episcopal supervision. At first Demetrius truly admired Origen as Eusebius claimed but this was changed later¹⁷⁷ and eventually the relationship between Demetrius and Origen sounds a bit confusing based on the *Ecclesiastical History*, as if Eusebius' intention was not to tell us whole story, also Grafton and Williams pointed out, that Demetrius influenced the life of Origen rather negatively.

Nevertheless Eusebius might be intentionally inaccurate when he only hinted that Clement was director of the school of Alexandria before Origen¹⁷⁸ on the other hand Eusebius was completely clear about Pantaenus who was succeeded by Clement.¹⁷⁹ Again, this line which intertwined the Fifth and the Sixth book of *Ecclesiastical History* had one main goal, as I believe, to introduce the catechetical school of Alexandria as a long-

¹⁷² GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 70.

¹⁷³ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 70.

¹⁷⁴ HE 5.24

¹⁷⁵ HE 6.14

¹⁷⁶ HE 6.15

¹⁷⁷ HE 6.8

¹⁷⁸ HE 6.6

¹⁷⁹ HE 5.12, HE 5.13

standing institution controlled by the bishop Demetrius at Origen's time¹⁸⁰. This brings me again to the tool which I have been trying to describe from the beginning of my thesis, the tool which was used by Eusebius – the idea summarized as follows: the most ancient was always the best. Thus Eusebius tried to highlight the school as an old and well-established institution. Repeatedly we could see distorted story and a few inconsistencies in his effort to present the school and Origen's teacher career.

9.2 The Alexandrian Christian philosophical erudition was brought to Caesarea (HE 6.19)

Although Eusebius was not direct heir of the Alexandrians, Eusebius portrayed himself as a member of a Caesarean offshoot of the Alexandrian tradition.

Eusebius tied Origen to Caesarea through historical accounts and Pamphilus to Origen through repetitive language and books. Eusebius suggested the school of Pamphilus and school of Origen were united in common tradition, *“a tradition that ties Eusebius' teaching lineage to the antiquity and everything else he claims for the Alexandrian school tradition. The physical link between the two traditions is Origen.”*¹⁸¹

Again we are able to recognize the attempt of establishing teaching lineage same as Eusebius tried to establish bishopric tradition (and other lineages as well) in his attempt to prove the Christianity was not anything new and any part of Christian life did not have features of novelty, neither teaching was not without clear connections.

In the Nineteenth chapter Eusebius hinted how Origen brought Alexandrian teaching to Caesarea during a period of civil riots in Alexandria moreover Eusebius did not hesitate to highlight “real” intention of Origen: he supposed to come to the city to pursue his studies. According to McGiffert, Origen arrived to Palestine, not to Caesarea, because

¹⁸⁰ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 71.

¹⁸¹ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 86.

of “bishops” who are spoken of¹⁸² therefore Origen’s coming to Caesarea could be questionable.

Surprisingly, Eusebius devoted a lot of space to description of Origen’s authority and his importance but he is oddly silent about relationship of his teacher, Pamphilus and Origen, while Eusebius listed students of Origen in the Thirtieth chapter of the *Ecclesiastical History*, he did not mention Pamphilus at all. According to Penland, the lack of concrete information about the teaching relationship shows that Pamphilus was not an immediate student of Origen. However Eusebius never said this explicitly, Eusebius did not mention neither teacher (nor teachers), who connects Pamphilus and Origen in the *Ecclesiastical History*, although Penland outlined Pierus.¹⁸³ Eusebius provided enough information to readers to make simply connection between the most learned men and the most respected teachers in Caesarea.

According to Penland, the next one strategy which was used by Eusebius, while he was making lineage of Origen and Pamphilus, was association with technical vocabulary, the use of word *diatribê*. In the *Ecclesiastical History* the term was used in association with Origen and with the catechetical school in Alexandria and it referred to philosophical or theological teaching activity. Moreover only two cities had been taking place of *diatribê* were Alexandria and Caesarea. At first, the word was used in the introduction of catechetical school in the Twelfth chapter of the Fifth book and the second appearance is in reference about Origen’s teaching, in *diatribê*, because there was no one in charge of catechetical school.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 555.

¹⁸³ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen. **In:** JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 86.

¹⁸⁴ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen. **In:** JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 87. See also HE 5.12 and HE 6.3.

Pamphilus is the only person other than Origen to have a *diatribê* at Caesarea and it is only counterpart to the Alexandrian school in the works of Eusebius, Penland highlighted.¹⁸⁵

Finally Penland harshly criticizes Eusebius' attempt to "*perform rhetorical work to construct and enhance this lineage... a narrative explanation, the creation of connections between points to form a line. Lineage is the struggle to relate elements to one another and to present the illusion that they have always been integrally related.*"¹⁸⁶

In my point of view, I agree on Penland opinion that Eusebius had tried to act as restorer of inheritance by Origen, which was presented in many different aspects (*diatribê*, the establishing of library in Caesarea, gathering works of Origen by Pamphilus and Eusebius as well). On the other hand it remains the fact that Eusebius maintained the most information about Origen alive, for the use of future generations, in his works although it could be clear target how to "*establish, maintain, cultivate and in part create the legacy of Origen at Caesarea*", according to Penland.¹⁸⁷

Anyway let me proceed to the very last issue relates with Origen therefore with the Sixth book of Eusebius's work, which need to be mentioned in my thesis;

9.3 The Hexapla (HE 6.16)

The earliest surviving text that refers to Origen's Hexapla we could find in *Historia Ecclesiastica*.¹⁸⁸ Grafton and Williams proposed evidences the original Hexapla was used by Eusebius at Caesarea library, moreover Eusebius listed three main translations placed

¹⁸⁵ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 88. See also HE 7.33.

¹⁸⁶ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 88.

¹⁸⁷ PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. *The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen*. In: JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6. Page 93.

¹⁸⁸ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 89.

alongside the Septuagint by Origen¹⁸⁹ even though not in the order in which they appear in two surviving fragments. According to Paul Maier the right order was as follows: Hebrew, a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew, the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint and Theodotion.¹⁹⁰

Interesting question is why Eusebius omitted the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew when he referred about the Hexapla? Based on the Sixth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* which is in detail focus on Origen, we could assume the goal of Eusebius was not the structure of the Hexapla but rather great zeal and impressive production of Origen.¹⁹¹

Indirect answer why Eusebius did not pursuit of a detailed description of the form of the Hexapla could be found in Eusebius's *Canon (or Tables)* which was the second part of *Chronicle*. Timothy Barnes, the great questioner of widely accepted beliefs, suggested that Eusebius had formal model for his work in Origen's Hexapla since it was written in innovative use of parallel columns to enable students of the Old Testament to move from version to version.¹⁹² This would means Eusebius another work the *Chronicle*, was not in all aspects distinctive. The Hexapla played a central role in Eusebius's arrangement of world history even though historical tables had already existed and a tool of historical synchronism as well, but still the Hexapla had a great impact on Eusebius.¹⁹³

Eusebius learned from the Hexapla (apart from other works) that a tabular presentation could bring information into completely new meaning. The using of tabular format enabled quick comparison across the pages of codex significantly affected Eusebius' way of making books while he engaged precedent set by Origen. The new way

¹⁸⁹ HE 6.16

¹⁹⁰ MAIER, Paul. *Eusebius-The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 218.

¹⁹¹ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 91.

¹⁹² GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 142.

¹⁹³ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 170. HE 6.16.

of synchronism of sacred texts made easier to compare different accounts although he avoid of fragmenting the biblical texts.¹⁹⁴

Finally, my point seems to be clear; why Eusebius devoted to Origen so much space in *Historia Ecclesiastica* even though he wrote only couple lines about the Hexapla while he described incorrect order of columns?

Although the Sixth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* contained many different accounts on Origen, I will not explore issue relates with him anymore. It seems to me that there are also interesting chapter which did not involve Origen at all but still are worthy to discuss them a bit;

9.4 The question of authorship the *Commentary on Hebrew* (HE 6.14)

While I was searching for parts of *Historia Ecclesiastica* where Eusebius misquoted or falsified some texts, I came across the article which is summing up object of interest some of sixteen-century scholars: the question of authorship the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the work attributed to Paul or to Luke or to Clement. According to Calvin, Eusebius' evidence was crucial to discrediting Pauline authorship.¹⁹⁵ In Calvin's *Argumentum* there was enough space devoted to disprove Pauline authorship and Calvin used Eusebius' part in the Sixth book while he misquoted it. Based on the Czech translation of *Historia Ecclesiastica* done by Novák, it is obvious that Eusebius cited Clement who was supporting the authorship by Paul.¹⁹⁶ The very same conclusion emerges from Maier translation with commentary: "The epistle to the Hebrews he (Clement in the *Outlines*) attributes to Paul but says that it was written in Hebrew for Hebrews and then carefully translated by Luke for the Greeks. Therefore the translation has the same style

¹⁹⁴ GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7. Page 194.

¹⁹⁵ BACKUS, Irena. Calvin's Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An analysis. **In:** *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. The Journal of Early Modern Studies. 1991, vol. 22, No.3. Page 425.

¹⁹⁶ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1.vyd. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 112.

and color as Acts.”¹⁹⁷ It is clear that it was rather Clement, not Eusebius, who evoked Luke as a possible translator.

According to Backus, it is interesting that it could not be a simple lapse on Calvin’s part while he focused on authorship of Hebrew in the *Argumentum*. Moreover she demonstrated the view of Bullinger and Erasmus, whose were asserted Paul was the author. Thus conclusion is simple: “Anyone reading the *Argumentum* quickly and without any knowledge of the sources will take it that Eusebius’ evidence is crucial to discrediting Pauline authorship of Hebrews.”¹⁹⁸

At the moment I am not searching for the author of Hebrews, rather considering the fact that already at the sixteenth century the image of Eusebius was quite dubious and his works were perceived full of interpolations of unlearned monk while not much credence should be given to them by readers, Calvin stated.¹⁹⁹ I will keep searching for ambiguous parts of *Historia Ecclesiastica* to help understand where all of flagrant divergences came from because right now it is not always transparent error of Eusebius.

¹⁹⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The church history*. A new translation and commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 216.

¹⁹⁸ BACKUS, Irena. Calvin’s Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An analysis. *In: The Sixteenth Century Journal*. The Journal of Early Modern Studies. 1991, vol. 22, No.3. Page 425.

¹⁹⁹ BACKUS, Irena. Calvin’s Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An analysis. *In: The Sixteenth Century Journal*. The Journal of Early Modern Studies. 1991, vol. 22, No.3. Page 428.

10 The Eighth book of *Ecclesiastical History*

10.1 Eusebius began writing differently (HE 8.1)

The Eighth book differs from the previous ones, because Eusebius from now was considered as historian of contemporary events, who reported his own observations on the one hand but a martyrologist and a panegyrist of Constantine on the other hand and all of these intentions are visible in the Eight, the Ninth and the Tenth book. According to Maier, the stylistic contrast in this book is noticeable, because Eusebius was an eye-witness, who was no longer depend on past sources for his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.²⁰⁰ Foakes-Jackson proposed to treat with him as an historian of contemporary events and he defended Eusebius against charges made by Edward Gibbon, the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, who perceived Eusebius as “reporter only what is to the credit of the Christians, and deliberately suppressing all that was not to their honor.”²⁰¹

This opinion should not be accepted unless we consider the opening chapter of the Eighth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* where the Great Persecution had started;

Eusebius wrote from his personal experience and his words were supported by his eye-witnessing. He described bishops who strove for supreme power and complacency, envy, hypocrisy and quarreling in the Church which caused that divine justice allowed to starting of persecution. Foakes-Jackson insisted on disregarding Gibbon’s strictures because of insufficient description of Eusebius’s friends (e.g. martyrs), which could be simply explained by his focusing on heroism rather than on lapses during trials.²⁰²

According to McGiffert, Eusebius quoted foretold by Jeremiah, which could be found in the *Lamentation* 2:1-2 and the second quotation is picked from the *Psalms* 89:39-

²⁰⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 317.

²⁰¹ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 99.

²⁰² FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 100.

45²⁰³, while Maier agreed on those sources²⁰⁴ but it is interesting that Czech translation by Novák outlined source from the *Psalm* 88:40²⁰⁵

10.2 A deep ulcerous fistula of Galerius (HE 8.16)

Lactantius, who belonged to the same generation, who was tutor of Crispus (Constantine's son), who was possible author of *De Mortibus Persecutorum* (*On the Deaths of the Persecutors*) had the main object to show that emperor who persecute the Christians would die miserably. According to Foakes-Jackson, the book was written brilliantly while is more interesting than recording actual events, because of the vilest and the nastiest motives describing deaths of persecutors.²⁰⁶ It seems to me that Eusebius let being inspired by describing horrific details which caused deaths of persecutors; “*Divine punishment overtook [Galerius], which started with his flesh and went on to his soul. An abscess suddenly appeared in the middle of his genitals, then a deep ulcerous fistula that ate into his inner intestines incurably*”²⁰⁷, excerpt from Eusebius' HE 8.16.

First of all let me clarify whose responsibility the Great persecution was. There were five emperors mainly blames; Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, Maximin and Maxentius. Diocletian who ruled 284-305 AD was not able to rule over such vast empire, thus he decided to divide into halves. Western part (Italy, Gaul, Britannia, Spain and western North Africa) was governed from Milan by Maximian (*an Augusti*) and his subordinate emperor Constantius Chlorus (*a Caesar*). The eastern part was ruled by

²⁰³ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 687.

²⁰⁴ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 291.

²⁰⁵ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1. vydání. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 152.

²⁰⁶ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 100.

²⁰⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 311.

Diocletian as Augusti and Galerius as Caesar from Nicomedia.²⁰⁸ According to Stevenson, the government was called the Tetrarchy from 293 AD.²⁰⁹

Secondly, even though it is not interesting that Constantius Chlorus (the father of Constantine) did not belong among to the “blame ones”, I would like to outline a few connections why he did not; all of the virtues were credited to Constantine family by Eusebius, same as vices which were credited to their rivals. The next reason could be the fact that Constantine Chlorus ruled as Caesar at Western part of the empire, Gaul and Britain, thus Eusebius was much more familiar with Diocletian and Galerius, the eastern rulers.

Thirdly, according to Maier, Caesar Galerius was the one, who commenced the Great Persecution on the Christians while he convinced Diocletian to do so although Diocletian would most probably tolerated the Christians²¹⁰ if he was not persuaded by Galerius moreover McGiffert stated that Prisca, the wife and Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian were very friendly to the Christians and McGiffert little doubted whereas they could be Christians or at least catechumens although they kept in secret their faith.²¹¹ Also Foakes-Jackson outlined the four successive edicts which marked the stages of the Great Persecution and Galerius caused to issue the second edict, which maintained capital punishment on the bishops and the imprisonment of clergy.²¹²

Finally I hope it is clear now, why Galerius belonged among the most hated man, thus is understandable that Eusebius took care about very detailed and disgusting description of Galerius’ fatal disease. On the one hand, as I have already showed, the literary from that period consisted of panegyrics, exaggerating or detraction motives moreover Lactantius had set the pattern by his *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. On the other

²⁰⁸ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 318.

²⁰⁹ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 411.

²¹⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 318.

²¹¹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 686.

²¹² FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 101.

hand I cannot imagine how would Eusebius know such details even though I do not suggest that Eusebius misinformed rather I would insist on parenthesis which is really catchy for readers. When I studied at University of Helsinki we spent one entire lecture by reading passages from the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which could be credited Eusebius' writing art rather than following historical facts.

The very last point which I want to highlight in this chapter is absolutely wrong translation made by Novák, who thought Eusebius described illness of Maximian²¹³ which is complete error. Maximian ruled until the year 305 AD, when he was persuaded by Galerius to retired (Stevenson stated it was abdication²¹⁴). The fact that Eusebius described the disease which caused death in the same chapter which he devoted to the end of persecution it simply cannot be before 305 AD, when Maximian was succeeded by Severus at the Western part of the empire. Again I perceive the urgent need to revise the Czech translation of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which was one of assumption for my thesis.

²¹³ NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1. vydání. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988. Page 162.

²¹⁴ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 411.

11 The Ninth book of *Ecclesiastical History*

The Ninth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* was sharply focused on the policies of Maximinus between the years 311 and 313, moreover it was chronologically precise and it was perceived the changes in imperial policy, in comparison with the Eighth book as Barnes judged²¹⁵, although Eusebius stated no clear dates, which would be concerned with the actions of Maximinus.²¹⁶ Fortunately some of the documents which was quoted by Eusebius contained cross-reference enabled to solve the problem deals with “*most precise ordinance in the most complete terms in behalf of the Christians*” (as was translated by Maier²¹⁷ in the HE 9.9), the ordinance issued by Constantine and Licinius, which we called the Edict of Milan.

According to Barnes, N. H. Baynes was able to identify this ordinance with letter wrote by Constantine to Maximinus, published by Lactantius in his *On the Deaths of the Persecutors (De Mortibus Persecutorum)*²¹⁸, which is writing about divine anger toward everybody who persecuted Christians). As I have already indicated, the contemporary historian of Eusebius, Lactantius, was the one who gave us Latin original of the Edict of Milan, based on McGiffert’ note.²¹⁹ Moreover it looks it was not coincidence that Constantine had been sympathetic to Christianity since he was young man, because he lived at court at Nicomedia, which was city where Lactantius and Lucian of Antioch were well known.²²⁰

Eusebius devoted a lot of space to Maximinus in the Ninth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* although Maier called him Maximin or Maximin Daia, by Stevenson is called

²¹⁵ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Constantinian settlement. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, ©1992. Chapter II/IX, 635-657. Page 647.

²¹⁶ BARNES, D. Timothy. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. ISBN: 0-674-61126-8.

²¹⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 330.

²¹⁸ BARNES, D. Timothy. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. ISBN: 0-674-61126-8.

²¹⁹ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 767.

²²⁰ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. **In:** BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 646.

Maximinus²²¹. To be list of chapters complete I outline HE 9.1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 even though Eusebius mostly called him “the tyrant of the East”. According to Maier, it would be better if Eusebius had been focusing on Constantine rather on the other hand Eusebius’s concern reflected the again-persecuted Christian East in contrast to now-liberated West as eye-witness to the persecution.²²²

To be my thesis coherent I would like to make clear that the battle at the Milvian Bridge happened between Constantine and Maxentius, who was co-ruler of tetrarchy, which means it happened between to Western rulers of tetrarchy. Therefore even it is very difficult to get orientated in Roman politics, it is understandable that most space Eusebius devoted to “the tyrant of the East” Maximinus, who was Eastern co-ruler together with Licinius.

11.1 Miracle at the Milvian Bridge (HE 9.9)

Although I would discuss conversion of Constantine more detail in the last chapter of my thesis, let me focus on miracle which happened before the Battle at the Milvian Bridge.

According to Barnes, Constantine refused to enter the Rome to give thanks to Jupiter as it was pagan act instead he fought on 28th October 312 under a Christian emblem instead.²²³

According to Eusebius, it was respond to the vision of the cross of light, which was seen by Constantine and his army during the march. This vision was followed by a dream in which Christ appeared to Constantine.²²⁴

²²¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 384.

STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 415.

²²² MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 339.

²²³ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. In: BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 646.

²²⁴ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 340.

According to Lactantius, in the dream before the battle Constantine saw first two letters (the *chi* and the *rho*) of Christ's name in Greek, moreover he heard the words "*In hoc signo vinces*" translated by Maier as "by this sign you will conquer".²²⁵



The morning after the dream-night, this symbol was on Constantine's soldiers shields and on his helmet (this monogram was later incorporated into the imperial standard).²²⁶

Therefore Eusebius wrote about witnessed miracle as in the days of Moses and reminded Exodus 15:4-5. In the same way as the chariots of Pharaoh, Maxentius and his army went down into the depths of Tiber, like a stone, after the Milvian Bridge collapsed when the soldiers crowding onto the bridge of boats. As a result thousands of Maxentius soldiers were drowned.²²⁷

According to Barnes, reliability of *On the Deaths of the Persecutors* by Lactantius need to be considered, while the manuscript was badly corrupt in many passages which include the description of the Christian sign. Barnes proposed different reading of key part: "*Constantine was instructed in a dream to mark the heavenly sign of God on the shields and thus join battle. He did as he was ordered and marked Christ on the shields. Armed with this sign, the army seized its swords*"²²⁸. Barnes insisted on no evidence better than rumour for the psychological experience, which Lactantius had, thus he assimilated the conversion of Constantine to one of the most familiar religious stereotypes – action in response to a dream.²²⁹

²²⁵ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 340.

²²⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 340.

²²⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 342.

²²⁸ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. In: BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 384.

²²⁹ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. In: BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 384.

Interestingly Eusebius proposed very different story because he had already known about conversion of Constantine when he wrote the Ninth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* and it seems to me he had an effort to point a miracle on one hand but on the other there visible intention to avoid the pagan manifestation of religion as it was for example magic. Thus Eusebius was focused on statue and its description: “...*knowing* [Constantine] *that his help came from God. He immediately ordered a trophy of the Savior’s passion placed in the hand of his own statue, and when it was erected in the most public spot in Rome, holding the Savior’s sign in his right hand...*” as it was translated by Maier.²³⁰

²³⁰ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 331.

12 The Tenth book of *Ecclesiastical History*

The last books of *Historia Ecclesiastica* reflect the torments and repressions against Christians that Eusebius witnessed and experienced in his own imprisonment, according to Maier.²³¹ The very last chapter of *Historia Ecclesiastica* was originally written as conclusions at the Eighth book (the conclusion of Constantine's war with Licinius in 324 AD) and transferred at the end of the Tenth book after editions by Eusebius. According to Barnes, Eusebius added a brief account of Licinius persecution and defeat to the Tenth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica* (HE 10.9) while he was removing the documents which concluded the edition of 315 AD.²³²

I would like to set eyes on panegyric style of Eusebius when he provide triumphalist, uncritical portrait of Constantine. On the other hand, it was a convention to write panegyrics and flowery epithets as “the emperor beloved by God”.

12.1 Victorious emperor filled with love for humanity (HE 10.9)

The part which caught my attention, therefore I would present more details is the very last paragraph of this chapter (HE 10.9.8) as it was translated by Stevenson:”...*there were promulgated in every place ordinances of the victorious Emperor full of love for humanity and laws that betokened munificence and true piety.*”²³³

The evidence that Constantine was sincere in Christianity and its charity and love for humanity is overwhelming, therefore Constantine's conversion is questionable. According to Barnes, we must distinguish between direct and indirect evidence for Constantine's conversion, moreover the only independent direct witness are Lactantius (*On the Deaths of the Persecutors/ De Mortibus Persecutorum* although badly corrupt) and Eusebius. Thus it is Eusebius, not Lactantius, whose testimony is more reliable although it

²³¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 373.

²³² BARNES, D. Timothy. The Constantinian settlement. In: ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, ©1992. Chapter II/IX, 635-657. Page 650.

²³³ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 337.

is later.²³⁴ Timothy Barnes relies on scholars as Baynes, A.H.M. Jones, Andreas Alföldi, Jean Gaudement, S. Calderone and Fergus Miller who have assembled a large amount of evidence to show that from the winter 312/3 AD Constantine commenced to proclaim his adherence to the Christianity, moreover he gave a plenty of privileges to the Church and reshaped Roman law in favor of Christianity. Eventually Barnes argued there cannot be any doubt that Constantine only pretended worshipping of Christian God from about the time of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge.²³⁵

On the other hand Stevenson outlined the numerous deeds, which have denied Constantine's striking care for humanity (for instance punishments which was ordained by Constantine) thus those are arguments which could deny his conversion. It could be partly because of transition from paganism to Christianity. Secondly we should not forget that Constantine was still the emperor for all Roman citizens and majority of them was pagan, who in their personal and domestic lives did not reflect Christian ideals and values neither, according to Maier.

The question have aroused; if conversion of Constantine was genuine, how could be explained the execution of Crispus and suicide of Fausta (which had never been solved)? Is this an example of truly Christian life? The description of Eusebius is confusing, because he wrote about Crispus as "*the most humane prince*"²³⁶ or "...*Crispus, a ruler most dear to God and like his father in every way*"²³⁷. On the other hand, Eusebius wrote so yet before the execution, according to McGiffert.²³⁸ Stevenson proposed that Crispus was executed in mysterious circumstances in 326 AD during Constantine's visit of

²³⁴ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. **In:** BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 381.

²³⁵ BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. **In:** BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9. Page 382.

²³⁶ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 371.

²³⁷ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History*. A New Translation and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 371.

²³⁸ MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 811.

Italy.²³⁹ Even more confusing is quotation from *Vita Constantini* where Eusebius stated that Constantine was singularly averse to the death penalty.²⁴⁰ What Crispus had done to be executed by the first Christian emperor, who "beloved by God"?

According to Maier, there are still many scholars who insist that conversion of Constantine was done on basis of cold political calculation rather than conviction. Maier named Jacob Burckhardt who belonged among those who disputed Constantine's conversion. He claimed that it was simple strategy to use Church for support of Constantine to serve his personal ambitions. Scholars who share this theory usually point to the titles, which were using by Constantine even after the conversion, *pontifex maximus* of Roman paganism and the *Sol Invictus* (emblem on his coinage which depicts unconquered sun). The last and the strong argument, which I outline against Constantine's conversion, is the execution in his own household.²⁴¹

It seems to me that Eusebius in the very last chapter of *Historia Ecclesiastica* was describing the emperor in atmosphere full of hopes and happiness (as McGiffert translated "*There was oblivion of past evils and forgetfulness of every deed of piety, there was enjoyment of present benefits and expectation of those yet to come.*"²⁴²) while he realized the triumph of the Church. Therefore it could not be surprising the proverbial happy ending, similar to the fairy tales, which was written by Eusebius as by author who did not hesitate to invent the ending, which would be serve to apologetic purpose in best way.

²³⁹ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337.* London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 337.

²⁴⁰ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337.* London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 337.

²⁴¹ MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2. Page 373.

²⁴² MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church.* Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1. Page 811.

13 Conclusion

While reading *Historia Ecclesiastica* one has to realize that Eusebius wrote it in the early fourth century, which was a period of huge movement of the Church. Suddenly, the Church was aligned with the principles of the imperial state. While one is considering that Eusebius had lived forty years in peace until the Great Persecution under Diocletian commenced, his attempt was not only to provide a definitive statement about the place of Christianity in the general history. He marked the beginning of a new understanding of history while attempting to legitimize the past history of Christianity in the eyes of its opponents. He maintained that Christianity was not a historical novelty, for Eusebius it was rather identical with the religion of patriarchs. Christianity was a nation distinct from pagans and Jews, it was a race from Adam linked to Moses and last but not least to Eusebius own time. In fact, Christian teaching was not neither new nor strange but the Church became a new reality, moreover there was an increasing influence and establishment of the Church in Eusebius' times.

Therefore, the attempt of Eusebius was to align the loyalty of his Christian readers with the Roman administration and to match his readers' sympathies toward the new situation of the Church when Constantine came as an expression of divine providence. Eusebius sought to renegotiate (based on his experience of peace) the relationship between the Church and the Roman administration by means of literature, especially by his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

I believe that it was not a mere coincidence that after all editions of *Historia Ecclesiastica* it had a happy ending, just like a fairy tale. The triumph of Christianity supposed to be the very last information which should have been perceived by readership. The writing ends with the triumphant emergence of the faith into the peace which God gave to his people and this surely should be perceived as apologetic pursuing rather than firm focus on veracity, because veracity it is not a point in this question. The matter is an era, when Eusebius wrote *Historia Ecclesiastica* as well as the relationship between new

reality perceived by Eusebius and objective true (historical facts). I sincerely believe that *Historia Ecclesiastica* narrated a plenty of stories while they were representing subjective description of reality rather than lies or intentional untruth (with good intentions of apologist).

In it is obvious that Eusebius recognized the “real-life” effect of his writing *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which is one of the reasons why the reader is able to find so many discrepancies, abridgements, interpolations, conflicting passages but flagrant divergences as well. Therefore the aim of my thesis was to explore the text, which was riven with errors on the one side, and to present different views of different scholars, on the other side. The accuracy and the veracity of Eusebius as a historian has been challenged by numerous scholars while his description of the contours of early Christian history has been generally approved.

Arthur Droge accurately states: *One of the uses of history is to control the present and to predict the future. Another is to legitimize the authority ...The future Eusebius wanted to predict and control and the authority he wanted to legitimize required him to construct a different past. Therefore, Eusebius was more than a recorder of history he was also an inventor of it.*²⁴³

The example of Eusebius’ attempt to invent a “suitable” history according to his own vision I presented in the chapter dealing with the Second book, especially his account of the death of Herod the King (known to us as Herod Agrippa I).

Eusebius was not only a church historian but also a church apologist with a particular vision of history. The apologetic purpose of *Historia Ecclesiastica* is evident in the beginning of his work, when Eusebius commenced to record the succession of bishops. This effort of Eusebius is described in detail in the chapter *The Prologue* and *The most ancient was always the best.*

²⁴³ DROGE, Arthur J. *The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History.* In: ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992. Chapter 19, 492-509. ISBN 9004096884. Page 506.

An example of his clear apologetic intent is denoted in the chapter entitled *Johannine authorship: John the Apostle or John the Elder?* It contained the part of my thesis which deals with the Third book of *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

I showed an example of his apologetic overtone in the combination with using quotations from Christian authorities by Eusebius in the chapter *The rescript referring to the Christians by Antonine emperors* (the chapter outlined in the part deals with the Fourth book). Therefore, Eusebius produced falsification in his passion to find evidence which would contribute to the process of establishing the Church. The apologetic overtone in combination of using quotation contributed worsens the final picture of *Ecclesiastical History* in sense of its reliability.

Even though the term *eusebia* usually has connotations of religious duty and devotion to the divine, some parts of *Historia Ecclesiastica* suggest that Eusebius was rather devoted to Origen and his attempt was to celebrate him in an uncomplicated fashion. Already Eduard Schwartz raised doubts about the accuracy of stories relates with Origen, moreover Eusebius's picture of Origen was warped by apologetic concerns. The significant deviation from the structure of other books *Ecclesiastical History* could be perceived in the Sixth book where Eusebius interrupted the narrative with biographical events of the life of Origen (Eusebius gave much more space to Origen than anyone else in *Ecclesiastical History*). The reason why Eusebius changed formulaic presentation in the Sixth book of *Ecclesiastical History* is double; on the one hand, Origen was under the doctrine attack, thus Eusebius cooperated on the *Apology for Origen*, which extended also to *Ecclesiastical History*. On the other hand, there was an attempt to establish a lineage of teaching at Caesarea and connect it with Eusebius own teaching circle, therefore, the description of the Alexandrian school by Eusebius reflects his desire to establish a lineage of teaching at Caesarea.

Finally, I must agree with the conclusion by Stevenson that “*Eusebius attempted so many branches of literature*”²⁴⁴, we may be sure that his main interest was not in Chronology or History, but it was in Apologetics. As Lake appropriately concluded, Eusebius was the last and the greatest of the Apologists, because when the Church was accepted within the Empire, there was no reason anymore to write a justification of Christianity.

Another feature of Eusebius’ writing could be perceived also in his effort to legitimize Christian authorities with well-educated figures, who used their skills for the welfare of the Christian community. He did so while he used a revolutionary concept of the rise of the Church although his history was different from those of all his predecessors, he was the first one who mentioned all his sources by names and quoted them, which was an extremely unusual technique. Thanks to this method we possess quotations from authors who would otherwise be lost in Antiquity. Eusebius acted as an editor who knew the power of his writing. Quotations and great authorities behind them made Eusebius’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* highly effective, although some parts of writing are gravely corrupt. However, the manner of Eusebius’ handled his sources may be worth researching although I did not really focus on it. Among secondary sources which I gathered about *Historia Ecclesiastica* I came across a description by Foakes-Jackson that “*Eusebius was not a profound thinker, a man of books rather the man of reflection*”²⁴⁵ which, in my opinion, suits him perfectly.

I presented the unintentional misleading quotation while Eusebius was trying to underpin his own writing by quoting other authorities in the Second book, in the chapter called *Herod Agrippa II., King of the Jews* when Eusebius quoted Josephus’ *Antiquities*.

The pattern of lineage or “fluent line of facts and connections”, which is often used by Eusebius, could be found in many chapters in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, although the

²⁴⁴ STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337.* London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7. Page 35.

²⁴⁵ FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian.* A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933. Page 61.

historicity of his accounts is distrusted, because of the misleading words, dates in the writing. In defense of Christianity, Eusebius did not hesitate to seek the truth which would be possible to accept until the end of time.

I demonstrated already the very first example of this tool in the chapter called *The Prologue* in the beginning of the main part of my thesis, while I presented intentional use of methods by Eusebius to show the relation of churchmen and Christian authorities with the generation of apostles. Eusebius presented their writings later, than they actually were, to connect Christian authorities with apostolic age.

Another example of this pattern of lineage is outlined in the chapter called *Heretical genealogy started by Simon* (the part dealing with the Second book of *Historia Ecclesiastica*). It describes attempt of Eusebius to differentiate Christianity from heresy, while he constructed unbroken line of Christian teaching from Christ to his own days by recording the successions of the sacred apostles to promote Christianity. The same pattern of lineage he used for heretical genealogies to discredit them.

I firmly believe I pointed this tool out also in the chapter called *The Alexandrian school and Origen*, which is included in the part dealing with the Sixth book of *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Eusebius's effort to introduce the lineage of Origenic teaching and Alexandrian erudition and sapience was visible in his presentation of its unbroken continuation in Caesarea, homeland of Eusebius, while he was celebrating Origen as described earlier in the thesis.

A completely new feature of pattern of lineage is suggested at the beginning of the chapter which deals with the Third book. The line of perpetually continuity of Episcopal Succession could be perceived as a counterpart of the regular succession of emperors, which were expressed similarly. Therefore it seems possible to me that the purpose of Eusebius was to present the Christianity not as a counterpart but also in balance to Roman administration although I did not come across this idea in my sources. However, the effort of Eusebius to align the loyalty of his Christian readers towards the Roman administration is described at the beginning of the Conclusion section of my thesis.

To sum up, I believe that *Historia Ecclesiastica* by Eusebius of Caesarea represents a book written with passion rather than a guile or lie, which I hopefully demonstrated in the main part of my thesis, dealing with particular chapters of *Historia Ecclesiastica*. The clearly intentional apologetic method, which I also demonstrated, confirms my basic assumption that Eusebius was an extremely devoted Christian thinker rather than a liar. The question of subjective and objective perception of reality by Eusebius is still hanging over the *Historia Ecclesiastica* without definite approval or condemnation. However, as far as I was able to provide clear conclusions on particular chapters, which I have been thoroughly studied, I provide them.

I sincerely believe my thesis proves the very important fact, that there is a lack of sources for *Historia Ecclesiastica* by Eusebius translated into Czech language. The translation made by Novák urgently needs to be updated and confronted with scientific research on Eusebius's writing by current scholars. While I was working on secondary sources I realized that Czech translation contains a number of grave mistakes of various natures. It seems to me that the issue dealing with Eusebius as the first church historian is not appealing enough to be continuously studied by Czech scholars although it represents paraphrase of "*hic sunt leones*" in current Czech historic-theological research.

14 Bibliography

14.1 The Primary sources

LAKE, Kirsopp. *Eusebius; The Ecclesiastical History with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

MAIER, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History. A New Translation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, ©1999. ISBN: 0-8254-3328-2.

MCGIFFERT, Cushman Arthur. *Eusebius: The History of the Church*. Oxon: Acheron Press, 2012. ISBN: 1-5058-6611-1

NOVÁK, Jan. *Církevní dějiny (Ecclesiastica historia)*. 1. vydání. Praha: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1988.

14.2 The Secondary sources

ADLER, William. Early Christian Historians and Historiography. **In:** HARVEY, Susan Ashbrook and David G. HUNTER. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 28, 585-602. ISBN-13: 978-0-1992-7156-6.

BACKUS, Irena. Calvin's Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An analysis. **In:** *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. The Journal of Early Modern Studies. 1991, vol. 22, No.3.

BACON, Benjamin W. The Elder John, Papias, Irenaeus, Eusebius and the Syriac Translator. **In:** *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Yale University: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1908. Volume XXVII, part 1.

BARNES, D. Timothy. *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman history*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010. ISBN: 978-3-16-150226-2.

BARNES, D. Timothy. The Conversion of Constantine. **In:** BARNES, D. Timothy. *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers, 1982-93*. Hampshire: Variorum, ©1994. Chapter II/III, 371-391. ISBN: 0-86078-397-9.

BARNES, D. Timothy. The Constantinian settlement. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, ©1992. Chapter II/IX, 635-657.

BARNES, D. Timothy. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. ISBN: 0-674-61126-8.

BAUER, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. ISBN: 0-8006-0055-X.

CAMERON, Averil. Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History. **In:** MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo and Emilio GABBA. *Tria corda: scritti in onore de Arnaldo Momigliano*. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983.

CARRIKER, Andrew. *The library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, ©2003. ISBN: 9004-13132-9.

CASSIDAY, Augustine and Frederic W. NORRIS. *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c. 600*. New York: Cambridge University Press, ©2007. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81244-3.

CLARK, Elizabeth. Eusebius on Women in Early Church History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 9, 256-268. ISBN: 9004096884.

CORKE-WEBSTER, James. Mothers and Martyrdom: Familial Piety and the Model of the Maccabees in Eusebius of Caesarea's Ecclesiastical History. **In:** JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 3, 51-82. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6.

DEFERRARI, Roy J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Ecclesiastical History*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953. ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0.

DROGE, Arthur J. The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History. **In:** ATTRIDGE, Harold W. and Gohei HATA. *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1992. Chapter 19, 492-509.
ISBN: 9004096884.

FERGUSON, Everett. Eusebius and Ordination. **In:** *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 1962, vol. 13 (April). London: William Clowes and sons Limited, 1962. Page 139-144.

FOAKES-JACKSON, F.J. *Eusebius Pamphili: Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and first Christian Historian*. A study of the Man and His Writings. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons LTD., 1933.

GRAFTON, Anthony and Megan WILLIAMS. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, ©2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02314-7.

GRANT, M. Robert. Eusebius and His Church History. **In:** REUMANN, John, F. W. BEARE, Sheldon H. BLANK and John L. MCKENZIE. *Understanding the Sacred Text. Essays in honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings.* Valley Forge: Judson Press, ©1972. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 235-247. ISBN: 0-8170-0487-4.

GRANT, M. Robert. Civilization As a Preparation For Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius. **In:** GEORGE, Timothy and F. Forrester CHURCH. *Continuity And Discontinuity in Church History.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, ©1979. Chapter by R. M. Grant, 62-70. ISBN: 90-04-05879-6.

HALTON, T. Hegesippus in Eusebius. **In:** LIVINGSTONE, A. Elizabeth. *Studia Patristica vol. XVII, part 2.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. Chapter by T. Halton, 688-693.

LOUTH, Andrew. Eusebius and the birth of church history. **In:** AYRES, Lewis, Augustine CASIDAY, Andrew LOUTH and Frances YOUNG. *The Cambridge history of Early Christian literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Chapter 23, 266-274. ISBN: 978-1-1390-5384-5.

MENDELS, Doron. The Sources of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; The case of Josephus. **In:** PODERON, Bernard and Yves-Marie DUVAL. *L'Historiographie De L'Église; Des Premiers Siècles.* Paris: Beauchesne, 2001. Chapter by D. Mendels, 195-205. ISBN: 2-7010-1413-1.

MITCHELL, Margaret M. and Frances M. YOUNG. *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Origins to Constantine.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81239-9.

PENLAND, C. Elizabeth. The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen. **In:** JOHNSON, Aaron and Jeremy SCHOTT. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Harvard University, ©2013. Chapter 4, 83-96. ISBN: 978-0-674-07329-6.

STEVENSON, J.: *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London: SPCK, 1968. SBN: 281-00802-7.

15 Summary

Historia Ecclesiastica by Eusebius of Caesarea is writing which shows, that his attempt was not only to provide a definitive statement about the place of Christianity in the general history. He marked the beginning of a new understanding of history. Eusebius sought to renegotiate (based on his experience of peace) the relationship between the Church and the Roman administration by means of literature, especially by his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

The apologetic purpose of *Historia Ecclesiastica* is evident in the beginning of this work, when Eusebius commenced to record the succession of bishops. He produced falsification in passion to find evidence which would contribute to the process of establishing the Church. The apologetic overtone in combination of using quotation contributed worsens the final picture of *Ecclesiastical History* in sense of its reliability.

I believe that it was not a mere coincidence that after all editions of *Historia Ecclesiastica* it had a happy ending, just like a fairy tale. The triumph of Christianity supposed to be the very last information which should have been perceived by readership. Therefore the aim of my thesis was to explore the text, which was riven with errors, exaggerations and apologetic methods on the one side, and to present different views of different scholars, on the other side.

In conclusion Eusebius's description of the contours of early Christian history has been generally approved, while he was not only a church historian but also a church apologist with a particular vision of history.