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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines ancient historiographic citation methodologies in light of Mikhail Bakhtin’s dichotomy between polyphony and monologization. In particular, this dissertation argues that Eusebius of Caesarea’s Historia ecclesiastica (HE) abandons the monologic citation methodology typical of previous Greek and Hellenistic historiography and introduces a polyphonic citation methodology that influences subsequent late-ancient Christian historiography to varying degrees. Whereas Pre-Eusebian Greek and Hellenistic historiographers typically use citations to support the single authorial consciousness of the historiographer, Eusebius uses citations to counterbalance his own shortcomings as a witness to past events. Eusebius allows his citations to retain their own voice, even when they conflict with his. The result is a narrative that transcends the point of view of any single individual and makes multiple witnesses, including the narrator, available to the reader.

Post-Eusebian late-ancient Christian historiographers exhibit the influence of Eusebius’ innovation, but they are not as intentional as Eusebius in their use of citation methodologies. Many subsequent Christian historiographers use both monologic and polyphonic citation methodologies. Their tendency to follow Eusebius’ practice of citing numerous lengthy citations sometimes emphasizes points of view that oppose the author’s point of view. When an opposing viewpoint surfaces in enough citations, a
polyphonic citation methodology emerges. The reader holds the two different narrative strands in tension as the author continues to give voice to opposing viewpoints.

After illustrating the citation methodologies with passages from numerous Greek, Hellenistic, and late ancient Christian historiographers, this dissertation concludes with a short computational analysis that uses natural language processing to reveal some broad trends that highlight the previous findings and suggest a possibility for future research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Eusebius of Caesarea, the so-called “father of church history” and bishop of Caesarea, finished the first edition of his *Historia ecclesiastica* (HE) perhaps a little after 300 C.E. The HE, which became his most famous work, originally comprised seven books, and eventually became 10 books when he added a narrative of the events of his own day. The HE is unique for two reasons. First, Eusebius claims that this is the first Christian history. Second, Eusebius copiously cites documentary and textual evidence in order to support the claims of his narrative. Not only is the quantity of these citations unusual for Greek historiography, but also the posture Eusebius assumes toward these citations is unusual. Frequently, Eusebius’ citations express a point of view that differs

---

1 See note 7 below.

2 Eusebius says it this way in 1.1.3: ἀλλὰ μοι συγγνώμην εὐγνωμόνων ἐντεῦθεν ὁ λόγος αἰτεῖ, μεῖζονα ἣ καθ’ ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ὄμολογον εἶναι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἑντελῇ καὶ ἀπαράλειπτον ὑποσχέσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ πρῶτοι νῦν τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐπιβάντες οία τινα ἐρήμην καὶ ἀτριβῆ οὐν ὡν ἐγχεῖρῳ ὑποκείμεν (“But my argument demands thenceforth [that] I ask pardon for myself from the right-minded, confessing that the full and complete promise I undertake is beyond our power [to deliver], since we, now the first to set foot upon the subject, are attempting to travel a certain sort of desolate and pathless road . . .”). He adds the following in 1.1.5: μηδένα ποι ἐνδιά τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων διέγνων περὶ τοῦ τῆς γραφῆς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ μέρος (“None of the ecclesiastical writers has yet until now taken pains concerning this branch of writing”). The veracity of these claims, of course, depends on whether one classifies the genre of Luke-Acts as historiography or some other genre. Scholars still debate the genre of Luke and Acts, but especially Acts. For a full discussion of the state of the question regarding the genre of Acts, see Todd Penner, “Madness in the Method? The Acts of the Apostles in Current Study,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 2004: 223-293 and Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 14-18.

3 This study typically uses the word “citation” to refer to the explicit citing of some kind of text or document. “Quotation,” on the other hand, will generally apply to the citing of a person’s words from any origin, including speeches, texts, documents, or even thoughts attributed to someone by the narrator.
from his own. When this happens, Eusebius will often not address these differences. At other times, Eusebius cites a source without any explanation of how the citation fits into his narrative. Frequently, the citations carry the entire argument or plot of the narrative. These features of Eusebius’ citation methodology, in combination with the relative quantity of citations Eusebius cites, present the central problem that this dissertation addresses. Why do Eusebius’ citations exert so much influence over his narrative? And why do they frequently express a point of view different from Eusebius’ own without any explanation on his part?

Scholars have answered these questions in a variety of ways. Some scholars have suggested that Eusebius is sloppy or that his project was too big. Or perhaps he did not review the citations before scribes inserted them. These explanations fail to account for how the HE made it through three iterations without Eusebius or one of his scribes

---


6 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 141.
noticing these differences. At some point, Eusebius (or one of his scribes) must have reviewed the evidence.

Others have suggested that Eusebius’ citation methodology constitutes a rhetorical technique. The withdrawal of Eusebius’ voice from the narrative paradoxically emphasizes his voice even more when he speaks. This proposal fails to account for the fact that often the citations do more work than Eusebius does. If one were to remove the citations, the HE would fail to say much of anything interesting regarding the history of the church. Something else must have motivated Eusebius to use this particular citation methodology.

By way of contrast, earlier historiographers cite their sources explicitly but much less frequently than Eusebius does. They make clear how their sources fit into their

---


8 See Inowlocki, Eusebius and the Jewish Authors, 55, 58.


10 Consider, for example, Book 7. Outside of a few laconic summaries of correspondences between Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria and his colleagues, Eusebius briefly mentions martyrdoms in Caesarea, the succession of bishops (and a Roman emperor), a statue of Jesus at Caesarea Philippi, the throne of James the brother of Jesus, some biographical information of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, Paul of Samosata and the Synod of Antioch, and the Manichean heresy. His citations, on the other hand, narrate extensively the debate over and pastoral considerations of the rebaptism of heretics, a number of persecutions and martyrdoms, the plague in Alexandria, the teaching of Nepos, the authorship of Revelation and its dissimilarity in style and language to other Johannine literature, Paul of Samosata’s life and excommunication, the date of Easter, and Emperor Gallus’ expulsion of holy men. If one were to exclude Eusebius’ citations, Book 7’s contribution to the overall narrative would be sparse. It would primarily summarize events and would lack most of the specific details of the events it describes.
narrative, and they address any conflicts or differences in point of view that arise between their citations and the rest of their respective narrative. Far from being oblivious to the presence of their citations, they frame them for the reader, indicating the historiographer’s point of view regarding the source text.

For a very brief example of pre-Eusebian citation methodologies, consider the Greek historiographer Thucydides’ citation of Homer’s *Iliad* in The Archaeology of *The Peloponnesian War*. Thucydides attempts to illustrate the preeminence of the navy of Agamemnon, who is the commander of the expedition against the Trojans. Thucydides begins as follows:

φαίνεται γὰρ ναυσὶ τε πλείσταις αὐτὸς ἀφικόμενος καὶ Ἀρκάσι προσπαρασχόν, ὡς Ὄμηρος τούτῳ δεδήλωκεν, εἰ τῷ ἰκανός τεκμηριώσαι. καὶ ἐν τοῦ σκήπτρου ἀμα τῇ παράδοσει ἐάρηκεν αὐτὸν πολλῆς νήσοις καὶ Ἀργεῖ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν . . .

(1.9.4; cf. *Iliad* 2.108)

For it is clear that he came with the most ships and that he supplied besides the Arcadians, as Homer has made clear, on the chance that he is sufficient to prove [this] to anyone. He has furthermore said it in the translation of the scepter:

That he is master of many islands and all Argos . . . .

Before citing Homer, Thucydides mentions in passing that Homer may or may not function as sufficient proof of Thucydides’ point, depending on the reader. Still,

---

Thucydides offers Homer as evidence for what he is worth. Thucydides has used a single, out-of-context line from the *Iliad* to attempt to bolster his argument, which is that Agamemnon had a greater navy than anyone else in his time. Thucydides is not presenting this line as evidence of someone else’s point of view of Agamemnon. Rather, he is presenting this line as evidence to support his own view.

Later historiographers, on the other hand, often (but not always) cite their sources in a Eusebian manner. That is to say, they drop large chunks of text into their narrative and often do not feel inclined to account for differences between the point of view of their source and their own point of view. They assume a different posture toward their citations, even if they are not as intentional about their posture toward their sources as Eusebius is.

For example, the Anglo-Saxon historiographer and polymath Bede (a late-ancient Christian historiographer) early on cites an entire letter filled with questions and answers concerning how to address practical issues that arise from observing Roman Christianity in a new culture (*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* 1.28). The letter from Pope Gregory to Augustine of Canterbury goes on for several pages and, though Bede praises the letter, stands in tension with the rest of Bede’s narrative. Bede never addresses the differences between the point of view of Pope Gregory’s letter and his own point of view. Chapter 4 will discuss this difference in viewpoint in detail.

Eusebius’ citation methodology, the way it differs from its precursors, and its influence on later historiography comprise the topic of this dissertation. In order to address these differences in a meaningful way, this dissertation will adopt a theoretical
framework that can account for the relationship between an author or narrator and the texts that the author or narrator cites.

**Thesis**

In view of the theoretical framework discussed below, this dissertation argues that Eusebius largely abandons the monologic citation methodology typical of previous Greek historiography and introduces a polyphonic citation methodology that continues to influence late ancient Christian historiography to varying degrees. In order to make this argument, this dissertation will need to argue three sub-theses (each corresponding to a single chapter):

1. Pre-Eusebian Greek historiography typically interprets its (explicitly) cited sources from the historiographer’s point of view (in order to present the reader with a single, expert authorial consciousness).

2. Eusebius’ HE diminishes the role of the narrator and begins to use a polyphonic citation methodology (in order to, in effect, increase the number of “witnesses” in the narrative).\(^{12}\)

3. Post-Eusebian late-ancient Christian historiography gradually (and often inadvertently) adopts a polyphonic citation methodology to varying degrees.

\(^{12}\) In a sense, Eusebius democratizes historiography; every voice in the text now has a say.
Theoretical Framework

In the classification of citations (or quotations), scholars often look to Stefan Morawski’s work on the basic functions of quotations. Morawski identifies five basic functions of the quotation: “maintenance of cultural continuity,” “appeal to authorities,” “the erudite function,” “the stimulative-amplificatory function” (where an author might use a citation as a springboard for another idea, for example), and “ornament.” These functions are useful for analyzing how authors use citations, but most (if not all) of these uses assume that the author wants to have a particular effect on the reader. What happens if an author wants the reader to use a citation to transcend—or perhaps even escape—the author’s own viewpoint?

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975) was a Russian literary theorist, linguist, and philosopher. He produced much of his work in times of either exile or war, and he lived with a disability. Despite the fact that the State denied him a doctorate, he went on to become one of the most important literary figures in the twentieth century.

Bakhtin constructed a philosophy of language to which scholars in a variety of fields have turned. For Bakhtin, utterances always address someone, and they always


anticipate someone else’s response.16 In other words, utterances (and the discourses they create) are inherently dialogic. When a speaker addresses a listener, the utterances of the speaker elicit consonance and dissonance in the conceptual system of the listener and anticipate an answer from the listener.17 The worldview of the speaker constantly disturbs (or recreates) the worldview of the listener, and their discourse is bound to the social and historical contexts of the speaker and listener. Although Bakhtin’s theories apply most directly to the modern novel (starting with Dostoevsky),18 literary critics, cultural theorists, sociologists, and even biblical scholars have found certain elements of Bakhtin’s theory useful for understanding the various “texts” they address. This dissertation will use Bakhtin to understand the citation methodology of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica* (HE) in contrast to ancient Greek historiography, and the citation methodology of later Christian historiography. Bakhtin’s concepts of monologization, polyphony, finalizability, and unfinalizability play a crucial role in explaining and differentiating between these various citation methodologies.


18 Indeed, Bakhtin would have originally been reluctant to apply theories such as polyphony and dialogism to anyone except Dostoevsky and those who followed his example. Nevertheless, scholars have profitably applied his theories to a number of fields, including Classics and biblical studies. His theories appeal to a much broader audience than he may have originally imagined. Part of their appeal rests in his view of the self, a view that he develops throughout his work.
Before I address these concepts, a distinction is in order. Bakhtin uses the concepts described below in order to understand the interactions between characters or between a character and the narrator in works of fiction. The author composes the words of all the characters, including the narrator, in such works. Ancient historiography, on the other hand, explicitly cites words that another author has composed. Despite this difference, however, ancient historiography also has characters and narrators. When an ancient historiographer cites a text, that historiographer often cites that text as a witness of events. That witness is acting as a character in the overarching narrative. Bakhtin’s concepts and distinctions below are just as applicable (if not more so) to ancient historiography as they are to fiction. In ancient historiography, the characters that speak through explicit citations really do use the words of another (and really can escape the authorial consciousness of the author), unlike their fictional counterparts. Bakhtin’s concepts of monologization, polyphony, finalizability, and unfinalizability are all useful for understanding the citation methodology of ancient historiography.

Monologization refers to a vision of a literary world where everything falls under a “unified authorial consciousness.”19 In a monologic text, the text reflects the point of view of a single consciousness—that is, the consciousness of the author. The primary role of the other voices in the text is to support the single authorial consciousness (or intention) of the text. The citations or other voices in a monologic text are bound to the narrative by logical interconnections; the logic of those citations is permeable and does

---

not belong to the author of the citation. The authors of monologic texts might agree or disagree with texts they cite, or they might build upon those texts or dismiss them entirely. In any case, the authors of monologic texts will typically indicate to the reader how the citation fits into the authors’ point of view. In a monologic text, the relationship between the voice of the author and the voice of the text it cites is the relationship of a superior to an inferior. The author of a monologic text controls the citations that appear in the text.

A citation in a monological text typically introduces the citation in the author’s language, transitions to the voice of the citation itself (if the citation is direct speech), and then monologically sums up, analyzes, or somehow indicates the significance of the citation from the author’s point of view. The point of view of the citation (or the author of that citation) is not significant. The citation is only significant in the way the unified authorial consciousness indicates it is significant. Since monologic texts carry only a single authorial consciousness, they possess a finalized (singular) meaning.

Finalizability refers to the capacity for a text to receive a single, finalized assessment from its author. Monologic texts are finalizable because the author assigns a particular significance to the voice of the other (whether the “other” is a character, another text, etc.). A monologic text does not allow the point of view of the other to

---

20 Ibid., 9.

21 See Ibid., 12.

22 Ibid., 7. Of course, readers often construct different meanings from the same text (such as the Bible or the United States Constitution) based upon how they have learned to read such texts. The point here is that the monological text presents a single, authorial point of view to the reader, even if readers are free to construct their own understanding of that single point of view.

23 Ibid., 67.
resist, control, or otherwise exert itself against the point of view of the author. The author’s consciousness transforms the consciousnesses of the other and gives a “secondhand” definition to that voice.\textsuperscript{24} The voice of characters or citations does not possess any significance other than what the author ascribes to it.

For the purposes of this dissertation, then, a \textit{monologic citation methodology} refers to a citation methodology that treats its citations in a monologic fashion. That is to say, texts that use a monologic citation methodology diminish the voice of their citations and finalize the meaning of those citations under the single, unified authorial consciousness of the monologic text. Texts that use a monologic citation methodology analyze, critique, summarize, dismiss, build upon, or otherwise use their citations to support the point of view of the author.

In contrast to monologization, polyphony refers to a literary vision of the world that recognizes “a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses.”\textsuperscript{25} In a polyphonic text, characters (or citations) are not only “objects of authorial discourse” but also “subjects of their own directly signifying discourse.”\textsuperscript{26} That is to say, the author or narrator relinquishes control over the voice of the other and allows that voice to speak on its own behalf, even if it speaks against the narrator or against the author’s purpose. The author’s posture toward the text has changed from the monologic point of view; the relationship between the author and the voice of the other is no longer the relationship of a superior to a subordinate but rather the relationship of two voices on equal terms. The

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 68.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 7.
author does not determine the final significance of the other voice. Since the author no longer has the final say over each voice in the text, the polyphonic text becomes unfinalizable.

Unfinalizability, then, refers to the capacity for a text to have multiple meanings, none of which the author determines once and for all. The unfinalizable text contains multiple points of view and an implicit dialogue between those points of view. Bakhtin draws a similarity between the unfinalizable human being, whose being cannot be finalized or assigned a single meaning, and the unfinalizable text.\textsuperscript{27} The unfinalizable text in some way mimics the human condition. The author relinquishes his or her godlike control over the other voices in the text, his or her omniscience, so that the meanings of the text have the capacity to transcend the point of view of the author, narrator, and other characters in a synergetic fashion.

For the purposes of this dissertation, then, a \textit{polyphonic citation methodology} refers to a citation methodology that allows its citations to maintain and assert their own point of view. That is to say, texts that use a polyphonic citation methodology relinquish control over the sources that they cite. Their citations dialogue with the narrator or author, and the author does not finalize the meaning or significance of these citations. The author or narrator and the voice of the citation stand on equal terms. Texts that use a polyphonic citation methodology present the voice of their sources to the reader and allow the reader the freedom to make meaning from the voice of the author or narrator and the voice of the author or narrator’s sources. In some sense, the author or narrator

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 76, 86, 117.
dialogues (in an indirect fashion) with explicit citations from the author or narrator’s sources.

An example from Bakhtin will help clarify these concepts, although Bakhtin’s examples are quite different from the genre this dissertation is analyzing. Nevertheless, an example may help. Bakhtin first worked out the concepts mentioned above in his analysis of Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s poetics. Bakhtin considers Dostoevsky’s novels to be the paragon of polyphony and unfinalizability. He astutely analyzes the ways in which many of Dostoevsky’s critics tried to fit Dostoevsky’s work into a monologic paradigm and goes to great lengths to demonstrate the author’s preference for polyphony.

As a novelist, Dostoevsky often created characters who represent an unfinalizable idea. These ideas interact with the ideas of other characters, but the narrator and the characters never fully resolve the differences between their ideas; nor do they merge their ideas. As an example of the unfinalizability (and polyphony) of these different points of view, Bakhtin turns to *The Brothers Karamazov*, where two independent and unfinalizable ideas dialogue with one another without reaching any conclusions. Father Zossima, an elder of a Russian monastery, and Ivan Karamazov, one of the Karamazov brothers, engage in the following dialogue:

> “Is that really your conviction as to the consequences of the disappearance of the faith in immortality?” the elder asked Ivan Fyodorovich suddenly.
> “Yes. That was my contention. There is no virtue if there is no immortality.”
> “You are blessed in believing that, or else most unhappy.”

---

28 Ibid., 85-87.

29 While this example illustrates a dialogue between characters, the same sort of difference in point of view can occur between a character (or text) and the narrator.
“Why unhappy?” Ivan Fyodorovich asked smiling.
“Because, in all probability you don't believe yourself in the immortality of your soul, nor in what you have written yourself in your article on Church jurisdiction.”
“Perhaps you are right! . . . But I wasn't altogether joking,” Ivan Fyodorovich suddenly and strangely confessed, flushing quickly.
“You were not altogether joking. That's true. The question is still fretting your heart, and not answered. But the martyr likes sometimes to divert himself with his despair, as it were driven to it by despair itself. Meanwhile, in your despair, you, too, divert yourself with magazine articles, and discussions in society, though you don't believe your own arguments, and with an aching heart mock at them inwardly.... That question you have not answered, and it is your great grief, for it clamors for an answer.”
“But can it be answered by me? Answered in the affirmative?” Ivan Fyodorovich went on asking strangely, still looking at the elder with the same inexplicable smile.
“If it can't be decided in the affirmative, it will never be decided in the negative. You know that that is the peculiarity of your heart, and all its suffering is due to it. But thank the Creator who has given you a lofty heart capable of such suffering; of thinking and seeking higher things, for our dwelling is in the heavens. God grant that your heart will attain the answer on earth, and may God bless your path.” [SS IX, 91-92; The Brothers Karamazov, Book Two, ch. 6]30

Later, Alyosha, the youngest of the Karamazov brothers, characterizes Ivan in a similar manner but in his own secular language:

“Oh, Misha, his soul [Ivan's-M. B.] is a stormy one. His mind is a prisoner of it. There is a great and unresolved thought in him. He is one of those who don't need millions, they just need to get a thought straight.” [SS IX, 105; The Brothers Karamazov, Book Two, ch. 7]31

These depictions of Ivan (and the idea he embodies) emphasize the unfinalizability of his character and his voice, “the unfinalized and inexhaustible ‘man in man’ can become a man of the idea,” in Bakhtin’s words.32 Zossima’s answer to Ivan’s questions illustrate

30 Bakhtin, Problems, 86-87.
31 Ibid., 87.
32 Ibid., 86.
this nicely: “If it can't be decided in the affirmative, it will never be decided in the negative. You know that that is the peculiarity of your heart, and all its suffering is due to it.” At the same time, Ivan in no way capitulates to the elder’s point of view but rather just gives him “the same inexplicable smile.” Bakhtin considers this passage further:

> It is given to all of Dostoevsky's characters to “think and seek higher things”; in each of them there is a “great and unresolved thought”; all of them must, before all else, “get a thought straight.” And in this resolution of a thought (an idea) lies their entire real life and their own personal unfinalizability.

He goes on:

> The second condition for creating an image of the idea in Dostoevsky is his profound understanding of the dialogic nature of human thought, the dialogic nature of the idea. . . . The idea lives not in one person's isolated individual consciousness—if it remains there only, it degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, to find and renew its verbal expression, to give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas, with the ideas of others.

For Bakhtin, the dialogic relationship between characters is transformative. Dialogue between characters (including the idea-driven characters of Dostoevsky) creates new possibilities and meanings for a narrative.

Although ancient historiography may seem far removed from Dostoyevsky’s novels, the two genres share much in common in light of these Bakhtinian categories. Some ancient histories impose a single, finalized authorial point of view on the sources or speeches they cite, whereas other ancient histories diminish the voice of their author or narrator in order to give more say to their sources (or speeches). These categories delineated above help distinguish between these different kinds of ancient historiography.

33 Ibid., 87-88.
34 Ibid.
Furthermore, monologic historiographies are not necessarily superior to polyphonic historiographies. Eusebius took a risk; he pushed a genre away from a view of the world that had worked well for historiographers and their audiences for centuries. For historiography, the advantage of the monologic view of the world is that its hearers and readers can benefit from the insights of an individual who has surveyed as much of the available data as possible and has drawn conclusions regarding those data. Polyphonic historiography, on the other hand, relinquishes some of the authority of the historiographer. Despite the loss of this narratorial authority, however, polyphonic historiography benefits the reader in another way. For historiography, the advantage of the polyphonic view of the world is that its hearers and readers can view more of the historiographer’s raw data, and the interpretation of that data does not skew as heavily toward the point of view of the narrator. From a polyphonic point of view, gone are the days when a historiographer converts all of the available data into that particular historiographer's own words and judgments. In polyphonic historiography, the narrator acts as just another witness and as one who provides a scaffolding on which to hang the rest of the raw data. In any case, neither form of historiography is necessarily superior to the other, although each may be more helpful to one set of readers than to another. Readers who prefer to draw their own conclusions and who find the narrator’s point of view constricting will benefit more from polyphonic historiography than monologic historiography. On the other hand, readers who need someone else to construct a singular

---

35 Bakhtin admitted this even for novels. See Ibid., 271.
narrative of past events will benefit from monologic historiography more than polyphonic historiography.

On a final note, Bakhtin also points out that texts do not have to be purely polyphonic in order for a reader to consider them polyphonic. Even Dostoyevsky, at times, blended these two views of the world in the same novel.³⁶ The reader should consider the author or narrator’s posture toward his or her sources throughout an entire work (or at least to as great of an extent as possible) instead of simply in one or two places.³⁷

Selection of Sources

The selection of which sources to include in this study constitutes one of the most difficult parts of this project. Space does not allow for the treatment of every pre-Eusebian Greek historiographer,³⁸ nor does it allow for a thorough treatment of even a subset of these historiographers.³⁹ Nevertheless, this dissertation needs to analyze an adequately sized sample of pre-Eusebian Greek historiography in order to illustrate the monologic character of that historiography. Likewise, the post-Eusebian Christian historiographers furnish ample source material. This dissertation similarly needs to

³⁶ Ibid., 92.
³⁷ Examining every citation in every work that this dissertation analyzes will not be possible. Nevertheless, this dissertation attempts to select representative samples from each piece of historiography it evaluates in order to draw conclusions about broader trends.
³⁸ A quick query of The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae returns 221 distinct Greek historiographers before 300 C.E. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker includes many more.
³⁹ Josephus’ Antiquities alone could easily fill several volumes.
review an adequately sized sample of late ancient Christian historiography as well. In light of these concerns, an explanation for the selection of sources is in order.

With regard to pre-Eusebian Greek historiography, this dissertation will focus on the following historiographers as representative: Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, the Acts of the Apostles, and Appian. These authors represent two strands of historiography: Greek historiography and Hellenistic historiography. Greek historiography comes from the pre-Alexander era, whereas Hellenistic historiography comes from the post-Alexander era. Herodotus and Thucydides are representative of Greek historiography, whereas Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, and Appian serve as samples of Hellenistic historiography. Scholars still debate Acts, the second volume of a two-volume work that exhibits a genre different from the first volume (the Gospel of Luke). For the purposes of this study (and in light of the fact that Eusebius has written Christian historiography), Acts will constitute an instance of (apologetic) historiography. Each of these samples illustrates the nuances of pre-Eusebian citation methodologies.

Eusebius’ HE constitutes the most important source material for this dissertation. It has such a high concentration of citations, and its relationship with those citations is unique. Since the concentration of citations in the HE is greatest in the first seven books, this dissertation will focus only on the first seven books. As noted earlier, the first seven books probably comprised the first edition of the HE. Books 8-10 comprise an appendix, in a sense, that deals with events of Eusebius’ own time.\(^40\) Although Eusebius still cites

\(^{40}\) Gregory Robbins suggested the possibility that books 8-10 might perhaps constitute an appendix via personal communication (May 15, 2015).
sources from time to time in books 8-10, he spends most of his time simply narrating events.

While most of the aforementioned historiographers logically correspond to a single work, Josephus presents more than one possible work. This study will focus on his *Antiquities* and his apologetic historiography *Against Apion* (CA) because they share certain similarities with Eusebius’ HE. Furthermore, the CA is somewhat self-reflective regarding its citation methodology.

With regard to post-Eusebian late ancient Christian historiography, this dissertation will focus on the following historiographers: Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and the Venerable Bede. Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret are illustrative of late-ancient Christian Greek historiography, whereas Bede constitutes a sample of English (Latin) late-ancient Christian historiography. This dissertation will look at the respective *Historia ecclesiastica* of each of these authors in order to illustrate how Eusebius influenced later historiography.

Of course, each of the samples of historiography mentioned above (with the exception of Acts), including Eusebius, contains many more citations than this dissertation can address. This dissertation will, whenever possible, select passages to discuss based on the following criteria (in descending order of importance):

1. Whenever possible, this dissertation will choose citations with which the narrator *explicitly* interacts. Sometimes historiographers cite texts without commenting upon or analyzing them at all. This dissertation will omit those sorts of citations from consideration because they do not *explicitly* display a monologic or
polyphonic citation methodology. Rather, their connection with the narrative is *implicit*. This dissertation will instead focus upon citations that the narrator explicitly comments upon, analyzes, or otherwise engages.

2. Whenever possible, this dissertation will select citations that come from a variety of genres in order to illustrate how ancient historiographers interact with various kinds of texts.

3. Finally, whenever possible, this dissertation will address citations that are representative of (and not unique to) an author’s citation methodology.

*Previous Work*

This dissertation analyzes texts from a period that spans over 1000 years. The secondary literature that corresponds to the historiography of this period is immense. This dissertation will engage the secondary material most apposite in the footnotes. Nevertheless, one study has proved particularly helpful that deserves mention here in the introductory chapter, namely Sabrina Inowlocki’s *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*.41

Inowlocki examines the citations in Eusebius’ *Apodeixis*—that is, the *Praeparatio evangelica* (PE) and the *Demonstratio evangelica* (DE)—and argues that Eusebius uses a more sophisticated citation methodology than scholars often suggest.42 She compares Eusebius’ citation methodology to the citation methodology of Greek literature and

---

41 Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*. This book is a revised edition of Inowlocki’s dissertation.

42 See, for example, Ibid., 289.
identifies various ways that Eusebius appropriates Jewish texts to suit them to his apologetic context. She pays careful attention to the pragmatics of cutting, modifying, and including citations. She finds that Eusebius cites both Jewish and pagan texts in a similar manner. In addition, she explores ways in which Eusebius modifies his sources in his various works. In the HE and the DE, Eusebius tends to cite texts faithfully, whereas in the PE, he tends to be looser in his citations.\textsuperscript{43} In any case, she exhorts scholars not to cast aspersions on Eusebius’ modification of sources, since he probably modifies these sources without any of the malice modern scholars tend to associate with the practice. It comprises one way of adding value to the text. Finally, she concludes that Eusebius does not uniformly look down upon Jewish authors; he treats Jewish authors in a wide variety of ways, both good and bad.

I also compare Eusebius’ citation methodology to the citation methodology of Greek literature, although I focus less on the scribal practices associated with inserting citations into a work. Whereas Inowlocki carefully analyzes how authors and scribes in antiquity practice their craft, I pay more attention to the interplay between metanarrative and citations and the extant text. Further, I do not focus only on the citations of Jewish literature. Rather, I consider citations of all varieties.

This dissertation shares many of the same concerns as Inowlocki but draws different conclusions based on a wider set of data. Inowlocki’s exclusive focus on Jewish texts perhaps leads her to interpret Eusebius’ citation methodology in an apologetic manner. Many of Inowlocki’s insights are valid and valuable, but widening her point of

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 190-191.
view leads to further insights regarding Eusebius’ citation methodology not only in the Apodeixis but in the HE as well.

**What Constitutes a Citation?**

The differentiation between true citations of another’s language and an author’s reconstruction of another’s language constitutes a difficult conundrum in ancient literature. This differentiation is particularly difficult for classical historiographers, since the words they cite, reconstruct, or otherwise allude to are often no longer extant. Indeed, Inowlocki devotes an entire chapter to topics related to this question. Although I do not wish to confuse her project with my own, this problem does demand some consideration before embarking on an examination of the citation methodologies of ancient historiographers.

For this study, a citation is a passage that (1) an author demarcates semiotically or linguistically in direct or indirect discourse and (2) an author expects the reader to view as the words of another and not the words of the author. Note that speeches generally do not meet the second criterion. The custom in antiquity of reconstructing speeches, even if not every author explicitly identifies this custom, suggests that authors rarely hope their readers will view a speech as the exact words of another person. In other words, this study will assume that Thucydides’ stated methodology for speeches (see below) indicates that authors and readers, as early as the fifth century B.C.E., understand that

---

44 Ibid., 33-73.

45 These criteria derive from Inowlocki’s working definition of the term “quotation,” which is the technical term Inowlocki uses for Eusebius’ citations. See Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 6.
historiographers had no choice but to reconstruct speeches if they were to include speeches in their work. Authors did not walk around in antiquity with a reed pen and papyrus in hand, ready to take shorthand dictation of someone else’s words should the occasion arise. Thucydides’ methodology explicitly states what other authors must have tacitly assumed readers would take for granted:

καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγω εἶπον ἐκαστοὶ ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ ὣν ὀντες, χαλέπον τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεγόμενων διαμηνυμένην ἦν ἐμοὶ τῆς ἢ ὄντων ἢ καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοθέν ποθέν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν: ὥς δε ἐν ἑδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἐκαστοὶ περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστα εἰπείν, ἐχομένῳ ὃ ἐγγύτατα τῆς ἐμφάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεγόμενων, οὕτως εἰρηται. (Thucydides 1.22.1)

Now as regards all that each spoke in debate, either when they were about to enter war or when they were already in it, it was difficult to recall the exactness of the things having been said both for me—the things which I myself heard—and for those who reported to me from somewhere else. As it seemed to me each would have said what is most appropriate concerning the ever-present circumstances, maintaining as closely as possible to the overall argument of the things having been truly said, so it is said.46

Modern editors of ancient texts typically mark citations based upon indentation or some form of quotation mark, but these indicators also function to identify speeches or discourse between two characters. In order to distinguish between citations and direct speech within the narrative itself (and in order to find citations in electronic texts that lack consistent citation information), I have created and used a classifier program for late-Christian Greek historiographers in order to identify potential introductions and conclusions to citations based upon common lemmas narrators use to introduce and conclude citations. (See Chapter 5 for further discussion regarding the construction this

sort of classifier.) For Eusebius, Bede, and pre-Eusebian Greek historiographers, I have modified (where necessary) and have used XML files available on the Perseus Digital Library.47

A few other remarks regarding special circumstances are in order. Occasionally, in early historiographers such as Thucydides, dialect alone may mark a citation.48 Although the transition from one dialect to another may not be obvious in English translations, Greek readers would have obviously sensed the difference between two passages in different dialects.

Inscriptions and oracles present another unique circumstance. When authors cite Greek inscriptions or oracles, they typically exhibit meter.49 When Herodotus cites translations of inscriptions from other languages, however, his translations are not in meter.50 Inscriptions or oracles that are in Greek and that retain their meter are more likely to be the voice of another and not an authorial reconstruction; historiographers probably do not create oracles (which are often ambiguous) in meter just to complicate or “ornament” their narratives (see Morawski, n. 13 above).


50 With regard to inscriptions, see especially 1.187.2, 2.106.4, 2.125.6, 2.136.4, 2.141.6, 3.88.3, and 4.91. See Detlev Fehling, Herodotus and His Sources: Citation, Invention and Narrative Art (vol. 21 of ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs; Leeds: Francis Cairns Publications, Ltd., 1989), 134.
Citations delivered in indirect discourse (oratio obliqua) but that an author suggests or implies reflect the actual words of his or her source will also constitute a citation. In Greek literature, an author can choose to retain the language of an original but simply change the inflection of the appropriate verbs and nouns in order to highlight that the words that he or she is citing are from the point of view of someone else.\(^{51}\) Despite these changes in inflection, indirect discourse can retain the meaning, force, and language of the original text.\(^{52}\) When a historiographer claims or implies that a passage reflects the exact words of another but presents that passage in indirect discourse for effect, that passage will constitute a citation for this dissertation. This dissertation analyzes only a couple of passages that use indirect discourse; the passages in question provide good reason for the reader to assume an almost word-for-word correspondence to the same passages in the historiographer’s source.

\textit{Natural Language Processing}

I have used natural language processing in various ways for the statistical analyses and tables throughout this dissertation. While Chapter 5 will discuss the more complex natural language processing analysis I use in detail, I want to take the opportunity here to mention how I have used natural language processing to find citations, generate word counts, and tally quotation counts.

\(^{51}\) See Herbert Weir Smyth, \textit{Greek Grammar} (rev. Gordon M. Messing; Harvard University Press, 1984), §2591b. This often occurs when confusion of the person of the verb might mislead the reader.

\(^{52}\) Indirect discourse even retains the tense of the original verb (when possible), so that indirect discourse is really something akin to quotation marks but for indirect (rather than direct) speech.
Natural language processing includes a number of different methods and strategies that enable a person to analyze texts or language. Traditionally, scholars divide natural language processing into five distinct tasks: tokenization, lexical analysis, syntactic analysis, semantic analysis, and pragmatic analysis. The first three stages (tokenization, lexical analysis, and syntactic analysis) are much easier to perform than the last two (semantic analysis and pragmatic analysis). Tokenization is the division of a text into meaningful units such as quotations, citations, sentences, or words. Lexical analysis concerns itself with the analysis of morphology. Syntactic analysis focuses on sentence structure, whereas semantic analysis focuses on the meaning of the sentence. Pragmatic analysis is the extraction of meaning at the level of discourse and is one of the most difficult tasks in the field of natural language processing. This dissertation uses tokenization and lexical analysis in order to obtain data on the citation methodologies of ancient historiographers. In particular, tokenization and lexical analysis provide a means to identify the language unique to each author or group of authors in their interaction with their sources. Examining these trends across an entire corpus furnishes a broader picture of the posture of authors toward their sources than a small handful of examples can give. Since the number of citations in Eusebius and other ancient historiographers is too vast to

---

53 Some scholars view lexical analysis as tokenization, but Dale separates the two tasks. For Dale, lexical analysis deals specifically with the decomposition of words. See Robert Dale, “Classical Approaches to Natural Language Processing,” in the Handbook of Natural Language Processing (ed. Nitin Indurkhya and Fred J. Damerau; 2nd ed.; Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2010), 5.


55 Ibid. The following discussion is based upon Dale’s helpful synopsis.
address comprehensively, natural language processing affords a way to examine the evidence in a more comprehensive fashion.

The tables that appear throughout the footnotes and in the main body of the text in the first four chapters primarily derived from the tokenization of citations and words. I have obtained electronic Greek texts from sites such as Perseus in the form of XML (eXtensible Markup Language) files and have modified them as necessary in order to demarcate quotations and citations.\textsuperscript{56} For some texts, this conversion requires a lot of work. I wrote a number of small programs to help distinguish between quotations and citations as well as between citations and normal narrative. In the end, however, human judgment plays a major role in determining what comprises a citation and what does not. Machine learning also plays a role in helping the computer learn to distinguish between citations, speeches, and narrative in a reliable manner.

After I create the XML files, I parse them with another small program that I wrote and count the words using regular expressions.\textsuperscript{57} This analysis forms the basis of all of the tables in the first four chapters of this dissertation. All of the statistics in these tables come from my own analysis.

Chapter 5 will discuss natural language processing in further detail, since I employ it there to teach a computer the best way to distinguish between the various

\textsuperscript{56} The Perseus Project is located at the following url: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/.

\textsuperscript{57} Regular expressions have been around since the 1950s. Regular expressions are search patterns that allow users to search electronic texts in a sophisticated fashion. For example, the regular expression "March\&s+\&d\{1,2\}?=(\&s+\&d\{4\})?\$" could be used to find all occurrences of the word “March” followed by one or more space characters (“\&s+”) followed by one or two digits (“\&d\{1,2\}”), as long as this pattern is also followed by (1) a comma (“,”), one or more spaces (“\&s+”), and four digits (“\&d\{4\}”) or (2) the end of the text or line (“\$”). This search pattern would return “March 17” if I used the pattern to search the string “Date: 1986 March 17” or the string “I went to the library on March 17, 1986.” The pattern would return no matches if I searched the string “I think that happened in March 2014.”
author’s introductions and conclusions to citations. This sort of analysis requires lexical analysis and machine learning algorithms.
CHAPTER 2: MONOLOGIZATION IN CLASSICAL GREEK AND FIRST-/SECOND-CENTURY CHRISTIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

This chapter cannot possibly review all the literary and documentary citations of all the Greek historiographers. In light of this fact, this chapter will analyze literary and documentary citations from eight samples of Greek historiography. These samples include the following: Herodotus’ *Histories*; Thucydides’ *Histories*; Polybius’ *Histories*; Diodorus Siculus’ *Library*; Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* (AJ) and *Against Apion* (CA); *Acts of the Apostles* (Acts); and Appian’s *Histories*. This chapter excludes the analysis of speeches, which are almost always a reconstruction of the words of another by a historiographer, and will focus when possible on those literary and documentary citations that may appear to be polyphonic. That is to say, I will demonstrate the monologic character of classical citations by carefully analyzing those citations that are most problematic for demonstrating this chapter’s thesis. This chapter argues that classical (and very early Christian) historiography primarily uses a monologic citation methodology; in other words, these historiographers cite their sources only insofar as they contribute to the historiographer’s authorial consciousness.

---

The assertion that classical and early Christian historiography uses a monologic citation methodology does not constitute a negative characterization of their citation methodology.\textsuperscript{59} Rather, each citation methodology comes with its own set of expectations. A monologic citation methodology is the preferred citation methodology for certain genres. For example, a dissertation should typically use a monologic citation methodology.\textsuperscript{60} If it were to use a polyphonic citation methodology, the writer’s voice would merely be one voice among the many voices it cites. Moreover, the writer’s voice would lack any sort of finalization. Advisors would then be unable to pin down what the dissertation as a whole is arguing. The preferable monologic voice informs the reader of what the author or narrator’s point of view is. The monologic voice is the voice readers require when they need the point of view of an “expert” who has surveyed as much of the data as possible relevant to the subject.

Classical historiography was often monologic because its author had access to much evidence and stood in the role of expert. Its readers expected classical historiography to convey the conclusions of someone who had reviewed the evidence as thoroughly as possible. Often, but certainly not always, this sort of historiography argued for a particular understanding of past events.\textsuperscript{61} This chapter concerns itself not with classical historiography in general, however, but specifically with the nature of historiographers’ citation methodologies. The examples in this chapter demonstrate that

\textsuperscript{59} Bakhtin, \textit{Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics}, 271.

\textsuperscript{60} Compare this to the scholarly article mentioned by Bakhtin. See Ibid., 188.

\textsuperscript{61} At the same time, some classical historiographers do use polyphony in their historiography. For example, scholars often cite the polyphony of Herodotus as exemplary among the classical historiographers. While Herodotus’ historiography is polyphonic in many ways, however, his citation methodology is not.
most classical and early Christian citation methodologies are characteristically monologic.⁶²

*Herodotus*

Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 484-c. 425 B.C.E.), who was born in Ionia, lived as a metic in Athens and wrote the earliest extant history in Greek literature. His work, *The Histories*, covers events from 545 B.C.E. to around 425 B.C.E. The main subject of *The Histories* is the Persian Wars (490-479 B.C.E.), the wars between Greece and Persia, which began before Herodotus’ birth and ended when Herodotus was probably an adolescent. Herodotus did not personally witness the events of the war, but he did have the opportunity to interview several of the participants of the war who were about the age of his parents and grandparents. Many readers know Herodotus’ work for its endearing stories and its ethnographically diverse, lively narrative.

Scholars have often identified Herodotus’ historiography as polyphonic in character, especially with respect to the interaction between his narrative and his numerous *speeches*.⁶³ His use of explicit literary or documentary citations, however, is

---

⁶² Some citation methodologies in classical and early Christian literature act as precursors to a later polyphonic citation methodologies. One example is the quotation of the Hebrew Bible in the book of Acts. Although the author gives particular meanings to quotations of the Hebrew Bible in Acts (thus making these quotations monologic), a substantial part of any given quotation may actually lack any logical connection to the rest of the narrative. These citations act as precursors to a phenomenon that had much, much broader application in Eusebius’ HE. At any rate, the point of this chapter is to demonstrate that the citation methodology before Eusebius is *predominantly*, not *always*, monologic in character. This chapter will describe one example of a polyphonic precursor in its discussion of the citation methodology of the book of Acts.

⁶³ See, for example, Vasiliki Zali, *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus’ Histories with Special Attention to Books 1-9* (International Studies in the History of Rhetoric; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 305-310. Scholars, however, sometimes misapplied the concept of polyphony to Herodotus. For example, polyphony does not imply that a work is fictitious, although fictitious elements
much less substantial than his use of speeches and demonstrates strong monologic

tendencies. The paucity of literary and documentary evidence in early Greek

historiography indicates that citing texts was not an important part of Greek

historiography at the beginning. The paucity of citations in early Greek historiography

comes most obviously from the fact that many of the sources early historiographers use

were oral sources rather than written sources. In general, early Greek historiographers

address events that take place in their own generation or in their fathers’ generation.

64 Herodotus cites texts rather sparsely compared to his use of speeches and direct speech. The exact

statistics are as follows. (Direct speech excludes literary or documentary citations and vice versa.)

Table 1. Concentration of citations and quotations in Eusebius’ HE and Herodotus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, Direct Speech</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>14.18%</td>
<td>26,008</td>
<td>183,453</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, Text Citations</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>183,453</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics and all the statistics that follow throughout this dissertation are my own and are calculations
based on the following Greek texts: Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History (ed. Kirsovpp Lake, J.E.L. Oulton,

sources that are no longer extant sometimes elude scholars. Nevertheless, these statistics give some idea of

how important citations of texts and speeches are in contrast to the first seven books of Eusebius’ HE.

65 The practice of citing texts in historiography perhaps comes from the Persians. See Arnaldo Momigliano,


66 Victor Castellani pointed out to me that Greek males often married women a half- or full-generation

younger than themselves (personal communication, 1 June 2015).
This section analyzes some of the rarer literary and documentary citations in order to illustrate the way that they interact with the narrative and narrator in monologic ways. Sometimes, Herodotus appeals in a monologic fashion to the poets of the past either to support his argument as narrator or to disprove what they say.\footnote{Many of these appeals are in oratio obliqua (indirect speech). See, for example, Herodotus’ citation of Pindar in 3.38.4: καὶ ὄρθως μοι δοκέει Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλέα φήσας εἶναι (“And I think that Pindar was correct when he said that custom is the king of all”). As noted above, these sorts of citations can still constitute citations for the purposes of this dissertation, as long as the historiographer presents them as citations of the voice of another (and not simply the historiographer’s summary of the voice of another).} For example, Herodotus describes what he learned from interviewing Egyptian priests regarding the story of Helen in 2.113-120.\footnote{Scholars debate whether Herodotus actually interviewed Egyptian priests. See, for example, László Török, \textit{Herodotus in Nubia} (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 58; Ian S. Moyer, "Herodotus and an Egyptian Mirage: The Genealogies of the Theban Priests," in Rosaria Vignolo Munson, \textit{Herodotus: Volume 2: Herodotus and the World} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 292–293. No good reason exists to doubt Herodotus on this point.} The Egyptian priests claimed that Alexandros attempted to take Helen to Troy but that the winds blew him off course, so he ended up in Egypt instead (2.113.1). An Egyptian king named Proteus intercepted Helen (2.114.3-2.115.1), sent Alexandros sailing away (2.115.6), and held Helen in Egypt until Menelaus came for her (2.119.2). In the Egyptian version, then, Helen never quite made it to Troy.\footnote{The Egyptian version also ends oddly, with Menelaus killing two Egyptians in a sacrificial fashion. Proteus, the Egyptian king, then stands as the “good guy” in opposition to Alexandros and Menelaus, “the bad guys.” See Irene de Jong, “The Helen Logos and Herodotus’ Fingerprint” in Emily Baragwanath and Mathieu de Bakker, \textit{Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 138–139. See also Norman Austin, \textit{Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom}, (1st ed.; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008) for a full analysis of the alternate Helen story through history and its social implications.}

Herodotus interjects into the description of the interview to argue that Homer knew these alternate versions of the story but chose not to use them because they failed to
conform to his intentions (2.116.1). He cites three passages as evidence of his claim. He begins his presentation of the evidence as follows:

Δῆλον δὲ, κατὰ περ ἐποίησε ἐν Ἰλιάδι (καὶ οὐδ’ ἄλλη ἀνεπόδισε εὐωτόν) πλάνην τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὡς ἀπηνείχθη ἄγον Ἐλένην τῇ τῇ δὴ ἄλλη πλαζόμενος καὶ ως ἦς Σιδόνα τῆς Φοινίκης ἀπίκετο. Ἐπιμέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν Διομήδεως Αριστηή. λέγει δὲ τὰ ἔπεα ὁδὸ: 
ἔνθ’ ἔσαν οἱ πέλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν 
Σιδονίων, τὰς αὐτός Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδῆς 
ἡγαγε Σιδονίηθεν, ἐπιράζοντος ἐνύρεα πόντον, 
τὴν ἄλλην ἄλλην Ἐλένην περ ἀνήγαγεν εὐπατέρειαν. 
(2.116.3; cf. Iliad 6.289-292)

And it is clear, he described in the Iliad (and in no other passage did he retract it) the wandering of Alexander, how he was carried off course, being warded off, when he was leading Helen to another land and how he came to Sidon of Phoenicia. And he mentioned it in the Excellence of Diomedes; and he speaks the words as follows:

There were many-colored robes there, the artisanship of Sidonian women; godlike Alexandros himself led the women from Sidon, having sailed over the wide sea, on the journey in which he took Helen, daughter of noble sire, out to sea.

Herodotus cites these passages simply for their references to Sidon (Σιδονίων and Σιδονίηθεν). Sidon is not particularly close to Egypt, but Sidon is also not on the way to Troy. If Alexandros stopped by Sidon, he could also have plausibly ended up in Egypt.

Herodotus interprets these references to Sidon as residue of the story the Egyptian priests tell. Herodotus’ posture toward the citation suggests that he is simply using this citation to give support to the alternate narrative he finds compelling (see below). Herodotus is

---

70 This chapter uses “Homer” because the ancient historiographers speak as if Homer alone is the author of the Iliad and Odyssey (and sometimes other works as well). The debate over Homeric authorship is longstanding.

71 Herodotus is looking for residue, not proof. See Lawrence Kim, Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 34.
using this citation in a monological fashion, since the voice of the citation serves the author’s point of view.

The next passage he cites as evidence comes from the *Odyssey*:

Ἐπιμέμνηται δὲ καὶ ἐν Ὅδυσσείᾳ ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖσι ἔπειτ-
τοῖα Δίος θυγάτηρ ἔχει φάρμακα μητιόδεντα,
ἔσθλά, τὰ οί Πολύδαμνα πόρεν Θόνος παράκοιτις
Αἰγυπτίη, τῇ πλείστα φέρει ξείδωρος ἀρουρα
φάρμακα, πολλὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ μεμιγμένα, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρά.
(2.116.4; cf. *Odyssey* 4.227-230)

And he mentions [the wandering of Alexander] in the *Odyssey* in the following words:

The daughter of Zeus had such drugs as attain their desired end, good [drugs], which Egyptian Polydamna the wife of Thon gave her, where the grain-giving earth bears most drugs, some very good, and others very painful when they are compounded.

In this passage, the reference to *Egyptian* Polydamna suggests to Herodotus that Homer again inadvertently betrays his knowledge of the alternate story that lands Helen in Egypt. Herodotus cares very little about Homer’s voice in this passage. Herodotus’ only interest in the passage is the word Αἰγυπτίη (“Egyptian”); that word suggests that Homer had knowledge of this alternate narrative. Herodotus entirely disregards the rest of the passage, since he only needs that single word to prove his point. If Herodotus’ interaction with this text were a dialogue, he would be completely missing what the text is saying. This citation also has a strong monologic character.
Finally, in the third passage, Herodotus finds evidence that Menelaus spent time in Egypt just as the Egyptian priests claim in 2.119. Herodotus cites the *Odyssey* in the following fashion: 

```
Καὶ τάδε ἐτερα πρὸς Τηλέμαχον Μενέλεως λέγει. Αἰγύπτῳ μ᾽ ἐτὶ δεύτερο θεοὶ μεμαῦτα νέεσθαι ἔσχον, ἐπεὶ οὐ σφιν ἐρεύα τεληέσσας ἐκατόμβας. Ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἔπει ἕληδο ὅτι ἡπίστατο τὴν ἐς Αἴγυπτον Ἀλεξάνδρου πλάνην- ὁμουρέει γὰρ ἦ Συρίη Αἰγύπτω, οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες, τὸν ἐστὶ ἢ Σιδὼν, ἐν τῇ Συρίῃ ὀικέουσι. (2.116.5; cf. Odyssey 4.351-352)
```

And Menelaus speaks again the following to Telemachus:

- Eager to come home hence, the gods still kept me in Egypt, since I did not sacrifice to them acceptable sacrifices.
- In these lines, it is clear that [Homer] knows about the wandering of Alexander to Egypt; for Syria borders Egypt, and the Phoenicians, who possess Sidon, inhabit Syria.

Again, Herodotus is simply interested in the fact that Menelaus was *Aἰγύπτῳ* (“in Egypt”). The passage has no other purpose for Herodotus’ narrative.

In all three of these passages, then, Herodotus is *using* the passage to support the claims of the Egyptian priests regarding the alternate Helen story. In 2.120.1, Herodotus himself begins to explain the reasons he finds the account of the Egyptian priests persuasive: Ταῦτα μὲν Αἴγυπτίων οἱ ιρέες ἔλεγον. Ἐγὼ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ περὶ Ἐλένης λεχθέντι καὶ αὐτὸς προστίθεμαι, τάδε ἐπιλεγόμενος . . . . (“Thus the Egyptian priests spoke. And I myself assent to their argument that was spoken concerning Helen, considering the following . . . ”) Herodotus then goes on to explain that the Trojans would have returned home and would not have endangered their city by keeping her there (2.120.1-2), and he adds other reasons why the Egyptian argument is more compelling as

---

72 The citation is a citation both because it matches the extant versions of the *Odyssey* and because Herodotus leaves these two lines in Homeric hexameter.
well (2.120.3-5). Although Herodotus is not obstinate in his reasoning, he is clearly doing his best to make his case and to persuade the reader of his point of view. The point of view of the texts he cites matters little to him. Explicit logical connections exist between Herodotus’ narrative and the texts he cites, and those connections minimize the voices of the texts he cites. Those citations are merely supporting Herodotus’ point of view and are thus functioning in a monologic manner.

Oracular citations also possess a monologic character in Herodotus. When Herodotus tells of the Spartans’ (Lacedaemonians’) attempt to best the Tegeans after Lycurgus improved Spartan institutions, he cites the Pythia’s response at the oracle at Delphi (in dactylic hexameter):

```
Ἀρκαδίην μ’ αίτεϊς; Μέγα μ’ αίτεῖς· οὐ τοι δώσω. Πολλοί ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ βαλανηφάγοι ἄνδρες ἔσαιν, οḯ σ’ ἀποκολύσουσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τοι οὕτι μεγαίρω· δώσω τοι Τεγέην ποσσίκροτον ὀρχήσασθαι καὶ καλὸν πεδίον σχοίνῳ διαμετρήσασθαι. (1.66.2)
```

You ask me for Arcadia? You ask me for a great thing; I will not give it to you. There are many acorn-eating men in Arcadia, who will hinder you. But I will by no means grudge you everything; I will give you tapped-by-the-feet Tegea to dance.

---


74 Oracles in verse often circulated in textual form in Herodotus’ era. Herodotus is much more likely to have cited these oracles from texts rather than compose the verse for each oracle. See Hugh Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle: Divination and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 71. Many of the citations in Herodotus are either oracular or inscriptionary. For Greek inscriptions, see 1.51.3–4, 4.14.3, 4.87.1, 4.88.2, 5.59–61, 5.77, 7.228, 8.22, and 8.82.1. See Stephanie West, “Herodotus’ Epigraphical Interests” *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 280–295 for a discussion of Herodotus’ faithfulness to the text of these inscriptions. Although Herodotus may well have conveyed many of the words of these inscriptions in an imprecise manner, he retains the meter of many of the oracles. This fact suggests that these citations are perhaps more intact than West avers; Herodotus is unlikely to have reconstructed these inscriptions in his own language using meter.
and a fair plain to measure out for yourself with a measuring-rope.

When the Lacedaemonians heard this, they brought shackles with them to bind the Tegeans and attacked Tegea because they believed that the Oracle indicated Tegea would fall into their hands (1.66.3). The Lacedaemonians had misinterpreted the Oracle, however. The Tegeans enslaved the survivors and made them measure out the Tegean plain with a measuring rope while wearing the very shackles the Spartans had brought (1.66.4).\textsuperscript{75}

Oracles typically possess ambiguity for two reasons. First, the giver of an oracle can affirm the truth of the oracle no matter the outcome. Second, it can explain a calamity that befalls people, especially when they demonstrate hubris in response to an oracle. The ambiguity of the oracle plays a crucial role in this episode.\textsuperscript{76} Although the characters who hear the oracle interpret it in the wrong way, the narrator retains knowledge of the future outcome; in no way does he compromise his omniscient point of view.\textsuperscript{77} The narrator, in his omniscience, knows from the beginning that the Spartans had misinterpreted the oracle, and the oracle has only one true meaning: the Spartans will end up in bondage.

From the perspective of the narrative, the oracle acts as a trap for the Spartans. A second

\textsuperscript{75} Measuring land with a rope would suggest that Spartan colonists could divide that land up amongst themselves. Gregory Crane, \textit{Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity: The Limits of Political Realism} (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 1998), 82. Of course, though, events did not turn out as the Spartans expected.

\textsuperscript{76} Herodotus often cites oracles in order to anticipate future events. See Jonas Grethlein, \textit{Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: Futures Past from Herodotus to Augustine} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 204.

oracle in 1.67.4 functions in a similar way but this time helps the Spartans discover a means of defeating the Tegeans. In both episodes, the oracle serves the narrative. In the first case, the oracle leads the Spartans into bondage and complicates their capture of Tegea. In the second case, the oracle—once the Spartans have developed some humility—helps the Spartans figure out how to defeat Tegea and reverse their fortune.

Similarly, Herodotus can use oracles to promote his own personal understanding of an oracle. Herodotus tells about an oracle that Mardonius misinterpreted regarding the battle at Plataea in 9.42.2-4. Herodotus, as narrator, addresses the Oracle that Mardonius misinterpreted as follows:

Τοῦτον δ’ ἔγγυε τὸν χρησμόν, τὸν Μαρδόνιος εἶπε ἐς Πέρσας ἔχειν, ἐς Ἰλλυρίους τε καὶ τὸν Ἐγχελέων στρατὸν οἶδα πεποιημένον, ἀλλ’ οὕκ ἐς Πέρσας. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν Βάκιδι ἐς ταῦτῃ τῇ πάχῃ ἐστὶ πεποιημένα, τὴν δ’ ἐπὶ Θερμώδων τοῖς ἐπιθετοῖς καὶ Ἀσσωπῶ λεχεποῆ Ἔλληνων σύνοδοι καὶ βαρβαρόφωνον ἰογήν, τῇ πολλῷ πεσόνται ὑπὲρ λάχησιν τε μόρον τε τοξοφόρων Μηδῶν, ὅταν αἰσθανόμεν ἠμαρ ἐπέλθη. (9.43.1-2)

Now I know that this oracle that was composed, which Mardonius said pertains to the Persians, [actually pertains] to the Illyrians and the army of the Encheles, but not to the Persians. Nevertheless, [I do know] that [oracles] by Bakis exist concerning this battle:

Now the hostile encounter of Hellenes and the cry of foreign speech  
on the Thermadon (river) and grassy Asopus,  
where many of the Medes armed with bows will fall  
beyond their allotted share and portion, whenever the fated hour falls.

Again, Herodotus is citing the oracle in direct support of his narratorial claim. Unlike many other oracles, this oracle lacks ambiguity because the narrator is interpreting it for
the reader.\textsuperscript{78} When Herodotus cites the oracle on his own behalf, he removes the ambiguity. When Herodotus speaks the meaning of the oracle, the oracle cannot be wrong. Herodotus diminishes the ambiguous voice of the oracle and subordinates it to his own voice and interpretation, making it a monologic citation.

The rest of Herodotus’ explicit literary or documentary citations follow similar patterns.\textsuperscript{79} Herodotus does not engage in polyphony when he cites texts explicitly, even though he uses polyphony in the speeches he (re)constructs and in his analysis of different points of view. For Herodotus, citing texts constitutes a means for persuading his reader that his own point of view is valid, or at least possible. When Herodotus gives words to the characters in his stories through speeches or other means, he then makes use of polyphony. Polyphony in these contexts draws the reader into the dialogic activity of the narrative. On the other hand, when Herodotus cites epic poetry, oracles, or inscriptions, he is attempting to persuade the reader of his own authorial view. In these moments, he diminishes the voice of the text that he is citing in a monologic fashion.

\textsuperscript{78} While Herodotus typically invites the reader to participate in oracular polysemy, here he bypasses the ambiguity altogether. See Elton Barker, "Paging the Oracle: Interpretation, Identity and Performance in Herodotus’ History," Greece and Rome Ser. 2, 53 (2006): 27.

\textsuperscript{79} The full list of literary or documentary citations in Herodotus is as follows: 1.47.3, 1.55.2, 1.62.4, 1.65.3, 1.66.2, 1.67.4, 1.85.2, 1.174.5, 2.116.3, 2.116.4, 2.116.5, 3.57.4, 4.29.1, 4.88.2, 4.155.3, 4.157.2, 4.159.3, 4.163.2, 5.56.1, 5.59.1, 5.60.1, 5.61.1, 5.77.4, 5.92B.2, 5.92B.3, 5.92E.2, 6.19.2, 6.77.2, 6.86C.2, 6.98.3, 7.140.2, 7.140.3, 7.141.3, 7.141.4, 7.142.2, 7.148.3, 7.220.4, 7.228.1, 7.228.2, 7.228.3, 8.20.2, 8.77.1, 8.77.2, 8.96.2, and 9.43.2.
Thucydides

Thucydides (c. 460-c. 400 B.C.E.), the Athenian aristocrat and rather unsuccessful general who composed an unfinished version of the history of the Peloponnesian War, often receives praise from modern historians for his methodical and even scientific approach to historiography. The Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.E.) occurred in Thucydides’ own lifetime. He both participated in the war as general (in 424 B.C.E.) and had the opportunity to witness many of the events of the war. As he narrates the events of the Peloponnesian War, he submits to the reader that he is critically evaluating his sources and carefully coming to conclusions, at least more scrupulously than his predecessors did. He dispenses with the entertaining anecdotes of other historiographers such as Herodotus and instead attempts to construct a rather methodical narrative. Thucydides carefully presents his own point of view on the causes of the war and on the events of the war itself, and he adduces evidence sparsely and only when it confirms the events he narrates or his own point of view.

---

80 Books 5 and 8 appear to be drafts, which is evident in (among other things) their use of documents instead of speeches. For a discussion regarding how scholars have accounted for these differences, see Jeffrey S. Rusten, “Carving Up Thucydides,” in A Handbook to the Reception of Thucydides (ed. Christine Lee and Neville Morley; Wiley Blackwell Handbooks to Classical Reception; Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015), 61-74. In 5.26.1, Thucydides indicates that his history covers events until the termination of the Athenian empire and the capture of their long walls and the Piraeus (404 B.C.E.), but his narrative ends rather abruptly in the summer of 411 B.C.E (in the 21st year of the 27-year war).

81 1.22.2-4. Thucydides does not explicitly name Herodotus, but many scholars believe Thucydides has Herodotus in view in some of his critiques of previous historiographers.

82 Despite the methodical nature of his narrative, he does still include polyphonic elements from time to time in the speeches he reconstructs. See especially the sui generis Melian dialogue in 5.85-111 (Victor Castellani, personal communication, 16 May 2015).
Thucydides relies more heavily on speeches, direct speech, and literary or documentary citations than his predecessor Herodotus. Even when one sets aside the speeches of Thucydides, the literary or documentary citations still comprise a small percentage of the entire work. Thucydides does not explain his methodology regarding the citations of texts and documents, although the methodology he propounds for his speeches in 1.22 may also apply to his use of literary or documentary citations. His lack of differentiation between the two suggests that he either viewed them similarly or decided to cite texts explicitly, well after he had written his programmatic statement in 1.20-22. Thucydides introduces new texts to the collection of genres to which historiographers appeal. In addition to the genres Herodotus draws from, Thucydides adds treaties and letters to his cache. Like Herodotus, though, Thucydides uses a

---

83 Thucydides cites texts very sparsely compared to his use of speeches and direct speech. The exact statistics are as follows. (Direct speech excludes literary or documentary citations and vise versa.)

Table 2. Concentration of citations and quotations in Eusebius’ HE and Thucydides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides, Direct Speech</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>33,788</td>
<td>150,149</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides, Literary or Documentary Citations</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>150,149</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


84 Of these, the following constitute poetic or inscriptional citations: 1.9.4, 1.132.2, 2.54.2, 3.104.4, 3.104.5, 6.54.7, and 6.59.3. The treaties include 4.118, 5.18-5.19, 5.23-5.24.1, 5.47, 5.77, 5.79, 8.18, 8.37, and 8.58, and the letters include 1.128.7, 1.29.3, 1.37.4, and 7.11-15.

85 See page 23 above. For the possible connection between documentary or literary citations and speeches, see Otto Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden Im Geschichtswerk Des Thukydides* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1942), 1127-1131.
monologic citation methodology to support the historiographer’s (and narrator’s) point of view. This section will analyze Thucydides use of citations by evaluating the citation of a poet, the citation of a treaty, and the citation of a letter.

In some cases, Thucydides’ language fails to indicate sufficiently whether he is giving his own reconstruction of a text or is citing a document word for word. When this sort of confusion exists, the passages that scholars can most easily identify as word-for-word citations are those texts that use a different dialect of Greek. These texts exhibit the language of the other, although Thucydides only allows the voice of such a text to stand on its own inasmuch as it supports his narrative. Readers can be confident that such texts in a different dialect exhibit the actual voice of the other.

When Thucydides cites the poets, he uses them to support his particular point of view of the past in a similar fashion to Herodotus, even if his point of view stems from the poets in the first place. For example, Thucydides uses two excerpts from the Homeric Hymns to prove the antiquity of the Delian games. Thucydides introduces the first excerpt in this fashion:

---

86 The historiographer and narrator are usually one and the same in ancient historiography. The narrator is the voice the author develops to tell the story and can sometimes be substantially different from the actual voice of the author (such as in Dostoevsky’s works).


88 This claim would not be true of Aristophanes, who incorporates several different dialects into a single comic drama. Furthermore, these differences in dialect tend to arise in the citation of documents rather than speeches. For the speeches, Thucydides uses good Attic (Victor Castellani, personal communication, 16 May 2015).
Now there was at one time long ago a great assembly of the Ionians and the neighboring islanders; for they used to observe the festival together with their women and children, just as now the Ionians do in Ephesus, and a contest is held there, both athletic and musical, and the cities conduct choirs. Homer is very clear that such events existed in the following epic poetry, which is from the hymn to Apollo.

Thucydides is very clear that he plans to use the citation that will follow as proof of his assertion.⁸⁹ He is using Homer as evidence for that claim:

```
ἀλλ’ ὑπὲ Δήλῳ, Φοίβε, μάλιστά γε θυμὸν ἐπέρφησι, ἐνθα τοι ἐλκεχίτωνες Ἰάονες ἠγερέθονται σὺν σφονίσιν τεκέσσι γυναιξὶ τα σὴν ἐς ἰγυιάν· ἐνθα σε πυγμαχίῃ τε καὶ ἄρχηστι καὶ ἀοιδὴ μνησάμενοι τέρπουσιν, ὅταν καθέσωσιν ἰγυία.
```

(3.104.4)

But when in Delos, Phoebus, you delight your heart most; there the Ionians with long robes gather together to you with their own children and women in your street; there with boxing and dancing and song they entertain as they remember you, whenever they sit at the contest.

The citation merely confirms what Thucydides had suggested before it. He uses the citation to quell any doubt about the existence of the games long ago. After citing a passage from the Hymn to Apollo, he further confirms the conclusion he has drawn in 3.104.6: τοσαῦτα μὲν Ὁμήρος ἐπεκειμήρωσεν ὅτι ἦν καὶ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλη ξύνοδος καὶ ἐορτή ἐν τῇ Δήλῳ . . . . (“Homer proved as many things. There was a great assembly and

---

⁸⁹ Thucydides does not trust everything Homer says. He merely uses Homer as evidence when no other evidence is available. See Thucydides 1.9.4 and Crane, Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity, 129.
festival long ago in Delos . . . ”) Thucydides cites Homer only because Homer provides specific evidence for the reader regarding his claim about the antiquity of the Delian games. From the standpoint of the reader, both Thucydides’ language and the language of the hymn to Apollo cohere.

When Thucydides cites treaties, his purpose for citing them is often less clear. For example, in 5.77 and 5.79 Thucydides cites two short-lived treaties between the Spartans and Argives, one a peace treaty and the other an alliance treaty (both written in the Doric dialect). After Thucydides explains the circumstances under which the Spartans and Argives began to negotiate the peace treaty, he simply and without much explanation introduces and quotes from the treaty:

καὶ γενομένης πολλῆς ἀντιλογίας (ἐτυχε γὰρ καὶ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης παρόν) οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις πράσσοντες, ἡ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ τολμῶντες, ἐπεισαν τοὺς Ἀργείους προσδέχεσθαι τὸν χιμνατήριον λόγον. ἔστι δὲ δάδε. Κατάδε δοκεῖ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων χιμβαλέσθαι ποτέ τῶς Ἀργείως, ἀποδιδόντας τῶς παῖδας τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις . . . (5.76.2-77.1)

Now after much dispute (for Alcibiades also happened to be present), those who acted for the Spartans—now daring to act openly—persuaded the Argives to accept the agreement that they were disposed toward. It is as follows: “In accordance with the following items, the assembly of the Spartans has resolved with the Argives that [the Argives] will return to the Orchomenians their children . . . .”

The rest of the treaty that follows delineates the agreements and stipulations. After confirming the acceptance of the treaty by the Argives, Thucydides quickly introduces an alliance treaty that the Spartans and Argives entered into and itemizes the terms upon which they agreed (5.78-79). These treaties constitute the fifth and sixth treaties

---

90 Thucydides wrote in the Attic dialect.
Thucydides has cited since he first introduced the genre in 4.118. Given Thucydides’ obsession with treaties in the first book and the role treaties play in the outbreak of the war, one would expect Thucydides to cite treaties—if he had access to them—far more often and earlier in his project. Although Thucydides rarely cites treaties, he has included the two treaties in 5.78-79 in quick succession. Three paragraphs later, however, the democrats in Argos cause trouble, which leads to the dissolution of the peace and the alliance (5.82). The Argives go back to the Athenians and then begin to build walls for themselves (5.82.6). What is the point of including the text of a treaty that is so short-lived?

The point may well be that the treaties between the parties involved in the Peloponnesian War do not last long. In a broader sense, these treaties reflect human nature, where each party is looking out for its own interests and where fortune changes quickly and unexpectedly. If Thucydides’ point is indeed to highlight the capriciousness of either human beings in general or at least the parties involved in the Peloponnesian War, then Thucydides is still functioning from a monologic point of view. These treaties simply serve his larger point about human nature or the parties involved. Parties negotiate and draw out the stipulations in detail only to break the treaty (eventually). The alliances

91 Thucydides spent many years in Argos, which explains why he had access to the treaties in 5.78 and 5.79. He may not have had access to other treaties, especially after the dissolution of the Athenian empire. Victor Castellani, personal communication, 16 May 2015.


93 Ibid.
of people come and go based upon how well they continue to serve each respective party’s interests. Alliances are fickle.

In addition to the citations of poets and treaties, the monologic nature of Thucydides’ citations also appears in the letters he cites. After the Spartans and their allies had decided on war, they attempted to find pretexts that would justify that war (1.126.1). The Spartans (and the Athenians themselves) believed that some Athenians had brought about a curse. An Olympic victor named Cylon misinterpreted a Delphic oracle and—together with some friends and his brother—attempted to gain control of the Acropolis, with the intention of becoming tyrant (1.126.3-6). After Cylon and his brother escaped, his deserted companions supplicated at the altar on the Acropolis and were approaching death due to hunger (1.126.10-11). When these Athenians—worn out from laying siege to these men—saw that they were approaching death, they led the men out agreeing to do them no harm and then killed them (1.126.11). The Athenians who killed these men became accursed for their violence improperly applied to suppliants, and the Athenians (and the Spartans as well) drove the accursed out (1.126.11-12). Later, however, the Athenians allowed the return of the descendants of the accursed, so the Spartans were asking the Athenians to get rid of the curse by expelling these descendants from Athens (1.126.12). They would get rid of the curse by expelling the families whose ancestors were the cause of the injustice. See Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle*, 146.

95 The Alcmaeonidae participated in the murder of the suppliants, although Thucydides does not mention this explicitly here. See Edith Foster, *Thucydides, Pericles, and Periclean Imperialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 126–129.
believed that the Spartans were under two curses. Therefore, the Athenian response to the Spartan request was a counter-request for the Spartans to remove both curses. One curse was the result of their killing suppliants in the temple of Poseidon, and the other was the result of Pausanias’ aiding and abetting King Xerxes by returning captives of Xerxes’ family taken by the Greeks (1.128). Thucydides then cites a private letter that Pausanias sent to King Xerxes with the captives (in good Attic):  

Παυσανίας ὁ ἡγεμῶν τῆς Σπάρτης τούσδε τέ σοι χαρίζεσθαι βουλόμενος ἀποπέμπει δορὶ ἐλών, καὶ γνώμην ποιοῦμαι, εἰ καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ, θυγατέρα τε τὴν σὴν γῆμα καὶ σοὶ Σάρτην τε καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὑποχείριον ποιήσαι. δυνατὸς δὲ δοκῶ εἶναι ταῦτα πράξει μετὰ σοῦ βουλευόμενος, εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει, πέμπε ἄνδρα πιστὸν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν δι᾽ οὗ τὸ λοιπὸν τοὺς λόγους ποιησόμεθα. (1.128.7)

Pausanias the commander of Sparta, who desires to give favors to you, dismisses these who I took in war. Furthermore, I propose, if it also seems good to you, to marry your daughter and to make Sparta and the rest of Hellas subject to you. And I think that I am able to do this with you if you desire. Therefore, if something about these things pleases you, send a trustworthy man by sea through whom we may converse in the future.

After Xerxes responds positively to the letter (1.129.1), he responds in his own letter:

ὥδε λέγει βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης Παυσανία. καὶ τῶν ἄνδρῶν οὓς μοι πέραν θαλάσσης ἐκ Βυζαντίου ἔσωσας κείσεται σοι εὔργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οίκῳ ἐς αἰεὶ ἀνάγραπτος, καὶ τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀφέσκομαι. καὶ σὲ μὴν τὴν μηθ᾽ ἡμέρα ἐπισχέτω ὅστε ἀνείναι πράσσειν τι ὃν ἐμοὶ ὑπισχυή, μηδὲ χρυσὸν καὶ ἀργυρὸν διαπάνη κεκωλύθσθω μηδὲ στραταῖς πλῆθει, εἰ ποὶ δεῖ παραγιγνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετ᾽ Ἀρταβάζου ἄνδρος ἀγαθοῦ, ὃν σοὶ ἐπεμψα, πρᾶσσε θαρσοῦν καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ τὰ σὰ ὅπῃ κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα ἔξει ἀμφότεροι. (1.129.3)

Thus says King Xerxes to Pausanias. For the men whom you have rescued for me on the other side of the sea, kindness will be laid up for you in our house recorded forever, and I am pleased by your words. Let neither night nor day stop you, lest you neglect to do anything you have promised me, and let there not be any hindrance on account of the spending of gold and

---

96 Victor Castallani, personal communication, 16 May 2015.
silver nor on account of the size of an army, whither it is necessary [for them] to come. But with my good man Artabazus, whom I send to you, act with boldness both for my affairs and yours in whatever way it will be most honorable and best for us both.

Thucydides uses these two letters to explain why Pausanias then began to act, with arrogance, like a Mede (1.130), and why the Spartans had to check him (1.131.1). Eventually Pausanias goes as a suppliant to the temple of the Bronze House, and the Spartan ephors starve him there, thus incurring another curse (1.134). Why does Thucydides use these letters? At the very least, they represent communication between two parties. They also provide incriminating evidence, although some Greeks value this sort of evidence more highly than other Greeks. Thucydides includes the text of these letters in order to illustrate the nature of this correspondence and to generate evidence for the conspiracy that was developing between Pausanias and King Xerxes. The form of these letters, then, supports Thucydides’ monologic aims; he wants to show the secret nature of Pausanias’ correspondence. He can expose Pausanias’ intentions and desire for power by citing these letters.

In sum, then, Thucydides’ use of literary or documentary citations is thoroughly monologic. Thucydides presents his citations as an extension of his own authorial consciousness. He maintains a strong narratorial presence that does not easily relinquish control to the voices of the texts he cites. His narrative diminishes the voice of those texts by simply highlighting only those elements that serve his own purposes. Thucydides, much like Herodotus, cites texts in order to strengthen his own argument rather than to

---


98 Ibid., 12.
offer the reader glimpses of alternate points of view. In addition to the genres from which Herodotus draws citations, Thucydides draws from treaties and letters in order to construct his narrative. Treaties and letters offer Thucydides evidence for demonstrating the fickleness of human allegiances and the rhetorical posturing states use in the context of war. His reliance on citations of text and speeches—greater than Herodotus’—demonstrates how historiography was beginning to change. The next historiographer this chapter will address adds yet another genre to the genres historiographers draw from: (previous) historiography, or annals.

**Polybius**

Polybius (c. 200-c. 118 B.C.E.) was a Greek historian who wrote about Rome’s rise and ascendancy over the Mediterranean. Polybius’ *Histories* covers events from 264 to 146 B.C.E. in 40 books, of which only the first five are extant in their entirety. Fragments of most of the remaining books also exist. He is more explicit about his methodology and the role of the historiographer than either Herodotus or Thucydides. For Polybius, the historian must have experience with politics, knowledge of geography, and the capacity to compare and critically analyze documentary and textual evidence. Polybius does not use speeches or explicit citations very frequently. Polybius cites a

---

99 One person Thucydides did not cite, however, was Herodotus—at least not explicitly.

100 See Polybius 12.25e.1.

101 Polybius cites military dispatches (see 3.75.1 and 3.85.8, for example), inscriptions (see 3.33.18 and 3.56.4), and earlier historians and annalists (see, for example, 1.58.5; cf. 3.8.1-8, 3.26.3). See T. Rood, “Polybius,” in Irene J. F. De Jong, René Nünlist, and Angus M. Bowie, *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 162.
number of treaties and other historians. This section will analyze two examples of Polybius’ citation of historians. When he cites historians (as when he cites other texts), he cites them with a monologic citation methodology much as one would cite an academic paper. He typically cites historians in order to demolish their argument. Polybius is an independent (and somewhat intolerant) thinker who takes his profession seriously.

For example, when Polybius cites the Roman historian Fabius Pictor’s assertion for the cause of the Second Punic (Hanniballic) War in 3.26, Polybius uses that citation to show the inadequacy of Fabius’ explanation and the incompetency of Fabius himself. Polybius’ citation is in fact in indirect discourse, but he implies that the words reflect the actual language of Fabius. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, indirect discourse constitutes a citation under these circumstances (for the purposes of this dissertation). After citing Fabius in indirect discourse in 3.8.1-7, Polybius concludes and transitions into another indirect quotation with the following words: ταῦτα δ᾽ εἰπὼν φησιν (“having said these things he says . . .”). Had Polybius merely paraphrased Fabius, he would have no need to use the conclusive formula ταῦτα δ᾽ εἰπὼν. At least one translation of Polybius

<table>
<thead>
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102 Scholars have gone both ways on the issue of whether or not Polybius also used Fabius as a source. Arthur M. Eckstein, "Polybius, the Gallic Crisis, and the Ebro Treaty," *Classical Philology* 107 (2012): 206–229 suggests that Polybius used Fabius heavily in Book 2.
renders this quotation as a direct quotation. Polybius appears to be emphasizing the fact that he is giving Fabius’ point of view and not his own. Under the assumption, then, that this passage constitutes a citation, Polybius begins this citation in 3.8.1 with an explanation of the cause Fabius gives for the war: Φάβιος δὲ φησιν ὁ Ῥωμαϊκὸς συγγραφέας ἀμα τῷ κατὰ Ζακανθαίους ἄδικήματι καὶ τὴν Ἀσδρούβου πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλαρχίαν αἰτήσαν γίνεσθαι τοῦ κατ᾽ Ἀννίβαν πολέμου (“Now Fabius, the Roman historian, says that, together with the wrong done against the Saguntines, the greediness and lust for power of Hasdrubal were the cause of the war against Hannibal”). Polybius then cites Fabius, but in indirect speech. Despite the fact that Polybius uses indirect speech, however, the words appear to belong to Fabius (except for the requisite changes to the verbs and subjects of each sentence).

εἰκεῖνον γὰρ μεγάλην ἀνειληφότα τὴν δυναστείαν ἐν τοῖς κατ᾽ Ἰβηρίαν τόποις, μετὰ ταῦτα παραγενόμενον ἐπὶ Λιβύην ἐπιβαλέσθαι καταλύσαντα τοὺς νόμους εἰς μοναρχίαν περιστῆσαι τὸ πολίτευμα τῶν Καρχηδονίων· τοὺς δὲ πρῶτους ἀνδρὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ πολιτεύματος προιδομένους αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιβολὴν συμφρονήσαι καὶ διαστήναι πρὸς αὐτὸν· τὸν δ᾽ Ἀσδρούβαν ὑπόδομεν, ἀναχωρήσασθαι εἰκ τῆς Λιβύης τὸ λοιπὸν ἡ ἡ ἐκατὰ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν χερίζειν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προάρεσιν, οὐ προσέχοντα τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῶν Καρχηδονίων. Ἀννίβαν δὲ κοινωνὸν καὶ ζηλωτὴν ἐκ μειρακίου γεγονότα τῆς ἐκείνου προαρέσεως καὶ τότε διαδεξάμενον τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγωγὴν Ἀσδρούβα ποιεῖσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων. διὸ καὶ νῦν τὸν πόλεμον τούτον ἑξενιηνόχεα κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προάρεσιν Ῥωμαίους παρὰ τὴν Καρχηδονίαν γνώμην. οὐδένα γὰρ εὐδοκεῖν τῶν ἀξιόλογον ἀνδρῶν ἐν Καρχηδόνι τοῖς ἢς ἢ Αννίβου περὶ τὴν Ζακανθαίων πόλιν πραγματεύσιν. ταῦτα δ᾽ εἰπὼν φησιν μετὰ τὴν τῆς προερημένης πόλεως ἀλλοις παραγενέσθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, οἰομένους δεῖν ἢ τὸν Ἀννίβαν εκδιδόναι σφίς τοὺς Καρχηδονίους ἢ τὸν πόλεμον ἀναλαμβάνειν. (3.8.2-8)

For [he says that] Hasdrubal, assuming great power in the regions of Iberia, after attending to these things desired eagerly to transfer the form of government into a monarchy after dissolving the laws in Lybia. But the leading men of the government, when they foresaw his plan, conspired and were at variance with him. Hasdrubal, having become suspicious, after retiring from Libya managed the affairs of Iberia according to his policy. He gave no heed to the Carthaginian Senate. Hannibal was a partner and zealous follower of Hasdrubal’s policy from when he was a lad. Then, having succeeded Hasdrubal with respect to the affairs of Iberia, he practiced the same leadership of affairs. Therefore, even now he carried out this war with the Romans in accordance with his plan contrary to the will of the Carthaginians. For not one of the noteworthy men in Carthage approved of the things being done by Hannibal concerning the city of the Saguntines. After saying these things, Fabius says that after the capture of the aforementioned city, the Romans arrived, thinking it necessary for the Carthaginians to deliver over Hannibal or to engage in war.

In other words, according to Fabius, Hannibal adopts the policy of Hasdrubal that enables him to rule from afar and to rule against the will of the Carthaginians. In this view, the Carthaginians become the victims of Hannibal’s heavy hand. For Polybius, though, this argument is unpersuasive. Polybius cites this quotation from Fabius simply to refute it.

Polybius, who is always on the lookout for sloppy historiography, responds to Fabius’ claims by pointing out a few logical inconsistencies in his argument.104

Whereas Eusebius tends to cite sources that he shares some agreement with, Polybius often explicitly cites sources when he disagrees with them.

104 Whereas Eusebius tends to cite sources that he shares some agreement with, Polybius often explicitly cites sources when he disagrees with them.
Now if someone should ask the historian [Fabius], since from the beginning [the Carthaginians] were displeased—just as he says—with the things having been managed by Hannibal, what sort of time would have been more suitable for the Carthaginians or what sort of action would have been more just or more expedient than to hand over the one who was the cause of the injustices to those who demanded [it], if they were persuaded by the Romans at that time, and to destroy with good reason through others the common enemy of the city, to procure the safety in their land, getting rid of the impending war, avenging themselves with a decree alone. What would he be able to say these things? Indeed, it is clear that he would say nothing. For those who refrained from doing something so great as something from the aforementioned things, having fought the war continuously for about 17 years against the policy of Hannibal, dissolved the war no earlier, until having put to the test all their hopes, they finally came to danger with respect to their native city and the bodies in it.

The question that occupies more than half of this passage is complex, but it simply argues that the Carthaginians waged war for way too long to be innocent of this war. They participated in the war for 17 years and did not relent until their city was in danger. Polybius argues that the Carthaginians must have had some reason for not betraying Hannibal, since the Carthaginians would have had every reason to cooperate with the Romans if Hannibal had been harming them. In short, the people of Carthage are also to blame for this war.

Polybius’ assertion that Fabius’ explanation of the cause of the war is inadequate subordinates the voice of Fabius to the voice of Polybius. Doubtless, Fabius would have explained his reasoning further in light of Polybius’ accusation of incompetency. Polybius, though, takes Fabius to task and dismisses his argument and logic as wrongheaded. Polybius directly addresses the inconsistencies between the words of...
Fabius and Polybius’ own assessment, and Polybius’ assessment of Fabius simultaneously becomes a part of Polybius’ narrative. Polybius’ critique, then, of Fabius exhibits a monologic citation methodology.

Polybius similarly takes the historian Philinus to task because Philinus argues that a treaty existed between Rome and Carthage and that Rome broke that treaty (3.26.3-4):

ἀλλὰ πόθεν ἢ πῶς ἐθάρρησε γράψαι τάναντι τούτοις, διότι Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Καρχηδονίοις ὑπάρχοις συνθήκαι, καθ’ ἀς ἐδει Ῥωμαίοις μὲν ἀπέχεσθαι Σικελίας ἀπάσης, Καρχηδονίους δ’ Ἰταλίας, καὶ διότι ὑπερέβαινον Ῥωμαίοι τὰς συνθήκας καὶ τοὺς ὀρκους, ἐπεὶ ἐποιήσαντο τὴν πρώτην εἰς Σικελίαν διάβασιν, μήτε γεγονότος μὴθ’ ὑπάρχοντος παρὰπαν ἐγγράφου τοιοῦτον μηδενός. τὰ τὰ γὰρ ἐν τῇ δευτερά αὐτοίς ὑπερβαίνον πολλάκις ὑπερβαίνον παρὰ τὸν ὑπολαμβάνει τις αὐτούς πεποίησθαι τὴν διάβασιν, ἀγνοεῖ προφανῶς. (3.26.3-5, 7)

But whence or how is he bold enough to write the opposite things in the following words, “That there would be a treaty between the Romans and Carthaginians, in accordance with which it was necessary for the Romans to stay away from all Sicily, and the Carthaginians from Italy, and that the Romans overstepped the treaty and oaths, when they first crossed over to Sicily,” since there absolutely has not been nor exists any such writing. For he says these things explicitly in his second roll. . . . Now if someone supposes that the Romans made a crossing contrary to their oaths and treaty, he is plainly ignorant.

Polybius is citing Philinus διὰ τὸ καὶ πλείους διεμψθαί τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τούτοις, πιστεύσαντας τῇ Φιλίνου γραφή, “because many who have believed Philinus have been deceived by these things” (3.26.5). As was the case with Fabius, Polybius’ only reason for citing Philinus is to refute what he has said and to persuade the reader of his own assessment of affairs.

At the same time, however, Livy records that Rome and Carthage renewed a treaty in 306 B.C.E., and Polybius himself suggests that (in 279 B.C.E.) the Romans
could not use their military in Sicily, and Carthage could not use their military in Italy.\textsuperscript{105} The strength of Polybius’ refutation, then, suggests one of three possibilities: (1) Polybius is naïve regarding this treaty, (2) he is consciously defending Rome’s behavior, or (3) the treaty never existed.\textsuperscript{106} Possibilities 1 and 2 suggest and highlight the rhetorical foundation of Polybius’ argument here, where possibility 3 takes Polybius at face value. This is not the place to decide this issue, but one point is important. Whether Polybius is ignorant of the treaty, lies about the treaty, or is correct that a treaty never existed, he is still simply using Philinus to prove and support Polybius’ own point of view.

In sum, then, when Polybius cites historians, he in no way gives them their own voice. Rather, he critiques their voice and repudiates their assertions. He diminishes their words, and impels the reader to accept Polybius’ voice as the true expert on whatever topic he is addressing. On the rare occasion when he cites other sources, he also uses these sources in a monologic fashion. Polybius diminishes the voice of his sources in order to elevate his own voice to the status of expert and historian extraordinaire.

\textit{Diodorus Siculus}

Diodorus Siculus (c. 80-c. 20 B.C.E.) spent 30 years (60-30 B.C.E.) writing his \textit{Bibliotheca} (“Library”), which was a universal history spanning from before the Trojan


War to 60 B.C.E. (the year he began to write it).\footnote{The total period Diodorus covers after the start of the Trojan War is 1,138 years, by his own calculation (1.5.1). Books 1-6 cover the period before the Trojan War, Books 7-17 the period between the Trojan War and the death of Alexander the Great, and Books 18-40 the period between the death of Alexander the Great and the start of the war between the Celts and the Romans (1.4.6).} Of the 40 books Diodorus wrote, only books 1-5 and 11-20 are extant in their entirety. Fragments remain of the other 25 books.

At times, scholars have seen Diodorus as nothing more than a copyist,\footnote{See, for example, K. Meister, “Absurde Polemik bei Diodor,” Helikon 13-14 (1973-1974): 454-459. Meister argues that Diodorus is simply a copyist because he challenges Ephorus with regard to his account of Agathocles but later uses Ephorus as his main source. Despite Meister’s argument, an author can certainly critique a source but also still rely on that source for its historical narrative. See Charles Edward Muntz, "Diodorus Siculus, Egypt, and Rome" (Ph.D. diss.; Duke University, 2008), 98. Scholars generally view Diodorus as a relatively unsophisticated historiographer.} but he rarely cites his prose sources explicitly. As a result, most of his citations come from poetic texts.\footnote{Of course, many of his sources are no longer extant, so this claim regards the patterns that are evident from the comparison of Dionysius’ narratives to extant sources and any indications he gives concerning whether he is citing a text or not. His literary or documentary citations from the first 32 books include the following: 1.1.2 (Odyssey 1.3), 1.7.7 (Frg. 488, Nauck), 1.11.2 (Odyssey 12.323), 1.11.3, 1.12.2, 1.12.4 (Frg. 302, Kern), 1.12.5 (Iliad 14.302), 1.12.10 (Odyssey 17.485), 1.15.7 (Homer Hymns 1.8), 1.19.4 (Odyssey 14.258), 1.27 (stele), 1.38.4 (Frg. 228, Nauck), 1.45.6 (Iliad 9.381), 1.96.6 (Odyssey 24.1), 1.97 (poet), 2.23.3, 2.25 (military communique), 2.56.7, 3.2.3 (Book 1.423), 3.56.2 (Iliad 14.200), 3.66.3, 3.67.3 (Iliad 2.594), 4.2.4 (Homer Hymns 1.8), 4.7.2 (Odyssey 24.60), 4.32.2 (Iliad 5.638), 4.39.3 (Odyssey 11.602), 4.49.7 (Iliad 5.638), 4.75.2, 4.80.2, 4.85.6, 4.85.7, 5.2.4 (Odyssey 9.109), 5.5.1 (Frg. 5 (Nauck)), 5.28.4, 5.66.6, 5.69.3, 5.79.4, 6.1 (stele), 6.1, 7.12.2, 7.12.5, 7.12.6, 7.5, 7.12.1, 7.16.1, 8.13.2, 8.17.2, 8.21.3, 8.23.2, 8.25.4, 8.27.2, 8.12, 8.17.1, 8.23.1, 8.29.1 (Herodotus 4.15.5), 9.3.1, 9.3.2, 9.6.1, 9.10.4, 9.16.1, 9.20.2, 9.20.3, 9.31.1, 9.31.2, 9.33.2, 9.36.2, 9.36.3, 10.6.4, 10.9.8, 10.22.3, 10.25.2, 11.11.6, 11.14.4, 11.29, 11.33.2, 11.62.3, 12.10.5, 12.14.1, 12.14.2, 12.40.6, 13.24, 13.28, 13.41.3, 13.52, 13.83.1, 14.4, 14.69, 15.52.4, 16.23.5, 16.56.7, 16.88, 16.90, 16.91.2, 17.10.3, 18.8, 18.56, 19.53.5, 19.97, 20.14.6, 22.10, 23.18.1, 24.3.3, 31.25, 32.23, and 32.27.1. (The poetic references come from Oldfather’s Loeb edition.)} While his paraphrases give evidence of an abundance of sources. He
quite clearly states his dependence on sources. For example, in his introduction he states the following:

ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐξ Αγυρίου τῆς Σικελίας ὄντες, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπιμέβην τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πολλὴν ἐμπείριαν τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου περιπεισμένοι, πάσας τὰς τῆς ἡγεμονίας ταύτης πράξεις ἀκριβῶς ἀνελάβομεν ἐκ τῶν παρ᾽ ἐκείνους ὑπομηνύτων ἐκ πολλῶν χρόνων τετηρημένων. (1.4.4)

For because we are from Agyrium in Sicily and because we have acquired much experience with the language of the Romans on account of [our] mingling with those on the island, we have accurately learned all the doings of this government from their public records which have been retained for a long time.

Furthermore, Diodorus has all but dispensed with the use of speeches. The paucity of explicit citations and speeches demonstrates Diodorus’ predisposition to suppress the voice of the other.

Diodorus’ dependence on his sources might lead one to expect that he would explicitly cite those sources frequently. Would not, after all, explicit citations be easier to manage and would they not require less effort on the part of Diodorus? This is, after all,
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111 Oldfather counts four speeches in total. See Charles Henry Oldfather, transl., Diodorus of Sicily (Loeb Classical Library; vol. 1; Harvard University Press, 1960), xxii. See also Diodorus Siculus 1.2.7.
what Eusebius does in the HE. All the necessary conditions for a polyphonic citation methodology exist in Diodorus. Instead of citing his sources extensively, though, Diodorus frequently paraphrases his prose sources. In other words, he does the opposite of Eusebius; he diminishes the voice of previous historiographers by removing their voices and inserting his own voice in their place.

For example, Diodorus explicitly cites the oracle in Herodotus 1.66.2 (quoted earlier in this chapter) but replaces the narrative context of Herodotus with his own voice in 9.36.2: Ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν Ἀρκαδίαν μέλλοντες καταστρέφειν ἐλαβον χρησμόν, Ἀρκαδίαν μ’ αἰτεῖς; μέγα μ’ αἰτεῖς· ὁ τοι δῶσω . . . (“That the Lacedaemonians when they were about to overturn Arcadia received the oracle, ‘You ask me for Arcadia? You ask me for a great thing; I will not give it to you . . .’”) Diodorus cites the entire oracle, which is in verse, but reduces Herodotus’ surrounding narrative into a single laconic line. After he cites the Oracle, he simply moves on to the next point in his narrative. He does not indicate the ambiguity of the oracle, nor does he indicate how it led to the enslavement of Spartans.

Of course, much of the time, Diodorus’ sources are no longer extant. Still, when he cites sources that are extant, he generally summarizes. One might expect, then, that he has done the same with sources that are no longer extant. One of his great values to modern historians is that he (often indirectly) cites sources that are no longer available. For example, Diodorus cites a lengthy, important treaty in book 18. The treaty comes in

---

112 Diodorus frequently conflates one source with another or even many books at the same source into a single narrative. See Robert Drews, “Diodorus and His Sources,” The American Journal of Philology 83 (1962), 383-385.
the aftermath of the death of Alexander the Great. When Alexander the Great dies (in 323 B.C.E.), his wife Roxane has not yet given birth to his son Alexander IV. Dissension follows regarding who should receive Alexander the Great’s kingdom. The Macedonian general Antipater attempts to claim control over the empire but dies in 319 B.C.E. Before he dies, he appoints Polyperchon as regent of Macedonia instead of Antipater’s son Cassander. Cassander eventually seizes control of Athens after Antigonus defeats Polyperchon’s fleet. Diodorus cites the public decree in 18.56, which comprises one of his longest citations. In the midst of the turmoil after the death of Antipater, the Macedonian satrap Polyperchon attempts to gain the allegiance of the Greek cities in the face of war. Diodorus explains the fear that led to the treaty in the following manner:

Now it was clear that Cassander, having been recruited by
Antigonus, would resist the cities across Greece—since some of them
would be guarded by the garrisons belonging to his father, others would be
managed by oligarchies, being ruled by the friends and guest friends of
Antipater, and that Ptolemy, who ruled over Egypt, and Antigonus, who is
clearly already a deserter of the kings, would become allies with these and
that both had great powers and much wealth, and were masters of many
nations and notable cities—therefore, after the plan was set out how war
must be made with these and many various kinds of arguments concerning
the war were spoken, it seemed good to them to free the cities in Greece,
and to dissolve the oligarchies in them which had been established by
Antipater. For in this way they would diminish Cassander, and procure for
themselves great glory and many important allies. Therefore, immediately
after summoning the ambassadors who were present from the cities and
encouraging them to have no fear, they promised that they would destroy
the democracies in the cities, and having written the public decree that was
ratified, they handed it to the ambassadors, in order that, having hastily
returned to their demes, they might report the goodwill of the kings and
commanders to the Greeks.

The decree that follows this introduction shares a similar point of view:

Ἐπειδὴ συμβέβηκε τοῖς προγόνοις ἡμῶν πολλὰ τοὺς Ἑλλήνας
ἐυεργετηκέναι, βουλόμεθα διαφυλάττειν τὴν ἑκεῖνον προαίρεσιν καὶ πάσιν
φανερὰν ποιῆσαι τὴν ἡμετέραν εὐνοιαν ἢν ἔχοντες διατελοῦμεν πρὸς τοὺς
Ἑλλήνας. πρότερον μὲν οὖν Αλεξάνδρου μεταλλάζαντος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων
καὶ τῆς βασιλείας εἰς ἡμᾶς καθηκούσης, ἠγούμενοι δὲν ἐπαναγαγεῖν
πάντας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑιρήνην καὶ τὰς πολιτείας ἀς Φιλίππος ὁ ἡμετέρος πατήρ
cατέστησεν, ἐπεστέλλαμεν εἰς ὀπάσας τὰς πόλεις περὶ τούτων. ἐπεὶ δὲ
συνέβη, μακρὰν ἀπὸντος ἡμῶν, τῶν Ἑλλήνων τίνας μὴ ὀρθῶς
γινόσκοντας πόλεμον ἐξενεγκεῖν πρὸς Μακεδόνας καὶ κρατηθῆναι ὑπὸ
tῶν ἡμετέρων στρατηγῶν καὶ πολλὰ καὶ δυσχερὴ ταῖς πόλεσι συμβῆναι,
tούτων μὲν τοὺς στρατηγοὺς αἰτίους ὑπολαβέτε γεγενήθαι, ἡμεῖς δὲ
τιμῶντες τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς προαίρεσιν κατασκευάζομεν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην,
pολιτείας δὲ προαίρεσιν κατασκευάζομεν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην, πολιτείας δὲ τὰς
ἐπὶ Φιλίππου καὶ Αλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶλα πράττειν κατὰ τὰ διαγράμματα
τὰ πρότερον ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνον γρα φέντα, καὶ τοὺς μεταστάντας ἡ φυγόντας
ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων στρατηγῶν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἄφ᾽ ἄν χρόνων Ἀλεξάνδρος
εἰς τὴν Ασίαν διέβη κατάγομεν· καὶ τοὺς ἄφ᾽ ἡμῶν κατελθόντας πάντα τὰ
αὐτῶν ἔχοντας καὶ ἀστασιάστους καὶ ἀμηνικακουμένους ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν
πατρίσι πολιτεύεσθαι· καὶ εἰ τι κατὰ τοὺτον ἐψῆφιστο, ἀκυρὸν ἔστω, πλὴν
eἰ τινὲς ἄφ᾽ αἴματι ἢ ἀσεβείᾳ κατὰ νόμον πεφεύγασι. μὴ κατίναι δὲ μηδὲ
Μεγαλοπολίτων τοὺς μετὰ Πολυανέτου ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ φεύγοντας μηδὲ
Ἄμφισσεῖς μηδὲ Τρικκαίους μηδὲ Φαρκαδονίους μηδὲ Ἡρακλεώτας· τοὺς
d᾽ ἄλλους καταδεχόμεθασαν πρὸ τῆς τριακάδος τοῦ ἐπαθθικοῦ μηνός. εἰ δὲ
Since it has fallen to the lot of our forebears to show much kindness to the Greeks, we wish to observe their policy and to make clear to all the goodwill that we continue to have toward the Greeks. In the first place, therefore, when Alexander quit from humankind and his kingdom came down to us, considering it necessary to return all [people] to peace and the forms of government that our father Philip established, we sent to all the cities concerning these affairs. But when it happened, while we were far away, that some of the Greeks, who were not perceiving correctly, began war against the Macedonians and were conquered by our generals and many vexatious things happened to the cities, understand that the generals have been responsible for these affairs, and we—holding the policy in honor from the beginning—are establishing peace for you and we are effecting the forms of government and the remainder of affairs in accordance with the earlier ordinances having been written by them in the presence of Philip and Alexander. And we are bringing back those who revolted or fled from the cities because of our generals from the times [when] Alexander crossed into Asia; and those who return because of us will live as free citizens with all their possessions, free from faction and enjoying amnesty in their own fatherlands. And if anything has been decided by vote against these [people], let it be obsolete, except if some have gone into exile for bloodshed or impiety in accordance with the law. Those of the Megalopolites going into exile for treason, together with Polyaenetus, will not return, nor those from Amphissa, Triccaeus, Pharcadonius, or Heraclea. But let [the cities] receive home the others before the thirtieth day of Xanthicus. Now if Philip or Alexander published any of the acts of administration contrary to one another, let them come to us in order that, after setting [them] right, they might achieve benefits for both the cities and us. The Athenians will have the other things just as in the time of Philip and Alexander, and the Oropians will have Oropus just as at present. We are giving Samos to the Athenians, since our father Philip also gave [it to them]. All the Greeks will make a decree not to wage war or to do things contrary to us. And if not, he and his family will go into exile and lose their possessions. We have
commanded Polyperchon to undertake [the affairs] concerning these things and the rest. Therefore, just as we wrote you earlier, you listen to him. For we will not yield to those who refuse to do any [one] of the things that we have written.

The decree itself does not mention democracy but does mention some other stipulations (such as the death of some oligarchs in 57.1). Nevertheless, the decree still correlates with the purpose Diodorus seeks to drive home with his narrative; Polyperchon and the notables of Macedonia are afraid of approaching war and are doing their best to enervate the alliances between Cassander and the oligarchs in the Greek cities. Monologization does not require a citation and narrative to mention all the same points. Rather, monologization occurs when an author’s point of view diminishes the point of view of the citation, so that the citation merely serves the author’s point of view. This decree serves the author’s point of view by confirming the fear of Polyperchon and his colleagues. Had the citation occurred by itself, the fear that Diodorus claims prompted these actions would not be apparent.

Finally, Diodorus’ citation of Polybius illustrates the way Diodorus transforms the language of his sources into his own language. During the Third Punic War (149-146 B.C.E.), the war between Rome and the Phoenician colony Carthage, the Carthaginians valiantly resist a Roman siege before succumbing to their legendary fate. Diodorus narrates this dramatic fate by citing Polybius’ account of Scipio as Scipio watches Carthage meet its end.\(^\text{115}\)

---


\(^{115}\) Appian also cites this passage, but much more faithfully. For an analysis of Appian's citation of Polybius, see the section on Appian below.
Ὅτι τής Καρχηδόνος ἐμπρησθείσης καὶ τῆς φλογὸς ἀπασαν τὴν πόλιν καταπληκτικῶς λυμαινομένης, ὁ Σκιπίων ἀπροσποιήτως ἐδάκρυεν. ἔρωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυβίου τοῦ ἐπιστάτου τίνος ἐνεκα τοῦτο πάσχει εἴπε, Διότι τῆς κατὰ τὴν τύχην μεταβολῆς ἔννοιαν λαμβάνω· ἔσεσθαι γὰρ ἰσος ποτὲ τινὰ καφρὸν ἐν ὦ τὸ παραπλήσιον πάθος ὑπάρξει κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην· καὶ τούτοις τοὺς στίχους παρὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ προηνέγκατο, ἔσεσται ἡμαρ ὧταν ποτ’ ὀλώλῃ Ἰλιος ἱρή καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαός. (32.24.1 ≈ Polybius 38.22.1)

[He says that] when Carthage was set on fire and when the flame had astonishingly cleansed the entire city, Scipio wept wholeheartedly. When he was asked by Polybius who stood nearby why he suffered, he said, “Because I’m reflecting on the vicissitudes of Fortune. For perhaps at some time there will be a time in which equal suffering will belong to Rome.” And he uttered these lines from the Poet,

There will be a day when sacred Troy has perished, both Priam and the people.

Diodorus’ cites Polybius’ citation of Homer rather precisely,116 but Diodorus’ transmission of the rest of Polybius’ account is rather loose. In fact, one could say that Diodorus has summarized everything in this narrative of Polybius except for the citation of Homer, which he cites explicitly (essentially making Homer a prophet). This “citation” demonstrates how Diodorus does away with the voice of his sources and substitutes his own voice in their place. Diodorus is in essence epitomizing his sources; he is clearly reliant on them but he subsumes their language into his own narrative.

Diodorus, then, demonstrates a monologic citation methodology in two ways. First, he typically does not allow the voice of his historiographic sources to speak explicitly. Rather, he puts their language into his own words and creates his own narrative as a result. The only genre he tends to cite on a regular basis is poetry, although citing poetry explicitly is typical of most of the Greek and Hellenistic historiographers.

116 Even then, however, Diodorus has slipped off the end of the Homer citation, or the rest of the Homer citation did not survive in the excerpt.
Poetry held unique cultural authority in the ancient world, and authors and readers alike could easily recognize poetry due to its cultural cachet and (at the very least) due to its meter. Second, like previous historiographers, when Diodorus uses citations, he uses them to support his own narrative instead of presenting them as evidence that in some way speaks for itself.

**Josephus**

Josephus (37-c. 100 C.E.) was a Jewish historiographer and priest who wrote extensively about the history of the Jews for a Roman audience.¹¹⁷ A commander of Galilee at one point, he composed the *Jewish War* (probably finishing it in 79 C.E.) to narrate events from the Maccabean revolt (beginning in 164 B.C.E.) to the end of the war between the Romans and the Judeans (70 C.E.). In his lengthy work the *Jewish Antiquities* (which he probably finished around 94 C.E.), Josephus narrates the events pertaining to the history of the Jews from creation until the events preceding the Jewish War. In addition, he wrote a short apology in c. 97 C.E., *Against Apion*, in order to defend the Jews from the calumny of (primarily Egyptian) writers who maligned Judaism between the third century B.C.E. and 40 C.E. He also wrote his *Life* (which he finished perhaps c. 99 C.E.), which appeared at the end of the *Jewish Antiquities* and (among other things) justified some of the decisions he made during his time as commander in Galilee.

---

¹¹⁷ He also wrote the *Jewish War* in Aramaic for a Jewish audience, but this work is no longer extant.
Josephus constitutes an important source for Eusebius. Scholars have suggested that Eusebius has borrowed some of his methodology from him.\textsuperscript{118} That may be true, but Eusebius relies much more on quotations than Josephus does, which drastically changes the force of Eusebius’ narrative. While quotations constitute approximately 45% of the first seven books of Eusebius’s HE, quotations of speeches or documents constitute only approximately 11% of Josephus’ AJ, 9.3% of Josephus’ \textit{Jewish War} (BJ), and 15.5% of Josephus’ CA.\textsuperscript{119} Moreover, many of the quotations in Josephus are speeches and not documents,\textsuperscript{120} whereas most of Eusebius’ quotations in the first seven books of the HE are excerpts from documents or texts. Eusebius clearly relies to a much greater extent than Josephus does on the citation of texts and documents.

\textsuperscript{118} See, for example, Inowlocki, \textit{Eusebius and the Jewish Authors}, 51. Inowlocki suggests that Josephus CA is closest to Eusebius’ citation methodology.

\textsuperscript{119} All of Josephus’ works rely on quotations and citations much less than Eusebius’ HE. The exact statistics for these four works (in descending order of quotation concentration) are as follows:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Work} & \textbf{Books} & \textbf{Percent Quotations} & \textbf{Quotation Word Count} & \textbf{Total Word Count} & \textbf{Number of Quotations} \\
\hline
Eusebius, HE & 1-7 & 44.83\% & 30,377 & 67,755 & 332 \\
Josephus, CA & 1-2 & 15.54\% & 3,534 & 22,744 & 20 \\
Josephus, AJ & 1-20 & 11.33\% & 34,655 & 305,805 & 437 \\
Josephus, BJ & 1-7 & 9.29\% & 11,633 & 125,274 & 71 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE and Josephus’ CA, AJ, and BJ}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{120} Josephus, unfortunately, is not as transparent as Thucydides is and does not explicitly reveal the method he uses to reconstruct speeches. Although he was probably privy to some speeches, many of his speeches constitute complete reconstructions based upon what Josephus felt was most suitable for the character delivering the speech.
This section will focus on two different works by Josephus: the AJ and the CA. The AJ alone provides more material than this chapter will be able to cover, but the CA seems to be closest to Eusebius’ own citation methodology.\footnote{Inowlocki, \textit{Eusebius and the Jewish Authors}, 51.} Therefore, this section will draw from both works to illustrate how Josephus uses a monologic citation methodology.

In the CA, Josephus characterizes his citations as witnesses in court. In my first example from the CA from 1.74-75, Josephus illustrates this characterization with a citation from Manetho, an Egyptian high priest and historiographer who wrote around 280 B.C.E. Josephus adumbrates his methodology in this fashion: οὗτος δή τοῖνον ὁ Μάνεθως ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ταύτα περὶ ἡμῶν γράφει. παραθήσομαι δὲ τὴν λέξιν αὐτοῦ καθὼς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον παραγαγόν μάρτυρα. (“Now this Manetho writes the following concerning us in the second book of his \textit{Egyptian Histories}. I will cite as evidence his text just as if I were introducing that man as a witness.”) Josephus’ courtroom analogy positions Josephus as a jurist and suggests that he is far from indifferent from the text he is citing.\footnote{Josephus’ judicial approach could in part come from textual traditions in the East or in Egypt. See Niclas Förster, “Geschichtsforschung als Apologie,” in Zuleika Rodgers, ed., \textit{Making History: Josephus And Historical Method} (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 170. See also 1.4, 1.59, and 1.69.} Indeed, he plans to adjudicate this witness before the reader. He is attempting to correct Manetho’s errant history, \footnote{Daniel S. Richter, \textit{Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 186} and he hopes the reader will understand why Manetho’s history is inadequate. Much like Polybius, Josephus is critiquing his sources and looking for weaknesses, so that he can refute his opponents.
After Manetho narrates how a dishonorable people (who eventually became the Judeans) came out of the East, subdued the Egyptians, and desired to extinguish them, he introduces and explains the meaning of the moniker for this people. Josephus uses different readings from two different manuscript traditions in order to elucidate this moniker:  

\[\text{ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ τὸ σύμπαν αὐτῶν ἔθνος Ὑκσώς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν βασιλέας ποιμένες: τὸ γὰρ ὅ ἐκαθ᾽ ἱερὰν γλῶσσαν βασιλέα σημαίνει, τὸ δὲ σῶς ποιμήν ἔστι καὶ ποιμένες κατὰ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον, καὶ οὖτως συντιθέμενον γίνεται Ὑκσώς. τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτοὺς Ἀραβᾶς εἶναι. [έν δὲ ἄλλῳ ἀντιγράφῳ οὐ βασιλέας σημαίνεσθαι διὰ τῆς ὑπό προσηγορίας, ἀλλὰ τούναντιν αἰχμαλώτους δηλοῦσθαι ποιμένας: τὸ γὰρ ὅ πάλιν Αἰγυπτιστὶ καὶ τὸ ὅ δασυνόμενον αἰχμαλώτους ῥητῶς μηνύει. καὶ τοῦτο μᾶλλον πιθανότερον μοι φαίνεται καὶ παλαιὰς ἱστορίας ἔχομεν.]} (CA 1.82-85)

Now their entire people were called Hyksos, that is, “shepherd kings.” For the “Hyk” means “king” in their sacred language, and the “sos” is “a shepherd” or “shepherds” in the common language, and thus when combined it became “Hyksos.” Now some say that they are Arabian. [Now in another copy it is said that through the name “Hyk” it is not “kings” that are meant but rather that the word signifies the opposite, captive shepherds. For in the Egyptian language the “Hak,” which is aspirated, in turn precisely indicates “captives.” And this seems more plausible to me and what follows ancient histories closely.]

On the one hand, Josephus seems to allow the reader to decide for himself or herself what the morpheme “Hyk” means. On the other hand, this particular passage has troubled scholars for a number of years because Josephus has not before mentioned another copy of the manuscript and because the second option undermines the authority of the first

---

124 This narrative is but one of five distinct narratives regarding the origin of the Exodus narrative. For a helpful summary and table, see John M.G. Barclay and Steve Mason, Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary (vol. 10: Against Apion; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 341-342.
etymology. Scholars have offered three proposals: (1) the entirety of the bracketed portion could be a Christian interpolation; (2) Josephus may have worked with an already interpolated edition of a manuscript that included the bracketed portion, and he has slavishly copied that source; or (3) Josephus may have added the “captive” proposal himself in the bracketed portion but has done a poor job incorporating it. In general, scholars have preferred option 2. This chapter will not solve this debate but will instead point out that none of these three options suggests that Josephus is using a polyphonic citation methodology. If the entire bracketed portion merely constitutes a later Christian interpolation, the bracketed words do not belong to Josephus and so do not suggest that he is proposing an alternative etymology. If Josephus is working from a manuscript that already contains the bracketed portion as an interpolation and is merely being a dutiful scribe, then he has not necessarily introduced an etymology contrary to his own point of view. He has simply cited more than is necessary. Although he touches on the topic again in 1.93, nothing there presents any major conflicts between the voice of the narrator and the voice of Manetho. Finally, if Josephus has added the alternate explanation himself, he has not diverged from the historiographic tradition that uses monologic citation methodologies. From Herodotus onward, historiographers do occasionally give readers options when ambiguous evidence presents itself, although this

---


126 Ibid., 57.

127 Ibid.

128 Some oddities do exist, but no major difference in voice or point of view occurs. See ibid.
ambiguous evidence typically arises in the narrative itself and not in citations. Still, when historiographers give the readers options for interpreting a citation, they are not necessarily creating dissonance between the text they cite and their own point of view. Rather, they are analyzing the ambiguities of the text they cite and delineating a finite number of possible interpretations from which the reader may choose. They in no way expect the reader to identify any options other than the ones they proffer.

Josephus gives two reasons why the latter etymology is the more possible. First, that explanation seems more reasonable to himself. Second, the latter option finds support among ancient histories. (In other words, he appeals to credibility.) He does not give any support for the first option in his conclusion. Josephus’ aside does not constitute polyphony. Josephus is fully aware of the alternate ways of interpreting the text, and he delineates these ways of interpreting the text to the reader. He simply indicates that two different manuscript traditions exist, and then he indicates which tradition he finds most compelling. He does not invite the reader to disagree with his explanation of the two options, but rather he invites the reader to choose between the two options that he as narrator provides. If the reader were to decide that neither of Josephus’ options is compelling, then the reader would be using Josephus’ text in a polyphonic manner. Josephus expects the reader to defer to the voice of the narrator. When he gives the reader options, he expects the reader to choose from among the options he offers.

After clarifying the ambiguity of the moniker Hyksos, Josephus maintains continuity in his narrative. He continues to cite Manetho’s narrative regarding how the Hyksos oppressed the Egyptians, the Egyptians subjugated the Hyksos, and the Hyksos
agreed to leave Egypt and ended up building a city in Judea called Jerusalem. Josephus then adduces a second book by Manetho, and explains after the citation that he will defer its treatment until a later point in his narrative, which he does. Josephus addresses each of the citations of Manetho, whether in the immediate context of the citation or later in his narrative, in order to refute them.\footnote{His refutations use a variety of strategies, not all of which are native to Greek rhetorical art. For example, Josephus generally supports the Egyptian textual tradition (neglecting the oral tradition) but claims that Manetho has not been loyal to that textual tradition. See Richter, *Cosmopolis*, 186; Gerald P. Verbrugghe and John Moore Wickersham, *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 107; and Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison, *Josephus’ Contra Apionem* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 303-307. Scholars have debated the authenticity of the Manetho accounts. See Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev, “The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus’ and Manetho’s Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974-1990),” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 24: 224-234.}

Josephus keeps very close track of what Manetho says, so that he may deal with his disparaging comments toward the Judeans.\footnote{Josephus in many ways undermines his own argument, which has had effects that have carried into the present day. Josephus portrays the Jews as both a young nation and a violent nation that subjugated more than one people. See Yaacov Shavit, *History in Black: African-Americans in Search of an Ancient Past* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 262-265.}

In the second book of the CA, Josephus again continues to exert control over the text that he cites. When he sets out to debunk the various proposals that others have made regarding the Judeans, he begins to address these issues in the following manner:

\[\text{Ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὗτε Αἰγύπτιοι τὸ γένος ἦσαν Ἦμων οἱ πατέρες οὗτε διὰ λύμην σωμάτων ἢ τοιαύτας ὀλλας συμφοράς τινας ἔκειθεν ἐξηλάθησαν, οὐ μετρίως μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πέρα τοῦ συμμέτρου προαποδεδεῖχθαι νομίζω. περὶ ὧν δὲ προστίθησιν ὁ Ἀπίων ἐπιμνησθήσομαι συντόμως. φησί γὰρ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν τάδε . . . .} \text{(CA 2.8-10)}\]

Therefore, that our fathers were not Egyptians with respect to race, nor were they driven out from that place on account of disfigurement of their bodies or some set of other misfortunes,\footnote{This translation, at the recommendation of Victor Castellani (personal communication, 16 May 2015), renders the word λύμη as “disfigurement” rather than “maltreatment.” This term refers to divine affliction rather than human mistreatment. See Bezalel Bar-Kokhva, *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: The Hellenistic Period* (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2010), 116.} I think that I have proved not
only pretty well but also beyond measure, but I will briefly make mention of the things which Apion submits. For he says the following in the third book of his *Egyptian Histories* . . .

Josephus’ posture toward the text he is citing is clearly antagonistic. Again, Josephus’ posture resembles the posture Polybius assumes when he addresses Fabius. Josephus intends to repudiate Apion. He addresses the text that follows for the sake of completeness. After citing Apion’s assertion that Moses built an obelisk and prayed in the custom of his ancestors, \(^{132}\) Josephus refutes his claims:

\[
\text{τοιαύτη μέν τις ἡ θαυμαστὴ τοῦ γραμματικοῦ φράσις: τὸ δὲ ψεῦδον λόγον οὐ δεόμενον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων περιφανές: οὔτε γὰρ αὐτὸς Μωσῆς, ὅτε τὴν πρῶτην σκηνὴν τῷ θεῷ κατεσκεύασεν, οὔθεν ἐκτύπωμα τοιόντων εἰς αὐτὴν ἐνέθηκεν οὐδὲ ποιεῖν τοὺς ἐπείτα προσέταξεν, ὦ τε μετὰ ταύτα κατασκευάσας τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις Σολομῶν πάσης ἀπέσχετο τοιαύτης περιεργίας οίναν συμπέπλεκεν Ἀπίων. (CA 2.12) \]

Such is the marvelous diction of the grammarian, the lie of his words not being necessary [to refute], but conspicuous from his actions. For Moses himself, when he constructed the first tabernacle for God, by no means put into [the tabernacle] such a figure of relief nor commanded those afterwards to do [such a thing]. After this, Solomon who prepared the Temple in Jerusalem abstained from all such over-elaboration such as what Apion has weaved together . . .

Josephus repudiates the idea that Moses created an obelisk. He addresses his voice against Apion, so that the reader (he hopes) will have no doubt about the falseness of Apion’s words. The narrator expects the reader to adopt the narrator’s point of view, if the narrator has done his job well. Again, Josephus is using a monologic framework as he adduces evidence to persuade his reader of his point of view.

---

Josephus’ quotations often have a monologic quality when he agrees with their content as well.\(^{133}\) In book 16 of the AJ, for example, when Greeks in the cities of Asia mistreated the Jews (16.160-161), Josephus appends to his narrative six different Roman imperial decrees that speak favorably of the Jews (16.162-173).\(^{134}\) In 16.161, Josephus introduces these letters with the following words: ὁ δ᾽ αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἱσοτέλειαν ἐδωκεν γράψας τοῖς κατὰ τὰς ἐπαρχίας, ὃν ὑπετάξαμεν τὰ ἀντίγραφα μαρτύρια τῆς διαθήσεως, ἣν ἔσχον ὕπερ ἢμῶν ἀνωθεν οἱ κρατοῦντες. (“Now he [Caesar Augustus] gave to them the same equality, writing to those in the provinces, from which we append the copied testimonies of the arrangement, which those who ruled held from above on our behalf.”) Josephus is simply attaching documents much in the way Eusebius might attach documents, but Josephus limits the voice in these documents. After Josephus finishes citing the letters, he exerts his control by clarifying his reason for including letters in his narrative:

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παρεθέμην ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἐπειδὴ μέλλουσιν αἱ τῶν ἡμετέρων πράξεων ἀναγραφαί τὸ πλέον εἰς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἴνα, δεικνύσαι αὐτοῖς ὅτι πᾶσι τιμῆς ἄνωθεν ἐπιτυγχάνοντες οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων ἐκολούθημεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἄρχοντων πράττειν, ἄλλα καὶ συνεργοῦμεθα τὰ τῆς θρησκείας ἔχοντες καὶ τῶν εἰς τὸν θεὸν τιμῶν. ποιοῦμαι δὲ πολλάκις αὐτῶν τὴν μνήμην ἐπιδιαλλάττων τὰ γένη καὶ τὰς ἐμπερικοίς τοῖς ἀλογιστοῖς ἢμῶν τε κάκεινον μίσους αἰτίας ὑπὲξαιροῦμενος. (AJ 16.174-175)

I juxtaposed these things, then, by necessity, since the copies of our achievements are likely to go toward the Greeks, showing them that by obtaining honor from all from long ago we have by no means been

---

\(^{133}\) Their monologic quality perhaps stems in part from the uniqueness of Josephus as a Jewish writer. Josephus tends to be much more apologetic than other Jewish writers from the same period. See Victor Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,” EOS: Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum 48: 169-193.

\(^{134}\) One other possible citation from a text exists in book 16, namely the citation in 16.317. Josephus seems unlikely to have had access to this source. Similarly, see 17.134-139.
prevented by the rulers from performing our ancestral customs, but rather we have cooperated while practicing the things pertaining to our service of and honor to God. I often make mention of these things to bring to reconciliation the peoples and to remove the causes of hatred ingrown among the unreasonable of both them [the Gentiles] and us [the Jews].

For Josephus, these citations have a clear purpose and a finalized meaning (δεικνύω αὐτοῖς, “to show to them”). Josephus cites these decrees, so that his Greek readers may know that Roman rulers have held Jews in high esteem from long ago and so that he might remove hatred from unreasonable people among Jews and Gentiles.135 Josephus does not anticipate any other possible meaning or significance from these letters. These citations have a monologic purpose; they do the work the author and narrator meant for them to do.

Similarly, when a revolt arose in Alexandria in the narrative of book 19, Josephus includes two edicts that Claudius sent (19.278-291), one to Alexandria and the other to the rest of the empire. Like the edicts Josephus includes in book 16, these edicts grant Josephus the opportunity to demonstrate what Claudius thought about the Jews. After the second edict, Josephus sums up the significance of the two edicts:

Τούτοις μὲν δὴ τοῖς διατάγμασιν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειάν τε καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν ἀποσταλέσθην ἐδήλωσεν ἢν περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἔχοι γνώμην Κλαύδιος Καίσαρ: αὐτίκα δὲ Ἀγρίππαν κομιούμενον τὴν βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τιμαῖς λαμπροτέραις ἐξέπεμψε τοῖς ἔπὶ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν ἠγεμόσιν καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις διὰ γραμμάτων ἐπιστείλας ἐράσμιον ἄγειν αὐτόν. (AJ 19.292)

Claudius Caesar, with these edicts that were sent to Alexandria and to the entire inhabited world, makes clear what his opinion is of the Judeans. He immediately sent out Agrippa who received his kingdom with more

---

135 The theme has come up before in 14.186 and reflects Josephus’ desire for all to know of the admiration Jews received from rulers. See Jack Pastor, Pnina Stern, and Menahem Mor, Flavius Josephus (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 139.
illustrious honors, having given orders in writing to the governors in the provinces and the procurators to treat them amicably.

The reason Josephus includes these edicts is to demonstrate that the Jews were beloved by Claudius. Moreover, a general congruence exists between Claudius’ edicts and Josephus’ assessment of the significance of these edicts, even if Josephus overstates the special affection Claudius has for the Jews.136

Despite some similarities between Josephus and Eusebius, the two assume different postures toward the sources they cite. Josephus adopts a monologic citation methodology, which is in line with the historiographic tradition that precedes him and in keeping with his aim to refute or correct. Josephus cites texts to support his narrative argument. He diminishes the voice of these texts on points where they might disagree with the narrator. Chapter 3 will show that Eusebius, on the other hand, gives far more freedom to his sources than Josephus does. A comparison of the percentage of each work that constitutes citations or quotations supports the idea that Eusebius has introduced a democratization of his sources. Whereas the highest concentration of quotations in Josephus hovers around 15%, the first seven books of Eusebius’ HE have a concentration closer to 45%. In both quantity and quality, Eusebius gives more control of his narrative to his citations than Josephus does.

136 Josephus perhaps reads more into these edicts than he should. Claudius’ language is probably de rigueur for these sorts of edicts. See Myles Lavan, Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 222-223. Interestingly, Claudius’s second edict speaks of the Jews’ loyalty to the Roman Empire instead of to the Emperor himself, which is more characteristic of the Roman Republic than of the Roman Empire. Some debate exists over the authenticity of this documentary evidence. See Michael E. Stone, Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984), 226.
Acts of the Apostles

The book of Acts (published c. 90-110) is the second part of a two-part work, the first volume of which is the Gospel of Luke. Neither Acts nor the Gospel of Luke names its author. Despite the fact that the same author almost certainly composed the Gospel of Luke and Acts as a single work, Acts never appears next to the Gospel of Luke in any early manuscripts. Scribes separated these two works in order to group the Gospel of Luke with the other Gospels. Acts, on the other hand, never quite fit the Gospel genre and often abutted the Catholic Epistles instead (many of which the apostles “greater than Paul” putatively authored). 137 Acts narrates the early days of the church and the proclamation of the gospel throughout the Mediterranean world and ending in Rome. Acts is rather unique in terms of its subject matter and certainly breaks the mold of the kind of historiography the reader has encountered so far in this chapter. Acts deals very little with wars, politics, and ethnography.

The book of Acts includes a number of citations from the Hebrew Bible and two citations of letters, one from the Jerusalem Council to Antioch in 15:23-29 and the other from Claudius Lysias to Governor Felix in 23:26-30. 138 Both letters have raised the


138 The proportion of citations in Acts is quite small compared to Eusebius. The following calculations are based on the Greek *text* of the NA28 (without taking into account the critical apparatus):
question of authenticity,\textsuperscript{139} but this question is of little importance here.\textsuperscript{140} Whether the words constitute the author of Acts’s reconstruction of the letters or reproduce the exact wording of documents the author somehow had in possession, the author still presents them as the voice of the other in a more unequivocal way than the speeches do. The speeches cited in the works of ancient historiographers generally represent an author’s

| Table 6. Concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE and Acts of the Apostles |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Work | Books | Percent Citations | Citation Word Count | Total Word Count | Number of Citations |
| Eusebius, HE | 1-7 | 44.83% | 30,377 | 67,755 | 332 |
| Acts (All Citations, Speeches, and Letters) | (All) | 32.16% | 5,936 | 18,455 | 181 |
| Acts (All Known Citations) | (All) | 4.09% | 755 | 18,455 | 155 |


\textit{Criswell Theological Review} 5 (1990): 31. Many of the smaller quotations occur inside larger quotations. These statistics account for that fact. Note that the known citations of Acts are, on average, quite short. (The known citations exclude the speeches and letters, since no way exists to confirm whether these are indeed citations or authorial reconstructions.) Their shortness places them in a different category of citation. That is to say, some of these citations constitute citations of the HB (as a way of incarnating the God of Israel through Jesus—see Richard B. Hays, \textit{Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness} [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014]), whereas others undoubtedly come from biblical phrases that had made their way into the author’s vocabulary and so merely constitute the author’s own manner of speaking. The Gospel of Luke has only half this concentration of HB citations (1.78%). Note also that the author of the book of Acts appears to have reconstructed most of the citations in the book. This assumption does not, however, necessarily exclude polyphony. Still, the author of Acts has created a largely monologic text.


\textsuperscript{140} Questions of authenticity have occupied biblical scholars for too long.
reconstruction of historical speeches,\textsuperscript{141} whereas documentary evidence at least suggests that the author has copied material from a surviving text, even if that suggestion is sometimes specious. In any case, the author of Acts uses a monologic citation methodology, which is especially evident in the citations of these two letters. This section will demonstrate the monologic character of the two citations of letters in Acts.

The letter in Acts 15:23-29 appears to do just what the narrator hopes it will do. In Acts 14:26, Paul and his companion Barnabas return to Antioch, and then some men from Judea come to Antioch and teach that Gentiles need circumcision to receive salvation. When dissension arises as a result, the church at Antioch sends Paul and Barnabas to pose the question to the apostles and elders (15:2). After the apostles and elders address the question, the author of Acts introduces the letter in 15:22-23a:

\begin{quote}
Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκλεξαμένους ἀνδρας ἔξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρναβᾷ, Ἰούδαν τὸν καλοῦμενον Βαρσαββᾶν καὶ Σιλᾶν, ἀνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν . . . .
\end{quote}

It seemed good to the apostles and elders together with the whole church that men having been chosen from them should be sent to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, Judas (who is called Barsabbas) and Silas, leading men among the brothers, having written through their hand . . . .

\textsuperscript{141} Most of the time, modern scholars implicitly read Thucydides’ statement of methodology as a preface to any historical work that uses speeches such as the book of Acts. This practice perhaps comes from the common sense nature of Thucydides’ methodology; since scribes do not usually transcribe speeches at the moment of delivery, historians must reconstruct them from their own memory or the memory of others as best they can. Nevertheless, reading this methodology into every ancient historical work that cites speeches might mislead the modern reader in other ways by reading the methodology of one work into all the ancient works that present the same problem. Some authors may not have been as self-conscious as Thucydides was in his methodology. This is not the place, however, to take up this quibble in full.
This introduction aligns closely with the letter that follows below. The apostles and elders were sending the men to Antioch as witnesses to the decision of the Council, and according to the letter:

Οἵ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτεροὶ ἀδελφοί τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κυπρίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν χαίρειν. Ἡπειροὶ ἤκουσαμεν ὃτι πινεῖς ἐξ ἡμῶν [ἐξειλθόντες] ἐπάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις ἄνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν οἷς οὐ διεστελλόμεθα, ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένους ὁμοθυμάδων ἐκλεξιμένους ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς σὺν τοῖς ἁγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Παύλῳ, ἀνθρώπους παραδεδοκόσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰουδαῖον καὶ Σιλᾶν καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά. ἔδοξεν γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἄγιῳ καὶ ἡμῖν μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιθέσθαι ύμῖν βάρος πληθοῦσαν τῶν ἑπάναγχος, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πυκτῶν καὶ πορνείας, ἐξ ᾗ διατηροῦντες ἑαυτούς εὐ πράξετε. ἔρρωσθε. (Acts 15:23-29)

The apostles and elders who are brothers, to those brothers from the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, greetings. Since we heard that some of us, whom we did not command, disturbed you, upsetting your hearts with words, it seemed good to us who were chosen with one purpose to send men to you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, who have entrusted their lives on behalf of the name the Lord Jesus Christ. We have therefore sent Judas and Silas who themselves are proclaiming the same things through their speech. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to add no further burden to you within the following things that are necessary: to abstain from things offered to idols, from blood, from strangled things, and from “non-kosher” sex, from which you do well to keep yourselves free. Farewell.

142 This translation uses “non-kosher” loosely, since the word “kosher” typically relates to food. The point is that all of the elements in this particular list appear to pertain to ritual rather than moral purity. James seems to be establishing bare minimum requirements regarding what it would take for Gentiles to get along well with Jews (at least, from the viewpoint of the author of Luke). “Immorality,” and even “impurity,” have moral connotations and do not match the context. Still, πορνεία, as a general term, would include prohibitions from the Torah, such as incest, adultery, etc. See Pervo, Acts, 377-379. For an opposing view of the role of ritual purity in Acts 15, see Jonathan Klawans, Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 151. Klawans argues that Jews do not view Gentiles as a source of ritual impurity. While that generally seems to be the case, the author of Acts does suggest that the character of James, at least, believes some Jews view Gentiles as a source of ritual impurity. (Peter, of course, takes a more liberal approach in 15:7-11.)
The letter concerns itself with establishing credibility with its recipients. The letter commends and esteems Paul, Barnabas, Judas, and Silas, who are bearing the letter back to Antioch, just as the introduction to the citation states. Furthermore, the letter reflects the conclusions reached by James in 15:19-20 concerning the requisite abstentions for Gentiles.

The voice of the narrator and the voice of the letter are congruent with one another. Acts 15:30-31 confirms the delivery of the letter and the positive response it received from the church in Antioch. Nothing suggests that the narrator has a point of view different from the letter. The narration is straightforwardly monologic.

Similarly, the letter from Claudius Lysias to Governor Felix in 23:26-30 further demonstrates the monologic character of the citation methodology:


Claudius Lysias to the most excellent governor Felix, greetings. After coming on this man, who was arrested by the Judeans and about to be condemned to death by them, with my army, I rescued him after I learned that he was Roman. And desiring to know why they were accusing him, I brought him down to their Sanhedrin, and I discovered that he was being accused concerning questions of their own law, having a charge in no way worthy of death or fetters. When the imminent plot was revealed to me to be against this man, I sent him immediately to you having instructed also his accusers to speak before you concerning him.

Many elements of this letter correspond to the preceding narrative in Acts. Consider, for example, the following: When the ordeal started, Israelites seized Paul because he was
putatively teaching against the people, the Law, and the Temple (21:28). When the people were seeking Paul’s death, the military tribune heard of the confusion and brought his soldiers and centurions to address the situation (21:31-32). The military tribune brought Paul back to the barracks (21:37) and later discovered, before flogging him, that he was a Roman citizen (22:27-29). He brought Paul to the Sanhedrin to find out why they were accusing him (22:30), and Paul claimed that he was being put on trial over the resurrection of the dead (23:6), which prompted a debate. Paul’s sister’s son caught wind of an ambush and informed Claudius (23:17-21), and then Claudius prepared for a hasty departure to Felix (23:23-24). Although the narrative lacks a few specifics (such as the charge being unworthy of death or fetters), most of the details of the letter correspond closely to the narrative that precedes it. The lack of an exact correspondence of specifics, of course, does not imply that the citation methodology is polyphonic, unless a central claim of the narrative about the letter is missing from the letter. One could explain the minor differences as merely reflecting the knowledge Claudius Lysias would have had under the circumstances. The citation is only a tool for the narrator and does not offer its own voice, and the citation is (for the most part) functioning just as the narrator intends.

In addition to the letters, Acts also cites the Hebrew Bible, but in ways that might seem polyphonic. These sorts of citations appear to be precursors to a phenomenon that will become much broader in Eusebius’ HE, and they are rare in the context of classical historiography. These Hebrew Bible citations in Acts sometimes take the form of a

---

143 This military tribune (tribunus militum) is somewhat atypical inasmuch as he listens to a man of lower rank before the flogging of Paul. See Laurie Brink, *Soldiers in Luke-Acts: Engaging, Contradicting and Transcending the Stereotypes* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 118.
reversed pesher, where interpreters interpret a prophetic text to refer to events in their own day or some day in the near future. Most of these citations of the Hebrew Bible occur in speeches, where a speaker is using these citations to persuade an audience. Perhaps the longest citation occurs in Acts 2:17-21 in Peter’s speech in Jerusalem. The citation comes from Joel 3:1-5:

καὶ ἕσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοί ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὁμοίας καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνιασθήσονται· καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἑκείναις ἐκχεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. καὶ ὁ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἵμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καὶ κόρο. ὁ ἡλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἵμα, πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. καὶ ἕσται πᾶς ὁ ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὅνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται. (Acts 2:17-21)

And it will be the last days, God says, I will pour out from my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters will prophesy, and your young men will see visions and your old men will dream dreams; and upon my male servants and female servants I will pour out from my spirit in the last days, and they will prophesy. And I will give wonders in the heaven above and signs upon the earth below, blood, fire, and vapor of smoke. The sun will be transformed into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and illustrious day of the Lord comes. And everyone who will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved.

---

144 Pervo, Acts, 79.

145 John Joseph Collins and Craig A. Evans, Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 104. The connection is only a loose one. Typically, pesharim have a well-defined structure that start with a citation of a prophetic text and then use a formula to introduce the interpretation of the text as it applies to the immediate context of a group, although variations on this pattern do exist. For example, some pesharim do not use any sort of introductory formula for the interpretation. See Shani L. Berrin, “Pesharim,” in Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; La Jolla, Calif.: Granite Hill Publishers, 2000), 644-645. Richard B. Hays has emphasized the hermeneutical aspect of the evangelists’ practice of citing texts from the Hebrew Bible in the Gospels; the gospel writers are transforming the interpretation of the Hebrew Bible texts in light of recent events rather than rejecting these texts outrightly. See Hays, Reading Backwards, xv.
As mentioned above, the lack of correspondence between the details of the citation and the narrative that surrounds it does not necessarily make a citation methodology polyphonic. If the narrative claims that a citation does something that the citation does not in fact do, then the point of view of the narrative and the citation conflict. In this case, however, the main difference between the citation and its narrative context (its immediate context is the context of the speech) lie in a number of details that the citation gives but that the narrative does not mention. Very few of the details from the citation match the rest of Peter’s speech.

The only firm connection between the vision of Peter’s speech and the voice of the citation is the pouring out of the spirit in the last days and the signs and wonders of Jesus mentioned in verse 22.¹⁴⁶ No sons or daughters are prophesying in Peter’s speech or the narrative that precedes it, and nobody is seeing visions or dreaming dreams. Male and female servants appear to be absent from the narrative, and no celestial signs involving blood, fire, or smoke exist in the remainder of the narrative. Peter juxtaposes the voice of the prophet with his own words, with the events of Pentecost, and with Jesus of Nazareth.

Despite the numerous lack of parallels between the Pentecost event and Joel 3:1-5, the author of Acts still puts Joel 3:1-5 to good use. The author of Acts is pushing the reader to inquire whether subsequent history confirms the prophecy in Joel 3:1-5.¹⁴⁷ Peter’s enunciation of this prophecy invites the reader to consider recent history in light of the words of this prophecy. For the author of Acts, Pentecost is but one example of the

---

¹⁴⁶ These signs and wonders are not celestial, however.

¹⁴⁷ Gregory Robbins, personal communication, 1 June 2015.
outpouring of God’s spirit. The author expects the reader to consider other examples of
the outpouring of God’s spirit.

The primary question to ask when determining whether a citation methodology is
monologic or not is this: does the author or narrator’s point of view subsume the point of
view of the text that the author or narrator cites? Clearly, the author of Acts and the
author of Joel fail to overlap in numerous ways. Nevertheless, the author of Acts uses the
citation from Joel not only as a “proof from prophecy”¹⁴⁸ but also as a challenge to
reexamine recent history. The citation of Joel, in other words, proves for the author of
Acts that what the people have just witnessed, and will witness further in the future, is the
pouring out of God’s spirit.¹⁴⁹ The viewpoints of Joel 3:1-5 and Acts 2 are not so far apart
after all.

Finally, the author of Acts, unlike Eusebius, nowhere extols the virtues of a
citation methodology that prioritizes the voice of the other over the voice of the narrator.
The speeches in Acts, in their unity of style and their common narrative role, suggest that
the author of Acts functions in a monologic framework. Similarly, the author interprets
the Hebrew Bible in a relatively consistent way throughout Acts. The author
demonstrates a predilection for a monologic citation methodology.

The citation methodology in Acts, then, is no precursor to the citation
methodology of Eusebius. The author of Acts weaves literary or documentary citations
into the logic of the narrative of Acts, and those citations support the narrative in

¹⁴⁸ Pervo, Acts, 79.

¹⁴⁹ As of this point in the narrative, God’s spirit has not yet poured out on πᾶσαν σάρκα (“all flesh”), unless
those who spoke in other languages somehow symbolically represent all flesh.
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important ways. While Eusebius takes on a project similar to Acts (that is to say, a project that narrates the story of early Christianity), Eusebius’ methodology is much different from Acts. Eusebius relies on explicit citations of his sources much more than the author of Acts and in different ways.

Appian

Appian, a Roman historiographer born in Alexandria, lived in the late first to mid-second century C.E. He wrote a history in 24 books about how Rome assimilated various peoples and about the Roman Civil Wars (books 13-17 of his history). He arranges these books ethnographically and chronologically. Appian does not often cite texts explicitly.¹⁵⁰

Like Polybius, Appian cites other historiographers in a monologic fashion, but unlike Polybius, Appian cites them when they support his narrative and not merely when he disagrees with them. In Punica 132, Appian cites Polybius’ account of Scipio’s weeping at the burning of Carthage,¹⁵¹ but he does not give much introduction to this passage (the single brackets demarcate text that was not in Polybius’ edition of the narrative, whereas the double brackets demarcate text that is in Polybius’ edition of the narrative but not Appian’s):

\[ \text{ὁ δὲ Σκιπίων πόλιν ὅρον [ἐπτακοσίοις ἔτεσιν ἀνθήσασαν ἀπὸ τοῦ συνοικισμοῦ, καὶ γῆς τοσὶδε καὶ νήσων καὶ θαλάσσης ἐπάρξασαν.} \]


¹⁵¹ Diodorus cites this passage as well, although Diodorus changes the order of events and is less faithful to Polybius’ words. See Baronowski, Polybius and Roman Imperialism, 209.
Now Scipio, as he beheld the city, [which had flourished for 700 years from its founding, which had ruled over so much land, islands, and the sea, which was wealthy with weapons, ships, elephants, and wealth equal to the most ancient cities, but far excelling them in courage and readiness to act, even as much as many ships and weapons having been taken away held out all the same for three years of such war and famine,] which was altogether coming to its end in utter, final destruction, it is said that he wept and he publicly cried because of the wars. And reflecting within himself for a long time, and understanding that it is necessary for both cities, nations, and empires to undergo change, as well as fate as it pertains to human beings; Troy, a city at one time of good fortune, also suffered this, and the city of the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians, who were foremost, suffered in those times, and lately the most distinguished city of the Macedonians. Whether wittingly or unwittingly, [[he spoke]] this utterance:

There will be a day when sacred Troy has perished,
both Priam and the people of Priam armed with good ashen spear.
And when Polybius asked him frankly (for he was also his teacher) about what his statement meant, they say that he, without his guard up, really spoke of his native city, on behalf of which he was then anxious while he looked toward human affairs. And Polybius himself, having heard these things, composed [it].

---

152 Xenophon was the first to write extensively about himself in the third person as he wrote about events in which he had participated; Thucydides began the practice when he wrote about his role in the embarrassing Athenian defeat at Amphipolis (Victor Castellani, personal communication, 16 May 2015).
Part of the reason Appian may have included this citation is that Polybius tells the story very well. It has a certain elegance to it, complete with a litany of praises for the city of Carthage. Furthermore, it comes from Polybius who spoke with Scipio directly. In Appian, the story follows immediately upon the death of Hasdrubal, his wife, and his children, and no discernible differences exist between the voice of the citation and the narrative that precedes it. In this case, then, Appian is still using a monologic citation methodology, but he is incorporating someone else’s narrative into his own narrative structure.

In fact, Appian does not even indicate that he is starting a citation, which suggests that he believes that the direct appropriation of Polybius’ actual words fits into the surrounding narrative. This direct appropriation of Polybius’ language into Appian’s language demonstrates that the citation methodology is highly monologic. Appian clearly esteems Polybius enough to give him space in Appian’s own narrative without any modifications at all.

The end of the citation of the Polybius passage further confirms the monologic character of this passage in Appian. Polybius, in the original citation, refers to himself in the third person. While that feature may seem odd in Polybius, it fits quite nicely into Appian’s narrative. Appian can thus bring over that part of the citation without first

153 The story also has a religious element to it, which undoubtedly interested Appian, who emphasized the religious elements of the Scipio narratives. See Howard Hayes Scullard, *Scipio Africanus in the Second Punic War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 27.

154 Polybius regularly uses the third person to refer to himself in order to maintain impartiality of his narrative. See John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 189.
introducing the whole citation as Polybius’ words. Polybius’ words end up supporting the veracity of Appian’s narrative, since the citation directly states that Polybius heard these words as well. Again, the citation of Polybius fits into the structure of Appian’s narrative without requiring any changes on Appian’s part. The voice of Polybius already matches the voice of Appian well.

Another example of Appian’s citation methodology occurs in The Civil Wars (BC), when Lucius Antonius, the brother of Mark Antony, surrenders to Octavian outside of Perusia. Appian cites the conversation between Lucius and Octavian from the memoirs of Octavian. Of course, Appian first translates this conversation from Latin into Greek (BC 5.5.42-45). After he conveys the dialogue, he sums up this portion of the narrative (noting also his translation):

```
Ταῦτα μὲν ἔλεξαν ἀλλήλοις, ὡς ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἦν ἐς τὸ δυνατὸν τῆς φωνῆς μεταβαλεῖν τεκμαιρομένῳ τῆς γνώμης τῶν λελεγμένων. καὶ διεκρίθησαν, ὃ μὲν Καῖσαρ ἐν ἔπαινῳ καὶ θαύματι τὸν Λεύκιον ἔχων, οὐδὲν ὡς ἐν συμφοραῖς ἄγχονεσ ὡς ὑπομνημάτων εἰπόντα, ὃ δὲ Λεύκιος τὸν Καῖσαρα τοῦ τε ἴδοις καὶ βραχυλογίας. οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ ἐτεκμαίροντο τῶν εἰρημένων ἐκ τῆς ὅψεως ἐκατέρων. (BC 5.5.45)
```

They spoke these things to one another, as far as it was possible from the language of the memoirs to reconstruct by judging the intention of the things having been spoken. They separated, Caesar holding in praise and admiration Lucius, because he did not say anything ignoble and unintelligent albeit amid misfortunes, and Lucius holding Caesar in admiration for his character and conciseness of speech. The others judged what was said from the appearance of each.

---

155 The memoirs are most likely Octavian’s. Scholars have also proposed that this document rather comes from some other official record, but Appian seems typically to use the word ὑπομνήματα (“memoirs”) as a reference to autobiography. See T. J. Cornell, ed., The Fragments of the Roman Historians (vol. 3; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 541.
The dialogue that Lucius cites coalesces with both the larger narrative and his conclusion. Lucius did speak briefly, under the circumstances, and he avoided raising Caesar’s ire. Caesar, on the other hand, was gracious toward Lucius and did not demand any undue recompense from him. Despite the fact that Appian is citing this text by translating it into another language, the citation has logical narrative connections to the rest of Appian’s narrative. Again, Appian is using a monologic citation methodology.

In sum, Appian very much follows in the tradition of Greek historiography. His citation methodology is monologic, and (like other later Greek historiographers) he cites historians and official records when they fit into his narrative. Frequently, however, he uses his sources without citing them explicitly, just as many of the previous Greek historiographers before him.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate that the modus operandi for most classical and pre-Eusebian historiographers was to use a monologic citation methodology. In all of the evidence that this chapter reviews, no author demonstrates a truly polyphonic citation methodology. Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Acts, and Appian all diminish the voice of their citations by using their citations to support their own narrative. They attempt to create a single, finalized, author-shaped meaning for each citation in the context of their narrative argument. From the perspective of the author, and doubtless many readers, this citation methodology largely accomplishes the various goals these historiographers had for their citations. These
citations each bear the interpretation of the historiographer who cites them, and that
historiographer is acting as an expert who has reviewed all of the relevant data and is able
to bring that data to bear on the interpretation of each citation.

In addition, each historiographer analyzed in this chapter uses explicit citations
much less frequently than Eusebius in his HE. In essence, Eusebius democratizes the
voices in his text (including the narrator’s voice) with his citation methodology. That is to
say, Eusebius gives his citations a voice equal to the narrator’s voice. The narrator plays a
much smaller role in Eusebius’ historiography. Almost half of his narrative in the first
seven books of his HE comprises explicit textual citations. Even from a simple
quantitative point of view, he gives these citations equal voice. When a reader spends
almost half the time reading citations, the point of view of the narrator holds much less
sway for the reader. In the historiography reviewed in this chapter, explicit textual
citations are relatively infrequent. Greek and Hellenistic historiographers simply do not
operate that way. Even when one counts speeches as (loose) citations, the concentration
of citations in Greek and Hellenistic historiography still pales in comparison to the
concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE. The historiographer plays the most important
role in Greek and Hellenistic historiography. The voice of the historiographer, as the
professional or expert who has reviewed the relevant data, is the most important voice in
these texts.

In the next chapter, Eusebius’ citation methodology, especially in the HE, will be
the subject under consideration. Although Eusebius’ citation methodology does
sometimes appear to have a monologic character, his stated methodology and the ways
his citations interact with his narrative suggest that his citation methodology is in fact more polyphonic than monologic. Unlike the historiographers who went before him, Eusebius diminishes the voice of the narrator and often refrains from delivering finalized interpretations for the texts he cites. Moreover, he allows his citations to carry the majority of the argument of his narrative. Eusebius’ HE constitutes a substantial deviation from the historiography that preceded him and an important bellwether of Christian historiography to come.
CHAPTER 3: EUSEBIUS’ POLYPHONIC CITATION METHODOLOGY IN THE

HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA

Throughout the first seven books of Eusebius’ *Historia ecclesiastica* (HE), Eusebius frequently juxtaposes his own voice with the voice of the other, that is, the voice of the texts he cites.\(^{156}\) When these juxtapositions occur, Eusebius’ voice often conflicts with the voice of the other in some way. Eusebius typically refrains from reconciling these conflicting voices, or these differences in point of view. Rather, Eusebius appears to accept the inconsistencies and simply proceeds to the next point in his narrative. At other times, he dialogues with his sources but exerts a substantial amount of energy to refute what seems to be the most natural interpretation of his sources. Why does Eusebius refrain from attempting to reconcile these differences? At other times, why does he include citations that clearly resist his own narrative argument? Why does he give equal weight to the voice of the other when that voice contradicts his own voice? Why does he abstain from exercising his full narratorial authority and fail to bridle his sources? This chapter answers those questions by examining Eusebius’ statements about his own methodology and—more importantly—by analyzing the effect these differences and similarities in voice have on Eusebius’ larger narrative. Eusebius

\(^{156}\) Erica Carotenuto suggests that Eusebius uses citations to add veracity to his claims and to juxtapose information pertinent to the general context. See *Tradizione e innovazione nella Historia ecclesiastica di Éusebio di Cesarea* (Istituto italiano per gli studi storici; Napoli: Il Mulino, 2001), xxviii.
has conceived of the reader in a manner quite different from how his predecessors conceived of the reader. In a sense, Eusebius has relinquished some of his narratorial authority to the reader. At times, he invites the reader to construct an understanding of the text that transcends both the narrator’s voice and the voice of the sources his text cites. This chapter argues that Eusebius’ HE has pushed historiography into a literary domain that previous historiographers had mostly left alone; Eusebius’ citation methodology in the HE has diminished the role of the narrator and has created the beginnings of a polyphonic historiography, which effectively increases the number of voices independently bearing witness to Eusebius’ metanarrative.\footnote{To be sure, previous historiographers sometimes present differing oral traditions, etiologies, or etymologies and then leave the reader to decide which explanation is most compelling. Those presentations of options are different from polyphony, however. The historiographers do not invite the reader to disagree with the narrative voice. Rather, they invite the reader to make their own decision between two or more options that the narrator has given. Disagreeing with the narrator in these passages would be something more like disagreeing with the choices the narrator has presented. Previous historiographers maintain control over the language of the traditions they cite. Their work is primarily monological, as Bakhtin would say. One historiographer who sometimes operates in a polyphonic manner is Herodotus. Still, he refrains from citing the voice of the other when the voice of the other contrasts with his own voice. See chapter 2 for further details.}

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Mikhail Bakhtin distinguishes between monologic texts and polyphonic texts.\footnote{This paragraph merely recapitulates theoretical matters that Chapter 1 addresses in depth.} Monologic texts remain always under the control of the worldview of their author(s). If monologic texts have multiple voices (that come through different characters or different sources), each of these voices obtains its ultimate meaning from the author’s point of view. These texts are thus “finalizable” inasmuch as their author has assessed the significance or worth of each voice and has “used” these voices accordingly. Polyphonic texts, on the other hand, allow voices to conflict with the author’s or narrator’s voice or other voices in the text. The author relinquishes control.
over these voices and leaves it to the reader to appraise the validity or worth of each voice in the text (including the author’s own voice or the narrator’s voice). Since the author refrains from imposing his or her own point of view on the voices of the text, polyphonic texts are “unfinalizable.” Different readers may give priority to different voices, or the same reader may give priority to different voices at different times or in different contexts.\textsuperscript{159} This chapter argues, in other words, that Eusebius’ citation methodology often presents multiple voices (or points of view) without trying to maintain constant control over these voices of “the other.”\textsuperscript{160} Eusebius submits his own voice to the reader as a single witness among many others, and the reader must decide how to adjudicate between conflicting points of view. Although the monologic voice arises in Eusebius’ historiography from time to time, his overall approach suggests that he views his historiography as a polyphonic enterprise.

Scholars have used a variety of tactics to explain the relationship between Eusebius’ narration and his sources.\textsuperscript{161} Some scholars have noted the discrepancies

\textsuperscript{159} Bakhtin uses Dostoevsky as the paragon of the polyphonic novel. This chapter applies Bakhtin’s conception of polyphony to Eusebius’ historiography but recognizes that Bakhtin used this concept to assess novels primarily. Nevertheless, scholars have used these concepts on a variety of texts, and this chapter employs these concepts to distinguish Eusebius citation methodology from his predecessors.

\textsuperscript{160} In fact, Eusebius exhibits a number of different relationships between his own voice and his sources. Inowlocki has distinguished between polyphony (in the linguistic sense, where “several voices are heard simultaneously and indistinctively), symphony (where Eusebius’ voice and the voice of his source agree on certain points even if they have very different aims), and cacophony (where Eusebius’ voice disagrees with the voice of his sources entirely). See Eusebius and the Jewish Authors, 67-68.

between Eusebius’ narrative and the narrative of his sources and have attributed these differences to sloppiness or to the unwieldiness of the size of the projects Eusebius and his staff attempted. For example, perhaps Eusebius had scribes insert citations, so that Eusebius did not explicitly consider his summaries and assessments to the actual words of the text. Rather, he simply had his scribes copy the relevant passage into his text. No doubt, Eusebius’ workflow and the size of his projects have contributed to some inconsistencies in his narrative. Nevertheless, these explanations fail to account for how major differences between Eusebius’ narrative and his sources survived three editions of the HE.

Others have suggested that Eusebius’ citation methodology (especially in the Apodeixis), albeit awkwardly at times, constitutes a rhetorical technique in its own


163 Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 141.

right. By withdrawing his own voice, Eusebius exerts his presence most of all when he allows the other to speak in the voice of another. Indeed, Eusebius does present his citations in a deliberate manner and not haphazardly. The selection and organization of his material around time demonstrates forethought, even if scholars do not always agree with his dating of sources. Despite these important observations, however, the reader of the HE may still legitimately wonder whether the differences between the voice of Eusebius and the voice of his sources are as deliberate as his methodology.

Furthermore, Eusebius offers several explicit statements of his citation methodology in his *Praeparatio evangelica* (PE) that support this chapter’s thesis. Although Eusebius most likely started to write the HE 10 years before he began to write the PE, the two documents are unique for Eusebius in that they use quotations far more heavily than any of his other extant works do. (See the table below.) Eusebius plays with the HE, PE, and *Demonstratio evangelica* (DE) in unique ways. In addition, the HE and PE share a number of methodological similarities. The PE’s explicit methodological

---

165 See Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 55, 58.


168 For the date of the books 1-7 of the HE, see Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 10-22 (especially 14); David Sutherland Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1960), 43; Andrew Louth, “The Date of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*,” *JTS* 41 (1990): 111-123; Paul Maier, *Eusebius: The Church History* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999), 16. For the date of the PE, see Aaron P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio evangelica* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11. This chapter operates under the assumption that Eusebius composed the first edition of the HE sometime between 300 and 310 and that he started to work on the PE around 313 or after. In any case, the relative dating (and proximity in time) of the two documents is most important here.
statements give a sense of how Eusebius viewed his citation methodology. Frequently in the narrative, Eusebius notes why he is quoting the numerous sources that he cites. At the very least, the PE illustrates some of the ways Eusebius imagined his own use of sources to create a compelling argument. The next section begins with some of the pertinent explicit methodological statements Eusebius uses in the PE and then considers the less explicit statements made in the preface of the HE.

Table 7. Eusebius’ compositions ordered by percent quotations (descending)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Percent Quotations</th>
<th>Quotation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praeparatio evangelica (Books 7-15)</td>
<td>59.18%</td>
<td>91,084</td>
<td>153,898</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeparatio evangelica (Books 1-6)</td>
<td>48.82%</td>
<td>40,004</td>
<td>81,944</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica (Books 1-7)</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica (All 10 Books)</td>
<td>36.55%</td>
<td>36,772</td>
<td>100,594</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratio evangelica</td>
<td>30.52%</td>
<td>48,012</td>
<td>157,308</td>
<td>3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementa minora ad quaestiones ad Marinum</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

169 Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 55-56. Inowlocki (following Laurin) notes that 71% of the PE is citations, excluding “the introductions, summaries, and conclusions made by the bishop” (54).

170 These word counts, with the exception of Books 1-7 of Eusebius’ HE, are in Greek and include any proemia. Most of these calculations come from the PG, and all of them (except for Books 1-7 of Eusebius’ HE) come from the Ερευνητικό έργο: ∆ΡΟΜΟΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΗΣ – ΨΗΦΙΑΚΗ ΠΑΤΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ, Εργαστήριο Διαχείρισης Πολιτισμικής Κληρονομιάς, http://www.aegean.gr/culturaltech/chmlab, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Πολιτισμικής Τεχ., Cited 31 December 2014. Online: http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG_Migne/Eusebius%20Caesariensis_PG%2019-24/.

171 The last three books of the HE obviously have a much lower density of quotations than the first seven books. This difference may help confirm that Eusebius composed the first seven books at an earlier date and with a different mindset, although the difference may merely indicate that Eusebius began to rely on non-textual traditions and memories more in the last three books than he was able to in the first three books. In any case, the difference between the first seven books and the last three books in terms of quotation density is fairly stark and also constitutes one of the reasons this chapter focuses on the first seven books of the HE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Percent Quotations</th>
<th>Quotation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita Constantini</td>
<td>22.18%</td>
<td>8,509</td>
<td>38,372</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cantica canticorum interpretation</td>
<td>21.42%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De ecclesiastica theologia</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>42,230</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica (Books 8-10)</td>
<td>19.47%</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>32,839</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Stephanum</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>11,412</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Hieroclem</td>
<td>13.83%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Euphratianem</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Caesarienses</td>
<td>9.98%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentarius in Isaiam</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementa ad quaestiones ad Stephanum</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>7,909</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomasticon</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>14,739</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Marcellum</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De theophania</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementa ad quaestiones ad Marinum</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaria in Psalms</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
<td>16,175</td>
<td>292,049</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De laudibus Constantini</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De martyribus Palaestinae Recensio breviar</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquorum martyrriorum collection</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta in Lucam</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaria in Psalms_1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,897</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantini imperatoris oratio ad coetum sanctorum</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De martyribus Palaestinae Recensio prolixior</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De mensuris et ponderibus</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De solemnitate paschali</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vitis prophetarum</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Alexandrum</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Percent Quotations</td>
<td>Quotation Word Count</td>
<td>Total Word Count</td>
<td>Number of Quotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Carpianum ad canones evangeliorum praeisssa</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Constantiam Augustam</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula ad Flacillum</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta in Danielem</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta in Hebraeos</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmenta in proverbia</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalis elementaria introductio Fragmenta</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalis elementaria introduction</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71,464</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passio sanctorum decem martyrum Aegyptiorum</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eusebius’ Stated Citation Methodology in the PE and the HE**

In the PE, Eusebius aims to introduce Christianity to those who were unfamiliar with it.\(^{172}\) The PE and the *Demonstratio evangelica* (DE) together comprise a single apologetic work.\(^{173}\) The PE assesses the philosophy and religion of the pagans in order to demonstrate the preeminence of Christianity.\(^{174}\) In the HE, on the other hand, Eusebius assumes a familiarity with scripture on the part of the reader. Unlike the PE, then, the HE assumes a certain level of familiarity with Christianity and especially Christian scriptures.

Despite the differences between the PE and the HE, however, Eusebius uses similar

\(^{172}\) Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*, 74.

\(^{173}\) Ibid. The DE also contains some pertinent methodological statements, but this chapter will leave these passages for another time in order to conserve space. See, for example, DE 1.1.13-14.

\(^{174}\) Ibid., 75.
citations methodologies in both projects. These similarities are evident from an
examination of Eusebius’ statements of methodology in the PE.

At several points in the PE, Eusebius comments upon his methodology. One of
the most noteworthy statements of Eusebius’ methodology occurs in PE 10.9.26-28:

Now it is time to examine the demonstrations of those preceding us
concerning the same subject. There have been learned men among us, of
those who are educated second to none, not [merely] casually conversant
with the divine. These men construct the ancient history of the Hebrews
by scrupulously distinguishing the present subject, proclaiming their
demonstration with an abundant and manifold argument. Indeed, some of
those narratives that were professed debated the times, while others
confirmed the testimony of older readings. Some were used with the
readings of the Greeks, and others [with the readings of] the Phoenicians,
Chaldeans, and Egyptians. Gathering the Greek items, the foreign items,
and the items pertaining to the Hebrews, and adding the narratives side by
side with one another, trying to reconcile one with another, they have
compared the events that took place with all [that took place] during the
same times. Then each with his own methods, having made the
plot/structure of the things being proved, submitted the proof. Therefore, I
considered it necessary to yield to their voices with regard to the present
argument, in order that the fathers of these words might not be deprived of
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their own fruit and [in order that] through many witnesses, but not through mine alone, the confirmation of the truth may receive unambiguous confirmation.

In this passage, Eusebius clearly makes three important points regarding his methodology. First, Eusebius distinguishes his own voice from the voices of the sources he cites (διὸ καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς αὐτῶν ἡγησάμην δὲ ἐν παραχώρησαι φωνᾶς τὸν παρόντα λόγον). Second, Eusebius recognizes that the voices of the other contribute to his own argument (τὸν παρόντα λόγον). Third, Eusebius suggests that confirmation of the truth will come through his own voice only when juxtaposed with the voices of other witnesses (διὰ πλειόνων μαρτύρων, ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ ἐνός ἔμοι, ἡ σύστασις τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναμφίελκτον λάβοι τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν). Each of these three points suggests that Eusebius conceives of his project as a sort of polyphonic historiography.

First, Eusebius’ differentiation between his own voice and the voices of others is a necessary element for polyphony. Each voice in a polyphonic text must speak from its own point of view without the narrator’s intervention. Of course, sometimes Eusebius has

---

175 See Andreas Schwab, Thales von Milet in der frühen christlichen Literatur: Darstellungen seiner Figur und seiner Ideen in den griechischen und lateinischen Textzeugnissen christlicher Autoren der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike (Studia Praesocratica; vol. 3; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 170.

176 Eusebius indicates that he has given careful consideration to his selection of sources in the PE: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐτεροδοξοῖς ἡμῖν τῶν παρ’ Ἑλληνιστικῷς ὁμοῦς εἴπαμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς σφόννους οὐκείους διεστῶτας ὑπὸ τοῦ γνωρίμου ἀνατετραμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγράμματι κατεφώρασε τό κριτήριον ἀδέκαστον ἐπιδεικνύοντος τοῖς ἐντυγχάνοντος, ἐργάζοντος, τῶς ἐπιδείξας τῶν ἀποδεικνύουσις ἡμᾶς, ἐκπρόσωπον δὲ καὶ σύμφωνον λογισμῷ πρὸ τῆς Ἑλλήνων τὴν Ἑβραίων ὑμῶν παλαιὰν καὶ ἀληθὴ ἡρμοσοφίαν τα ἐνεστῶτα ἐπιγνώσθησαν παρασχόμενοι. (15.1.6)

[I have detected that the heterodox Greek philosophers in the preceding book [have] become overturned not with respect to us alone, but also with respect to their own; through all these books [is] the impartial judgment of our decision; [I have] shown the proofs both with actions, so to speak, and with events, not being heedless; but by choosing with prudent calculation the simultaneously ancient and true philosophy of the Hebrews instead of the Greeks, [I have] showed that piety is professed.

See also PE 5.5 and 9.32.
modified his sources. Nevertheless, these modifications rarely change Eusebius’ posture toward the source in question. Eusebius allows texts to speak in their own voice, even when the text contradicts his own voice in some way.

Second, Eusebius’ reliance on the voice of the other (in the words of another) to make his argument further indicates the polyphonic character of Eusebius’ citation methodology. Without these voices, Eusebius cannot sufficiently make his argument. He needs their voices in order to support his argument (or narrative). Eusebius understands that his voice, as both the author and narrator, will not suffice for the reader. The reader must hear words that differ from Eusebius’ words in order for Eusebius to persuade the reader of his argument. Like the first point, this point is a prerequisite of a polyphonic historiography, but it does not guarantee a polyphonic historiography. The third point is not merely prerequisite but also confirms the polyphonic nature of his historiography.

Third, Eusebius’ understanding that he is one voice among many voices that contribute to his narrative demonstrates the polyphonic character of his citation methodology. Eusebius distinguishes between his own voice and the voice of the texts he cites, recognizes how the voice of those texts contributes to his argument, and views his own voice as inadequate for his project in and of itself. Only by combining the voice of the narrator with the differentiated voices of the “others” does Eusebius find his historiography successful. Eusebius’ statements concerning his citation methodology suggest that polyphonic sensibilities have penetrated his work. A survey of his citations

177 Note Eusebius’ comments in PE 4.7.1, where he indicates that he has made minor modifications to his sources. See Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 69-70 for further discussion on this matter. Victor Castellani has incisively suggested the possibility that Eusebius may have become more faithful to his sources over time, especially if readers had complained (personal communication, 1 June 2015). Compare Socrates Scholasticus 2.1.1-7.
in the HE will make it clear that the HE uses similar methodologies, but first a few more methodological statements from the PE deserve consideration.

Earlier in the PE, Eusebius suggests that the “proofs” of others constitute his most important asset. In 4.6.1, he gives priority to their voice over his own: έι δὲ μέλλουμι παρ’ ἐμαυτοῦ τοὺς ἐλέγχους τῶν δηλωμένων προφέρειν, εὑροί σοι ὑπὲρ ἄνεπιληπτον παρέξω τοῖς φιλεγκλήμοσι τὸν λόγον. διότερ αὐτὸς οὐδὲν οἴκοθεν εἰπὼν αὖθις ταῖς τῶν ἔξωθεν ἀποχρήσομαι μαρτυρίαις. (“Now if I were to proffer my own refutations of things being explained, I know well that my argument would not be invulnerable to outside faultfinders. Therefore, I myself will exploit the testimonies of outsiders, saying nothing of my own.”) The reason Eusebius offers the voice of the other instead of his own is that the voice of the other carries more weight with the reader than his own voice does.

Eusebius’ estimation of his own voice differs substantially from his predecessors. Eusebius’ predecessors typically present their own work as if it were superior to their predecessors. Eusebius, on the other hand, exercises a great deal of humility and even piety toward his predecessors. The granting of authority to the voices of his sources makes Eusebius’ overarching argument more compelling. Eusebius wants to avoid accusations of fabrication (τὸ πλάττεσθαι). Unlike most previous historiographers, he cites the very words (ipsissima verba) of those who played a role in the events he

---

178 Victor Castellani (personal communication, 16 May 2015) observed this point, and a quick survey of the sources confirms it. See, for example, Thucydides 1.22; Polybius 1.4.2-5; Diodorus 1.3.5, 1.4.1; Josephus BJ 1.praef.1-4; and Josephus AJ 1.praef.1-4. None of these authors suggests that they are in any way incompetent or unable to complete their various projects, nor did they suggest that they lack of authority.

179 Pamela Eisenbaum, personal communication, 1 June 2015.

180 PE 1.5.14.
describes. These words, or voices, function as his witnesses to the events that took place. This seemingly innocuous change brought a multi-voicedness to Eusebius’ writing that exists in both his more overtly apologetic works (such as the PE) and his more subtle works (including the HE).

Finally, Eusebius’ methodology comes from a keen awareness that he needed to keep himself in check. Even if this impulse is rhetorical, Eusebius embraces this ethos throughout the PE and HE. In the PE, he explains his approach as follows:

πόθεν δέητα πιστωσόμεθα τὰς ἄποδείξεις; οὐ μὲν δὴ ἐκ τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν γραμμάτων, ὥς ἂν μὴ δοκοῖμεν κεχαρισμένα πράττειν τῷ λόγῳ-μάρτυρες δὲ παρέστωσαν ἡμῖν Ἐλλήνων αὐτῶν οἱ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ αὐξοῦντες καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἱστορίαι διηρευνηκότες. (PE 1.6.8)

From where, then, shall we confirm our proofs? Not indeed from our own writings, so that we may not be considered to show favor to our argument; rather, those of their own Greeks who boast in philosophy and search out the other history of the nations will stand as our witnesses.

In other words, Eusebius uses the voice of the texts he cites as a means for controlling his own voice and his own argument. He limits the role of the narrator in order to give the reader the opportunity to evaluate Eusebius’ own arguments in light of what his sources actually write.

---


At the same time, Eusebius’ strategy in the PE differs from his strategy in the HE. In the PE, Eusebius cites those who presumably hold rapport with his opponents in order to convince them of his argument. As a result, Eusebius postures himself in relation to his sources in the PE in a manner different from how he postures himself in relation to his sources in the HE. In the HE, Eusebius rarely cites texts that support his opponents. Nevertheless, Eusebius prioritizes the voice of the other in the HE, and he often lessens the force of the voice of the narrator and heightens the voice of his sources. The examples that follow will highlight this aspect of Eusebius’ citation methodology in the HE.

What is curious about the HE, in contrast to the PE, is that Eusebius’ voice comes to the forefront of the narrative a little more. Only 36.55% of the HE (all 10 books) is quotation, whereas 55.58% of the PE is quotation. Nevertheless, Eusebius still defers to the voices of the texts he cites because those voices carry more authority than his own voice. At the same time, the HE requires its narrator to string together these voices of “the other” and to help its readers place these voices within the framework of the Christianity of the past.

In addition to Eusebius’ claims about his methodology in the PE, Eusebius also makes some less explicit claims about his methodology at the beginning of the HE:

183 Numerous scholars cite passages such as PE 5.5.5, where Eusebius states that he often uses a witness to put his opponents “to shame as if they were being attacked by their very own darts and arrows” (ὡς ὁν ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων βελῶν καὶ τοξωμάτων βαλλόμενοι κατασχύνοντο). See also 6.9.32. Regarding this strategy, see Inowlocki, Eusebius and the Jewish Authors, 56; Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism (London: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006), 71-72; and Kofsky, Eusebius of Caesarea Against the Pagans, 241.

184 In addition, he rarely cites scripture in both works, which suggests that his readers may have already known scripture well enough to understand his allusions to scripture. Note the allusion to 1 Cor. 1:26-31 in PE 1.6.8 above. See Johnson, Eusebius, 34-35.
But my argument demands thenceforth [that] I ask pardon for myself from the right-minded, confessing that the full and complete promise I undertake is beyond our power [to deliver], since we, now the first to set foot upon the subject, are attempting to travel a certain sort of desolate and pathless road, praying that God be our guide and that we may have the helping power of the Lord, being by no means able to discover from men or women preceding us the same faint footsteps, not to speak of the small utterances each by itself, through which another in another way during the times they have completed has left behind accounts for us, from long ago just as if lifting up their own fiery voices and again from where [they are] calling out and encouraging [us] as if from hidden places and from a watch-tower, where it is necessary to proceed and to guide straight the journey of the narrative unerringly and free from danger. As many things as we aim to embody in this historical narration, we consider advantageous for the aforementioned subject from those things being remembered by each themselves in no particular order, loving therefore the teachings of the illustrious apostles of our savior—if not of all—let us remember in accordance with the still eminent and now memorialized...
churches. Now I consider it for myself most necessary to toil at the subject, since I have determined that none of the historians has yet until now taken pains concerning this branch of writing; but I hope that it will be declared most beneficial to those who generously hold fast the useful learning of history. Now, of these things and the earlier Chronicle in which I imagined, I render an abridgement, I started to create a most complete narration up to the present.

Unlike in the prefaces of Eusebius’ other works, Eusebius confesses to the reader that he feels inadequate to construct a satisfactory narrative, even if he is able to access one of the greatest libraries in antiquity.185 The difficulty of his task and his sense of inadequacy as narrator and compiler receive further confirmation in his statements regarding his lack of predecessors and the sparseness of his sources.186 These concerns are unique to the

---

185 Compare, for example, the prefaces in the PE, DE, De martyribus Palaestinae (MP), Theophania, and Contra Hieroclem (CH). In the PE and DE, Eusebius requests the prayers of his patron Theodotus but does not suggest that the work at hand is beyond his power to complete. Similarly, Eusebius prays for his own strength to complete his task in the MP. In the Vita Constantini (VC), the circumstances and the extent of Constantine’s influence overwhelm Eusebius, so that he struggles to know where to begin. The preface of the HE stands in contrast to the rest of these prefaces inasmuch as Eusebius admits the sparseness of his sources, his lack of predecessors, and his sense of inadequacy in the face of his project.

186 Eusebius finds the paucity of sources particularly problematic because the nature of his project relies so heavily on sources. Eusebius is setting out to compile a ἱστορία, which for him means a collection of records of the past. Two points highlight this understanding of his project. First, in contrast to Eusebius’ other works, a passage with the words ἱστορέω or ἱστορία is about 8.5 times more likely (8.7 and 8.4 times more likely, respectively) to show up in the sentences that immediately precede or follow a quotation in the HE than to show up in any of his other works. (These numbers are based on a Naïve Bayes analysis of the three sentences preceding and following quotations in all of Eusebius’ works compared to the HE.) In other words, Eusebius often cites authors who record certain events in the HE, but he has less interest in these sorts of sources in his other works (including in the PE and DE). The density of these words in the HE indicates what kinds of sources Eusebius is using. He is not using sources from the opposition, especially when compared to a work like the PE. Rather, Eusebius is using sources as simple witnesses of events. Second, in contrast to the sources he cites, the most distinctive difference between Eusebius’ language and the language of his sources are the words ἱστορέω (in this text, often “record” or “observe,” but also “investigate”) and ἱστορία (an “investigation” or “narrative,” but now closely attached to textual media). No other frequently used word occurs so disproportionately (in either narrative or quotations) as these two words. The narrator’s voice in the HE is more concerned about these words than any other voice in Eusebius’ works. ἱστορέω occurs one or more times in 63 narrative blocks and one or more times in only 3 quotation blocks. Similarly, ἱστορία occurs one or more times in 60 narrative blocks and one or more times in only 3 quotation blocks. The following lists of passages are all the references to these words in Eusebius’ HE, Books 1-7. An N (for “narrative”) or Q (for “quotation”) follows a reference or series of references (separated by a comma) from a single narrative or quotation block. Eusebius’ work clearly aims to be a ἱστορία. ἱστορέω occurs in the following passages and blocks: 1.7.6 (Q); 1.8.15 (N); 1.10.4 (N); 1.11.3 (N); 2.0.0, 2.1.2 (N); 2.2.4 (N); 2.4.3 (N); 2.5.7 (N); 2.6.3 (N); 2.6.6 (N); 2.7.1, 2.8.2 (N); 2.10.1 (N); 2.11.2
HE; his other prefaces do not give this strong of a sense of inadequacy, even if they do express a certain humility in the face of the daunting projects that Eusebius undertook (together with his team of scribes). Although the HE does not delineate an explicit citation methodology as the PE does, the HE exhibits a further diminishment of the role of the narrator.

In sum, then, Eusebius’ explicit claims about his citation methodology indicate that he has given a prominent role to polyphony in the PE and HE. Eusebius’ claims about his citation methodology openly admit that the voice (and language) of his sources has taken primacy over the voice of the narrator and author. The reader should expect the narrator’s overarching arguments to remain intact, but the reader should bear in mind that Eusebius has used polyphony to create and structure his narrative. Eusebius relies on the uniqueness of the voices of his source in contradistinction to his own voice in order to tell his story. Eusebius desires the reader to assess his claims in light of the voice of the texts he cites. In other words, Eusebius has begun to leave behind the monological world of

(N); 2.17.2, 2.17.3 (N); 2.17.22 (N); 2.20.4 (N); 2.22.3 (N); 2.25.5 (N); 3.4.1, 3.4.5 (N); 3.4.10 (N); 3.5.5 (N); 3.6.20 (Q); 3.8.5 (Q); 3.8.10 (N); 3.10.8 (N); 3.11.1 (N); 3.18.4 (N); 3.20.8 (N); 3.29.1 (N); 3.30.2 (N); 3.32.2, 3.32.3 (N); 3.32.5 (N); 3.36.6 (N); 3.39.8, 3.39.9, 3.39.10 (N); 3.39.16 (N); 4.2.5, 4.3.2 (N); 4.6.3 (N); 4.8.6 (N); 4.10.1 (N); 4.11.7 (N); 4.14.1 (N); 4.15.5 (N); 4.16.7 (N); 4.17.2 (N); 4.18.7 (N); 4.22.7 (N); 4.22.9 (N); 4.26.4 (N); 4.29.1 (N); 5.5.3 (N); 5.8.7 (N); 5.13.1 (N); 5.16.11 (N); 5.18.12, 5.18.14 (N); 5.20.3 (N); 5.28.2 (N); 5.28.19 (N); 6.0.0 (N); 6.3.1 (N); 6.5.7, 6.6.1 (N); 6.9.1 (N); 6.40.1 (N); 6.41.1 (N); 7.10.2 (N); 7.12.1 (N); and 7.18.4 (N). ἱστορία occurs in these passages and blocks: 1.0.0, 1.1.1, 1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1 (N); 1.3.18, 1.4.1 (N); 1.5.1, 1.5.3 (N); 1.5.6 (N); 1.7.1 (N); 1.7.12 (Q); 1.8.4 (N); 1.8.9 (N); 1.11.7 (N); 1.12.2 (N); 1.12.3 (N); 1.13.1 (N); 2.0.0, 2.0.1 (N); 2.1.8 (N); 2.8.1 (N); 2.9.2 (N); 2.10.2 (N); 2.15.2 (N); 2.17.23 (N); 2.21.3 (N); 2.22.1 (N); 2.22.6, 2.23.3 (N); 2.25.5 (N); 2.25.8 (N); 3.0.0, 3.3.3 (N); 3.4.11 (N); 3.5.4, 3.6.1 (N); 3.7.6, 3.8.1 (N); 3.9.1 (N); 3.9.3 (N); 3.10.10 (Q); 3.18.4 (N); 3.23.5 (N); 3.23.19, 3.24.9 (N); 3.24.13, 3.26.1 (N); 3.28.6 (N); 3.30.2 (N); 3.31.6, 3.32.3 (N); 3.33.3 (N); 3.39.6 (N); 3.39.17 (N); 4.0.0 (N); 4.15.1 (N); 4.15.15 (N); 4.15.46 (N); 4.22.8 (N); 5.0.0 (N); 5.3.1 (N); 5.5.3, 5.5.5 (N); 5.7.1 (N); 5.16.1 (N); 5.24.14 (N); 5.27.1, 5.28.1 (N); 6.0.0, 6.2.1 (N); 6.11.2 (N); 6.13.5 (N); 6.17.1 (N); 6.19.10 (N); 6.25.14 (Q); 6.31.1, 6.31.2, 6.32.3 (N); 6.44.1 (N); 7.0.0, 7.0.1 (N); and 7.26.3 (N).

187 Regarding the staff Eusebius may have employed, see Grafton and Williams, Christianity and the Transformation of the Book, 200-203.
previous historiographers; Eusebius has started to introduce polyphony into the world of historiography.\textsuperscript{188}

\textit{Examples of Polyphony in the HE}

Whereas the previous section analyzes some of Eusebius own statements regarding his citation methodology, the present section provides explicit examples of polyphony in the HE. One may rightly wonder whether Eusebius \textit{intends} to use polyphony in each of the examples below. After all, if Eusebius is exercising a literary technique, should he not be conscious of the technique he is using? The answer to this question is no. Polyphony describes an orientation toward the voice of the other, not another technique an author may use to maintain control over the text. In fact, the author (or narrator) must relinquish control over the voice of the other for polyphony to work. A text that remains under the control of its author(s) constitutes a monological text. The author’s explicit or implicit assessment of the voice of the other is what matters most in a monological text. In a polyphonic text, the author allows the other to speak from the other’s own point of view, \textit{even if the author attempts to dialogue with the texts she or he cites}. The author relinquishes the right to have the final say in a polyphonic text.\textsuperscript{189} This posture is the posture Eusebius exhibits at several points in the HE. Of course, he

\textsuperscript{188} To be sure, Eusebius’ historiography still contains plenty of monological characteristics, even as Dostoevsky—Bakhtin’s paragon of polyphony—contains monological characteristics from time to time. (See Bakhtin, \textit{Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics}, 92.) The point here is that Eusebius has started pushing his historiography in a new direction, where he places his own point of view alongside the points of view of the other. The reader must understand the multi-voicedness of this new direction as an invitation to evaluate the narrator’s point of view in the same way the reader evaluates the point of view of the texts Eusebius cites.

\textsuperscript{189} This discussion presumes that a text is either polyphonic or monological.
sometimes slips into a monological mentality. The point is, however, that Eusebius has
introduced polyphony into his historiographic citation methodology. He orients himself
to the voice of the other in order to allow the other to make the argument that Eusebius
claims he cannot make himself. For Eusebius, the voice of the other must differ from the
voice of the author or narrator. 190 Without that difference, Eusebius’ rhetorical strategy
would fall flat. For Eusebius, the voice of the other is his argument.

The language of Eusebius’ sources differs from Eusebius’ own language in
varying degrees. Perhaps the starkest differences between the language of Eusebius’
sources and his own language occur in the first three books, where Eusebius frequently
cites Jewish authors and the Hebrew Bible. Eusebius often treats these authors as
Christians, 191 but he uses their language even when their language is problematic for his
own point of view. 192 Much of the polyphony that occurs in the HE occurs in the first
three books.

190 At times, Eusebius does fall back on the presentation of points of view more stereotypical of previous
historiography. For example, after the story of the Christian soldiers who pray for rain and receive an
answer to their prayer in 5.5, Eusebius addresses his readers in the third person and assumes a certain
independence of those readers from the narrative. He concludes the story with the following: ἀλλὰ τὰءτα
μὲν ὅπη τὶς ἐθέλοι, τιθέσθω μετίωμεν ὅ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἑξῆς ἀκολουθίαν. (HE 5.5.7-8) “But let one
regard these things in whatever way he or she wishes. Now let us move on to the sequence of the following
events.” Scholars have debated what Eusebius means by ἀλλὰ τὰءτα μὲν ὅπη τὶς ἐθέλοι, τιθέσθω. Was this
deverential conclusion merely a rhetorical device for confronting the disbelieving reader? Or was Eusebius
truly open to allowing the reader to reject this story? Michael M. Sage notes Origen’s reluctance to accept
nature miracles (in  Contra Celsum 7.44 and On Prayer 5.3) and concludes that Eusebius might have felt
similarly about nature miracles. See Michael M. Sage, “Eusebius and the Rain Miracle: Some
Observations” Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 36:1 (1987), 96-113. For a different point of view,
see Robert McQueen Grant, Eusebius as Church Historian (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980). Eusebius does
not require the reader to believe the story he has just presented in the same way Herodotus often gives
freedom to the reader to make up his or her own mind. These presentations are not the norm in the HE,
however.

191 For Eusebius’ distinction (and the contradictions he introduces within this distinction) between
Hebrews, Jews, and Christians, see Inowlocki, Eusebius and the Jewish Authors, 105-138.

192 Note especially Eusebius’ treatment of Philo’s Therapeuta in 2.17.
As Eusebius’ narrative continues, the sources he cites follow along the trajectories that lead to the “orthodoxy” of his own day. By books 6 and 7, Eusebius is primarily citing sources that entirely relate to his own branch of Christianity. He rarely cites the voices most distinct from his own, namely the voices of the heterodox communities, probably because he once suffered an accusation of heterodoxy against himself. Despite the growing similarity in points of view between Eusebius and his sources, however, Eusebius still relies on differences between his own voice and the voice of his sources to make his argument. Eusebius’ project concerns itself with the particular narrative of his own branch of Christianity. The narrowness of his selections by no means undermines his reliance on the language of the other to tell his story. Rather, his selectiveness merely determines the scope of his narrative. Eusebius is investigating the history of his own form of Christianity, not every form of Christianity that ever existed up to his own time. He has selected his sources accordingly.

The Christian Testament

Eusebius frequently cites extra-scriptural (and especially extra-Christian) sources in order to support the historical claims of scripture. Although Eusebius discusses the claims of scripture in these passages, he very rarely quotes scripture itself. Instead, he

---

193 Book 6 is somewhat exceptional, since Eusebius cites very few sources when he narrates the life of Origen.

194 Perhaps themes such as apostolic succession hold importance for Eusebius because they constitute an important part of the rhetoric of Eusebius’ Christianity, even if the idea is also prominent in his sources or if he takes up this practice from Josephus’ succession of priests. On the latter, see Robert Lee Williams, *Bishop Lists: Formation of Apostolic Succession of Bishops in Ecclesiastical Crises* (Gorgias Dissertations: Early Christian Studies; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2005), 219-220.
summarizes scripture or alludes to scripture in his own voice before citing his extra-
scriptural source. In a sense, Eusebius’ allusions to or summaries of scripture constitute
a monological voice. He controls the scriptural text by using his own voice to narrate its contents. At the same time, however, he juxtaposes these allusions and summaries with extra-scriptural texts. The extra-scriptural texts are necessary to support Eusebius’ summaries of scripture, even though they frequently support scripture in a refracted way. The differences between his own language and the language of the text simultaneously confirm and conflict with his summary of or allusion to scripture. For Eusebius, his narrative requires differences—even contradictions—between his own voice and the voice of the other. The similarities and differences in voice both work to support Eusebius’ overarching argument and narrative. Eusebius prefers these different and often conflicting voices to simply citing scripture itself. Moreover, these differences anticipate the possibility of agreement or disagreement in the reader. The simultaneous presence of similarity and dissimilarity—along with the lack of guidance from the narrator—leaves the readers to synthesize their own (unfinalized) understanding of the events Eusebius describes.

An important example of Eusebius’ polyphonic juxtaposition of his own voice (and its understanding of scripture) and the voice of the other occurs in Eusebius’ account of the demise of King Agrippa (2.10). Eusebius begins this passage by summarizing the events described in Acts 12:19-23. Agrippa was responsible for killing James and

195 He seems to presume an audience that is familiar with scripture, probably a Christian audience.

196 The possibilities of agreement and disagreement are important to Bakhtin’s conception of dialogic discourse (especially with regard to what he calls stylization). See Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson, Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 150-151.
imprisoning Peter, and he refused to chastise the crowd when they called out “the voice of a God and not of a human being.” In 2.10.1, Eusebius begins by including the following summary of the account in Acts: παραχρήμα τὸ λόγιον πατάξαι αὐτὸν ἁγγελον κυρίου ἱστορέη, γενόμενον τε σκωληκοβρωτὸν ἐκψυξάι (“The saying records that immediately a messenger of the Lord struck [Herod Agrippa], and that he expired after becoming worm-eaten”). Eusebius and the Acts of the Apostles both (somewhat awkwardly) begin the sentence that describes King Agrippa’s death with the word παραχρήμα (“immediately”). A scribe of the Western text of Acts even attests to a reading that contains ἐτὶ ζῶν (“while still alive”), apparently to emphasize the immediacy of the event. Neither Eusebius nor Acts give any other indication of the duration of time that transpired between when the messenger struck King Agrippa and King Agrippa’s death. The force of παραχρήμα, then, continues through the entire sentence; these events happened immediately. The immediacy of the event in Eusebius’ paraphrase contrasts with Josephus’ account of the same event, which Eusebius cites after describing Agrippa’s folly:

ἀνακύψας δὲ μετ’ ὀλίγον, τῆς ἐαυτοῦ κεφαλῆς ὑπερκαθεξόμενον εἶδεν ἁγγελον. τοῦτον εὐθὺς ἐνόησεν κακῶν εἶναι ἀτίην, τὸν καὶ ποτὲ τὸν ἁγαθὸν γενόμενον, καὶ διακάρδιον ἐςχῖν ὀδύνην, ἀθροὺν δ’ αὐτῷ τῆς

197 The exact wording is as follows: ὡς ἐπί θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (HE 2.10.1) and θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (Acts 12:22).

198 Acts has the following in 12:23: παραχρήμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἁγγελος κυρίου ἁνθ’ ὀν οὐκ ἐδωκεν τὴν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκοβρωτὸς ἐξεφυγεν (“And immediately an angel of the Lord struck him because he did not give glory to God, and becoming worm-infested he breathed his last”).


κοιλίας προσέφυσεν ἀλγήμα, μετὰ σφοδρότητος ἀρξάμενον. συνεχεῖς δ ἐφʼ ἡμέρας πέντε τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι διεγρασθείς, τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν . . . (2.10.6-7, 9)

Now after lifting up his head a little, he saw a messenger sitting above his head. Immediately he perceived that this was the cause of evil things, being also at [another] time the cause of good things, and he had a heart-piercing pain; and at once pain of the abdomen attached itself to him, having begun with acuteness.201 Now having been worked over by the suffering of his abdomen continuously for five days, he ended his life.

In 2.10.1, Eusebius emphasizes the immediacy of the event at the beginning of his summary of Acts: Τὰ δὲ γε τῆς κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγχειρήσεως τοῦ βασιλέως οὐκέτ’ ἀναβολῆς εἶχετο, ἀμά γε τοι αὐτὸν ὃ τῆς θείας δίκης τιμωρος διάκονος μετῆμι, παραντικά μετὰ τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιβουλῆν, ως ἡ τῶν Πράξεων ἱστορεῖ γραφή . . . . (“Now the events of the king’s undertaking against the apostles brought no further delay. The least [one can say is that] at once divine justice, the avenging servant, followed straightaway after the plot concerning the apostles, as the passage in Acts relates . . . .”)

While Eusebius’ summary of Acts makes it sound like Agrippa died right away, Josephus’ account suggests that five days transpired before Agrippa died. For Josephus, the nature of the event, rather than the timing of the event, illustrates that the event constitutes divine retribution. For Eusebius, on the other hand, the immediacy of the

201 One surprising element is that Eusebius has changed Josephus’ account by changing Josephus’ owl into a messenger (or angel). Usually Eusebius’ text is scrupulous in its rendering of citations. Nevertheless, this difference may simply come from a scribal error. See Thomas Africa, “Worms and the death of kings: a cautionary note on disease and history,” Classical Antiquity 1:1 (1982), 13-14 and Paul L. Maier, Eusebius: The Church History (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1999), 67; Peter G. Bietenholtz, Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age (vol. 59; Brill's Studies in Intellectual History; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 71; and even William Whiston, The Works of Flavius Josephus (Ward, Lock, & Company, 1879), 515-516. This modification is less of a concern for the argument at hand because this chapter is attempting to find discrepancies between the narrator’s voice and the voice of his cited sources, not the narrator’s voice and the voice of the sources themselves. Still, a number of scholars mentioned above note that Eusebius’ modification is not as significant as it may seem in English.
event and lack of remorse on the part of Agrippa are paramount to showing that the event
took place as an act of divine vengeance against Agrippa for the way he treated the
apostles. By placing these two events as closely together as possible, Eusebius is
attempting to tighten the connection between King Agrippa’s treatment of the apostles
and King Agrippa’s death. Josephus, on the other hand, clearly connects King Agrippa’s
fate to his failure to remember that he was but mortal. Moreover, Josephus gives Agrippa
five days to demonstrate self-reflection and to reproach himself, which aligns with
Josephus’ positive appreciation of Agrippa elsewhere in his work.202

These differences between Eusebius’ summary of Acts and his citation of
Josephus represent two different points of view. They describe similar (but not identical)
events but assess the significance of these events very differently. They agree that
Agrippa’s fate was some kind of divine justice and that Agrippa delivered an address to
the crowd. Further, they agree that he awed the crowd with this address and that they
called (explicitly or by simile) his voice the voice of a god. Shortly thereafter, Agrippa
died because (at least in part) he failed to acknowledge the inappropriateness of these
words.

Eusebius’ summary of Acts and his citation of Josephus disagree, however, on the
ultimate cause of Agrippa’s fate and on Agrippa’s posture toward his fate. The narrator’s
voice (following Acts) suggests that this fate ultimately came as the result of the
mistreatment of the apostles and fails to suggest that Agrippa understood why he was

---

202 G. W. Trompf, The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought: From Antiquity to the
Reformation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 173; G. W. Trompf, Early Christian
Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice (Studies in Religion; London: Continuum, 2000), 76. See
dying. Josephus’ voice, on the other hand, suggests that this fate came only from Agrippa’s failure to rebuke the crowd for comparing his voice to the voice of a god.

Moreover, Josephus suggests that Agrippa was ultimately aware of why he was dying, accepted his fate as the will of God, and was grateful for the resplendent life he had led:

ο ἵθος ὑμῖν ἐγώ, φησίν, ἣδη καταστρέφειν ἐπιτάττομαι τὸν βίον, παραχρήμα τῆς εἰμαρμένης τὰς ἀρτί μου κατεγευσμένας φωνὰς ἔλεγχουσίς. ὁ κληθεὶς ἀθάνατος ύφ’ ὑμὼν, ἣδη θανεὶν ἄπαγομαι. δεκτέον δὲ τὴν πεπρομένην, ἦ θεὸς βεβούληται, καὶ γὰρ βεβιώκαμεν οὐδαμῇ φαύλῳς, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς μακαριζομένης μακρότητος. (2.10.7)

“I, your god,” he said, “am now ordered to end my life, since immediately fate has reproved my present lying utterances. I, who was called immortal by you, am now led away to die. Fate must be understood in what way God desires. We have lived by no means miserly, but rather a most happy life.”

Eusebius concludes with a pronouncement of awe at the agreement between Josephus and scripture and offers a single and so far unaddressed clarification for the reader regarding Agrippa’s name:

ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωσήφον μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ταῖς θείαις συναληθεύοντα γραφαῖς ἀποθαυμαζόμε- εἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως προσηγορίαν δόξειν τινι διαφωνείν, ἄλλ’ ὁ γε χρόνος καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις τὸν αὐτὸν ὅτα δείκνυσιν, ἦτοι κατὰ τι σφάλμα γραφικὸν ἐνηλλαγμένου τοῦ ὅνοματος ἢ καὶ διωνυμίας περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν, οἷα καὶ περὶ πολλοὺς, γεγενημένης. (2.10.10)

I am astounded that Josephus joins with the sacred scriptures and with others in speaking these true things. Now if one should think that there is a disagreement regarding the appellation of the king, the time and activity show that he is the same, perhaps as the result of a certain scribal error during the transmission of the name or because it has become a double-name for the same person of the sort which also is the case for many.

Eusebius worries that the reader may question his citation selection. In other words, Eusebius worries that his reader might view the citation as irrelevant to the passage he
alludes to in Acts, since they refer to different people.  

He does not worry about how the reader may perceive the difference between Josephus’ understanding and his own understanding of the reason for Agrippa’s fate and Agrippa’s posture toward that fate. The differences in point of view stand without any explanation on the part of Eusebius, even if he does anticipate the objection on the part of the reader that the king’s name is not correct. Eusebius allows these different points of view to stand side-by-side. The similarities in the historical narratives surprise Eusebius. These similarities confirm certain elements of Eusebius’ (or his interpretation of scriptures’) narrative but only find confirmation from the differences in point of view that surround them. Josephus and Eusebius’ summary of Acts agree that the fate King Agrippa suffers constitutes God’s recompense for unjust actions. The narrative of Acts finds support from Josephus’ narrative in this regard. Josephus and Eusebius’ paraphrase of Acts disagree on which actions ultimately lead to his death. This discrepancy supports the fact that Josephus is functioning as an independent witness. The reader now has two witnesses that attest to God’s retribution on King Agrippa.

Eusebius’ citation of Julius Africanus’ letter to Aristides regarding the incongruities in the genealogy of Jesus constitutes another important example of Eusebius’ use of polyphony in the HE. The quotation begins without much by way of

---


an introduction to the substance of Africanus’ letter.

Instead, Eusebius merely mentions that many of the faithful believe that the accounts of Jesus’ genealogy disagree with one another, and then he mentions that he finds it worthwhile to include Africanus’ explanation. In Eusebius’ citation, Africanus proposes that Matthan (a descendant of Solomon) married Estha, and Estha gave birth to Jacob (Joseph’s biological father). After Jacob’s birth, Matthan died. Melchi (a descendant of Nathan)—from a different family—then married Estha, and Estha bore Heli (or Eli, Joseph’s legal father) to Melchi. Thus, two men from two different patrilineal genealogical lines (but from the same mother) were brothers. When Heli died without any offspring, his brother Jacob took Heli’s widow in accordance with levirate marriage (Deut 25:5-6) and begot Joseph. Whereas the Gospel of Luke traces Jesus’ genealogy through Heli and Melchi, the Gospel of Matthew traces Jesus’ genealogy through Matthan and Jacob. Africanus does not comment on the fact that, in any case, Joseph was not the one who begat Jesus. His explanation concludes in the following manner:

εἴτ’ οὖν οὕτως εἴτ’ ἄλλος ἔχοι, σαφεστέραν εξήγησιν οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τις ἄλλος εξευρέω, ὡς ἔγογγε νομίζοι πᾶς τε ὅς εὐγνώμον τυγχάνει, καὶ ἡμῖν αὕτη μελέτω, εἰ καὶ ἀμαρτοῦσιν ἐστίν, τῷ μὴ κρείττονα ἢ ἄληθεστέραν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν· τὸ γέ τοι εὐαγγέλιον πάντως ἄληθευε. (1.7.15)

Therefore, whether one should be able to explain [this problem] in this way or in another way, someone else would not be able to find a clearer explanation. So I think and everyone who happens [to be] reasonable. Let us take thought of this explanation, even if it is unsupported by evidence, 205


Africanus apparently excludes Matthat, who is the father of Eli (Heli), as well as Matthat’s father Levi. See Luke 3:24.
since we cannot speak better or truer. The least [we can say is that] the gospel is in every way true.

Africanus clearly admits that his explanation is provisional, or at least the best he can offer. His first two clauses constitute a future less vivid conditional sentence and merely highlight what should happen if someone were to find another plausible explanation; that alternate explanation will not be any clearer than Africanus’ explanation, the implication being that no completely satisfactory explanation accounts for all of the evidence. Africanus does not insist on his explanation and even admits that the explanation lacks support based on evidence. Rather, he only insists on the conclusion that the gospel is in every way true.

Eusebius, on the other hand, uses language that suggests that Africanus’ explanation is a good deal more certain than Africanus perceives it to be. After another brief quotation from Africanus that summarizes his provisional conclusions, Eusebius assesses the significance of Africanus’ explanation in the following manner:

καὶ δὴ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὃδε πως γενεαλογουμένου, δυνάμει καὶ ἡ Μαρία σὺν αὐτῷ πέφηνεν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οὕσα φυλῆς, εἰ γε κατὰ τὸν Μωυσέως νόμον οὐκ ἔχην ἑτέραις ἐπιμίγνυσθαι φυλαῖς· ἐν γὰρ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὅμου καὶ πατριᾶς τῆς αὐτῆς ζεύγνυσθαι πρὸς γάμον παρακελεύεται, ὡς ἄν μὴ περιστρέφοιτο τὸ γένος ὁ κλῆρος ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἐπὶ φυλήν. (1.7.17)

What is more, when he had thus traced the genealogy of Joseph, he has also powerfully shown that Mary was from the same tribe as Joseph, since really in accordance with the Law of Moses it was not possible to marry with other tribes. Indeed, it was prescribed with regard to marriage that she should be joined together with one from the same deme and clan, so that the inheritance of the clan would not be transferred from tribe to tribe.

Eusebius’ assessment diverges from Africanus’ assessment.\textsuperscript{208} The tone of Eusebius’ assessment suggests that Africanus’ explanation is a powerful (δυνάμει) refutation of those who believe the genealogy of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew disagrees with the genealogy of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke. The difference goes beyond a difference in tone. Eusebius also brings Mary into the picture, whom the quotation from Africanus never mentions. Eusebius’ perspective on whether or not the problem has a satisfactory solution and on what that solution looks like differs rather substantially from Africanus’ perspective.\textsuperscript{209}

Eusebius appears to believe a satisfactory answer exists to the problem of the different genealogies in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, whereas Africanus is merely attempting to speculate from a pastoral perspective about how readers might resolve the dilemma in a somewhat satisfactory fashion. Instead of stopping Africanus’ explanation short, however, Eusebius includes Africanus’ doubts about any explanation of the problem. This difference in language and level of confidence earn the reader’s trust, so that the reader might agree on at least one thing that Eusebius and Africanus seem to have in common: scripture is in every way true.

A third prominent example of Eusebius’ use of polyphony in the context of his paraphrasing of scripture and the voice of the other occurs in HE 1.11. Here Eusebius

\textsuperscript{208} In some sense, Eusebius is following Africanus’ exhortation: καὶ ἡμῖν αὕτη μελέτη, εἰ καὶ ἁμάρτινος ἐστίν (let us take care of this explanation, even if it is unsupported by evidence). Eusebius is taking care of this explanation by passing it on in his own narrative.

twice refers to Josephus’ *Antiquities* in order to offer some support for the claims of scriptural accounts concerning the characters of John the Baptist and Jesus. Eusebius does this in order to refute the ὑπομνήματα (or *Memoirs*, which Eusebius clearly does not think highly of and thus avoids citing directly). The *Memoirs* (referred to as κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠμῶν ὑπομνήματα, the “Memoirs against our Savior,” in 1.9.3) refers to the Acts of Pilate, which is probably no longer extant. Eusebius cites Josephus’ *Antiquities* 18.5.2 as a source that confirms some of the things mentioned in the Gospels (and presumably mentioned in the *Memoirs*). Eusebius implies through a question that Josephus’ independent citations of Jesus confirm some of the characterizations of John the Baptist and Jesus in the Gospels:

Ταῦτα τοῦ ἔξ αὐτῶν Ἑβραίων συγγραφέως ἀνέκαθεν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ γραφῇ περὶ τῆς Βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠμῶν παραδεδοκότος, τίς ἂν ἔτι λείποιτο ἀποφυγή τοῦ μὴ ἀναισχύντους ἀπελέγχεσθαι τούς τὰ κατ’ αὐτῶν πλασμένους ὑπομνήματα; (EH 1.11.9)

Since a historian from the Hebrews themselves from the beginning has handed these things down in his own writing concerning John the Baptist and our savior, what excuse remains but to refute those who fabricated the *Memoirs* against them?

This question implies that the reader should clearly expect a difference between Eusebius’ point of view and the point of view of an author “from the Hebrews” such as Josephus. The fact that these two different points of view agree with one another on various points acts as support for the scriptural point of view over against the point of

---

210 Another Acts of Pilate from the fourth century C.E. is extant.

211 Of course, scholars today debate the reliability of Josephus’s passage on Jesus, since the passage appears to be a possible later Christian interpolation.

view of the *Memoirs*. Eusebius’ interpretation of scripture and Josephus support one another for the very reason that they have such clearly distinct voices.

Substantial differences exist between the death of John the Baptist as Josephus describes it and the death of John the Baptist described in the Gospels. Josephus’ description of the reason for the death of John the Baptist is quite different from the description given in the Gospels.213 Eusebius summarizes the Gospels in the following fashion:

Οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν δὲ τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ὑπὸ τοῦ νέου Ἡρώδου τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτιμηθέντος μὴ μονοεύει μὲν καὶ ἡ θεία τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφή, συνιστορεῖ γε μὴν καὶ ὁ Ἰώσηπος, ὁνομασία τῆς Ηρῴδιας μνήμην πεποιημένον καὶ ὡς ἁδελφοῦ γυναική οὕσαν αὐτήν ἡγάγετο πρὸς γάμον Ἡρώδης. . . . δι’ ἡν καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἄνελὼν . . . φησίν . . . . (1.11.1-2)

Not long after, the divine scripture of the Gospels recalls the beheading of John the Baptist by the young Herod, and besides Josephus records as well, having made mention by name of Herodias, how Herod took in marriage her who was wife of his brother, . . . on account of whom also he killed John . . . [Josephus] says . . . .

Eusebius clearly understands from scripture (and of his own accord) that Herodias was the reason for John’s death. The account of John’s execution in Josephus, however, never directly connects the execution of John to Herodias. Rather, Josephus suggests that Herod executed John out of fear of revolt due to John’s influence on the people:

δείσας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι (πάντα γὰρ ἐσθαναὶ συμβούλῃ τῇ ἑκείνου πράξεντες), πολὺ κρείττων ἤγειται, πρὶν τι νεότερον ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀναρεῖν, ἢ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεσῶν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ο μὲν ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδου δέσμως εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθείς, τὸ προειρημένον φρούριον, ταύτῃ κτίννυται. (1.11.6)

---

213 For more discrepancies between Eusebius (and other Christian writers) and Josephus, see James Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity* (vol. 251; Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 185-266.
Herod, fearing how great [John’s] credibility was among the people, lest he should bring them to some revolt (for they seemed likely to do all things in accordance with his advice), thought it would be much better to take initiative to remove [him] before something untoward happened because of [John] rather than falling into remorse once a change in affairs had taken place. And the prisoner, having been sent to Machaerus, the aforementioned citadel, was killed there because of Herod’s suspicion. Although Eusebius does summarize some of the material in Josephus’ *Antiquities* 18.109-115, nowhere does Josephus attribute the execution of John to Herodias.²¹⁴ Had Eusebius not cited Josephus, the reader might well have missed this discrepancy. Instead, however, Eusebius juxtaposes his own claim about what Josephus said and Josephus’ actual language without addressing this difference. The incongruity sets the narrator and Josephus at odds with one another.

One final example of polyphony in the New Testament comes from Book 3. In this case, the narrator’s voice at one point in the narrative conflicts with the narrator’s voice at other points in the narrative. In Book 3, Eusebius refrains from making a decision on the genuineness of Revelation. Rather, Eusebius gives the reader a sense that this dialog is ongoing and unfinalized, and the reader should expect the dialog to continue beyond Eusebius’ narrative. Eusebius states that some classify Revelation as a New Testament writing, whereas others classify it as a spurious book (3.24.18). When Eusebius catalogs the writings, he lists Revelation in two places. First, he lists Revelation under the New Testament writings with this comment in 3.25.2: ἐπὶ τούτων τακτέον, εἰ γε φανεῖ, τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἓς τὰ δοξαντα κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθησόμεθα (“In

addition to these, one must classify [here] the Apocalypse of John, if it should at least be recognized, concerning which we will explain what we think at the proper time”). Next, he lists Revelation under the spurious writings with this comment in 3.25.4: ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω . . . , ως ἔφην, ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανείη· ἣν τινες, ως ἔφην, ἀθετούσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσιν τοῖς ὀμολογομένοις (“Let be classified as spurious . . . , as I said, the Apocalypse of John, if it should be recognized, which some—as I said—reject and others accept with the accepted [books]”).

In Book 7, however, Eusebius surprises the reader with yet another conversation on encovenanted texts and seems much more amenable to Revelation than he was previously.215 Although Eusebius says very little about Revelation in 7.25, he lets Dionysius speak without any qualification of his assessment. Dionysius clearly views Revelation as the work of a foreigner who is not the author of the Gospel of John or the Johannine epistles; he spends a substantial amount of effort simply differentiating Revelation from the Gospel of John and the Johannine epistles (HE 7.25). He does not outrightly reject the work or embrace it whole-heartedly. Nevertheless, Dionysius’ voice differs from Eusebius’ own voice in that Eusebius more readily dismisses Revelation as spurious in 3.25. Dionysius’ voice contrasts with Eusebius voice in two vastly different sections of the HE. Dionysius’ voice seems more open to Revelation than Eusebius’ voice.

In sum, the incongruities that arise between the language of Eusebius’ allusions to scripture and the language of the sources he cites confirm the importance of the voice of the other in his historiography. For Eusebius, scripture cannot confirm itself. Exact citations are not sufficient for showing the truth of scripture, since they merely convey the unaltered language of scripture itself. The language of outsiders, on the other hand, does have the capacity to demonstrate the truth of scripture, since outsiders can act as external witnesses to the truth of scripture. When external witnesses also attest to the truth, the historical narratives of scripture gain traction because Eusebius has increased the number of credible witnesses. At the same time, the discrepancies that Eusebius feels he must include have the capacity to detract from his narrative and illustrate to the reader that the narrator is far from omniscient. The reader must take some of the responsibility that the narrator relinquishes in order to evaluate the juxtaposition of Eusebius’ own voice with the voice of the other. Eusebius expects that the reader who takes on such responsibility will gain an understanding of the narrative that surpasses the understanding of its narrator’s point of view.

*The Hebrew Bible*

Eusebius begins his history with the pre-existent Christ. This starting point allows Eusebius to extend his history (as it pertains to Christianity) back to before the beginning

---

of time.\textsuperscript{217} As a result, Eusebius draws heavily from sources concerning the Christ that pre-date early Christian texts. That is to say, Eusebius draws heavily on the Hebrew Bible to confirm the directed teleology of history.\textsuperscript{218} The juxtaposition of Eusebius’ assertions with these pre-Christian texts leads to an often-rich polyphony.

Eusebius cites numerous passages from the Hebrew Bible (and later texts such as Hebrews and the Gospel of John) in order to show that Christ pre-existed and was divine (1.2-4). Some of these citations come from theophanies and are perhaps not entirely surprising. Other citations, however, are a bit more shocking to modern readers. For example, Eusebius claims that the voice that called out to Moses from the burning bush was the voice of the pre-existent Christ.\textsuperscript{219} His basis for interpreting Exodus 3:4-6 in this way is the similar wording between the theophany in Joshua 5:13-15 and Exodus 3:4-6. Just before discussing Exodus, Eusebius cites what the commander-in-chief of the Lord says to Joshua in 1.2.12: \(λῦσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου: ὁ γὰρ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἔστηκας, τόπος ἁγιὸς ἐστὶν\) (“Remove the sandals from your feet: for the place in which you stand is a holy place”). These instructions from the commander-in-chief remind Eusebius in 1.2.13 of the words spoken to Moses from the burning bush: \(μὴ ἐγγίσῃς ὁδὲ: λῦσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου: ὁ γὰρ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἔστηκας ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, γῆ ἂγια

\textsuperscript{217} Eusebius is demonstrating a progressive view of human culture, for which he has to explain Christ’s late arrival in human history. See Arthur J. Droge, “Apologetic Dimensions” in Harold W. Attridge and Göhei Hata, \textit{Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism} (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 494-498.

\textsuperscript{218} Eusebius similarly and systematically combs the Hebrew Bible for evidence of Jesus (or Christ) in the DE. See Aaron P. Johnson, \textit{Eusebius} (London: I. B. Tauris, 2013), 68-69.

“Do not approach here: remove the sandals from your feet. For the place, on which you stand upon it, is holy ground.” Based upon the similar wording, Eusebius surmises that the voice that spoke from the burning bush must also be the voice of the commander-in-chief. Since Eusebius had previously asserted that the commander-in-chief was none other than Christ himself, Eusebius then links the voice that spoke from the burning bush with the voice of Christ. This coupling allows Eusebius to make a bolder claim in 1.2.14: καὶ ὅτι γε ἐστίν οὐσία τις προκόσμιος ζῶσα καὶ ύφεστώσα, ἢ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ θεῷ τῶν ὀλον εἰς τὴν τῶν γενητῶν ἀπάντων δημιουργίαν ὑπηρετησαμένη, λόγος θεοῦ καὶ σοφία χρηματίζουσα . . . (“That this is the being who lived before the worlds and supported [them], the one who served God the father of all in the creative act of all created things, being called the word of God and wisdom . . .”).

What conclusions might a reader draw from Eusebius’ connection and his conclusion? How might a reader comprehend this sort of polyphony where a pre-Christian text gives voice to a Christian context? On the one hand, Eusebius’ connection seems quite reasonable. His method is clear. If a divine being speaks specific words in one setting, one might conclude that the same divine being is speaking in another setting where an author uses similar words. This sort of figural reading may reveal something new in the original locution without undermining it. On the other hand, (to set aside the figural nature of this reading for the

220 As Pamela Eisenbaum pointed out to me, Eusebius’ argument here, in effect, constitutes a gezerah shawah, a sort of argument from analogy (personal communication, 1 June 2015). Since the voice in the first instance is the voice of Christ, the voice in the second instance can legitimately receive the same attribution.

221 David Dawson, Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity (University of California Press, 2001), 211-213; Ben Fulford, Divine Eloquence and Human Transformation: Rethinking Scripture and History Through Gregory of Nazianzus and Hans Frei (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 13; and
moment) Eusebius’ understanding of the identity of the voice in the burning bush differs
from the identity Exodus ascribes to the voice in the burning bush. Exodus itself does not
suggest that Christ was a being living before the beginning of the world, supporting that
world, assisting God the Father in the creation of all things, being the word of God, or
imparting the wisdom that gives divine revelation. The reader may sense this
discrepancy. If Eusebius were to offer this Exodus passage baldly as proof of the pre-
existence of Christ, then his evidence would be lacking. Instead, Eusebius juxtaposes this
voice of the other—this voice from the Hebrew Bible—with his own voice. If the voice
of the Hebrew can be heard to bear witness in some way to Eusebius’ claim, then
Eusebius’ assertion of the pre-existence of Christ should not seem so far-fetched to the
reader. The fact that Exodus does not explicitly name Christ in this passage demonstrates
for Eusebius that the other is truly speaking and not just Eusebius. The pre-existent Christ
finds support in the obscure foresight of the Hebrew other.

The point here is not that Eusebius’ theology lacks support. Rather, the point here
is that the language of the text Eusebius cites is distinct from Eusebius’ own language
and his own assessment of the text. Had Eusebius refrained from citing the Exodus text
explicitly but had rather simply alluded to it, the reader might not have noticed the seam
that runs between the language of Exodus and the language of Eusebius. Eusebius seizes
the opportunity, however, to distinguish his own voice from the voice of his source.
These sorts of citations are complex figural uses of the Hebrew Bible, but they are also
examples of polyphony.

Jane Barter Moulaison, *Thinking Christ: Christology and Contemporary Critics* (Minneapolis: Fortress
Of course, one might object that Eusebius understood these Hebrews as Christians and so did not see any difference in voice or perspective.222 After all, Eusebius states that they are “Christians in action, if not also in name” (ἔργῳ Χριστιανούς, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὀνόματι).223 Still, Eusebius later cites Christian voices that are dissonant with his own, and this rhetorical move does not undermine Eusebius’ valuation of the voice of the other in his citation methodology. Eusebius cites all who testify to the (especially proto-orthodox) Christian past, and his language frequently differs from theirs nonetheless.

Philo and Josephus

Eusebius infamously understands the fate of the Jews as closely tied to their putative treatment of Christ.224 In 2.5, Eusebius quotes Philo only to the extent that Philo helps him show the things that happened to the Jews because of the evil that they supposedly undertook against Christ. Eusebius explains his use of Philo in this way:

καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Φίλων ἐν ἡ συνέγραψεν Πρεσβεία τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβῶς τῶν τότε πραχθέντων αὐτῷ δῆλοι, ὅπερ τὰ πλεῖστα παρεῖς, ἐκεῖνα μόνα παραθήσομαι, διὸ δὲ τοὺς ἐνυγχάνουσι προφανῆς γενήσεται δῆλος τῶν ἀμα τε καὶ οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τετολμημένων ἐνεκεν Ἰουδαίοις συμβεβηκότων. (2.5.6)

And Philo himself, in The Embassy that he wrote, accurately explains point by point the things that transpired at that time to him. Omitting most of these things, I will adduce those alone, through which there will be a clear manifestation of the things which happened to the Judeans on

---


223 HE 1.4.6.

account of those who together and not for long had been rash against Christ.

A little later, in 2.6.1, Eusebius similarly starts in the following manner: πάντων δὲ μάλιστα τὸ πᾶν Ἰουδαῖον ἔθνος οὐ σμικρὰ καταβλάψαι . . . (“Most of all that the whole people of the Judeans did no little harm . . .”). Eusebius clearly views the quotations that he will take from Philo as evidence that the Jews suffered because of how they treated Christ. Philo’s actual words, on the other hand, in no way suggest that the Jews suffered because they mistreated Christ. In contrast to Eusebius’ point of view, Philo’s perspective suggests that the Jews suffered because of Gaius. Philo’s De legatione ad Gaium (Embassy to Gaius) describes how the Alexandrian Jews suffered for their refusal to honor the Emperor as a god and how they sent Philo as part of an embassy to entreat the Emperor to restore their rights. At the same time, Philo (like Eusebius) does admit that the Jews especially were suffering. He singles them out in the following manner in 2.6.2: Τοσαύτη μὲν οὖν τις ἡ τοῦ Γαίου περὶ τὸ ἢθος ἢν ἀνωμαλία πρὸς ἀπαντας, διαφερόντως δὲ πρὸς τὸ Ἰουδαῖον γένος, ὃ χαλεπῶς ἀπεχθανόμενος τὰς μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἀλλαῖς πόλεσιν προσευχάς, ἀπὸ τὸν κατ’ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἀρξάμενος, σφετερίζεται . . . (“The inconsistency of Gaius with respect to conduct, then, was so great toward all, but especially toward the race of the Judeans, at which he, grievously feeling hatred, seized the prayer houses in other cities, beginning from those in Alexandria . . .”). In the passages Eusebius cites, Philo attributes the suffering of the Jews to the anomalous and

---

deviant Gaius (Caligula).\textsuperscript{226} The Jews received maltreatment under his rule because they refused to pour libations on his behalf and perform other religious actions that violate Torah. Their suffering resulted from his sadism. Eusebius, on the other hand, clearly understands Gaius’ behavior as somehow reasonable; it comprises the just recompense of God. Eusebius’ evidence, however, lacks this explicit connection. Although the citation confirms Gaius’ mistreatment of and special focus on the Jews, Eusebius lets lie the differences in point of view. These differences in voice confirm a few historical facts while simultaneously highlighting differences in interpretation of those facts. Once again, Eusebius is using polyphony to construct his narrative. Instead of maintaining a cohesive narrative, he deliberately includes passages that he knows are debatable with regard to his own interpretation.

At the beginning of Book 3, Eusebius uses polyphony to demonstrate that the siege of Jerusalem was God’s judgment for how the Jews treated Christ. To this effect, Eusebius cites Josephus’ \textit{Histories} extensively. Eusebius has to select certain parts of Josephus’ narrative because Josephus goes to such great lengths to illustrate how awful things became for Jews in Jerusalem and because Josephus attributes the events that took place to the hand of God.\textsuperscript{227} Eusebius includes the stories about the famine, presumably because those stories include depraved characters. For Eusebius, depraved characters illustrate the sort of Judaism that requires God to intervene on behalf of the innocent. Perhaps the most well known story that Eusebius includes is the story of Mary the


daughter of Eleazar, who cannibalized her own infant son (HE 3.6). Eusebius’ citation of this story, however, differentiates between different kinds of Jewish characters, not all of whom appear to receive their just dessert (at least in the passages that Eusebius cites).

Although Eusebius argues that these narratives illustrate God’s judgment against the Jews, Eusebius fails to recognize that some of the Jews make out fairly well in these stories. This observation may seem trivial in the context of the similarities in points of view shared by Eusebius and Josephus regarding God’s role in this catastrophe. Nevertheless, this discrepancy does arise from a difference in language and from a difference in point of view. Eusebius seems to believe all Jews deserved to receive blame for their sufferings, whereas Josephus places much of the blame for the catastrophe on the partisans. The “torturers” (βασανισταί) make out fairly well in the portions of the narrative that Eusebius cites and are even the cause of the suffering of others. In 3.6.9-10, Eusebius’ citation from Josephus notes that some of the Judeans suffer less: οἱ βασανισταί δ’ οὐδ’ ἐπείνων ἵνα ὡμόν ἦν τὸ μετὰ ἀνάγκης, γυμνὰζοντες δὲ τὴν ἀπόνοιαν καὶ προπαρασκευάζοντες ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἕξης ἡμέρας ἑρόδια (“The torturers did not hunger [for it would have been less savage with necessity], but [they were] exercising their madness and preparing beforehand provisions for the days to come”). The quotations that Eusebius cites never retract this assertion. Rather, the

228 See Josephus, De bello Judaico (BI) 6.194-213.

229 Both the Sicarii and Zealots played important roles during the siege of Jerusalem. The two groups appear to overlap somewhat in Josephus’ BJ. See Mark Andrew Brighton, The Sicarii in Josephus’s War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations (Early Judaism and Its Literature 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 2-11. Eleazar ben Simon, Simon bar Giora, and John of Gischala—all leaders of Zealot groups—engaged in civil war within Jerusalem and greatly weakened the city. The Zealots burned the grain stores of Jerusalem, which Josephus says would have lasted the city many years (AJ 5.23-24).
quotations further confirm that the partisans seize from the citizens whatever food or treasures they can find, as for example in 3.6.22: τὰ δὲ λείψανα τῶν κειμηλίων καὶ εἰ τι τροφῆς ἐπινοηθεὶς καθ’ ἡμέραν εἰσπιθώντες ἠρπαζον οἱ δορυφόροι (“Now if one might notice some food, the spearmen rushing in would also snatch the remainder of the stores daily”). Josephus, then, suggests that the partisans are responsible for much of the suffering and in fact suffer less themselves than others. From the perspective of Eusebius’ metanarrative, however, the Romans would make a better executor of God’s recompense on the Judeans than their own kin.

Even when Eusebius cites Josephus’ own assessment of the depravity of the city, the brigands and partisans remain the sole deservers of God’s just recompense.230 The other Judeans appear as victims. The citation that Eusebius offers immediately before Josephus’ summary concerns the λῃσταί (robbers) who broke into houses and stole from those victims.

Eusebius then mentions Josephus’ appraisal of the situation as follows:

οἶμαι Ῥωμαίον βραδυνάτων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλληρίους, ἢ καταποθῆναι ἀν ὑπὸ χάσματος ἢ κατακλυσθῆναι τὴν πόλιν ἢ τοὺς τῆς Σοδομηνῆς μεταλαβεῖν κεραυνοῖς: πολὺ γὰρ τῶν ταῦτα παθόντων ἠνεγκεν γενεάν ἀθεωτέραν: τῆ γοῦν τούτων ἀπονοία πάς ὁ λαὸς συναπώλετο. (3.6.16)

I think that if the Romans had hesitated on behalf of these wicked people, either they would have been swallowed up by a chasm, the city would have been flooded, or they would have received in succession the thunderbolts of Sodom. For many of those who suffered these things endured a more godless generation. The whole people, then, perished in their madness.

Note that the episode of John melting the temple vessels and desecrating the temple in other ways immediately precedes Josephus’ summary in BI 5.560-566. This passage is the passage that prompts Josephus’ overarching assessment of the depravity of the populace in Jerusalem.

The ἀλιτρίοι ("wicked people") are the robbers and partisans, not the entire Jewish populace. Eusebius, though, alludes to these events because they reflect one of his general themes for his history, namely the fate of the entire Jewish people. Eusebius allows this polyphony to stand without trying to rein in Josephus’ assertions about the identity of the real evildoers.232

**Philo’s Therapeutae**

In 2.17, Eusebius quotes extensively from Philo’s *Therapeutae* in order to demonstrate that this group comprised early ascetic Christians.233 The Therapeutae were an Egyptian community of ascetic Jews near Alexandria who fasted, studied the Hebrew Bible, devoted themselves to prayer twice a day, and met together regularly on the Sabbath to worship. The connection between the Therapeutae and early ascetic Christians

---

232 A bit later, Eusebius alludes to an oracle that Josephus cites and takes a different point of view on the most fitting interpretation of that oracle. Interestingly, though, Eusebius does not cite Josephus here but rather simply summarizes the oracle in 3.8.10: Ἐτέρων δὲ τούτου παραδοξότερον ὁ αὐτὸς ἰστορεῖ, ἱστηκὼν τινα φάσκον ἐν ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν εὑρήσατι παρεῖχοντα ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκέινον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτὸν ὑρῆλα τῆς οὐκομίης, ὃν αὐτὸς μὲν ἐπὶ Οὐσισπασινὸν πεπληρώθη ἐξελθεὶν . . . ("The same [author] records another still more remarkable thing than this, saying that a certain oracle was found among their sacred documents that contained how one of them from [that] land will rule over the inhabited world at that time, which he understood to be fulfilled in Vespasian . . ."). Josephus, then, clearly understands the oracle as a juxtaposition of the Judaisms of Jerusalem with the might of Rome. Eusebius, on the other hand, views the fulfillment of the oracle as being Christ in 3.8.11: Ἀλλ’ ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀναστήθη . . . ("But he did not rule over all [the inhabited world] but rather only over that which was under the Romans; it would be interpreted more fittingly [to be fulfilled] in Christ . . ."). The different interpretations of this oracle highlight the two different points of view in Eusebius’ narrative and in his citations of Josephus’ narrative but in a monological way. Still, Eusebius is not over insistent on the correctness of his interpretation. Note the comparative δικαιότερον ("more fitting").

233 For Eusebius, the *Therapeutae* link the ascetic Christian practices of Eusebius’ own day to very early on in the history of the church. See David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 219. The identification of the Therapeutae as Christians began with Eusebius and did not receive further consideration until the 17th to the 19th centuries. See Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 227. Sozomen also points to Philo’s account of the *Therapeutae* as a precursor to monasticism, although Sozomen mentions that some believe monasticism arose from persecutions that drove people to the wilderness. In the latter view, these people grew used to living in desolate places and eventually became monastics. See Sozomen 1.12.
allows Eusebius to link the church in Alexandria to the church in Rome (from where Mark, the author of the Gospel of Mark, left for Alexandria after writing his Gospel).\textsuperscript{234}

They say that this Mark was first to be sent to Egypt to proclaim the Gospel, which he also in fact composed, and first to establish the Alexandrian churches in [Egypt]. He established so great a number of men and women who believed on the spot from their first apprehension through a most contemplative and most severe training, so that Philo also considered their ways of life, their assemblies, their feasts [or symposia], and every other conduct of their life worthy of writing about.

Eusebius is then able to use Philo’s account to discuss the early church in Alexandria, a new (and important) community of early Christianity. Eusebius expends a lot of energy to persuade the reader that the Therapeutae were in fact Christian.

Nevertheless, Eusebius realizes that he has introduced a problem into his narrative. The reader has no reason to believe that the Therapeutae are Christians. He anticipates doubt on the part of the reader:\textsuperscript{235}

\begin{quote}
εἰ δὲ τῷ μὴ δοκεὶ τὰ εἰρημένα ἴδια εἶναι τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείας, δύνασθαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις παρὰ τοῦς δεδηλωμένους ἁρμότειν, πειθέσθω
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{234} The Venerable Bede mentions the Therapeutae in his \textit{Commentary on Mark}, which demonstrates how long lasting Eusebius’ assessment of the Therapeutae is. See Runia, \textit{Philo in Early Christian Literature}, 231.

If the aforementioned items do not seem to someone to belong properly to the way of life in accordance with the gospel but can also belong to others beside the men and women having been explained, let him or her be persuaded by the voices that come next, among which it is undisputed, if one has the right disposition, one will obtain the testimony concerning this.

Then, after citing Philo again, Eusebius anticipates still more doubt on the part of the reader:

We think that these passages of Philo are clear and incontrovertible concerning the things that belong to us. But if someone, contradicting these things, should still be hardened, let that one be set free from disbelief, submitting to more clear proofs, which one is able to find not in some [other form of worship] but alone in the worship of Christians.

Further, in 2.17.21, he adds the following as if he has thoroughly proved his point, but still with the anticipation of doubt on the part of the reader: Τί δεῖ τούτοις ἐπιλέγειν τὰς ἐπὶ ταύτων συνόδους . . . ; (“Why must we add to these things their meetings in an identical account?”) He ends the section in 2.17.24 with a firm conclusion that he has proved that the people Philo was speaking of were Christians: . . . ὅτι δὲ τούς πρῶτους κήρυκας τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας τὰ τε ἀρχήθηκεν πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθη παραδεδομένα καταλαβὼν ὁ Φίλων ταῦτα ἐγράφειν, παντὶ τῷ δήλον (“. . . Philo wrote these things comprehending that these were the first heralds of the teaching of the gospel and the traditions from the beginning having been handed down from the apostles”).

Again, Eusebius alludes to his reason for including the Therapeutae in the first place:
they carry on the teaching of the apostles from a very early date. Finally, Eusebius carefully notes that the selling of property is especially important for the disciples in Acts and for the Therapeutae in Philo (2.17.6).

Eusebius’ comments throughout this narrative—and in his narrative concerning Justin Martyr (below)—take on a tone somewhat different from the tone he has adopted elsewhere in the HE. Eusebius has started to use clauses such as τάχα δ’ εἰκός (2.17.12), “it is perhaps reasonable” to express the dubious nature of his evidence. Eusebius may appear to take on a monological tone, but he relentlessly cites his sources despite their difference in viewpoint. He dialogs with the reader in an attempt to convince the reader of his own point of view, but he highlights his lack of evidence in the process. Had he summarized the passages he cites or modified his citations, he might have persuaded the reader to adopt a position similar to his own.

In all of these passages, Eusebius anticipates resistance on the part of the reader. He suspects that he has not adequately persuaded the reader that the Therapeutae belong in this narrative, so he keeps adding citation after citation to attempt to make his case. Still, Eusebius relies on the voice of the other to make his point instead of interpreting that voice for his reader. If Eusebius were virtually certain the Therapeutae were Christians, he might simply have mentioned that they were Christians before citing or alluding to their practices. Instead, he cites a few passages that he anticipates will raise

---


237 Compare his uncertainty regarding whether Revelation should be included in the encovenanted books or the spurious books in 3.25.2. When Eusebius delineates the spurious books, he includes Revelation in the following words: . . . ἐὰν φανεῖη, τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου . . . (“. . . if it should seem reasonable, the Apocalypse of John . . .”).
objections in the reader because he needs the reader to hear the voice of the other, which is more authoritative than his own voice.

Despite Eusebius’ rhetorical efforts, however, he still values and uses polyphony throughout this subnarrative. For example, consider how Eusebius includes Philo’s description of what Eusebius considers their churches:

Then next after delineating what sort of houses they have, he says the following about the churches in their land:

“In each house there is a sacred room that is called a sacred place or hermit’s cell, in which they perform the mysteries of the sacred life when they are alone, carrying in nothing—not drink, not food, not anything else that is necessary for the service of the body—but ordinances, sayings that have been prophesied through the prophets, hymns, and other things by which knowledge and godliness are augmented and accomplished.”

And after other things, he says:
“During the interval from early in the morning until evening they have training all together. They study, reading their sacred scriptures [and] interpreting their ancestral philosophy allegorically, since they consider the things of literal interpretation as signs of a hidden nature having been revealed in conjectures. And they have compositions of ancient men, who are the founders of their sect. They left behind many remembrances of the form with those things spoken allegorically, which by using them just as patterns they imitate the way of the sect.”

These things, then, seem to have been said by a man who was listening to them expound their sacred scriptures. It is perhaps reasonable [to say] that their compositions from of old he speaks of are the Gospels, the writings of the apostles, certain interpretive accounts in the likeness of the ancient prophets, of the sort which the letter to the Hebrews and other epistles of Paul contain many.

Eusebius’ comments here focus on the practices of the Therapeutae. The focus on the “Christianization” of the Therapeutae plays a subordinate role here. Eusebius merely speculates (τάχα δ’ εἰκός, “it is perhaps reasonable”) regarding the sort of readings the Therapeutae did. Eusebius does not insist on this point. Eusebius’ interests are in the ἐκκλησία (churches, for Eusebius) and the study practices of these people. Eusebius’ speculation adds to the voice of the narrative without attempting to control its effect on the reader entirely. Instead of selectively citing only those passages that share his point of view, he fights with the text publicly, as it were. By fighting with the text in front of the reader, he simultaneously identifies the weaknesses in his own argument and addresses those weaknesses to make the best possible case he can for his point of view. Still, he refuses to omit the voice of the other just because it disagrees with his own voice.

---

238 Philosophy also enjoyed a reputation for adherents who led ascetic lifestyles, which is perhaps another reason why Eusebius includes the Therapeutae (and its references to philosophy) in his account. See Goehring, “The Monastic Life,” 238.
Tertullian and Pliny the Younger

The Judeans were not the only ones to suffer divine recompense in Eusebius’ narrative. Eusebius also gives an account of divine wrath directed against rulers who persecute the church. Even in these accounts, however, Eusebius uses polyphony to tell his narrative to his readers.

For example, Eusebius narrates how Emperor Trajan stopped the killing of Christians in response to Pliny the Younger’s report to the emperor. After Eusebius narrates the story as found in Tertullian, he then offers a translation of Tertullian from Latin into Greek. Eusebius’ own narrative of events and his citation of Tertullian are very similar, except on a few key points.

In Eusebius’ narrative, Eusebius neglects to mention why Trajan requires the authorities (or even normal people) to continue to punish Christians they meet. Eusebius simply states the following:

πρὸς ὁ τὸν Τραϊανὸν δόγμα τοιόνδε τεθεικέναι, τὸ Χριστιανῶν φύλον μὴ ἐκζήτεσθαι μέν, ἔμπεσόν δὲ κολάζεσθαι· δὲ ὃν ποσὸς μὲν τὸ διωγμὸν σβιθήναι τὴν ἀπειλήν σφοδρότατα ἐγκειμένην, οὐ χειρὸν γε μὴν τοῖς κακουργεῖν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἐθέλουσιν λείπεσθαι προφάσεις . . . (3.33.2)

To which Trajan issued a decree as follows, that the community of Christians not be sought out but rather be punished if met with; through which the most severe threat of persecution that was upon [us] was to a certain extent extinguished, no fewer pretexts remained for those who wished to maltreat us . . .

---

239 Eusebius knew very little about Tertullian and perhaps did not understand his full importance for the narrative of early Christianity. See David E. Willhite, Tertullian the African: An Anthropological Reading of Tertullian’s Context and Identities (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 20; Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 131-132; and Marian Hillar, From Logos to Trinity: The Evolution of Religious Beliefs from Pythagoras to Tertullian (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 193.
Whether intentional or not, Eusebius omits the reason for the punishment. This omission makes the punishment seem unreasonable. For Eusebius, the punishment simply reflects the persecution that was happening in various places. The persecution both had to happen and happened because Christians must suffer such persecution. Eusebius’ first clause in 3.33.1 suggests as much: Τοσοῦτος γε μὴν ἐν πλεῖοσι τόποις ὁ καθ’ ἡμῶν ἐπετάθη τότε διωγμός . . . (“The persecution against us was increased to such an extent in many places . . .”). Eusebius simply treats the persecution as one of his larger themes; he fails to explain why the persecution was happening.

In the Tertullian passage that Eusebius cites, however, the reason for the persecution is explicit (in 3.33.3): ἕξω τοῦ μὴ βούλεσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰδολολατρεῖν οὐδὲν ἀνόσιον ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρηκέναι . . . (“Nothing unholy was discovered among them outside of the fact that they did not desire to worship idols . . .”). For Tertullian, Christians are upstanding citizens except for the fact that they refrain from idol worship. Pliny is not simply persecuting Christians; he is responding to their refusal to worship idols.

In addition, the Tertullian quotation notes the motivation for Pliny the Younger’s inquiry in the first place. In 3.33.3, Pliny the Younger makes the inquiry for the following reason: διὸ ἦγνοει τί αὐτῷ λοιπὸν εἴπῃ πρακτέον . . . (“Wherefore he was ignorant of what he must do in the future . . .”). He was unsure of how to act in the future after he had already condemned some Christians. Eusebius, on the other hand, suggests that the sheer number of martyrs was what caught Pliny the Younger’s attention in 3.33.1: ἐπετάθη τότε διωγμός, ὡς Πλίνιον Σεκοῦνδον, ἐπισημότατον ἠγεμόνων, ἐπὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν μαρτύρων κινηθέντα . . . (“At that time, the persecution increased, so that Pliny Secundus, a most
notable governor, was moved by the number of martyrs . . .”). In the quotation from Tertullian, Pliny the Younger is thinking about how to handle future cases that arise, since he had encountered some cases that puzzled him. Eusebius, however, wants to leave the reader with the impression that the persecution is so massive (and unjust) that Pliny the Younger took note based on what he had seen. The reason for Pliny the Younger’s inquiry and his reason for participating in persecution are somewhat ambiguous in Eusebius’ polyphonic narrative.240

Justin Martyr

Sometimes, the difference between Eusebius’ language and the language of his sources complicates his narrative. For example, Eusebius has difficulty in HE 4.16 when he attempts to use his sources to bear witness to the martyrdom of Justin. Eusebius cites Justin’s Defense and Tatian’s Against the Greeks. None of the three quotations Eusebius cites in 4.16 suggests that Justin had become a martyr.241 A perceptive reader would easily notice the difference between Eusebius’ language and the language of his sources, especially since Eusebius has to provide further context to this evidence in 4.17. Instead of using a monological approach, Eusebius persistently gives voice to the words of Justin Martyr and retains his polyphonic methodology.


241 The ambiguous evidence that exists for Justin’s martyrdom includes Epiphanius Haer. 46.1, Tatian Oratio 32, the Acts of Justin’s Martyrdom, and Eusebius. See Leslie William Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 5-6 and E. R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968), 76. This section is not questioning whether Justin received his martyrdom. Rather, this section explores how Eusebius understands that martyrdom given the sources he has to work with.
In Eusebius’ introduction to his first quotation in 4.16, he explicitly claims that

Justin experienced martyrdom as the result of the devices of the philosopher Crescens:

Κατὰ τούτους δὲ καὶ ὁ μικρὸς πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δηλωθεὶς Ἰουστῖνος δεύτερον ὑπὲρ τὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς δογμάτων βιβλίον ἀναδοῦσι τοῖς δεδηλομένοις ἄρχουσιν, θείῳ κατακοσμεῖται μαρτυρίῳ, φιλοσόφου Κρήσκεντος τὸν φερόνυμον δ’ οὗτος τῇ Κυνικῇ προσηγορίᾳ βίον τε καὶ τρόπον ἐξῆλθοι τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν αὐτῷ κατάστασος, ἐπειδή πλεονάκις ἐν διαλόγοις ἀκροατῶν παρόντων εὐθύνας αὐτὸν, τὰ νικητήρια τελευτῶν ἢς επρέσβεσθεν ἀληθείας διὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀνεδήσατο. (4.16.1)

Now during these times Justin, having been mentioned earlier, after distributing a second book to the rulers mentioned on behalf of our teachings, was adorned with divine martyrdom, after the philosopher Crescens (he imitated the life and way named after the Cynic appellation) stitched up a plot, since too often in arguments during public examinations while hearers were present [Justin] won victories against [Crescens] in the end through his testimony of the truth he was ambassador of.

The connection between Justin’s martyrdom and Crescens becomes important for Eusebius, and he alludes to it again later. Eusebius then claims in 4.16.2 that Justin anticipated his own martyrdom and spoke about it in his Defense: προλαβὼν ἀποσημαίνει τούτοις τοῖς ρήμασιν . . . (“Anticipating [this], he indicated by signs with these words . . .”). In order to prove his claim, Eusebius cites from Justin’s Defense in 4.16.3 as follows: κάτω οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ἄνωμομενῶν ἐπιβουλευθῆναι καὶ ξύλῳ ἐντιναγῆναι ἢ κἂν ὑπὸ Κρήσκεντος τοῦ ἀφιλοσόφου καὶ φιλοκόμου . . . (“I also therefore expect to be plotted against by one of those mentioned and to be hurled against a tree, or perhaps even by that unphilosophical and ostentatious Crescens . . .”). Justin’s claim that someone will hurl him against a tree does not necessarily amount to a prediction of martyrdom, notwithstanding the fact that Justin is enunciating these words and not some later historian. The story that precedes this quotation in Justin’s Second Apology does suggest that Lucius condemned three Christians to death, but the reader of
Eusebius does not have the full context of Justin’s quotation. The reader might just as well view the words ξύλῳ ἐντιναγῆναι (“to be hurled against a tree”) as a reference to punishment rather than as a reference to death, since the reader has no idea what the adverbial καὶ of κάγῳ (“and I”) points back to in Justin’s narrative. The citation merely suggests that Justin anticipates trouble because others oppose him. Eusebius would have made his point more explicit by either citing more of Justin’s narrative (which he does later) or by summarizing the preceding content of the narrative in his own words. Eusebius himself evidently senses as much, as 4.17 will demonstrate below.

Eusebius’ second citation—taken from Tatian’s Against the Greeks—offers no evidence of Justin’s martyrdom but rather merely comments on Justin’s character. Tatian states the following in 4.16.7: καὶ ὁ θαυμασιώτατος Ἰουστῖνος ὀρθὸς ἐξεφώνησεν ἐοικέναι τοὺς προειρημένους ληστὰς (“And the most remarkable Justin rightly pronounces that the aforementioned men are like robbers”). The most important takeaway from this citation is presumably that Tatian views Justin as remarkable.

Eusebius’ third citation in 4.16 (his second quotation from Tatian) also lacks specific evidence for the martyrdom of Justin. Tatian clearly indicates that Crescens was intent on bringing about the death of Justin in 4.16.9: θανάτου δὲ ὁ καταφρονεῖν συμβουλεύων οὐτως αὐτὸς ἐδείξει τὸν θάνατον, ὡς καὶ Ἰουστῖνον, καθάπερ μεγάλῳ κακῷ, τῷ θανάτῳ περιβαλεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι, διότι κηρύττων τὴν ἀλήθειαν λίχνους τοὺς φιλοσόφους καὶ ἀπατεώνας συνήλεγεν (“Now [Crescens], who was plotting to treat

---

242 At best, Justin conveys a sense of foreboding, although Tatian never confirms Crescens’ involvement. See Barnard, Justin Martyr, 5.

243 Incidentally, Eusebius credits this same Tatian with the origination of the heresy of the En克拉蒂tes in 4.29. Despite Tatian’s role in that heresy, Eusebius still finds some of Tatian’s writings useful (4.29.7).
[Justin] with contempt by spending time surrounding him with death just as a great evil, was thus afraid of death (as also he was of Justin), since [Justin], proclaiming the truth, confuted the gluttonous and rogue philosophers”). Note that Justin does not claim that Crescens succeeded in bringing about the death of Justin.\textsuperscript{244} Rather, Crescens was busying himself with encompassing Justin with death. In other words, Tatian describes what Crescens was attempting to do rather than what Crescens actually did.

Eusebius’ readers will be largely unaware of Tatian’s own words, but they do further support the notion that Eusebius’ language should at most convey a sense of foreboding. Tatian’s meaning becomes even clearer when one juxtaposes Eusebius’ language with Tatian’s own (extant) language.\textsuperscript{245} Tatian states the following in \textit{Oratio ad Graecos} 19.1: ως καὶ ὸυστίνον καθάπερ καὶ ἔμε ὡς κακῷ τῷ θανᾶτῳ περιβαλεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι . . . (“So that he busied himself with surrounding Justin with death just as also me . . .”). Eusebius, on the other hand, puts it differently in 4.16.9: ως καὶ ὸυστίνον, καθάπερ μεγάλῳ κακῷ, τῷ θανᾶτῳ περιβαλεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι . . . (“So that he busied himself with surrounding Justin with death just as a great evil . . .”).

Granted, manuscript traditions vary and the “original” texts of both Eusebius and Tatian are now figments of scholarly imagination. Nevertheless, whether a scribe, Eusebius, or Tatian himself says ως καὶ ὸυστίνον καθάπερ καὶ ἔμε, the writer seems to suggest that he himself is also subject to the same pressure from Crescens. The reader of this text (and of Eusebius’ text) would conclude that the speaker of the text was still alive at this point.

\textsuperscript{244} Again, Tatian merely gives a sense of “foreboding.” See Barnard, \textit{Justin Martyr}, 5.

\textsuperscript{245} E. J. Goodspeed, \textit{Die ältesten Apologeten} (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1915), 286.
in the narrative of Tatian’s text and would further conclude that Justin is still alive.

Eusebius has not succeeded in making his argument by citing the texts he has adduced so far.

Despite the paucity of his evidence, however, Eusebius proffers the following conclusion in 4.16.9: καὶ τὸ μὲν κατὰ Ἰουστῖνον μαρτύριον τοιαύτην εἰλήφην αἰτίαν (“And he obtained just such a cause for the martyrdom of Justin”). The difference in language between Eusebius’ assessments and the language of the sources he cites demonstrates to the reader that Eusebius’ conclusion goes beyond his evidence. He cannot establish Justin’s martyrdom in two different voices using his own citation methodology. Nevertheless, Eusebius refuses to assert his own voice as a finalized proof of the matter. He continuously goes back to the text of Justin because Eusebius believes his own voice will not compel the reader of its own accord.

In 4.17, Eusebius perhaps realizes that he has not presented enough evidence to persuade the reader that Justin suffered martyrdom and realizes that perhaps he should cite the story that directly precedes the quotation he previously offered from Justin’s narrative. This story also happens to include the exchanges that presumably led to three other martyrdoms. Whereas Urbicius gives orders for soldiers to lead away all three Christians, Justin implies martyrdom only in the case of the second Christian (Lucius):

καὶ πρὸς τὸν Λούκιον ἔφη Ἰάκχος, καὶ καὶ σὺ εἶναι τοιοῦτος, καὶ τοῦ Λουκίου φήσαντος μάλιστα, πάλιν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπαρχήναι ἐκέλευσεν: ὁ δὲ χάριν εἰδέναι ὑμολόγησεν: πονηρὸς γὰρ δεσποτῶν τῶν τοιούτων ἀπηλλάχθαι ἐπέτειν καὶ παρὰ ἁγαθὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τὸν θεὸν πορεύεσθαι. (4.17.13)

Now to Lucius he said, “I think you are a man such as this.” And when Lucius responded, “Certainly,” he again ordered him to be led away. [Lucius] gave thanks that he knew [better], for he said that he was
departing evil despots such as these and going to God, the good father and king.

In 4.17.13, after this lengthy citation, Eusebius adds a clarification that points back to the evidence he cites in 4.16: τούτοις ὁ Ἰουστῖνος εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως ἄς προεμνημονεύσαμεν αὐτοῦ φονᾶς ἐπάγει λέγων ἑκάτερον ὁ προσδοκῶ ὑπὸ τινὸς τῶν ὀνομασμένων ἐπιβουλευθήναι καὶ τὰ λοιπά (“To these things, Justin similarly and suitably added the words that we mentioned previously from him saying, ‘Therefore, I expect to be plotted against by one of those who have been mentioned’ etc.”). Eusebius’ citation methodology is certainly sloppy here. Eusebius has to connect the narrative to the narrative that precedes it in Justin’s Second Apology.246 By doing so, Eusebius presents Justin’s expectation as evidence of Justin’s martyrdom. Had Eusebius begun his narrative of Justin’s martyrdom with an introductory comment, he could have avoided having to step backward through Justin’s narrative. Had a monological approach interested Eusebius, he might simply have introduced his first citation with something like this (which is my own translation of a suitable sentiment into Greek): ἱστορήσας ὡς ἀρα τρεῖς τὸ μαρτύριον εἰλήφσαν . . . (“After recording how three obtained martyrdom . . .”). This might have provided more compelling evidence from the start of Eusebius’ narrative of Justin’s martyrdom, even if the events surrounding Justin’s martyrdom are by no means clear from the sources that Eusebius cites. Eusebius cites sources that imply Justin’s martyrdom rather than prove it or describe it. The divergence in language between Eusebius’ narrative and the narrative of his sources has weakened the claim and has left his reader to do their own assessment of Eusebius and his sources. Eusebius preserves a

246 He does this with the καὶ (“and”) of κάγῳ (“and I”) in 4.17.13 and 4.16.2.
polyphonic approach even when he realizes that the text fails to support fully his own point of view. Without the voices of the texts he cites, Eusebius cannot adequately tell his story. His ἱστορία succeeds insofar as he diminishes his role as narrator and elevates the voice of the texts he cites.

Rhodo

In 5.13, Eusebius again uses polyphony when he cites Rhodo, who argued against Marcion’s sect. Eusebius avers that Rhodo did the following in his books against Marcion:

Ἐν τούτῳ καὶ Ῥόδων, γένος τὸν ἀπὸ Ἀσίας, μαθητευθεὶς ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, ὡς αὐτὸς ἱστορεῖ, Τατιανῷ, ὃν ἐκ τῶν πρῶτων ἔγνωμεν, διάφορα συντάξας βιβλία, μετὰ τὸν λοιπὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν Μαρκίωνος παρατέτακται αἵρεσιν ἢν καὶ εἰς διαφόρους γνώμας κατ’ αὐτὸν διαστάσαν ἱστορεῖ, τοὺς τὴν διάστασιν ἐμπεποιηκότας ἀναγράφων ἐπ’ ἀκριβές τε τὰς παρ’ ἕκαστο τούτων ἐπιεννοημένας διελέγχων ψευδολογίας. (5.13.1)

In this time, Rhodo, a descendant of those from Asia, having been taught at Rome (as he reports) by Tatian (whom we know from earlier) and having composed remarkable books, has juxtaposed the heresy of Marcion with the rest. He records the separation [of that heresy] into different doctrines, registering those who created those separations and scrupulously refuting the contrived falsehoods of these one by one. After Eusebius makes this claim, he cites three passages from Rhodo’s books that mention Apelles and then offers an estimation of Apelles.247 His conclusion is as follows:

The least one can say is that this Apelles uttered myriad impieties against the law of Moses, after slandering the divine words through many compositions as a refutation, as he thought, and having exerted himself not a little in refutation of them. Enough said.

The language of Eusebius’ conclusions differs from the language of Eusebius’ citation in revealing ways. Whereas the language of Rhodo’s conclusions appear to agree with the language of Eusebius’ conclusions to a certain extent, the language of Rhodo simultaneously conflicts with the language of Eusebius’ conclusions in several ways.

First, far from “exerting himself not a little,” Rhodo states that Apelles suggested that each person should continue to believe whatever that person has believed:

ο γὰρ γέρων Ἀπελλῆς συμμίξας ἡμῖν, πολλὰ μὲν κακῶς λέγον ἡλέγχθη: οδὲν καὶ ἔφασκεν μὴ δείν ὅλως ἑξετάζειν τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ ἐκαστὸν, ὡς πεπίστευκεν, διαμένειν: σωθήσεσθαι γὰρ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ἥλπικότας ἄπεφαίνετο, μόνον ἐὰν ἐν ἔργοις ἁγαθοῖς εὑρίσκωνται . . . . (5.13.5)

For the elderly Apelles, having mingled with us, was refuted because he spoke many things badly; for which reason he spoke that it was not necessary to scrutinize entirely the argument, but that each should remain as he or she has believed. For he declared that those who hope in the one who was crucified would be saved, only if they succeed in good deeds . . . .

Rhodo begins by claiming that he has refuted Apelles in many ways, which is a claim that agrees with Eusebius’ conclusions. Nevertheless, Rhodo simultaneously characterizes Apelles as someone who refrains from responding to those refutations. In this citation, Apelles is quite content to let his opponents continue on believing whatever they have believed. He demurs, while his opponents clearly desire to refute him. In other words, Apelles gives up active participation in the argument and refrains from exerting

---

248 The historical Apelles appears to have been more influential, since translators translated his works into Latin. See Phillip Carrington, *Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 260.
himself against his opponents. Second, Rhodo concludes the passage Eusebius cites in 5.13.5 on the following point of similarity in belief: τὸ δὲ πάντων ἀσαφέστατον ἐδογματίζετο αὐτῷ πρᾶγμα, καθὼς προειρήκαμεν, τὸ περὶ θεοῦ. ἔλεγεν μὲν γὰρ μίαν ἄρχην καθὼς καὶ ο ἡμέτερος λόγος. (“Now he taught him a most obscure matter, just as we mentioned earlier, concerning God. For he said that there is one beginning just as our teaching [says].”) Both Apelles and Rhodo (along with his associates) teach that God is a single source. This common teaching demonstrates similarity, not difference, between Apelles’ teaching and Rhodo’s teaching. Eusebius’ reader might well sense the disparity between Eusebius’ conclusions and Apelles’ teachings. Apelles’ teachings do not seem far from Rhodo’s own belief, since God is a single source for them both. Third, Eusebius’ next quotation from Rhodo’s books suggests that Rhodo desired to refute Apelles more than Apelles desired to refute Rhodo:

Now how there is one beginning, he said that he did not know, but thus that he was only moved. Since I swear to speak the truth, he swore telling the truth that he spoke not to assume somehow that one is an unbegotten God, but to believe this. Having laughed, I condemned him, since claiming that he was a teacher, he did not know [how] to confirm what was taught by himself.

Again, the character Apelles leaves no impression that he desires to refute Rhodo, but Rhodo clearly does desire to refute Apelles.249 Apelles only appears to exert effort to

249 I am not the first to point out Rhodo may have in fact been the more aggressive party. See, for example, Gerd Ludemann, Heretics: The Other Side of Early Christianity (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 168.
defend himself rather than to refute Rhodo’s brand of Christianity. Eusebius’ point of view appears to agree with Rhodo’s to a certain extent, but the language of the passages that Eusebius has cited to support his point of view differs from the language Rhodo has used to narrate his dialog with Apelles. These polyphonic juxtapositions leave the reader to assess the validity of the narrator’s claims. Did Apelles really mutter myriad impieties against the Law of Moses and refute the divine words? Readers must construct their own narrative that transcends both the narrator’s point of view and the point of view of his sources.

Refuter of the Phrygian Sectarians

In 5.16, Eusebius cites six times from an unknown author who refutes the Phrygian sectarians who affiliate with Montanus.250 These quotations disagree with one another and exhibit polyphony. The problem begins with the third citation, which takes the followers of Montanus to task for not having martyrs but rather having two leaders who died in the same way Judas did:

ἔστιν τις, ὃ βέλτιστοι, τούτων τῶν ὑπὸ Μοντανοῦ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν λαλεῖν ἀρξαμένου δόστις ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἐδιώχθη ἢ ὑπὸ παρανόμων ἀπεκτάνθη; οὐδείς, οὐδὲ γέ τις αὐτῶν κρατηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀνεσταρωθή; οὐ γὰρ οὖν. οὐδὲ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ἰουδαίων τῶν γυναικῶν τις ἐμαστιγώθη ποτε ἢ ἐλιθοβολήθη; οὐδαμώς οὐδαμῶς, ἄλλω δὲ θανάτῳ τελευτήσαι λέγονται Μοντανός τε καὶ Μαξίμιλλα. τούτως γὰρ ὑπὸ πνεῦματος βλαψίφρονος ἐκατέρους ὑποκινήσαντος λόγος ἀναρτήσας ἐαυτοῦς ὑμῖν ὀμοῦ, κατὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς ἐκάστου τελευτῆς καιρὸν φήμη πολλῆ

250 This material appears to have come from three books, and Eusebius probably compiled this material himself. See William Tabbernee, Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 4-5; Andrew Carriker, The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 60-61; and Grant, Eusebius as Church Historian, 43. Montanism remained influential in Phrygia for at least six centuries. See William H. C. Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 294.
καὶ οὖτω δὲ τελευτῆσαι καὶ τὸν βίον καταστρέψαι Ἰουνᾶ προδότου δίκην . . . (5.16.12-13)

Is there any one of these from Montanus and their women who began to speak, my dear friends, who was persecuted by the Judeans or killed by the lawless? Not one. And were any of them crucified having been seized on account of the name? No, doubtless. Were any of the women at all ever flogged in the synagogues of the Judeans or stoned? In no place at all. Montanus and Maximilla are said to have died another death. For the report [is] that these [two] hanged themselves under the agency of a maddening spirit who moved each of the two separately.251 At the time of the death of each, [there was prompted] a great report that they died and ended their life with the penalty of the betrayer Judas . . . .

In this citation, the idea that martyrdom grants authority to the victims’ teaching is clear. Eusebius’ assessment of this argument is apparent in his transition to the next quotation in 5.16.11: Ταῦτα ἐν πρώτοις ἰστορήσας καὶ δὲ ὅλου τοῦ συγγράμματος τὸν ἔλεγχον τῆς καὶ αὑτοὺς πλάνης ἐπαγαγόν, ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ τῆς τελευτῆς τῶν προδεδηλωμένων ταῦτα φησίν . . . (“Having reported these things in the first part and having brought forward the refutation of their deceit throughout the whole composition, he says the following things concerning the death of the aforementioned in the second book . . .”).

Eusebius believes the unknown author is (successfully) refuting the Phrygian sectarians.

Despite the argument mentioned above about martyrs, Eusebius quotes this author again in the fifth and sixth citations, where the author undermines the argument expressed above. In the sixth citation, the unknown author claims that having martyrs by no means indicates that a sect has the truth:

τὸν τοῖνυν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἔλεγχθέντες ἀπορήσωσιν, ἐπὶ τούς μάρτυρας καταφεύγειν πειράνται, λέγοντες πολλοὺς ἔχειν μάρτυρας καὶ τούτῳ εἶναι τεκμήριον πιστῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ παρ’ αὑτοῖς λεγομένου

Therefore, whenever they are refuted in all that they have said and they are at a loss, they try to resort to the martyrs, saying that they have many martyrs and that this is trustworthy proof of the power of the prophetic spirit which is claimed by them. That is, as it seems, more than anything not true. For some from the other heresies have very many martyrs, and we will surely not consent despite this; we will not confess that they have truth.

This argument directly contradicts the first argument the unknown author makes in 5.16.12-13. Moreover, the contradiction between this argument and the argument in 5.16.12-13 suggests that the unknown author is not succeeding in the refutation of the Phrygian sect. Eusebius juxtaposes two contradicting points of view from a single source in a very short space.

Serapion

In 6.12, Eusebius uses a treatise by Serapion used to address the Gospel of Peter, an apocryphal text usually dated to the second century, in a polyphonic manner. Eusebius’ understanding of the Gospel of Peter differs substantially from Serapion’s view that the work might be somewhat innocuous. Later he discovered that docetists might find support for their Christology in the document. See Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 15.
Another narrative having been compiled by him, Concerning the Gospel Called According to Peter, which he [Serapion] has created to refute the things having been falsely said in [the Gospel of Peter] on account of persons who have some off-course heterodox teachings in the community of Rhossus as the result of the said writing . . . .

Eusebius clearly mentions the falsehood of the things mentioned in the Gospel of Peter and that these falsehoods led some into heterodoxy, but Eusebius’ language does not suggest anything about the nuances of Serapion’s interpretation of the Gospel of Peter.

Serapion, by way of contrast, states the following:

ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρὸ υμῖν, ὑπενάθλους τοὺς πάντας ὤρθῃ πίστει προσφέρεσθαι, καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὄνοματι Πέτρου εὐαγγέλιον, εἰπὼν ὅτι εἰ τοῦτό ἦστι μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν υμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω . . . . (6.12.4)

For I, when I was with you, supposed that all were exhibiting orthodox faith, and without passing through the Gospel having been produced by them in the name of Peter, I said that if this is the only thing that seems to cause dissension among you, let it be read . . . .

Serapion exhibited very little concern about the text at the start. After the text had led some to heterodoxy, however, Serapion gave the text a closer review and came to this conclusion:

ἐδυνήθημεν γὰρ παρὸ ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦτ’ ἦστιν παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρχαίνων αὐτοῦ, οὕς Δοκητάς καλοῦμεν (τὰ γὰρ πλείονα φρονήματα ἐκείνων ἦστι τῆς διδασκαλίας), χρησάμενοι παρ’ αὐτῶν διελθέντι καὶ εὑρέθη τά μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ σωτῆρος, τινά δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν υμῖν. (6.12.6)

---

For we were able from others who practiced this [form of the] gospel itself, that is from the successors who began it, whom we call Docetists (for more thoughts belong to their teaching), to go through [it] making use of them and to discover that there are more [elements] of the correct instruction of our savior, but some things being added, which also we have appended for you.

Serapion argues that most of the document agrees with the teachings of the savior, but some things differ. These items he appends to the document, although Eusebius cuts his quotation off before the list of differences. Serapion’s overall assessment is that the document is somewhat innocuous. He does not even explicitly prohibit the reading of the document. Rather, he wants to be clear about the differences between the teachings of Jesus and the Docetist accretions of the teachings in the document.

One might reasonably assert that Eusebius and Serapion share a similar viewpoint here, since Eusebius cites Serapion explicitly. Indeed, the two may have come to common estimation. Serapion’s point of view, however, chafes against Eusebius’ other, earlier statements about texts such the Gospel of Peter. Consider the following example:

εἰδέναι ἐχομεν αὐτὰς τε ταύτας καὶ τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν ἀποστόλων πρὸς τῶν ἀρετικῶν προφερομένας ἦτοι ὡς Πέτρου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Ματθία ἢ καὶ τινῶν παρὰ τούτως ἄλλων εἰσαγγέλα περιεχούσας ἢ ὡς Ἄνδρέου καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων πράξεως: ὃν οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ τὰς διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνήρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἡζίωσεν, πόρρω δὲ που καὶ ὁ τῆς φράσεως παρὰ τὸ ἥθος τὸ

---

254 These are presumably additions to (or items that go beyond) orthodoxy rather than false teachings. Serapion seems relatively open to the document. See Henderson, The Gospel of Peter and Early Christian Apologetics, 6-7.

255 He appears to leave the document at the very point where this list begins. See Sellew, Eusebius and the Gospels, 129.

256 Some debate exists concerning Serapion’s stance toward the Gospel of Peter at the end of this letter. From the beginning, Serapion may have referred to reading the Gospel of Peter in private, though probably he would not permit someone to read it in public. For a fuller discussion, see Markus Bockmuehl, “Syrian memories of Peter: Ignatius, Justin and Serapion” in The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature (WUNT 158; Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 128-132.
We are able to know that these very [writings] that have been produced in
the name of the apostles by the heretics, such as Peter, Thomas, and
Matthias or also those containing the gospels of some others in addition to
these or the Acts of Andrew, John, and the other apostles, from which
anyone in the succession of the ecclesiastical writers has by no means
considered it worthy to make mention of in a composition. The character
of their way of speaking varies widely with respect to the apostolic
disposition, and they clearly demonstrate that the opinion and choice of
the things being asserted in them are the farthest from the true orthodoxy,
since it happens that they are fabrications of heretical men. Hence they
must not be classed with the spurious, but they must be rejected as
improper in every way and impious.

Here Eusebius clearly assesses texts such as the Gospel of Peter in a manner quite
different from Serapion. For Eusebius, members of the church should refrain from
reading texts such as the Gospel of Peter. Serapion, on the other hand, never prohibits
such reading but rather engages the texts himself in order to differentiate them from the
four Gospels in the minds of his readers. Eusebius puts Serapion’s indifference on display
for all to see and does not attempt to hide it. Eusebius is quite used to different points of
view pertaining to other parts of scripture (e.g., Revelation), so it only makes sense that
he is open to displaying a conflicting view on the Gospel of Peter here as well.257

Eusebius’ display of the diversity in points of view makes the historical narrative more
compelling and complex and prevents it from becoming canned.

257 Indeed, Eusebius’ catalogues that differentiate between heretical and orthodox works are flexible and
open-ended; his developing taxonomy governs his inclusion of works in one category or another. See
Gregory Allen Robbins, “‘Number Determinate Is Kept Concealed’ (Dante, Paradiso XXIX 135):
Dionysius of Alexandria

In 7.9, Eusebius cites a letter from Dionysius of Alexandria, who survived the Decian persecution and was Bishop of Alexandria from 248 to c. 264 C.E., concerning a parishioner who had some difficulty accepting his baptism, since he received his baptism from the heterodox. Eusebius cites this letter right after discussing a number of other letters from Dionysius concerning baptism and Novatian and Novatus (Eusebius believes they are the same person). Eusebius notes that Novatian did not view the baptism of the heterodox as sufficient. He cites Dionysius’ letter in order to show, apparently, how far Dionysius had gone to refrain from re-baptizing those who had received baptism from the heterodox. Eusebius introduces the excerpt from the letter in 7.9.1: Καὶ ή πέμπτη δὲ αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπον Ξύστον γέγραπτο: ἐν ἦ πολλὰ κατὰ τῶν αἵρετικῶν εἰπὼν, τοιοῦτον τι γεγονός καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκτίθεται, λέγων . . . (“And the fifth [letter] was written to Xystus the bishop of the Romans, in which he speaks many things against the heretics, he sets out just such an event of his, saying . . .”). Despite Eusebius’ understanding of the text as one test that speaks against the heretics, Dionysius’ letter suggests that he has agonized over the orthodox position and even feels he might have made a mistake. In 7.9.1, Dionysius begins the letter in this way: καὶ γὰρ ὅπως, ἀδελφέ, καὶ συμβουλής δέομαι καὶ γνώμην αἰτῶ παρὰ σοῦ, τοιοῦτον τινός μοι

---

258 Novatian wanted to prohibit the readmittance of those who had compromised with paganism during the Decian persecution and was eventually appointed as an opposing Bishop of Rome by his supporters. Eusebius only knows of this western scission from Dionysius’ letters and conflates the two personalities. See Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 135.

259 Since bishops do not typically write bishops regarding a single person, Dionysius’ predicament may have been a question about the policy of the church. See A. van de Beek, “Heretical baptism in debate,” In die Skriflig 43:3 (2009), 550-551.
Indeed really, brother, I have need of advice and I request an opinion from you, since just such a matter comes to me, having been afraid lest I am mistaken”). Dionysius by no means expresses resolve that he has taken the correct action or made the proper pastoral decision. After Dionysius describes how a certain man continues to come to him in tears because he received a baptism from the heterodox that differs greatly from the baptism he continuously sees in his own community, Dionysius concludes this passage with a statement that indicates he has grave doubts about the decision to refrain from re-baptizing this man. Dionysius concludes in 7.9.5: ὃ δὲ οὖτε πενθῶν παῦεται πέφρικέν τε τῇ τραπέζῃ προσίεναι καὶ μόλις παρακαλούμενος συνεστάναι ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἀνέχεται (“Now he who has not ceased to grieve has shuddered to approach the table and with difficulty he who is comforted refuses to unite [with us] in prayers”). Dionysius suspects he is making a mistake. As illustrated above in 7.9.1, however, Eusebius uses the passage to argue that Dionysius has held steadfastly against the idea of rebaptism. Dionysius and Eusebius appear to understand the incident in rather different ways. What should the reader make of this difference in point of view? Whereas the narrator understands these issues in terms of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, his source understands the issue at a human level. Dionysius is considering the appropriate pastoral response in this situation. Dionysius strikes a similar tone in 7.24 when he addresses the views of Nepos. Both points of view contribute something to Eusebius’ narrative. Orthodoxy is not the sole reason to consider issues such as these.
Synod of Antioch and Paul of Samosata

In 7.30, Eusebius cites two lengthy excerpts from the synod convened to address the teaching of Paul of Samosata. Eusebius identifies four points that the document addresses:

ἐπὶ πάσας διαπέμπονται τὰς ἐπαρχίας, τὴν αὐτῶν τε σπουδήν τοῖς πάσιν φανερῶν καθιστάντες καὶ τοῦ Παύλου τὴν διάστροφον ἐπεροδοξίαν, ἐλέγχουσι τε καὶ ἐρωτήσεις ἢς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄνακεκινήκασιν, καὶ ἔτι τὸν πάντα βίον τε καὶ τρόπον τοῦ ἀνδρός διηγούμενοι: ἐξ ὧν μνήμης ἕνεκεν καλῶς ἂν ἔχων ταύτας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος διελθεῖν τὰς φωνὰς . . . . (7.30.1)

They are sent through all the provinces, presenting [1] their earnestness and [2] the twisted heterodoxy of Paul to all, [3] the questions and refutations which they have stirred up for him, and still [4] recounting the whole life and way of the man. From which, on account of memory, they are able to pass through these words of theirs at the present . . . .

Of these four points, however, the excerpts that Eusebius selects focus on the fourth point and—to a lesser extent—the second and first points. That is to say, Eusebius’ selection largely neglects his third point, which concerns the cross-examining and questioning of Paul. Instead, the excerpts Eusebius cites focus on ad hominem attacks, broad characterizations of Paul’s heterodoxy, and the trouble the church took to convene the synod.

In other words, Eusebius appears to mention the cross-examination and questioning of Paul in hopes that the reader will gather from the characterizations and ad


hominem attacks that the cross-examination sufficiently refuted Paul. The letter may have failed to mention Eusebius’ third point at all. From the perspective of the reader, Eusebius has added language that the source never uses. The synod may well have ousted Paul for his reputation and associations more than for his teaching.262

One might reasonably object that Eusebius’ language does not actually differ from the synod’s language here. After all, Eusebius may simply have omitted the portions of the letter that address the cross-examination that took place. Nevertheless, from the reader’s perspective, Eusebius’ language differs from the language of the text he cites. Eusebius claims that the letter accounts for the questioning of Paul when the evidence Eusebius proffers never touches on the issue at all. The refutation of Paul’s ideology is important to Eusebius, even if his source does not grant the same importance to that refutation. Eusebius gives a significance to the synod that may not have existed or that simply may have existed in another form. The synod’s refutation of Paul may have come from a character assassination, or it may have stemmed from a cross-examination based on assumptions that no longer held currency in Eusebius’ day. In any case, Eusebius’ language does differ from the language of the excerpts he cites, and this difference in language forces the reader to create meaning from two different points of view.

A small slip in language occurs in 6.25. In 6.25.3, Eusebius notes that Origen μόνα τέσσαρα εἰδέναι εὐαγγέλια μαρτύρεται (“testifies to have known four Gospels”), whereas the passage from Origen that Eusebius cites states the following in 6.25.3-4:

ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίρρητα ἐστίν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ . . . (“As we have learned in the tradition concerning the four Gospels, which also are incontrovertible in the church of God under heaven . . .”). Origen clearly knows more than four gospels. The church, however, acknowledges only four Gospels without opposition. Eusebius’ language appears to imply that Origen only knew of four Gospels. That is to say, Origen knew only of the existence of the four Gospels. No doubt, Eusebius understood that Origen knew of the existence of several more than four Gospels. Nevertheless, Eusebius is attempting to construct a taxonomy for scripture, and he needs to fill in the Gospels slot. In any case, though, this example of a difference in language is a minor one.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated the polyphonic character of Eusebius’ citation methodology in two ways. First, it has assessed Eusebius’ own explicit statements on his citation methodology in order to show how he has diminished the authority of the voice

---

263 Origen does indicate that the scriptures contain four Gospels in his Commentary on John 1.14-26. See Ronald E. Heine, Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 78. The focus of this critique is on the language Eusebius and Origen use, not on whether or not Origen accepted four gospels.

264 Eusebius is constructing a taxonomy based upon random remarks Origen had made. See Robbins, “PERI TON ENDIATHEKON GRAPHON.”
of the narrator and given more sway to the sources he cites. Second, it has cited numerous examples where the voice of one or more citations (or the voice of the narrator himself) differs from the voice of the narrator or from the voice of another citation in its proximity in order to show how Eusebius presents differences in voice to the reader for the reader to assess. Eusebius has lessened the finalizability of his story. Eusebius’ citation methodology endeavors to be polyphonic rather than monologic whenever it can be. The polyphonic character of Eusebius’ citation methodology requires different reading strategies to digest Eusebius’ historiography. Readers must take on some of the responsibilities of the narrator. That is to say, they must assess differences in point of view themselves. They are responsible for bridling both the sources the narrator evokes and the voice of the narrator himself as they seek to make sense of the text.

At the same time, Eusebius’ narrative sometimes conveys a monologic view of the world. For example, much of Eusebius’ narrative regarding Origen’s early life is free from citations.265 The present chapter is not arguing that Eusebius’ entire narrative is polyphonic, as if Eusebius were some precursor to Dostoevsky (who is Bakhtin’s paragon of polyphony). Rather, this chapter has attempted to argue that Eusebius has largely introduced polyphony into the historiographic enterprise.266 Moreover, polyphonic narratives are not always distinguishable as such. That is to say, sometimes a narrator might have a point of view that is distinct from the citation he or she cites, but the two distinct points of view may be indistinguishable to the reader. A particular citation may


266 A few prior historiographers occasionally give glimpses of the polyphony that was to come.
not give enough detail to make these differences apparent to the reader. Polyphonic texts can have monologic elements or simply look like a monologic text in places, even if a polyphonic methodology is governing those texts.

In many respects, then, this chapter has been a response to scholars who place Eusebius firmly in the traditions of his predecessors; Eusebius has complicated the genre of Ecclesiastical history but has also broken away from his predecessors.²⁶⁷ David J. DeVore has similarly highlighted Eusebius’ innovations. DeVore (following the Classicist John Marincola) focuses on elements such as content, chronological limits, chronological arrangement, focalization (the point of view of the narrator), and whether the HE comprises narrative or not.²⁶⁸ While these are useful criteria with which to analyze the genre Eusebius’ HE, none of them captures one of Eusebius’ greatest innovations of all: the polyphonic citation methodology.²⁶⁹ The polyphonic citation methodology allows an author’s sources to speak in their own respective languages. The author lessens the authority of the narrator and elevates the role of the reader, so that the reader becomes in many cases the one who has to adjudicate between different points of view (or even between different worldviews). The narrator no longer has the final say in the narrative, and the narrative is never entirely finalizable. The narrator can change his mind, and so can the reader. Eusebius, as an innovator of the polyphonic citation


²⁶⁹ The polyphonic citation methodology could perhaps fall under focalization, but not in the way DeVore discusses it.
methodology, has done his utmost to present the reader with a variety of witnesses rather than with a single, authoritative narratorial voice.

Several of the preceding examples may seem like they stem from mistakes on Eusebius’ part rather than on intentional choices that Eusebius makes. Some of them may indeed stem from mistakes, but all of these examples constitute examples of Eusebius’ citation methodology. As Eusebius notes in the PE, he believes that using the voice of another is imperative to constructing the narrative of the past, and the voice of the other necessarily carries a point of view different from the voice of the narrator in order for it to be effective.\footnote{PE 10.9.26-28.} Eusebius sees himself as merely one witness among several witnesses, and he refrains from presenting himself as an omniscient narrator.\footnote{PE 10.28.} Therefore, whether differences arise from intentional inclusiveness of all data or from unintentional juxtapositions, Eusebius’ citation methodology demonstrates a commitment to polyphony.
CHAPTER 4: POLYPHONY AND MONOLOGIZATION IN POST-EUSEBIAN CHRISTIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

This chapter examines historiographic practices after Eusebius in order to assess the effect that his polyphonic citation methodology had on later Christian historiography. This chapter will analyze citations from four post-Eusebian Christian historiographers. These historiographers include Sozomen, Socrates, Theodoret, and Bede, and this chapter will analyze the citation methodologies of each of these authors individually. Scholars often note that Eusebius’ HE (and especially his Chronicle)\(^\text{272}\) was a decisive juncture in the history of ancient historiography.\(^\text{273}\) While Eusebius did significantly influence the methodology of later historiographers, the polyphonic nature of the HE did not immediately become their modus operandi. Neither was the effect of his citation methodology wholesale. This chapter argues that Post-Eusebian late-ancient Christian historiography gradually (and often inadvertently) adopts a polyphonic citation methodology to varying degrees.
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Initial Quantitative Considerations

While the qualitative data remains important for this chapter, the quantitative data adds some important perspective to the difference between late-ancient Christian historiography and the historiography of Eusebius. In the first seven books of the HE, Eusebius essentially democratizes the authority of the narrator by giving an almost equivalent number of words to his own voice and the voices of his sources.\(^{274}\) To be sure, he still controls his narrative with the selection of texts that he cites. At the same time, though, he relies upon the difference between his voice and the voice of the texts he cites; his own voice does not possess the necessary authority, credibility, or knowledge to establish the narrative of the past by itself. Eusebius has to include the language of others, so that the reader will know that Eusebius is not speaking the narrative on his own authority, but rather many voices are declaiming the narrative on the authority that each has as witness.

No late-ancient historiographer that this chapter will cover uses the voice of the other to the same extent as Eusebius does. Most of the historiographers that this study highlights produce texts with decidedly fewer citations than Eusebius’ HE. Furthermore, unlike Eusebius, these later historiographers use other media such as speeches to convey

\(^{274}\) As noted in chapter 2, Eusebius’ statistics are as follows:

Table 8. Concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their narrative. While Eusebius’ HE did alter the Christian historiographer’s craft, it did so slowly. For whatever reason, late-ancient Christian historiographers, while they often look to Eusebius as the starting point of their narrative or their methodology, do not often intentionally embrace Eusebius’ citation methodology in its entirety. Nevertheless, late-ancient Christian historiographers do eventually implement one aspect of Eusebius’ methodology: explicit citations of different points of view. As they increasingly cite sources that exhibit divergent viewpoints, they introduce subnarratives that differ from their own. Moreover, they often fail to address these differences. Although these historiographers often assume a monologic posture toward their sources, they also introduce polyphony in ways they probably did not always anticipate. The concentration of citations thus becomes an important factor for considering the potential for contrary subnarratives in these texts:

Table 9. Citation concentrations in Eusebius’ HE, Theodoret’s HE, Bede’s HEGA, Socrates’ HE, and Sozomen’s HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Quotations</th>
<th>Quotation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret, HE(^{275})</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>36.27%</td>
<td>25,916</td>
<td>71,452</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{275}\) Theodoret’s statistics come from his larger block quotations. His block quotations include the following: 8.12-17.4, 17.6-25.9, 25.20-27.7, 27.20-29.18, 33.24-34.23, 35.4-37.14, 38.14-42.2, 42.14-44.25, 45.1-46.10, 48.10-54.3, 54.12-55.4, 55.7-14, 56.11-58.12, 59.2-19, 60.2-23, 61.18-63.19, 66.20-69.12, 76.21-78.17, 78.19-79.13, 82.2-9, 83.11-23, 84.2-85.4, 94.9-95.16, 99.18-100.2, 101.5-118.4, 122.5-11, 123.20-124.22, 125.15-127.13, 127.17-128.3, 129.1-18, 130.1-20, 131.13-17, 131.19-23, 132.2-3, 132.5-6, 132.9-10, 132.12-13, 132.15-16, 132.18, 132.20-133.10, 133.12-14, 133.16-17, 133.19-20, 133.22, 134.1-8, 134.10, 134.12-13, 134.15-16, 134.18-19, 134.21-135.3, 135.5-10, 135.12-14, 135.16, 135.18-19, 135.21, 139.2-143.6, 143.19-144.16, 145.4-146.12, 147.2-150.8, 150.12-152.17, 153.2-5, 163.2-165.8, 212.12-213.20, 214.1-20, 215.1-216.7, 220.6-223.3, 223.7-224.8, 224.12-227.23, 249.16-260.16, 289.6-294.2, 294.4-19, 294.24-25, 295.7-297.9, 297.13-302.15. |
This table demonstrates the wide variation in the concentration of citations in post-Eusebian late-ancient Christian historiography. While none of these authors uses citations to the extent Eusebius does, the authors with higher concentrations of citations tend to exhibit more polyphony in their citations than those with lower concentrations. If half a narrative exhibits viewpoints different from the author’s and if the author does not constantly address these differences in viewpoint, opposing narrative strands begin to develop. If these differences become strong enough, the citation methodology effectively becomes polyphonic; the author is giving voice to multiple viewpoints without exerting a unified authorial consciousness, intentionally or not.  

Thus, a quick synopsis of the quantitative differences is in order.

Sozomen uses citations the least of all these historiographers. Usually, he merely summarizes, narrates, or analyzes his sources without citing them, much as Polybius did.

---

276 Sozomen’s statistics come from his larger block quotations, which include the following: 2.16.3.2-7.6, 2.17.4-3.7, 2.22.5.2-5, 2.27.6.3-10.9, 2.28.2.2-12.7, 2.30.1.2, 2.30.1.3-5.9, 3.2.3.2-6.3, 3.22.1.2, 3.22.1.3-6.5, 3.23.2.2-5.2, 3.24.1.2, 3.24.1.3-2.4, 4.6.12.5-10, 4.13.2.2-3.7, 4.14.1.2, 4.14.1.3-7.8, 4.18.2.2-15.3, 5.16.5.2-15.7, 6.1.15.2-16.5, 6.4.7.4-10.5, 6.11.1.2, 6.11.1.3-3.12, 6.23.7.2-15.4, 6.27.2.2-6.8, 8.26.2.2-6.4, and 8.26.7.2-19.4.

277 In fact, Eusebius is by far the most intentional user of the polyphonic citation methodology in late-ancient Christian historiography.
in his historiography. He also uses speeches from time to time. Sozomen, however, is by no means a professional historiographer, although he apparently visited numerous sites in order to acquire his data (Sozomen HE 1.1). He largely neglects Eusebius’ citation methodology, and the concentration of his citations is low enough that he does not risk inadvertently producing a polyphonic citation methodology. The vast difference between the quantity of citations in Sozomen and Eusebius suggests that Sozomen has inherited very little from Eusebius, aside from some content early in his narrative.

Socrates uses citations somewhat extensively, but certainly less than Eusebius or Theodoret. Many of these citations occur in the first two books. Socrates mentions two editions (one partial) of his HE, and he notes that the first edition used a substantially different citation methodology than the second one. Socrates, then, was cognizant of his citation methodology and had obviously given it some thought, at least the second time around. The qualitative data will be most important for determining how much Socrates uses a polyphonic citation methodology. He seems particularly open to many different kinds of sources, some of which would have struck terror into the heart of Eusebius.

---


279 Ibid., 46.


Bede makes lengthy citations of letters, poetry, epigraphs, and other documents. Based on the density of citations he uses, he certainly runs the risk of inadvertently introducing a polyphonic citation methodology.\textsuperscript{283} Although he does not cite texts as often as Eusebius does, he does include some very lengthy citations. Bede often uses his citations in a literary fashion,\textsuperscript{284} where the significance of a citation is greater than the way that a particular citation fits into the context of the argument at hand.

Finally, Theodoret uses citations extensively. His citations can easily introduce a secondary storyline into his narrative. He cites both champions and detractors of his own branch of Christianity. Unless he manages his detractors carefully, he could easily and inadvertently introduce a polyphonic citation methodology.

\textit{Socrates}

Socrates Scholasticus (c. 380-c. 450), a lawyer in Constantinople, wrote his \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica} (HE) in order to extend Eusebius’ HE from the year 305 to 439. His HE primarily deals with the East, and he addresses state affairs far more than Eusebius does. In addition, he seems to have had Novationist sympathies.\textsuperscript{285} A relationship exists between Socrates’ historiography and Sozomen’s historiography, and

\textsuperscript{283} Indeed, Bede’s use of sources distinguishes him from other early Christian historiographers. See Scott DeGregorio, \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Bede} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 233.

\textsuperscript{284} Bede certainly read classical literary works and had literary sensibilities, at least for his own time in a particular location. See Peter Clemoes, Simon Keynes, and Michael Lapidge, \textit{Anglo-Saxon England} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 33.

\textsuperscript{285} Novationists were reluctant to make concessions for those who had capitulated to paganism during the Decian persecution (249-250 C.E.).
scholars have debated who might have used the other as his source.\textsuperscript{266} The evidence is not unambiguous, but Sozomen seems most likely to have borrowed from Socrates.\textsuperscript{287} In any case, Socrates explicitly cites sources, including letters and creeds, far more often than Sozomen.

The first book of Socrates’ HE covers the events between the conversion of Constantine and his death. At the beginning of his second book, Socrates explains that he had originally composed a first draft of the first two books but that he has substantially reworked his present (second) draft.\textsuperscript{288} Here is Socrates’ cursory explanation of his modifications and his change in methodology:

\begin{quote}
'Ῥουφῖνος ὁ τῇ Ῥωμαίων γλώττῃ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν συντάξας περὶ τοὺς χρόνους ἐπλανήθη. . . Ἡμεῖς οὖν πρότερον Ῥουφῖνῳ ἀκολουθήσαντες τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον τῆς ἱστορίας βιβλίον ἢ ἑκείνῳ δοκεῖ συνεγράψαμεν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου ἄχρι τοῦ ἐβδομοῦ βιβλίου τὰ μὲν παρὰ Ῥουφῖνοι λαβόντες, τὰ δὲ ἐκ διαφόρων συναγαγόντες, τινὰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐτῶν ἐκώστων ἀκούσαντες ἐπιληφθοῦμεν. . . Ἡμεῖς οὖν πρότερον Ῥουφῖνῳ ἀκολουθήσαντες τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον βιβλίον ἀνωθεν ὑπαγορεύσαι, συγχρώμενοι καὶ ἐν οἷς ὁ Ῥουφῖνος οὐκ ἐκπίπτει τοῦ ἀληθοῦς. Οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ τοῦτο ἱστέον, ὅτι οὐ παρεθήκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ὑπαγορεύσει τὸ καθαιρετικὸν Ἀρείου οὔτε μὴν τὰς βασιλείας ἀναγινώσκοντες ἐπιστευθοῦμεν, ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς σὴν χάριν, οἶκῷ ἡ ἱερὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέθρεσε Θεόδωρε, καὶ τούτο ἐδει ποιῆσαι, ὅπερ μὴ ἀναγείνει καὶ ὅσα αὐτάς λέξεωι αἱ βασιλείαι ἐπέστειλαν ἢ κατὰ διαφόρους συνόδους οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τήν πίστιν κατὰ βραχὺ μεταποιοῦντες ἐξεδουκαν, διὰ τούτῳ ὅσα ἀναγκαία ἡγησάμεθα ἐν
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{287} See ibid. Socrates relates a story that he says no one had ever published before. Sozomen has the same story but does not claim to be the first to publish it. Of course, any conclusions drawn from this evidence takes Socrates’ word at its face value. Nevertheless, in the absence of better evidence, this conclusion seems reasonable.

\textsuperscript{288} Clearly, this is the logical place for an introduction to one’s methodology.
Rufinus, who composed the Ecclesiastical History in Latin, was misled concerning the times. . . . Therefore, we, having earlier followed Rufinus, composed the first and second book of the history in the way that seemed best to him, and we completed from the third to the seventh book having received some things from Rufinus, having gathered some things from differing authors, and having also heard some things from those still alive. . . . And besides that, having attained differing epistles at that time, as much as possible we searched out the truth. Wherefore we were compelled to compose again the first and second book, making use of [Rufinus] in what ways he did not fall from the truth. Nevertheless, one should know that we did not adduce in the first edition the deposition decree of Arius nor indeed the letters of the King, but only the bare facts themselves in order to avoid making the readers hesitating due to the prolixity of the history. Since for your sake, Theodore holy man of God, it was necessary to make it this way, so that you may not be ignorant of as many things as the Kings sent (in writing) in their own style or as many things as the bishops published in their different synods when they changed the faith little by little. For this reason, as many things as we thought necessary we have thereupon changed in this edition. And having done this in the first book, we are also taking pains to do [it] in [the book] in hand, I mean the second [book]. One must now make a fresh start of the history.

This indirect methodological statement highlights some important points.

Socrates was reluctant to use many (or lengthy) citations in his first iteration of his project for fear that he would bore the reader (compare the preface of book 5).289 This observation, of course, suggests that Socrates from the beginning may not have fully appreciated the citation methodology of Eusebius’ HE. He found that citation methodology more off-putting for the reader than useful, so he cited hardly anything at all. One should note that the originally excluded sources Socrates mentions are important

289 Urbainczyk, Socrates of Constantinople, 56.
pieces of evidence. In addition, Socrates mentions these sources as if they are merely examples among others that he originally omitted. Socrates may not have cited any sources at all in the first iteration of the first two books of this project, or at least he cited very few.

Socrates’ original method, then, sounds similar to the citation methodology Sozomen uses (which this chapter will address below). Perhaps these two historiographers share a similar point of view on the task of the historiographer. Their methodologies resemble Polybius’ or Diodorus’ more than Eusebius’. These two historiographers may have modeled their citation methodology after the citation methodology of pre-Eusebian historiographers instead. The legacy of Eusebius’ citation methodology apparently failed to capture the attention of Socrates (and Sozomen) at this stage.

Despite the similarities between Socrates’ original citation methodology and the citation methodology of Pre-Eusebian historiographer, however, Socrates’ first edition (and approach) met its demise apparently due to the needs of a single reader. Socrates first believed that copious citations would bore his reader, but at least one of his readers expected a citation methodology that would include the voice of the other. Socrates addresses Theodore, whoever he was, and notes that he (Socrates) changed his approach for Theodore’s sake (πρὸς σὴν χάριν). At that point, Socrates tells us that he

---

290 See, for example, Arius’ deposition in HE 1.6.

291 Compare the treatment of Classical citation methodologies in chapter 2.

292 Urbainczyk suggests that he may have simply been an early reader of Socrates’ drafts. She notes that the preface of Book 6 indicates that Socrates intended his work for a wider general audience. See Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople*, 66.
began to cite documents whenever they might be useful. Had Socrates’ reader not required this sort of citation methodology, Socrates’ historiography would have resembled ancient Greek or Hellenistic historiography. Still, the density of Socrates’ citations remains rather sparse.\textsuperscript{293}

On a broader level, the change of Socrates’ citation methodology because of a reader raises some interesting questions. Were readers beginning to find citation methodologies that explicitly cite sources more helpful than citation methodologies in previous Greek and Hellenistic historiography? Did Eusebius’ HE generate interest in this sort of citation methodology because his readers found it particularly useful? If so, what does the growing popularity of this method suggest about the way people read Eusebius’ HE? These questions might reframe how modern historians conceive of ancient citation methodologies. Perhaps the movement toward copious, explicit citations was reader-driven rather than author-driven. Some readers who might find explicit citations particularly useful include those with limited access to a library and those who lack the time to sift through one. Perhaps the readership of these pieces of historiography spanned a wide swath of socioeconomic groups.\textsuperscript{294}

\textsuperscript{293} Here are Socrates’ preliminary statistics. Again, I am presently fixing a single error in the xml files that I have constructed from TLG and Perseus data.

Table 10. Concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE and Socrates’ HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>12.52%</td>
<td>12,962</td>
<td>103,524</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socrates indicates the reason why he has changed his citation methodology for Theodore. Socrates says that he has changed his methodology, “so that Theodore may not be ignorant of as many things as the Kings sent (in writing) in their own style or as many things as the bishops published in their different synods when they changed the faith little by little” (ὡστε μὴ ἄγνοεῖν καὶ ὅσα αὐταῖς λέξεσιν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐπέστειλαν ἢ κατὰ διαφόρους συνόδους οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τὴν πίστιν κατὰ βραχὺ μεταποιοῦντες ἔξεδωκαν).

Socrates clearly believes that the synods changed the faith over time. Whether this change constitutes a good thing or a bad thing in the eyes of Socrates remains uncertain, but the documentation of that change is one of the primary reasons Socrates changed his citation methodology. In the most recent edition of the HE, Socrates believes that Theodore should be able to notice these changes in Socrates’ documentation. This line of reasoning of course is suggestive of a polyphonic citation methodology. Socrates discovered that for his reader, Theodore, the voice of the other in the style of another (αὐταῖς λέξεσιν) communicates in a way that his own voice as narrator could not. At least from a theoretical viewpoint, the very words of his sources have taken on a new importance in the same way the sources of Eusebius carry a significance that Eusebius’ own voice did not.

Throughout Socrates’ HE, he cites sources that are typically not included in an orthodox author’s work. Many have noted that, despite Socrates’ orthodoxy and Catholicism, he seems to hold a high esteem for Novatianists and uses the work of the

---

295 The differences, rather than the similarities, seemed to be the reason Socrates juxtaposes several synodal documents with one another. Urbainczyk (Socrates of Constantinople, 126) argues the opposite.

296 For a recent discussion of the sources that Socrates may have used, see David Rohrbacher, The Historians of Late Antiquity (Routledge, 2013), 111–113.
heterodox in the construction of his own narrative.297 At the same time, this openness to the voice of the other is greater than Eusebius’ openness (or even policy) in the HE. Eusebius frequently avoids explicitly citing heterodox sources (and scripture, but for different reasons).

One interesting citation of a heterodox writer occurs in 1.26, which is after the Council of Nicaea and before the Synod of Bishops at Tyre. Socrates cites the recantation of Arius and Euzoïus. The actual words of the recantation are quite congruent with orthodoxy. The Nicene Creed comes from the mouths of two heretics. Socrates’ remarks after the citation are clearly monologic.298 After Socrates offers his monologic explanation, he cites the Emperor writing to Athanasius again in 1.27.2 and threatening to exile Athanasius if he does not receive Arius. The emperor clearly sides with Arius and Euzoïus and believes that their recantation is genuine. Arius’ deception of the emperor does not surface until after Athanasius rejects him. The weight of the words of the Emperor and the orthodox content of the confession of Arius and Euzoïus may give the reader pause. The juxtaposition of the citations of the confession of Arius and Euzoïus


298 Socrates’ remarks after the citation are as follows:

Οὕτω μὲν οὖν Ἀρείος τὸν βασιλέα πείσας ἐχώρει εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Οὐ μέντοι κρείσσων ἢ κατασκευὴ τῆς σωφρονείας ἰληθείας ἐγένετο· ὡς γὰρ καταλαβόντα αὐτὸν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν Ἀθανάσιος οὐκ ἔδεχετο (ὦς μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔξετρέπετο), αὐθὰς ἀνακεῖν ἐπεχείρη τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν παρεμβάλλον τὴν αἵρεσιν, ἐκ τούτου πάλιν Ἀἰγυπτὸς ἐταράττετο. (1.27.1)

Thus Arius, having persuaded the Emperor, departed to Alexandria. Nevertheless, his fabrication was not greater than the kept-in-silence truth: for when he reached Alexandria, Athanasius did not receive him (for he turned him away as a defilement), and he tried to stir up Alexandria again by insinuating his heresy. Because of this, Egypt was again unsettled.

Socrates and Athansius clearly share the same point of view (as pointed out to me by Victor Castellani, personal communication, 1 June 2015).
and the later letter of the Emperor with the voices of Socrates and Athanasius comprise a mild form of polyphony, even though Socrates asserts his own monologic comments in his own observations.

In addition to citing heterodox writers, Socrates also cites pagan oracles and seems remarkably open to the possibility of the fulfillment of these oracles. For example, when Emperor Valens destroyed the walls of Chalcedon, the oracle appeared on one of the stones of the wall. Socrates reports the oracle in this way:

Οὐδὲν δὲ κωλύει φιλομαθείας ἐνεκεν καὶ τὸν χρησμὸν ἐνταῦθα προσθεῖναι.

All’ одерж ἤτε δὴ νύμφαι δροσερὴν κατὰ ἄστυ χορεῦσιν τερπόμεναι στήσονται ἐνσυνεφέας κατ’ ἀγυιάς καὶ τείχος λουτρὸν πολύστον ἐσσεται ἄλκαρ, δὴ τὸτε μυρία φῦλα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων, ἄγρια, μαργαίοντα, κακὴν ἐπιειμένα ἄλκην, Ἰστροῦ καλλιρόου πόρον διαβάντα σὺν αἰχμῇ καὶ Σκυθικὴν ὀλέσι χώρην καὶ Μυσίδα γαῖαν, ὸρηκίης δ’ ἐπιβάντα σὺν ἐλπίσι μανομενήνον, αὐτὸ δὲντο βιότοι τέλος καὶ πότμον ἐπίσποι.

Οὔτος μὲν οὖν ὁ χρησμὸς. . . Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὸν χρησμὸν μικρὸν ὄστερον ἐγένετο (4.8.5-7, 10)

On account of the love of learning, nothing prevents us from adding the oracle here:

Well, when nymphs delighting in the dewy dance in town
Will stand on well-girded streets
And the wall of the bath will be a grievous defense,
Then myriad tribes of widespread people,
Wild and raging, clothed in evil warcraft,
Passing through the passage of the beautiful-flowing Danube with spear,
Will destroy Scythian land and Mysian ground,
But when they enter Thrace with raging expectations,
The end of his life would meet Fate.

This is the oracle. . . . Well it came to pass in accordance with the oracle a little later.

299 Urbainczyk, Socrates of Constantinople, 50.
A few important points arise from this citation. First, Socrates provides the citation to satisfy curiosity or the desire for learning. Second, Socrates appears to believe that the protection promised by the oracle came to pass. That is to say, the pagan oracle was fulfilled. Socrates is demonstrating a syncretistic attitude toward the oracle. Third, as often in Herodotus and in other historiographers, the oracle has a potentially ambiguous meaning. After claiming that the oracle was fulfilled, Socrates describes other people’s interpretation of the oracle before reiterating that his interpretation is the correct one (4.11-13). Despite Socrates’ monologic interpretation of the oracle, the inclusion of the oracle and his openness to its fulfillment suggests that divine revelation can come from Christian and non-Christian sources alike. If one embraces syncretism, the approach is still monologic. But if his readers do not practice syncretism, Socrates is introducing conflicting evidence regarding the source of divine revelation. The voices of his sources are in opposition to one another.

Socrates largely assumes a monologic posture toward the texts he cites, but he also introduces conflicting voices that run contrary to one another and sometimes to his own narrative. Socrates differs from Eusebius in the way he cites sources. Socrates’ concentration of sources is much lower than Eusebius’, and Socrates’ citation of sources plays a more diminished role in his historiography. Nevertheless, Eusebius does appear to have eventually had some effect on Socrates, even if some of Socrates’ use of Eusebian methodologies comes mostly from the request of one of his readers. One of his readers may well have motivated Socrates to implement a methodology more prone to polyphony.

300 Note that Eusebius was very careful to exclude narratives of pagan oracles being fulfilled. See Chesnut, The First Christian Histories, 55.
than his original citation methodology. Citation methodologies disposed toward polyphony give readers greater access to the primary data. In the late ancient Christian world, access such as this may have become an expectation for readers who had become more accustomed to book culture.

Sozomen

Salmaninius Hermias Sozomenus (Sozomen) was a lawyer in Constantinople who continued Eusebius’ HE from 323 down to 425. Sozomen dedicated his work to the Emperor Theodosius II, and like Socrates, he treated the affairs of the state much more substantively than Eusebius. He uses both Eusebius and Socrates as sources, the latter acting as a source for the majority of his work.\textsuperscript{301} Despite his heavy use of sources, however, his citations comprise a relatively small percentage of his HE.\textsuperscript{302} The paucity of direct citations is illuminative.

\textsuperscript{301} For his other sources, see Holdsworth and Wiseman, \textit{The Inheritance of Historiography}, 350-900, 49.

\textsuperscript{302} Sozomen’s citations that have more than 50 words include the following: 1.17.4-5 (69 words), 1.18.3 (62 words), 2.7.5-6 (68 words), 2.9.8 (56 words), 2.9.11-13 (98 words), 2.16.3-7 (224 words), 2.28.2-12 (487 words), 4.18.2-15 (797 words), 6.1.15-16 (118 words), 6.11.1-3 (219 words), 6.16.5-7 (107 words), 8.26.7-19 (591 words), and 9.17.2-3 (52 words).

Table 11. Concentration of citations in Eusebius’ HE and Sozomen’s HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sozomen, HE</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>108,493</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast to Eusebius, for Sozomen, the language of his sources is almost entirely dispensable. Toward the beginning of his narrative, Sozomen offers a brief, explicit declaration of his citation methodology:

μεμνήσομαι δὲ πραγμάτων οίς παρέτυχον καὶ παρὰ τῶν εἰδῶν ή θεασαμένοις ἕκκοια, κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν καὶ πρὸ ἡμῶν γενεάν. τὸν δὲ περαιτέρῳ τὴν κατάληψιν ἐθήρασα ἀπὸ τῶν τεθέντων νόμων διὰ τὴν θρησκείαν καὶ τῶν κατὰ καιροὺς συνόδων καὶ νεωτερισμῶν καὶ βασιλικῶν καὶ ἱερατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ὃν ἄι μὲν εἰσέτι νῦν ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις καὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σώζονται, αἱ δὲ σποράδες παρὰ τοῖς φιλολόγοις φέρονται. τούτων δὲ τὰ ῥήτα περιλαβέτι τῇ γραφῇ πολλακις ἐννοηθεὶς ἄμεινον ἐδοκίμασα διὰ τῶν ὀγκον τῆς πραγματείας τῆς ἐν αὐτώις διάνοιαν συντόμως ἀπαγγέλα, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τί τῶν ἀμφιλόγων εὐρήσομεν, ἐφ’ ὃν διὰφορός ἐστι τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξα· τηνικαῦτα γὰρ εἰ εὐπορήσῳ τινὸς γραφῆς, παραθήσομαι ταῦτην εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀληθείας.

(Sozomen HE 1.1.13-14)

I will have made mention of the affairs in which I was present and [about which] I heard from those who know or from those who have seen, according to our own generation and [the generation] before us. And beyond these things, I have sought the apprehension of established laws on account of worship, in accordance with the times of the synods, revolutions, and royal and sacred epistles, some of which are still now preserved in the palaces and churches. And others are in circulation here and there among scholars. Having often thought it better to include the words of these items in my writing, I thought fit to relate summarily the thought in them on account of the mass of activity, unless we will find something disputable, on the grounds that there is in many ways a difference in thought. For then if I will have plenty of a writing, I will transmit this for the display of truth.

Whereas Eusebius’ narrative relies almost entirely on the language of his sources, Sozomen’s narrative dispenses with the language of his sources out of predilection for concision. Sozomen is producing an abridgment rather than a detailed history.

Not surprisingly, then, when Sozomen and Eusebius discuss the same sources or events, Sozomen summarizes his sources where Eusebius cites his sources extensively.

For example, both Sozomen and Eusebius discuss Philo’s *Therapeutae* (compare
Eusebius HE 2.17 with Sozomen HE 1.12). Whereas Eusebius cites from Philo’s text extensively and repeatedly, Sozomen merely summarizes the text instead of citing it directly. Sozomen frequently refrains from using the actual language of his sources as evidence because conciseness is more important to him than completeness.

Sozomen gives much less voice to his sources than Eusebius does and relies more on his own analysis and narratorial skill. In addition, unlike Eusebius, Sozomen also uses speeches or dialogue to further his narrative. These differences in citation style suggest that Sozomen’s citation methodology, or at least the way he thought about citations, is much different from Eusebius’ citation methodology. Sozomen’s citation methodology is primarily monologic, although polyphony shows up now and then.

In his sixth book, Sozomen describes a number of theological debates between the orthodox and the heterodox in the fourth century. Sozomen tells of Apollinaris and Eunomius, two heterodox teachers. Apollinaris, a champion of orthodoxy throughout most of his life, later in his life appears to have taught that Christ brought his own flesh with him from heaven and thus did not possess complete manhood. Eunomius, on the other hand, was an Arian who also adhered to Anomoeanism, the doctrine that the Son is unlike the Father because the Son was begotten. Sozomen addresses Gregory Bishop of Nazianzus’ letter regarding Apollinaris and Eunomius in 6.27.2-6.27.4. He introduces the citation in 6.27.1 without summarizing, assessing, or anticipating for the reader what is to come: Ἀπολλινάριον δὲ ἐπαιτιώμενος Γρηγόριος ὁ Ναζιανζου ἐπίσκοπησας ἐν ἐπιστολῇ που τάδε γράφει πρὸς Νεκτάριον τὸν ἡγησάμενον τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει

303 Sozomen might draw his narrative from Philo’s text or perhaps from Eusebius’ account of Philo’s text. In either case, Sozomen refrains from explicitly citing his source(s).
ἐκκλησίας· (“Gregory, the one who oversees Nazianzus, writes the following about Apollinararius in a letter to Nectarius, who leads the church in Constantinople”). After he records the citation, he refrains from further analysis except to discuss his lack of knowledge regarding Apollinararius and Eunomius:

Οἷα μὲν οὖν καὶ ὅπως περὶ θεοῦ δοξάζουσιν Απολιναρίως τε καὶ Εὐνόμιος, ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ὑμῶν μέλει σκοπεῖτο. εἰ δὲ περὶ μάθησιν ἁκριβῆ τῶν τοιούτων ποιεῖν ἐγνωκεν, ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ αὐτοῖς ἢ ἐτέροις περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιζητεῖτο τὰ πλείον, ἐπεὶ ἔμοι οὔτε συνέναι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὔτε μεταφράζειν εὐπητές. ὡς ἔοικε δὲ, πρὸς ταῖς εἰρημέναις αἰτίαις τὸ μὴ κρατήσας τάδε τὰ δόγματα καὶ εἰς πολλοὺς προελθὲν μάλιστα τοῖς τότε μοναχοῖς λογιστέον· ἀπρίζ γὰρ εἴχοντο τῶν ἐν Νικαία δογμάτων οἱ τε ἐν Συρία καὶ Καππαδοκία καὶ περὶ τούτων φιλοσοφοῦντες, ἡμὲν γὰρ ἔως ἀπὸ Κιλίκων ἀρξαμένη μέχρι Φοινίκων ἐπετές.ὡς ἔοικε δὲ, πρὸς ταῖς εἰρημέναις αἰτίαις τὸ μὴ κρατήσας τάδε τὰ δόγματα καὶ εἰς πολλοὺς προελθὲν μάλιστα τοῖς τότε μοναχοῖς λογιστέον· ἀπρίζ γὰρ εἴχοντο τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ δογμάτων οἱ τε ἐν Συρίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ περὶ τούτων φιλοσοφοῦντες, ἡμὲν γὰρ ἔως ἀπὸ Κιλίκων ἀρξαμένη μέχρι Φοινίκων ἐπετές.ὡς ἔοικε δὲ, πρὸς ταῖς εἰρημέναις αἰτίαις τὸ μὴ κρατήσας τάδε τὰ δόγματα καὶ εἰς πολλοὺς προελθὲν μάλιστα τοῖς τότε μοναχοῖς λογιστέον· ἀπρίζ γὰρ εἴχοντο τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ δογμάτων οἱ τε ἐν Συρίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ περὶ τούτων φιλοσοφοῦντες, ἡμὲν γὰρ ἔως ἀπὸ Κιλίκων ἀρξαμένη μέχρι Φοινίκων ἐπετές.

Therefore, what sort of things and in what manner Apollinararius and Eunomius thought about God, for whomever it is a concern, let [that] one contemplate from the aforementioned things. But if one has determined to toil concerning the exact knowledge of such things, let [that] one search further in the things having been written about them either by they [themselves] or by others, since I do not perceive how to interpret such things without difficulty. Now it seems to me that, in addition to the aforementioned causes, the fact that these teachings did not lay hold and proceed to many must be reckoned especially to the monks at that time.

For the philosophers and those round about in Syria and Cappadocia held fast to the teachings of Nicaea. For the sect that was of Apollinararius endangered those from Cilicia until as far as Phoenicia . . . .

Sozomen uses Gregory here because Sozomen is deficient in knowledge regarding the history of these two characters. Sozomen is also somewhat unsure about the adequacy of his citation from Gregory. Nevertheless, Sozomen refrains from falsely assuming an authoritative posture toward the reader and refrains from presenting to the reader a finalized understanding of Gregory’s words. Sozomen is interacting with his source in a weakly polyphonic manner. He offers some of his own speculations but appears to understand if his readers disagree with him. Sozomen is allowing Gregory to speak his
own knowledge without being able to verify whether Gregory’s knowledge reflects the history of these individuals.

At the same time, Sozomen often uses a monologic citation methodology. In his fifth book, Sozomen relates events that took place during the reign of Emperor Julian “the Apostate” (361-363 C.E.). Julian was pagan with a philosophical predisposition. Sozomen argues that Julian attempted to strengthen paganism in the empire by adopting Christian social practices, and he produces a letter as proof of this assertion:

He wanted to put in place self-discipline for intentional and unintentional sins corresponding to the Christian tradition of repentance, but not least it is said that he wanted the episcopal letters of commendation, which in turn it was customary that strangers traveling whithersoever, for whomever they might reach, at all events introduce and that they be deemed worthy of care just as they are known and beloved on account of the witness of their credential. Having these things in mind, he took pains to accustom the Greeks to the ways of living of the Christians. But since to many this perhaps seems unlikely, not from the words of another but from the words of the emperor himself, I will offer the proof of the aforementioned things. He writes as follows . . . .

In this case, Sozomen is using the Emperor’s own writing against him; he is refuting the Emperor with the Emperor’s words. This introduction reflects a monologic citation methodology, since it serves Sozomen by proving that Julian attempted to add pagan elements to Christian customs. Sozomen maintains control over this citation and does not
allow it to speak on its own, with its own significance. Sozomen as author grants significance to this passage.

Sozomen is perhaps the least like Eusebius of all the post-Eusebian late ancient Christian historiographers. He very rarely cites texts, and most of the time he interacts with his citations in a monologic fashion. In many ways, Sozomen resembles some of the pagan historiographers. For example, he frequently condenses his sources into his own singly constructed narrative. Sozomen acts as proof that the post-Eusebian historiographers did not immediately adopt his citation methodology indiscriminately. Whereas they may have extended his narrative temporally, they did not adopt his historiographical method.

_Theodoret_

Theodoret (c. 393–c. 459), from Antioch, was a lucid and prolific writer, who wrote a number of histories, apologies, commentaries, and various compendia. As a supporter of Nestorius, he advocated for Nestorianism, the Christological teaching that argues for a separation between the divine nature and the human nature of Jesus. 304 One church council condemned him, another church council restored him, and a third church council condemned his writings again after his death. 305 His _Historia ecclesiastica_ (HE)

---

304 See Adam M. Schor, _Theodoret’s People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria_ (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2011), 60–64.

continues Eusebius’ HE through 428 C.E. and abounds with citations of documents. Theodoret’s HE is a treasure trove for scholars.

Theodoret’s elegant introduction compares historiographers to artists; historiographers use books instead of panels and descriptions instead of paint (prologue). In this description, Theodoret suggests that the historiographer imbues memories with greater permanence than the artist’s renderings can give to his or her artwork, and therein lies the purpose of Theodoret’s history. He intends to give permanence to his account of events through 428 C.E. In this prologue, he also refers to Eusebius’ HE, but he does not mention Eusebius’ citation practices. Rather, Theodoret simply notes that he will begin his history from point where Eusebius stopped his (prologue). Eusebius’ appearance, then, is merely for indicating the lower limit of the temporal scope of Theodoret’s content.

Despite Theodoret’s lack of allusion to Eusebius’ craft per se, Theodoret follows Eusebius’ methodology in one important way as already alluded to above: Theodoret cites numerous sources explicitly throughout his narrative. Theodoret modifies this Eusebian practice, however, inasmuch as he is more careful to select the relevant material from his sources rather than to cite extra material that may not pertain directly to his

306 The following represent Theodoret’s statistics:

Table 12. Concentration of Citations in Eusebius’ HE and Theodoret’s HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret, HE</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>36.27%</td>
<td>25,916</td>
<td>71,452</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
narrative. Theodoret rarely cites a text in an unambiguous way. He has a very strong hand as narrator, and he typically uses his citations to demonstrate either his arguments or his own point of view. Nevertheless, Theodoret does use his citations to carry much of his narrative. He allows the voice of the other to speak, but he does his best to manage it carefully. Theodoret orients himself toward the texts he cites primarily in a monologic fashion, but polyphony does arise in his citations due to the magnitude of the concentration of citations in his work.

Toward the end of Theodoret’s fifth book, he narrates how some Christians became martyrs in Persia. After he tells of the atrocities that took place in Persia, he offers a reflection that is revealing of the demeanor he strikes in his history.  

It is not necessary to be surprised that the governor of all endured their brutalities and impieties. For even before the reign of Constantine the Great, as many emperors as there were of the Romans raved against the
disciples of the truth. And Diocletian, on the day of the passion of the savior, destroyed the churches in the entire realm of the Romans; but when nine years had passed, they bloomed and were received much larger and fairer, and the one together with his impiety was extinguished. The lord foretold these wars and the unconquerability of the church. And these events teach us that war provides more benefit than peace. For peace causes us to be delicate, give up, and be timid, but war sharpens our way of thinking and prepares us to despise the present that is flowing away. But we have often mentioned these things in other works.

Theodoret notes that he has mentioned this posture toward the world in his other works, which suggests that his posture toward the world and the opponents of Christianity was consistent. He obviously did not mind contentious environments, which often surrounded him in the various theological debates of his time in which he involved himself. This sort of acceptance of the combativeness of the world perhaps indicates in part why Theodoret primarily uses a monologic citation methodology. As an author, Theodoret orients himself and his sources against the opponents that waged war against him. When he cites sources that he agrees with, he champions them. When he cites sources that he disagrees with, he repudiates them as best he can.

Theodoret’s refutation of those opposed to his point of view demands that he adopt a monologic citation methodology, even if he cannot always maintain that methodology. Early in Theodoret’s history, in the first book, he reports an exchange of letters between Arius and Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, and he is very clear about why he includes these letters in his history:

"ἄλλα" οὐδὲ ὁ Ἀρείος ἰσχυρὰν ἁγείν ἣνεχθετο. Ἐγραψε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς ἐκεῖνος ὡς ὁμόφωνας ἁγεῖν ἤγειτο. ὅτι δὲ οὔθεν ἅγεισας κατ’ αὐτοῦ γέγραφεν ὁ θείος Ἀλέξανδρος, αὐτὸς Ἀρείος ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Ἕσεβιον τὸν Νικομηδέας μεμαρτύρηκε γράμμασιν. ἐνθήσο δὲ καὶ ταύτην τῇ συγγραφῇ, ἵνα καὶ τοὺς κοινονοὺς τῆς ἀσεβείας δήλους τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι ποιήσω. (1.3; p. 25)
But Arius refused to keep quiet. And he himself wrote to those whom he thought would be of the same mind. That the divine Alexander wrote nothing false against him, Arius himself bears witness in his writings to Eusebius of Nicomedia, so that I might make public the sharers of his impiety to those who are uninformed.

Theodoret cites the very words of Arius because he believes those words will be self-condemning and informative for others. His purpose for citing the letters to come is clear.

Similarly, after citing Arius’ letter, Theodoret introduces Eusebius’ letter to Paulinus in a rather unflattering fashion in 1.5: ταύτην δεξάμενος Εὐσέβιος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔμεινε καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ἁσέβειαν. γράφει δὲ οὕτω πρὸς Παύλινον τὸν τῆς Τυρίων ἤγομίνων. ("When Eusebius received this epistle, he vomited his own impiety. He wrote to Paulinus, ruler of the Tyrians, as follows . . . ") Again, Theodoret’s opinion is obvious.

Finally, Theodoret, at the conclusion of Eusebius’ letter, writes:

Τοιαῦτα καὶ οὕτωι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπέστελλον, εἰς τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἁληθείας καθοπλιζόμενοι πόλεμον. Οὕτω δὲ τῆς βλασφημίας ἐν ταῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀἴγυπτον καὶ τὴν Ἐώον ἐκκλησίας διασπαρέσης, ἐρίδες ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει καὶ κόμη καὶ μάχαι περὶ τῶν θείων δογμάτων ἐγίγνοντο. ὁ δὲ λοιπὸς δριμός θεατῆς ἦν τὸν γινόμενον καὶ τῶν λεγομένων κριτής, καὶ οἱ μὲν τὰ τούτων, οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐκείνων ἐπήνουν (1.6; p. 29)

Such things they wrote to one another, equipping themselves in the war against the truth. Thus when the blasphemy had been dispersed throughout the churches of Egypt and the East, discord and disputes about the divine teaching happened in each city and village. And the remaining throng became spectator of the things that happened and judge of the things having been said; some of them praised the teachings of these, and others praised the teaching of those.

Each of Theodoret’s comments illustrates how he cites the words of another to support his own point of view. No doubt, Arius and Eusebius interpreted the letters to one another in a manner quite different from Theodoret. But Theodoret gives them a very particular,
emphatic interpretation, which is that Arius and Eusebius sent these letters to war against the truth. Theodoret clearly uses the voice of another for his own purposes.

At the same time, however, Eusebius would never have cited his opponents in the same fashion in the HE, 308 which is why Eusebius can often allow the voice of the other to stand on its own. Theodoret, then, goes one step beyond Eusebius in terms of his selection of sources to cite. Eusebius cites his sources specifically because they use a different voice than his own voice. Theodoret, on the other hand, is citing the voice of the other because he believes that voice is so self-evidently wrong that any reader will see the error in these letters. Instead of letting the voice of the other be, Theodoret has to address the voice of the other because he has included the voice of two of his opponents. One of the ways Eusebius can allow texts to speak on their own is by controlling which texts he cites. Theodoret, by citing a text that he fervently disagrees with, has to address that text, so that the reader will not be tempted to interpret a text in another fashion. Paradoxically, by citing the text that is more contrary to his own point of view, Theodoret necessitates the use of a monologic posture toward his sources. If he cares less about the points of disagreement with his opponents (such as Sozomen and Socrates do), then he would be able to let this text speak for itself. The confluence of Theodoret’s passion for correct teaching and the citation of the text he disagrees with requires him to speak from a monologic viewpoint. At the same time, insofar as Theodoret includes the distinctive voices of Arius and Eusebius as well as orthodox voices, he allows these voices to speak

308 For the most part, Eusebius refrains from citing heterodox texts in the HE.
in dissonance with one another (or with his own voice). The possibility for polyphony is present.

Early in his fifth book, Theodoret includes a letter from the Council of Constantinople, where bishops from the East condemned Apollinarianism and sanctioned the doctrine of Christ from the Council of Nicaea. He defers to this letter because the letter itself can convey the courage and wisdom better than Theodoret can communicate. Theodoret introduces the letter this way:

ἐπέστειλαν δὲ τὸν τε κλύδωνα τὸν κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπαναστάντα σημαίνοντες καὶ τὴν γεγενημένην αὐτὸν ἀμέλειαν αἰνιττόμενοι, ἐν κεφαλαίῳ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀποστολικόν τοῖς γράμμασιν ἐνέθηκαν φρόνημα. σαφέστερον δὲ τὴν γεγραφότων ἄνδρείαν τε καὶ σοφίαν αὐτὰ δηλώσει τὰ γράμματα (5.8; pp. 288-289)

They sent a message indicating the rough water that rose up against the churches and signifying their neglect that had come into being, and they inserted in summary into their writings the apostolic doctrine, but more clearly the writings will make clear with respect to these letters the courage and wisdom of those who had written them.

The language of his introduction suggests an openness to polyphony. Theodoret knows that he cannot do the letter justice, so he defers to the language of the Council instead. Furthermore, the presentation of the language of the letter to the reader comprises (in effect) unmediated evidence. The synodic letter contains a summary of doctrine, instructions for administration of churches, and discussion regarding the false teachings of Arius, Aetius, and Eunomius. In essence, the letter contains many voices inasmuch as the Council produced the letter and not an individual. The first person plural verbs used throughout the letter further highlight the fact that this letter represents a number of voices as witnesses. Despite the otherness of this letter, however, these witnesses express the same point of view that Theodoret expresses elsewhere except that they do it as a
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group of witnesses. The Council is not exhibiting a point of view that is different from the author’s point of view.

Although Theodoret rejects heterodox teachers, the voices of these teachers still appear throughout Theodoret’s narrative. These voices appear both in Theodoret’s own summary of these groups (a form of polyphony that this dissertation does not address directly) and in the documents that Theodoret cites from these people, and they accumulate. Reading Theodoret’s narrative as a form of polyphony is perhaps a subversive meaning of his narrative, but the more he cites his opposition the more he invites the reader to read against his point of view. Still, he attempts to maintain a strong single authorial consciousness throughout this work, and his work lacks any statement of methodology that suggests he is using a polyphonic citation methodology.

In his second book, Theodoret recounts the exiles of Athanasius for his opposition to Arianism. Theodoret details the third exile of Athanasius and uses Athanasius’ words to describe that exile:

τούτοις ὑπαχθεὶς ὁ Κωνστάντιος οὐκ ἔλαβήναι μόνον ἄλλα καὶ σφαγῆναι τὸν θείον προσέταξεν Αθανάσιον, καὶ τινὰ Σεβαστιανὸν ἐξέπεμψε στρατηγὸν μετὰ στραταῖς ὅτι μάλλον πλείστης, ἁνελεῖν κελεύσας ὡς ἀλιτήριον. Ὄπως δὲ καὶ οὗτος ἐπεστάτευσε κάκεινος διέφυγεν, αὐτὸς ὁ ταῦτα πεπονθὼς καὶ παραδόξος σωθεὶς κάλλιον διηγήσεται. ἐν γὰρ τῇ τῆς φυγῆς Ἀπολογία ταῦτα διεξεῖσιν (2.10; p. 123)

Constantius, having been brought to these things, commanded that the divine Athanasius not only be driven out but also killed, and he sent a certain Sebastian with an army especially great in number, after ordering them to kill him on the grounds that he was guilty. Now how this one attacked and that one fled, the one who himself was paradoxically rescued will relate better these things that he suffered. For he goes through these things in detail in his Apology of the Escape.
Athanasius then narrates how he escaped his enemies. Theodoret believes that his own voice is insufficient to tell the story. The one who suffered harm is the one who should tell the story. The circumstances of Athanasius were extreme, so perhaps Theodoret senses that the reader might suspect Theodoret will exaggerate the story. In any case, Theodoret’s voice is not sufficient when Athanasius’ voice is available. Such a reluctance to speak on another’s behalf resonates with Eusebius’ citation methodology. Again, a certain ripeness for polyphony exists here. The numerous citations that Theodoret uses increase the likelihood that he will inadvertently introduce a polyphonic citation methodology. Simply by frequently citing the voice of another, one explicitly increases their chances of slipping into a polyphonic citation methodology in a post-Eusebian historiographic framework. Theodoret constantly plays on the edges of polyphony but still maintains a consistent authorial consciousness throughout his narrative.

In sum, Theodoret has used a mostly monologic posture toward his sources in his HE. More than Sozomen or Socrates, he relies upon documentation and written sources to a great degree. Whenever possible, he defers to the voices of witnesses or first-hand accounts. Theodoret attempts to maintain a strong authorial consciousness throughout his history, and he actively interprets for the reader the sources that he cites. Part of the reason he has to interpret the text for the reader is that he has included the texts of his opponents and not simply texts that support his narrative of his own branch of Christianity. As these texts accumulate, they invite the reader to consider the viewpoint that opposes Theodoret’s. At times, then, Theodoret plays on the edge of a polyphonic citation methodology.
Bede

The polymath Bede (c. 673-735) joined the monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow at age 7, became a deacon at age 19, and then became a priest at age 30. In contrast to other historiographers, Bede appears to have traveled very little. He wrote several works in various genres, including history, hagiography, and biblical commentary. He composed his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (HEGA) late in his career, perhaps sometime around 731. Bede includes a number of lengthy citations in his HEGA just as Eusebius does in his HE, although Bede’s citations are not as concentrated as the citations found in Eusebius’ HE.

Bede’s introduction hints at a polyphonic approach to his use of sources. In his preface, after he indicates what sources he has drawn from, he states:

Lectoremque suppliciter obsecro, ut, siquae in his, quae scripsimus, aliter quam se ueritas habet, posita reppererit, non hoc nobis imputet, qui, quod uera lex historiae est, simpliciter ea, quae fama uulgante collegimus, ad instructionem posteritatis litteris mandare studuimus. (preface)

So I humbly beseech the reader, that, if in these things that we have written he should find anything written down that does not contain the truth itself, he should not impute it to us, who, because it is the true law of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Citations</th>
<th>Citation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede, HEGA</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>26.04%</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>57,039</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotations occur in the following 27 chapters: 1.23, 1.24, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.30, 1.31, 1.32, 2.4, 2.8, 2.10, 2.11, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 3.29, 4.5, [4.10?], [4.11?], 4.17 (15), 4.20 (18), 5.7, 5.8, 5.16, 5.17, 5.19, 5.21. For the peculiarity of the paucity of citations in Book 3, see N. J. Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede: The Ecclesiastical History in Context* (London: Routledge, 2006), 129-130, 243. Higham notes that Bede also diminishes the role of some of the heroes in that book.
history, for in it, what we have obtained by common report, we have simply taken pains to put it down for instruction in writings for posterity.

The “common report” Bede refers to is not simply a reference to word-of-mouth. Rather, it refers back to the several written and oral sources Bede has compiled and consulted before and during his preparation of the HEGA. The common report may include any narrative that Bede finds beneficial for the reader; it may not always be textual or even always verifiable, but Bede has a high standard. He is, after all, among the erudite and has “taken pains” to produce the HEGA. Most importantly, Bede is committing to record that common report. Bede commits himself to record the report and the voice of others (and not merely his own voice) for posterity.

Beginning as early as book 1, Bede cites textual evidence in a polyphonic fashion, but not always advertently. After Pope Gregory sent Augustine to the English race (HEGA 1.23), he and Augustine exchanged letters on a variety of different issues. Bede includes the entirety of the shorter letters and large chunks of the larger letters. In this respect, Bede’s citation methodology resembles the citation methodology of Eusebius. Bede allows the citations in 1.23-24 and 1.27-32 to carry most of the narrative. Bede’s contribution in these sections is quite small. Furthermore, these citations primarily cite the voice of Pope Gregory. The least one can say is that Pope Gregory’s voice is the voice that dispenses most of the wisdom in these chapters. In at least one place, Pope Gregory’s voice speaks in ways that contradict Bede’s larger project, although Bede

310 Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, 80-81.


312 See 1.23, 1.24, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.30, 1.31, and will 1.32.
never addresses this difference in voice explicitly. He simply juxtaposes the two distinct voices and allows each voice to speak on its own. The polyphony begins in 1.27.

In response to an inquiry from Augustine (the second question in 1.27), Pope Gregory provides an answer that suggests a remarkable openness to novel customs in the English church. This openness contrasts strongly with the view of Bede himself.

Augustine had asked the question in 1.27: “II. Interrogatio Augustini: Cum una sit fides, sunt ecclesiarum diversae consuetudines, et altera consuetudo missarum in sancta Romana ecclesia, atque altera in Galliarum tenetur?” (Augustine’s question: Since there is one faith, are there different customs for the churches, and is one custom of the masses observed in the holy Roman church, and another in the Church of the Gauls?). Pope Gregory’s response was as follows:

Respondit Gregorius papa: Nouit fraternitas tua Romanae ecclesiae consuetudinem, in qua se meminit nutritam. Sed mihi placet ut, siue in Romana, siue in Galliarum, seu in qualibet ecclesia aliquid inuenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum ecclesia, quae adhuc ad fidem noua est, institutione praecipua, quae de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt, eliges; et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem depone. (1.27)

Pope Gregory responds: your brother knows the custom of the Roman church in which he remembers having been raised. But it is pleasing to me

---

313 Compare Pope Gregory’s response to the response of Pope Innocent I (416) when Pope Innocent I wrote the Bishop Decentius: “If the priests of the Lord really wished to preserve ecclesiastical uses intact as received from the holy apostles, no diversity and no variation would be found in the ritual and ceremonial. . . . It behooves them to follow what the Roman church observes, from which they doubtless took their own beginning, lest by favoring adventitious opinions, they overlook the real source of their own institutions” (Innocent I, Ep. 25.2, PL 20, col. 552). Pope Innocent and Pope Gregory are on opposite ends of the spectrum. See James A. Brundage, “E Pluribus Unum” in Mia Korpiola, Regional Variations in Matrimonial Law and Custom in Europe, 1150-1600 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 22–23.

314 Other scholars have noted this as well. See T. M. Charles-Edwards, Early Christian Ireland (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 412–414.
that, whether in Rome or in Gaul, if you have found something in a church wherever, which may be more pleasing to all-powerful God, carefully select, and in the church of the English, which is now new to the faith, with the particular custom, you should administer what you are able to gather from many churches. For institutions are not to be loved in preference to places, but places are to be cherished for good institutions. Therefore, from whatever churches that are devout, conscientious, and right, choose; and here just as in a collection of small bundles commit this custom to the minds of the English.

Gregory demonstrates humility and an open mind in view of the possibility of the English people introducing other customs into the church. He does not insist that the English church should observe the traditions of the Roman church. Rather, he introduces the possibility that non-Roman practices or traditions may please God more than the practices and traditions observed in the Roman church. This suggestion implies that the English church may in fact do some things better than the Roman church.

In addition, Pope Gregory suggests that the English church should not love the traditions and practices of the Roman church simply because they originate in Rome. Rather, Augustine should love both the good that comes from Rome and the good that comes from the English churches. Pope Gregory embraces the possibility of a church that exhibits different practices in different regions.

In the end, Pope Gregory suggests that Augustine inculcate the minds of the English with those customs (and the mass) that Augustine deems “devout, religious, and right.” Despite the fact that Augustine grew up in the Roman church, Pope Gregory gives him license to encourage alternate customs and other forms of mass.

By way of contrast, Bede spends a great deal of time and effort showing why the English church should conform to Roman customs. Bede believes the English church must accept the Roman dating of Easter rather than the dating of Easter in the native
English church. Bede mentions the Paschal controversy several times. As early as in 2.2 (not long after the citation of Pope Gregory’s letter), Bede notes in 2.2 that the Britons observed Easter on a date different from the Roman church and that they had other differences that did not encourage unity: “Non enim paschae diem dominicum suo tempore, sed a XIX usque ad XX lunam observabant; quae computatio LXXXIII annorum circulo continetur. Sed et alia plurima unitati ecclesiasticae contraria faciebant.” (‘For they did not observe the day of the Pascha belonging to the Lord in its time, but from the 14th until the 20th day after the new moon, which computation hinges upon the cycle of 84 years. But they also did many other things contrary to the unity of the church.’) Bede does not simply note the difference, however. The dispute is severe enough that it needs resolution. Augustine and the Britons resolve the dispute with a showdown resembling the face-off between Elijah and the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18:1-40). The Britons brought forward a blind man, and the British bishops attempted to heal the blind man. When they could not heal the blind man, Augustine kneeled down, prayed, and restored the blind man’s sight thus proving that the Britons should celebrate Easter in accordance with the Roman calendar (2.2).

Despite Bede’s obvious allegiance to the Roman dating of Easter, he also does nothing to dampen Pope Gregory’s encouragement of alternate customs in the English

---

315 For further details on how the difference between Pope Gregory and Bede played into the Easter controversy, see Ibid. and Máirín Mac Carron, “Christology and the Future in Bede’s Annu Domini,” in Carolyn G. Hartz, “Bede and the Grammar of Time,” British Journal for the History of Philosophy 15, no. 4 (November 2007): 625–40. Mac Carron suggests that the major issue Bede has with Easter is its implications for unity with the rest of the church worldwide. Nevertheless, other customs—customs which would have received Pope Gregory’s approval—may have had similar effects. Pope Gregory does not seem concerned regarding this loss of unity.

316 See 2.2, 2.19, 3.3, 3.4, 3.17, 3.25, 3.28, 3.29, 4.5, 5.15, 5.18, 5.19, 5.21, 5.22, and 5.24.
church. Even in his introduction, Bede offers no hint of any difference between his own view and the view of Pope Gregory:

Interea uir Domini Augustinus uenit Arelas, et ab archiepiscopo eiusdem ciuitatis Aetherio, iuxta quod iussa sancti patris Gregorii acceperant, archiepiscopus genti Anglorum ordinatus est; reuersusque Britanniam misit continuo Romam Laurentium presbyterum et Petrum monachum, qui beato pontifici Gregorio gentem Anglorum fidem Christi suscepisse, ac se episcopum factum esse referrent; simul et de eis, quae necessariae uidebantur, quaestionibus eius consulta flagitans. Nec mora, congrua quaesitui responsa recepit; quae etiam huic historiae nostrae commodum duximus indere. (1.27)

In the meantime, Augustine, the man of God, went to Arles, and by the archbishop of that city, Aetherius, they had immediately received him as commanded by the holy father Gregory, [and] he was ordained archbishop of the English people; and returning straightaway to Britain, he sent Laurence the priest and Peter the monk to blessed Pope Gregory [to report] that the English people had received the faith of Christ, and he had been made Bishop; at the same time, about the things which seem necessary, [he] solicited his counsel regarding questions. Not much later, he received a suitable response to his question, which also we have thought fit to insert in this history of ours.

Similarly, after citing the lengthy excerpt from Pope Gregory’s letter, Bede concludes in 1.28 without any indication of a difference of opinion: “Hucusque responsiones beati papae Gregorii ad consulta reuerentissimi antistitis Augustini” (“Thus were the answers of the blessed Pope Gregory to the consultations of the most Rev. Bishop Augustine”).

Bede then immediately moves on to a letter written to the Bishop Vergilius. He says nothing more about the correspondence directed toward Augustine’s questions. Bede’s estimation of Pope Gregory’s response is positive, despite the difference between Pope Gregory’s openness to the customs of the native British Christianity and Bede’s insistence on the preeminence of Roman Christianity.
Pope Gregory plays an important role in the narrative of Bede. He is, after all, the individual who commissions and sends Augustine to bring Christianity to the English race. This formative role played by Pope Gregory further emphasizes the wisdom he bestows to Augustine at a very early date. Bede allows the words of this important character to speak in his own voice even when that voice contradicts Bede’s larger project. Bede has exhibited a polyphonic approach to his citation methodology in his citation of Pope Gregory’s letter.

The debate over the date of Easter culminates in Bede’s narrative at the Synod of Whitby in 664 C.E. (HEGA 3.25). King Oswiu of Northumbria needs to determine a single date for observing Easter in Northumbria and had previously observed the Celtic date of Easter. (He also needs to decide on the style of tonsure.) Bishop Colman represents the Celtic date for Easter, and Wilfrid represents the Roman date. Wilfrid frames the debate by pitting John, who supposedly observed Easter in accordance with the Mosaic Law, against Peter, who putatively observed Easter in the Roman fashion. The debate concludes with King Oswiu choosing to follow Peter’s practice, and Bede speaks as though they had settled the debate once and for all. The unity that Bede sought has finally come to fruition at the end of 3.25: “Haec dicente rege, fauerunt adsidentes quique siue adstantes maiores una cum mediocribus, et abdicata minus perfecta institutione, ad ea, quae meliora cognouerant, sese transferre festinabant” (“When the king spoke these things, the eminent sitting in council or standing by, together with the ordinary, were unanimously well disposed; with their less perfect custom having been
rejected, they made haste to devote themselves to those [customs] that they had found to be better”).

Not long after, however, Bede cites a text that suggests continued variation in the date of the observance of Easter. Bede cites the Synod of Hertford that occurs eight years after the Synod of Whitby, and the citation indicates that no one has yet enacted the results of the Synod of Whitby concerning the date of Easter (HEGA 4.5). When Bede reproduces a selection from the canonical decrees of the ancient church at the Synod of Hertford, he emphasizes ten decrees that require special attention within his narrative of the Synod. The first canon he lists is as follows: “Primum capitulum: Ut sanctum diem paschae in commune omnes seruemus dominica post XLIam lunam mensis primi” (“First chapter: That we observe the day of Pascha [Easter] on the Sunday after the 14th day of the new moon of the first month for common use”). In 672 C.E., the Synod of Hertford enacts the results of Whitby, no doubt because some are not yet observing the date of Easter decided on at Whitby (HEGA 4.5). Indeed, Bede’s obsession with the date of Easter suggests it is still an item of concern in his own day. The incongruence between these two passages constitutes polyphony. The voice of the narrator in 3.25 paints a picture of a unified church, but a citation from eight years later indicates that various churches probably continue to observe Easter at different times. Bede does not resolve this tension. He lets the incongruence lie, despite the fact that the Synod of Whitby comprises the central point of his entire narrative.

At the same time, Bede also cites texts in a monologic fashion, but many of these citations recall Pope Gregory’s admonition in subtle ways. For example, he cites a
number of documents throughout the HEGA that support the Roman view of Easter.\textsuperscript{317}

Not only does he cite letters, though, he also cites other documents that bolster his own point of view as author. For example, he cites the poetic epitaph of Wilfrid, which includes the following reference to the Paschal controversy:

\begin{quote}
“Paschalis qui etiam sollemnia tempora cursus  
Catholici ad iustum correxit dogma canonis,  
Quem statuere patres, dubioque errore remoto,  
Certa suae genti ostendit moderamina ritus . . .”
\end{quote}

(5.19)

Who also corrected the course of the established time of the Pascha to the correct doctrine of the canon, as the fathers established, with dubious error removed, he showed a firm control of ritual to his people. . . .

Despite the poetic nature of this text, it still serves Bede in ways beyond giving praise to Wilfrid.\textsuperscript{318}

When Bede tells of Pelagius, he uses a snarky epigram that simultaneously rebukes the British followers of Pelagius of old and upbraids the Irish and British churches who would oppose Roman practice.\textsuperscript{319} Although Bede cites numerous authoritative letters and other documents throughout the five books of the HEGA, in this case he chooses an epigram of Prosper:

\begin{quote}
Contra Augustinum narratur serpere quidam
\end{quote}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{317} See, for example, 2.19, 3.29 (but omitting part of the letter related to Easter), 4.5, 5.19, and 5.21. Compared to Bede’s own voice: 2.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.17, 3.25, 3.28, 5.15, 5.18, 5.22, and 5.24.

\textsuperscript{318} Wallace-Hadrill suggests that Bede may have written this himself. While this may be the case, one can still cite oneself in a polyphonic or monologic way. Bakhtin notes that people often have dialogic sensibilities within themselves. See Wallace-Hadrill, \textit{Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People}, 194–195.

Sscriptor, quem dudum liuor adurit edax.
Quis caput obscuris contectum utcumque caurnis
Tollere humo miserum propulit anguiculum?
Aut hunc fruge sua aequorei pauere Britanni
   Aut hic Campano gramine corda tument. (1.10)

A certain writer is said to crawl against Augustine,
   Whom rapacious spite burned a short time ago.
Who at some time impelled this wretched little serpent
   To raise its head from the ground covered in a dark hole?
Here the seagirt Britons fed it with their own fruit,
   And here it swells in its heart with the Campanian grass.

Just before citing this epigram, Bede notes “St. Augustine and the rest of the Orthodox fathers answered them by quoting many thousands of Catholic authorities against them but failed to correct their folly” (1.10). Instead of playing nice and citing a Catholic authority, Bede inaugurates his procession of citations with elegiac couplets that demonstrate the misguidedness of the British church. Bede is using the epigram to drive home his main point. He is using a monologic citation methodology.

Only a couple of chapters later, Bede cites a lengthy letter from Abbott Ceolfrith that not only repudiates alternate understandings of Easter, but also produces what Bede must have thought was the ideal response for someone who had received right instruction concerning the correct date of Easter. In that letter, Abbott Ceolfrith begins his explanation of the correct observance of Easter based on scripture with the following words:

“Tres sunt ergo regulae sacris inditae litteris, quibus paschae celebrandi tempus nobis praefinitum, nulla prorsus humana licet auctoritate mutari; e quibus dueae in lege Mosi diuinius statuta, tertia in euangelio per effectum dominicae passionis et resurrectionis adiuncta est.” (5.21)

Therefore, three rules exist in the appointed sacred Scripture, by which the time of the Paschal celebration is ordained for us, by no means can it be changed by human authority; of which have been divinely established two
statutes in the Law of Moses, a third in the gospel by result of the passion and resurrection of the Lord.

The fact that no human authority can change these rules fervidly supports Bede’s understanding of the date of Easter. Moreover, when the lengthy letter finishes, Bede narrates how King Nechtan responded in the most favorable manner to the letter:

Haec epistula cum praesente rege Naitono multisque uiris doctioribus esset lecta, ac diligenter ab his, qui intellegere poterant, in linguam eius propriam interpretata, multum de eius exhortatione gauisus esse perhibetur; ita ut exsurgens de medio optimatum suorum consessu, genua flecteret in terram, Deo gratias agens, quod munusculum de terra Anglorum meretur accipere. “Et quidem et antea noui,” inquit, ‘quia haec erat uera paschae celebratio, sed in tantum modo rationem huius temporis obseruandi cognosco, ut parum mihi omnimodis uidear de his antea intellexisse. Unde palam profiteor uobisque, qui adsidetis, praesentibus protestor, quia hoc obseruare tempus paschae cum uniuersa mea gente perpetuo uolo; hanc accipere debere tonsuram, quam plenam esse rationis audimus, omnes, qui in meo regno sunt, clericos decerno.” (5.21)

This letter had been read in the presence of King Nechtan and with many learned men, and having been scrupulously translated into his own language by those who were able to understand, it is said that he rejoiced greatly at this exhortation; so much so that rising from the midst from the great men who sat, he knelt to the ground giving thanks to God that he was worthy to receive such a gift from the English. “And, indeed, I knew before,” he said, “that this was the true paschal celebration, but just now am I learning the reason for observing this time that I seem to have understood too little about before. Therefore, I publicly declare and announce to you all that I will forever observe this time of the Paschal celebration with my whole people; I decree that all the clergy who are in my kingdom must accept this tonsure, which we have heard is most reasonable.

Bede has no doubt played up this narrative conclusion to this lengthy letter in order to support his own view concerning the date of Easter. According to Bede, the letter’s explanation was so compelling that the King made it compulsory to observe the Roman date of Easter and for all the clerics in his kingdom to wear the Roman tonsure.
Again, however, Gregory’s letter to Augustine stands ever in the background of and in tension with this Easter debate. Despite the strong arguments of Bede and of the texts he cites, this discussion constantly comprises one side of a two-sided discussion in Bede’s metanarrative. Bede, as narrator and author, holds a strong view concerning this matter. In spite of that strong view, a dialogue is still taking place for the reader between Pope Gregory and Bede along with his allies. Pope Gregory’s prominence at the beginning of Bede’s narrative further highlights the dialogic relationship between Bede and the point of view that Pope Gregory represents. While Bede is not as deliberate as Eusebius is in this respect, he is still not averse to including voices that contradict his own, however subtly. Indeed, Gregory’s letter stands in the background of Bede’s entire project, which is to argue for a Roman Christianity over against a native English Christianity.

In sum, then, Bede demonstrates more of a polyphonic citation methodology than any of his post-Eusebian Christian historiographer predecessors do. While the point of view of the author in Bede’s HEGA is still dominant, tensions exist in his narrative that allow the reader to listen in on a subtle dialogue taking place between the voice of the narrator and texts such as the letter from Pope Gregory and the chapters of the Synod of Hertford. In addition, Bede’s predisposition toward texts from different genres further contributes to the presence of alternate voices in his narrative. Texts such as epigrams and epitaphs bring to the reader a less heady approach to some of the issues of the church in Bede’s day.
In the end, Bede’s selection of sources resembles Eusebius’ selection of sources, but Bede exhibits coercive tendencies and tends to bully his narratives. Bede is ultimately less open to the voice of the other than Eusebius and so relies less on polyphonic citation methodologies than Eusebius does. Nevertheless, Bede has inadvertently incorporated a polyphonic citation methodology at a number of points in his narrative.

Conclusion

The post-Eusebian late-ancient Christian historiographers did not uniformly or suddenly change their citation methodology as the result of Eusebius’ HE. Nevertheless, Eusebius’ explicit citation of sources did have an influence on later Christian historiography. It led to an increase, on average, to the number of explicit citations Christian historiographers made in contrast to their pagan counterparts. This increase in citations led in many cases to inadvertent polyphonic citation methodologies, even as late-ancient Christian historiographers did their best to retain control over their sources.

Despite the similarities, however, later Christian historiographers did not typically have as high of concentrations of citations as Eusebius had in his HE. In the first seven books of Eusebius’ HE, Eusebius gives almost equal share of space to explicit citations and to his own narratorial voice. Later Christian historiographers, for the most part,

---


utilized fewer citations compared to Eusebius. The following table summarizes all the data thus far:

Table 14. Summary of quotation concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Percent Quotations</th>
<th>Quotation Word Count</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>30,377</td>
<td>67,755</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret, HE</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>36.27%</td>
<td>25,916</td>
<td>71,452</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede, HEGA</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>26.04%</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>57,039</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus, CA</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>22,744</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates, HE</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>12.52%</td>
<td>12,962</td>
<td>103,524</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus, AJ</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
<td>34,655</td>
<td>305,805</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus, BJ</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>9.29%</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>125,274</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sozomen, HE</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>108,493</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts (All Known Citations)</td>
<td>(All)</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>18,455</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides, Literary or Documentary Citations</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>150,149</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, Literary or Documentary Citations</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>183,453</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca</td>
<td>1-5, 9-20</td>
<td>0.009%</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>393,014</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polybius, Literary or Documentary Citations</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>311,454</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, later Christian historiographers did not assume the same posture toward the voice of the other that Eusebius assumed. Whereas Eusebius explicitly prioritizes the
voice of the other over his own voice, his successors still give pride of place to their own respective narratorial voices. Eusebius’ influence on citation methodologies, then, was important but not decisive for later Christian historiography. In some respect, then, Eusebius’ HE was unique, a blip on the radar, in terms of its citation methodology and the prominence it gives to its citations.

The final chapter will attempt to synthesize the findings of this study so far and attempt to demonstrate the variation in citation methodologies on a more global scale. The final chapter uses natural language processing to help analyze and summarize vast amounts of data and condense that data into a useful, readable format. It will apply natural language processing to Eusebius’ HE and several of the other historiographies mentioned already in the study in order to identify patterns or language that can help identify monologic and polyphonic citation methodologies. It will further support the argument that Eusebius has introduced a polyphonic citation methodology, whereas those who preceded him tended to use monologic citation methodologies.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES VIA
NATURAL LANGUAGE PROCESSING

The preceding chapters of this dissertation have attempted to demonstrate that Eusebius abandoned the monologic citation methodologies of previous Greek and Hellenistic historiographers and instead embraced a polyphonic citation methodology that allowed the voices of his sources to interact with his own voice on equal terms. Eusebius allows the points of view of his sources to conflict with his own point of view without feeling the need to address these differences, and he relies on his sources to provide the majority of the main content of his narrative. Eusebius relies on the synergy produced by the differences between his own voice and the voices of his sources in order to enliven his narrative and extend its reach beyond his own point of view.322

Furthermore, this dissertation has attempted to show the various degrees to which Eusebius’ citation methodology influenced successive late-ancient Christian historiographers. Eusebius’ influence on the citation methodologies of later Christian historiographers was neither immediate nor universal. Despite previous historiographer’s

322 Bakhtin similarly asserts the living nature of Dostoevsky’s polyphonic work: “In Dostoevsky's work each opinion really does become a living thing and is inseparable from an embodied human voice” (16). “As [Raskolnikov's idea] loses its monologic, abstractly theoretical finalized quality, a quality sufficient to a single consciousness, it acquires the contradictory complexity and living multi-facedness of an idea-force, being born, living and acting in the great dialogue of the epoch and calling back and forth to kindred ideas of other epochs. Before us rises up an image of the idea” (Bakhtin, Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics, 89). Eusebius’ narrative in the HE also takes on a living quality that calls back and forth to previous epochs, and Eusebius brings forth his citations (characters) as witnesses to these past epochs.
eagerness to begin their narratives where Eusebius had left off, their reliance on Eusebius as a source, and their similar selection of topics to address, later Christian historiographers frequently assume a monologic posture toward the sources they cite and primarily introduce polyphonic citation methodologies inadvertently. When historiographers use a polyphonic citation methodology, the narratives they tell extend beyond the point of view of the narrator and begin to take on their own life.

Why Eusebius effected this change in citation methodology (and not someone else in some other time or place) is a bit of a mystery. Perhaps Eusebius’ work with non-linear codices led him to experiment with the possibility of using codices for collecting relatively short snippets of other texts, or perhaps his desire to place himself and his colleagues into a legitimate line of apostolic succession compelled him to use the voices of his apostolic predecessors as witnesses to his own form of Christianity.\textsuperscript{323} Or perhaps these possibilities merely laid the groundwork for Eusebius’ innovation, which had revealed itself in other ways in his \textit{Chronicle}.\textsuperscript{324} Technological innovations and Eusebius’ own dispositions no doubt both contributed to Eusebius’ groundbreaking polyphonic citation methodology.

The first chapter of this dissertation briefly alluded to Stefan Morawski’s taxonomy of citations.\textsuperscript{325} As a reminder, Morawski proposed the following functions for the citation (or quotation): “maintenance of cultural continuity,” “appeal to authorities,”

\textsuperscript{323} Pamela Eisenbaum (personal communication, 1 June 2015).

\textsuperscript{324} The \textit{Chronicle} is two books, one a summary of universal history and the other a synchronic table of dates and the events of each nation in parallel columns.

\textsuperscript{325} See page 7.
“the erudite function,” “the stimulative-amplificatory function” (where an author might use a citation as a springboard for another idea, for example), and “ornament.” In light of my discussion of polyphony, his classification system perhaps deserves reconsideration. Eusebius and the late-ancient Christian historiographers use citations in most of the capacities mentioned above: to maintain cultural continuity; to appeal to authorities; to argue briefly the historiographers’ primary contentions in order to further their scholarship; and to operate as a “kind of ‘surgical appliance’ doing duty for part of [their] argument[s],” a springboard for new ideas, or a reinforcement of their own ideas. Of these uses, Eusebius’ citations frequently utilize the erudite function and the stimulative-amplificatory function. Some of Eusebius’ citations fall under the erudite function, but they do not merely support his own viewpoint. His citations carry his entire narrative and assert their own point of view into the story. They often support his contentions but also speak on their own and frequently contradict those contentions. Most of all, however, Eusebius’ polyphonic citation methodology falls under the stimulative-amplificatory function. He uses citations as a “springboard for speculations in the same vein.” He uses them to amplify the texts he cites in new ways and to juxtapose

327 Ibid., 693.
328 Ibid., 694.
329 Eusebius and his successors use citations for ornament less often. Gregory Robbins made these observations in my oral defense (personal communication, 1 June 2015). Regarding the variations on the stimulative-amplificatory function, see Ibid.
330 Ibid.
contextually situated voices with his own. The voices he cites act as independent witnesses within their own respective worldviews. He refrains from adopting their worldview, as if they are authorities on the matter, and instead uses them as supplements to, even jumping off points for, his own voice or interpretation of scripture. His citations carry his narrative, but they also inspire his narrative in creative ways. For the most part, Eusebius dialogues with his citations without bullying his sources or being overpowered by them. Morawski’s stimulative-amplificatory function encompasses his polyphonic citation methodology, as long as the reader understands that Eusebius and his sources are independent from one another.

Thus far, chapters 2 through 4 of this dissertation have used various examples of monologic and polyphonic citation methodologies in order to illustrate how historiographers interact with their citations. That is to say, this dissertation has focused on qualitative evidence. The qualitative evidence, however, is not the only sort of evidence that speaks to the citation methodologies of ancient historiographers; quantitative evidence can offer evidence that is more comprehensive in nature than the handful of examples analyzed so far.

This chapter makes some brief quantitative observations to support further the polyphonic character of Eusebius’ citation methodology, to underscore the monologic citation methodology of his predecessors, and to proffer a proposal for future research that would further identify the polyphonic style Eusebius introduces. The next section

331 Others have also used Morawski’s stimulative-amplificatory function in similar ways. For example, see Richard L. Schultz, The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 196.
compares Eusebius’ language to the language of his predecessors, especially in the introductions to and conclusions of their citations and quotations. After doing this comparative work, this chapter will offer a statement on the relevance of this dissertation to the study of early Christian historiography and a short summary.

Techniques for More Comprehensive Analysis: Natural Language Processing

Natural language processing (NLP) is the analysis of human language by computers.\textsuperscript{332} It encompasses a broad range of activities that aim to illuminate texts and speech in new and comprehensive ways, and the field is ever expanding. For the purposes of this dissertation, NLP provides a means for analyzing the linguistic differences and the uniqueness of Eusebius’ historiography and the historiography of his predecessors. The previous chapters used isolated examples from Greek, Hellenistic, Jewish, and Christian historiographers to show how each author employed either a monologic or polyphonic citation methodology. This strategy cannot in and of itself comprehensively assess all the citations in Eusebius, his predecessors, and his successors. NLP provides a way to analyze citation methodologies in a more comprehensive, quantitative manner.\textsuperscript{333}


\textsuperscript{333} Of course, the most comprehensive way to evaluate this data would be to evaluate the character of every citation in Eusebius’ HE, in his predecessors, and in his successors. A work of this sort would take up many volumes.
Scholars in the past have often used word studies to attempt to understand the range of meanings of a given word in order to illuminate its usage in a particular passage. NLP views each word as one among many features of the text. It takes *all* the words of the texts it evaluates into account rather than simply those words that catch a scholar’s attention. Whereas readers can often miss important data points, natural language processing constitutes a much more comprehensive (within its purview) means of assessing a text. This section explores the possibility of using natural language processing to support the polyphonic-monologic divide in the citation methodologies of a representative sample of early historiographers (including Eusebius).

In order to analyze citation methodologies with natural language processing, I had to make a number of decisions. First, since polyphonic and monologic citation methodologies concern the posture of an author toward his or her sources, I had to determine where an author was most likely to display that posture. An author usually expresses that posture not just anywhere but rather in the sentences immediately preceding and succeeding a citation. For the purposes of this analysis, then, I have chosen the two sentences preceding and succeeding citations as a means of ascertaining an author’s posture concerning the citation.\textsuperscript{334}

Second, I had to decide which features are most relevant to the question at hand. Any given passage has innumerable potential features. For example, the following are just a few that NLP could take into account in a particular introduction or conclusion to a citation:

\textsuperscript{334} This number can be easily changed in the code.
(1.) The form of a word (e.g., ἔλεγεν).

(2.) The lemma (or dictionary form) of a word (e.g., λέγω).

(3.) Whether or not a word is capitalized (e.g., Ποῖος is capitalized).\textsuperscript{335}

(4.) The aspect, voice, mood, etc. of a word (e.g., present active indicative).

(5.) The collocations of a word (e.g., γράφων occurring together with ἔλεγεν, or the lemma γράφω occurring together with λέγω). Collocations include two words occurring together (bigrams), three words occurring together (trigrams), or more words occurring together.

In light of the fact that this section deals with future research possibilities and in light of the fact that this dissertation has included texts from more than one Greek dialect, I have conducted the present analysis based upon Greek lemmas and forms. Lemmas bridge the space between dialects, and forms can often capture specific formulaic constructions (or parts thereof) despite differences in dialect.

Third, I had to prepare a number of machine-readable Greek texts.\textsuperscript{336} I have used the open-source texts available from the Perseus site at Tufts University,\textsuperscript{337} which has been highly influential in the digital humanities. I have also refined these files by comparing them to print editions of the Greek text. In some cases, I had to add quotation tags in some texts that otherwise lacked them.

\textsuperscript{335} Capitalization pertains to today’s edited texts rather than the uncial manuscripts within which many of these texts originally appeared. Modern editors of Ancient Greek texts typically indicated names and the beginning of a new paragraph in this manner.

\textsuperscript{336} These texts have been converted to Extensible Markup Language (XML) using the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) guidelines, which govern the preparation of electronic texts and their exchange for scholarly research. See http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml. XML is relatively easy to parse in most programming languages.

\textsuperscript{337} See http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/, whose managing editor is Gregory R. Crane.
Fourth, I had to decide whether to include only textual citations or citations of both texts and speeches. Previous tables have illustrated how meager textual citations are in pre-Eusebian historiographers. The sparseness of the textual citations in these texts already suggests that they rely less on the other than Eusebius does. I have decided to include speeches in this analysis in order to balance the data. For example, if I were to compare a corpus of 350 citations to a corpus of only 40 citations, my data set would be imbalanced and would skew toward the larger dataset. A better way to solve this problem would be to gather more literary and documentary citations from pre-Eusebian historiographers. The time constraints of the dissertation unfortunately preclude this possibility. The present analysis is an assessment of how these historiographers use the reconstructed voice of the other in (1) reconstructed speeches and (2) explicit citations of the other.

Finally, I had to decide on how to classify these texts. One can pursue several strategies for classifying these texts. For example, one might simply count how many times a lemma occurs before citations and after citations in each text and then report the resulting ratios that exhibit the most differentiation to the reader. Unfortunately, this approach fails to account for the fact that some texts have drastically more citations than other texts and that some texts are longer than other texts. Another approach might look for words that are unique or relatively unique to a particular author. For example, if συντάσσω (“compose”) occurs 59 times in Eusebius’ language before or after a citation.

---

338 For example, the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) comes with many classifiers, including a maximum entropy classifier, a conditional exponent classifier, a decision tree classifier, a naïve Bayes classifier, and a Weka classifier. All of these classifiers are useful for evaluating and classifying texts.
but only once elsewhere (98.3% of the time), then that word constitutes a highly informative feature. The problem with this approach is that if a feature occurs only one time in one author, the feature will appear to be highly informative (100%) but will rarely be useful for differentiating the citation methodology of one author from the citation methodology of another.

Due to these (and other) complexities, I have selected a Naïve Bayes classifier, a small piece of code (a class, really) that a user trains to classify texts into one label or another (e.g., the label “Eusebius,” “Josephus,” etc.). The Naïve Bayes classifier is a well-known, widely used, relatively simple probabilistic classifier to identify the features that are most informative for differentiating between different citation methodologies and to weight these features based upon their informativeness. If these features are

\[ P(label|features) = \frac{P(label) * P(features|label)}{P(features)} \]

In order to find the most informative features from this classifier, one simply finds the maximum values of the probability that a feature (e.g., λέγω) exists given label 1 (e.g., “Eusebius”) divided by the probability that a feature exists given label 2 (e.g., “Thucydides”). (In reality, the formula is slightly more complicated than the latter statement in different situations, but the formula has been simplified in order to fit the present situation.) The full formula is as follows:

\[ \max [P(featurename = featurevalue | label1) * P(featurename = featurevalue | label2)] \]

These algorithms are installed in the Naïve Bayes classifier written by Edward Loper (University of Pennsylvania) for the open-source Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK). The source code can be found here: http://www.nltk.org/_modules/nltk/classify/naivebayes.html. This section uses the NLTK (with a few modifications that help accommodate Greek text and record results in a more permanent fashion) to implement the Naïve Bayes classifier and to find the most informative features. See also chapter 6 of Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper, Natural Language Processing with Python (Sebastopol, Calif.: O’Reilley, 2009), 221-260.
indicative of a polyphonic citation methodology of Eusebius and indicative of a monologic citation methodology in previous historiographers, then these features further support the thesis of this dissertation, but in a manner more comprehensive than the select few examples of previous chapters. These features highlight the differences between Eusebius’ language of his citation methodology and the language of his predecessors’ citation methodology.

A number of linguistic features in Eusebius’ posture toward his citations highlight the polyphonic character of his citation methodology in contrast to the linguistic features of other historiographers that tend to use a monologic citation methodology. This section will address both introductions and (briefly) conclusions to citations in Eusebius and his predecessors. Below are the most informative features related to polyphonic and monologic citation methodologies in the introductions of Eusebius and other early Greek and Hellenistic historiographers:

Table 15. Introductions to citations: the most informative features pertaining to citation methodology for Eusebius and other Greek historiographers.\textsuperscript{340}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Label 1</th>
<th>Label 2</th>
<th>Prob. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γραφή\textsuperscript{341}</td>
<td>“writing,” “scripture,” “letter”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>61.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{340} The probability ratio constitutes the probability of label 1 to the probability of label 2.

\textsuperscript{341} The following footnotes contain the location of citations that have a given lemma in the two sentences prior to the citation. That is to say, the lemma occurs in the introductions to the following citations. For the lemma γραφή, see the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.8; 1.2.9; 1.7.1-15; 1.8.9-13; 2.1.3; 2.6.6-7; 2.10.3-9; 2.13.3-4; 2.15.2; 3.4.7; 3.6.1; 3.7.3-5; 3.8.1-9; 3.10.1-5; 3.18.2-3; 3.24.9; 3.31.2-3; 3.36.11; 4.8.2; 4.8.3; 4.15.2-3; 4.15.15-45; 4.29.2-3; 5.1.3; 5.2.1-4; 5.6.1-3; 5.6.3-5; 5.8.2-4; 5.8.10; 5.11.2-5; 5.20.2; 5.24.1-7; 5.25.1; 5.28.7-12; 6.8.2; 6.11.3; 6.11.5; 6.11.6; 6.12.2-6; 6.13.3; 6.25.1; 6.25.3-6; 6.43.5-6; 6.44.1-6; 7.1.1; 7.15.4; 7.21.2-10; 7.22.1-6; 7.25.6-8; Herodotus 2.78.1; and Thucydides 1.137.4.
Feature
ἱστορέω342
ἐπιφέρει343
ῥῆμα344
ἱστορεῖ345
λέξις346
ἑξῆς347
τάδε348

Translations
“inquire about,” “give an
account,” “record”
“he/she joins,” “he/she adds”
“word,” “saying”
“inquire about,” “give an
account,” “record”
“diction,” “style”, “the very
words”
“one after another,” “in order”
“the following”

Label 1

Label 2

Prob.
Ratio

Eusebius

Others

42.6 : 1

Eusebius
Eusebius

Others
Others

40.6 : 1
30.2 : 1

Eusebius

Others

28.1 : 1

Eusebius

Others

28.1 : 1

Eusebius
Others

Others
Eusebius

25.6 : 1
23.9 : 1

342

See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.10.4-5; 2.5.2-5; 2.6.6-7; 2.9.1-2; 2.11.23; 2.25.6-7; 3.10.8-11; 3.32.5-6; 3.36.6-9; 3.39.10; 4.3.2; 4.18.7; 4.22.7; 4.26.4-5; 5.16.11-15; 5.20.4-8;
5.28.2-6; 6.40.1-3; 6.41.1-23; 7.10.2-4; and Josephus AJ 1.3.95.
343

See the introductions to the following citations: Diodorus 4.85.7; Eusebius HE 2.17.7-8; 2.21.1-2;
3.26.3; 3.36.13-15; 4.11.9-10; 4.26.7-11; 5.8.11-15; 5.13.6-7; 5.16.21-22; 5.18.4; 5.24.8; 6.25.2; 6.42.5-6;
6.43.17; 7.7.4; 7.10.5-6; 7.22.7-10; 7.24.6-9; and 7.25.6-8.
344

See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.13; 1.4.12; 1.7.1-15; 1.13.5-9; 2.20.23; 3.10.1-5; 3.10.8-11; 3.28.3-5; 5.2.1-4; 5.18.1-2; 5.24.11-13; 5.25.1; 5.28.7-12; 6.46.4; and Herodotus
7.228.3.
345

See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.10.4-5; 2.6.6-7; 2.11.2-3; 3.36.6-9;
3.39.10; 4.3.2; 4.18.7; 4.22.7; 4.26.4-5; 5.28.2-6; 6.40.1-3; 6.41.1-23; 7.10.2-4; and Josephus AJ 1.3.95.
346

See the introductions to the following citations: Diodorus 1.12.4; Eusebius HE 1.8.5-8; 2.2.5-6; 2.5.2-5;
2.6.2; 2.23.20; 3.7.3-5; 3.20.1-2; 3.32.3; 3.39.2-4; 4.15.15-45; 4.23.9-10; 5.2.1-4; 5.8.2-4; 5.8.10; 5.17.1;
5.18.1-2; 5.28.2-6; 6.2.6; 6.11.3; 6.12.2-6; 6.19.4; 6.25.1; and Josephus AJ 17.5.139.
347

See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.25; 1.3.6; 1.3.16; 2.6.6-7; 2.12.1;
2.17.8-9; 2.17.13; 2.17.15-17; 2.21.1-2; 2.22.4; 3.30.1; 3.36.13-15; 4.15.15-45; 5.1.4-35; 5.1.62-63; 5.8.8;
5.16.6-10; 6.40.4; 7.22.7-10; 7.25.1-5; Josephus AJ 8.7.207-208; and 16.11.370.
348

See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.4.3; 5.24.11-13; Herodotus 1.11.2-3;
1.11.4; 1.27.3; 1.30.2; 1.35.3; 1.36.2; 1.36.3; 1.37.2-3; 1.41.1-3; 1.47.3; 1.55.2; 1.62.4; 1.65.3; 1.66.2;
1.67.4; 1.71.2-4; 1.85.2; 1.87.3; 1.90.1; 1.91.1-6; 1.110.3; 1.112.2-3; 1.117.3-5; 1.121.1; 1.124.1-3;
1.155.1-2; 1.159.1-2; 1.159.3; 1.174.5; 1.187.2; 1.187.5; 1.206.1-3; 1.207.1-7; 1.212.2-3; 1.214.5; 2.106.4;
2.114.2; 2.114.3; 2.116.5; 2.136.4; 2.141.6; 3.3.2; 3.14.9; 3.21.1; 3.34.2; 3.34.5; 3.40.1-4; 3.57.4; 3.63.1;
3.65.1-7; 3.71.2; 3.80.2-6; 3.81.1-3; 3.83.2; 3.85.1; 3.88.3; 3.119.3; 3.119.4; 3.122.3-4; 3.127.2-3; 3.128.4;
3.134.5; 3.137.2-3; 3.142.3-4; 4.3.3-4; 4.88.2; 4.91.2; 4.97.3-5; 4.98.2-3; 4.114.2; 4.114.3-4; 4.115.2-3;
4.118.2-5; 4.119.2-4; 4.126.1; 4.127.1-4; 4.133.2-3; 4.139.2-3; 4.155.3; 4.157.2; 4.163.2-3; 5.18.2; 5.19.1;
5.20.4; 5.23.2-3; 5.24.1-2; 5.24.3-4; 5.40.1-2; 5.49.2-5; 5.56.1; 5.77.4; 5.91.2-3; 5.98.2; 6.9.3-4; 6.11.2-3;
6.12.3; 6.86A.3-5; 6.86A.3-5; 6.97.2; 6.108.2-3; 6.109.3-6; 6.130.1-2; 7.8A.1-2; 7.10A.1-3; 7.10H.1-3;
7.13.2-3; 7.15.1-3; 7.16A.1-2; 7.18.2-3; 7.38.1; 7.38.2-3; 7.46.1; 7.53.1-2; 7.101.1-3; 7.102.1-3; 7.135.2;
7.135.3; 7.136.2; 7.140.2; 7.141.3; 7.148.3; 7.157.1-3; 7.159.1; 7.228.1; 8.22.1-2; 8.24.2; 8.26.3; 8.29.1-2;
8.60A.1; 8.68A.1-2; 8.75.2-3; 8.79.3-4; 8.84.2; 8.94.3; 8.101.2-4; 8.102.1-3; 8.106.3; 8.109.2-4; 8.110.3;
8.114.2; 8.137.5; 8.140A.1-2; 8.143.1-3; 8.144.1-5; 9.7A.1-2; 9.9.2; 9.11.1-2; 9.12.2; 9.18.3; 9.21.2;
9.26.2-7; 9.27.1-6; 9.45.1-3; 9.46.2-3; 9.46.3; 9.48.1-4; 9.60.1-3; 9.76.2; 9.78.2-3; 9.79.1-2; 9.87.1-2;
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Label 1</th>
<th>Label 2</th>
<th>Prob. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἱστορίαν</td>
<td>&quot;inquiry,&quot; &quot;narrative,&quot; &quot;history&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφῇ</td>
<td>&quot;in a letter,&quot; &quot;in scripture&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φωνάς</td>
<td>&quot;utterances,&quot; &quot;voices&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρατίθημι</td>
<td>&quot;juxtapose,&quot; &quot;place side by side&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19.2 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραθέω</td>
<td>&quot;touch on briefly,&quot; &quot;pass on&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.6 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέλει</td>
<td>&quot;at the end&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.6 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μνημονεύω</td>
<td>&quot;mention,&quot; &quot;remember&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14.9 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἕτερα</td>
<td>&quot;other things&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14.4 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτύριον</td>
<td>&quot;witness,&quot; &quot;testimony&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συντάσσω</td>
<td>&quot;arrange,&quot; &quot;compile,&quot;</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.89.3; 9.111.2; 9.111.3-4; 9.111.5; 9.122.2-3; Josephus AJ 5.1.93-99; 8.2.51-52; 8.9.232; 9.9.197-198; 11.1.12-17; 11.2.22-25; 11.2.26-28; 11.4.99-103; 11.4.104; 12.3.145-146; 12.5.262-263; 13.2.48-57; 17.5.134-135; 18.9.321-323; 19.1.92; Thucydides 1.128.7; 1.129.3; 3.104.5; 5.18.2-19.2; and 6.54.7.

349 See the introductions to the following citations: Diodorus 9.16.1; Eusebius HE 1.5.3; 1.7.1-15; 2.9.2-3; 2.10.3-9; 2.25.6-7; 3.23.5; 3.30.2; 5.5.7; and 5.24.1-17.

350 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.8.9-13; 2.6.6-7; 3.6.1; 3.8.1-9; 5.8.2-4; 5.20.2; 5.24.1-7; 6.43.5-6; 6.44.1-6; and Herodotus 2.78.1.

351 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 3.10.8-11; 3.28.2; 3.30.1; 4.17.13; 4.18.9; 5.1.3; 5.8.2-4; 5.28.13-19; 6.40.1-3; and Josephus AJ 19.8.345-346.

352 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.7.1-15; 2.9.2-3; 3.6.1; 3.7.1; 3.8.1-9; 3.28.2; 3.30.2; 4.15.15-45; 4.23.9-10; 5.1.3; 5.6.1-3; 5.8.2-4; 5.16.20-21; 5.17.1; 5.24.14-17; 5.28.2-6; 6.12.2-6; 6.40.1-3; 7.7.1-3; 7.11.1-11; 7.24.3-5; Herodotus 6.86A.3-5; 6.139.4; and Josephus AJ 12.3.135.

353 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.7.1-15; 5.1.3; 5.8.2-4; 5.16.20-21; 5.24.14-17; 5.28.2-6; 6.40.1-3; and Josephus AJ 12.3.135.

354 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.24; 1.7.16; 5.8.7; 5.20.2; 6.11.3; 6.11.6; 7.30.17; and Josephus AJ 16.2.31-57.

355 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.5.3; 1.7.1-15; 2.1.5-6; 3.4.7; 3.24.11; 3.26.3; 3.31.2-3; 3.32.5-6; 3.36.12; 3.39.1; 4.11.9; 4.17.2-13; 5.8.10; 5.20.4-8; 6.11.3; 6.13.3; 6.14.8-9; 7.11.20-23; 7.21.2-10; 7.24.3-5; 7.32.13-19; Herodotus 1.36.3; Josephus AJ 1.4.119; 1.7.158; and 8.6.147-149.

356 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.21.1-2; 5.1.4-35; 5.2.6-7; 5.16.6-10; 5.24.11-13; 6.25.13-14; 6.43.13-15; 6.43.20; 7.11.18-19; 7.24.6-9; 7.30.6-16; Herodotus 2.116.5; and Josephus AJ 18.7.254.

357 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.12-13; 2.22.5; 3.36.6-9; 3.36.12; 4.16.2-6; 6.2.6; and Josephus AJ 16.6.162-165.
A couple of these features indicate the loose coupling Eusebius often uses to cite from an already cited source for a second time. For example, Eusebius uses the word ἐπιφέρει (“he/she adds”) to allow Philo to continue Eusebius’ narrative in 2.17.6. Similarly, he uses παρατίθημι (“juxtapose” or “place side by side”) in 2.9.1 to describe how Clement of Alexandria juxtaposes a tradition regarding James the brother of John with the narrative of Acts 12:1-2. In both of these cases (and in several others), Eusebius uses language that simply passes the control of the narrative to his sources without

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Label 1</th>
<th>Label 2</th>
<th>Prob. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δόγμα (359)</td>
<td>“teaching”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστολῶν (360)</td>
<td>“(of) letters”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μνημονεύει (361)</td>
<td>“he/she mentions,” “he/she remembers”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.9 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱστορία (362)</td>
<td>“inquiry,” “narrative,” “history”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτύρων (363)</td>
<td>“(of) martyrs”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.4 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

358 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 3.10.1-5; 4.11.9; 5.11.2-5; 5.20.2; 5.28.7-12; 6.25.7-10; and Josephus AJ 1.7.159-160.

359 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.13.3-4; 3.28.6; 4.11.9-10; 4.16.2-6; 7.5.6; 7.24.3-5; and Josephus AJ 14.8.145-148.

360 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.13.5-9; 3.36.12; 4.23.12; 5.25.1; 6.25.7-10; 7.8.1; and Josephus AJ 12.2.36-39.

361 See the introductions to the following citations: Diodorus 9.16.1; 11.11.6; Eusebius HE 1.5.3; 2.1.5-6; 3.31.2-3; 3.36.12; 3.39.1; 4.11.9; 4.17.2-13; 5.8.10; 5.20.4-8; 6.11.3; 6.13.3; 6.14.8-9; 7.11.20-23; 7.21.2-10; Josephus AJ 1.4.119; 1.7.158; and 8.6.147-149.

362 See the introductions to the following citations: Diodorus 9.16.1; 11.11.6; Eusebius HE 1.5.3; 1.7.1-15; 1.8.9-13; 1.12.2; 2.9.2-3; 2.10.3-9; 2.21.3; 2.25.6-7; 3.6.1; 3.8.1-9; 3.23.5; 3.24.9; 3.30.2; 3.33.3; 4.15.2-3; 4.15.15-45; 5.5.7; 5.7.1-2; 5.24.14-17; 5.28.2-6; 6.19.11-14; 6.44.1-6; Josephus AJ 1.7.159-160; 10.11.220-226; and 12.3.135.

363 See the introductions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 3.23.3; 5.1.3; 5.2.1-4; 5.2.5; 5.18.6-10; and Josephus AJ 18.8.301.
attempting to control these outside voices in any way. He is merely adding or juxtaposing narratives that help illuminate the story he is telling.

In other cases, Eusebius uses vocabulary that characterizes his project as a whole (such as in the title of the HE). He uses features such as ἱστορέω ("inquire about," “give an account,” or “record”), ἱστορεῖ ("he/she inquires about,” “he/she gives an account,” or “he/she records”), and ἱστορίαν (“inquiry,” “narrative,” or “history”) to give voice to his sources in order to narrate the events of the past that he aims to depict. For example, after citing an account of the Apostle John from Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius states that he has cited the story on account of its history (ἱστορίας) and for the benefit of those who come across it (3.23.19). In some way, the citation is doing the work of history and is not merely a supplement to the larger narrative.

At other times, Eusebius’ uses features such as λέξις (“diction,” “style”, or “the very words”), φωνάς (“utterances” or “voices”), μαρτύριον (“witness” or “testimony”), or μαρτύρων (“[of] martyrs”) to emphasize the voice of the other and not merely the content of the utterance he cites. For example, the lemma λέξις (“diction,” “style”, “very words”) is more than 28 times more likely to occur in Eusebius than in other early historiographers.364 The lemma λέξις is demonstrative of Eusebius’ polyphonic citation

---

364 λέξις is 28.1 times more likely to occur in the two sentences before a citation in Eusebius than in the two sentences before a citation in the following sample corpus: Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, and Josephus. Within and without citations, the word occurs a total of 45 times in Eusebius’ HE: 1.5.4 (citing Josephus as support for scripture), 1.8.5 (citing Josephus as support for scripture), 1.13.22 (after citing the letter of Abgar, which was translated from Syriac), 2.2.4 (citing Tertullian translated from Latin), 2.5.2 (citing Josephus on the riot in Alexandria), 2.6.1 (citing Philo on Gaius), 2.11.1 (citing Josephus on Gamaliel), 2.17.18 (after citing Philo’s take on the Therapeuta, which Eusebius takes to be Christian monastics), [2.17.20 (in a citation of Philo),] 2.19.2 (summarizing Josephus on Claudius), 2.23.20 (citing Josephus on the retribution toward the Judeans regarding James the Just), 2.26.1 (summarizing Josephus on the Judeans who were flogged in Jerusalem), 2.26.2 (after summarizing the atrocities that took place in Syria), 3.1.3 (after summarizing Origen on the martyrdom of Paul), 3.4.2 (summarizing Peter’s preaching
methodology because it explicitly calls attention to the words of someone else. Eusebius frequently uses this word to emphasize the otherness of a text (see, for example, Eusebius HE 1.5.4 or 1.8.5). For Eusebius, the word λέξις does not refer to different languages or dialects so much as to an author’s exact articulation of a narrative. Even when Eusebius uses the term for excerpts that were originally in Syriac or Latin, he uses the term with regard to the Greek translation of these original sources instead of to the original sources themselves. (If he were to use the word λέξις to refer to another language, he would not cite the text in Greek as he does.) When Eusebius uses this word, the word often points to texts (such as Jewish texts) or points of view that exhibit differences from their immediate context. This lemma emphasizes the language of Eusebius’ sources while implicitly diminishing his own voice. Eusebius is highlighting for the reader the fact that he is dealing carefully with someone else’s language. He takes care to preserve the
original author’s own style, and he retains differences that arise between his own voice and the voices of his sources. His predecessors rarely emphasize the voice of their sources in the same way.

For a more concrete example, consider Eusebius’ use of λέξις in his introduction to a citation of Josephus regarding the rebel Theudas mentioned in Acts (2.11.1): φέρε, καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτου παραθώμεθα τοῦ Ἰωσήπου γραφῆν. ἰστορεῖ τοίνυν αὐθίς κατὰ τὸν ἀρτίως δεδηλωμένον αὐτοῦ λόγον αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν. (“Come, and let us juxtapose the writing of Josephus concerning this [Theudas]. He indeed narrates these very things word for word again in his work, having been made perfectly clear . . . .”)

Here Eusebius emphasizes the exact language of Josephus to signal to the reader the importance of Josephus’ actual words. Instead of paraphrasing Josephus, Eusebius focuses on the voice of Josephus in juxtaposition with his paraphrase of the text from Acts.

Similarly, the concluding remarks that Eusebius and other historiographers make after citations further reveal the polyphonic uniqueness of Eusebius’ citation methodology in contrast to his predecessors’. Below are the most informative features related to polyphonic and monologic citation methodologies in the conclusions of Eusebius and other early Greek and Hellenistic historiographers.
Table 16. Conclusions to citations: the most informative features pertaining to citation methodology for Eusebius and other Greek historiographers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Label 1</th>
<th>Label 2</th>
<th>Prob. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἑξῆς 365</td>
<td>“one after another,” “in order”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>28.0 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτύριον 366</td>
<td>“testimony,” “witness”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19.7 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱστορία 367</td>
<td>“inquiry,” “narrative,” “history”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.6 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μνημονεύει 368</td>
<td>“he/she mentions,” “he/she remembers”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.6 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὔδεις 369</td>
<td>“no one”</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>14.9 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλήθεια 370</td>
<td>“truth”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφή 371</td>
<td>“writing,” “letter,” “scripture”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.5 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φησιν 372</td>
<td>“he/she says”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.0 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακάριος 373</td>
<td>“blessed,” “privileged”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.4 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

365 See the conclusions to the following citations: Diodorus 19.53.5; Eusebius HE 1.2.24-25; 1.3.6; 1.3.14; 2.6.4; 2.22.3; 3.36.13; 5.1.3; 5.8.7; 6.40.1-3; 6.43.13-15; 6.46.4; 7.5.3-5; and 7.24.6-9.

366 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.22.5; 3.18.2-3; 3.20.1-2; 3.36.11; 4.16.8-9; 5.1.36-61; 5.16.21-22; 6.38.1; 7.22.7-10; and Josephus AJ 6.4.66.

367 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.12.5; 2.25.8; 3.7.5; 3.10.8-11; 3.18.2-3; 3.23.4; 3.30.1; 3.39.16; 4.22.7; 6.13.3; 6.25.13-14; 7.32.13-19; Herodotus 9.122.2; and Josephus AJ 20.4.90.

368 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.1.4-5; 3.36.11; 4.22.7; 5.8.8; 6.13.1; 6.13.3; 6.43.20; and Josephus AJ 1.4.118.

369 See the conclusions to the following citations: Diodorus 11.62.3; 16.85.4; 19.97.3-6; Eusebius HE 2.17.15-17; Herodotus 1.11.5; 1.30.2; 1.71.2-4; 1.86.4; 1.87.3-4; 1.115.2-3; 1.153.1; 1.207.1-7; 2.78.1; 2.181.3; 3.35.1-2; 3.35.4; 3.50.3; 3.63.2; 3.72.2-5; 3.82.1-5; 3.127.2-3; 3.155.4-6; 4.118.2-5; 4.119.2-4; 5.56.1; 5.72.3; 6.12.3; 6.50.3; 6.63.2; 7.8.C.1-3; 7.9.1-2; 7.9A.1-2; 7.10D.1-2; 7.12.2; 7.16C.1-3; 7.46.2-4; 7.56.2; 7.101.3; 7.150.2; 7.172.2-3; 8.20.2; 8.24.2; 8.57.2; 8.59.1; 8.114.2; 8.142.1-5; 9.9.2; 9.116.3; Josephus AJ 2.5.80-83; 2.6.136; 5.1.106-110; 6.3.40-42; 6.5.86-87; 6.11.233-234; 7.10.254-256; 8.1.19-20; 8.15.405; 9.11.239; 11.3.49-54; 11.8.333-335; 12.6.206-207; 16.4.105-120; 16.6.171; 16.10.331; 17.3.48; 17.4.74-76; 17.6.158-159; 18.6.186; 19.1.54-58; and 19.7.333.

370 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 3.39.2-4; 4.16.8-9; 5.8.11-15; 5.16.20-21; 5.16.21-22; 5.28.2-6; and Josephus AJ 8.10.243.

371 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.2.9; 2.17.10-11; 5.8.11-15; 5.11.2-5; 5.28.13-19; 6.2.6; and Thucydides 1.128.7.

372 See the conclusions to the following citations: Diodorus 9.25.1; Eusebius HE 2.1.3; 2.22.4; 3.39.1; 3.39.10; 4.11.1; 4.23.11; 4.26.3; 5.17.2-3; 6.4.3; 6.19.4; 6.40.4; 7.5.6; 7.10.5-6; Josephus AJ 6.13.284; and 7.5.101.

373 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 4.15.2-3; 5.6.1-3; 5.24.14-17; 6.14.8-9; 7.9.1-5; and Josephus AJ 2.6.136.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Label 1</th>
<th>Label 2</th>
<th>Prob. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>προσηγορία374</td>
<td>“greeting,” “appellation,” “name”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.4 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφῇ375</td>
<td>“in a letter”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.4 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτυρέω376</td>
<td>“bear witness,” “testify”</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the similarities between the features in the introductions and the features in the conclusions.377 Several of the words that are unique to Eusebius’ introductions are also unique to Eusebius’ conclusions, but to a lesser extent. The probability ratios of the conclusions are somewhat smaller than the probability ratios of the introductions, which suggests more variation among the conclusions of both Eusebius and his predecessors. Eusebius establishes his distinctive posture toward his citations in his introductions more than in his conclusions.

Eusebius’ conclusions are less different from the conclusions of his predecessors than his introductions are from theirs. Eusebius’ uniqueness in his conclusions to citations overlaps substantially with the distinctiveness of his introductions. Eusebius concerns himself with giving voice to the language of another and highlights this achievement with his own language that leads into his citations.

Of course, this chapter could greatly expand this brief analysis of Eusebius’ citation methodology in light of natural language processing. The bottom line is that

374 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 1.3.2; 2.1.5-6; 3.26.3; 5.2.1-4; 6.43.20; and Josephus AJ 4.8.261-262.

375 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.6.4; 3.24.11; 5.4.1-2; 5.7.6; 5.25.1; and Josephus AJ 12.6.225-227.

376 See the conclusions to the following citations: Eusebius HE 2.22.5; 3.4.7; 3.20.1-2; 3.32.5-6; 3.36.11; 4.14.3-8; 4.15.2-3; 4.16.8-9; 5.2.1-4; 5.4.1-2; 5.6.3-5; 5.16.2-5; 5.16.21-22; 5.18.5; 7.30.3-5; Josephus AJ 5.1.73-75; 6.4.66; 6.14.354-355; 12.3.148-153; and 18.6.175.

377 Note the difference in probability ratios, however. The assessments of the introductions and of the conclusions are two different assessments.
natural language processing can also highlight the polyphonic transformation that Eusebius precipitated in the citation methodologies of late-ancient Christian historiography.

Relevance to the Study of Historiography in Early Christianity

The larger aim of this study has been to elucidate the new role Christian historiographers gave to the sources they cite. Scholars have long noted the methodological character of Eusebius’ history and have speculated about its origins. Nevertheless, Eusebius’ uses a citation methodology in the HE that differs substantially from the citation methodology he uses elsewhere. Whereas in the PE Eusebius cites sources in order to allow the opposition to refute themselves with their own words, in the HE Eusebius cites sources for an apparently Christian audience in order to allow the eye witnesses of events or those closest to the eyewitnesses to tell the narratives that comprise his church history. Eusebius’ citation methodology demonstrates his predilection for the voice of his sources over the voice of the narrator. The diminishment of the narrator’s voice is perhaps the most important element of Eusebius’ new citation methodology.

Despite the fact that the modification in citation methodology that Eusebius introduced did not have immediate, extensive influence over later Christian historiographers, his modification did eventually profoundly influence the role of the

---

378 See, for example, Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 22-23 and Grafton and Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 200-205. Grafton and Williams connect this methodology to Eusebius’ predecessor Pamphilus.

379 Eusebius preserves the voices of his sources in part so that nothing is lost in the transmission of the narratives to which they attest.
narrator over time. Christian historiographers, unlike their pagan and Jewish predecessors, often presented their sources as self-sufficient witnesses to the sub-narratives of the past. Furthermore, Christian historiographers diminished the authority of the narrator, offering their evidence to the reader without extensive analysis of the validity or worth of the evidence.

By leaving the analysis of the evidence to the reader, early Christian historiographers assumed their readers would have the capacity to analyze such citations. The assumed reader of early Christian historiographers suggests that these historiographers expected their readers to analyze citations independently from the historiographer or narrator.\(^{380}\) Of course, the danger of this new approach is that the reader might interpret citations in a positivistic manner. Over time, this citation methodology also allowed readers to take these historiographers’ citations at face value. Although early Christian historiographers, beginning with Eusebius, generally gave more agency to the reader, the reader would of course not always live up to the historiographer’s expectations. Early Christian historiographers assumed a somewhat sophisticated readership who could assess the significance of citations for themselves but also left less sophisticated readers with the danger of oversimplifying the nature of the evidence that the citations presented.

---

\(^{380}\) See, for example, Eusebius’ dialogue with the assumed reader in his treatment of the Therapeutæ in HE 2.17.
**Summary**

Along the spectrum of Bakhtin’s distinction between polyphony and monologization, Eusebius’ citation methodology tends toward the polyphonic side. Eusebius’ polyphony becomes apparent in the comparison of his citation methodology with his predecessors and successors and in the broader analysis of his language in the introductions and conclusions to his citations of other texts. In many ways, Eusebius seeks to diminish his own voice as narrator and to elevate the voices of his sources as witnesses to the history of Christianity. This diminishment of his own voice and elevation of the voices of his sources results in a different experience for the reader of his historiography and eventually comes to characterize the citation methodology of Christian historiographers. Eusebius leaves the reader to construct his or her own interpretation of the narrative of the past from the literary flowers that intersperse his history.
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