INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Barry L. Cohen

TITLE Greek Philosophy and the Hebrew Scriptures Eusebius' Philosophical and Apologetical Interpretation of the Biblical Heritage of Ancient Israel

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

3/2/98
Date

Barry L Cohen
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed 18 September 1998
Date

Allan D. Satin
Signature of Library Staff Member

GREEK PHILOSOPHY AND THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES:
Eusebius' Philosophical and Apologetical Interpretation of the Biblical Heritage of Ancient Israel

by Barry L. Cohen

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
1998

Referee: Prof. Adam Kamesar

This thesis is dedicated to my family and friends, who remind me what is most important, and to Mr. John V. Lavecchia, an exemplary teacher.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: *A Presentation of the Greek Paideia and Its Relation to the Apologists*

As Alexander the Great defeated his enemies in the east, whether in Egypt, Syria, Persia, or Babylon he introduced his particular western "stamp." He built new cities, such as Alexandria in Egypt, settled foreign cities, and populated them all with his veteran Greek and Macedonian soldiers. Alexander, tutored by Aristotle, had been schooled in Greek philosophy, culture, science, and religion. He died at the height of his power, most likely stricken by malaria during his campaign in India. However, his influence and legacy remained vibrant, as his successors continued the expansion of western values to the east. Greek scholars, merchants, and traders moved to the lands conquered by the Macedonians. As they did, the Greek language and the Greek point of view spread throughout the known world.

The West, possessing its Greek *paideia*, roughly translated as "culture," had a unique paradigm, or way of viewing the world. This paradigm was molded by a number of systems based on language, culture, philosophy, and religion.

> ...[T]hese systems constitute the individual's conceptual world, that is, they govern the perspectives by which he views reality. As well as constituting his conceptual world, they also constitute the 'authority structures' and social worlds related to the conceptual so that when the conceptual and social are enmeshed they give concreteness to the 'picture.'[1]

Alexander hoped to create a single, unified world, based on the same Western, Greek paradigm that he learned as a child.

One's paradigm, by definition, comprises a number of different levels and categories, depending upon the context, the time, and the place. A way to understand the Greek

---

1 Christopher J. Berry, "On the Meaning of Progress and Providence in the Fourth Century," *The Heythrop Journal*, July 1977, p. 260

paradigm is to take a close look at its *paideia*, its culture. This is connected to a community's system of education, for this system reflects and instills society's values. These values include the standards set by family, social class, profession, race, and state.[2] While "culture" in a modern sense represents the characteristics of individual peoples, ethnicities, religions, and nations, it meant much more for the ancient Greeks. *Paideia* embraced a unique value concept and the pursuit of an ideal. While today, every people has what they call a culture and an educational system which reflects and supports it, "...the law and the prophets of the Israelites, the Confucian system of the Chinese, the Dharma of the Indians are in their whole intellectual structure fundamentally and essentially different from the Greek ideal of culture."[3] According to the Greek *paideia*, its people had a historical destiny to create a "higher type" of man. This could only be achieved through proper education.[4]

While Alexander the Great first exposed Greek paideia to the east, the Romans raised it to a higher level by making it the foundation of the empire. As they conquered the Greek people, they were exposed to their world view, their culture, the institutions of their society, and the conquerers embraced them as their own.

When west met east, the uniqueness of Greek culture became evident. One can first look at the position of the individual within the community. In the east, the individual is overwhelmed by the community, the community is overwhelmed by the ruler, and the ruler is overwhelmed by the god (or gods). In the west, each individual has infinite value and the freedom and ability to control his own destiny.[5]

Also, the western individual possesses a driving desire to discover and formulate the laws which govern reality. Furthermore, he has the belief that these laws will be

---

2 Werner Jaeger, *Paideia*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939), pp. xiii-xiv.
3 ibid, p. xvii.
4 ibid.
5 ibid, p. xix.

comprehensible, not mysterious rules beyond the ability of the human mind to understand through reason. The western individual learns how to break apart organic wholes into separate and distinct parts and how to put it back together. This worldview is reflected in their thought, speech, deeds, and art.[6]

The clearest contrast between east and west, however, was the crowning achievement of Greek paideia, philosophy. While other peoples had codes of law, the Greeks attempted to find the one *Law* pervading everything, in order to create harmony between their individual lives and their greater community. In other words, they worked to determine the universal patterns. "[Philosophy] is the clear perception of the permanent rules which underlie all events and changes in nature and in human life."[7]

These philosophical achievements relate directly to education and to paideia. The Greeks learned that in planning an educational system, they had to consider both the general natural principles governing human life and the specific laws by which humanity exercises its physical and intellectual powers.

> To use that knowledge as a formative force in education, and by it to shape the living man as the potter molds clay and the sculptor carves stone into preconceived form - that was a bold creative idea which could have been developed only by that nation of artists and philosophers.[8]

They were the first to see that education can be used to pattern human character according to an ideal. And this concept made the Greek *culture* at this time unique. The east had no comparable concept, no parallel ideal by which to model their communities, no similar means of educating in pursuit of an model of perfection.[9] Thus, a better definition of Greek *paideia* than "culture" is "the process of educating man into his true form, the real and genuine human nature." Again, the *paideia* adopted by the Roman empire used

---

6 ibid, p. xx.
7 ibid, p. xxi.
8 ibid, p. xxii.
9 ibid.

human investigation to identify the ideal and then determined the best means to move from where the individual is to where he should be[10].

A question is with which ideal did the Greco-Roman world identify? While the process originated in Greece, it moved beyond its borders and changed depending upon the stage of historical development of the people who embraced the same *paideia*. As a result, this ideal was never fixed and final.[11] One of the best sources on which to base the study of the evolution of the Greek paideia is classical literature. The following is but a sampling of its authors: Homer, Hesiod, Solon, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Isocrates, Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Plato. However, one must not overlook that Greek culture influenced many other areas of interest. Everyone embracing the Greco-Roman paradigm had an educational mission, expressing the same *paideia*. This included artists, poets, musicians, orators, philosophers, legislators, and authors.[12]

As Greek influence spread, west met east, and different worldviews collided. The Westerners claimed that their paradigmatic world view was superior, based upon the richness of its paideia. Again, while these views were molded by different paradigms, no eastern system possessed any cultural system that could rival the Greek paideia. However, what all peoples had in common, whether east or west, was their view towards tradition. A common definition of the concept is that

> ...there is one...authority which was an authority in the full sense, a body of teaching in which the fullness of universal truth was contained and with which it was not permissible to disagree, though of course it had to be interpreted rightly and intelligently.[13]

---

10 ibid, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

11 ibid.

12 ibid, p. xxvii.

13 A. H. Armstrong, "Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries A.D.," *Studia Patristica*, vol. XV, Part I (1984), p. 414.

In addition, this allegiance was to one authority, not any blanket acceptance of everything handed down from antiquity. For the various Platonic schools, their tradition was based upon Plato.[14] For the Jews, their tradition was based upon the Hebrew Scriptures and the teachings of Moses.

The Jews and the Greeks first made contact in Alexandria in the third century BCE. While the Jews initially could not relate with them in terms of Greek paideia, they could relate to them in terms of monotheism, and more importantly, philosophy. After Alexander's conquest, philosophy built the bridge linking east and west, fostering mutual understanding. The Greeks quickly labeled the Jews as a "philosophical race." The reason was "...that the Jews had always held certain views about the oneness of the divine principle of the world at which Greek philosophers had arrived only quite recently."[15] Alexandrian Jews easily related with the Greek concept of the importance of using reason and careful investigation to make sense of one's world.

In the lost dialogue of Clearchus, when Aristotle meets a Jew, the philosopher describes him as having a Greek soul, "the intellectualized human mind in whose crystal-clear world even a highly gifted and intelligent foreigner could participate and move with perfect ease and grace."[16] Of all Alexandrian Jews, Philo best represents the Greek paradigmatic world view. He was able to study and absorb *aspects* of the Greek tradition and the Greek paideia and use their terms and concepts to communicate his interpretations to his fellow Jews.[17] It follows that Philo, in order best to be understood by Alexandrian Greeks, chose to speak the vocabulary that they could understand, terms and concepts originating in the west, not the east.

---

14 ibid, p. 415.

15 Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 29.

16 ibid, p. 30.

17 ibid, pp. 30-31.

Four centuries later, with the rise of Christianity, a new group confronted both the Jews and Greeks. The Jews had an ancient tradition, as well as a paradigmatic world view, based on their Scriptures, and the Greeks had their own tradition, their paradigmatic world view and their paideia. As the Christians sought legitimacy and acceptance, its intellectual class created a large body of apologetic literature. The apologists were Christian writers, living between 120 and 220 CE, who made the first reasoned defense and recommendation of their faith to outsiders. Originally, they wrote to members of their own community in order to maintain unity and shared beliefs. An example is Clement's letter to the Corinthians. He stressed that if the Christian religion was to remain a true community, its followers would have to develop the discipline of the citizens of a well-organized state, with one spirit.[18]

This letter shows the influence of the Greek paideia upon the early Christian communities. Clement attempts to educate the Corinthians according to expected norms, standards, and expectations of the faith, what he saw as the counterpart to the Greek culture.

> There can be no doubt that what he takes over in his letter from a great philosophical tradition and from other pagan sources is included by him in this comprehensive concept of divine paideia, for if this were not so, he could not have used it for his purpose in order to convince the people at Corinth of the truth of his teachings.[19]

Clement makes Jesus the instrument of proper education, the source of tradition, with his closing words of thanks to their savior "through whom Thou hast *educated* and sanctified and honored us."[20]

Since the Christians only accepted as tradition the teachings of Jesus as found in their Bible, they could not deviate, disagree, or reject its instruction. However, when

---

18 ibid, p. 16.
19 ibid, p. 25.
20 ibid, p. 26.

confronted with the dominant Greek paradigm, they had more freedom. "This meant that the whole of Greek philosophy was free to them for critical reading, selective acceptance or rejection, and adaptation according to the requirements of their own sacred and authoritative tradition."[21] Even though the apologists always had veto power, their early tradition clearly was open to outside influences. As he worked to come to terms with the dominant culture in which he lived, an apologist had to find links between believing Christians and the outside world. "As he tries to present its ideas as persuasively as possible, the persuasion is likely to convert the converted and modify their ideas, at least in form."[22]

By the early second century, these Christian advocates, to gain greater understanding, began to shift the focus of their writings from the Christian community to the outside world, specifically to the Roman emperors, such as Hadrian in 124 and Antonius Pius in 156. But just a few years later the focus shifted again, in response to state-sponsored persecution, starting with the bloody martyrdoms in Gaul in 176. They now had to write to the general pagan community, specifically the intellectual and ruling class, in order to justify their existence and prove the truth of Christianity, as well as to defend against various accusations and slanderous charges.[23] Unlike in the past when they wrote for the Christian community, they could no longer assume that their target audience had a working knowledge of Christianity and that it knew what they were trying to defend. In order to teach them the basics, they had to speak in terms they could understand. Thus, to enable outsiders to join in an honest discussion, they rejected eastern esoteric spiritualism and chose western philosophical reason.[24] At this point, an exchange of views began between pagan and Christian, building upon the previous exchange between pagan and

---

21 Armstrong, "Pagan and Christian Traditionalism...," p. 417.

22 Robert M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), p. 9

23 ibid, p. 11.

24 Jaeger, *Early Christianity...*, pp. 26-27; Grant, *Greek Apologists...*, p. 11.

Jew. Sometimes the "discussion" was cordial, but more often it was heated, passionate, and attacking. Each party attempted to prove that it was more legitimate, had a longer legacy, and had a greater influence.[25]

Before presenting the content of specific apologists, one must first examine the basic categories that were points of controversy and disagreement. One must keep in mind that the categories fell within the arena of the Greek paradigm and the Greek paideia. The first category concerns the issue of the antiquity. Which one of the respective traditions, whether pagan, Jewish, or Christian, was older? According to Greek conventional wisdom at that time, nothing could be both new *and* true. In all cases, the oldest was best, for "...the ancients were nearer to the gods and the beginnings of things and therefore knew much more about them."[26] This concept could be traced back to the fourth century BCE when Ptolemy I Soter of Egypt commissioned Hecataeus of Abdera to write a history. This assignment was propagandistic, since "...one of Hecataeus' chief aims was to compare the civilizations of Egypt and Greece to demonstrate the antiquity and superiority of the former and the derivative nature of the latter."[27] The more ancient civilization could logically claim that it had the greater influence. It could state that later civilizations did not have the right to claim advances as their own. Instead, they had borrowed, if not stolen, insights from peoples that came before.

Centuries later, Josephus wrote *Against Apion*, which was originally titled, *On the Antiquity of the Jews*.[28] His usage of the term "antiquity" was an attempt to undercut Greek arguments proving the greater age of its civilization. Josephus used excerpts from Plato's *Laws* to show that the Greeks were more modern than the Jews. Obviously, if the Greeks were more modern, then they must have received their culture from another

---

25 Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1989), p. 7.
26 ibid, p. 9.
27 ibid, pp. 5-6.
28 Grant, *Greek Apologists...*, p. 17.

people or peoples. Josephus argued that the Mosaic law was more ancient and had influenced the Greek legal system. Josephus also responded to criticisms that the Jews had contributed nothing to the advance of civilization, while the Greeks had contributed immensely. Again, Josephus focused on the age and wisdom of Moses' legislation.

> Now I maintain that our lawgiver is the most ancient of all lawgivers in the records of the whole world. Compared with him, your Lycurgus and Solon and Zaleucus, who gave the Locrians their laws, and all who have been held in such high esteem by the Greeks appear to have been born but yesterday. Why, the very word "law" was unknown in ancient Greece.. the masses were governed by "maxims" not clearly defined and by the orders of royalty, and the use of unwritten customs continued long afterwards. On the other hand, our legislator, who lived in the remotest antiquity proved himself the people's best guide and counselor. [29]

The Jewish historian claimed that the Jews, with their superior system of *theokratia*, or theocracy (a word coined by Josephus, based on Greek usage), had created culture and harmony long before the Greeks. Furthermore, the Greeks were dependent upon the Jews for their definition of "God" as an uncreated, immutable, single, supreme power. Josephus concluded that since the Jews and their Mosaic legislation were older that the Greeks, Hellenism was dependent upon Moses.[30]

This provided a valuable precedent, for "this argumentative strategy would become the hallmark of the early Christian apologists from Justin to Eusebius."[31] The Christians as well stressed the antiquity of Moses. Since their Scriptures included both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, they traced their origins back to the Jewish patriarchs.[32] A recurring argument was whether Homer or Moses was more ancient. The Christians

---

29 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* p. 45

30 ibid, pp. 45-46.

31 ibid, p. 44.

32 This notion of tracing the origins of Christianity to a time centuries before the birth of Jesus will become clearer when the apologists are explored in greater depth.

related to Moses just as the Greeks related to Homer, as the founders of their tradition. Whoever was older had a greater claim to legitimacy and influence.[33]

Another category in the debate between pagans, Jews, and Christians involved differing views about Hesiod's "Golden Age" and the progression of humanity's civilization. Generally, pagan intellectuals described the original condition of mankind as a "golden age" or an "age of heroes." Life was filled with bliss, free from sorrow, and lacking toil and hardship. In contrast, Jewish and Christian writers endorsed the idea, also shared by the Sophists, of steady progress from a "bestial and chaotic life" to a civilized society.[34] If Christian writers at this time mentioned the "fall of man" at all, they described it as a part of the general history of humanity and a necessary stage for man to break from the static existence in Eden and strive towards civilization. For them, life in the Garden of Eden was no golden age.[35]

Moreover, the teachings found in both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament were necessary to help humanity to become more civilized. The Christian apologists believed that man could never accomplish his goal without divine guidance.

> ...the wickedness of primitive man was such that only a succession of divine revelations could gradually instruct him. First came punishments by flood and fire, then revelations to a few (such as the patriarchs), then the 'images and symbols' delivered to Moses. After Moses came legislators and philosophers among the gentiles, changing 'wild and fierce brutality' into 'a gentler mood.' Then the word himself appeared 'in the early days of the Roman empire.[36]

The "word" refers to Jesus, the culmination of divine instruction to civilize humanity.

This leads to another category of the dialogue, a category concerning different interpretations of the "word," or *logos*, also translated as "reason." Originating in Greek

---

33 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* p. 11.

34 ibid, pp. 36, 41.

35 Robert M. Grant, "Civilization as a Preparation for Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius," in *Christian Beginnings: Apocalypse to History* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1983), p. 62

36 ibid.

antiquity, Heraclitus in 500 BCE defined *logos* as "the universal reason governing and permeating the world."[37] The Stoics adopted the concept of logos, defining it as a pantheistic divine "world reason," manifested in the order and the beauty of the world. They believed that the mission of humanity was to live in accordance with this immanent divine logos.[38]

One can see how the Hebrew Scriptures both paralleled and expanded upon the Greek concept of *logos*. One of the Jewish doctrines was that God created the universe and communicated with humanity via speech. An example is in Genesis with the verse, "Va'yomer Elohim yihi or, va'ye'hi or," "The Lord *said*, let there be light, and there was light." By the age of the prophets, this communicative-creative power nearly had an independent existence. Isaiah 55:11 states, "So is the *word* that issues from My mouth: It does not come back to Me unfulfilled, but performs what I purpose, achieves what I sent it to do."[39] The Hellenistic Jews made the association between God's creative-communicative power and divine wisdom even stronger. Philo labeled this divine attribute as the divine blueprint for the manufacture of the world, the divine creative power in the cosmos, and the intermediary between God and humanity.

The Christians continued to adapt the meaning of the Greek *logos* according to their own needs. The Gospel of John makes the logos divine and equivalent to a supreme being. "In the beginning was the Word (logos), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God...all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made." (John 1:1, 3)[40] The apologists, realizing the importance of presenting their own Christian conception of logos, "saw in it a welcome means of making

---

37 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second edition, s.v. "Logos," p. 833.
38 ibid, s.v. "Stoicism," p. 1312.
39 *Tanakh: the Holy Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985), p. 737.
40 *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (with the Apocrypha, Expanded Edition), Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 1286.

the Christian teaching compatible with Hellenistic philosophy."[41] Again, both Jews and Christians who wished to interpret, to explain and to defend their beliefs in a world dominated by a Greek paradigmatic worldview, embraced Greek concepts as a necessary precondition in the arena of debate, made them their own, and fostered a unique Hellenistic-Jewish or Hellenistic-Christian synthesis.

The early Christians believed that the logos represented divine guidance for all of humanity. The logos became "Jesus-incarnate" in order to teach humanity according to the divine, not the human, will. The advancements of the Jews and of the Romans could take humanity only so far. Christianity would complete the journey. As a result, these Christians believed that providence was present at all times, and that humanity never did and never will work alone.

This concept was a point of controversy between Greek intellectuals and Christian apologists. The pagans claimed that Christians could only base their convictions concerning the logos upon faith and subjective evidence, not upon reason or epistemological evidence.[42] Pagan intellectuals did not understand how Christians could claim that the divine, the supreme being, could become incarnate, by definition corrupt and imperfect. These conflicting claims relate back to differing views of tradition and authority. While the Christians found themselves in an arena of debate dominated by the western paradigmatic worldview, they did not accept every western teaching. Again, when they could, the apologists incorporated western wisdom into their Christian paradigm. But if the teachings conflicted, they were rejected with little difficulty. Their main priority concerning Christianity, Jesus, and logos was to maintain divine providence in the progress of humanity, but to communicate this in terms that the dominant Greek culture could understand. Based upon the Greek tradition, pagan intellectuals found many

---

41 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 833.
42 Jaeger, *Early Christianity...*, p. 32.

Christian teachings to be contradictory, but based upon the Christian tradition, apologists saw their insights as reasonable. "It is assumed with complete confidence that whatever is found in the documents of traditional authority will, if properly investigated, turn out to be perfectly reasonable and, in all essentials, consistent."[43]

A final category in the debates between apologists and pagans concerned the concept of *genos*. This is roughly translated as tribe, nation, or race. The apologists were responsible for transforming the Christians from believing they were the mere followers of Jesus to Jesus' *people*, a chosen race, a holy nation. They grew to believe in a number of convictions that fostered their own historical and political self-consciousness. The world was created for the sake of Christians. The world is maintained for the sake of Christians. Christians are destined to rule the world. Divine teachings have been revealed to Christians. Christians will participate in the judgment of the world.[44]

They were responding to the scathing critique directed at the early Christian communities after they distanced themselves from the Jews. Christianity was seen as a superstition and an unlawful faction. Its followers were accused of worshipping demons and assembling in abominable shrines.[45] Caecilius, a third century pagan intellectual and author, represented the general attitude with the following description:

> A people skulk and shun the light of day, silent in public but talkative in holes and corners...They recognize each other by means of secret tokens and marks, and love each other almost before they are acquainted. Why have they no altars, no temples, no recognized images...unless what they worship and conceal deserves punishment or is something to be ashamed of?[46]

---

43 Armstrong, "Pagan and Christian Traditionalism...," p. 424.

44 Adolf Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), pp. 240-41.

45 ibid, p. 267.

46 Caecilius, *Minut. Felix*, viii. f, quoted in Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity...*, p. 269.

Often, Christians even had to defend themselves against the charge of being so bizarre as to be non-human.[47]

In response, apologists tried to show that they had a characteristic, worthy lifestyle. They considered themselves to be special, possessing an absolute morality. The reason they rejected many of the standards of the present society was that they and they alone lived by the highest moral standards. If being like everyone else meant behaving like everyone else, then they had no choice but to live in their own communities, divorced from pagan and Jew alike.[48]

They also believed that other peoples had plagiarized their learning, worship, and political organization. Thus, the early Christian community distinguished itself from the Jews, "...thereby dethroning the Jewish people and claiming for herself the primitive revelation, the primitive wisdom, and the genuine worship."[49] And they distinguished themselves from the Greeks and their pagan wisdom by claiming that "whatever truth is uttered anywhere has come from us."[50] They claimed that Christianity was the only true *philosophy*, working to shed the stereotype of being a superstition rooted deeply in eastern thought. Their claim that they were no mere superstition was based on the belief that they received their wisdom from the divine *Logos* itself.

Lastly, the apologists wanted to show the importance of their being a part of the Roman empire. They claimed that by divine providence, the empire and Christianity were an indivisible pair, destined to usher in a new era of human history. Melito expresses this notion in his *Apology*, written to Marcus Aurelius:

> [Christianity] brought rich blessings to thine empire in particular. For ever since then the power of Rome has increased in size and splendour; to this hast thou succeeded as its desired possessor, and as such shalt thou continue with thy son if

---

47 Harnck, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity...*, p. 269.
48 ibid, p. 252.
49 ibid, p. 254.
50 ibid.

> thou wilt protect the philosophy which rose under Augustus and has risen with the empire...The most convincing proof that the flourishing of our religion has been a boon to the empire...is this - that the empire has suffered no mishap since the reign of Augustus, but, on the contrary, everything has increased its splendour and fame.[51]

Christianity perceived itself to be the sustaining force of the Roman empire, as ordained by divine providence.

The culmination of this rise of historical and political consciousness was their belief of being a *genos*, specifically the "third genos." They saw the first genos as the Greeks, the Romans, and other nations who mutually recognized their gods, honoring them, and even sacrificing to them. The second genos was the Jews, who were exclusive, offering sacrifices to their national God, an imageless supreme being. The third genos was the Christians, who worshipped a spiritual and imageless God, but without sacrifices.[52] The Christians accepted this title with pride, claiming that they had the right to be exclusive and to reject the norms and standards of the greater community, simply because they alone were correct in their belief.

Individual apologists incorporated some or all of these principles in their defense of the early Christian communities. They grew up a minority in a Greek world, and most of them received a Greek education, learning first hand the Greek paradigm and its unique paideia. Some built on the work of those who came before, and others made original contributions.

Justin Martyr studied various philosophies before converting to Christianity, including Stoicism, Aristotelianism, Pythagoreanism, and Platonism.[53] He also analyzed the Greek poets from Homer through Hesiod, learning the myths of the various Greek gods. He justified his conversion by stating, "Do not suppose, O Greeks, that my separation from your customs is irrational or uncritical. I found nothing in them that was either holy or

---

51 ibid, p. 261.
52 ibid, p. 273.
53 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 770.

pleasing to God."[54] In his writings, he was not trying to reconcile Greek thought with Christian thought, but rather to show the superiority of Christianity as a correction and completion of the Greek tradition.[55]

Justin stated that what pagans believed to be gods were really evil demons, a notion traced back to the fourth century BCE with Xenocrates. After his studies, Justin discarded the historical development of Greek religion, and "...intended to purge the traditional mythology and religious cultus of their base and unseemly aspects."[56] To support his views, he quoted the verses of *Enoch*, which state "...the angels who have connected themselves with women, and their spirits assuming many different forms, are defiling mankind and shall lead them astray into sacrificing to demons as to gods." (I Enoch, 19:1)[57] In addition, he supported a more pessimistic view of human history as found in the Jewish apocalyptic tradition. He believed that the evil demons and rebellious angels introduced *technai*, or "technology" to mankind, such as magic, astrology, and metalurgy. One can clearly see the influence of both Greek and Jewish thought upon his convictions.[58]

Justin attempted to prove that Moses and the Jewish prophets were older than all of Greek culture, particularly Plato, and that the Greek philosopher was dependent upon Moses for the wisdom he claimed to be his own.[59] Justin based his argument partly upon Josephus' *Against Apion*, stating that Moses wrote the Hebrew Scriptures before the Greeks had even developed an alphabet.[60] However, Justin only provided literary evidence, not chronological evidence to prove his point. Rather than providing actual

---

54 R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, p. 193
55 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 53.
56 ibid, pp. 54-55.
57 ibid, p. 57.
58 ibid.
59 ibid, pp. 59-60.
60 Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, p. 192.

dates, he provided concepts. Plato's insights concerning fate, freewill, the problem of evil, and even the formation of the universe, were all taken from Moses. Justin believed that Plato read Moses' teachings and then claimed them as his own. This built upon the widespread tradition, based upon the writings of Hecataeus of Abdera, that Plato visited Egypt and read the writings Moses left behind.[61] Numenius of Apamea also accepted this tradition with his words, "What is Plato but Moses in Attic Greek."[62]

However, one can clearly see how Platonic philosophy, specifically the schools of Middle Platonism, influenced Justin's point of view. His doctrine of divine transcendence is clearly Platonic. Justin described God as the following:

> ...the eternal immovable, unchanging Cause and Ruler of the Universe, nameless and unutterable, unbegotten, residing far above the heavens, and is incapable of coming into immediate contact with any of his creatures, yet is observant of them although removed from them and unapproachable by them.[63]

He stated that all of the titles one can give to God, such as Father, God, Creator, Lord, or Master, all refer to God's activities, not to his essence.[64]

Justin embraced the Greek *logos* and added his own unique Christian interpretation to it. He believed that Jesus represented the eternal *logos* and that his presence on earth was the logos' incarnation. Throughout the ages, humanity had received through "natural revelation" the divine *logos*, such as ethical and religious knowledge.

> We (Christians) have previously testified that Christ is the *logos* of which every race of man partakes. Those who lived in accordance with the *logos* are Christians, even though they were called atheists, such as, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus and men like them, and, among the barbarians, Abraham and Ananias and Azarias and Misael and Elijah and many others.[65]

---

61 Variant traditions stated that Homer, Pythagoras, and Solon all learned from Egyptian priests.

62 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, pp. 60, 63-64.

63 Robert M. Grant, *Gods and the One God* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), p. 87.

64 ibid.

65 Justin, *Apol.* i. 46. 1-3, quoted in Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 65.

Not only did Justin equate "Jesus-as-*logos*" with the Platonic world soul, but also he made Christianity as ancient as the *logos*, older than all of the world's religions.[66] If Jesus in the form of the divine *logos* had inspired Moses and the prophets, and all of Greek philosophy was dependent upon the Hebrews, then Greek philosophy was dependent upon Christianity.

Justin also built upon the teachings of Posidonius to complete his imperialistic view of history. Posidonius taught that philosophy was given to humanity by God in ancient times. However, with the evolution of Greek thought into various schools, all philosophy after the death of Aristotle became corrupt. Justin concluded that Christianity alone was the accurate conception of philosophy given to mankind centuries before.

> What then is the original philosophy which 'was sent down to men?' It is nothing other than the revelation of the *logos* to Moses and the prophets contained in Scripture. Christianity therefore is not one, or even the best philosophy among many; it is the *only* philosophy insofar as it is the reconstitution of the original, primordial philosophy.[67]

Clearly, Justin attempted to legitimize the "new" doctrines of his faith by viewing them not only as the most ancient, but also the only correct doctrines of faith.

Tatian, one of Justin Martyr's students, carried his teachings forward and added to them. His two main contributions were *Oratio ad Graecos* ("Against the Greeks") and *Diatessaron*. The former, an impassioned attack on Greek civilization as incompatible with Greek faith, is more important.[68] Before converting, Tatian, like Justin, was schooled in the Greek paideia, as well as the Hebrew Scriptures. He justifies his decision to become Christian in his *Oratio ad Graecos*:

> While I was engaged in serious thought I happened to read some barbarian writings, older by comparison with the doctrines of the Greeks, and more divine by comparison with their error...My soul was taught by God, and I understood that

---

66 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 66.
67 ibid, p. 72.
68 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1341

> some parts had a condemnatory effect, while others freed us from many rulers and countless tyrants, *giving us not something we had never received, but what we had received but had been prevented from keeping because of error*.[69]

Tatian's argument was straight-forward. Greek culture was dependent upon barbarian (Jewish) culture, but had corrupted much of its wisdom. Moses was the author of barbarian culture. Jesus as *logos* had inspired Moses. Therefore, Christian philosophy is older than Greek culture.[70] This was a direct response to the criticisms of the pagan intellectual Celsus and his *Alethes Logos*, the first systematic attack against Christianity. Celsus charged that Christianity was both a revolt against the Roman state and an introduction of new ideas. Tatian responded by stating that Christianity is not an innovation, but a restoration of correct ancient ideas that the Greeks had corrupted.[71]

To prove his argument that Greek culture was dependent upon the Jews, Tatian improved upon Justin's conceptual argument of the antiquity of Moses by providing a chronology. The goal was to prove the legitimacy of "barbarian" teachings by showing that the revelation found in the Hebrew Scriptures was older than Greek literature. Since the Christians accepted the Hebrew Scriptures as part of their Bible, proving the legitimacy of the truth of Hebrew teachings proved the legitimacy of Christian teachings. Tatian was the first Christian apologist to use eastern historians to set a date for Moses. This precedent, however, was set by Josephus, who cited Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phoenicians in his work *Against Apion*, in his attempt to prove the antiquity of Moses.[72]

By citing evidence from Phoenician historians, Tatian attempted to show that Moses lived well before the Trojan War. Then he used the Egyptian priest Ptolemy to show that Moses was a contemporary of Inachus, the first king of Argos, the earliest figure in Greek legend. He accomplished this with a three-point argument. The Trojan War occurred in

---

69 Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 29.1-2, quoted in Arthur Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 85.

70 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, pp. 85-86.

71 ibid, pp. 73, 89.

72 Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, p. 125.

the eighteenth year of the twentieth Argive king. The Argive kings reigned for roughly four hundred years. Moses lived during the time of the first Argive king. Therefore, Moses lived four centuries before the Trojan War. The Greeks commonly believed that Homer lived after the Trojan War. Therefore, the founder of barbarian culture lived centuries before the greatest of Greek literary writers. This argument greatly influenced and was repeated by later apologists, such as Clement, Origen, and Eusebius.[73]

Even though he taught that Greek philosophy was riddled with corruptions and errors, Tatian used Greek philosophical concepts to describe his own beliefs about God. Like Justin, he viewed God as ineffable, incorporeal, and superior to the spirit that pervades matter. Furthermore, God is the creator, invisible, and intangible. This is clearly influenced by Platonic thought, even though Tatian claimed that the Greeks lifted these concepts from the barbarians. Tatian saw the Word, or *logos*, as God's "firstborn work," similar to light from a torch or words from an all-knowing teacher.[74] However, he added that *logos* is also the God who suffered in human form.[75]

Three other apologists of note were Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Tertullian. Athenagoras was known as the "Christian philosopher of Athens." Answering charges of atheism and incest, he directed his writings to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus. He was one of the first of the apologists to present the philosophical defense of the Christian doctrine of God as three-in-one.[76] Like his predecessors he stated that God could only be apprehended by mind and reason, and that the supreme being was "uncreated, eternal, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, and infinite."[77] Theophilus stressed the superiority of the Christian conception of creation over the version presented by the Greek myths. He also further developed the concept of *logos*, making a distinction

---

73 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, pp. 93-96.
74 Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, p. 129.
75 Grant, *Gods and the One God*, p. 87.
76 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 102.
77 Grant, *Gods and the One God*, p. 87.

between the "intelligence of the Father" and the "word" he used to create the universe.[78] This doctrine was used by later apologists to criticize the anthropocentric Greek mythological stories.[79] He also referred to the Garden of Eden as "an opportunity for progress," the first stage in the advancement of humanity. His belief in the careful use of technology for the steady improvement of civilization ran counter to Hesiod's "Golden Age."[80] He also made great efforts to show the connection between the Hebrew Scriptures and Christianity. He called the Jews an ancient divinely-inspired race, while the Greeks were blinded by errors. Theophilus calls Moses "our prophet," the Hebrew Scriptures "our books," and the Hebrews themselves "our forefathers."[81] Tertullian, the African Church Father, addressed both pagan and Christian communities. In his early writings he responded to slanderous attacks by defending Christian morality, claiming Christians were not a threat to the state, and criticizing pagans as superstitious. He called for Christians to separate from pagan society in order to escape contamination from western immorality and idolatry.[82]

Special attention needs to be paid to Alexandria, the great meeting point of east and west. It provided a central arena for the exchange and debate of views between pagan, Jew, and Christian. The Christian intellectuals Clement and Origen grew up there, learning first-hand the principles of the dominant Greek paideia.[83] Clement (1st century CE) and Origen (2nd-3rd century CE) attempted to show the chronological and theological superiority of Moses over the founders of Greek culture and that their poets, sages, and philosophers imitated the Hebrews.[84]

---

78 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1364.
79 Grant, *Gods and the One God*, p. 89.
80 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 103.
81 ibid, p. 122.
82 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1352.
83 Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, pp. 37, 55.
84 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 124.

Clement taught that pagan religion had experienced seven degrees of decline and corruption from primitive times. This ranged from originally worshipping the celestial bodies as gods ultimately to apotheosizing divine benefits, believing them to be savior gods. Christianity alone presented the firm foundation of the truth, grounded in the writings of the Hebrew prophets. Clement urged the pagans to abandon their conventional, corrupted religion and find wisdom in Christianity.[85]

After criticizing Greek religion, Clement then turned to Greek philosophy. He presented three possibilities for its origin: The philosophers obtained a limited degree of truth either through their own efforts or through divine inspiration. They stole their doctrines from Moses and claimed them as their own. They were granted it by "inferior powers" or angels, who originally stole it from God. The notion of philosophy being stolen from Moses was used by Josephus, adapted by Justin and Tatian, and highly developed by Clement.[86] Of the three choices, Clement stressed this one the most.

They desired to show that the Greeks stole from "barbarians" knowledge they claimed to be their own. The apologists taught that Plato and Pythagoras visited Egypt, Democritus visited Babylon, Persia, and Egypt, and Aristotle learned from a Jew. In *Stromateis*, Clement writes, "...philosophy, that most useful thing, flourished long ago among the barbarians, shedding its light over the nations, and only at a later date came to the Greeks."[87] Clement adds that the oldest of the barbarians in the Jewish *genos*. Then he tried to answer the following question: If the Greeks learned their wisdom from the barbarians, who taught the barbarians? By returning to what he believed to be the origins of human knowledge, Clement showed that the *logos*, Jesus, was the teacher of teachers. This reflected the tendency of Greek philosophy, specifically Middle Platonic philosophy,

---

85 ibid, pp. 130-131, 137.
86 ibid, pp. 139-40.
87 Clement, *Stromateis* 1.71.3, quoted in Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 144.

to return to the pristine origins of knowledge.[88] The pagan intellectual Celsus and Clement presented two sides of the same coin. Celsus believed that the Greek paideia represented the highest expression of human culture and that the Greeks recovered the pristine teachings of the primordial past, while the Hebrews and Christians had corrupted them. Clement taught that the ancient Hebrews possessed the pristine teachings and that the Greeks had derived their culture from them and distorted their knowledge.[89]

Origen built upon the foundation laid by those who came before, most notably Clement. He saw that in the debate between Celsus and Clement that the pagan had viewed Christianity as a philosophical school.[90] Whether Celsus meant to do this is unknown, but it added greater respectability to a faith perceived as being illegitimate. Both Clement and Origen defended Christianity much as pagan intellectuals defended their philosophies. However, the apologists started from a different original premise.

> New was the fact that philosophical speculation was used by them to support a positive religion that was not itself the result of independent human search for the truth, like earlier Greek philosophies, but took as its point of departure a divine revelation contained in a holy book, the Bible.[91]

Clement and Origen used Greek vocabulary, grounded in Greek paideia, to describe their theologies, but added a unique Christian perspective. Clement's God was incorporeal, formless, beyond space, time, and virtue. He identified the supreme God with the Mind, the locus of Ideas. Origen adapted this concept. He originally rejected anthropomorphic descriptions of God, preferring allegorical interpretations. This shows the influence of the Greek paideia, specifically of Middle Platonism. But then he shifted, advocating the belief that the divine *logos* became incarnate and suffered with humanity.[92]

---

88 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, pp. 140, 147.
89 ibid, p. 152.
90 ibid, p. 154.
91 Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, p. 47.
92 Grant, *Gods and the One God*, pp. 90-91.

> [Jesus] came down to earth, taking pity on the human race, and experienced our passions before he suffered the cross and condescended to assume our flesh. For if he had not suffered he would not have entered into human life.[93]

Thus, he began to blend allegorical and literal interpretations together.

Clearly, Origen, having grown up in Alexandria, lived in two philosophical worlds, one "barbaric" and the other Greek. He learned the Greek paradigmatic world view. But in addition to studying the teachings of Plato and Pythagoreas, he also read the Hebrew Scriptures. He had learned from Middle Platonism the importance of determining the source of all wisdom.[94] Clement traced teachings back to Aristotle and Socrates and attempted to use *logos* to find happiness and the true good. Origen on the other hand, employed traditional forms of Greek scholarship, such as utilizing critical editions of works and consulting dialogues, to express his views. He used a more sober and rational tone than his predecessors, reflecting the approach of the Alexandrian schools.[95]

Both Clement and Origen saw Christianity playing a vital role in the development of civilization. Jesus as *logos* became the greatest of all teachers. They acknowledged the contributions made by the Greek paideia, but they saw Christianity taking control from the Greeks. They believed that Christians would fulfill the "paideutic mission of mankind" to the highest possible degree.[96]

Clement had conflicting views concerning the role of providence and the advancement of civilization under Greek instruction. He stated that the Greeks could not have made the inroads they did without some level of divine guidance. However, the only true paideia could not be traced back to the Greeks, but the Christians, well before the Greeks had ever begun to develop their own culture and body of literature.[97] Origen, on the other hand, was more accommodating, believing that God intended all along to mold Greek and

---

93 ibid, p. 93.
94 Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, pp. 50, 52.
95 ibid, pp. 57-58.
96 ibid, p. 60.
97 ibid, pp. 61-62.

Christian philosophy together. For Origen, Jesus became the master teacher, and his main textbook was the Christian Bible. This represented a departure from the Greek notion of a purely human philosophy and education. With Jesus, providence was involved at every step of human advancement.[98]

By this time, the Christians had presented themselves as a distinct people from the barbarians and the Greeks. They saw themselves as the third *genos*.[99] The apologists had attempted to prove the antiquity of their "nation," how their teachings had contributed to the progress of civilization, how their own culture had been influential and its wisdom co-opted, and how the Greeks were steeped in corrupted superstition and myth.[100] Against critics who said their communities were too young to have a history, they presented their own unique interpretation of humanity's history, showing that they were present all along.[101]

They had to show that Jesus' "arrival" on earth was no one-time revelation, but that Jesus as *logos* was older than humanity.

> To maintain the unity of the revealed tradition from the beginning was for them to maintain the unity of God's action in the world. It meant that the Redeemer was also the Creator: that the same God, the same Logos and the same Spirit had acted, spoken, given life and inspired in the beginning and throughout all the ages and who continued do so with even greater fullness and clarity in the new dispensation.[102]

One could see the effects of *logos* in the creation of the world, the revelation to the Hebrew prophets, the wisdom of the Greek philosophers, divine providence, and the order of the universe.

---

98 ibid, p. 66.
99 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 196.
100 ibid, p. 195.
101 ibid, p. 197.
102 ibid, p. 199.

The early apologists set the stage for those who followed, especially Eusebius, who widened their focus to build more connections linking east and west. While in the past, the apologists concentrated on communicating mainly with classical Greek concepts, those who followed communicated with a more eclectic mix, influenced to a greater degree by the orient and by Middle Platonic concepts.[103] Eusebius had received a large body of apologetic literature. He was able to pick and choose from Justin, Tatian, Clement, Origen, and many others. In addition, he had access to the large number of authors that had produced the Greek paideia. He utilized them all in his comprehensive Christian defense, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in which he justified the Christians' shifting their allegiance from the religion and philosophy of the Greeks to accepting the philosophy of the Hebrew Scriptures.[104] He also used this work to show how aspects of the Jewish philosophy were superior to Greek philosophy and paved the way for the revelation of the Christian Gospel.[105] He followed this up with *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in which he proved why the Christians ultimately rejected the Mosaic legislation of the Jews and embraced the teachings of Jesus.

---

103 Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, p. 67.

104 J.B. Lightfoot, "Eusebius of Caesarea," *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, Albemarle St., 1880), p. 330.

105 Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, 1986), p. 329.

Chapter 2: *Eusebius Pamphili and an Overview of His Works*

Little is known about the life of Eusebius. He left behind no information about his family, whether it was Greek, Syrian, or both. Scholars assume he was born a Christian in 263 CE.[1] While his birthplace is uncertain, it is known that he lived the majority of his life in Caesarea. This location was the place of his intellectual training, his literary activity, and his episcopal see. In his lifetime, Caesarea was an intellectual center, the location of Origen's school. Origen started a library there that the presbyter Pamphilus greatly expanded. The presbyter earned a respected reputation, and students sought him out as a mentor and a model. Eusebius was one of these students, learning all he could from his mentor. He looked to Pamphilus with respect and gratitude and even took the name "Eusebius Pamphili," "the spiritual son of Pamphilus."[2]

Pamphilus exposed him to scripture, pagan and Christian history, ancient literature, geography, technical chronology, exegesis, philology, as well as philosophy.[3] Clearly, Eusebius benefited from the wide range of works contained in the library. His expertise was rivaled only by Origen in its breadth and depth. He will be remembered as the first church historian, as "father of the science of Church chronology," as a topographer of Palestine and as a compiler of theological views. This work will focus, however, on his accomplishments as an apologist.

Eusebius distinguished himself and became Pamphilus' close confidant. At the presbyter's death, he became the new bishop of Caesarea. But earlier in his educational career, he already accepted the role as literary defender of Christianity, facing hostility from the Roman authorities. Living during rapidly changing times, he experienced

---

1 J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1929), p. 20.
2 Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, 1986), pp. 309-10.
3 ibid, p. 311

firsthand times of peace, times of organized Roman persecution, and times of successful expansion of Christianity.[4]

One needs to note the historical context, as well as relations between the Church and the Roman government at this time, to get a better understanding of Eusebius' literary career. At the end of the third century, after a period of instability, Emperor Diocletian attempted to bring conformity throughout his lands. He made Latin the official language and insisted that Roman law be superior to local law and custom. He built upon the momentum from the Constitutio Antoniana in 212 to make upholding the law the sacred duty of every Roman citizen.[5] The incentive was partly religious, to insure that "...the immortal gods will favor the Roman name, as they have in the past, if the emperors ensure that all their subjects lead a pious, religious, peaceable, and chaste life."[6] Only one religion was valued, the religion of the state.

The Roman government viewed with prejudice and suspicion efforts to reform contemporary religions or to start new religions. Diocletian made it a crime to call into question what one's ancient ancestors had established. The authorities punished those "...who wantonly rejected the gifts of the gods, and who set up a novel and unheard-of creed in opposition to the established religions."[7] More than anything else, the Romans feared efforts to disrupt the internal peace and stability of the empire.[8] This was a natural reaction to the crisis of instability that plagued that empire from 235 to 284.

Galerius, one of Diocletian's Caesars, convinced the emperor to devote special attention to a new religion that began in the east, a religion he particularly despised,

---

4 F.J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1933), pp. 39-40.

5 F.J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons Ltd., 1933), p. 19.

6 ibid, p. 20.

7 ibid.

8 ibid.

Christianity. At the festival of Terminalia on February 23, 303, Diocletian passed an edict for the Roman Empire officially to persecute Christianity. Churches and private homes containing Christian writings were to be destroyed. Their Bibles and liturgical books were to be burned. Their property was to be confiscated. Their assemblies were made illegal. Christians who refused to sacrifice to Roman gods had their citizenship stripped. Their freedman were captured and returned to slavery.

The severity of the persecution, however, depended upon the will of local Roman officials.[9] Caesarea became one of the centers of persecution. The Romans destroyed houses of prayer, burned Christian Bibles, and hunted down pastors. Periods of calm unpredictably shifted to violence, forced confessions, and executions. Eusebius saw it all first hand, including the death of his teacher and friend, Pamphilus. The persecution lasted for ten years, until the Edict of Milan in 313. At the end of the violence, Eusebius was named bishop of the vacant see.[10]

Both before and in the midst of the persecutions, Eusebius took advantage of the vast library resources available to him and began to write. Because his career as bishop dominated his time and energy, he did the majority of his writing before and after his twenty-plus year tenure. Roughly, his collection can be divided into six categories: historical, critical and exegetical, doctrinal, orations and sermons, letters, and apologetics. However, these categories are rough generalizations. A single work, though placed in one category, can overlap several different categories. In other words, a work can fit mainly in one area but possess qualities of many others.[11] Determining the correct dating of his works is difficult. Some are known with certainty, some within a range a years, and others are unknown.

---

9 ibid, pp. 21-23.

10 J.B. Lightfoot, "Eusebius of Caesarea," *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, Albernarle St., 1880), p. 310.

11 ibid, p. 319.

Eusebius completed his first historical work, the *Chronicle*, before the year 303.[12] It is divided into two parts. The first part is an extended introduction and contains sections dealing with the Chaldeans, the Assyrians, the Hebrews, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans. The second and more important part is divided into five synchronous tables in parallel columns. The divisions are marked by the birth of Abraham, the taking of Troy, the first Olympiad, the second year of the reign of Darius,[13] the death of Jesus, and the year 303. His overall goal followed the precedent set by the second century apologists to show that the Jewish religion was older than any other and to illustrate the antiquity of Moses. Most likely, Julius Africanus' *Chronicles*, written in the third century, influenced Eusebius' approach. This work was the first synchronistic attempt to show the antiquity of the Jews. However, Eusebius improved upon Africanus' version by using better and older authors and a more critical approach.[14] Extant versions of the *Chronicle* are based upon the version compiled by the fourth century Roman Biblical scholar, Jerome.[15] He carried Eusebius' version to 378 CE, the date of the Battle of Hadrienople, and added more information about general Roman history, including the life and death of Emperor Valens.[16]

A second historical work was the *Martyrs of Palestine*, finished sometime after 311.[17] Its shorter version is extant, found within Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. However, the longer form, written in Greek, is no longer entirely extant. Apparently, he captured events

---

12 D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. LTD, 1960), p. 57.

13 In the second year of the reign of Darius I (522-486 BCE), the second Temple in Jerusalem was completed. (*Encyclopedia Judaica*, second printing, s.v. "Darius," pp. 1303-1304.)

14 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 312.

15 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second edition, s.v. "Jerome," p. 731.

16 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 313.

17 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.

reported by eyewitnesses to the Diocletian persecutions. His motivation was to record and inform.[18]

> It is not our part to commit to writing the conflicts of those who fought throughout the world on behalf of piety toward the Deity, and to record in detail each of their happenings; but that would be the special task of those who witnessed the events. Yet I shall make known to posterity in another work those with whom I was personally conversant.[19]

As a result of this work, detailing local events, historians are better informed of the persecutions in Palestine than in any other region.[20]

Scholars believe that his third historical work, *Ecclesiastical History*, was completed sometime between the Edict of Milan in 313 and the Council of Nicaea in 325.[21] It covers a number of topics, including the succession of the apostles; events in the church history; distinguished church rulers, preachers, and writers; heretical teachers who targeted Christianity; the fate of the Jews who suffered in retribution for Jesus' death; and the persecutors of the church and Jesus' deliverance in Eusebius' day.[22] Though historical by design, the work includes the clear apologetic theme that divine providence guided the rise of Christianity and its acceptance as the official religion of the Roman Empire. Of all his works, the *Ecclesiastical History* made Eusebius immortal.[23] His contemporaries and successors viewed him as having written the definitive history of the early church. As a result, no one attempted a comparable work.[24]

His last historical work was *Vita Constantini (The Life of Constantine)*. Eusebius' connection with the once pagan emperor and later Christian convert is open to debate. Most likely, Eusebius' suggestion that he had a close connection with Constantine has led

---

18 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, pp. 319-20.
19 *Ecclesiastical History* 8.13.7, quoted in J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 318.
20 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p 318.
21 Some believe that the first edition could been completed even earlier.
22 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, pp. 322-323.
23 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, pp. 314-15.
24 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 324.

to an exaggerated modern conception, that he was a close confidant, and his principal ecclesiastical advisor. A more accurate view is based both upon geography and chronology. Eusebius did not reside near the imperial capital. Thus he did not have ready access to the emperor and could not come to court whenever he chose. In addition, only four meetings between the two men have been documented. They did not meet each other for the first time until the Council of Nicaea in 325. Next was the Council of Nicomedia in 327. They met again at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in 335. Lastly, they saw each other at a council in Constantinople, which deposed Marcellus of Ancyra for the statements he made against Arius.[25] This council also celebrated the thirtieth year of Constantine's reign.[26]

This work, devoted specifically to the emperor, was far from objective. Moreover, critics have condemned him for being dishonest with his presentation of the emperor and his family. However, Eusebius explained that he purposely chose not to critique Constantine, for not only had he unified the eastern and western halves of the Empire, not only had he become a Christian, but moreover, he was chosen by God to rule.

> The author paints a vivid picture of Constantine, 'who alone of all that ever wielded the Roman power was the friend of God, the Sovereign of all, and appeared to all mankind so clear an example of a godly life' (1.3), whom God distinguished 'as at once a mighty luminary and most clear-voiced herald of genuine piety' (1.4), who as the 'new Moses,' delivered the new race of the chosen people from the tyrants and from the bondage of the enemies.' (1.12)[27]

While this work omits the dark aspects of the emperor's life, such as the fact that his son, nephew, and wife were all murdered, the incidents that are included are believed to have been accurate.[28]

---

25 Marcellus' connection to Eusebius will be detailed in a later section dealing with his doctrinal works.

26 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 266.

27 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 319.

28 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, pp. 327-28.

Scholars debate both the authorship and the dating of *Vita Constantini*. The problem is that it contains reports of events that happened after Eusebius died. Also, many versions of the work contain portions which contradict each other. As a result of these two factors, it is unknown which portions Eusebius originally wrote.[29] An estimate is that the core of the work was completed by 337.[30]

Eusebius also devoted much of his time to biblical scholarship. This followed naturally from his working with Pamphilus. The presbyter devoted part of his career to correcting biblical texts and providing critical versions, both for the scholar and layman alike.[31] As a result, Christian communities looked to Caesarea to provide accurate versions of their Scriptures. Eusebius picked up these skills, with Pamphilus as his guide. Eusebius completed *Gospel Questions and Solutions* sometime before 312.[32] Its first part, "Addressed to Stephanus," dealt with various discrepancies of the narratives dealing with Jesus' infancy. Its second part, "Addressed to Marinus," concerns discrepancies in the resurrection narratives. Only fragments of this work are still extant.[33] The *Commentary on Isaiah* was completed between 324 and 325. Scholars have praised it for being an effective historical commentary. However, others have criticized it for occasional allegorical interpretations.[34] Eusebius is believed to have composed his *Onomasticon* between 326 and 330.[35] It is a compilation of Biblical placenames in alphabetical order, including their geographical and historical descriptions and their location in Eusebius' day. Both in the West and the East, later scholars held this work in high repute, and Jerome translated it into Latin. Its first three parts are no longer extant, though the subjects are

---

29 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 324.
30 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 58.
31 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 334.
32 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.
33 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 337.
34 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 337.
35 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.

known: an interpretation of the Greek translation of the ethnological terms of the Hebrew Scriptures, the topography of ancient Judea and the inheritance of the twelve tribes, a plan of Jerusalem and the Temple.[36] *On Easter* was completed between 325 and 335.[37] Eusebius dedicated this work, which dealt with the mystical importance of the holiday, to Constantine. He explains that the Jewish Passover celebration has been fulfilled by the Christian Easter celebration. He also wrote this to standardize the date of Easter, divorcing it from being determined by the Jewish calendar. Lastly, he wrote it because Constantine did not want local tradition to determine when Christians celebrated Easter. This work is no longer extant.[38] *In Psalmos*, or *Commentary on Psalms*, was completed after 335. Scholars consider this work a first-rank patristic commentary. Like *Commentary on Isaiah* it was translated into Latin for the use of Western communities.[39] The dating for a final critical work is unknown. He wrote *Sections and Canons, with the Letter to Carpianus prefixed*, in order to provide a "user friendly" method of comparing the Gospel writings. Eusebius wanted to present a harmony between the Gospels and to furnish critical material to determine their relation. Ammonius of Alexander provided the model, but in his attempt, only the Gospel of Matthew could be read continuously.[40] Eusebius provided a model which incorporated a system of tables, which allowed the reader easily to compare the Gospels.[41]

Eusebius also composed several doctrinal or dogmatic works. He wrote his *Prophetical Extracts* between 303 and 312.[42] The purpose of this book was to show that the prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures spoke of three aspects of Jesus: his being the pre-

---

36 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 336.
37 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.
38 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, pp. 339-40.
39 ibid, p. 337.
40 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, pp. 334-35.
41 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 335.
42 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.

existing Word, his being the second cause of the universe, and his two advents. His *Defence of Origen*, a refutation of the detractors of Origen, was a joint work with Pamphilus. They composed the first five books when Pamphilus was in prison during the Diocletian persecution. Eusebius composed the last book himself. The first book sets the tone for the remaining work, detailing Origen's main principles, focusing on the Incarnation and the Trinity, and refuting the nine specific charges against him.[43] Both *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia* were completed by 337. Both are extant. The first is a defense of Eusebius' Arian position against Bishop Marcellus of Ancyra. The first part rejects Marcellus' attacks against the Arian party, while the second part uses Marcellus' own words to show that he espouses heretical beliefs. The second work is simply a more detailed refutation of Eusebius' charges against Marcellus.[44]

Eusebius also wrote a number of orations and collected sermons delivered by Constantine. *At the Dedication of the Church in Tyre* explains that the building of the structure was prophesied by the Hebrew prophets. This church was one of the most ornate buildings constructed after the close of the Diocletian persecution. Eusebius stated that the church at Tyre illustrated the spiritual power of the collective earthly church. All that is known of *At the Vicennalia of Constantine* is that Eusebius delivered a speech in praise of the emperor at the twentieth anniversary of his reign.[45] *Ad coetum sanctorum* is a collection of sermons believed to have been written and delivered by Constantine. The speeches condemn the error of polytheism and argue that only Jesus could provide salvation. Strong arguments exist that the emperor did not write the sermons, but actually proving the forgery is difficult. A final work is *Laus Constantini* or *At the Tricennalia of Constantine*. This work, printed in the *Life of Constantine*, has a highly apologetic tone. Its first part is a panegyric delivered at the palace in Constantinople on July 25, 335, the

---

43 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 339.
44 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 341.
45 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 343

thirtieth anniversary of the emperor's reign. Eusebius makes Constantine the reflection of the divine Word and makes his monarchy on earth the reflection the monarchy in heaven. Its second part occurred chronologically before the first part and concerns the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Eusebius justifies the building of the church as part of Constantine's mission of spreading Christianity to the pagan world.[46]

Since the church historian was highly involved in the doctrinal disputes of the times, one must assume that he wrote a number of epistles, or letters, and received many from others, including Constantine. Unfortunately, only three complete letters are extant. One covers the events that transpired at the Council of Nicaea. Accused of wholly supporting Arius, he had to defend his own orthodoxy. Though he initially swore allegiance to the Creed of Caesarea, responding to pressure, he had to submit to the Creed of Nicaea.[47] Another extant letter was *To Constantia Augusta*. She was the sister of Constantine and closely connected to the Arians. In a previous letter, she requested from Eusebius a likeness of Jesus. In his response, he rejected the production of likenesses of their savior, claiming it encouraged idolatry.[48]

The category of literary work that remains is apologetics. Throughout his lifetime, Eusebius devoted much of his time, energy, and passion defending his faith.
His early experience of working with Pamphilus, taking advantage of the resources available in Caesarea, laid the foundation for his responses to the critics of Christianity. As he corrected Bible texts, he learned the importance of accuracy, order, and perseverance. He also honed his skills of picking and choosing the exact text he needed for his defense and how to reproduce it accurately in his own works.[49] Rather than an author of original ideas, he will be remembered more as a compiler and arranger.

---

46 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, pp. 343-44 and J. Quasten, *Patrology*, pp. 326-28.
47 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 343.
48 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 344.
49 J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*, p. 33.

Both during and after government-sponsored persecution, the early Christian communities faced the criticism of pagan intellectuals. Even after Constantine converted and Christianity slowly spread, the old arguments remained. Eusebius rose to the challenge and provided a response.

> In his apologetic treatises Eusebius sums up the entire literary efforts of the past for the defense of the Christian religion. He combines the ideas of the Greek Apologists with a new scholarly method, which overwhelms the reader by a plenitude of facts and arguments drawn from his amazing knowledge of ancient literature and history.[50]

Thus, he was able to blend his many areas of expertise together, knowledge culled from east and west, from Christian and Greek, to respond to the critics.

He completed his *General Elementary Introduction* before 303, preceding his becoming bishop. It is his oldest work and only partially extant. Its second part contains extracts and explanations of messianic prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures.[51] He wrote *Against Porphyry* between 303 and 312, but unfortunately, the work is completely lost.[52] It is his response to the pagan's *Against the Christians*. If Eusebius devoted his energies to writing a lengthy book in response to the Neoplatonic critic, one can speculate that it must have posed a serious threat to the intellectual legitimacy of Christianity. Another work was *Against Hierocles*, written before 313, in response to the governor in Bithynia, who used his power to persecute Christians.[53] Hierocles' polemic claimed that Apollonius of Tyana was superior to Jesus.[54] Apollonius was a neo-Pythagorean philosopher whose virtuous life and accomplishments were exaggerated after his death. Anti-Christian intellectuals wrote biographies of "righteous individuals," by design modeled after the

---

50 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 328.
51 ibid, pp. 328-29.
52 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57.
53 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57 and Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 328.
54 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 333.

Gospels in order to mock the Gospel writers and undercut the significance of Jesus.[55] His *Numerous Progeny of the Ancients* is another lost work, most likely written before 313.[56] However, scholars agree that its purpose was to reconcile the polygamous practice of the ancient patriarchs with the ascetic Christian lifestyle of Eusebius' day.[57]

His *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica* are complementary works with a connected goal. The *Praeparatio* was written to prove the inferiority of pagan polytheism and the superiority of the Jewish religion, which was a "preparation" for the birth of Jesus and the spread of the Gospel. The *Demonstratio* was an answer to Jewish criticisms that Christians adopted the Hebrew Scriptures and stole the title of the "chosen people" without accepting the rules, regulations, and restrictions of the Jews.[58] These works were written over several years, between 312 and 318.[59] He also composed two other complementary works, the *Praeparatio Ecclesiastica* and *Demonstratio Ecclesiastica*. Neither is extant. Scholars have speculated that their names suggest that these works attempted to show on a larger scale about society what *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica* attempted to show about the foundational doctrines of society.[60]

He composed *Theophania* or *Divine Manifestation* after 337.[61] It is divided into five books. The first is an account of revelation and its recipients. The second speaks of the necessity of revelation. He writes that demons had used polytheism to make humanity go mad and that the philosophers, including Plato, could not save them. The third book concerns a proof of the revelation. This covers how the Word became incarnate, died, and

---

55 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Apollonius of Tyana," p. 73.
56 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57
57 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 334.
58 ibid, pp. 329-331; Note that later in this chapter, *The Preparation* and *The Demonstration* will be investigated in greater depth.
59 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 57
60 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 331.
61 Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, p. 58.

rose. The fourth is a proof of continued revelation. The final book answers the objection that Jesus was a sorcerer, deceiver, and magician. Of interest is that excerpts from Eusebius' previous apologetic works can be found in *Theophania*, including *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*.[62] A last work whose date is unknown is *Refutation and Defense*. It is simply a response to pagan objections to Christian religion.[63]

Special attention needs to be paid to what is arguably his ultimate response to all of Christianity's critics, *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*. Eusebius argues that before the "Gospel truth" can be demonstrated, it must be prepared. This is accomplished by showing through reasoned argument why Christians hold that Jewish beliefs are superior to pagan beliefs. Only afterwards can they claim the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, how Jesus fulfilled the prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures.[64] The following chapter will deal with an investigation of the structure and arguments of these two apologetic works.

---

62 J. Quasten, *Patrology*, p. 333.

63 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 334.

64 Aryeh Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caearea and the Christian-Jewish Polemic," in *Contra Iudaeos* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1996), p. 60.

Chapter 3: The Significance and Structure of the ***Praeparatio Evangelica*** and the ***Demonstratio Evangelica***

In the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Eusebius responds in turn to the three main contemporary arguments levied against Christianity. Critics claimed that Christians abandoned the religion of their ancestors. The first part of the *Praeparatio* investigates the beliefs of their ancestors, attempting to shatter the foundations of pagan religion and philosophy. Critics also condemned Christians for preferring barbarian (i.e. Hebrew) religion to pagan religion. The *Praeparatio* continues by comparing barbarian beliefs to pagan beliefs. The goal is to show how the Hebrew religion and philosophy is superior to pagan culture. Lastly, critics argued that the Christians adopted the Hebrew Scriptures but rejected the laws that guide their way of life. Part of the *Praeparatio* and the majority of the *Demonstratio* explain the differences between Christianity and Judaism, and the superiority of the former.[1]

In doing so, Eusebius argues for a unique Christian view of human history. He develops this view of history in these two works by weaving together apologetics against the Greeks and apologetics against the Jews. The apologetics against the Greeks are broken down into two categories: apologetic-polemical, in which he responds to pagan criticisms, stating what Christians do *not* believe by breaking down their pagan beliefs; and positive-doctrinal, in which he shows how the beliefs of the Hebrews are preferable to the beliefs of the Greeks, arguing *positively* what the Christians do believe. The apologetics against the Jews mainly comes later in the *Demonstratio*, after the groundwork has been laid, though aspects of it can be found in the *Praeparatio*.[2]

---

1 Eusebius makes a distinction between "Hebrew" and "Jew," between the doctrines espoused by the patriarchs and the Mosaic code called Judaism. The remainder of this chapter will clarify this distinction and how Eusebius develops it.

2 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea...," pp. 60, 61, and 70.

In the first six books of *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Eusebius presents the history of pagan religion by breaking it down into three categories, mythical, natural and political. He begins by examining rival fables, or mythology. He writes, "I thought it important in the beginning of the *Preparation for the Gospel* to refute the polytheistic error of all the nations, in order to commend and excuse our separation from them, which we have made with good reason and judgement."[3] Eusebius criticizes the fact that the Greeks handed down their fables in the guise of history, and legitimized them as *tradition*al beliefs.[4] He stresses that the Greek religion did not develop independently, but derived itself from the Phoenicians and the Egyptians. In addition, the Greek religion was flawed in its earliest stages, for it was based on a belief system that advocated worshipping the heavenly bodies. Only the ancient Hebrews possessed the first true religion, worshipping the one supreme God. Books two and three continue by systematically refuting the *mythical* theology of the poets and the *natural* philosophy of the philosophers. He next develops the argument that the Hebrews stand alone.

> They (pagans) had not, however, chosen the course which accords with reason. For only some one or two perchance, or at most a very few others, whose memory is recorded in the oracles of the Hebrews, could not adapt their idea of God to any of the things that are seen, but with unperverted reasonings led up their thoughts from visible things to the Creator of the whole world and the great Maker of the universe, and with purified eyes of the understanding perceived that He alone is God, the Saviour of all, and sole giver of good gifts.[5]

These handful included the patriarchs, who rejected the worship of the heavenly bodies.[6]

In books four to six, Eusebius considers the *political* theology, or the religion of the state. He states that the corrupted religion of the temples and oracles are controlled by

---

3 Gifford, E.H. *Eusebii Praeparatio Evangelica*. [Eusebius. *The Preparation for the Gospel*.] Oxford, 1903. Greek text, English translation and notes.

4 *P.E.*, Book 15, Chapter I.

5 ibid, Book 2, Chapter VI, p. 80.

6 Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1989), pp. 180, 182-83.

evil demons. Jesus' teachings made his followers aware of this reality, and as a result, they have chosen no longer to pay respect or sacrifice to the gods recognized by the Romans.

> ...Wherefore with good reason, after being enlightened in the eyes of our understanding by the word of salvation, and made prudent, and wise, and pious, and free from all ills, we will neither sacrifice nor be in bondage to the supposed gods of the heathen, who formerly indeed tyrannized over us also...[7]

He states that Jesus' teachings have stripped all power away from the demons and nullified the authority of their religion. As a result, Christians, by following Jesus, are responsible for the newly-revived progress of civilization which the demons kept in check. Book six continues the criticism of the Greek political theology by presenting a defense of freewill against astral determinism.[8]

These first books of the *Praeparatio* are devoted to undercutting the foundations of pagan religion and philosophy, thus responding to the pagan intellectuals' first criticism of Christianity. Beginning with book seven, Eusebius makes a transition. He starts to develop the two-fold argument that the Hebrews possess a different origin than the pagans and that the Christians have legitimately adopted beliefs based on the Hebrew Scriptures. He explains this at the beginning of the seventh book.

> For since it has been proved that our abandonment of the false theology of Greeks and barbarians alike has not been made without reason, but with well-judged and prudent consideration, it is now time to solve the second question by stating the cause of our claiming to share in the Hebrew doctrines...[9]

He justifies this claim by stating that Christians believe in the same ancient dogmas as the Hebrew patriarchs.[10] Thus Christian history does not begin with the arrival of Jesus. It can be traced back *at least* to the time of Abraham.

---

7 *P.E.*, Book 4, Chapter XXI, p. 187.
8 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* pp. 183-84.
9 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter I, p. 321.
10 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* p. 185.

This notion builds upon the apologetic precedent that Christianity is not new, but an ancient tradition. And its followers are not deserters, but a people, the *triton genos*, or third race. Eusebius mentions this concept in his *Ecclesiastical History*, and fully develops it in the *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio*. He argues that the Christian way of life and its *eusebias dogmata*, or teachings about piety, are not new. Both are traced back to "the beloved of God," who used their *physikai ennoiai*, or natural perceptions, to guide their lives. The *Hebraion ethnos*, or Hebrew people, describe these "beloved" in their Scriptures.

Some of these "beloved" existed before the flood, before the time of Noah. The first of them was Enos, who "...hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God."[11] Eusebius calls him a "true man" because he attained divine knowledge and reverence for God.[12] By using the rational faculty of his soul,

> he was persuaded that not only by creative power had He well and orderly disposed the whole, but also, like the lord as it were of a great city, was the ruler of the whole, and dispenser, and master of the house, being at once Lord, and King, and God.[13]

Eusebius stresses Enos' innovative use of logic, rationality, and contemplation of the divine nature.

The second "beloved" was Enoch, which Eusebius translates as meaning "grace of God." Enoch "...pleased the Lord, and was not to be found...because God translated him" because he was perfect in virtue.[14] Those who are *translated* by God are taken from this world to the next. Even though these individuals can no longer be found in the world of

---

11 Genesis 4:26, quoted in *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 329.

12 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII.

13 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 329.

14 Genesis 5:24 quoted in *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 331. According to the *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures*, (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985), p. 10, this verse is translated, "Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, for God took him." What follows in this chapter is Eusebius' explanation of why he "pleased" God and why God "translated" him.

the senses, they exist by God's side, for they have been welcomed as a "friend" of God.[15] The next "beloved" was Noah, who was known as "a righteous man in his generation."[16] Eusebius describes him as a "spark" which kindled future generations, devoid of the wickedness of his contemporaries.

Next in line were those referred to as the "Hebrew patriarchs." Foremost was Abraham, who achieved a unique knowledge of God through pure contemplation. His son Isaac received his knowledge and divine favor. Next was Jacob, who later became Israel. Eusebius explains that in Greek, Jacob means "man in training, an athlete."[17] He received his other name after he won victory over his opponents, a reference to his wrestling with another being in Genesis, chapter 32. Thereafter, he would no longer be called Jacob, for "...in the enjoyment of the blessings of contemplation, then his name also is changed by the God who communes with him..."[18] Eusebius states that "Israel," or "ish ra'eh El," is translated as the man who "sees" and contemplates God.[19] All of Israel's sons are viewed as the "beloved of God," and they all exhibit "philosophic endurance and discipline." However, Joseph, more than any of his siblings, was graced with piety. He possessed a unique knowledge of God and was chaste, just, and prudent.[20]

Eusebius devotes much space to investigating the nature of the "beloved of God" for a two-fold reason. First, he needs to show why they are called "beloved." He focuses upon their piety, their purity, and their rational contemplation, to show that they had no need of the later Mosaic legislation to commune with God. Second, he needs to show that the Christian communities traced themselves back to antiquity, back to Enosh and Enoch and their descendants.

---

15 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII.
16 Genesis 6:9, quoted in *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 331
17 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 334.
18 ibid.
19 ibid.
20 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII.

But Eusebius goes further. In this chapter, he states that another name for these "beloved of God" is *Christian*. He stresses that the dogmas of the "beloved" are different than the dogmas of the Jews, who base their belief system on the Mosaic legislation.[21] They lived generations before Moses, before the enactment of his legislation, which included the commandment of circumcision. These "beloved" were not even called Jews, but rather *Hebrews*. Eusebius explains that this name was based upon the root "eber."

> ...they are a kind of 'passengers' who have set out on their journey from this world to pass to the contemplation of the God of the universe. For they are recorded to have travelled the straight path of virtue aright by natural reasoning and by unwritten laws, and to have passed beyond carnal pleasures to the life of perfect wisdom and piety.[22]

Judaism (and Jew) were later developments, established by Moses to end the decline of the religion and morality of the Jews who had been corrupted by the Egyptians. The patriarchs, in Eusebius words, the original Christians (or *proto-Christians*), guided their lives by "natural religion," and had no need for the later Mosaic legislation.[23]

Eusebius stresses that a clear difference of moral content exists between Christians, who guide their lives by the teachings of Jesus, and Jews, who guide their lives by the Mosaic Law.

> [Christians,] from their knowledge of Christ and his teaching, were distinguished by moderation, charity, a restrained way of life and virtues requiring courage, as well as by the religious consciousness that God is one, unique, and superior to all.[24]

The Jewish laws, on the other hand, were handed down much later, centuries after the patriarchs. Eusebius stresses that the Gospel of Jesus is not new, but is the same religion

---

21 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea...," pp. 71-72.

22 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 333.

23 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* p. 186. This concept will be developed later in this chapter. Eusebius explains that Judaism was still vital, serving as a stepping stone, connecting the Hebrew religion with Christianity.

24 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea...," p. 72.

revealed to the Abraham and the other "beloved of God."[25] Eusebius uses a quote from *Romans* to show that divine favor is not granted through law, but through righteousness and faith.

> What then shall we say about Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh....For what does the scripture say? 'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness.'...Is this blessing pronounced only upon the circumcised, or also upon the uncircumcised? We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness. How then was it reckoned to him? Was it before or after he had been circumcised? It was not after, but before he was circumcised. He received circumcision as a sign or seal of the righteousness which he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised....The promise to Abraham and his descendants, that they should inherit the world, did not come through the law but through the righteousness of faith.[26]

Thus, Abraham received the divine promise before he was circumcised, before he was instructed to follow any specific law, centuries before the development of the detailed Mosaic legal code.

In Book 7, Eusebius builds upon his conception of *Hebraism* (as opposed to *Judaism*) to show that the Hebrews guided their lives by a unique *philosophical* world view. He devotes several chapters to explain Moses' motivation as he composed the Hebrew Scriptures. Eusebius explains that Moses based his writing upon the theology of the Hebrew patriarchs. He logically began with the creation of the universe to introduce the "universal Cause and Creator of things visible and invisible,"[27] the God which existed over all of creation.

In Chapter XI of Book 7, Eusebius argues that the Hebrew theology embraces the idea of the First Cause of the universe. All of creation is constantly administered by the divine providence of this First Cause. He adds that Abraham viewed God in these terms, and that the prophets who lived centuries after Moses related to God in these terms. Then, in

---

25 ibid.

26 *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (with the Apocrypha, Expanded Edition), Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 1365.

27 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter IX, p. 338.

the same chapter, Eusebius compares this Hebrew theology to the variant forms of Greek theology. Unlike the Hebrews, some Greeks say that the stars in the skies are gods, that fire is the same as God, that only the heavenly bodies are administered by God, that God is not providential, or even that God does not exist.[28]

In Chapter XII, Eusebius argues that the Jews believe in a Second Cause as well. Also known as "Word" and "Wisdom," it is *included* in the First Cause. While the First Cause is without beginning, uncreated, and incapable of mixture, the Second Cause is sent from the First to communicate with humanity in the form of prophecy. Eusebius states that the divine according to Hebrew theology, is existent as "Father and Son," or First and Second cause.[29] Eusebius then quotes Philo and Aristobulus as examples of Jewish "philosophers" who developed this aspect of Hebrew theology. In Chapter XV, Eusebius argues that Hebrew theology includes a hierarchy of rational powers which mediate from lower levels, such as humanity, to higher levels, such as from the heavenly bodies to the "Word," and finally to the Supreme God.

In the next chapter, he begins to discuss the "adverse powers," or the daemons, those beings who oppose the hierarchy of rational powers imposed by the Divine. First, he speaks of the positive powers set over the world, such as the ministering angels, who "...like the stars of heaven, they circle round the Sun of Righteousness and His fellow the Holy Spirit, and enjoy the supply of their light, and for that reason are naturally compared to the luminaries in heaven."[30] The daemons are those mediating powers which turn away from the path of "light" and "rational contemplation." Through their actions, they express their hatred of God.

> A proof of their hatred of God is that they wish themselves to be proclaimed gods, and steal away for themselves the honours intended for God, and attempt to entice

---

28 *P.E.*, Book VII, Chapter XI.
29 *P.E.*, Book VII, Chapter XII.
30 *P.E.*, Book VII, Chapter XVI, p. 355.

> the simple by divinations and oracles as lures and baits, and draw them away from looking up to the God of the whole world...[31]

Eusebius calls these self-deceived powers apostates from the proper path of mediating between higher and lower powers.

In the next chapter, Eusebius shifts from the investigation of the nature of the hierarchy of rational beings to the nature of man. He praises the Hebrew conception that God, through divine decree, called to exist an intelligent, rational being able to comprehend the divine nature. This rational *immortal* aspect of humanity was modeled after the likeness of God.[32] This is what God meant with the words, "And God said, 'Let us made man in our image, and after our likeness.' And God created man, in the image of God created He him."[33] Eusebius provides quotes from Philo to supplement his argument of God's intention of creating humanity in the divine likeness.

Eusebius devoted much space in Book 7 to show the transcendent nature of Hebraism (as opposed to Judaism). Again, he stresses the pure, rational contemplation of God's "beloved." He also investigates the nature of this contemplation, the unique features of Hebrew theology and philosophy. This world view was handed down through the generations, from Enosh, to Abraham, to Moses, to the prophets, to Philo, and ultimately to contemporary Chrisitan communities. Eusebius needs to present this argument not only to show how the Christians can trace themselves back to ancient origins, but also to prove that the patriarchs, or *proto-Christians*, embraced a philosophy parallel to Platonism, specifically Middle Platonism. Thus, they were both ancient and intellectually sophisticated.

Middle Platonism is a general term for the development of Greek philosophy during the period in between the ancient form of Platonism and the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and his followers. It focused upon the concept of *transcendence*, parting from the previously-

---

31 ibid, p. 357.
32 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter XVII.
33 Genesis, 1:26, quoted in *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter XVII, p. 358.

dominant materialism, stressing the supersensible and immaterial as the ultimate ground for the physical world. This concept of transcendence depended upon a reinterpretation of the Platonic doctrine of the demiurge, or Second Cause of the universe, found in the dialogue *Timaeus*.[34]

The metaphysics of Middle Platonism embraced the notion of God being both First Cause and a Second Cause. The former is atemporal and immobile, whose primary role is the contemplation of Ideas. Philo, an advocate of Middle Platonic doctrine, linked the Second Cause to the biblical concept of *Wisdom*. It is this Second Cause which is the creative power of the universe.[35]

A point of controversy in Middle Platonic thought concerned the status of matter Plato stated that the cosmos, the material universe, was created, having an actual beginning, but would never "die." Aristotle, on the other hand, stated that the cosmos was eternal, rejecting the Platonic notion that the universe could be born but never perish.[36] Eusebius' presentation of the Hebrew theology advocated the Platonic notion that the universe was indeed created, according to the will of the First Cause but under the direction of the Second Cause.

The mystical-religious tenets of Middle Platonism embraced a hierarchical conception of the divine. Highest is the Supreme God (First and Second Causes). Next are the Secondary Gods, such as the stars, the sun, and the moon. Next are the Daemons, neither divine nor human, yet superior to mankind. They served as mediators between the higher God and man.[37] Both humans and daemons, according to Middle Platonism, transcend and assimilate with the divine by leading a distinctly moral life. According to Eusebius,

---

34 Giovanni Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy: vol. 4 Schools of the Imperial Age*, ed. and trans. by John Catan, (New York: State University of New York Press, 1990), p. 210.

35 ibid, p. 219.

36 ibid, p. 224.

37 ibid, p. 226.

what made the "beloved" of God distinct was their admirable moral behavior. They were able to learn by the example of those positive daemons who turned towards God and offered God praise, but they were able to resist the temptations of those corrupt daemons who rejected God, believing falsely they were gods themselves.

Eusebius, in Books 1-6, attempted to break down the pagan belief system with the apologetic-polemical section of the *Praeparatio*. Book 7 begins the positive-doctrinal portion of his work, an explanation of what the Christians believe. They had no need of the detailed Mosaic legislation. The law was needed for the descendants of the Hebrew patriarchs, whose moral code spiraled downward in Egypt. For Eusebius, the Egyptians possessed the worst of the worst morality. It was this same corrupt morality that adversely influenced the Jews. They needed the Mosaic code to rebuild their deteriorated way of life. But Eusebius stresses that the code was never intended to be permanent.[38]

> ...For they [the former Hebrew slaves] were unable through moral weakness to emulate the virtue of their fathers, inasmuch as they were enslaved by passions and sick in soul; so He gave them the polity that corresponded to their condition, ordaining some things openly and clearly, and implying others enigmatically...for them to keep and observe.
>
> And so the Jewish polity began about that time with Moses, and continues in accordance with the voices of their own prophets until the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ. For this also was a prophecy of Moses himself and the prophets who followed, that the customs and ordinances of Moses should not fail before those of the Christ appeared, the ordinances, that is, of the new covenant, which has been proclaimed to all nations through our Saviour...[39]

Thus, Judaism, guided by the Mosaic code, was only to exist for a limited period of time. The Mosaic law was only intended for a temporary purpose, to spread the patriarchal teachings throughout the world, paving the way for the arrival of Jesus and humanity's acceptance of Christianity. At this point, Eusebius finally presents his definition of

---

38 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea...," pp. 73-74.

39 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter VIII, p. 337.

Christianity, which is related to Judaism. He states that Christianity is the pristine, pure, contemplative religion of the Hebrew patriarchs, and that it is older than Judaism. [40]

Book 8 of the *Praeparatio* focuses upon the Jewish polity founded by Moses. The laws and regulations which guided this state presented humanity with the most advanced form of civilization. A problem, however, is that it could only be followed by Jews, more specifically, only Jews who lived in Israel. Still, this was part of the divine plan, in preparation for the incarnation of Jesus. Another part of this preparation was the *Septuagint*, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. This was done in order to spread the prophetical teachings throughout the world.[41] The translation of the teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures had a civilizing effect upon the Greco-Roman world, creating sufficient political and social conditions for the acceptance of Jesus' seemingly new, but actually ancient, teachings.[42] Even though he believed that Christianity was more ancient than Judaism, it was directly connected to Judaism, for the latter served as a bridge connecting the ancient Hebrews to the Christians that lived in his day.

This raises a serious problem, however, for according to Eusebius' argument, Christianity was dependent upon and developed from Judaism, not from the patriarchs. He attempted to solve this problem by claiming that two categories of Jews have lived throughout the centuries. One group lives by the literal meaning of the Mosaic code. The other group have lived virtuous lives without needing the Mosaic code. Eusebius referred to this group as "Jewish philosophers." These individuals have devoted their energies to striving to understand the inner significance of the laws without having to live by them literally. One example of this group, according to Eusebius, was Philo. This latter group, more similar to the Hebrew patriarchs than to the Jews, maintained the thread of continuity connecting the patriarchs, or *proto-Christians*, to the masses led by Moses, to

---

40 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 181.
41 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea...," pp. 75-76.
42 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 185.

the people living with the prophets, to the Alexandrian Hellenistic Jews, and finally to the contemporary Christians communities following the teachings of Jesus. In every generation these "Jewish philosophers" have carried forward the pure, pristine, older lifestyle of the patriarchs.[43]

In Book 9, Eusebius shows

> ..that the most illustrious of the Greeks themselves have not been unaquainted with the affairs of the Hebrews; but some of them testified to the truth of the historical narratives current among them as well as to their mode of life, while others treated doctrinal theology also in the same manner as they did.[44]

He hopes to show that the Hebrews' morality and actions are respected by acclaimed Greek writers and thinkers. Books 7-9 as a unit set the stage for the next part of overall argument in Books 11-13. He has attempted to show the parallels between Hebraism and Platonism by stressing the contemplative, transcendent nature of the theology and philosophy of the ancient patriarchs. The next section of the *Praeparatio* further develops this concept. But in between is a Book that stands alone, dealing specifically with the *derived* nature of Greek learning. This will be briefly considered before investigating Books 11-13.

Book 10 of the *Praeparatio* represents another shift. Scholars claim that starting here, Eusebius presents the watershed argument of the entire work.[45] Eusebius argues that the Greeks derived all of their learning, and even all of their philosophy, from the Hebrews. But he goes further by stating that they more than *derived* their knowledge from the Hebrews. The Greeks *plagiarized* their learning from them by claiming it as their own. He quotes both Clement and even Porphyry to prove his claim.[46] The fourth chapter of this book states that no critic should be surprised that the Christians prefer the theology of

---

43 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea," pp. 76-77.

44 *P.E.*, Book 15, Chapter I, p. 434.

45 Please note that later chapters of this thesis will return to Books X-XIII, further investigating the importance of this section of Eusebius' apologetic argument.

46 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 181.

the Hebrews to the Greeks, for any redeeming Greek teaching was derived from the Hebrews. What follows in the next three chapters is Eusebius' claim that the Greeks are dependent upon the Hebrews for the culture, even for their alphabet. In order to do this, he must prove the antiquity of Moses and the patriarchs. As stated before, showing that they are more ancient than the earliest figures in Greek history is absolutely crucial. Eusebius presents extracts from a number of sources. Porphyry, Julius Africanus[47], Tatian, Clement, and Josephus.[48]

This sets the stage for Eusebius' second argument, developed in Books 11-13, which complements his previously developed antiquity argument. This second argument concerns the origin of Plato's concept of transcendance. He argues that Plato did not derive his uniqe concept of transcendance from the Greek philosophical world. The other main Greek philosophical schools, such as the Stoics, the Epicureans, and the Aristotelians, were all materialists. Plato, with his doctrine of transcendance, was a classic dualist and stood apart from the rest. Eusebius states that since Plato presented a stark contrast from previous and contemporary schools of thought, then he must have derived his doctrines from an outside, non-Greek source. He argues that this souce was Hebraism, particularly from the "beloved of God." One of his central points is that whenever Platonism and Christianity agree, one must remember that Christianity did not derive its wisdom from the Greeks, but that the Platonists derived their wisdom from the more ancient Christians. Whenever Greek philosophy in general, or Platonic philosophy in particular differ from Christianity, the former drifted from the wisdom and truth of the latter. Eusebius continues this argument in Book 13, citing Plato's criticism of the

---

47 Africanus (160 - c. 240) had close connections with Roman officials, including Emperor Alexander Severus, and with many Christian apologists, including Origen. He also wrote *History of the World*, which claimed that the world was 5500 years old at Jesus' birth and would last another 500 years. Fragments of it are preserved in Eusebius' *Chronicle*. *(Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 768.)

48 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* pp. 187-190.

"absurdities" of Greek religion and mythology, stating that critics should not condemn Christians for rejecting doctrines that the greatest of all Greek philosophers rejected. He concludes this section by stating that Plato was simply misstaken whenever he disagreed or diverged from the Hebrew Scriptures.[49] The next chapter of this thesis will focus specifically upon Eusebius' investigation of Books 11-13 and his reasoning of the derived nature of Platonism from Hebraism.

In the final two books of the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius boldly argues that all non-Platonic forms of philosophy are useless. He has already attempted to show how Hebraism shares many tenets with Platonism.[50] Now he tries to show how Hebraism does not agree with all other variant non-Platonic Greek philosophies. Eusebius' motive is to justify Christianity's rejection of non-Platonic Greek thought and its acceptance of "Barbarian" philosophy.

> ..when I compare them with the sacred writers and prophets of the Hebrews, and with God who through them has both uttered predictions of things to come and exhibited marvellous works, nay more, has laid the foundations of instruction in religious learning and true doctrines, I no longer think that any one ought with reason to blame us, if we prefer God before men, and truth itself before human reasonings and conjectures.[51]

In these final two books of the *Praeparatio*, he sets up a clear contrast between Greek philosophical principles and Christian philosophical principles, which are firmly planted in Hebraism. In Book 14, Eusebius specifically targets the pre-Platonic School of Xenophanes and Parmenides, Plato's successors, the Sceptics, the School of Aristippus, the School of Metrodorus and Protagoras, and the Epicureans.

---

49 ibid, pp. 190-191.

50 In this context, when Eusebius uses the term "Patonist," he is speaking of the philosophical movement we call "Middle Platonism." The movement labeled "Middle Platonism" is a blanket term used to describe the evolution of the Platonic school up to the time of the Neoplatonists. Eusebius in his time knew of no such terminology. He considered himself simply to be an advocate of some aspects of "Platonism."

51 *P.E.*, Book 14, Chapter I, pp. 773-774.

Book 15 is mainly devoted to Aristotle and the Stoics. Both the Church and Eusebius looked with suspicion upon the teachings of Aristotle. The prevailing Christian opinion was that his teachings led to a materialistic view of the world and a rejection of transcendence. In addition, Aristotle was seen as the diametric opposite of Plato, who was held in high regard by Christian intellectuals. The contrast between the two concerned their different interpretaion of *Ideas*, or forms. Plato believed in a hierarchy. The source of all *Ideas* was the "Idea of the Good." This became synonymous with the "Idea of God," which in turn became "God." He taught that only the "Idea of the Good" exists, or *is*, while all other entities are in the process of *becoming*. Aristotle, in contrast, taught that *Ideas* are only expressed in actual objects. Any material object X is a combination of the *Idea* (or form) of X and the matter of X.[52]

This Aristotelian notion of a combination of *Idea* and matter required a theory of causation which was foreign to the Christian notion of causation. While this theory begins with a First Cause, the origin of all *Ideas*, it is nothing compared to the personal Christian First Cause, or "God the Father." For Aristotle, there were the material, formal, final, and efficient causes. The material cause concerns the matter on which the form of any entity is imposed. The formal cause is the form, in combination with the matter, that comprises an entity. The final cause is the ultimate end which determines an entity's course of change and development. Lastly, the efficient cause is the motive which leads to change in an entity.[53] This conception focuses on the material world, drifting from the Platonic transcendent world of form, *Ideas*, and contemplation of the divine. It is no surprise that Eusebius rejected Aristotelianism as foreign to Hebraism and Christianity.

Aristotle's system was condemned for its inability to incorporate a providential god or the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Moreover, early Christian

---

52 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Aristotle," p. 86.
53 ibid.

intellectuals condemned him for his heretical teachings and his allegedly teaching dialectics to the Gnostics. Yet, he still provided a powerful influence, specifically for Clement, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa. They utilitzed his physics and metaphysics, as well as his logic in ideological debates.[54]

Next, Eusebius turned to Stoicism, a philosophical school founded in Athens by Zeno of Citium (335-263 BCE). The Stoics embraced materialistic pantheism, in stark contrast to Platonic idealism. The Stoic God was "the immanent all-pervading energy by which the natural world is created and sustained."[55] For the Stoics, therefore, the divine reality was found in every element of the material world. As a result, since God was indivisible from the physical world, even *God* was corporeal.[56] In addition, the Stoic God was also the world reason, or *Logos*, which was manifested materially in the order and beauty of the world. The power of this *logos* eliminated all possibility for randomness or chance. This complete rejection of transcendence and divine hierarchy ran counter to early Christian thinking. For example, when Justin taught that God could not be limited spatially and existed before the world was created, he was responding directly to the Stoic position. In contrast, for the Stoics, God only exists in this world, in the material world, and no personal relationship or transcendent, one-to-one connection with the divine is possible. Their version of Providence was God's concern for the harmony of the universe, not for the well-being of any of its parts.[57] For the early Christians, such a doctrine was not only foreign, but also unacceptable.

With the Stoics, Eusebius concludes his attempt to disarm and dismantle pagan religion, philosophy, and culture. After systematically tracing the origins and principles of the Greek paideia, he concludes the following:

---

54 *Encyclopedia of Early Christiantiy*, 2nd ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997), s.v. "Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), Aristotelianism," pp. 113-114.

55 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Stoicism," p. 1312.

56 *Encyclopedia of Early Christiantiy*, s.v. "Stoicism," p. 1089.

57 ibid, p. 1090.

> ...we have preferred the truth and piety found among those who have been regarded as Barbarians to all the wisdom of the Greeks, not in ignorance of their fine doctrines, but by a well examined and thoroughly tested judgement.[58]

Books 14 and 15 provide the bridge to the second part of his complementary work, the *Demonstratio*, in which Eusebius turns his attention to the Jews.[59]

At the beginning of this work, he has to address the charge the Christianity deviated from Judaism. Continuing the argument begun in the *Praeparatio*, he states that Christianity neither developed from Hellenism or Judaism, but from the ancient patriarchs.

> ..those who pass from Hellenism to Christianity do not join Judaism, and those who reject the Jewish cult do not automatically become Hellenes. Rather, they ascend to the middle road, a road that was traversed by the holy men of old. This road was revived by the redeeming Lord, according to the prophesies of Moses and the other prophets.[60]

In the *Praeparatio*, Eusebius presented an idealized conception of Judaism, whose major purpose was to serve as a means to an end, linking Christianity to the patriarchs. He does this to answer the charge that Christians deserted to a barbarian religion. He responds by attempting to argue that the Christians are not apostates but have returned to an ancient religion, reviving it for the benefit of humanity. Again, Eusebius argues that his religion is even older than Judaism, esteemed in its own right for maintaining ancient traditions, and that Christians have advanced past Judaism to reach the distinct, ideal faith.[61]

However, Eusebius still faces a criticism concerning Christianity's acceptance of the Hebrew Scriptures. The issue is how its followers can accept their Bible and yet not live by it. How can they reject the Mosaic code? He begins to answer by stating that if Moses had advocated a code of laws similar to the doctrines of the patriarchs, then all of

---

58 *P.E.*, Book 15, Chapter I, p. 851.
59 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 182.
60 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 78.
61 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea," pp. 77-78.

humanity would have been able to accept the Law. As stated earlier in the *Praeparatio*, not everyone can accept all of the Mosaic code, not even all of the Jews. For example, not everyone can make the required pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and not everyone can offer sacrifices at the Temple. Eusebius then claims that a distinct doctrine had to be spread, one that all of humanity can embrace, to allow everyone to share in the divine promise to Abraham.[62] For this reason, the restrictive rules and regulations of the Mosaic code can be placed to the side, since they were never meant to apply all of humanity in the first place. The reason Christians accept the Hebrew Scriptures and ignore the Law is that it contains prophecies about the coming of Jesus and the growth of Christianity. While the "old" Mosaic code was transitional, purifying the corrupted Jewish people, the "new" covenant of Jesus will usher all of humanity into the promised land.[63]

Eusebius makes a distinction between the old covenant of the Jews and the new covenant of the Christians, based upon the source of their respective doctrines. The patriarchs witnessed the "christ-logos" not through the Supreme God (God the Father), but the Second God, *tis deuteros theos*. They lived by the "commandments of christ," distinct from and unbound by the Mosaic code.

> The new covenant is both old and new. It is new in that it was concealed since the days of Moses and only seemingly reborn to new life by the teachings of the Savior. But the degeneration had begun earlier in Egypt, when the ideal of the new covenant was forgotten. The Law of Moses was introduced to nurse those childish souls....the Law had to introduce a less perfect way of life to the children of Abraham, who were too weak to follow their ancestors as a result of having adopted Egyptian customs, becoming idolatrous and in fact being life Egyptians in every way.[64]

---

62 An example is Genesis 18:18, which states, "since Abraham is to become a great and populous nation and all the nations of the earth are to bless themselves by him." Quoted in *Tanakh: the Holy Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985), p. 25.

63 Kofsky, "Eusebius of Caesarea," pp. 78-80.

64 ibid, p. 81.

Eusebius attempts to use the *Demonstratio* to delegitimize the Judaism that continued to thrive after the death (and supposed resurrection) of Jesus. He stresses that even Moses knew that his Law was temporary and fated to be invalidated by Jesus' new covenant. He concludes that the clearest sign for the obsolescence of Judaism is the fact that Jerusalem had been conquered and the Temple destroyed. The "phasing out" of Judaism was part of Providence's guiding hand.[65]

Arguably, a theme which influenced every work within the body of Eusebius' contribution to early Christian literature was the unity of God's action in the world. For Eusebius, whether he wrote historical, exegetical, doctrinal, oratorical, or apologetic works, the divine was ever-present. For him, the implication was clear

> ...It meant that the Redeemer was also the Creator: that the same God, the same Logos and the same Spirit had acted, spoken, given life and inspired in the beginning and throughout all the ages and who continued to do so with even greater fullness and clarity in the new dispensation.[66]

As a writer, compiler, and editor, he possessed a keen ability to choose the right text for the right purpose to prove his point.[67] He responded to the challenges of his day from anti-Christian intellectuals to defend early Christianity and argued not only to prove the legitimacy of the faith but the superiority of the faith to all other alternatives.

Eusebius, however, will be foremostly remembered as an apologist. He lived in a delicate time which saw the beginnings of the transfer from the dominant Hellenistic world to the Christian world. Influenced by the Greek world and adopting many of its principles, he bridged the gap, arguing for the truth of Christianity in terms all could at least understand, whether Greek or Christian, pagan or Jew. By building upon the contributions of his predecessors and contributing his own breadth and depth of

---

65 ibid.

66 Droge, *Homer or Moses?* p. 199.

67 Lightfoot, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 345.

knowledge, he left behind an impressive body of work which solidified the foundation of early Christianity.[68]

---

68 ibid, p. 346.

Chapter 4: *A Closer Investigation of Eusebius' Arguments in Books 11-13 of the* ***Praeparatio Evangelica***

I.

As stated earlier, according to the Greek *paideia*, the Hellenist Greeks believed they had a unique historical destiny to create a "higher type" of man. This could only be achieved through proper education. According to the Greek paradigmatic world view, their *paideia* was "the process of educating man into his true form, the real and genuine human nature."[1] The early Christian communities, which experienced this *paideia* first hand, attempted to adopt this pedagogic perspective. They looked to the divine logos in the embodiment of Jesus Christ as a means to educate not only themselves, but the rest of the Hellenistic world, to develop fully their "genuine human nature." Christians believed that this providential direction, instructing humanity according to the divine will, was necessary, for human rationality alone was not good enough to develop this "higher type" of humanity. Eusebius clearly embraced this notion, for whether he wrote historical, exegetical, doctrinal, oratorical, or apologetic works, providence was ever-present.

While Greek scholars placed complete authority in the traditions of Homer, Hesiod, and later Pythagoras and Plato, Christian intellectuals placed complete authority in the tradition of the teachings of Jesus. The source of these teachings was their canonical text, the Christian Bible, rooted in the Hebrew Scriptures. Within its books, Christians believed they could find signs of the divine *logos*, which provided knowledge about the one "true" religion. Through this text, they gained the knowledge that enabled them to transcend their reality and ultimately receive salvation. Yet again, the early Christian communities borrowed a pedagogic concept from the Hellenistic world. One of the groundings of the

1 Werner Jaeger, *Paideia*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939), pp. xxiii.

Greek paideia was the power scholars placed in their authoritative texts, and equally as important, how they were approached and interpreted. Thus, a clear relation existed between the written word, education, and the perfection of humanity. The gateway into *paideia* and the authoritative texts became known as *grammatica*, "the science of interpreting the poets and other writers and the systematic principles for speaking and writing correctly."[2]

The Greeks developed the concept that grammatical knowledge was indispensable in all text-based systems, whether within the arts of discourse, biblical exegesis, literary interpretation, philosophy, theology, or law. In effect, this "*grammatica* provided the readerly and interpretive skills for the production of literary and textual knowledge across the disciplines."[3] This can be seen in a first century BCE writing by Diodorus Siculus.[4] This writing describes a proposed law that all sons of citizens should have the opportunity to learn *grammata*. The reason?

> ..it is writing alone which preserves the finest sayings of men of wisdom and the oracles of the gods, as well as philosophy and all learning (*paideia*), and is constantly handing them down to succeeding generations for the ages to come.[5]

This excerpt shows the clear connection that existed between *paideia* and *grammatica*.

As later Christian communities struggled to establish themselves as a people, they emphasized the authoritative nature of their traditional texts and, like the Greeks, considered mastery of *grammatica* a precondition to understanding Hebrew, Latin, and Greek. Moreover, *grammatica* sustained the power of the Christian Scriptures and was *sustained by* the power of the Christian Scriptures. *Grammatica* was the gateway to a

---

2 Martin Irvine, *The Making of a Textual Culture - 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) p. xiii.

3 ibid, p. 2.

4 This is found in the *Bibliotheca historica*, a historical compilation researched in Alexandra. It is a story about Charondas, a Sicilian *nomothetes*, or lawgiver.

5 Irvine, *Making of Textual Culture*, p. 12.

proper understanding of the very foundation of their religious culture, their attempt to foster a religious *paideia*.[6]

Centuries earlier, Plato and Aristotle paved the way for this necessity of grammatical knowledge. For them, *grammata* concerned writing, the letters of the alphabet, and the system of spoken sounds transferred to the printed text. A *grammatikos* was one who knew *grammata*, how to read and write. And a *grammatist* was one who maintained and transmitted *paideia*, or literary culture. The grammatist possessed the necessary skills to approach the canonical texts, such as those written by Homer and Hesiod, and to discover their proper moral interpretations. In time, the mastery of *grammatica* became the "...only point of entry into a culture defined by a program of liberal arts (the *enkyklios paideia*, the "cycle" of general culture) and an authoritative cultural scripture."[7]

The early Christian communities attempted to define themselves as a third genos, possessing their own culture, their own history, and their own legacy. As a result, for their intellectuals, the mastery of *grammatica* became a necessary tool, not only for their self-understanding, but also for their self-promotion in the Hellenistic world. Clearly, these early Christian communities were influenced by the Greek *paideia* and its foundational *grammatica*. But in addition, they embraced elements of Stoic philosophy, in particular their theory of the *logos* and their poetic and literary interpretation of canonical texts.[8]

The Stoic theory of poetics viewed poetry and *logos* as interconnected. "The theoretical frame supplied by the **doctrine** of *logos*...provides the basic presuppositions of a metaphysical system that became interwoven with *grammatica*."[9] The Stoics believed that the logos pervaded all aspects of existence. It could be found in the structure of

6 ibid, p. 14.
7 ibid, p. 24.
8 ibid, p. 34.
9 ibid, p. 36.

being, in the nature of discourse, and in the nature of the very foundation of discourse. As a result, *grammatica* became a crucial means of approaching the *logos*, identifying it, and understanding it.

Thus, they placed great value on the allegorical interpretation of the written text. The Stoics viewed human discourse as the corporeal vehicle of "meaning," the very embodiment of the *logos*. Within the written text, particularly within poetry, they found signs of deeper structures and meanings of the *logos*. Thus, poetic language contained the secrets of the *logos*, providing clues for the reader to be aware of the relationship between *language* and *nature*. They developed a two-fold allegorical method. The first concerned etymology, the deconstruction of single words to determine the connection between "words and things." The second was inter-textual, concerning the organized and systematized relationships between separate authoritative texts. This two-fold method was related to *logos*, which was "...understood to be disclosed in the structure and lexicon of a language and most evident in poetrical and religious texts."[10]

Early Christian intellectuals saw the Stoic doctrine of allegorical interpretation as a means of deciphering a code, of identifying the divine *logos* within both speech and text. One must remember that they viewed Scripture as "a supreme text bearing a plenitude of meaning as a written reflex of *logos*."[11] Therefore, both knowledge of *grammatica* and the Stoic allegorical interpretation became necessary tools to unlock the prophecies and teachings of Jesus *as logos* within their Scriptures.

The Christians owe the Stoics a debt, for they legitimized allegorical interpretation. In addition, the Stoics documented their commentaries of primary texts in written form. As a result, both their primary and secondary texts received authoritative status. This enabled the Christian intellectuals to view not only their Scriptures but also their commentaries as

---

10 ibid, p. 37.
11 ibid, p. 38

authoritative texts. As Christians grew to view their religion as a philosophy, they saw a connection between *paideia*, *grammatica*, and Scripture. Text became a primary element of defining their culture, their *paideia*. Thus, their intellectuals were concerned over who would have control over Scriptural reading and interpretation. They looked more and more to *grammatica* to obtain the means to control access to authoritative texts, their interpretation, their acceptance, and their rejection.[12]

As libraries were constructed in Alexandria, Rhodes, Pergamum (as well as other locations), and as the Greek educational system became institutionalized, *grammatica* became known as a *techne*. An artform comparable to philosophy, *grammatica* embodied literary scholarship, textual exegesis, literary criticism, and the systematic study of language.[13] With this institutionalization of libraries, the *grammatikos* became *the* authority of classical literary texts. He also became the protector and transmitter of *paideia*. "Hellenistic culture was a culture of the book, a culture of supreme texts that functioned as scripture."[14] Therefore, libraries such as the one in Alexandria were considered to be a vast authoritative storehouse of the Hellenistic culture, preserving in a written form the dominant Greek paradigmatic world view. This authoritative textual storehouse influenced the Alexandrian religious community. The main players of this community included Philo Judaeus, Clement, and Origen. All of them had access to the greatest literary resources in the Greek world.[15] And Eusebius was one of the inheritors of their legacy.

One can view Clement, Origen, and Eusebius as fitting the description of a *grammatikos*. They were experts at text correction and transmission. They studied various Greek literary texts to ensure the continuity of the Greek *paideia*. Lastly, they

---

12 ibid, p. 39.
13 ibid, p. 39.
14 ibid, p. 40.
15 ibid, pp. 40-41.

became experts at textual exegesis and criticism. In general, the *grammatikos* was most valued for his commentaries of authoritative texts. Literary criticism, "...involved interpretation, criticism of esthetic, ethical, and political worth, and judgment on the authenticity of texts."[16] To obtain the title of *grammatikos*, one had to possess a working knowledge of a wide variety of texts, from mythology to politics to philosophy.[17]

In Caesarea, working with his mentor Pamphilus, Eusebius grew familiar with the authoritative texts of the Greek "canon." In addition, Pamphilus exposed him to scripture, pagan and Christian history, ancient literature, geography, technical chronology, exegesis, philology, as well as philosophy.[18] At this library, Eusebius learned how to pick and choose the exact text he needed for his defense of Christianity and how to reproduce it accurately in his own works.[19] He clearly built upon the contributions of his predecessors, including Clement and Origen, and developed a broad working knowledge of a wide diversity of texts. He clearly was worthy of the title, *grammatikos*. In addition, Eusebius became "...the overseer of the corpus of inherited texts central to cultural identity."[20]

The ultimate goal of a mastery of *grammatica* was to comprehend the true meaning of a text, "...that is, to teach what is signified and how it is signified, through which the meaning (i.e. *logos*) is made clear."[21] Therefore, a *grammatikos* such as Eusebius could use his understanding of *grammata* to criticize meanings attributed to various texts viewed as authoritative in the Hellenistic world. In addition, he could use this same understanding to argue that the Christian authoritative texts were the true texts and that the Christian

---

16 ibid, p. 43.
17 ibid, pp. 42-43.
18 Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, 1986), p. 311
19 J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*, p. 33.
20 Irvine, *Making of Textual Culture*, p. 45.
21 ibid, p. 46.

interpretation of these texts was the only true interpretation. In effect, the "...function of the Hellenistic *grammatikos* was the interpretation of the inner *logos* of a literary text by proceeding from *grammata* to *lexis* (the outer form or structure of a text as well as its verbal expression) to *logos*."[22] Eusebius, acting as a Christian *grammatikos*, attempted to use his skills to interpret the lexis, to determine the signs, secrets, and teachings of the divine *logos*, represented by Jesus.

In Books 11-13 of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Eusebius sets up the argument that Hebraism embodies the greatest Platonic teachings. However, he states clearly that Hebraism anticipated these teachings, and that if Plato did not plagiarize them, then through the grace of God he received them and was allowed to translate them for a Greek-speaking audience. Eusebius concludes this part of his argument by claiming that Hebraism not only possesses Platonic wisdom, but is superior to this wisdom, since it is the product of the divine teachings of the *logos*, not the teachings of a mere human being. By the end of Book 13, Eusebius attempts to present a Christian *paideia* that is superior to its Greek counterpart. He bases his reasoning in these three books upon Xenocrates' tripartite division of philosophy into logic, physics, and ethics. Originally, this division was a means to subdivide and understand Greek philosophy. Eusebius uses it as a means to understand the truth of Christianity as a philosophy. For Eusebius, Jesus, the embodiment of the *logos*, was the ultimate teacher and disseminator of knowledge. Using his expertise as a *grammatikos*, he presents a survey of the authoritative Greek and Christian texts in his attempt to prove that his religion's canon is the only accurate expression of truth, and that only Christianity can create the "higher type" of humanity.

Eusebius devotes the first eight chapters of Book 11 to a discussion of ethics and logic. The rest of the book concerns physics and is subdivided in the following order: God; the intelligible essences; the adverse powers; the immortality of the soul; the origin, nature,

---

22 ibid

and completion of the world; and the resurrection of the dead, the celestial world, and the final judgment.[23]

He begins Book 11 by stating that his purpose is "...to exhibit the agreement of the Greek philosophers with the Hebrew Oracles in some if not in all their doctrinal theories."[24] Eusebius chooses Plato, in part because he was the most respected of the Greeks, but also because his doctrines most closely resembled Christian ideals. The goal of this book is to justify why Christians prefer "Barbarian" philosophy to Greek philosophy.[25] In the beginning of Chapter I, he claims that the Hebrews had developed the tripartite division of philosophy centuries before Plato was born. Chapter II is an extract from Atticus which first confirms that Plato divided his philosophy into ethics, physics, and logic, and then provides definitions for the terms. "Ethics" is viewed as the procedure -

> ...to make each one of us honourable and virtuous, and to bring entire households to the highest state of improvement, and finally to furnish the whole commonalty with the most excellent civil polity and the most excellent laws.[26]

In turn, "physics" "...pertains to the knowledge of things divine, and the actual first principles and causes, and all the other things that result from them..."[27] "Logic" is "...adopted to help in determining and discovering what concerns both the former."[28] Chapter III is an extract from Aristocles, from the seventh book of *Of Philosophy*, which repeats Atticus' description. Throughout Books 11-13, Eusebius uses extracts from various Platonic philosophers both to echo his own conclusions and to criticize Plato's

---

23 Eusebe de Cesaree, *La Preparation Evangelique*, Book XI, trans. by Genevieve Favrelle, with revised Greek text by Edouard des Places (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1982), p. 8.

24 Eusebius, P.E., Eusebii Pamphili, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, trans. E.H. Gifford (London: E Typographeo Academio, 1903), Book 11, preface, p. 544.

25 ibid.

26 ibid, Chapter II, p. 546.

27 ibid.

28 ibid.

teachings. He explains that he uses this technique to add strength to his claims. He hopes to show that if Plato's supporters agree with a Christian apologist, then his conclusions are beyond reproach.

Chapter III also includes a "bridge" to the next chapter, that the Hebrews too divided their "philosophy" into these three categories. Books IV-VII explain how they viewed these subjects. One can be ethical "in deed" and "in word." The Hebrew patriarchs, "friends of God," were the model of acting ethically in deed. They viewed God as the dispenser of good, the fountain of virtue, and the provider of all good things. Eusebius describes them as God's "friends" because friends have all in common.[29] Through their actions they attempted to model God as the source of virtue and piety. Eusebius then explains that one can be ethical "in word" by following the moral precepts found in Solomon's *Proverbs*. This source contains concise judgments and apophtegms.[30]

Chapters V and VI concern "logic," or dialectics. Eusebius explains that the writers of the Hebrew Scriptures, illuminated with the divine light of God's providence, used logic as their guide. The result of their work was comparable to the Sophists.

> And if any one were also to study the language itself with critical taste, he would see that, for Barbarians, the writers were excellent dialecticians, not at all inferior to sophists or orators in his own language.[31]

In addition, he praised the authors for setting much of the texts to meter, comparable to efforts made by the Greeks. This reveals the influence of the Stoic doctrine of the *logos* and their view that poetry and music encoded the message of the *logos* within the text. He concluded this chapter by claiming that one knows the Hebrew writings and their prophecies, predictions, and teachings are true because of their divine, not mortal

29 This concept is described in detail in Plato's *Phaedrus*.
30 *P.E.*, Chapter IV.
31 ibid, Chapter V, p. 551.

source.[32] The question is whether those who investigate the text will be able to discern the truth hidden within its verses.

In Chapter VI, he explains that the goal of the dialectician is to discover the names which naturally belong to things, as reflective of their nature. In other words, the names found in the Hebrew Scriptures are not arbitrary, but accurately reflective of the item's nature. This is reflective of the Stoic attempt to understand the "etymos *logos*," or true meaning of proper names.[33] In this chapter, Eusebius stresses the effectiveness of the Hebrew names to express this "true meaning." He cites an excerpt from *Cratylus* to show the importance of correct etymologies, and adds that the Greeks have taken many names from Hebrew sources. Eusebius provides many examples to show the accuracy of the Hebrew names, such as the derivation of "Adam," "Enos," "man," "woman," "firmament," and "God." Then he makes the distinction that while the Greeks cannot explain the etymologies of the letters in their alphabet, the Hebrews can. In addition, he states that by combining the seven vowels of the Hebrew language, one produces the name of God, "the enunciation of one forbidden name."[34] This proves the accuracy of the Hebrew language, for even its vowels divorced from consonants play a significant role in communicating the message of the *logos*. Eusebius concludes this chapter with an explanation of the accuracy of the name "Heber." In the following, he explains why it is correct that the term describes one who "passes over:"

> For the term teaches us to cross over and pass from the things in this world to things divine, and by no means to stay lingering over the sight of the things that are seen, but to pass from these to the unseen and invisible things of divine knowledge concerning the Maker and Artificer of the world.[35]

---

32 ibid, Chpater V.
33 Irvine, *Making of Textual Culture*, p. 37.
34 *P.E.*, Book VI, p. 558.
35 ibid, p. 559.

In the very name of the Hebrews, one can perceive the Middle Platonic concept of *transcendence*. This is a fitting term for the very first people who devoted their lives to contemplating the "All-ruler" and "Cause of the Universe."[36]

Chapter VII concerns "physics."[37] Eusebius begins by stating that the Hebrews acquired this knowledge, appropriately, via transcendence. Both Moses and Solomon in particular and the prophets in general excelled in this area. Via prophecy, the Hebrews learned information about physics, or the natural world, and metaphysics, or the First Cause, the Second Cause, and Providence. Eusebius adds, however, that this knowledge was not evenly distributed throughout the masses. What he describes as metaphysical "surface level" wisdom was available to anyone willing to use the basic skills of logic and reasoning. The deep and occult knowledge is only available to those pious individuals deemed capable of understanding. Here, Eusebius does not get specific. He simply hints that those who are worthy possess the ability to incorporate this information and know what to do with it.[38]

After introducing how the Hebrews divide their philosophy into three parts, Eusebius devotes the remainder of Book 11 to the concept of "physics." Chapter VIII sets the tone. He explains how Plato's writings paralleled Mosaic teachings. He hypothesizes that he could have acquired this information by studying among the Egyptians, where Moses and the Hebrews had lived. Another possibility is that he simply acquired it on his own, though he gives this alternative little credence. A final possibility is that God deemed Plato worthy, and through grace granted him the knowledge.[39]

Chapters IX-XIII represent a greater investigation of the First Cause. Chapter IX outlines the difference between the incorporeal world and the corporeal world. Eusebius

---

36 *P.E.*, Chapter VI.
37 This term incorporates what is known today as "physics" and "metaphysics."
38 ibid, Chapter VII.
39 ibid, Chapter VIII.

compares excerpts from *Timaeus* with quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures, to show how the latter influenced the former. Eusebius states that the incorporeal world, which can only be described as "being," is perceived by the mind; in contrast, the corporeal world, which can only be described as "becoming," is perceived by the senses.[40] In particular, he quotes Exodus 3:14, translated as "I am that I am," the expression the God of "pure existence" uses to describe Himself. Chapter X is complementary, an extract from Numenius' the Pythagorean *Concerning the Good*, which develops this distinction between "being" and "becoming." As stated earlier, Eusebius includes this extract to prove he was not misinterpreting Plato's words, since Plato's own supporters derived the same conclusions. In this chapter is the quote, "For what else is Plato than Moses speaking Attic Greek?"[41] Numenius says this because the wide array of Platonic doctrines can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, which Eusebius describes as having been written by Moses under divine guidance. In other words, Plato is not teaching any lesson that has not been taught before. Numenius' final point in this extract is that the Hebrew Scriptures teach that God *is* and cannot change, that only the incorporeal exists in a constant state of *being* and cannot change or be changed in any manner.[42]

Chapter XI is an extract from Plutarch's *Concerning the Ei at Delphi*, which, like Numenius, provides a detailed distinction between *being* and *becoming*. Plutarch claims that using the term "is" for corporeal beings is a misnomer. A material substance is constantly in a state of change, shifting from what it *was* to what it *will be*. Because it never stays in the same moment of time, it cannot be described in terms of the present. He continues by claiming that only the incorporeals, which are eternal, uncreate, and timeless, can be truly described as "being" or "existing," *as is*. Moreover, only God, the First Cause, is the ultimate incorporeal. Plutarch expresses this notion when he writes,

---

40 ibid, Chapter IX.
41 ibid, Chapter X, p. 567.
42 ibid, Chapter X.

> ...we ought to say of God, He is, and is in relation to no time, but in relation to eternity the motionless, and timeless, and changeless, in which is no 'before' nor 'after,' nor future, nor past, nor elder, nor younger...[43]

This is reflective in the translation of the title of his work, *Concerning the Ei at Delphi*. Delphi is the home of the Delphic oracle, who has access to God, or *Ei*, which means "Thou *art*." This description of God parallels the Exodus quote from Chapter IX.

Chapter XII focuses upon the specific topic of the ineffable nature of God, or the First Cause. Eusebius writes that just as Moses and the prophets taught that the proper name of God could not be pronounced, so too Plato taught that God cannot be defined according to any known areas of learning. By comparing these texts and their common vocabulary, he attempts to interpret what Plato meant by his word choice. Plato taught that the nature of God could only be understood as a spark that leaps from fire. Eusebius related his usage of the term "spark" or "light" to Psalms 4:7, "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, was shown upon us," and Psalms 36:9, "In Thy light shall we see light."[44] Eusebius ends this chapter by stating again that this Platonic teaching was originally found in the Hebrew Scriptures and that Plato did not originate it.

Eusebius concludes this investigation of the First Cause with Chapter XIII. He shows that Plato and Moses agree that God is *one*. Again, he does by relating specific texts from *Timaeus* and *Laws* with quotes from Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms, Romans, Thessalonians, James, and Job, among others. He cites these parallels to show how the Hebrew Scriptures anticipated this teaching that Plato falsely claimed as his alone.[45]

Chapters XIV and XV concern the Second Cause. Eusebius provides many terms found throughout the Hebrew Scriptures that refer to this God. These include *Word of God*, *God of God*, *Creator God*, *Word of the Father*, *Saviour* and *Wisdom*. He provides

---

43 ibid, Chapter XI, p. 570.
44 ibid, Chapter XII, p. 571.
45 ibid, Chapter XIII.

many separate quotations, including Genesis, Psalms, Proverbs, and the Wisdom of Solomon which contain these titles.[46]

Chapter XV is an extract from Philo concerning God as the Second Cause. He makes a distinction between "true being" (the First Cause), and "His image, the...Word" (the Second Cause). He writes, "For it becomes those who have made companionship with knowledge to desire to behold the true Being, but should they be unable, then at least to behold His image, the most holy Word."[47] Philo also quotes Zachariah 6: 12, "Behold! the man whose name is the east," to express this distinction.[48] The following is Philo's lengthy interpretation of the term *east*:

> ..if you mean that incorporeal Being who wears the divine form, you will fully acknowledge that the 'East' was happily given to Him as a most appropriate name: for the Universal Father made Him rise as His eldest Son...And indeed He that was begotten, imitating the ways of His Father, looked to His archetypal patterns in giving form to the various species.[49]

These archetypal patterns refer to the pattern of the heavenly bodies which traverse the heavens in a circular motion. Moreover, Philo sees the "incorporeal Being" following the archetypal model of the Middle Platonic Second Cause, namely contemplating the essence of God the First Cause.

Chapter XVI is an extract from Plato's *Epinomis*. It deals with the hierarchical conception of God as a First Cause and a Second Cause. Eusebius draws the following conception concerning how Plato derived this teaching:

> Does it not seem to you that in speaking thus Plato has followed the doctrines of the Hebrews? Or from what other source did it occur to him to name another God who is mightier than the cause of all things, whom also he calls Father of the All-

---

46 ibid, Chapter XIV.

47 ibid, Chapter XV, p. 575.

48 There is a problem concerning this translation. The word "east" is not found in either the *Tanakh*, (the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures by the Jewish Publication Society) or the *New Oxford Annotated Bible*. In the place of "east" these two sources translate "branch."

49 *P.E.*, Chapter XV, p. 575.

> ruler? And whence came his idea of setting the name of Lord on the Father of the Demiurge, though never before him had any one brought this to the ears of the Greeks...[50]

He concludes that Plato copied this teaching from the Hebrews and then claimed it as his own. Clearly, Eusebius is attempting to undercut the very foundations of Greek philosophy. This claim leads directly to the common theme of the following three chapters, that if Plato did not blatantly copy the Hebrews' teachings, he was *at least* influenced by them.

Chapter XVII is an extract from Plotinus' *Concerning the three Primary Hypostases*. Eusebius attempts to show that Plato's hierarchical conception of the divine is found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Plato's First Cause is synonymous with the *Father* and the *Good*. His Second Cause is synonymous with *Cause*, *Mind*, and *Creator*.[51]

Chapter XVIII is a lengthy extract from Numenius' *Of the Good*, which concerns Plato's First and Second Causes. Once again, Eusebius includes this to show how Plato's followers interpreted his teachings. Numenius stresses that the First Cause is divorced from all dealings with the material world and that the Second Cause is engaged with the material world, acting as its creator. Eusebius in turn interprets Numenius' words by relating them to quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures. An example is his quoting the following excerpt:

> So when God is looking at and turned towards each of us, the result is that our bodies then live and revive...But when He turns away to the contemplation of Himself, these bodies become extinguished, but the mind is alive and enjoying a life of blessedness.[52]

Then, he relates this to Psalms 104:27-28:

> ...All things wait upon Thee, to give them their meat in due season. When Thou givest it them, they will gather it, and when Thou openest Thine hand, they all will be satisfied with goodness. But when Thou turnest away Thy face, they will

50 ibid, Chapter XVI, p. 577.
51 ibid, Chapter XVII.
52 ibid, Chapter XVIII, p. 580.

> be troubled: if Thou takest away their breath, they will die, and turn again to their dust...[53]

Eusebius concludes that the central message of these two quotes is the same, with the implied conclusion that Plato must have been influenced by the verses from Psalms. He applies the same strategy to relating other quotes from Numenius to the Book of John. In all these examples, the conclusion is the same: "...that Plato is not the first who has made these attempts, but has been anticipated by the Hebrew sages, and has been proved by the examples already set forth."[54]

Chapter XIX is another extract, a fragment of Amelius. Again, the goal is to show agreement between the Greek philosophers and the Hebrew doctrines concerning the Second Cause. Eusebius concludes this chapter, by relating Amelius' words to the following quote from Colossians 1:15ff:

> Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation: for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, whether visible or invisible,...and by Him all things consist, and in Him were they all created.[55]

Here, Eusebius likens Jesus, who previously was referred to as the *logos*, to the Second Cause, equivalent to Plato's Creator God.

Chapter XX, concerning the three primary hypostases, stands alone. Eusebius first describes the version found in the Hebrew Scriptures, that of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Then he quotes an excerpt from Plato's *Epistle to Dionysus*, which states, "Around the King of the Universe are all things, and all are for His sake...and around the Second are the secondary things, and around the Third the tertiary."[56] He concludes that Plato was influenced by the version found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

At this point, Eusebius shifts from discussing the hierarchical conception of the divine to considering qualities of the divine. Chapters XXI-XXV concern *Ideas*, which emanate

---

53 ibid.
54 ibid, p. 583.
55 ibid, Chapter XIX, p. 584.
56 ibid, Chapter XX, pp. 584-85.

from the divine.[57] He begins Chapter XXI by stating that the Hebrew Scriptures and Plato agree about the *nature of the good*, that they both teach that the "Good" and "God" are equivalent in every way. He relates quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures, *Timaeus*, and the *Republic* to conclude that the Hebrew "God" is synonymous with the Platonic "Good." Eusebius uses Chapter XXII, an extract from Numenius' *Of the Good*, to clarify the conclusions from the previous chapter. Plato, in his *Timaeus* and the *Republic*, does not seem consistent concerning his distinction between "God," "good," and the Idea of the "good." Numenius explains that one cannot understand "good" in terms of the physical, sensible world, since it has no corollary in the material world. Rather, one can only understand it through contemplating the question, "What is being?" While "God the Creator" is understood in terms of generation, the "good" is understood in terms of existence or essence. And if the former is described as "good," then the latter is described as "absolute good." Numenius adds that the goal is to participate with this absolute good, not the good. In *Timaeus*, Plato calls the Creator God "good." But in the *Republic*, he calls the "good" the *Idea* of the good, "...meaning that the idea of the Creator was the good, because to us He is manifested as good by participation in the First and only Good."[58] This first Good is what was earlier referred to as the First God, the source of all Ideas. If all objects in the sensible world are manifested by participating in Ideas of themselves, then the Creator God participates in an analogous higher Idea. This Idea is the *ultimate* Idea, the *truly final* Idea, the original Mind, the First God.[59]

Eusebius uses Chapter XXIII to show that this corresponding notion of Ideas and participation in Ideas can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He provides quotes from *Timaeus* Didymus' *Concerning the Opinions of Plato* to review the relation between sensible objects and their corresponding Ideas in the intelligible world. This shows that

---

57 need to add another footnote from the DesPlaces translation here.

58 ibid, Chapter XXII, p. 588.

59 ibid, Chapter XXII.

every element in the sensible world has a corresponding "conception" or "idea," and that "...the idea is an eternal essence, cause, and principle, making each thing to be of a character such as its own."[60] The First God, the ultimate Mind, is the pure Idea which includes within itself all other ideas.

Just as the demiurge in *Timaeus* used the Idea of the sensible world to create the sensible world, so too in the Hebrew Scriptures elements in the physical world are modeled according to previously existing images (or ideas). An example is the creation story itself in Genesis, in which God created "light" before God created the luminaries.[61] In this instance, the "light" is the Idea, the model, for the sun, moon, and stars, which all produce sensible light. Eusebius then provides another example, claiming that the "Sun of righteousness" mentioned in Malachi 3:20 corresponds to the Idea of righteousness mentioned in Isaiah 41:2.[62] Eusebius then relates the concept of the Idea to the divine Word, by quoting Corinthians 1:30, "Who was made unto us Wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."[63] This "Wisdom" refers to the Word, or Jesus. Eusebius compares quotes from various texts to investigate the relation between sensible objects and ideas to show that this first "light" corresponds to an "idea," which relates directly to Jesus as *Word* and *Logos*.[64] He uses this chapter, in part, to express the idea that the Hebrew Scriptures are a vast storehouse of knowledge, filled with divine teachings and wisdom. The question is who has the skills to interpret its verses correctly,

---

60 ibid, Chapter XXIII, p. 589.

61 Genesis 1:3 reads, "God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Genesis 1:14, a description of the *fourth* day, reads, "God said, 'Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate day from night; they shall serve as sings for the set times..." [quotes from *Tanakh*, *The Holy Scriptures*, p. 3.]

62 Malachi 3:20 states, "And to them that fear Me shall the Sun of righteousness arise." Isaiah 3:20 states, "Who raised up righteousness from the East? He called it before His face, and it shall go forth as it were before the nations." [quoted in *P.E.*, Chapter XXIII, p. 590.]

63 *P.E.*, Chapter XXIII, p. 590.

64 ibid, Chapter XXIII.

revealing the lessons of the logos? One can see the Stoic influence upon these early Christian interpretations of Scripture. Clearly, Eusebius believes that he has the skills and the expertise to discover the signs of the *logos* within these verses, signs which predated the wisdom found within the Platonic writings.

Chapter XXIV is an extract from Philo, showing how Ideas can be found in the Mosaic teachings. Eusebius' motive is clear. If Philo draws the same conclusions as him, then this only adds strength to his argument that the Hebrew Scriptures anticipated the wisdom found in the Platonic writings. Philo explains that one should speak of the intelligible world in terms of the Word, or reason, of God, much like an architect plans a city with his reason before the city is constructed. By extension, everything is created according to an image, an archetypal seal, and that " .the archetypal seal, as we call the intelligible world, must itself evidently be the archetypal pattern, the Idea of the Ideas, the Word (Reason) of God."[65] Thus, Philo concludes with the teaching that in order to avoid an infinite regress of entities corresponding to the ideas of entities, then an ultimate absolute Idea must exist. Philo calls this the *Word* (or Reason) *of God*.

In Chapter XXV, Eusebius provides yet another extract, from Clement's *Miscellany*, to show how Ideas can be found in the Mosaic teachings. After an introduction repeating Plato's teachings, he explains the specific case of how humanity could be made in the image or likeness of God. This requires making a distinction between the sensible body and the insensible soul. Clement states that while the *divine* image is synonymous with the divine Word, the human soul, modeled after the divine image, is synonymous with that which attempts to contemplate the divine Word (i.e. the Ideas or archetypes of the intelligible world).[66]

65 ibid, Chapter XXIV, p. 591.
66 ibid, Chapter XV.

In Chapter XXVI, Eusebius makes the transition to cover "good incorporeals" and "bad incorporeals." Here, he argues that while he does not know the source Plato used to derive his teachings, he knows that the Hebrews derived these same views thousands of years earlier. In the *Laws*, Plato speaks of souls that have the power to do good and to do evil. This corresponds to the book of Job, which speaks of a devil, *HaSatan*, who works evil. In addition, while Plato speaks of a human race defined as possessions of gods and daemons, the words from Deuteronomy 32:8 anticipated this concept with the description, "When the Most High was dividing the nations, when He was separating the children of Adam, He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God."[67] Eusebius concludes that these verses from the Hebrew Scriptures directly influenced Plato, who paraphrased them into the Greek language.[68]

Next, with Chapters XXVII and XXVIII, Eusebius attempts to show how Plato and Moses possess similar doctrines concerning the immortality of the soul, as opposed to the mortality of the body. He states that Moses was the first to state that the soul, created in God's image, possessed an immortal essence. Eusebius then adds that this "essence" can best be described as virtuous. Interestingly, while the latter half of Book 11 deals with "physics," in this chapter, one can see Eusebius relating aspects of this investigation to "ethics," such as notions of virtue and piety. This is shown by the quotes from *Alcibiades* and *On the Soul*. The former speaks of the importance of understanding that knowledge and wisdom emanate from the divine, and that the more one is educated properly and achieves self-awareness, the more one knows about the divine. The latter sets up a clear distinction between the body and soul. The goal of humanity is to achieve a state of contemplation, divorced from the body, a state of transcendence, when the soul "...passes at once into yonder world, to the pure, and eternal, and immortal, and unchangeable, and

---

67 ibid, Chapter XXVI, p. 595.
68 ibid, Chapter XXVI.

there and with that world she ever communes as one of kindred nature..."[69] The goal is to ensure that throughout one's lifetime, the soul is not corrupted by the body, and that at the death of the body, the following occurs to the soul:

> If the soul is pure when released, drawing nothing of the body after her, as she never during this life had any communication with it willingly, but shrank from it, and was gathered up into herself, as making this her constant study, and this is nothing else than practicing true philosophy...and on arriving there she finds ready for her a happy existence, released from error, and folly, and fears, and wild desires, and all other human ills, and...she truly passes the rest of her time with the gods.[70]

The next chapter provides another commentary of Plato's teachings that the soul, after the death of the body, will be able to dwell with the gods with ease and security.[71]

Chapter XXVIII is an extract from Porphyry's *Answer to Boethus Concerning the Soul*. Porphyry states that the human soul, which is similar to the divine, is itself *divine* and *immortal*. The question, however, is whether the soul will be able to escape being corrupted by the body and achieve a state of communion with the divine. For Porphyry, this is an open-ended question. But for Eusebius, it is closed, for he concludes that since Moses was able to assimilate to the divine, not only is the soul truly immortal, but it is possible for the rest of humanity to accomplish this goal. Eusebius concludes this section of Book 11 dealing with the intelligible world ("metaphysics") with the statement that since the Mosaic teachings are perfectly true, that whenever Plato disagreed with them, he was incorrect. What follows is a section concerning the physics of the sensible world.

Chapters XXIX - XXXII are a block showing more parallels between the Hebraic and Platonic teachings. Chapter XXIX shows that the two authorities agree that the world was created. Eusebius compares quotes from the creation narrative found in Genesis with quotes from *Timaeus*. Plato states that the world must have been created, since that

---

69 ibid, Chapter XXVII, p. 597.
70 ibid, Chapter XXVII, p. 599.
71 ibid, Chapter XXVII.

which is sensible must have been generated. He adds that anything generated must have a cause and concludes, "...we must say, according to probable reason, that this world was in truth made through the providence of God a living being endowed with soul and mind."[72] This is clearly parallel with Genesis' opening words, "When God began to create heaven and earth..."[73] and the conclusion that the creation that God made was "very good."

Chapter XXX concerns the specific subject that both Plato and the Hebrew Scriptures agree that the luminaries and heavenly bodies were created. Eusebius presents quotes from Genesis and *Timaeus* to show that they used similar vocabulary. Moses speaks of the *word* of God, while Plato speaks of *reason* or *thought* of God. Eusebius already attempted to show that *word* and *reason/thought* are synonymous concepts. The common purpose of the creation of these luminaries was to mark off the seasons. Chapter XXXI briefly shows that Plato and the Hebrews agree that the world was "good," by comparing a verse from Genesis with a quote from *Timaeus*.[74] The final chapter in this section, Chapter XXXII, shows parallels concerning change and alteration in the universe and the unfolding of time. Eusebius quotes Isaiah to show the Hebrews believe in a heaven and earth that renew themselves. Then he relates these to *Timaeus* and *Politicus*, to show how this creation and dissolution is part of the divine process, guided by providential will.[75] What all of these chapters have in common is that Eusebius compares various texts from the Hebrew Scriptures with Platonic writings to show how the wisdom within the Hebrew Scriptures predated Plato, and how he derived many of his conclusions from these Mosaic teachings.

The remaining chapters of Book 11 all concern the "end of days." Chapters XXXIII and XXXIV are exclusively devoted to Platonic teachings and have no references to the

---

72 ibid, Chapter XXIX, p. 604.
73 Genesis 1:1, quoted in *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures*, p. 3.
74 *P.E.*, Chapter XXXI.
75 ibid, Chapter XXXII.

Hebrew Scriptures. The former quotes *Politicus* to show that Plato believed in the restoration of the dead, how animals die, are buried, decompose, and later spring up from the earth, reborn.[76] The latter is another extract from *Politicus*, which describes the restoration of order after the world degenerated into chaos. Plato compares God to a captain at the helm of a ship, restoring it back on its course after it had drifted aimlessly with no navigator.[77] According to this notion, the universe is constantly shifting between order and disorder, between providential care and chaos.

The final four chapters all concern the judgment that occurs after death. Chapter XXXV is an excerpt from the *Republic* describing how the just proceed to heaven and the unjust are sent elsewhere.[78] The next chapter is an extract from Plutarch's *On the Soul*, describing the adventures of a man who dies, comes back to life, and relates what happened to him. Eusebius then states that the Hebrew Scriptures too have stories of people who come back to life. The difference, however, is that they receive promises of what they will receive. Matthew 5:5 states that "The meek shall inherit the land."[79] He then quotes Galatians 4:26 to show that this will be a heavenly land. It reads "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of all."[80] He adds that an allegorical description of this city is described by Isaiah, which sees it adorned with precious stones and gems.[81] Once again, Eusebius views an allegorical interpretation of the text as a means of revealing the secrets of the *logos*. Then Eusebius uses Chapter XXXVII with its extract from Plato's *Phaedo* to show how the Greek philosopher himself agrees with the same conclusions. Plato describes a "yonder world," which Eusebius relates to the Jerusalem mentioned in Galatians and Isaiah, where pure, unspoiled gems, jaspers, and

---

76 ibid, Chapter XXXIII.
77 ibid, Chapter XXXIV.
78 ibid, Chapter XXXV.
79 ibid, Chapter XXXVI, p. 611.
80 ibid.
81 ibid, Chapter XXXVI.

emeralds are plentiful. Plato writes, "For they shine out on the surface, being many in number and of great size and in many places of the earth, so that to see it must be a sight for the blessed to behold."[82]

Eusebius concludes Book 11 with a final description of the judgment that occurs after death. He begins by quoting Daniel 7:9-10:

> The judgment was set, and the books opened,...and the Ancient of days did sit...A river of fire flowed before Him; ten thousand times ten thousands ministered unto Him, and thousand thousands stood before Him.[83]

Then, he compares this to Plato's *Concerning the Soul*, which contains similar images of rivers and fires. If the souls led good lives, they experience a short period of purification and are forgiven for their sins. Those who committed irredeemable sins are sentenced to eternal punishment. Lastly, those who led exemplary lives are granted the prize of living in "upper earth," where they act virtuously and pursue wisdom. This chapter concludes with quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures, revealing similar rewards waiting for having lived a life of virtue and piety and similar punishments for living a life of sin.[84]

---

82 ibid, Chapter XXXVII, p. 614.
83 ibid, Chapter XXXVIII, p. 614.
84 ibid, Chapter XXXVIII.

II.

As compared to Book 11, Eusebius' argument in Book 12 lacks a clear, concise, coherent order. What follows is an attempt to show how he develops various themes and how they relate to one another. Whether Eusebius was following a line of argumentation from a then-extant philosophic guidebook or manual is a possibility. The problem is that past research on Eusebius' apologetic writings have not provided evidence which would support this conclusion.

Chapter I begins by explaining that what follows will supplement the argument made in the previous book.

> Our twelfth Book of the *Preparation for the Gospel* will now from this point supply what was lacking in the preceding Book in proof of Plato's accordance with the Hebrew Oracles, like the harmony of a well-tuned lyre.[85]

One of the teachings lacking in the previous book was the notion of faith before understanding. Eusebius provides excerpts from a number of sources, including Plato's *Laws*, as well as Isaiah and Psalms to support this claim. He adds that what all authoritative texts have in common is that in varying degrees, they all contain the word of God. However, only those who are older and experienced "...are permitted to dive into the deeps, and test the meaning of the words."[86] Eusebius is stressing the need to control who has access to these texts and who is allowed to interpret these texts. This issue of general control over texts is a recurring theme throughout Book 12.

Chapter II further develops what is meant by "faith" and "faithfulness." To be faithful, one must either be virtuous or pursue virtue. This reference to *imitatio dei* is a clear reference to ethics, a segment of the tripartite division that Eusebius did not fully develop in the previous book. Concerning virtue, Plato's *Laws* provides the following requirement:

85 ibid, Chapter I, p. 620.
86 ibid, p. 621.

> ...that before all things both the heaven-sent lawgiver in this country...will always enact his laws with a view chiefly to the greatest virtue: and this is...faithfulness in dangers, which one might call perfect justice.[87]

Eusebius qualifies this statement by explaining that he does not advocate unreasoned faith, but a faith combined with other virtues, such as wisdom and goodness.[88]

The following group of chapters concern the pedagogy of this *reasoned* faith before understanding. Chapter III deals specifically with how human souls have power, even after death, and serves as a bridge to the chapters that follow. Eusebius uses quotes from *Laws* and the Book of Maccabees to stress the need to believe in ancient stories, retold by lawgivers.[89] In the next three chapters, there is an implicit connection between pedagogy and state law. The overall goal is to educate a faithful generation which understands the ethical value of *imitatio dei*. With Chapter IV, Eusebius shows that both Plato and the Hebrews taught the value of teaching fables to young children. Whether or not the fables are true is not a priority. Only later will they learn the more sophisticated aspects of the tales learned in their childhood.[90]

In Chapter V, Eusebius expresses the need to maintain strict control over which tales children learn and the content of these tales. The *Republic* clearly instructs to censor any tale that could have potential counter-productive results. The Hebrews followed this practice as well, making decisions guided by the Holy Spirit about which tales from their tradition to teach children and which to reject. Eusebius adds that the overall goal was a consistent curricula which prepared children for the religious lessons they would receive when they were older.[91]

Chapter VI speaks of the need to use stories concerning death and judgment after death as important teaching tools. Eusebius quotes *Gorgias*, which includes stories that

---

87 ibid, p. 622.
88 ibid, Chapter II.
89 ibid, Chapter III.
90 ibid, Chapter IV.
91 ibid, Chapter V.

vividly describe how souls are judged. Punishment is seen as instrumental, either as repentance or to serve as an example for others. One of the central lessons is to live as virtuously as possible, searching for the truth, embracing philosophy and rejecting the concerns of daily life. Plato writes, "...I am convinced by these stories...So renouncing what most men deem honours, I shall try to be really practicing truth both to live the best life in my power..."[92] He concludes that he must accept these tales, since they cannot be refuted. Eusebius then provides quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures to show how these previous tales were anticipated. II Corinthians 5:10 states, "...all must appear before the judgment-seat of God, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad."[93] And a quote from Romans 2:16 reveals that each individual will receive the fate he or she deserves, depending upon one's past motives and behavior.[94]

Chapter VII considers who should be taught the underlying lessons of these fables. Plato's *Epistles* states that the well-disposed, not the multitude, should be taught. The Hebrew Scriptures agree, as stated by Matthew 7:6, "Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine."[95]

What follows this section on pedagogy begins a new non-related group of chapters dealing with society's leaders and the qualities they need to possess. This section culminates with the importance of *imitatio dei*, the value of leaders behaving as ethically as possible. For Eusebius, a leader is not necessarily restricted to governmental positions. Rather, to be a leader in society is to be a righteous individual, a prophet. Chapter VIII, which quotes Plato's *Laws*, stresses that leaders must value wisdom. They are to express this value by living and ruling in accordance with reason.[96] Chapter IX stresses that

---

92 ibid, Chapter VI, p. 627.
93 ibid, Chapter VI, p. 628.
94 ibid, Chapter VI.
95 ibid, Chapter VII, p. 628.
96 ibid, Chapter VIII.

leaders should first humbly decline office when they are appointed. Eusebius provides various quotes to show that Moses, Saul, and Jeremiah were all hesitant to accept the reins of leadership. Eusebius then provides quotes from the *Republic* to explain that leaders should be hesitant because they realize that they are to be completely consumed with what is best for those who are governed. No one should accept such responsibility rashly.[97]

This section culminates with Chapter X, which reveals additional hardships and challenges of leadership. There is a price to be paid for living piously and virtuously, and modeling one's motivations and behavior according to divine principles. Eusebius quotes the *Republic* to show that one of the goals is to be just for the sake of being just, not for the sake of reward. He adds that an individual knows he is truly just when he suffers the greatest insults and yet remains committed to being just. What follows is examples of righteous individuals. First Eusebius quotes the Hebrew Scriptures in an attempt to show that Hebrew prophets and righteous men suffered centuries before the time of Socrates and Plato. This list includes Jesus and his apostles, who all suffered for their faith and beliefs and yet embraced the ideal of *imitatio dei* and followed the highest path of justice and piety. Then Eusebius mentions Socrates and claims that his example, suffering the ultimate price for the sake of his righteousness, anticipated the sufferings endured by the early Christians.[98] Eusebius explains that "...they were both scourged, and endured bonds and racks, and even had their eyes torn out, and at last after suffering all terrible tortures they were crucified."[99] The vocabulary he uses to describe these events indicate that the persecution had just recently ended when he wrote this part of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*.[100] For Eusebius, Socrates, the Hebrew prophets, and the early Christians,

---

97 ibid, Chapter IX.
98 ibid, Chapter X.
99 ibid, Chapter X, p. 632.
100 *P.E., vol. IV* (notes), p. 420.

even though they did not hold official positions of authority in state government, were leaders nonetheless, leaders who guided their lives by piety, virtue, and righteousness.

The next group of chapters provides a new parallel between Plato and the Hebrew Scriptures. It continues the previously developed argument that Plato was not only aware of the teachings in these Scriptures, but that he was influenced by them, translated them into Greek, and claimed them as his own. This grouping of chapters ends with Eusebius' declaration that state law should be pious and reflective of *imitatio dei*. It then dovetails to the issue of pedagogy. Earlier in Book 12, Eusebius showed how fables and legends must be viewed as instrumental in properly educating society's youth. This section shows how state law must be reflective of this concept to ensure the proper education of its citizens.

Eusebius begins this section by continuing the argument that every kernel of truth in Platonic teachings can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, in the guise of the divine *logos*. With Chapter XI, he attempts to show that the Hebrew Scriptures, with its description of the Garden of Eden, anticipated Platonic teachings dealing with the divine paradise and the snake's deception.[101] Chapter XII discusses parallels concerning Eve's being created from Adam. In comparison, Eusebius quotes the *Symposium*, which describes how male and female were created from the hermaphrodite, the "third sex." Of note is Eusebius' admitting that Plato did not clearly understand the Genesis narrative.[102] With Chapter XIII, Eusebius claims that Plato translated Moses' description of life in the Garden of Eden directly into Greek. Moses paints the picture of a life divorced from the need of money, possessions, clothing, planting, and harvesting. In the *Statesman*, Plato describes God as a guardian who provided everything, ensuring that possessions, clothes, houses, and government were all unnecessary.[103] Chapter XIV shows parallel narratives of human

---

101 *P.E., vol. III*, Chapter XI.
102 ibid, Chapter XII.
103 ibid, Chapter XIII.

communication with lesser animals. Eve's dialogue with the serpent is compared with Plato's description in the *Statesman* that humanity could speak with animals as easily as they could talk to each other. Even though Eve's conversation led to the expulsion from Eden, Eusebius claims that these dialogues contributed to humanity's storehouse of wisdom.[104]

The final two chapters of this section argue that Plato and Moses included these early narratives, which culminated with the destruction of the flood, in order to describe the aftermath, when humanity formed ethical governments and instituted proper laws which facilitated the development of humanity. For Moses, the original models of this upward development were the patriarchs, the "friends of God." In the *Laws*, Plato describes the early evolution of state government and the first steps taken to pass just laws.[105] Chapter XVI provides a more detailed description of these various laws and the need for them to be ethical. Moses' methodology made law dependent upon piety towards God. He fostered a state-sponsored code which made human good dependent upon divine good. Plato's *Laws* similarly outlined a hierarchy of goods which instituted the value of piety and *imitatio dei*. This state called for its guardians to protect this code of law "...so that intelligence may bind all these ordinances together and render them subservient to temperance and justice, not to wealth and ambition."[106] Eusebius then states that the Hebrews attempted to create the same type of government with the same type of laws, as shown by the words of Matthew 6:33, which state, "Seek ye first the kingdom (of God) and (His) righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."[107] Eusebius ends this section by stating again how the Mosaic code predates the arrival of Plato, and how this code was correct, guided by wisdom and true opinion.[108]

---

104 ibid, Chapter XIV.
105 ibid, Chapter XV.
106 ibid, Chapter XVI, p. 638.
107 ibid.
108 ibid, Chapter XVI.

With this chapter, Eusebius brings the argument back to pedagogy, by emphasizing the importance of the state to pass the best laws which will foster within its citizens virtue, wisdom, and justice. Chapter XVII shows that both Plato and Moses embraced the value of teaching children from an early age the precepts they will use to guide their lives. In *Laws*, Plato explains,

> The chief point then in education, we say, is the right 'training in the nursery,' which will best lead the soul of the child in his play to the love of that, in which, when he has become a man, he will need to be perfect in the excellence of his work.[109]

Similarly, Moses teaches in Deuteronomy 6:6, "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart and in thy soul, and thou shalt enforce them upon thy sons."[110]

At last, in Chapter XVIII, Eusebius provides a definition of what he means by *education*. He looks first to Plato, who explains in *Laws* that education is "...that training to virtue from childhood, which makes a man desire and long to become a perfect citizen, knowing how to rule and to obey with justice."[111] He adds that education is not intended to be used to acquire wealth, strength, or cleverness that is divorced from intelligence and justice. This definition reveals the centrality of *imitatio dei*. Eusebius clearly sees a connection between education, state law, and ethics. Later, he stresses the connection between education and reason. Another quote from *Laws* states that with a proper education, one will hate what one should hate, and love what one should love, *in accord with reason*. However, the Hebrew Scriptures anticipated this notion, as shown by Psalms 34:11-12, which states the following:

---

109 ibid, Chapter XVII, p. 639.
110 ibid.
111 ibid, Chapter XVIII, p. 640.

> ...I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he that desireth life...Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips that they speak no guile. Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it.[112]

Eusebius adds that various Proverbs teach a similar lesson, stressing the importance of the acquisition of piety and virtue.

The previous two chapters stressed the role of education in fostering harmony within oneself and between individuals. The following chapter considers harmony between worlds. Chapter XIX stresses the creation of institutions in the sensible world according to a divine model found in the intelligible world. This chapter begins with a quote from the Hebrew Scriptures, which describes the blueprints for the traveling sanctuary that the Israelites used as they journeyed to the Promised Land. Exodus 15:40 reads, "See, thou make all things after the pattern which was shown to thee in the mount."[113] This pattern, according to Eusebius, exists only in the intelligible, non-sensible world. Plato teaches a similar lesson in the *Republic*. He states that the philosopher's task is to introduce what he sees in the "yonder world" into the private and public habits of humanity. The philosopher is to work like a painter to embody in each and every individual "the form and likeness of God."[114] In this chapter, Eusebius seems to weave categories from physics and ethics together, for he stresses the need to look to physical models (what we would call "metaphysical" models) to create an ethical society. He describes the Hebrews' following a divine model to create a physical structure they will use to become a more complete, more ethical people. Plato follows a similar model, looking to the intelligible world in order to foster the concept of *imitatio dei* in humanity. The result of creating this harmony between worlds by modeling the sensible world according to models in the intelligible world is the creation of harmony between individuals and within society.

---

112 ibid, Chapter XVIII, p. 640.
113 ibid, Chapter XIX, p. 641.
114 ibid, Chapter XIX, p. 642.

Chapters XX-XXIII consider the pedagogical subcategory of the proper use of odes. Plato's *Laws* speaks of the functional use of songs to foster harmony within the souls of children. Thus, music and reason combine to create harmony which will enable children to receive the best education as possible. Eusebius then mentions how Christians have developed an educational system in which "...the children are trained to practice the songs made by divine prophets and hymns addressed to God."[115] He adds that these songs have a correct content, since prophets inspired by God composed them.[116] This teaching of the functionality of music and its relation to pedagogy is reminiscent of the Stoic doctrine that music (as well as poetry) is the best medium to identify and communicate the lessons encoded by the *logos* within authoritative texts.

In Chapter XXI, Eusebius outlines the proper content of the odes. First, he quotes the *Laws*, which teach that odes should praise the "good man," who is temperate, just, honorable, and above all, virtuous. In addition, they should speak of the importance of health, beauty, wealth, and accurate senses. The poet should set all of these lessons to rhythms and harmonies and use them to educate the youth. Eusebius then explains that David anticipated all of these lessons when he wrote his Psalms and set them to music. Moreover, his teachings are true because he wrote them under divine inspiration. As proof, Eusebius writes that while Plato said that if a man is rich and unjust, he is miserable, David said, "If riches abound, set not your heart upon them."[117] And Eusebius concludes this chapter with the general statement, "...at your leisure you may find each of the philosopher's (Plato's) sayings stated word for word throughout the whole sacred writing of Psalms."[118]

115 ibid, Chapter XX, p. 643.
116 ibid, Chapter XX.
117 Psalms 62: 10, quoted in *P.E.*, Chapter XXI, p. 644.
118 *P.E.*, Chapter XXI, p. 645.

Chapters XXII and XXIII consider who is to have control over both the composition and the judgment of these odes. Clearly, Eusebius is concerned about who has access and who is allowed to critique authoritative texts. He quotes the *Laws* to show that only a courageous or a godlike man should be allowed to compose odes. Similarly, he states that the Hebrews only accepted those hymns concerning religious instruction which were written by men of prophesy, men influenced by God.[119] Chapter XXIII shows that Plato and the Hebrew Scriptures agree that the masses should never be allowed to judge the odes. Instead, only those who are divinely inspired, well-educated, wise, courageous, and above all, virtuous, should be granted this privilege.[120]

The next two chapters concern the control of the consumption of alcohol. Chapter XXIV relates the odes mentioned in the previous chapters to proper behavior at banquets. Plato, in the *Laws*, describes how the souls of those who consume alcohol at banquets become hot as iron heated in a fire. In this state, the souls become malleable and can be transformed for the better or for the worse. As a result, Plato stresses the need to instill fear and reverence within those present. Eusebius then cites the practices of the Christians to explain how this is to be done. At their banquets, the guardians maintain order by encouraging the attendees to sing hymns in honor of God.[121] Eusebius possibly wrote about this practice to respond to the conventional wisdom which claimed that Christians at their banquets engaged in hedonistic drinking and orgies.

He continues this discussion in Chapter XXV by clarifying how to control the consumption of alcohol. Many of the Greek practices mentioned in Plato's *Laws* were anticipated by the Hebrews. Plato explains that drinking alcohol should be illegal for slaves, for magistrates when in office, and for judges when on duty. The Hebrews in the book of Leviticus, chapter 10, made drinking illegal for their priests when they conducted

---

119 ibid, chapter XXII.
120 ibid, Chapter XXIII.
121 ibid, Chapter XXIII.

sacrificial rites. Solomon in Proverbs, chapter 31, forbade rulers and judges to consume alcohol because it causes them to forget their wisdom. Lastly, these Scriptures forbade the drinking alcohol for anyone making a vow of purity before the Lord.[122]

The next chapter seems to stand alone. Eusebius writes that Plato's laws concerning the state can be applied to other governments and other peoples, even "Barbarian" peoples. In particular, he mentions how the Muse, or divine inspiration, can apply to everyone.[123] Eusebius may be explaining that truth and wisdom are absolute entities accessible via reason, and that any individual has the ability to receive the divine direction necessary to create a worthy state. Therefore, even when viewed in Platonic terms, the Mosaic code, on principle, can reflect this divine inspiration and be used to create a state run by accurate and true laws.

Chapters XXVII and XXVIII argue that the soul is the source of good and evil and that an internal conflict rages within each individual. As a result, state law is necessary to help the soul act for the sake of the good. Eusebius begins Chapter XXVII by stating, "...a man's conquest over himself is the first and noblest of all victories, but to be defeated by himself is at once the basest and worst defeat of all."[124] To win this battle, each person will need to use reason to live according to virtue and to resist the temptation of vice. He looks to the state as an ally, "For inasmuch as reason is beautiful and gentle and not violent, its guidance needs assistants, in order that in us the golden kind of motive may prevail over the other kinds."[125] State law, authored by proper statesmen under divine guidance, can provide this necessary assistance. Eusebius then clarifies that the Hebrews anticipated this need for divine providence as an ally in this internal struggle. He quotes Romans 7:22, which states, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see

---

122 ibid, Chapter XXV.
123 ibid, Chapter XXVI.
124 ibid, Chapter XXVII, p. 649.
125 ibid, Chapter XXVII, p. 649.

another law in my members warring against the law of my mind."[126] Eusebius uses chapter XXVIII to provide a proof that the soul, not the body, is the source of this conflict. He quotes Plato's *Laws*, which state first that the soul is older than the body, and as a result, the qualities of the soul are older than the qualities of the body. If one assumes that the soul is the cause of all things, then one can only conclude "...that the soul is the cause of all that is good and evil, and noble and base, and just and unjust, and of all opposites."[127] Yet again, however, Eusebius states that the Hebrews anticipated this lesson, for Leviticus 6:2 states, "And if a soul sin and commit a transgression..."[128] According to this verse, the soul, not the body, is responsible for sins.[129]

In Chapters XXIX and XXX, Eusebius discusses the qualities of the true philosopher. One struggles to find a connection with the previous section. Perhaps he places this topic here as a means to show that philosophers can best illustrate through their contemplation of the divine how to prevent the soul from committing evil acts. In the beginning of Chapter XXIX, he cites the description of the Hebrew philosopher in Lamentations 3:27,28, which states, "It is good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth: he will sit alone, and keep silence, because he hath taken it upon him."[130] In this silence, he contemplates the qualities of God. This anticipates Plato's *Theaetetus*, which similarly speaks of the burden of being a philosopher, but stresses the inherent advantage and reward for rejecting the incorrect values and ideals of the greater society. Plato explains that as they contemplate sophisticated subjects, such as astronomy or the nature of existence, they appear at best awkward and foolish, and at worst arrogant. He adds that few understand that they are struggling to foster peace and reduce the evil that their fellow human beings are committing. When asked how can this be done, they respond with the following:

---

126 ibid, Chapter XXVII, p. 650.
127 ibid, Chapter XXVIII, p. 651.
128 ibid.
129 ibid, Chapter XXVIII.
130 ibid, Chapter XXIX, p. 651.

> ...we should try to escape from this world to the other as speedily as possible. And escape means assimilation to God as far as is possible, and assimilation means to become just and holy and wise withal.[131]

Their goal to pursue wisdom and virtue clearly falls within the category of ethics. The philosophers warn that those who reject their responsibility of *imitatio dei* will fail to transcend from this world and suffer for their mistake at their time of judgment. Eusebius ends this chapter by explaining that ultimately, philosophers will be rewarded for their virtue, and those who chose to ridicule them and reject their philosophical life will suffer for their vice.[132]

With Chapter XXX, Eusebius provides details of how to live a philosophical life. He sets up a clear distinction between the sensible and the intelligible worlds. By quoting Corinthians 3:19, he expresses his condemnation of the sophistry, or the concerns of the world. This verse states, "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will set at nought the prudence of the prudent."[133] Then, he cites several other verses to show the need to contemplate the eternal, to strive to transcend to the divine plane, to reject the need for wealth, and to refuse to admire ruling earthly powers.[134] But then, at the end of these chapters which deal with the ethical development of humanity, Eusebius shifts back to discuss pedagogy. It is unclear why he does this. Perhaps, after having explained the qualities of the philosophical life, he is stating that philosophers are the best qualified to be the lawgivers that pass legislation which will ensure the proper education of the population.

Chapter XXXI begins by quoting the *Laws*, which states that teachers are allowed to tell falsehoods to children, since the first goal is to teach them to live justly. Later, they can learn that the fables they studied when young were not absolutely true. Eusebius then

---

131 ibid, Chapter XXIX, p. 654.
132 ibid, Chapter XXIX.
133 ibid, Chapter XXX, p. 656.
134 ibid, Chapter XXX.

quotes various verses from the Hebrew Scriptures which describe God anthropomorphically as being jealous, as sleeping, as angry, and as experiencing other human passions.[135] Clearly, these verses are inaccurate in describing God in terms of the sensible world. Eusebius' point is that if viewing God in these terms represents an effective teaching technique, then it is advantageous. Furthermore, Christians can respond to critics who condemn them for believing in a God described as human by adopting the teachings of the Stoics and interpreting these verses allegorically. In addition, they can respond that Plato himself advocated the acceptance of inaccuracies if they can be used functionally to produce a properly educated population.

These chapters clearly concern more than just pedagogy. They are also a defense of Christianity. Chapter XXXII is similar. On the one hand, it is the most generalized of all the chapters concerning pedagogy. Eusebius shows by quoting the *Laws* that both men and women possess natural qualities that make them suitable for particular professions. The same criteria should be used for everyone in determining which occupations they should fill. Eusebius then shows that in a similar way, the divine instruction via the Word is available alike to men and women, free men and slaves, and Barbarians and Greeks.[136] He seems to be offering a defense of the Christian practice of accepting no distinctions between people, that anyone and everyone can become Christian and receive the divine benefits of Jesus as *logos*.

Chapter XXXIII does not fit under the category of pedagogy, but it is clearly another example of a defense of Christianity. Eusebius had to respond to those who criticized the greater Christian community of no longer having a single leader and of having examples of bad leaders in their individual communities. He first looks to the *Laws* to provide a defense. He offers the teaching that just as one cannot rightfully condemn a shepherdless

---

135 ibid, Chapter XXXI.
136 ibid, Chapter XXXII.

flock of goats for feeding on cultivated ground, one cannot rightfully condemn a people who have only known bad leaders and do not know any better. He then relates this lesson to the Christian communities by stating that if isolated communities lack a leader or have an incompetent leader, one should not condemn *every* Christian community. Instead, Eusebius concludes, critics should "...admire our religious constitution from the conduct of those who follow it rightly."[137]

Eusebius, in Chapters XXXI-XXXIII, uses Platonic teachings as a means of self-defense for the Christian Scriptures, practices, and communities. Even though he has devoted the majority of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* to show Plato's lack of originality, his plagiarism, and his mistakes, he still looks to this authoritative tradition to respond to Christianity's critics. Yet again, this shows how Christians could pick and choose from these authoritative texts and use the teachings for their own purposes. After all, in the eyes of the Hellenistic Greeks, these Platonic texts still possessed almost unquestioned authority.

With the next nine chapters, Eusebius returns to an old apologetic argument. He provides various parallels between Mosaic legislation and Platonic laws, and by citing the antiquity of the Hebrew teachings, concludes that they have greater authority. Eusebius states that these parallels can only be explained by the fact that either Plato was influenced by them or that he simply plagiarized them. A question is whether Eusebius is attempting to say anything new by presenting these chapters.[138]

In Chapter XXXIV, Eusebius argues that Plato took a Proverb and rewrote it in Hellenic form. This Hebrew lesson is that those who are deserving should receive fitting

---

137 ibid, Chapter XXXIII, p 660.

138 This section shows the influence of non-ethical Mosaic laws upon the development of Platonic laws. The significance of this claim by Eusebius is that in a general sense, Christians had rejected the legal/political aspects of the Mosaic legislation. The only laws which remained to be binding were the *ethical* "10 commandments."

eulogies at their deaths, but not before.[139] In Chapter XXXV, he accuses Plato of rewriting another Proverb, one teaching the lesson of avoiding extremes of riches and poverty, since extremes lead to revolution.[140] Chapter XXXVI is an attempt to show that the Mosaic legislation influenced Plato concerning laws about fearing and honoring one's mother and father.[141] Chapter XXXVII concerns parallel regulations about owning countrymen as slaves. Moses taught that if a Hebrew were to own a fellow countryman as a slave, he must set him free after six years of labor. Plato in the *Republic* taught that one should never own a Greek as a slave, implying that if one did, he should immediately set him free.[142]

Chapter XXXVIII concerns property rights. Eusebius quotes the *Laws*, which state that landmarks are to be respected in all cases.[143] Chapter XXXIX concerns prohibitions of punishing a son for the crimes of his father.[144] Again, Eusebius quotes the *Laws*. Of note is that in both chapters, he provides no reference to parallel Mosaic legislation.

In Chapter XL, Eusebius provides a parallel concerning restitution after a theft. He specifically quotes the book of Exodus and Plato's *Laws*. What they have in common is a similar formula to be used for the restitution of stolen property.[145] Chapter XLI concerns whether or not one can kill a thief while he is in the act. Again, Eusebius quotes Exodus and the *Laws*. Both agree that one who kills a thief should not be prosecuted.[146] Chapter XLII concerns what to do with a beast of burden that kills a human. The two traditions agree that the animal should be slayed and its carcass cast away, but they differ in that

---

139 ibid, Chapter XXXIV.
140 ibid, Chapter XXXV.
141 ibid, Chapter XXXVI.
142 ibid, Chapter XXXVII.
143 ibid, Chapter XXXVIII.
144 ibid, Chapter XXXIX.
145 ibid, Chapter XL.
146 ibid, Chapter XLI.

Plato teaches that the owner should be prosecuted for murder, but Moses teaches that he should not.[147]

With the next group of chapters, Eusebius attempts to argue that Plato took sections from the Hebrew Scriptures and translated them into Greek. This claim is often weak, for while the vocabulary may be similar or even identical, the context is often quite different. In Chapter XLIII, Eusebius claims that Plato in his *Republic* copied vocabulary from a fable in Ezekiel which describes individuals as copper, tin, iron, and lead. The difference, however, is that Ezekiel describes the Israelites being smelted in a furnace to form pure silver, but Plato uses these metals to show the hierarchy of the Republic's citizens according to their natures.[148] In Chapter XLIV, Eusebius argues that Plato looked to the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly to Ezekiel and to John, to derive his imagery of sheep and shepherds and to relate the two to proper government.[149] Chapter XLV concerns parallel vocabulary dealing with childbirth imagery and its accompanying pain. Both relate these concepts to associating with the divine and how metaphorically God can cause this pain or bring deliverance from this pain.[150]

In Chapter XLVI, Eusebius cites parallel imagery of a man with many different animal faces. This is the clearest example of similar vocabulary but a radically different context. The example from Ezekiel 1:3,5 is the prophet's vision of angels with four faces, that of a man, a lion, a calf, and an eagle. The example from the *Republic* speaks of a creature that is the combination of many images, including a Chimaera, a Scylla, and a Cerberus. The former speaks of how Ezekiel experienced the divine, but the former speaks of a lesson of justice and injustice.[151] One can logically ask that if Plato supposedly translated Hebrew vocabulary into Greek, why did he not do a better job? This parallel relating Ezekiel and

---

147 ibid, Chapter XLII.
148 ibid, Chapter XLIII.
149 ibid, Chapter XLIV.
150 ibid, Chapter XLV.
151 ibid, Chapter XLVI.

the *Republic* is weak, for the figure in the former contains four faces, while the latter contains four heads, and the faces themselves are not identical.

In Chapter XLVII, Eusebius presents similarities of the number twelve. While the Hebrews had twelve tribes, an excerpt from the *Laws* describes how the leaders were to divide their country into twelve equal parts.[152] Again, a question is whether Plato truly plagiarized the Hebrew system or whether it was a parallel development with no direct influence. Chapter XLVIII, the last chapter in this section, concerns how Plato allegedly copied Jerusalem, its location, and its description. In the *Laws*, Plato explains how the capital should be far from the sea, in a rocky setting, situated in a fruitful land with uninhabited surroundings. His explanation is that this would be the best locale for its citizens to contemplate God and attain virtue.[153]

The next section draws Book 12 to a close. In these remaining chapters, Eusebius explains how Plato's teachings concerning God and Providence agree in every aspect with the Hebrews. However, the next chapter, Chapter XLIX stands alone. Here, Eusebius shows how Plato criticized the great poets, Homer and Hesiod. Thus, he uses Plato to undercut the poets who formed the very foundation of the Greek paideia and served as the backbone of the Greek educational system. Eusebius focuses on Plato's critique in the *Republic*, when the philosopher stated that the great poets lacked the knowledge and the skills to educate Greek society properly. At issue is the fact that they formed no schools to carry on their teachings. They never held political office and never led armies into battle. They were not even inventors. Moreover, even though their teachings appeared attractive and appealing, they did not accurately represent the truth. At best, their writings were a *copy* of the truth. Eusebius concludes by saying, "Then must we not assume that all the poets, from Homer downwards, only copy images of virtue and of the other

---

152 ibid, Chapter XLVII.
153 ibid, Chapter XLVIII.

subjects of their poetry, and do not touch the truth?"[154] Eusebius then boldly states that Homer and Hesiod only appeared to have been wise and virtuous, but when one strips away the poetry, metre, and rhythm of their texts and reduces it to prose, their words become simple, reflecting the truth, not representing the truth.

The Stoics taught that poetry, metre, and rhythm were the best means to express the secret, hidden lessons of the *logos*. Eusebius, citing Platonic criticisms condemns Homer and Hesiod for presenting teachings in a form of poetry, metre, and rhythm which deceived the readers to believe that their textual content possessed correct, true, divine teachings.

In Chapter L, Eusebius uses Platonic criticisms to discard the beliefs of the Epicureans. He condemns them for believing that the universe was created by chance, that the soul is material, and that the gods and justice are not absolute, existing entities, but human conventions. Plato concludes that Epicurean belief causes horrible repercussions. If one does not believe in the gods, then the authority of the state is undercut. As a result, society will disintegrate into anarchy as its citizens struggle to live in mastery over everyone else.[155] Eusebius must discard the beliefs of the Epicureans, and he uses Plato to do so. As shown earlier, Eusebius believes that divine providence maintains order in both the material and spiritual worlds. Since the Epicureans are diametrically opposed to this belief, he must discredit their entire world view.

The concluding two chapters explain how Plato agreed with the Hebrews' doctrines concerning God and Providence. At the beginning of Chapter LI, Eusebius provides Plato's definition of "soul" from the *Laws* as "the motion which the power of moving itself."[156] Then he repeats the concept that the soul existed before the body, since it is the soul that moves the body, and that therefore, the qualities of the soul are older than the

---

154 ibid, Chapter XLIX, p. 671.
155 ibid, Chapter L.
156 ibid, Chapter LI, p. 676.

qualities of the body. Another quality of the soul is that it is the cause "...of good and evil, and honourable and base, and just and unjust, and of all opposites."[157] This includes what human beings call emotions. Then Plato asks the question concerning what kind of soul rules over the heaven and the earth. What follows is a lengthy discussion dealing with the order of the universe, the primary elements, and the hierarchy of sensible bodies and the souls which control them. This discussion includes another extract from *Philebus*, which describes the ultimate soul. Plato states, "...over them a cause of no little power, ordering and arranging years, and seasons, and months, which cause is most justly called wisdom and mind."[158] After stating that this "wisdom" and "mind" also have souls, Plato explains that at the top of the hierarchy is the ultimate *kingly* soul, order the universe. While he calls it "Zeus," Eusebius, basing his view upon the Hebrew Scriptures, would call it "God."[159]

In Chapter LII, Eusebius presents the Platonic concept of Providence. In this final chapter of Book 12, he attempts to answer the critic who claims that no such concept exists, since the wicked clearly thrive in this world. He begins by drawing a distinction between virtue and vice, and then stating how the gods (and God) only can be described as virtuous. He then describes how Plato taught that every human being possesses the freewill to direct himself towards virtue or towards vice. This is central, for if one's soul attempts to embrace virtue, the gods reward this soul at the time of judgment. However, if the soul directs itself towards vice, it is punished at the time of judgment. No escape from this time of reckoning is possible. Therefore, whether or not human beings seem to be successful in this lifetime is not a clear indication of what verdict is waiting for them. Eusebius states that this same teaching can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, which

---

157 ibid, p. 677.
158 ibid, p. 683.
159 ibid, Chapter LI

teach that there is no escape from divine judgment. This is detailed in verses from Psalms, Isaiah, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Romans.[160]

Eusebius concludes Book 12 by stating clearly that *all* of Plato's accurate interpretations and teachings were anticipated by the Hebrew doctrines. He defines these doctrines as the Mosaic code and the writings of all the godly men who followed him, including the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles. For Eusebius, the Hebrew Scriptures refers to the *Greek translation* of the Bible used by the Jewish people, in addition to what is referred to today as the New Testament. A logical question in response to these claims is how writings composed after the time of Plato could be claimed simultaneously to *anticipate* his teachings.

[160] These particular verses are Psalms 19:1, 73:3, and 89:7; Isaiah 40: 26; Wisdom of Solomon 13: 5; and Romans 1:20.

III.

The first half of Book 13 remains within Xenocrates' tripartite division of philosophy. Eusebius provides the final details concerning the section on ethics that he started in the previous chapter. In Book 13, he develops the claim that one cannot look to traditional Greek teachings to lead a truly ethical life, since this so-called authority ineffectively teaches youth the ideals of *imitatio dei*, of correct behavior, and of transcendence.

This chapter begins where the previous chapter ended, with the following words:

> Since it has been seen in the preceding Books that the philosophy of Plato in very many points contains a translation, as it were, of Moses and the sacred writings of the Hebrews into the Greek language, I now proceed to add what is still wanting to the argument...[161]

He follows this statement with the question from the critic that if Plato and Moses are so similar, why follow Moses, when the Platonic teachings seem preferable, since he is a Greek and not a Barbarian? He provides a two-fold answer, that Plato was not always correct, and that Plato himself was critical of the traditional poets and writers of Greek religion. He develops the latter point in the first five chapters by showing how Plato did not agree with the Greek theologians.

In Chapter I, he states that Plato criticized the ancient poets and theologians in his *Timaeus*. There he argues that people must believe the fables, since the "children of gods," Homer and Hesiod, wrote them, even though they failed to present certain or even probable proofs. Eusebius explains that Plato could not have been serious when he gave credence to their fables, for "...it seems to me that he scoffingly implies that the gods also had been men, and of the same nature as their children."[162] He then stated that Plato only made his claims because he was required by law.[163] He follows up these claims with

---

161 *P.E.*, Book 13, "Preface," p. 693.
162 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter I, p. 694.
163 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter I.

Chapter II, where Eusebius provides quotes from *Epinomis* to show how Plato rejected all would-be theologians. Here he tries to show that past conceptions of the origin of the gods and the living beings were false and that only the impious believe these stories.[164]

Chapter III contains a lengthy extract from the second book of the *Republic*, where Plato condemns the poets and theologians and the traditions they handed down concerning the Hellenic gods. This is a clear indictment of the authority granted to Hesiod's and Homer's tales which misrepresent the nature of the gods. Plato explains that the state authorities should compel poets to tell other kinds of tales for the following pragmatic purpose:

> ...if we could in any way persuade them [his fellow countrymen], that no citizen was ever at enmity with a fellow citizen, and that such a things was unholy, these are the kind of tales that ought rather to be told to children from the first by old men and old women...[165]

He adds that whether or not Homer's and Hesiod's fables can be interpreted allegorically makes no difference. Instead, the authorities should simply censor them. Plato's justification is that no child can adequately interpret the traditional tales allegorically. The risk is that these tales do not promote virtue. Eusebius continues to develop the clear connection between pedagogy and ethics. He also shows that he was concerned that control over the interpretation of authoritative texts should be maintained at all times. Eusebius would allow Christian intellectuals allegorically to interpret problematic verses found in the Hebrew Scriptures; however, he cites Platonic teachings to disallow Greek intellectuals from using similar techniques to address their own authoritative texts.

One must remember that with the *Republic*, Plato speaks from the perspective of the founder of a new state. Similarly, Eusebius is apologetically arguing as one of the founders of a new kind of state, a Christian state, with its own philosophy, its own

---

164 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter III.
165 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter III, p. 696.

traditions, and its own pedagogy instilling a unique *paideia*. Eusebius therefore agrees with Plato that the gods cannot be portrayed as the authors of evil, that they cannot be shown as a power that would transform into something *worse*, and that they cannot be presented as deceptive, *making humanity think* they could change their form into something worse. With the following words, he summarizes this section, which connects pedagogy and ethics:

> When a poet says such things as these about gods...neither shall we allow our teachers to use them for the education of the young, if our guardians are to grow up devout and godlike, as far as it is possible for man to be.[166]

Instead, the poets must consistently show that God is absolutely simple and true both in actions and in words.[167] Anything less is not what the divine *logos* intended.

Eusebius contrasts Hesiod's and Homer's texts with the Hebrew Scriptures. He provides a number of quotes which show that its verses contain no disgraceful tales about the "beloved of God," angels, or God. Instead, they teach how God is not the author of evil, how God does not bring evil to humanity, and how God does not change form.[168] Eusebius clarifies that when the Word of God appeared as Jesus incarnate, this portrayal was not the same as the poets' claim that the gods transformed themselves. The Word *appeared* human in order to heal humanity and cure their madness, for "...they knew neither God their Father, nor the proper essence of their own spiritual nature, nor yet God's providence which preserves the universe..."[169] Eusebius stresses that when Jesus appeared in human form, he did not depart from his nature, for he represented both the *true* Word of God and the *true* man. This was the best means available to ensure the spread of the one true religion.

---

166 ibid, p. 703.

167 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter III.

168 Josephus in his *Antiquities*, 1.15, 22-23, mentions similar claims. Thus, both Eusebius and the Jewish historian presented similar arguments to defend their respective views against the Greek Hellenist critic.

169 ibid, p. 705.

Eusebius concludes Chapter III by using Plato's own words in the *Republic* to defend the argument of the absolute truth of Christianity. He says that concerning those who disagree, "...we shall be angry, and refuse them a chorus, neither shall we allow our teachers to use their sayings for the education of the young, if our guardians are to grow up devout and godlike..."[170] He then states that Jesus "our philosopher," would agree with this conclusion.[171] With this chapter, Eusebius builds upon the argument that Christianity is a unique philosophy, that Jesus is the ultimate philosopher, that the Hebrew Scriptures form the foundation of their pedagogy, that Christians are citizens of a new state, and that Christian intellectuals are the new statesmen.

In Chapter IV, Eusebius shows that Socrates as well doubted the traditional stories about the gods. He provides an extract from Plato's *Euthyphron*, which asks the following question: "Do you then also believe that there has really been war among the gods, and dire quarrels and battles, and many other such things, as are told by the poets..."[172] The answer, according to Socrates, is "no."[173] Clearly, the gods would never behave in such an unethical manner, since they would never be the author of pain, violence, or death. Eusebius brings this section to a close with Chapter V by providing an extract from *The Secrets in Plato*, detailing Numenius' interpretation of Plato's words in the previous chapter. Numenius explains that Plato did not have the luxury of being able to condemn the traditional stories about the gods. If he had, the authorities would have sentenced him to death. Thus, Plato had to criticize these stories by placing his words in the mouth of Socrates.[174]

In the next section, Chapters VI through X, Eusebius argues that many Christian practices reflect the best values taught by Plato. This represents an interesting

---

170 ibid, p. 706.
171 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter III.
172 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter IV, p. 706.
173 ibid, Chapter IV.
174 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter V.

"turnabout." The bulk of Eusebius' past arguments criticized various Platonic teachings; however, with this group of chapters, he argues that some of Plato's words represent accurately the wisdom of the *logos*. Chapters VI through IX deal particularly with the value of justice. Chapter VI is an extract from *Crito*, which teaches that even when the price is death, one should only be concerned with justice and with what the just man will think of you. After Socrates is condemned to death, at issue is whose opinion he should trust in determining how to react. The philosopher says, "...we must not care thus at all what the many will say of us, but what the man who understands about justice and injustice will say, the one man, and the very truth."[175] Eusebius argues that the Christian communities followed the same advice. He explains, "Wherefore we also in our conflicts for religion do rightly in not considering what the many will say of us, but what is the will of one, even the Word of God..."[176] Then, he uses Plato's words from *Crito* to defend how Christians will not bow to their enemies, "...not even if the power of the multitude should scare us like children with bugbears."[177]

Chapter VII concerns the subject of doing wrong. Again, Eusebius quotes Plato's *Crito*. His preliminary conclusion is that in an *absolute* sense, "...to do wrong is in every way both evil and disgraceful to the wrong-doer."[178] He then provides parallel quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures, including Romans 12:17, "Render to no man evil for evil;" Corinthians 4:12, "Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we ensure; being defamed, we entreat;" and Psalms 120:7, "With them that hate peace, I am for peace."[179]

In Chapter VIII, Eusebius shows how Socrates was willing to live by justice as determined by the Athenian state. Again, he provides quotes from *Crito*. Socrates explains that he would refuse to change his mind, even if he were condemned to die for his

---

175 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter VI, p. 709.
176 ibid, p. 710.
177 ibid.
178 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter VII, p. 710.
179 ibid, p. 711.

decision. Thus, he chooses to accept legal judgments, regardless of the outcome.[180] A logical question is how Socrates, and by extension, Eusebius, can accept legal judgments, even when they do not *seem* to be reflective of truth and justice. Eusebius answers this question in Chapter IX. Eusebius again uses an extract from *Crito* to detail the *Law's* advice to Socrates. The conclusion is that the rejection of the laws of the state is the rejection of virtue and justice, which is inherently unethical. Therefore, one should not reject these laws even if this requires forfeiting one's life. The *Laws* state,

> Nay, dear Socrates, listen to us who have reared you, and value neither children, nor life, nor any thing else as of more account than justice, that when you come to the unseen world you may have all these pleas to offer in your defense to the rulers there.[181]

This chapter makes a distinction between suffering injustice from people and suffering injustice from laws. One can resist the former; however, one cannot resist the laws of state, for such action is it itself unjust, since it is the breaking of a covenant.[182] In this chapter, Eusebius implies that state law *ideally* reflects a "higher law," a law that reinforces an ethical life, a life representing the quest for virtue. He also argues that Christians are committed to living and dying according to the teachings of the *logos*, which reveals the wisdom and the requirements of this "higher law."

In Chapter X, Eusebius relates justice to the Christians' commitment to their faith, explaining why they have remained dedicated to their religious beliefs, regardless of persecution and suffering. In this chapter, he provides an extract from Plato's *Apology of Socrates*. Plato presents Socrates' teaching that one needs to obey the orders of a superior officer. Socrates explains how he never would desert his post, regardless of fear of death:

---

180 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter VIII.
181 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter IX, p. 713.
182 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter IX.

> ...how strangely should I have acted, when the god...ordered me to live the life of a philosopher, examining myself and others, if in this case, through fear either of death or anything else whatever, I should desert my post.[183]

Socrates explains that basing one's decision on whether one will live or die is a poor criterion, for no one positively knows what death entails. He adds that to *assume* one does know is a "disgraceful ignorance."[184] Therefore, he refuses to promise to cease practicing his philosophy in order to save his life. In effect, he will not desert his post, disobeying the orders of his superior divine officer. He adds that for all he knows, death could be a paradise. It could represent the greatest opportunity to engage in philosophy with all the great philosophers that proceeded Socrates to the grave. After drawing this conclusion, Eusebius shows how the same teachings are found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He quotes Acts 5:29, which presents the image of obeying a "superior officer" with the words, "We ought to obey God rather than men."[185] And he quotes Corinthians 5:1, which expresses the beauty of the hereafter with the words, "...that if the earthly house of our bodily frame be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."[186] Then he quotes verses detailing God's promise of humanity's living a blessed life in eternity, dwelling with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets.[187] Eusebius clearly argues that like Socrates, Christians have been placed at their post by a superior officer, "God," and that they have no reason to desert, for death is not to be feared but to be embraced.

Chapter XI stands alone, but it falls within the category of Eusebius' use of traditional Greek practices to defend the Christian rituals, in particular the visiting of tombs and offering of prayers. He provides an extract from the *Republic*, which justifies worshipping the "golden race," those who died honorable deaths. Here Plato reveals that Hesiod

---

183 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter X, p. 715.
184 ibid.
185 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter X, p. 717.
186 ibid.
187 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter X.

teaches that these heroes become holy daemons and guardians of humanity and deserve to be worshipped. Eusebius then relates this to the Christians' "beloved of God..., soldiers of the true religion."[188] This practice originated with the martyrdom of one of these "soldiers," Polycarp, in 168 C.E. Eusebius describes the procedure of visiting these tombs in a letter from the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium:

> There the Lord will permit us to assemble as we may in joy and gladness to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom, both for the commemoration of those who have already contended for the prize, and for the training and preparation of those who shall do so hereafter.[189]

He concludes that the Greeks should not criticize the Christians for their practice of praying at these tombs, for it parallels their traditional "daemon-worship."[190]

With Chapters XII and XIII, Eusebius returns to the old argument, "from antiquity," which states that the more ancient Hebrews influenced the doctrines of Greek philosophers. Chapter XII contains an extract from Aristobulus that clearly fits within the category of ethics. He explains that both Plato and Pythagoras adopted many Hebrew doctrines and incorporated them into their own systems of thought. One example is how they referred to "words of God" not as literally "spoken," but in the Hebrew sense, as a means of creation. Another example concerns how the Hebrews set up a reflective philosophic system based upon *accurate* views of the divine. As a result, their laws are correct and arranged according to piety, justice, and temperance. Eusebius then shows how Orpheus' *Sacred Legend* embodied these same ideals: the value of contemplation and *imitatio dei*; how God (the First God) is beyond our comprehension, save for Abraham, who was able to discern God via astronomy; and how Moses handed down divine instructions. A final example concerns the Hebrew teaching of the connection between the observance of shabbat, wisdom, and ethics. While the Hebrews refer to shabbat as a

---

188 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XI, p. 718.
189 *P.E.*, vol. 4, "notes," p. 444.
190 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XI.

day of rest and the first birth of light, Aristotle teaches that wisdom is a "beacon light," guiding humanity on the correct path. The Hebrews also ordained that the observance of this day of rest is *holy*, a symbol of divine reason, reason used to obtain knowledge of truth. Eusebius then provides quotes from Homer and Hesiod, which detail how the seventh day is a holy day. He concludes that they borrowed this concept from the Hebrew teachings and traditions.[191]

Chapter XIII supplements the previous chapter and begins with Eusebius' words, "But we must add the further evidence, and show now more clearly the plagiarism of the Greeks from the Barbarian philosophy."[192] This chapter contains a large extract from Clement's *Miscellany*, which itself contains a wide breadth of sources, including excerpts from many Pythagorean, Stoic, and Platonic philosophers, in addition to lyrical, philosophical, comic, and tragic poets. Clement first claims that Plato borrowed the notion of punishment after death from the Hebrews. In addition, he plagiarized their concept of "gehenna,"[193] the teaching that God created the world *ex-nihilo*, and the view that some souls are evil and exist in conflict with souls that are good. Clement then explains that the Barbarian belief in both an intelligible and a sensible world clearly anticipated the Greek teachings of these two worlds. In addition, both the Stoics and Plato received the doctrine of *imitatio dei*, "walking in God's ways," from Mosaic teachings detailing the virtuous life.[194] This extract continues with Clement's explaining how the Greeks borrowed from the Hebrews the notion of an all-powerful God, the doctrine of the First Cause and the Second Cause, and in addition, the Christian Trinity. They even borrowed the concept that the ultimate goal of the soul is to escape the body and journey

---

191 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XII.

192 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIII, p. 722.

193 Christians referred this to the concept of "hell." Plato referred this to the location where souls received punishment for their sins. Jews referred this to a place in the wilderness, exiled from the safety of the camp.

194 This particular teaching is found in Deuteronomy 13:4.

transcendentally back to the divine. This is a direct reference to Jesus' "entrance" into a body, his death, and his later resurrection. However, Clement clarified this teaching by explaining that anthropomorphic descriptions of God are figurative, and that one who interprets them literally is not only inaccurate, but also impious. He adds that the Greek teaching that the Gods literally assumed material form is idolatrous and false. Towards the end of this extract, Clement states that God can only be perceived via contemplation, meditation, and reason, not through the senses. The goal for all is to achieve the final ascent to the divine through true philosophy. He concludes that all peoples, to varying degrees, have developed similar conceptions of how to relate to the divine. Then he refers directly to the Greeks by saying the following:

> Much more did the inquisitive philosophers among the Greeks, by an impulse from the Barbarian philosophy, ascribe the pre-eminence to the One invisible most mighty and most skillful chief cause of all things most beautiful, without understanding the consequences of this, unless they were instructed by us...[195]

While the Greeks may understand some of the teachings of the *logos*, Clement argues that the Christians not only aided them in this understanding, but also that the Christians understand the true nuances and the implications of the secrets of the *logos*. Through the centuries, the Greeks successfully corrupted the pure wisdom embodied in the teachings of the "beloved of God."

With the conclusion of Chapter XIII, Eusebius presents the bridge to the second section of Book 13. In the previous chapters, he attempted to show that the Christians follow Mosaic traditions instead of Greek traditions because the Greek philosopher himself was critical of the teachings of many of the traditional poets and writers. In the remaining chapters, he attempts to show that Mosaic teachings are preferable to Platonic teachings because Plato was not always correct. Eusebius explains, "...it is time to consider what the points are in which...we are no longer favourably disposed towards him,

---

195 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIII, pp. 744-45.

but prefer that which is accounted the Barbarian philosophy to his."[196] He states that whenever Plato disagreed with the Hebrews, Plato was incorrect, and the Hebrew teachings were preferable. At this point, Eusebius breaks from the format of comparing the two doctrines according to the tripartite division of philosophy. Chapters XIV through XVIII are a block, illustrating how some Platonic teachings are contradictory, inconsistent, and untrue. As a result, one struggles to understand when they *are* reflective of the truth.

Eusebius explains with Chapter XIV that the Hebrew Scriptures, in contrast, are free from errors. Using reason, one understands that the same cannot be said for the Platonic texts. Plato's first mistake was his dishonoring the name of the gods. He supported idolatry, engaged in idolatrous practices, and regarded the ancestral prophet of the Greeks as "the daemon who sits enshrined at Delphi"[197] as a god. Another problem is Plato's inconsistency. One example compares his conclusions in *Timaeus* with the *Republic*. In the former, he states that since Homer and Hesiod claim they are "ancestors of the gods," everyone must believe their teachings concerning the divine, even though the two poets present no clear proofs to justify their claims. Then, in the *Republic*, he states that Homer and Hesiod present fictitious tales. In addition, he rejected their anthropomorphic descriptions of the gods as a clear misrepresentation of their nature. Eusebius claims that Plato's opinions about the Greek authoritative texts are inconsistent because he was afraid of legal prosecution. In other words, he bowed to the pressure of the state and accepted the validity of Homer's and Hesiod's teachings, among others.[198] As a result, one cannot tell when Plato is advocating the "true religion," and when he is falsely advocating the state's religion. However, one *knows* that the Hebrew Scriptures, by definition of their divine origin, absolutely reflects the truth.

---

196 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIII, p. 745.
197 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIV, p. 746.
198 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIV.

In Chapter XV, Eusebius argues that Plato advocates contradictory teachings about the origin and nature of the "intermediate nature of rational beings." However, he first presents the Hebrews' teachings. According to their doctrine, these beings are generated by the Cause of all, but not as an "effluence" of this Cause.[199] Thus, these intermediate beings are capable of changing their nature for the worse. The beings that maintained the purity of their natures are called *spirits, powers, ministering angels,* and *archangels*. Those that chose to be corrupted through transgressions are called *daemons*. The Hebrews teach that "gods" must be self-generated and possess virtue and goodness according to their nature. Lastly, he explains that the intermediate rational beings acquire well-being, virtue, and immortality in a different manner than the Second or the First God. Eusebius then attempts to show that Plato presented a different conception of these same "intermediate rational beings." First, he claims they are "unoriginated" and formed from "...an effluence of the First Cause."[200] Then he claims that a race of gods exists, and according to their nature, they are good and incapable of changing for the worse. His inconsistency is his claim that the intermediate beings are formed from the same essence of the First Cause, and yet, they *can* change for the worse and become evil. Eusebius stresses that Plato does not justify logically how this can be true. He concludes that one can only look to the Hebrew conception of these intermediate beings to determine the truth.

> ...thus they are no gods, nor have been properly dignified with the title, because they are not equalized in nature with their Maker, nor have goodness inseparably attached to them, like God, but sometimes would even admit the contrary to that which is good through disregard of that study of the higher power...[201]

---

199 If they are not generated as an "effluence," then their very essence is not the same as the First Cause, or Cause of all.

200 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XV, p. 749.

201 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XV, p. 751.

Plato's conception simply cannot be trusted because it is inconsistent and lacks reasonable proof.[202]

With Chapter XVI, Eusebius focuses upon the doctrine of the soul. He begins by stating that Plato agreed with the Hebrews that the soul is immortal but disagreed with them by saying that the essence of the soul is composite, a unique intermediate essence formed from separate divisible and indivisible essences. Eusebius then states that Plato's *first claim* concerning the soul is that divine essences, "like unto God," descend from the celestial regions and join material bodies. He presents three separate extracts to explain this procedure. In *Phaedo*, Plato writes that these essences crave material bodies and choose bodies which reflect the habits of previous lives. In *Phaedrus*, he writes that after a one thousand year period of extended judgment, each soul chooses the body it will inhabit. Lastly, in the *Republic*, he presents a report of each soul's choosing from a selection of bodies to inhabit.[203]

Eusebius then proceeds to condemn these Platonic teachings. He criticizes him for following the doctrines of the Egyptians, not the Hebrews, and for lacking any form of demonstration. Worst of all, however, is how Plato contradicts himself with his own writings. Eusebius presents additional extracts from *On the Soul* and *Gorgias*, which describe how the deceased are punished for their sins and are purified. The worst of the worst souls are eternally punished in Tartarus, but the best of the best souls are eternally rewarded. Eusebius hopes to show that Plato's writings concerning the afterlife are inconsistent. Previously, he described how souls have the ability to choose the bodies they will inhabit, according to their own desires, regardless of how pious or wicked they may have been. Eusebius states that one simply cannot resolve the one claim that a soul can

---

202 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XV.
203 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XVI.

choose a life of bodily pleasure and be rewarded with free choice in another life, with the claim that the soul will be punished for choosing a life of bodily pleasure.[204]

Eusebius follows this by presenting Plato's *second claim* that the souls are "composite." To offer an explanation and a critique, Eusebius looks to another extract, Severus' *On the Soul*. Once again, Eusebius shows that the best way to condemn Plato is to present a critique from one of his supporters.[205] Severus argues that Plato cannot argue for the immortality of a soul that is composite. The reason is that, in time, the opposite elements of the soul will separate. When this occurs, the soul will no longer exist as a soul.[206]

In Chapter XVIII, Eusebius attempts to show that Plato is incorrect concerning the luminaries in the heavens. While he agrees with the Hebrews that they have a maker and are created from perishable substances, in *Epinomis*, he states that humanity should worship these luminaries as *gods*. Eusebius then uses an extract from *Timaeus*, in which Plato explains that the luminaries possess both body and soul. A problem, however, is that an entity that contains a soul is liable to change, since the soul is the very cause of change, and that this change can be for the worse. And yet, Plato claims that they are eternal gods. Eusebius asks how *gods* can possess mortal, dissolvable bodies. Plato answers this question in *Timaeus*, by stating that these bodies are prevented from dissolving by the will of God. Plato justifies this claim with the following words, spoken by God to His creation:

> ...though ye are not altogether immortal nor indissoluble, nevertheless ye shall not be dissolved nor incur the fate of death, since in My will ye have found a still stronger and more valid bond than those by which ye were bound together at the time of your creation.[207]

---

204 ibid.
205 ibid.
206 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XVII.
207 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XVIII, p. 760.

Eusebius contrasts this doctrine with the Hebrew teachings. First, he shows that Moses taught the people to worship the Creator, not the creations. He commanded them to believe in God alone, "Lest, when thou see the sun and moon and all the stars and all the host of heaven, thou be deceived and worship them."[208] Then he provides an extract from Philo's *De Monarchia*. The Alexandrian explains that Moses saw the world as created and as the greatest of all possible "states." Therefore, this state must have a single, solitary ruler that institutes justice and law. The purpose of the law described in Deuteronomy 4:19 is to teach that lesser officials are not independent and equal to the most powerful leader. Philo writes that if one uses the best of all tools, reason, one will understand that only God is to be worshipped, not the parts of God's creation. He concludes with the words, "...in the same way as sense is the servant of mind, so also were all who can be perceived by sense made ministers of Him whom mind alone can perceive."[209] Eusebius then provides the bridge to the next section. He states that while he admires Plato and grants him honor, he sees a clear contrast between his philosophical teachings and the divine teachings of the Hebrew religion. He explains, "...I wished to show in what his intelligence falls short in comparison with Moses and the Hebrew prophets."[210]

In Chapter XIX, Eusebius details Plato's call for equality among the sexes and his "extraordinary" laws which he hopes will brings this about. He provides various quotes from the *Republic* and *Laws*. In these works, Plato calls for complete equality of the sexes. Men and women are to practice gymnastics together, old and young alike. Boys and girls are to learn dancing. Moreover, women are required to learn about warfare, including fighting, strategy, and leadership. As an example, the queen is to wear a full array of armor. Eusebius then contrasts these quotes with the Hebrew Scriptures, which teach that true credit for success in warfare should not go to men and women, but to God

---

208 ibid. This is a from Deuteronomy 4:19.
209 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XVIII, p. 761.
210 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XVIII, p. 762.

alone. In the remainder of the chapter, Eusebius details the Platonic laws concerning the sexes that he considers to be extreme. Plato taught that one should judge the quality of men and women for marriage by viewing them naked. In addition, he instructed that boys and girls should dance and play sports together naked. He also advocated state-controlled procreation, in which marriage would be eliminated and children would be held in common, not knowing their true parents.[211]

In Chapter XX, Eusebius criticizes the "unnatural love" found in Plato's *Phaedrus*, which opposes the laws of Moses.[212]

Book 13 concludes with Chapter XXI, in which Eusebius contrasts the Platonic laws concerning murder with the Mosaic legislation. Eusebius provides various quotes from *Laws* which outline the punishments for varieties of premeditated murder and manslaughter. Then he contrasts this criteria with the doctrine presented in the Hebrew Scriptures.[213] In general, Eusebius considers the Mosaic code to be more noble, humane, and rational than the Platonic code. Again, he provides quotes from *Laws* and compares them with the Hebrew Scriptures.[214] This is yet another example of the continued relevancy of the non-ethical Mosaic legislation.

Eusebius brings Book 13 to a close by stating that he has effectively answered the question of why the Christians do not follow Plato's philosophical doctrines. He then provides the bridge to the next book, which will begin to explain why they do not follow other Greek philosophical systems. Thus, after providing a critique of Platonic schools of thought, Eusebius sees his remaining task as the dismantling of non-Platonic schools of thought.[215]

---

211 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XIX.
212 Chapter XX is not included, for some unknown reason, in this translation.
213 In particular, he quotes Exodus 21:12ff and Exodus 21:26.
214 In particular, he quotes Deuteronomy 23:24-25, and 24:19.
215 *P.E.*, Book 13, Chapter XXI.

Chapter 5: *Eusebius' Argument that the Hebrew Scriptures Anticipated Platonic Teachings — A Study of Three Verses*

This chapter will provide a textual study of three verses Eusebius presents to show that the Mosaic legislation embodied Platonic wisdom. The first, Exodus 3:14, concerns God as the *First Cause*. It states, "*Ego eimi ho on*. Thus shalt you say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you."[1] The second, Genesis 19:24 concerns God as the *Second Cause*, with the words, "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah sulfurous fire from the Lord out of heaven."[2] The last deals with *Ideas*, quoting Genesis 1:27, which states, "And God created man in His image, in the image of God He created him..."[3]

This chapter will attempt to answer several questions concerning the interpretation of these verses. How does Philo, the best example of a Jewish Hellenist, interpret them? How do other Christian intellectuals interpret them? Does Eusebius have more in common with Philo or with the Christian intellectuals? Lastly, how does his interpretation of these verses relate to Middle Platonic thought? For all three verses, Eusebius' interpretation will be presented first, followed by Philo's interpretation and the Christian intellectuals' interpretation. Lastly, conclusions will be drawn concerning how accurately Eusebius' interpretation reflects Middle Platonic thought, and whether he has more in common with Philo or with the Christians.

In Chapter IX of Book 11, Eusebius quotes Exodus 3:14 to show that Moses taught the Platonic concept of God as a First Cause centuries before Plato was born. With its words, "I am the One Who is," (*ego eimi ho on*) Eusebius argues that Moses

---

1 Eusebius, P.E., Eusebii Pamphili, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, trans. E.H. Gifford (London: E Typographeo Academio, 1903), Book 11, Chapter IX, p. 563. (A translation for "Ego eimi ho on" will be provided later.)

2 ibid., pp. 27-28.

3 ibid., p. 4.

"...represented God as the sole absolute Being."[4] He explains that this God of pure being can only be perceived by the mind, since it is *incorporeal*, rational, imperishable, immortal, and uncreated. That which is *corporeal* does not literally exist and cannot be accurately described as "being," since it is always in a state of flux, change, and decay. Moreover, Eusebius states that this God as First Cause is the cause of both the incorporeal *and* the corporeal.[5] Eusebius also quotes this verse in Book 7, Chapter XI of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*. He does this simply as an example that Moses believed in the concept of God as the First Cause. In the beginning of this chapter, he explains that Moses acquired this knowledge by divine guidance.[6]

A first question is how did Philo interpret this same verse, Exodus 3:14? In *On the Life of Moses*, Philo similarly looks to God as "pure existence." He explains that God chose the name "I am He Who is" in order to teach two lessons: "...that they may learn the difference between what is and what is not, and also...that no name at all can properly be used to Me, to Whom alone existence belongs."[7] Philo adds that this "Existent One" is the only perfect source of sacred truth. Humanity alone does not have the power or the intelligence to comprehend this truth without the help of God. The first truth humanity must understand is simply that God *is Who God is*.[8]

Philo explains that the description of God offered in Exodus 3:14 is the best possible description. Any other description, especially those that refer to God in anthropomorphic terms, are not to be interpreted literally, but allegorically.[9] A question is whether

---

4 Eusebius, P.E., Eusebii Pamphili, *Evangelicae Praeparationis*, trans. E.H. Gifford (London: E Typographeo Academio, 1903), Book 11, Chapter IX., p. 563.
5 *P.E.*, Book 11, Chapter IX.
6 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter XI.
7 F.H. Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), vol. VI, "On the Life of Moses," Book 1, Chapter XIV, p. 315.
8 Ralph Marcus, trans., *Philo, Supplement II, Questions and Answers on Exodus* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), Book 1, Chapter XX.
9 ibid., Book 2, Chapter XLVII.

humanity has the ability to relate to this purely existent God directly. He provides an answer by relating Exodus 3:14 to Exodus 25:21, "I [God] shall be made known to thee from there." Philo interprets this verse with the words, "The most lucid and most prophetic mind receives the knowledge and science of the Existent One not from the Existent One Himself...but from His chief and ministering powers."[10] Therefore, one can only relate to the purely existent God through mediation, a secondary level of communication.

This verse reveals that the Philonic doctrine of God at times is unlike the Platonic division of a First God and a Second God. At the top of Philo's hierarchy is the "Existent One." Next is the *Logos* of the "Existent One," which he also calls *Word*. Two powers divide from this *Logos*, namely the creative power (God) and the royal power (Lord), which rules over created things. An even more detailed hierarchy breaks down from this "God" and "Lord."[11] In order to reach this "Existent One," one must climb this theological hierarchy through contemplation and meditation.

Philo explains that descriptions of God in which God seems to be in a different form than purely existent, such as an angel or a burning bush or as a human visitor, are intended to be aids for those who cannot comprehend God's true essence. This will enable them to get closer to comprehending God as *pure being*. Again, such descriptions are meant to be interpreted allegorically, for in truth, God's nature and essence can never change.[12]

Lastly, Philo interprets Exodus 3:14 to show that not only is God purely existent, but also that this God is the creator of Ideas, also referred to as "forms" and "archetypes."[13]

One can clearly see similarities between Eusebius' and Philo's interpretations. However, Philo's interpretation of Exodus 3:14 reveals much more than simply an

---

10 ibid., Book 2, Chapter LXVII.

11 ibid., Book 2, Chapter LXVIII. Also found in Colson, *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. VI, "On Dreams," Book 2, Chapter XXXVI.

12 Colson, *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. VI, "On Dreams," Book 2, Chapter XL.

13 *Philo, Supplement II, Questions and Answers on Exodus*, Book 2, Chapter LXIII.

incorporeal, intellectual, existent, First God.[14] With the following various Christian intellectuals, there is much less consistency and common ground with Eusebius' interpretation.

One begins with Justin Martyr. He merely quotes this verse from Exodus to show how Moses influenced Plato concerning his opinion that God signifies "pure existence."[15] Another interpretation of this verse can be found in Clement's *Stromateis*. He begins by claiming that Moses influenced Plato's view of political science. He relates this term to the highest intelligence that guides, organizes, and controls the universe. He explains that by acting righteously and keeping our eyes fixed on God, one determines the best laws rulers can use to care for their subjects and that subjects can use to obey their rulers. As a result, living in accordance with these laws, one ensures that one will live by excellence and truth. The only means to determine these laws is to contemplate the one *Who is*, and guide one's life according to reason. This relates directly to God's description in Exodus 3:14 as "I am He Who is," as pure existence.[16] Another interpretation by Clement can be found in *The Instructor*. In this instance, he does not view the words from Exodus as describing either a First God or a Second God. And unlike the Eusebian interpretation of God's existing beyond time, Clement views God in terms of time, such as the past, present, and future.[17]

Tertullian provides another interpretation in his *Treatise Against Praxeas*. He argues that "He Who Is" refers to both Father and Son, for both are singular. His goal is to respond to the Monarchian "heretic" who claims that the Son was generated from the

---

14 This point will be further developed later in this chapter.

15 Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, gen. eds., *Ante Nicene Fathers*, 10 vols. (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1903), vol. I, "Justin's Hortatory Address to the Greeks," Chapter XX, p. 281.

16 *The Fathers of the Church*, (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991), vol. 85, *Stromateis - Books One to Three*, by Clement of Alexandria, Book I, Chapter 25.

17 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol. III*, "Treatise Against Praxeas," by Tertullian, Book I, Chapter VIII.

Father.[18] Tertullian clearly is not interpreting this verse from the perspective of a Platonist. He speaks nothing of a First God or Second God.

Origen also speaks in the context of this verse's relating to the Father and the Son. His goal is to show that the "activity" of the Father and Son can be found in saints and sinners alike. He argues that all rational beings partake in the word of God through reason. Furthermore, all rational beings derive their being from that which truly exists. For Origen, Exodus 3:14 shows that God is that which truly exists. Therefore, even sinners, since they exist, partake in the word of God.[19] With this interpretation, Origen is not speaking about metaphysics in a purely Platonic sense. Furthermore, his teaching conflicts with Eusebius' doctrine. Unlike Eusebius, Origen uses the terms "exist" and "being" to refer to God's creations. Eusebius stated clearly that only God, the First God in particular, "exists" and be described as "being." Lastly, Eusebius would disagree that one could simultaneously be a sinner and partake in God.

Hilary of Poitiers, a convert from Neoplatonism who became the leading and most respected Latin theologian of his age,[20] provides an interpretation in the *Trinity* which originally agrees with Eusebius but then relates the verse to the Father and the Son. He embraces the notion described in Exodus that there is nothing more characteristic of God than *to be*, "...because that itself which *is* does not belong to those things which will one day end or to those which had a beginning."[21] Then he shifts to show that God's "being" relates to God's majesty and omniscience. He attempts to show that part of this majesty is to exist within all of creation and beyond all of creation. According to this view, there is

---

18 Ernest Evans, ed. *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1948), Chapter XVII.

19 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol. IV*, "On First Principles," by Origen, Book 1, Chapter III.

20 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Hilary of Poitiers," p. 649.

21 *The Fathers of the Church*, (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1954, 1954), vol. 25, *The Trinity* by Hilary of Poitiers, trans. by Stephen McKenna, Book I, Chapter 6, p. 6.

no place which is not God.[22] This view, which appears pantheistic, is not at all how Eusebius interpreted this verse from Exodus. In a later section of his work, Hilary attempts to show that Father and Son are equal in nature and power. Not only does the Son contain in Himself the form and image of the Father, but that both have always existed. He supports this notion of unified existence by quoting the verse from Exodus.[23]

Novatian the Presbyter[24] used his interpretation of Exodus 3:14 to refute both the gnostics and various heretical sects. His goal is to show that God is pure being and never subject to change. If this is the case, he claims that God is good, can only be the source of good, and never the source of evil. In addition, he states that this verse teaches that God's proper name in unknown and unknowable. Since none of our finite names can reflect God's incomprehensible nature, God could only provide a term for humanity to use by convention to refer to God.[25] Of note is that this interpretation does not *disagree* with Eusebius' interpretation of the First God.

The next verse to be covered is Genesis 19:24, from Book 11, Chapter XIV of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, which states, "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah sulfurous fire from the Lord out of heaven."[26] Eusebius interprets this verse as proving the existence of the Second God, or Second Cause. He states that the Hebrew Scriptures refers to this God as the *Word of God* and *God of God*. He explains that in the verse, the first "Lord" is the First Cause, the *truly existent* God, and the second "Lord" is the Second Cause, the Creator God. Eusebius adds that this Second Cause is also referred to as

---

22 ibid., pp. 6-7.

23 ibid., Book 12, Chapter 24, p. 517.

24 Novatian was the first Roman theologian to write a theological treatise in Latin. Thus, he was a pioneer in Roman Latin theology. [*The Fathers of the Church*, (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974), vol. 67, *The Trinity*, by Novatian the Presbyter, trans. by Russel DeSimone, Introduction, , p. 14.]

25 *The Fathers of the Church*, (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974), vol. 67, *The Trinity*, by Novatian the Presbyter, trans. by Russel DeSimone, Introduction, Chapter IV.

26 *Tanakh - The Holy Scriptures*, p. 27.

Saviour and as Wisdom. In particular, this "Wisdom" was at God's side during the creation of the universe. It mirrors the operation of the divine and is an image of God's goodness.[27] Eusebius also interprets this verse in Book 7, Chapter XII. Here, he explains that this verse shows that the Second Cause is sent to humanity from the First Cause, in the form of prophecy, for the purpose of healing, and as shown by Sodom and Gomorrah, as an expression of punishment. In addition, he explains that this combination of First and Second Causes is also referred to as Father and Son.[28]

The question is how Philo interprets this same verse which relates to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Eusebius includes an extract from chapter XX of the *Confusion of Tongues* in the next chapter of Book 11, which concerns hierarchical means of contemplating the divine. While Philo does not mention the Second God specifically, he did explain what could be interpreted as a "second-tier" God. At the top is the God of True Being. Below this God is the first-begotten Word, as described in Chapter XIV of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Eusebius provides an extract in Chapter XIII of Book 7, in which Philo uses the term *Second God* to refer to this "second-tier" God and equates it with *logos*.[29] Clearly, this interpretation is in line with Eusebius' interpretation. Of note, however, is that Philo's commentary in Chapter XIV, Book 11, does not quote Genesis 19:24 and does not even include a veiled reference to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. In fact, in all of the following citations of Philonic interpretations of this verse, none refer to any Second Cause, *Word*, or any other God that could be interpreted as Eusebius previously described. One possible justification for this is that Philo worked from a translation that did not include any second reference to a "Lord."

---

27 *P.E.*, Book 11, Chapter XIV.

28 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter XII.

29 He draws this extract from the following Philonic source: Ralph Marcus, trans., *Philo, Supplement I, Questions and Answers on Genesis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), Book 2, Chapter LXII.

In *The Unchangeableness of God*, Philo provides an allegorical interpretation of Genesis 19:24. He explains that this anthropomorphic description of God reigning down fire is intended to help people understand the expectations and qualities of God in terms they could comprehend. Philo argues that the behavior of the citizens of the city was unacceptable, and they deserved to be punished. This is yet another example of Philo's allegorizing verses that do not make sense to him literally.[30]

In his *On Drunkenness*, he provides another allegorical interpretation. He claims that the verse teaches that the those who are lustful and gluttonous deserve their punishment and that the contemplative life which leads to the pursuit of virtue is preferable.[31] His interpretation from *On Abraham* claims that God destroyed the city as punishment for the lust of the inhabitants and their pursuit of unnatural and forbidden intercourse. The punishment was severe simply because the crimes were severe.[32] Philo's interpretation from *On the Life of Moses* continues this theme that they deserved extraordinary punishment. He explains that the citizens rebelled against divine virtue and practiced untold vices. In addition, they failed to learn the lesson of the victims of the flood to live a virtuous life. Since they were enemies both of humanity and the world, they deserved their punishment. The reason God saved Lot was that he maintained his pursuit of virtue even when surrounded by those who pursued vice.[33]

The various Christian intellectual interpretations of this verse are inconsistent. Some are anti-heretical. Others attempt to justify the existence of the Father and the Son. Almost none of them interpret them in the same way as either Eusebius or Philo.

---

30 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. III, "The Unchangeableness of God," Chapter XIII.

31 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. III, "On Drunkenness," Chapter CCXXIII.

32 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. VI, "On Abraham," Chapter XXVII.

33 ibid., "On the Life of Moses," Book 2, Chapter X.

Justin Martyr relates this verse to the three visitors of Abraham.[34] He claims that not all three were angels, for one was both God and Lord, sent by the God in heaven to direct the other two angels and to inflict punishment on Sodom and Gomorrah.[35] Later, Justin refers to the first "Lord" in this verse as God the Father and the second "Lord" as God the Son. Justin uses this verse to claim that this Second God was begotten by the Father, and that this God is distinct and separate. One remains in heaven, and the other descends to the earth to do the other God's will.[36] This interpretation is clearly much more Christian than it is Platonic, for Justin uses it to justify his people's theology.

Tertullian first uses this verse to respond to those who blame Christian communities for various calamities. He states that many disasters occurred in the past, including the fantastic destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, long before Christians existed. While disasters continue to occur, people still pray to their false gods. He concludes that only the ascetic lifestyle of the Christians has tempered God's judgment.[37] Tertullian also uses this text to argue for the non-binding aspect of religious law. He argues that laws change, depending upon people and circumstances. As a result, the Jews possess no monopoly, and their circumcision and sabbath observance are not the only means to salvation. Tertullian uses Genesis 19:24 as part of his argument to show that Lot's righteousness, not his observance of the law, saved him from destruction.[38] He also uses this verse twice in response to the Marcionites. The first justifies the punishment as deserving, not the work of some evil demiurge. The second argues that God has many aspects but that only one unified God exists.[39] In his anti-Monarchian text, *Against Praxeas*, Tertullian uses this

---

34 This occurs in Genesis, Chapter 18.

35 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol. 1*, "Dialogue of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, a Jew," by Justin Martyr, Chapter LVI.

36 ibid., Chapter CXXVII.

37 ibid., vol. III, "Apology," by Tertullian, Chapter XL.

38 ibid., "An Answer to the Jews," by Tertullian, Chapter II.

39 ibid., Book 2, Chapter XIV; Book 4, Chapter XXIX.

verse to justify the existence and equality of the Father and the Son. The purpose of God's being mentioned as a plurality was to make the Father more manifest and known in the world. However, even though two Gods are mentioned, their unity is preserved, for this God possesses an undivided *essence*. Differing with both Philo and Eusebius, he adds that one need not interpret the text through parables or allegories, and that in this case, a literal interpretation is sufficient.[40]

Both Origen and Hilary use this verse to respond to heretical sects. The former uses it against the Marcionites. This heretical sect used the same verse to show how the demiurgic God of the "Old Testament" is purely a God of judgment, unlike their anti-law, God of love. Origen needs to use the same text to show that God both pursues justice *and* spreads love. He argues with the following words:

> ...it is plain that the just and good God of the law and the gospels is one and the same, and that he does good with justice and punishes in kindness, since neither goodness without justice nor justice without goodness can describe the dignity of the divine nature.[41]

The verse from Genesis, which mentions "Lord" twice, reveals that the same God can be both good and just. Hilary uses the verse against the Arians to show that the Father and the Son do not have distinct natures.[42]

Novatian interprets the verse to mean that there is one incorporeal Lord in heaven and another Lord that has contact with the physical world. This latter Lord, also called *Word*, also the God that appeared to Abraham, also the God that became flesh as Christ, is the same Lord that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.[43] This is a final highly Christian

---

40 Evans, ed. *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas*, Chapter XIII, pp. 147-48.

41 G.W. Butterworth, trans., *Origen on First Principles* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1936), Book 2, Chapter V, pp. 104-105.

42 *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 25, *The Trinity* by Hilary of Poitiers, Book 4, Chapter XXIX..

43 *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 67, *The Trinity*, by Novatian the Presbyter, Chapter XVIII.

interpretation of the verse, which Novatian uses as a proof of the existence of God the Father and God the Son.

The third and final verse to be considered is Genesis 1:27, "And God created man in His image, in the image of God He created him...,"[44] which is found in Chapter XXIII of Book 11. In this Chapter, Eusebius explained how the Platonic concepts of Ideas and participation in Ideas are found in the Mosaic legislation. He explains that these scriptures

> ...make known to us all things which have essential being and subsistence, nay more, they show us myriads of other incorporeal powers beyond both heaven and all material and fleeting essence; and the images of these powers...He expressed in things sensible, after which they have now received the name each of its image.[45]

He adds that the First God is the pure Idea which "embodies" all of the other Ideas.[46] Eusebius also quotes this verse in Book 7, Chapter X. In this case, he explains that man was created in God's image in order to teach that the image, or essence of God is intelligent, incorporeal, and rational. For this reason, part of humanity's nature is to be drawn towards God, since he was made in the image of God.[47]

The first question is how Philo interprets this verse. Eusebius provides an extract in the very next chapter, Chapter XXIV, taken from *On the Creation*. Philo quotes Genesis 1:27 and states that if man was modeled after an image, then the visible world must be modeled after an image as well. He adds that the ultimate model or image is the archetypal pattern, the "Idea of the Ideas, the Word (Reason) of God."[48] As expected, this parallels the preceding chapter, with the assumption that the First God, or "purely existent" God is the author of this "Idea of the Ideas" or "Word."

---

44 *Tanakh - The Holy Scriptures*, p. 4.
45 *P.E.*, Book 11, Chapter XXIII, p. 590.
46 ibid., Book 11, Chapter XXIII.
47 *P.E.*, Book 7, Chapter X.
48 ibid., Book 11, Chapter XXIV, p. 591.

In other sources, Philo further develops this concept of the first human being made in the image of God. In *On the Creation* and *Who is the Heir*, he explains that the first man created was an image of God, representing the idea or archetype of man. However, the second man created was the *corporeal* man. It was this man that was made *in* the image of God, *according* to this archetype.[49] In his *Noah's Work as a Planter*, Philo explains that this man made *in* the image of God was placed in the garden. This neutral, corporeal individual possessed freedom of choice, unlike the first man, reflecting the imperishable image of God, which was pure, untainted, and could only behave correctly.[50] In the *Allegorical Interpretation*, he explains that the Word, the "Idea of Ideas," includes the image God used to model man. He explains that God created the Word and used it as an instrument to create the world and as a pattern for future creation. Thus, man was made according to a pattern within this Word.[51]

The Christian intellectuals' interpretations of both Exodus 3:14 and Genesis 19:24 were marked by their inconsistency. However, their interpretations of Genesis 1:27 possess two recurring themes: The internal image of God is the model for mankind's proper behavior and can be tarnished and forfeited. This image of God refers to the Son, God's firstborn, Jesus.

Clement explains that one becomes what one worships. Thus, humanity's worshipping idols precipitates the loss of the image of God. In fact, any instance of acting unrighteously results in the forfeiture of the divine image. However, it can be recovered and maintained through contemplation, performing good deeds, and following

---

49 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. I, "On the Creation," Chapter XLVI; and vol. IV, "Who is the Heir," Chapter XLVIII.

50 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. III, "Noah's Work as a Planter," Chapter XI.

51 Colson, gen. ed., *Philo: in 10 volumes*, vol. I, "Allegorical Interpretation," Book 3, Chapter XXXI.

Christianity, the one true religion.[52] Thus, Clement interprets this verse to mean that humanity is to live like Jesus, according to *His* image and likeness. Such behavior is humanity's only means to salvation, for it results in the transformation from an earth-bound creation to a holy creature.[53] The stakes are high.

In the *Clementine Homilies*, the author explains that this image of God makes humanity immortal. However, the price for tarnishing or abandoning this image is the just punishment of the destruction of the soul.[54] The author's interpretation of being made in the image of God does not concern the Platonic doctrine of participating in an incorporeal form or image. Instead, it is about maintaining an "image" or recovering a "pattern" that was once possessed.

Tertullian continues this theme with his *De Corona*, in which he defends the Christian practice of refusing to wear laurels. He argues that one becomes a reflection of what one practices, which includes what one does and what one wears. Thus, he explains that Christians refuse to wear laurels, since it is a pagan practice. He uses the Genesis quote to conclude that if man is made in the image of God, then he should never model himself after the image of idols.[55] In his *Treatise Against Praxeas*, he interprets the verse to develop the argument that God was speaking to both the Son and the "Spirit" before the creation of man. He explains that the Son would one day assume the likeness of humanity and that the Spirit would sanctify humanity. Furthermore, man would be made according to the image of the Son.[56] While this image is reminiscent of the Platonic Idea, his overall

---

52 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol.* VIII, "Recognitions," by Clement, Book 5, Chapters XIII-XV.

53 Clement of Alexandria, *Christ the Educator*, trans. by Simon Wood, (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954), pp. 11, 12, 86, and 87.

54 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol.* VIII, "Clementine Homilies," Chapters X, XIX.

55 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers, vol.* VIII, "De Corona," by Clement Chapter X.

56 Evans, ed. *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas*, Chapter XII, p. 145.

interpretation is Christian in its attempt to use a verse from Genesis to justify the existence of the Trinity. A final excerpt from Tertullian is a simple defense of the Christian belief in the creation story described in Genesis and his mentioning the formation of mankind in passing, to illustrate the clear organization of the narrative.[57]

In Origen's *Contra Celsum*, the author argues that the "image of God" mentioned in Genesis refers to the *Logos*, Wisdom, the firstborn of all creation. Then he asks the question of what it means to be made in the image of God. He explains that this image concerns only the "inward man" and that one develops it through striving to obtain the virtue of the divine.[58] Later, Origen returns to this concept when defending himself against Celsus' claim that Christians contradict themselves when they state that God is invisible and incorporeal, and yet that humanity is made in the image of God. Origen explains that this divine image is developed and preserved in the *rational* soul when it behaves according to virtue. While this interpretation agrees with the Eusebian and Philonic notion that the image of God relates to *Logos* and to Wisdom, it clearly diverges when it deals with how this image must be developed and preserved.

Hilary continues the theme that this verse from Genesis foreshadows the Trinity. He explains that in the verse before,[59] God (the Father) was speaking to God the Son, and that through the Son, all things were created. He states that God's talking to "God's self" would not make sense. Hilary stresses that one would falsely conclude from Genesis 1:26 and 1:27 that Christians believe in more than one God. For him, these verses reveal that God the Father spoke to God the Son, and that both possess the same nature.[60] This is another instance of Genesis being used as a prooftext for the life and teachings of Jesus.

---

57 Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante Nicene Fathers*, *vol.* III, "De Corona," by Clement, Chapter XXVI.

58 Henry Chadwick, trans., *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953), Book VI, Chapter 63, pp. 378-79.

59 "Let us make mankind in our image..." *Tanakh - The Holy Scriptures*, p. 4.

60 *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 25, *The Trinity* by Hilary of Poitiers, Book 4,

Novatian interprets this verse to respond to the heretics who claim that Jesus, in the form of man, is also God the Father. He attempts to show that God the Father created humanity through God the Son, and that this same Son later became flesh as Jesus Christ. However, the heretic is wrong to conclude that Jesus incarnate is the *same* as God the Father. Rather, God the Son, which became Jesus incarnate, was born of the Father and serves the Father faithfully. This "image of God" mentioned in the creation narrative refers to God the Son.[61]

The next section of this chapter will first consider to what extent Eusebius' interpretations agree with Middle Platonic thought. Then his interpretations will be related to Philo's and to the Christian intellectuals' interpretations to determine with which he has more in common. Lastly, general conclusions will be drawn concerning the nature of Eusebius' interpretations.

One begins with Exodus 3:14, Eusebius' interpretation that the First Cause can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and its relation to Middle Platonism. In a general sense, Middle Platonic thought characterized the First Cause as purely transcendent, supersensible, immaterial, and the ground for the material and physical. In addition, Plutarch referred to the First God as the God of *Being* and to the objects in the corporeal realm as *becoming*.[62] Clearly, Eusebius' characterization of the First Cause, shown by his interpretation of Exodus 3:14, agrees with this characterization of the Middle Platonic conception of the First Cause.

Concerning the Philonic interpretations of this verse, in one example, he agrees with Eusebius that God is the God of pure existence, and that the incorporeal is the true cause

---

Chapter XVII, pp. 107-108.

61 *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 67, *The Trinity*, by Novatian the Presbyter, Chapters XVII, XXVI, pp. 65-66, 92.

62 Giovanni Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 4, *The Schools of the Imperial Age* (Albany: State University of New York, 1990), pp. 210, 215.

of the corporeal.[63] However, an investigation of Philo's conception of God shows that from his common ground with Eusebius and the Middle Platonists, he took his theology in new directions.

According to Philo, while God's "nature" is understandable, God's "essence" is incomprehensible. This represents a break from previous Greek tradition, which claimed that even God's essence was theoretically understandable.[64] This tradition referred to God as the "One," or the "Monad," the supreme principle which was eternal, unchanging, and imperishable.[65] However, all of these concepts are comprehensible by the human intellect. Philo believed that because God is infinitely transcendent, God is infinitely beyond human comprehension. Philo adds, "God transcends not only being and the sensible world, but also the intelligible world and its entities, because...He is the creator of both."[66] In many places, Philo presented a God which existed above the "Monad." He characterized this God as "...the Existent, which is better than the Good, purer than the One, and primordial than the Monad."[67] According to this concept, one can only know *that* God is, not *what* God is. For Philo, only a mystical vision or event could enable humanity to make contact with God, since reason alone is not good enough.[68]

Philo derived his detailed theological conception from his allegorical interpretation of the text. A common theme of his interpretations of all three verses in this chapter is his belief that wisdom can be derived through an allegorical investigation. In fact, the very foundation of Philo's interpretive approach is viewing the text from an allegorical perspective. From the Hellenistic world, he received the belief that truth is hidden within

63 ibid., p. 181.
64 ibid., p. 183.
65 John Dillon, *The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources*, from "Protocol of the Sixteenth Colloquy, 20 April 1975, "The Center for Hermeneutical Studies," (Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1975), p. 5
66 Reale, *Schools of Imperial Age*, p. 186.
67 Dillon, *The Transcendence of God...*, p. 5.
68 ibid., p. 6.

symbols. The goal is to break through the literal level of words and penetrate texts in order to comprehend their hidden meanings. Philo took this teaching and raised his allegorical methodology to a new level. While he believed that Bible verses had a *literal* meaning, he believed that their allegorical understanding was more significant.[69] Moreover, he used this allegorical understanding to derive vital ethical lessons.[70] For Philo, the greatest goal was to transcend the divine hierarchy. One accomplished this, in part, through contemplation and through virtuous deeds. Through contemplation, one derived an allegorical understanding of the Scriptures, which in turn taught ethical lessons. One then put these ethical lessons into action through righteous behavior. This behavior, in turn, allowed one to climb higher through the divine hierarchy. Clearly, from Philo's perspective, the lines between the physical and the ethical were purposely intertwined.

One must always keep in mind one of the underlying premises in Book 11 of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, namely Eusebius' attempt to maintain a clear division between the physical, the ethical, and the logical. Philo did not bind himself by this philosophical framework. Similarly, the majority of the Christian intellectuals did not make any attempt to maintain their interpretations according to any tripartite division. As a result, with *all three verses* considered in this chapter, there is a fundamental discontinuity between the Christian intellectuals and Eusebius. From their perspective, they saw no need to maintain clear lines between the physics and the ethics. One needs to remember that Eusebius was attempting to prove Christianity's legitimacy within the context of its being a philosophy, not only comparable to the Greek systems, but superior to them. Thus, he presented an argument in terms that Greek Hellenists could understand. It is not clear that any of the Christian intellectuals approached Scripture from the same perspective, within the same limitations, or with the same intentions.

---

69 Reale, *Schools of Imperial Age*, p. 174.

70 John Dillon and David Winston, *Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), p. 80.

In addition, as shown earlier, some of these writers, after reading Greek philosophical texts and studying their teachings, attempted to set up a clear division between Christian and "pagan" thought, viewing the latter as a threat. One example was Justin Martyr. In his writings, he did not try to reconcile Greek thought with Christian thought. Rather, he wanted to show the clear superiority of Christianity as a correction of the Greek traditions.[71] In his effort, while he may have coopted facets of Middle Platonic thought, he radically reinterpreted them as Christian. He *did* believe God to be wholly transcendent and beyond human comprehension. But at the same time, he viewed Jesus as *the* representative of the *Logos* in all of his incarnations. For Justin, any who "participated" in the *Logos* were Christian, regardless of whether they viewed themselves as pagan or Jewish. He concluded that the original philosophy that God revealed to humanity was sealed by the *Logos* in Scripture. Thus, Christianity was not one of many philosophies, but the only *true* philosophy.

Tertullian took Justin's conclusions even further. The African Church Father was so critical of Greek Hellenist society that he called for all Christians to break away in order to avoid contamination.[72] Thus, he totally rejected their way of life and refused to find any redeeming values that he could embrace and reinterpret through Christian lenses.

Clement and Origen, who lived in Alexandria, the crossroads of East and West, were not nearly as threatened by Greek Hellenism. They approached its literature, philosophy, and culture with a greater openness. However, Clement did passionately advocate the belief that the Greeks stole their philosophy from Moses and claimed it as their own.[73] While Eusebius provided plagiarism as a clear possibility, he never advocated it as strongly as Clement. Clement added that if the Greeks obtained their wisdom from Moses, then Moses acquired his wisdom from the *Logos*. This reflected the Stoic/Middle Platonic

---

71 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 53.
72 *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Tertullian," p. 1352.
73 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, pp. 139-40.

concept of tracing back knowledge to its pristine origins.[74] Moreover, he believed that the Greeks had tarnished this original revelation by corrupting it.[75] Origen built upon Clement's teachings. He was also influenced by the Middle Platonic doctrine of the First Cause. However, he adapted many of its teachings to Christian needs. One example concerns the *Logos*. While Origen believed it revealed divine wisdom to humanity, he taught that it adopted *human* form and suffered for the sake of humanity's salvation.[76] The fact that Clement and Origen lived in a city where the Christian-Hellenist and Greek Hellenist societies collided and blended clearly effected their interpretation of the various authoritative texts. But they downplayed the Platonic influence in favor of their triumphalist Christian beliefs. Both saw Christianity playing a vital role in the development of civilization. Jesus as *Logos* became the greatest of all teachers. Thus, Christianity would fulfill the "paideutic mission of mankind," educating humanity to the highest possible degree.[77]

A quick review of their interpretations of Exodus 3:14 (and the other two verses) will clarify this contextual information. Both Novatian and Tertullian used this verse to argue against heretical *Christian* points of view. Clement in his *Stromateis* spoke of a God of pure existence, which represented the perfect model of virtue and proper behavior. However, much of his interpretation blurs the lines between physics and ethics. These parallels with both Philo and Eusebius concerning Clement's characterization of God are not surprising, since he lived in Alexandria, had access to common literary Hellenistic sources, and was surrounded by the same culture. However, even Clement is inconsistent, since in his *Instructor*, he refers to God in "time-bound" terms. This conception is completely unlike both Philo and Eusebius. Concerning Origen, his disagreements with

---

74 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 140, 147.
75 Droge, *Homer or Moses?*, p. 152.
76 Grant, *Gods and the One God*, p. 93.
77 Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, p. 60.

Eusebius have already been detailed. Lastly, while Hilary's interpretation of the Exodus verse began by agreeing with Eusebius' God of pure existence, he took his reasoning in a direction with which Eusebius would categorically disagree.

Interpreting the second verse, Genesis 19:24, Eusebius concludes that the doctrine of the Second Cause is found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He explains that the Hebrews refer to this Cause as "Word of God" and "God of God," and that Christians refer to it as a Deity, as well as "Son."[78] A first question is how the Middle Platonists refer to this Second Cause. Unfortunately, Middle Platonic thought is not nearly as clear about its view of the Second Cause as it is about the First Cause. Their hierarchical conception of the divine was both Platonic and mystical. At the top was a Supreme God, the First Cause described earlier. Next were secondary gods, which ranged from the invisible to the visible and included heavenly bodies. Last were daemons, which were inferior to God but superior to humanity. Another concept, however, referred to the Second God as a Creator God, further developing the concept of the Demiurge detailed in Plato's *Timaeus*. This Second God took images of *Ideas* from the First God and impressed them on matter as the forms of the creations in the corporeal world.[79] Clearly, Eusebius attempted to argue that the Hebrew anticipated this doctrine of the Second Cause. However, he question is whether *any* commentator can connect the words, "And the Lord rained down sulfurous fire from the Lord" and claim that it anticipated the eclectic Middle Platonic concept of the Second Cause.

One begins with Philo. A fundamental question is whether he adopted any concept of a Second God similar to Eusebius and whether he interpreted Genesis 19:24 to substantiate his claim. In the preceding section concerning his interpretation of Exodus 3:14, Philo detailed his hierarchical conception of the divine. At the top is the "Existent

78 *P.E.*, Book 11, Chapter XIV; Book 7, Chapter XI.
79 Reale, *Schools of Imperial Age*, pp. 225-226.

One." Next is the *Logos*, which he also calls *Word*. The *Logos* then divides into "God," the creative power, and "Lord," the ruling power. The breakdown continues from here. As shown earlier in the section dealing with Genesis 19:24, Philo does equate Eusebius' concept of a Second God with both *Logos* and *Word*. However, in other cases, Philo often speaks of *Logos* in a veiled context, through allusions, and his perspective changes depending upon the context. In one instance, he refers to *Logos* as the divine *power* which used the ideals or models to create the corporeal world. However, he does *not* equate this *power* with God. In other cases, he equates the *Logos* with "Wisdom" and the "Word of God," but does not specifically state that they are *equal* to God. In other instances, he relates *Logos* with the two principal divine "powers," the Creative power and the Ruling power. Sometimes, Philo presents the *Logos* as the source of these powers, and at other times he refers to it as what unites these powers.[80]

In the majority of his interpretations of Genesis 19:24 quoted earlier, he does not derive the conclusion that the verse provides evidence for any kind of Second God or Second Cause as described by Eusebius or by the Middle Platonists. Instead, he uses his allegorical technique to derive ethical lessons. Rather than focusing on the divine, he focuses on the deserved extraordinary punishment of the citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah for their wicked behavior.

Once again, the Christian intellectuals present interpretations of Genesis 19:24 that derive conclusions distinct from and often non-related to the conclusions derived by Eusebius. Justin Martyr uses it to prove the existence of Father and Son. However, this is a Son that actually appears on earth, sometimes in the guise of a human being, but always in order to follow the will of the Father. Tertullian uses the text apologetically against non-Christians and heretical Christian sects, including the Monarchists and the Marcionites. Origen and Hilary as well use it for apologetic purposes, the former against

---

80 ibid., pp. 191-194.

the Marcionites and the latter against the Arians. Of note is that Novatian interprets the verse as revealing a First and Second God. However, he concludes that this Second God is the same as the Son, which is the same as Jesus incarnate. While Eusebius in one reference referred to the Second Cause as "Son," he did not claim that this same power related with humanity as Novatian describes, as resembling humanity or as Jesus incarnate. Thus, most likely, Eusebius would only agree with Novatian's interpretation to a limited extent.

The final verse to be covered is Genesis 1:27. Again, Eusebius quotes it to show that the Platonic concept of Ideas and participation in Ideas can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He explains that all sensible things have their corresponding incorporeal images. Eusebius adds that the source of these images, or Ideas, is the First God, the pure Idea which possesses all of the other Ideas. In Chapter XXIII of Book 11, Eusebius explains that in addition, what humanity calls *Wisdom* and *Truth* relate to an ultimate intelligible image, namely the Word or Jesus. Lastly, he interprets this verse in Chapter X of Book VII, to explain the essence of humanity and why they are drawn to God in worship.

Eusebius' doctrine of Ideas, based upon both his interpretation of the Genesis verse and his commentary in the following chapter, is in line with Middle Platonic thought. In a similar way, Middle Platonism defines Ideas as the transcendent thoughts of God and views the divine as identical with "pure mind." However, their doctrine is more developed than Eusebius' interpretation, in part because Eusebius was constrained by the verses found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in part of the Middle Platonists' attempt to harmonize divergent views of Aristotle and Plato concerning Ideas. Based upon the Aristotelian notion, they view the divine Mind as a "primary principle." Combining this concept with Plato's view of Ideas, they hold that Ideas become the content of the divine Mind. Finally, these "thoughts," or Ideas, are immutable, eternal, and paradigmatic. In this effort to harmonize the two schools of thought, they had to develop a new relationship between the

Platonic *transcendent Ideas* and the Aristotelian *immanent forms*. The Middle Platonists transformed these contradictory doctrines into complementary concepts by viewing the Platonic conception of Ideas/forms as "causes" and the Aristotelian conception of Ideas/forms as "effects." Another way of expressing this notion is that the forms become the images of the Ideas that the Demiurge, or Creator God, impressed on matter.[81]

Philo was highly influenced by the Platonic concept of Ideas. However, he greatly expanded upon its core principles and developed his own unique doctrine relating the divine to Ideas and the Ideas to the sensible world. Perhaps, his doctrine influenced how the doctrine of Ideas developed among Middle Platonic thinkers. Clearly, Philo embraced the Platonic concepts that God is superior to Ideas, and that Ideas are directly dependent upon God. In addition, he accepted the notion that each Idea has a well defined role as serving as the foundation of its corresponding sensible entity. In other words, he believed that the corporeal realm exists only because the incorporeal realm produces it, sustains it, and maintains it.[82]

However, he only agreed with the Platonic doctrines of Ideas to a limited extent. According to Plato, Ideas are ungenerated and eternal. Philo developed the concept that Ideas are created by "divine thought," in order to be archetypes for the sensible world. However, after they are generated, these Ideas become immortal and are maintained and "housed" by the *Logos* in the "intelligible cosmos." No one before Philo had presented a similar doctrine of the Ideas in such detail and organization. His concept of Ideas as divine thoughts could very well have provided the philosophic "soil" in which later Middle Platonic thought thrived.[83]

---

81 ibid., pp. 210, 215, 220.

82 ibid., vol. 4, pp. 172, 181-182.

83 ibid., vol. 4, pp. 190, 194-95. This section reflects Reale's point of view, which is controversial. Other scholars disagree with his argument of Philo's expansion of the Platonic concept of Ideas.

There are clear parallels between Eusebius' and Philo's interpretations of Genesis 1:27. Both agree that entities in the sensible world are modeled after intelligible patterns. In addition, they believe that an ultimate pattern, or "Idea of the Ideas" must exist, whom they both refer to as the Word. However, in Philo's other interpretations of this verse, he uses his allegorical technique to explain that God created the Word, and that it is not equal or synonymous with the divine. In this way, Eusebius' and Philo's interpretations diverge.

As stated earlier, the Christian intellectuals' interpretations of this verse do not seem to be based in any way upon Middle Platonic, Philonic, or Eusebian doctrines. For these intellectuals, this verse is intended to justify the existence of the Trinity and to teach the necessity of proper behavior. Eusebius' view was limited to interpreting this verse to understand the "divine image" as only revealing aspects of the human essence, not as blurring into the realm of ethics. One can confidently conclude that these Christian intellectuals and Eusebius did not influence each other in any way.

The final question is what if any conclusions can be drawn concerning the relation of the various interpretations of Eusebius, Philo, and the Christian intellectuals concerning these three verses. In some cases, there are no signs of influence whatsoever. In other cases, the influence is limited at best. One would have expected that Clement and Origen would have influenced Eusebius to a greater extent, and that Platonic streams of thought would have played a greater role in their interpretations. However, one must return to the constraints that Eusebius constructed for his overall argument. He attempted to prove to the Greek Hellenistic community the legitimacy of Christianity not only as a religion, but as a philosophy and a way of life. He had to speak in terms that his audience could understand. Thus, he stressed the concepts and vocabulary of Platonic philosophy and structured his arguments according to Greek Hellenist logic and rationality. His interpretations, at least in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, embodied more Western influences than mystical, esoteric, Eastern influences. Clement and Origen, however, stressed East over West, Christian over Platonic. In this apologetic work, concerning these particular

verses, Eusebius chose a different emphasis. Still, one cannot deny that he attempted to prove the truth of Christianity and its legitimacy with equal passion and devotion as any other Christian intellectual.

In addition, there do not appear to any *direct* influences between Philo and Eusebius. Clearly, in some aspects, they interpret these verses in similar ways. However, it is unclear that Philo shaped any of Eusebius' interpretations. Eusebius may simply have read his works, surgically picked appropriate extracts, and interpreted them in line with conclusions that he had already drawn. One must remember that earlier in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Eusebius explained that he purposely picked extracts from various Platonic Greek philosophers which agreed with his own critique of in order to justify and substantiate his arguments. In a similar way, he may have selectively quoted and interpreted Philo in a way which justified his claim that Jewish intellectuals agreed with his arguments that the Hebrew Scriptures anticipated key teachings Plato claimed as his own. Thus, one must hesitate to conclude that Eusebius carried forward Philo's "Jewish-Hellenic" interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures. With these three verses, Eusebius agreed to a certain extent with the Philonic interpretations. However, there is no indication in this limited investigation that he was influenced by Philo's detailed hierarchical theology or his developed doctrine of Ideas. Quite possibly, their commonalties are more dependent on the fact that they lived in the same Hellenized region of the world, only 300 years apart. As a result, they could not avoid being influenced by Greek culture, education, and literary resources, the elements comprising its *paideia*.

Perhaps, Eusebius successfully made new inroads in his attempt to prove the legitimacy of Christianity by presenting it as a philosophy. The conclusions in this chapter claim he was *not* directly influenced either by Philo or by various Christian intellectuals, and that he did *not* use their teachings to alter his own beliefs or conclusions concerning the wisdom found within the Hebrew Scriptures. The following are two unanswered questions: Who *positively* influenced Eusebius' interpretations? Concerning his arguments and

interpretations in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, whose teachings, if any, did he develop and carry forward?

Chapter 6: *Putting Eusebius' Conclusions in the Context of Christian Paideia*

With the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Eusebius chose to respond to the three main contemporary arguments levied against Christianity. Critics claimed that Christians had abandoned the religion of their ancestors. Critics condemned Christians for preferring Barbarian (i.e. Hebrew) religion to pagan religion. Lastly, critics argued that Christians adopted the Hebrew Scriptures but rejected the laws that guide their way of life. In order to show how Eusebius used his talents as an apologist successfully to respond to each critique, one must return to the definition of the Greek Hellenistic *paideia* presented earlier in this paper.

The Hellenes possessed a unique paradigm, or way of viewing the world. They based this paradigm on systems of language, culture, philosophy, and religion.

> ..[T]hese systems constitute the individual's conceptual world, that is, they govern the perspectives by which he views reality. As well as constituting his conceptual world, they also constitute the 'authority structures' and social worlds related to the conceptual so that when the conceptual and social are enmeshed they give concreteness to the 'picture.'[1]

Their *paideia* reflected the coalescence of these systems and was reflected by their values, their institutions, and their individualistic pursuit of the ideal.

In responding to the critic, Eusebius argued that the Christians too possessed their own *paideia*, with its respective values, morals, traditional practices, authority structures, and institutions. However, it was not only older than the Hellenic *paideia*, but it was superior as well.

Eusebius argued that the Christian *paideia* possessed clear parallels to the central features of the Hellenic *paideia*. The Greeks praised as the transmitters and preservers of

---

1 Christopher J. Berry, "On the Meaning of Progress and Providence in the Fourth Century," *The Heythrop Journal*, July 1977, p. 260

their *paideia* Homer, Hesiod, Plato, Zeno, Pythagoras, and Aristotle, among others. The Christians looked to the Hebrew prophets and Jesus as their ultimate transmitters, the embodiment of truth, wisdom, virtue, and piety. While the Hellenes developed varying interpretations of the *logos*, ranging from reason to divine creative power, the Christians considered *logos* to be equivalent to Jesus, as illustrated by the Gospel of John. Another example is the argument from antiquity, the belief that both the Christians and the Hellenes considered their respective *paideia* to have the more ancient roots.

An additional feature of *paideia* is its role in the steady development of human civilization. The Hellenes viewed rationality and logical investigation as the primary means to better society. Christians agreed, but added the notion that humanity is guided by divine providence. They believed that previous peoples, such as the Jews and the Romans, could take humanity only so far. But Christianity with its divinely-grounded *paideia* would complete the journey. Another aspect of the Hellenic *paideia* was that its supporters viewed themselves as a "genos," representing a unique people or race. The Christians too considered themselves to be a unique "genos." The difference, however, was that they considered themselves to be superior and sanctified.

A foundational value of the Hellenic *paideia* was the quest to discover the one Law which would foster harmony between the individual and the community. The respective Christian quest was to discover the signs of Jesus as *logos*, the transmitter of the divine Law which will foster a providential harmony between the individual, the community, and *God*. While the Hellenes viewed state-sponsored education as a primary means of achieving this harmony, Christians developed their own ideology of culture to achieve a similar harmony which would enable humanity to reach towards its ideal. The Hellenes chose to express this social harmony in their works of literature, art, poetry, music, oration, and in politics. The Christians saw it expressed in the Hebrew Scriptures and its commentaries. This leads directly to the concept of authoritative texts. The Greeks considered a wide array of literary texts, starting with those composed by Homer and

Hesiod, to be the foundation of their *paideia*. The Christians possessed only one foundational text, their scriptures.

In the process of arguing that the Christians possessed their own *paideia*, Eusebius had to distinguish it from that of both the Hellenes and the Jews. First, he claimed that Christianity as a whole was more ancient than *Judaism*, since it could be traced back to a people much older than the *Jews*, who specifically followed the Mosaic legislation. In addition, he argued that the Christian *paideia* was more ancient than the Hellenic *paideia* and that the Greeks had plagiarized from Christian sources.

In summary, Eusebius continued a long line of apologists who attempted to justify the legitimacy of Christianity as possessing some or all of the preceding features of *paideia*. One cannot question his training under Pamphilus or the resources he had at his fingertips in Caesarea. In addition, one cannot question his passion and dedication, for he devoted his life to defending Christianity. Along the way, he learned the importance of accuracy and order, and he honed his skills to be able to pick and choose the exact text he needed for his defense.[2] By the end of his career, he had composed a large body of work, covering history, critical and exegetical investigation, orations, sermons, letters, and apologetics.

His exposure in Caesarea to the great works of Greek literature enabled him to learn the power of authoritative texts and the methodology scholars used to approach and interpret them. He realized that Greek society valued the relation between the written word, education, and the perfection of humanity. The very gateway into *paideia* and the authoritative texts became known as *grammatica*, "the science of interpreting the poets and other writers and the systematic principles for speaking and writing correctly."[3]

---

2 J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*, p. 33.

3 Martin Irvine, *The Making of a Textual Culture - 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) p. xiii.

Christian scholars, including Eusebius, adopted a similar means as the Hellenes to approach their own authoritative texts, as a means of unlocking the secret teachings that the *logos* placed within their Scriptures. Living in a Greek environment, these scholars used *grammatica* to explain and justify their presence in the Western world. Thus, Eusebius used his skills as a *grammatikos* not only to find wisdom in the Christian authoritative texts, but also to disprove variant interpretations and critique interpretations of pagan authoritative texts.

Eusebius used the first part of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* to respond to the first critique that the Christians had abandoned the religion of their ancestors. The first six books consider the three categories of pagan religion, the mythical, the natural, and the political. His goal is to shatter the very foundations of pagan religion.

The seventh book begins to answer the second critique that condemned the Christians for preferring the Barbarian (Hebrew) religion to pagan religion. This response continues until the end of the *Praeparatio*. He presents a two fold argument, that the Hebrews possess a different origin than the pagans and that the Christians have *legitimately* adopted beliefs based on the Hebrew Scriptures. The goal is to show that the Christians, based upon logic and reason, have justifiably split from the doctrines of the majority Greek Hellenist society.

Eusebius explains that the earliest Christians can be traced back to the time before Abraham. These "proto-Christians," or Hebrews, had no need of the Mosaic legislation to commune with God. Instead, they adopted a "natural religion," which was contemplative and philosophical. Thus, he does not refer to their belief system as *Judaism*, but as *Hebraism*. Judaism is the system guided by the Mosaic code, which developed after the exodus from Egypt. These laws were never intended to be permanent. Their purpose was twofold, to prevent the downward moral spiral of the Israelites which began in Egypt and to spread the patriarchal teachings throughout the world, in preparation for the arrival of Jesus and the "return" of Christianity. As opposed to Judaism, Hebraism is pristine, pure,

and contemplative. It represents the same wisdom passed down from the patriarchs to the first Christians, the same Gospel taught by Jesus.

Throughout Books 7, 8, and 9, Eusebius successfully argues that these *philosophical* tenets of Hebraism are parallel with many teachings of Platonism, by stressing the contemplative, transcendent nature of the theology and philosophy of the ancient patriarchs. He develops the claim that the First God and Second God are found in the Hebrew Scriptures, as well as the mediating rational powers (in addition to their logical counterpart, the daemons, those powers who turned away from God). Time and time again, he shows that features of Platonic philosophy, particularly Middle Platonism, were anticipated by the ancient Hebrews.

With Book 8, Eusebius describes the polity formed by the Mosaic legislation. He claims that it represents humanity's most advanced civilization. Moreover, the translation of these legal teachings into Greek (as the *Septuagint*) spread the Mosaic wisdom throughout the Hellenized world. This effort paved the way for the reappearance of the "ancient" teachings spread by Jesus and his followers. He adds that the bridge uniting the patriarchs with Jesus' followers was dependent upon "Jewish philosophers," such as Philo and Josephus, who lived among the Jews following Judaism, but who attempted to find the inner significance of the Mosaic legislation without living by it *literally*.

With Book 9, Eusebius argues that respected Greek writers and thinkers knew of the Hebrew teachings and wisdom and viewed them all as representing truth. In Book 10, he presents the argument that the Greeks plagiarized *all* of their learning, philosophy, and culture from the Hebrews and claimed it as their own. Once again, this argument depends upon the greater antiquity of the Hebrews, or "proto-Christians."

Books 11-13 as a whole continue this theme, arguing that Plato derived his concepts of transcendence from the Hebrews, not from Greek sources. All of the other Greek philosophical schools embraced materialism. Plato was a dualist, and Eusebius claims that he must have received his wisdom from a non-Greek source. He argues effectively that

this source was the Hebrew Scriptures. The importance of Chapter 5 of this thesis was to illustrate clearly Eusebius' claim that the interpretations of the three verses show that the Hebrew Scriptures contain the Platonic wisdom of the First God, the Second God, and the Ideas. These are foundational Middle Platonic doctrines, which were developed by the later Neoplatonists. He presents a strong argument that all three concepts were anticipated by Moses and documented in the more ancient Hebrew Scriptures. This argument from antiquity shows that Plato obtained his wisdom from the Hebrews. Eusebius attempts to show that since the Christians possess the same wisdom as these early Hebrews, the "beloved of God," Plato in effect derived his teachings from the Christians. Eusebius sees the doctrines concerning the First God, Second God, and Ideas as fundamental Christian beliefs. However, he views Jesus as the Second God and the ultimate teacher of Ideas as expressed by the *Logos*. The investigation of these three verses shows that Eusebius took various verses from the Hebrew Scriptures, interpreted them from the perspective of a believing Christian, and yet communicated them to the Hellenes in philosophical terms that they could understand and hopefully embrace. Thus, by coopting Greek vocabulary and concepts, he worked to explain, justify, and legitimize Christianity

In addition, a recurring point of these three books is that whenever Plato and the Christians agree, he must have derived his wisdom from them, but whenever they disagree, Plato has drifted from the truth of Christianity, or *Hebraism*, the doctrines of the proto-Christians which were reintroduced by the wisdom of Jesus. Eusebius' conclusion to the critic's second accusation is that the Christians had every reason to abandon the teachings of the pagans and adopt the wisdom of the Hebrews.

In Books 14 and 15, Eusebius argues that all non-Platonic schools of philosophy are useless. He must make this claim in order to justify why the Christians embrace Hebrew teachings and reject all other Greek Hellenist schools of thought

As explained earlier, Eusebius uses his complementary work, the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, to respond to the critic's third charge, that the Christians adopted the Hebrew Scriptures but rejected its laws that guide their way of life. In this work, he argues that Christianity is the superior middle road between Hellenism and Judaism. In other words, one who passes from Hellenism to Christianity does not need to embrace Judaism, and one who rejects Judaism does not need to accept Hellenism.

Eusebius' response to the critic's three-fold accusation fostered a unique Christian-Hellenistic interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Both from the perspective of a believing Christian and a non-religious pagan intellectual well-versed in Platonic thought, he presents coherent, strong, rational arguments. From Eusebius' perspective, a number of successive revelations, ranging from the Hebrew patriarchs, to Moses, to the prophets, culminated in the appearance of Jesus. He believed that at last, the followers of the ultimate teacher and transmitter of divine wisdom and piety, the Christians, believed it to be their mission to spread Jesus' teachings throughout the world, to encourage the salvation of all of humanity. Eusebius' lifetime of leadership, study, and writing was a clear example of this fervent dedication. In particular, his apologetic works, the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*, represented his attempt not only to dismiss the charges of the critic, but to legitimize and justify the Christianity as a religion and a culture, a *paideia*, to the learned, Greek-Hellenistic world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

textual sources -

Gifford, E.H. **Eusebii Praeparatio Evangelica**. [Eusebius. **The Preparation for the Gospel**.] In four volumes. Oxford, 1903. Greek text, English translation and notes.

Ferrar, W.J. **The Proof of the Gospel**. 2 vols. London: 1920.

- - - - - - -

Armstrong, A.H. **The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus**. Cambridge, 1940.

Armstrong, A.H., ed. **The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Mediaeval Philosophy**. Part I, "Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus." Edited by Philip Merlan. Part II, "Philo and the Beginnings of Christian Thought." Edited by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge, 1967.

Armstrong, A.H. "Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries A.D." In **Studia Patristica**, vol. XV, Part I. 1984.

Attridge, Harold W. and Hata, Gohei. **Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism**. Leiden, 1992.

Barnes, Timothy D. "Christians and Pagans in the Reign of Constantius." In **L'Eglise et l'empire au IV siecle**. Geneva, 1989.

Barnes, Timothy D. **Constantine and Eusebius**. Cambridge, 1981.

Baynes, Norman H. "Eusebius and the Christian Empire." **Melanges Bidez: Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves 2**. (1934) 13-18. Reprinted in **Byzantine Studies and Other Essays**. London, 1955. pp. 168-72.

Benko, S. "Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries A.D." In **Aufstieg und Niedergang der romischen Welt**. 1980. Vol 23.2, pp. 1055-1118.

Berry, Christopher J. "On the Meaning of Progress and Providence in the Fourth Century." In **The Heythrop Journal**. Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1977. pp. 257-270.

Biblia Patristica - Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Litterature Patristique. Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Vol. 1. Paris, 1975; Vol. 2. Paris, 1977; Vol. 3. Paris, 1980; Vol. Paris, 1987; Supplement. Paris, 1982.

Bigg, C. **The Christian Platonists of Alexandria**. Oxford, 1886.

Billings, T.H. **The Platonism of Philo Judaeus**. Chicago, 1919.

Bruns, J. Edgar. "The Agreement of Moses and Jesus' in the **Demonstratio Evangelica** of Eusebius." **Vigiliae Christianae** 31, 1977. pp. 117-125.

Butterworth, G.W., trans. **Origen on First Principles**. London, 1936.

Cassells, W.R. "The Purpose of Eusebius." In **Hibbert Journal** 1, 1903. pp. 781-8.

Chesnut, Glenn F. "Fate, Fortune, Free Will and Nature in Eusebius of Caesarea." In **Church History** 42, 1973. pp. 165-82.

Chesnut, Glenn F. **The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius**. Macon, GA, 1965.

Clement of Alexandria. **Christ the Educator**. Translated by Simon Wood. New York, 1954.

Colson, F.H., ed. **Philo: In 10 Volumes**. Cambridge, MA, 1966. Vols. I, III, and VI.

Cranz, F.E. "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea." In **Harvard Theological Review** 45, 1952. pp. 47-66.

Danielou, J. **Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture**. Philadelphia, 1973.

DeVogel, C.J. "On the Neoplatonic Character of Platonism and the Platonic Character of Neoplatonism." In **Mind** 62, 1953. pp. 43-64.

Dillon, John. **The Middle Platonists**. London, 1977.

Dillon, John. **The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources**. "Protocol of the Sixteenth Colloquy, 20 April 1975. Berkeley, 1975.

Dillon, John and Winston, David. **Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria**. Chico, CA, 1983.

Downey, Glanville. "The Perspective of the Early Church Historians." In **Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies** 6, 1965. pp. 57-70.

Drake, Harold A. "Eusebius on the True Cross." In **Journal of Ecclesiastical History** 36, 1985. pp. 1-22.

Drake, Harold A. **In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations**. University of California Publications, Classical Studies 15; Berkeley, 1975.

Droge, Arthur J. **Homer or Moses?** Tubingen, 1989.

Ehrhardt, C.T.H.R. "Eusebius and Celsus." In **Jahrbuch fur Antike und Christentum** 22, 1979. pp. 40-49.

Eusebe de Cesaree, **La Preparation Evangelique**. Book XI. Introduction, translation, and commentary by Genevieve Favrelle. Revised Greek text by Edouard des Places. Paris, 1982.

Eusebius. **History of the Martyrs of Palestine**. Translated by William Cureton. Borrani, 1861.

Evans, Ernest, ed. **Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas**. London, 1948.

The Fathers of the Church. New York, 1954. Vol. 25. **The Trinity**, by Hilary of Poitiers. Translated by Stephen McKenna.

The Fathers of the Church. Washington, 1974. Vol. 67. **The Trinity**, by Novatian the Presbyter. Translated by Russel DeSimone.

The Fathers of the Church. Washington, 1991. Vol. 85. **Stromateis - Books One to Three**, by Clement of Alexandria. Translated by John Ferguson.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. **Eusebius Pamphili**. Cambridge, 1933.

Goodenough, E.R. **Introduction to Philo Judaeus**. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1962.

Grant, Robert M. "The Case Against Eusebius, or, Did the Father of Church History Write History?" In **Studia Patristica** 12, TU 115; Berlin, 1975.

Grant, Robert M. "Civilization as a Preparation for Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius." In **Christian Beginnings: Apocalypse to History**. London, 1983.

Grant, Robert M., "Eusebius and Church History." In **Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honour of M.S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings**. Edited by Reumann, J. Valley Forge, 1972.

Grant, Robert M. **Gods and the One God**. Philadelphia, 1986.

Grant, Robert M. **Greek Apologists of the Second Century**. Philadelphia, 1988.

Harnack, Adolf. **The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries**. New York, 1961.

Harris, J.R. **Apologetics Toward Judaism**. In **Testimonies**. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1916.

Heinemann, I. "The Attitude of the Ancient World toward Judaism." In **Review of Religion** 4, 1940. pp. 385-400.

Irvine, Martin. **The Making of a Textual Culture - 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory, 350-1100**. Cambridge, 1994.

Jaeger, Werner. **Paideia**, vol. 1. Oxford, 1939.

Jaeger, Werner. **Early Christianity and Greek Paideia**. Cambridge, 1961.

Kofsky, Aryeh. "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Christian-Jewish Polemic." In **Contra Iudaeos**. Tubingen, 1996.

Lange, N. R. M. de. **Origen and the Jews**. London, 1976.

Lightfoot, J.B. "Eusebius of Caesarea." In **Dictionary of Christian Biography**, vol. 2. pp. 308-348. 4 vols. London, 1877-1887

Marcus, Ralph., trans. **Philo, Supplement I, Questions and Answers on Genesis** and **Philo, Supplement II, Questions and Answers on Exodus**. Cambridge, 1953.

McGiffert, Arthur C. "Prolegomena, the Life and Writings of Eusebius of Caesarea." In **A Selected Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers**. Edinburgh, 1895. pp. 1- 56.

Meijering, E.P. **God Being History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy**. Amsterdam, 1975.

Merlan, P. **From Platonism to Neoplatonism**, 3rd. ed. The Hague, 1968.

Momigliano, Arnaldo, ed. **The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century**. Oxford, 1963.

Mosshammer, A.A. **The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition**. Lewisburg, 1979.

The New Oxford Annotated Bible (with the Apocrypha, Expanded Edition), Revised Standard Version. New York, 1977.

O'Meara, D.J., ed. **Neoplatonism and Christian Thought**. Albany, 1982.

Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge, 1965.

Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 2nd. ed.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Eusebius: Finality and Universality in History." In **The Finality of Jesus Christ in an Age of Universal History: A Dilemma of the Third Century**. Richmond, 1965.

Prestige, G.L. **God in Patristic Thought**. London, 1936.

Quasten, Johannes. **Patrology**. 3 vols. Westminster, Maryland, 1986.

Reale, Giovanni. **A History of Ancient Philosophy, vol. IV, The Schools of the Imperial Age**. Edited and translated by John R. Catan. New York, 1990.

Roberts, Alexander Donaldson, James., gen. eds. **Ante Nicene Fathers**. 10 vols. New York, 1903. Vols. I, III, IV, and VIII.

Rokeah, D. **Jews, Pagans, and Christians in Conflict**. Leiden, 1982.

Sant, C. **The Old Testament Interpretation of Eusebius of Caesarea**. Malta, 1967.

Simon, M. **Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)**. New York, 1986.

Stern, Menachem. **Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism**. 3 vols. Jerusalem, 1974-84.

Stevenson, J. **Studies in Eusebius**. London, 1929.

Tanakh: the Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia, 1985.

Tasker, R.V.G. "The Text Used by Eusebius in the Dem. Evang. in Quoting from Matthew and Luke." In **Harvard Theological Review** 28, 1935. pp. 61-67.

Von Harnack, Adolf. **The Mission and expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries**. 2nd ed. London, 1908.

Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. **Eusebius of Caesarea**. London, 1960.

Wallis, R.T. **The Neoplatonists**. London, 1972.

Whittaker, T. **The Neo-Platonists**. Cambridge, 1928.

Wilken, Robert L. **The Christians as the Romans Saw Them**. New Haven, 1984.

Wilken, Robert L. "The Christians as the Romans (and Greeks) Saw Them." In **Jewish and Christian Self-Definition**. Vol. 1, **The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries**. Edited by E.P. Sanders, pp. 100-25. Philadelphia, 1980.

Wilken, Robert L. **Judaism and the Early Christian Mind**. New Haven, 1971.

Wolfson, H.A. **Philo**. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1947.