Classical Quarterly 56.1 239–248 (2006) Printed in Great Britain
doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000188

PHILONIC ALLUSIONS IN EUSEBIUS, *PE* 7.7–8

I

Eusebius' magisterial attack against the Greeks in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (hereafter *PE*), written soon after Licinius' defeat of Maximinus Daia in A.D. 313,[1] possesses a wealth of material from earlier, especially middle Platonic, authors.[2] Since an extensive portion of the *PE* is direct quotation from other authors,[3] much attention has been turned towards these sources, either for text-critical issues or to determine the extent and quality of the Caesarean library.[4] The literary allusions of the *PE*, however, have gone largely unnoticed. Eusebius' employment of sources goes beyond the verbatim quotations. The following remarks examine allusions to Philo of Alexandria's *The Life of the Wise Man Perfected by Teaching*, or *The Life of the Unwritten Laws*, or *On Abraham* in *PE* 7.7–8.

Philo's thought had already appeared attractive to earlier Christian authors.[5] His allegorical approach to the sacred texts of the Jewish tradition had proved irresistible to Christians seeking an alternative to the ethnic and cultic particularity of their literal sense, while his formulation of a philosophically respectable concept of the Logos was deemed amenable to Christian attempts to offer credible articulations of their own faith. The appropriation and adaptation of Philo's writings found their most far-ranging and obvious climax in Eusebius.[6] In historical matters, Philo provided documentation of hardships faced by Jews following their rejection of

[1] See the notice at *PE* 4.2.10–11, with *HE* 9.2; 9.11.5–6 (for which, see T. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* [Cambridge, MA, 1981], 64). For considerations of date, see E. Schwartz, 'Eusebios von Caesarea', *RE* 11 (Stuttgart, 1909), cols. 1390–1; J. Sirinelli and E. des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation Évangélique*, SC 206 (Paris, 1974), 8–14; K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke VIII. Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, GCS 43.1 (Berlin, 1954), LIV–LV.

[2] See Barnes (n.1), 183. The works Eusebius had at his disposal have finally been given extensive treatment by A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius* (Leiden, 2003).

[3] J.-R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens de 270 a 361*, Analecta Gregoriana 61 (Rome, 1954), 358 calculates that 71 per cent of the *PE* is direct citation from other authors. This has lead, naturally, to rather low evaluations of Eusebius' merits as a thinker; see e.g. D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers* (Göteborg, 1995), 147: 'It would not be totally unfair to say that Eusebius did not write the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, he compiled it. It is basically a collection of texts from various writers. Eusebius orders them in such a way as to let them speak for him. His own comments are restricted to the absolute minimum.'

[4] On text-critical issues: G. Bounoure, 'Eusèbe citateur de Diodore', *REG* 95 (1982), 433–9; E. Des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée commentateur: platonisme et ecriture sainte* (Paris, 1982); and the relevant essays in idem, *Études Platoniciennes. 1929–1979* (Leiden, 1981), 249–58. On the library at Caesarea: D. T. Runia, 'Caesarea Maritima and the survival of Hellenistic-Jewish literature', in A. Raban and K. Holum (edd.), *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia* (Leiden, 1996), 476–95, esp. 490–2; Carriker (n. 2).

[5] The most exhaustive treatment is D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (Assen, 1993); more limited but useful are A. Van Den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and his Use of Philo in the* Stromateis (Leiden, 1988); ead., 'Philo and Origen: a descriptive catalogue of their relationship', *Stud. Philon. Ann.* 12 (2000), 44–121.

[6] For a list of all of Eusebius' specific references to Philo's works, see D. T. Runia, 'References to Philo from Josephus up to 1000 AD', in id., *Philo and the Church Fathers* (Leiden, 1995), 232–3; see also Carriker (n. 2), 164–77.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christ as well as the alleged foundations of Christianity in Egypt.[7] Eusebius' quotation of Philonic sources in the *PE*, on the other hand, was necessarily within areas of cosmological and theological importance.[8]

In contrast to the Greeks, who postulated a number of unpalatable views—from the non-existence (or physical existence) of God, or denial of Providence (*PE* 7.11.13, cf. 15.13), to the assumption that the first principle of created things was water, air, fire, or the like (7.12.1)—Eusebius argued that the ancient Hebrews considered the God over all to be the First Cause (7.11) and his Word (Logos) or Wisdom to be a Second Cause (as well as the first principle, *archē*, of generated things) (7.11.14–12.13). The Logos was intimately involved in the affairs of humans (8.13.7–14.72),[9] whose souls were fashioned in its image (7.18.1–2). Philo entered the argument as testimony to the accuracy of Eusebius' representation of Hebrew thought, for he had gained precise knowledge of the ancestral teachings from his forefathers (7.12.14).[10] This 'precise knowledge', at once Platonic and biblical (allegorically understood), was fundamental to Eusebius' contention that the Hebrews alone among ancient nations possessed true wisdom and piety, and furthermore that Plato's philosophical system was thoroughly indebted to the Hebrew writings from which he was 'all but translating' (*PE* 12.11.1).[11]

Philo's middle Platonic thought was thus central to Eusebius' own theological formulations, which he sought to defend as the doctrinal repository of the ancients.[12] The presentation of these doctrines was not an exercise in heady abstraction, but was couched within Eusebius' historical narrative of Hebrew origins in Book 7. Interestingly, however, Eusebius only directly cites Philo as proof for his account of Hebrew doctrine, but never in the narrative of the individual holy men themselves. It is here, I argue, that one may hear the echoes of Philo's otherwise unquoted *De Abrahamo*.

II

Book 7 is central to the overall structure of the *PE* and openly marks a change from what preceded (*PE* 7.1.1).[13] The Greeks had been subjected to sustained criticism in the first six books. Their historical lateness, dependence upon other nations, corruption in character, and irrational ways of thinking had all received the apologist's castigation and contempt.[14] The piety and wisdom marking the lives of

[7] On the Jews: *HE* 2.4.2–2.6.8; *DE* 8.2 (Heikel 403a). On Egyptian Christianity: *HE* 2.16.2–2.17.24; the best treatment is now S. Inowlocki, 'Eusebius of Caesarea's *Interpretatio Christiana* of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*', *HTR* 97 (2004), 305–28; see also, J. Goehring, 'The origins of monasticism', in H. Attridge and G. Hata (edd.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (Leiden, 1992), 235–55.

[8] Direct quotations are taken from the following Philonic texts: *De agricultura*, *De confusione linguarum*, *De opificio mundi*, *De plantatione*, *De providentia*, *De specialibus legibus*, *Hypothetica*, *Pro Judaeis defensio*, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. See Runia (n. 5), 223.

[9] Preserving the only Greek version of this passage from the *de Providentia* now extant; see P. Wendland, *Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung* (Berlin, 1892), 94–100.

[10] See Runia (n. 5), 224–5.

[11] See also 12.13.1; for discussion, see Ridings (n.3), 141–96.

[12] See F. Ricken, 'Die Logoslehre des Eusebios von Caesarea und der Mittelplatonismus', *Theologie und Philosophie* 42 (1967), 341–58.

[13] D. König-Ockenfels, 'Christliche Deutung der Weltgeschichte bei Eusebs von Cäsarea', *Saeculum* 27 (1976), 356: 'Besonderer Höhepunkt der Praeparatio evangelica ist das siebte Buch.'

[14] See A. P. Johnson, 'Identity, descent and polemic: ethnic argumentation in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*', *JECS* 12 (2004), 23–56.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the ancient Hebrews in the seventh book thus presented a brilliant contrast to the darkened and depraved Greek way of life.[15] Contrary to the superstition and impiety of the Greeks, the ancient Hebrews were *philotheous kai theophileis* (*PE* 7.4.6).[16]

Eusebius' portrayal of these Hebrew holy men found a salutary model in Philo's own survey of the patriarchs in the *De Abrahamo*. As already noted, Eusebius quoted numerous passages from Philo's other works and reserved a position of high esteem for the Alexandrian Jew. Philo's *De Abrahamo*, however, is nowhere quoted directly or even mentioned by name. Yet the allusions to Philo's quasi-biographical work are unmistakable throughout this passage of the *PE*. When Eusebius introduces his treatment of the lives of the ancient Hebrew forefathers, he claims that he must rely upon their own native sources (*PE* 7.8.1). Moses had been their principal biographer who had, according to Eusebius, prefaced his law code with the lives of the ancient holy men as a means of encouragement (εἰς προτροπήν) to his readers in the attainment of virtue (7.7.1). Moses, he writes, 'transmitted their images (*eikonas*)[17] to those who wanted to learn the divine teachings, enumerating the lives of the ancients and portraying (διατυπούμενος) the virtue peculiar to each as if in the image of a painting (ἐν εἰκόνι γραφῆς)' (*PE* 7.7.4).[18]

Painting as a metaphor of writing a *bios* clearly recalls Plutarch's well-known introductory remarks in his biography of Alexander.[19] The general aims and purpose of the metaphor, however, evoke Philo's *De Abrahamo* 3–5. There, Philo argues that the particular written laws of Moses' code were images (*eikones*) of the Hebrew holy men who served as their models (ἀρχετύπους),[20] and were in fact 'living and rational laws' (ἔμψυχοι καὶ λογικοὶ νόμοι) themselves.[21] In Eusebius, it was the written *bioi* of Moses that were *eikones* of the virtuous Hebrews, rather than the written laws as for Philo; but, both agree that the holy men were models to be emulated[22] and that their lives bore a protreptic role[23] for the readers of Moses' writings. For both authors, the written 'memorials'[24] (whether these were laws or lives) demonstrated to the readers that the life 'according to nature'[25] was practicable.[26]

[15] The contrast is made explicit in Eusebius' brief *parathesis* at 7.2–4; see G. Schroeder, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation Évangélique, Livre VII*, SC 215 (Paris, 1975), 41–2.

[16] Already an allusion to Philo's *Abr.* 50; cf. *Virt.* 184.

[17] Eusebius continues to refer to the lives of the Hebrews as *eikones*; see *PE* 7.8.12, 15, 18; cf. Clement, *Strom*. 4.5.19.3; Isocr. *Evag.* 73–77.

[18] A similar description is given at at *DE* 5.praef [207A]; for text, see I. Heikel (ed.), *GCS* 6 (Berlin, 1913). See also, Eus. *VC* 1.9–10; for discussion, see A. P. Johnson, 'Ancestors as icons: the lives of Hebrew saints in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*', *GRBS* 44 (2004), 245–64.

[19] Plut. *Vit. Alex.* 1.3. See also, *Vit. Cim.* 2; *De mul. vir.* 243B. For discussion see J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch. Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1969), xxxvii–xliii. Later writers would capitalize on this metaphor; see Basil, *Ep*. 2; Theodoret, *Hist. Rel.* praef. 2–3, 5.6, 9.6, 12.6. See P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, *Théodoret de Cyr. Histoire des moines de Syrie*, SC 234 and 257 (Paris, 1977), 1.149–50; D. Krueger, 'Typological figuration in Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Religious History* and the art of postbiblical narrative', *JECS* 5 (1997), 413–419.

[20] Philo, *Abr.* 3; for Moses himself as an image, see *Virt*. 51–2; for broader discussion, see D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley, 1992), 110–12; see also Philo, *Quod Omnis* 62, 94–5; *Spec. Leg.* 4.149.

[21] Philo, *Abr.* 5; cf. *Dec.* 1; *V. Mos*. 1.162; 2.4.3; *Virt*. 194; see H. Najman, 'The law of nature and the authority of Mosaic law', *Stud. Philon. Ann.* 11 (1999), 55–73, for Philo's conception of living laws who instantiate the law of nature.

[22] Philo, *Abr.* 4: ζῆλον; Eus. *PE* 7.7.3: ζηλωτάς. See also, *PE* 7.8.12, 15, 25, 32; Clement, *Strom*. 4.5.19.3.

[23] Philo, *Abr.* 4: προτρέψασθαι; Eus. *PE* 7.7.1: προτροπήν. See Johnson (n. 18).

[24] Philo, *Abr.* 5: ὑπομνήματα; Eus. *PE* 7.7.1: μνήμαις; 7.7.2: μνήμης.

[25] Philo, *Abr.* 6: ἀκολουθίαν φύσεως; Eus. *PE* 7.6.4: κατὰ φύσιν.

[26] Philo, *Abr.* 5: οὐ πολὺς πόνος; ῥᾳδίως καὶ εὐπετῶς; Eus. *PE* 7.7.4: δυνατά.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At the outset of Eusebius' narrative of Hebrew holy men, therefore, Philo's influence, both verbal and conceptual, may be glimpsed. Although Eusebius invokes the writings of Moses, they have been filtered through the interpretive lens of the Hellenistic Jew. Philo's treatise then divides the Hebrew holy men into two triads: those before the Deluge (Enos, Enoch, Noah), and those after (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob).[27] Without explicitly applying the term 'triad', Eusebius follows Philo (*PE* 7.8.2, 19).[28] A brief survey of the series of biographical sketches in Eusebius will draw out further Philonic allusions as well as indicating the distinctiveness of Eusebius' approach to the ancient Hebrews.

Among the ancient 'friends of God' (*theophileis*) was one 'who hoped to invoke the name of the Lord God' (*PE* 7.8.2). Eusebius postpones this individual's identity as Enos, whose name in Hebrew 'by a straight-shooting appellation' meant true man, until about a dozen lines later (7.8.5).[29] Only one who knew God and was pious was worthy of the title of true man (ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος) (7.8.5); the general run of humanity, on the other hand, received its appellation from the progenitor of all humans, Adam, whose name meant 'earthborn' (γηγενῆ) (7.8.8). Without the piety and knowledge of God that typified Enos, others were not 'true men' but rather were properly called wolves, dogs, swine, reptiles, or serpents, for they 'differed not at all from the beasts, who have fallen headlong upon their belly and pleasure' (7.8.6–7). Philo had also given much attention to the etymology of Enos' name as 'a man in truth' because he was 'a lover of hope,' while the one without hope was merely 'a beast in human shape' (ἀνθρωποειδὲς θηρίον).[30] Significantly, he had drawn the etymology from the Chaldaean word meaning 'man (*anthrōpon*), the common name of the race'.[31] While this at first seems to contradict Eusebius' separation of Enos as true man from the earthborn man (Adam) who represents humanity in general, Philo quickly made the distinction between the 'mixed race' of the 'earthborn' and the 'pure race,' that is, 'that which is truly rational'.[32] Both authors separated humanity into the earthborn and the true human based upon the qualities of beastly living, on the one hand, or of hope and rationality, on the other.

After Enos, Eusebius claims, was another 'who was well-pleasing to the Lord and was not found, because God transferred him' (7.8.13).[33] Again, Eusebius postpones revealing his name for many lines: he is called Enoch, signifying 'grace of God' (7.8.15). 'He was not found', Eusebius explains, 'for the truly wise man is difficult to find (δυσεύρετος)', he avoids the market, courts, and the general crowd, 'shoving and being shoved, swallowed amidst the very depths of wickedness' (7.8.13–15). Enoch was, therefore, transferred from this life to the next and was not found by men. In a similar manner, Philo had noted Enoch's etymology from grace (κεχαρισμένος) and

[27] Philo, *Abr.* 46, 48; cf. *Praem.* 24.

[28] See Schroeder (n. 15), 61, n. 1. Note, however, the Eusebian additions: after the Deluge, he inserts Melchizedek, Job, and Joseph at various places in the Philonic succession of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

[29] ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος, εὐθυβόλῳ προσωνυμίᾳ. 'Straight-shooting' as an epithet for etymologically or allegorically significant words is common in Philo: see e.g. *Opific.* 15, 37, 150; *Migr.* 145; *Mutat. Nom.* 90, 94; *de Jos.* 28; *V. Mos.* 2.119. Incidentally, it does not seem to occur at all in the *Abr.*

[30] Philo, *Abr.* 7–8; see Schroeder (n. 15), 63, who also notes Philo, *Deter.* 138–139.

[31] Philo, *Abr.* 7; cf. *Praem.* 14. On Philo's appellation of Chaldean for Hebrew, see C. K. Wong, 'Philo's use of *Chaldaioi*', *Stud. Philon. Ann.* 4 (1992), 1–14.

[32] Philo, *Abr.* 9.

[33] Drawn from Gen. 5.24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the biblical passage heralding his transference by God.[34] Philo claimed that his transference referred to a conversion from the worldly life to that of the wise man (rather than Eusebius' interpretation of transference from earthly to heavenly life);[35] but his description of the rejection of the marketplaces and crowds is closely paralleled by Eusebius' account. Both authors consider the wise person to be δυσεύρετος.[36] He avoids 'the market, theaters, law courts, council halls, assemblies and every group and company of humans' (so Philo),[37] or 'the markets, law courts, taverns, shops and general crowd' (so Eusebius) (*PE* 7.8.14). Philo offers a more extensive and rhetorical description of the life eschewed by the wise man than Eusebius, who moves on after exclaiming, 'We considered it a blessed thing to emulate the life of this image [*eikonos*] as good' (7.8.15). Such claims for the wise man's avoidance of society recall similar statements by Plato.[38] Indeed, a passage from the *Theaetetus* seems to have provided the model. There, Socrates declares that the leading philosophers from their youth, 'do not know the path to the market-place, nor where the courtroom, the council-chamber, or any other meeting-place of the city is. And they neither see nor hear the decrees—whether spoken or written. Rivalries of factions for office, meetings, banquets, and revels with flute-girls never occur to them to do, even in a dream' (*Theaet*. 173CD). Later in the *PE*, Eusebius will quote this passage *in extenso* at 12.29.2–21, and more briefly at 13.13.20 (within a citation from Clement's *Strom*. 5). However, his application of the theme of the detached philosopher to Enoch clearly depends upon the portrayal given by Philo (which remains, in turn, verbally closer to Plato).[39]

Interestingly, the allusions to Philo's *De Abrahamo* quickly seem to fade as Eusebius moves on to discuss the later Hebrew saints. Noah, 'a just man in his generation', is narrated by Eusebius with scarcely any other parallels to Philo than in following the epithet of a 'just man'.[40] As a 'life-kindling seed' (ζώπυρον σπέρμα)[41] Noah and his family, according to Eusebius, were preserved through the Deluge, which had been sent to purge the world of the wickedness wrought by the Giants who 'waged war against God' (θεομαχίας . . . ἀπειργάζοντο) and to eradicate the evil arts taught by their parents.[42] Philo's account entirely leaves out any mention of the Giants or the proliferation of magical arts (as Eusebius: γοητεία, μαγγανεία), but is most concerned to offer a full etymological discussion of Noah's name,[43] as well as a vivid description of the extent of the flooding (even the tops of mountains were covered by tumultuous waters).[44] Importantly, Philo argues that Noah (who was

[34] Philo, *Abr.* 17; Enoch is etymologized as χάρις σου at *Post*. 35–6; cf. *Post.* 41–3.
[35] See Schroeder (n. 15), 65; cf. *Praem*. 17.
[36] Philo, *Abr.* 19 (cf. *Post*. 43); Eus. *PE* 7.8.13 (cf. *PE* 10.1.6; *Comm. Is.* 1.47 [Ziegler 53.29]).
[37] Philo, *Abr.* 20; cf. *Dec.* 2–13; *Praem*. 20–21.
[38] See e.g. *Resp.* 3.405B, 5.476B, 6.492B, 503D, 7.517D, 8.549D.
[39] On the *Theaetetus* in Philo's thought, see H. Tarrant, 'The date of Anon. in *Theaetetum*', *CQ* 33 (1983), 177. For Philo's relation to Platonic thought more generally, see J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (Bristol, 1996), 139–83; D. T. Runia, 'Was Philo a middle Platonist? A difficult question revisited', *Stud. Philon. Ann.* 5 (1993), 112–40. Others have (less convincingly) stressed his dependence upon earlier Jewish exegetical traditions; see especially, N. Calvert, 'Philo's use of Jewish traditions about Abraham', *SBLSP* 33 (1994), 463–476.
[40] *PE* 7.8.16; Philo, *Abr.* 27, 31. See Schroeder (n. 15), 65.
[41] See Pl. *Leg.* 3.677B; *Ti.* 23C; Lucian, *Timon* 3 (noted by Schroeder [n. 15], 184).
[42] *PE* 7.8.16–17; compare with Josephus, *AJ* 1.73.
[43] Philo, *Abr.* 27–30.
[44] Philo, *Abr.* 41; this is, no doubt, an implicit criticism of Plato's assumption that those on the mountains were able to escape the (repeated) floods throughout primitive history; see Pl. *Leg.* 3.677BC.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

named 'perfect')[45] only embodied a form of perfection secondary (τὰ δευτερεῖα)[46] to the patriarchs after the Deluge, for they were perfect within themselves whereas Noah was only perfect in comparison with the evil characters of antediluvian society.[47] Later, when introducing the second triad of Hebrews after the flood, he reiterates this evaluation: 'the second [triad] is greater'.[48] Eusebius, on the contrary, only confirms Noah's piety and lauds his righteous life: 'This one also should be an archetype, a living and animate image,[49] furnishing an example of a God-beloved character to his descendants' (*PE* 7.8.18).

Eusebius' treatment of the second triad (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) follows less closely the Philonic model. Both authors here share only a single biblical reference that 'Abraham believed God'.[50] The prophetic utterances that Abraham's progeny would produce blessing for the nations, which are important to Eusebius, hardly occur in Philo's treatment of Abraham. Eusebius' appellation of Abraham as '*genarchē*s of the whole nation' more probably alludes to Philo's *Quis heres* than the *De Abrahamo*.[51] Isaac's extreme chastity even in marriage (not even mentioned in the *De Abrahamo*) could draw on Philo's *De congressu*, though verbal parallels are absent.[52] Likewise, Philo's extensive treatment of the importance of Isaac's name, meaning laughter,[53] is entirely omitted from Eusebius' segment on Isaac.[54] The athletic terminology applied to Jacob is clearly Philonic, though again not from the *De Abrahamo*.[55] Two additions in Eusebius' series of Hebrew holy men (Joseph and Job) receive no treatment in Philo's *De Abrahamo*;[56] a third Eusebian addition, Melchizedek, is only briefly (and anonymously) alluded to by Philo.[57]

A significant allusion to Philo not yet mentioned deserves special note: Eusebius claims that the ancient Hebrews 'were deemed worthy to be named a chosen race and royal priesthood of God, and a holy nation' (*PE* 7.4.6). The ascription of titles regarding race, priesthood and nation to the Hebrews had its roots in the Septuagint. The LXX of Exodus 19.5–6 records the words of God to Moses regarding the Jewish people: 'If you heed my voice and observe my covenant, you will be for me a people peculiar from all the nations; for the whole earth is mine. You will be for me a royal priesthood and a holy nation.'[58]

Allusions to this appellation from Exodus are rare in Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman era.[59] Philo, however, had adopted the phrase at *De Abrahamo*

[45] Philo, *Abr.* 34: τέλειον. [46] Philo, *Abr.* 39. [47] Philo, *Abr.* 36–8.

[48] Philo, *Abr.* 48.

[49] Compare with Pl. *Leg.* 11.931D. Incidentally, the only 'living image' Eusebius allows the Greeks to produce is that of the beetle; see Porph. *Abst*. 4.9 ap. *PE* 3.4.13.

[50] Philo, *Abr.* 262; *PE* 7.8.23.

[51] *Quis heres* 279; see Schroeder (n. 15), 66.

[52] See Philo, *Congr.* 34–8; Schroeder (n. 15), 67. Unfortunately, Philo's treatise dedicated to Isaac is no longer extant.

[53] Philo, *Abr.* 201–7; cf. *Praem* 31–5.

[54] See, however, *PE* 11.6.29.

[55] See *PE* 7.8.26–27; Philo, *de Ios.* 26, 223, 230.

[56] Joseph, of course, receives his own treatise (the *de Ios.*); Job is mentioned only once in all of Philo's writings (*Mutat. Nom.* 48).

[57] *PE* 7.8.19; Philo, *Abr.* 235. See Schroeder (n. 15), 66. Of course, Philo's reference to Melchizedek is quite brief and anonymous as well.

[58] Other biblical references to the people as a nation of priests are at Is. 61.6; Rev. 1.6, 5.10, 20.6.

[59] For a brief discussion and other references, see G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1996), 220–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

56. About the 'new race of humanity' (καινοῦ γένους ἀνθρώπων) established through Noah after the Deluge, he writes: 'The oracles call [Abraham, Isaac and Jacob] a much revered and greatly upheld triad of one form (εἴδους) called royal and priesthood and holy nation.'[60] It may very well be this characterization by Philo that prompted the author of the New Testament epistle attributed to Peter to apply the appellation in a slightly different form to the Christians, 'You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a people for [God's] possession.'[61] The addition of 'chosen race' and 'people for possession' results from combining an allusion to Isaiah 43.20–1[62] with the Exodus passage. The claim in the New Testament passage is specifically for the Christians and made only a generation or so after Philo had written the *De Abrahamo*.[63]

Eusebius' use of the Exodus passage to evoke the philosophic and virtuous character of the early Hebrews parallels Philo's application.[64] The fact that Eusebius' allusion is verbally closer to the New Testament passage (especially the use of γένος ἐκλεκτόν), which definitively gives the appellation to the Christians, while describing the ancient Hebrews, serves to strengthen the later claim that Christians are the restored Hebrew nation. There is thus a reversion of this text, after being appropriated by Christians in the New Testament (and other Christian authors)[65] for themselves, to refer, in Eusebius, to the Hebrew ancestors once more.[66]

This sketch of Eusebius' Philonic allusions shows remarkable closeness in the methodological statements, the overall structure, and the representation of the first two Hebrew ancestors (Enos and Enoch). Eusebius leaves his Jewish predecessor behind in the latter lives and offers his own evaluations of them. This is most likely the case merely because of the great increase in space that Philo allots to these later Hebrews. Eusebius, for his part, maintains his purpose of providing a brief narrative synopsis of the lives of the Hebrew holy men before pushing forward his apologetic programme.

III

Eusebius drew freely upon Philo's *De Abrahamo* in his narration of the Hebrew holy men. While a number of divergences have already been noted, two features marking the distinctive outlook of Eusebius and his guiding apologetic purposes are noteworthy: the historical emphasis (against the allegorical in Philo) and the manipulation of the narrative to separate his own position, and that of the ancient Hebrews, from the Jews and Judaism.

The ancient Hebrews play an emphatically historical role in Eusebius' argument. His narration focused on peoples rooted firmly in the distant past, whose historical trajectories spanned the distance from the greatest antiquity up to Eusebius' own time. Attempts to interpret ancient stories under an allegorical rubric had little place in the historian's thought. A scathing critique of the Greek allegorical enterprise filled

[60] Philo had elsewhere referred to the nation as fulfilling a priestly function; see e.g. *Abr.* 98; *Spec. Leg.* 1.97, 2.163.

[61] I Peter 2.9; see T. Seland, 'The "common priesthood" of Philo and 1 Peter: a Philonic reading of 1 Peter 2.5, 9', *JSNT* 57 (1995), 87–119.

[62] See F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Oxford, 1958), 100–5.

[63] Ibid. 9–19. Cf. Clement, *Protr.* 4.

[64] Eusebius, however, had been preceded in this by Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.32, 5.10, 5.43.

[65] See e.g. Clement, *Protr.* 4.

[66] See also Origen, *C. Cels.* 4.32, 5.10, 5,43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a great many pages in an earlier portion of the *PE* (2.6.16–3.16.4).[67] Of course, Eusebius would soon herald the allegorical approach to Moses' law suggested in the *Letter to Aristeas*, Aristobulus, and the Essenes (recorded by Philo) (*PE* 8.9–12). Yet, he significantly limits the legitimate practice of allegory to the laws themselves; Eusebius' retelling of the lives of the Hebrews otherwise eschews allegory. It is here that we sense most the distinctiveness of Eusebius' manipulation of the Philonic material. Philo, while not denying the historicity of the ancient Hebrews, nevertheless had duly stressed the symbolic truths represented by each one's life and activities.[68] Philo makes repeated appeals to look beyond the literal sense towards the allegorical realities that the Hebrew holy men represented.[69] The overarching aims of Philo's project are emphatically allegorical rather than historical.[70] His concern was the identity of the truly wise 'lover of virtue'. He declares, 'There is no home, kindred, or fatherland for the wise man other than virtues and virtuous actions.'[71]

Eusebius, for his part, wanted to impress upon the reader the virtue embodied by each Hebrew holy person; but they were not merely 'types'.[72] His effort to 'delineate the virtue peculiar to each one, as if in a painting' (*PE* 7.7.4),[73] was meant to emphasize the paradigmatic status of firmly historical figures as a contrast to the vices prevalent in the lives of the other nations' ancestors (denounced in the first half of the *PE*). The virtuous lives of the Hebrew holy men were portrayed as part of the historical heritage, which Eusebius was appropriating to form part of the Christian past. His argument for Christianity's legitimacy against the rival claims for historical precedence and cultural superiority necessitated that his narration be firmly historical. Claims to antiquity had become a staple of apologetic treatises (both Jewish and Christian) in antiquity.[74] The *PE* stands as the most comprehensive contribution to this way of doing apologetics. In Eusebius, the apologist and historian are inextricably united. From the most ancient and pious nation of the 'friends of God' Eusebius procured a decisive means of legitimating Christianity against Greek accusations of novelty.[75]

In no way, however, should these historical Hebrew ancestors be confused with the Jews, for a second feature of Eusebius' narration of Hebrew antiquity rested incisively

[67] See. J. Pépin, *Mythe et Allégorie* (Paris, 1976), 387–92; Johnson (n. 14).

[68] For Philo's use of allegory see Pépin (n. 67), 231–41; R. Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian* (Berkeley, 1986), 44–54; Dawson (n. 20), 73–126.

[69] See e.g. *Abr.* 99, 119, 147, 200, 217, 236; also, cf. *de Ios.* 28, 125.

[70] On occasion, Philo invoked the argument of Hebrew historical priority and Greek theft from earlier Hebrew wisdom; however, this seems rare and is clearly subsumed within an allegorical programme: see P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron Kreitton. Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1990), 173–92; G. E. Sterling, 'Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism', *Stud. Phil. Ann.* 5 (1993), 101–102.

[71] Philo, *Abr.* 31; cf. Eus. *PE* 11.36.2, Porph. *Abst.* 1.30, Plot. *Enn.* 1.6.8. Philo would later remark that the second triad of holy men were from 'one house and one race' (*Abr.* 50). Even more anomalous is his statement against extreme allegorists who act as if no place is home or a fatherland, at *Migrat.* 89–90. M. Niehoff (*Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture* [Tübingen, 2001]) has recently attempted to show the importance of notions of ethnic descent for Philo's thought.

[72] *Pace* Schroeder (n. 15), 60: 'Chaque personage est présenté simplement par un trait ou une anecdote tirés de Philon.' Eusebius' Enos is 'le type de l'Hébreu, le type même de l'homme pieux' (64); Enoch is 'le type . . . du Sage' (65).

[73] As noted above, drawing on the Plutarchan biographical method.

[74] See Pilhofer (n. 70); G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition* (Leiden, 1992); A. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen, 1989); G. R. Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy* (Oxford, 2001).

[75] See A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism* (Leiden, 2000), 100–14.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

upon the crucial disjunction he drew between Hebrews and Jews.[76] The ways of the Hebrews, Eusebius alleged, 'were known long ago by the forefathers of the Jews, a great time before Moses and the race [*genos*] of the Jews were established. . . . The Hebrews were first both in name and in character, while the Jews neither were nor yet were named' (*PE* 7.6.1). Eusebius again emphasizes the disjunction after his treatment of the antediluvian Hebrews: 'Among all of them there was no mention of circumcision nor of the Judaic pronouncements of Moses; wherefore it is not right to call them either Jews or Greeks . . . they should more properly be called Hebrews' (7.8.20). The Hebrew–Jew distinction is narrated historically at the end of his discussion of the ancient Hebrew saints. The Jews, he explains, only arose after the descendants of the Hebrews forgot the ways of their pious forefathers while sojourning in the land of Egypt. Their moral and rational acuity was blunted as they forgot their 'paternal virtue' and 'embraced the same character of life as the Egyptians' (7.8.37). It was during this period that the *ethnos* of the Jews was established. Moses, though 'a Hebrew of Hebrews, if ever anybody was' (7.7.1), nevertheless was compelled to institute a secondary form of piety for the Egyptianized Jews. The wisdom and ways of their Hebrew ancestors were expressed in Moses' writings only through riddles and dark sayings (7.8.39). The lives of the pious Hebrews that prefaced his law code were intended as solitary reminders of the pure character and untainted rationality from which they had fallen (7.7.1–2).

In this way, Eusebius could excise the earliest moments from Jewish history and effectively adopt them as the Christians' own under the distinguishing appellation of Hebrews. He thus deftly appropriated the most ancient and pious holy men while validating the Christian rejection of Jewish customs and teachings. The Jews were relegated to a secondary position both in piety and history; they were represented as merely a later, bastardized deterioration from the Hebrews. It would remain for the Christians (not Jews) to fully revive the Hebrew *politeia*.[77]

Christians were those 'from all the nations under the sun' (*PE* 1.3.10)[78] who had been grafted into the national identity and way of life of the Hebrews. Paul was called a 'Hebrew theologian' (11.19.4), while John the Evangelist was a 'Hebrew of Hebrews' (11.19.2).[79] Summarily, 'the apostles and disciples of our Saviour are Hebrews' (11.23.11).[80] The *PE* envisioned a direct continuity running from the ancient Hebrews, through the prophets, and culminating in the Christian movement.[81] Philo himself was made an important figure in this regard. He is consistently given the appellation

[76] *Pace* J. Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden. Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Berlin and New York, 1999), 79–88. See J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéene* (Dakar, 1961), 147–8; A. Kofsky, 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Christian–Jewish polemic', in O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (edd.), *Contra Iudaeos. Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews* (Tübingen, 1996), 59–83; M. Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire* A.D. 135–425, trans. H. McKeating (London, 1996), 80–5.

[77] See E. Gallagher, 'Eusebius the Apologist: the evidence of the *Preparation* and the *Proof*', *SP* 26 (1993), 256. See also id., 'Piety and polity: Eusebius' defense of the Gospel', in J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs, and A. J. Levine (edd.), *Religious Writings and Religious Systems* (Atlanta, 1989), 2.139–55, esp. 148.

[78] See also 1.1.6.

[79] Joseph (7.8.36) and Moses (7.7.1) had already received the appellation of 'Hebrew of Hebrews' in the *PE*; and even Josephus receives the title at *DE* 6.18 (291b). The phrase recalls Paul's statement that he was a 'Hebrew of Hebrews' at Phil. 3.5.

[80] For a more complete enumeration of Hebrews after Moses, see Ulrich (n. 76), 64–8; see also, A. Jacobs, *The Remains of the Jews* (Stanford, 2004), 26–36.

[81] See especially *PE* 14.3.1–4; König-Ockenfels (n. 13), 357.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Hebrew, never Jew.[82] Like Moses, according to Eusebius, he preserved the wisdom of the ancient Hebrews in his own discourses. Eusebius eliminated Philo's Jewishness, identifying him only as Philo the Hebrew and hence a quasi-Christian.[83] Eusebius' application and manipulation of Philo's writings must, then, be seen within the context of the fundamental assertion of the entire *PE*: Christianity was the restoration of the ancient Hebrew *politeia*[84] and any Jew serving Eusebius' apologetic purposes could be represented as no longer a Jew, but instead a remnant of the Hebrews.

IV

Philo played multiple roles in Eusebius' monumental *PE*. Represented as a substantial figure in the historical lineage of the Hebrews from antiquity to Eusebius' day, his writings became important sources for numerous verbatim quotations. The *De Abrahamo*, while never named, provided a model from which Eusebius could develop his own distinctive approach to the ancient Hebrews. The Christian apologist was neither a clumsy imitator nor a dull 'compilateur'.[85] His master argument was carefully formulated and skilfully structured; its contribution to the Christian–Greek and Christian–Jewish polemical discourses was substantial.

University of Texas at Austin AARON P. JOHNSON
Aaron_Johnson@mail.utexas.edu

[82] In the *HE*, however, Philo is labelled a Jew (see 6.13.7; though elsewhere he is a Hebrew, see 2.4.2); this may be a case of Eusebius adopting the language of his sources (e.g. Clement).
[83] See Runia (n. 5), 4–6; for a more cautious approach, see Inowlocki (n. 7).
[84] See E. Gallagher (n. 77).
[85] Laurin (n. 3), 357.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000188 Published online by Cambridge University Press