

Multiple Temporalities and Narrative Modulation in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*

David DeVore
Cal Poly Pomona
ddevore@cpp.edu

Introduction

To the modern discourse of history, periodization is integral. Europeans and descendants of European colonists divide the past into “ancient,” “medieval,” and “modern” periods. In the United States we divide our past by centuries (eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth). In much historical discourse the past is divided by the ruling regime or individual (“Han China,” “Victorian England”). For more socially and economically minded historians the past divides into economic system (“feudal period,” “industrial age”).¹ In literary and artistic history periodization typically reflects artistic movements (“the Renaissance,” “the Romantic age”).²

We tend to talk, moreover, as if such periodic divisions constitute sharp social, cultural, political, and/or economic breaks. As Michel de Certeau has written, “Each ‘new’ time [period] provides the place for a discourse considering whatever preceded it to be ‘dead,’ but welcoming a ‘past’ that had already been specified by former ruptures. Breakage is therefore the postulate of interpretation (which is constructed as of the present time) and its object....”³ Likewise, Kathleen Davis has asserted that traditional period breaks between medieval and modern “exercise exclusionary force, and require alignment with historically particular cultural, economic, and institutional forms” and “impose homogeneities.”⁴ These divisions, moreover, structure our institutions: the desired period of study (“medieval historian,” “postcolonial literature”) typically defines positions advertised in the humanities (at least, positions that are still around).⁵

The discourse and discipline of early Christianity have long been no different. Until recently, most histories of Christianity had divided the first few hundred years of Christianity into periods, naming these periods after the chief characters of Christian events each duration of time. In his fundamental *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, for instance, Adolf von Harnack distinguished an “apostolic period” (*apostolische Zeitalter*) from the later, “post-

¹ See Kathleen Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).

² Eric Hayot, “Against Periodization; or, On Institutional Time,” *New Literary History* 42.4 (2011); Lucian Hölscher, “Time Gardens: Historical Concepts in Modern Historiography,” *History and Theory* 53 (2014), 588.

³ Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 4. Cf. Chris Lorenz, “‘The Times they are A-Changin’’: On Time, Space and Periodization,” in A. Carretero et al., eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017), 123, quoted below.

⁴ Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty*, 3-4.

⁵ As Hayot, “Against Periodization,” complains.

apostolic period (*nachapostolischen Zeitalter*).⁶ Anglophone scholars have employed similar periodization: in his update of Harnack, *The Rise of Christianity*, W.H.C. Frend termed the “sub-apostolic period” the years between 65 and 135 CE.⁷ Scholars who further extend the post-apostolic period after the apostles typically distinguish the latter as “patristic”: as Mark Humphries has observed in his book about Christianity to Constantine, “the early Christianity of the New Testament is often described as ‘apostolic’, whereas that described by authors writing after c. 100 is termed ‘patristic.’”⁸ The “apostolic,” “sub-” (or “post-”) “apostolic,” and “patristic” ages have become the lasting terms for the periods of ancient Christian events. These periods have become institutionalized divides in narratives of the Christian past, even if the precise chronological boundaries in our post-Christian BCE/CE dating system remain undetermined.⁹ And specialists in ancient Christianity are typically divided according to these subjects: specialists in early Christianity are divided among “New Testament” scholars (who study “apostolic-age” events and characters) and “patristic” scholars (who study events and characters from after the apostles).¹⁰

In this paper I suggest that the distinctions long employed between ancient Christian periods go back to the first historian of the Christian church, Eusebius of Caesarea. I begin by discussing Eusebius and his intellectual activity in the time when he was writing the *Ecclesiastical History*, between 313 and 324 CE. Eusebius, I show, organized his seminal narrative of the Christian church to his lifetime with three, overlapping temporal schemes: one cosmic, one protagonistic, and one epistemological. I argue that Eusebius combined multiple temporal schemes subtly in the same text to produce a subtle, multifaceted, carefully-authorized but frequently-misleading narrative of the first three centuries of Christianity.

⁶ Adolf von Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906), VI, 15-16, 60, 157, 186, 277, 311, 339, 342, 359, 363, 388; cf. 177. A fuller archaeology of this periodization is beyond my COVID-restricted resources at the moment.

⁷ W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 121; see also 123, 125, 133, 139, 232.

⁸ Mark Humphries, *Early Christianity* (Routledge, 2006), 76. Whereas the “patristic” period typically extends to Iconoclasm in the eighth century (cf. e.g. Frend, *Rise of Christianity*, 76), I focus here on the period of the “Ante-Nicene Fathers,” named after the famous translation series of “orthodox” Christian authors of the second and third centuries, as the Council of Nicaea typically marks the elevation of Christianity into a position of power and honor in the Roman Empire and thus the start of a new period.

⁹ Note e.g. that in one solid recent textbook—Joseph Lynch, *Early Christianity: A Short History* (Oxford University Press, 2010)—the chapters proceed from “The Jesus Movement in the First Century” to “Christian Diversity in the Second and Third Centuries,” rendering a clear break at AD 100 between the apostolic period and the post-apostolic period.

¹⁰ This has had the notable consequence that “New Testament” scholars dominate the study of “apocryphal” texts such as the Nag Hammadi scrolls or apocryphal gospels, acts, or apocalypses to “New Testament” scholars, while “patristics” scholars tend to study texts that often date earlier but more forthrightly acknowledge the distance of time between Christ and the apostles on the one hand and each text’s speaker on the other. The narrative settings of the texts, not the chronology of composition, has determined our division of disciplinary territory. This point was brought to my attention by David Eastman, “The Convergence of New Testament Studies and Patristics,” paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the North American Patristics Society, 23 May 2013.

1. Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*: Sources, Content, Aims

Eusebius was perhaps the most qualified Christian thinker to spin a narrative of early Christianity. He was thoroughly educated in pagan and Christian texts: his works show a deep familiarity with numerous texts from Christian, Jewish, and pagan authors, and Plato, Homer, Euripides, Herodotus and Thucydides among the Greek classics.¹¹ Eusebius also delivered public orations with enough skill to deliver important public orations for the emperor Constantine late in his life.¹² Along with his education, Eusebius also possessed the information needed to narrate much of the Christian past up to his time. His master Pamphilus had recopied the library of Origen, the famous Christian philosopher and scholar based in Caesarea Maritima of Palestine, after Origen had died. Upon Pamphilus' death Eusebius inherited this library in Caesarea.¹³ In addition, Eusebius had particular skills in textual criticism gained from Pamphilus. The colophons to a number of biblical manuscripts claim to have been copied from exemplars of Pamphilus, or Pamphilus and Eusebius.¹⁴

Importantly, the *Ecclesiastical History* was not Eusebius' first broadly historical work. Sometime between 306 and 311 Eusebius completed his *Chronological Tables*. The *Chronological Tables* had traced the chronological order of persons, states, events, and cultural contributions from the time of Abraham to 306 CE.¹⁵ The *Tables* had divided time according to the rulers of different peoples. The format of this text was tabular: Eusebius had placed columns for each nation he knew side-by-side on the pages of a codex. The columns proceed in time with the change in rulers over each nation. Eusebius began in our year 2016 BCE with four columns, for the Assyrians, Hebrews, Egyptians, and Sicyon (a Greek city-state that boasted a very old monarchical dynasty). As the rulers of more peoples entered Eusebius' sources, the *Tables* swelled to nine columns for the later sixth century BCE; but as the Persians, Hellenistic Greeks, and the Romans conquered peoples, the columns fell away. After the death of Cleopatra, only the

¹¹ Andrew Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), who underestimates Eusebius' knowledge of Herodotus and Thucydides: see David DeVore, "Genre and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*: Notes Toward a Focused Debate," In Aaron Johnson and Jeremy Schott, *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations* (Washington, DC: Hellenic Studies, 2013), 31.

¹² Eusebius, *In Praise of Constantine and Oration for the Dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher*.

¹³ Jerome, *de Viris Illustribus* 75; *Apology Against Rufinus* 1.9-10, with Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2006), 179-181.

¹⁴ Grafton and Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation*, 184-188, 194-200; and see now Matthew Crawford, *The Eusebian Canon Tables Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

¹⁵ The date: Richard Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*" *JTS* 47.4 (1997). While no manuscript of the Greek *Chronicle* survives, two translations do, Jerome's in Latin (see R. Helm, ed. *Eusebius. Die Chronik des Hieronymus* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1956]) and an Armenian translation (Josef Karst, ed. *Eusebius. Die Chronik: aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911]). The classic study of the *Tables* is Alden Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1979); see also Burgess, "Jerome Explained: An Introduction to his *Chronicle* and a Guide to its Use," *Ancient History Bulletin* 16 (2002).

Romans and Jews remained; and after 70 CE the Romans were alone, with Christian bishops the only consistent.¹⁶ The *Chronological Tables* thus ordered the passage of time for Eusebius. Its visual layout was innovative; the progression of time by rulers' reigns, traditional.

Eusebius' historical sequel to the *Chronological Tables* was the *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁷ The *History* narrates the church's past from Christ's Incarnation (book 1) through the time of the apostles and (Eusebius asserted) their successors the bishops of major churches (books 2 to 7) up to the persecution of Diocletian and the church's restoration under the western emperor Constantine and the eastern emperor Licinius (books 8 to 10). Its chronological range thus goes, in our years, from the first century CE to the early fourth century.¹⁸

As for its content, although the *History* ranges from Lyon in the west to India in the east,¹⁹ four major cities dominate the account: Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch.²⁰ For these four cities Eusebius traces successions of bishops from the apostles to Rome: indeed, the first five words of the *History*, "the successions of the holy apostles" (τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχάς), signal that Eusebius structured the *History* around these successions.²¹ These Christian successions appear alongside a second line of succession, that of Roman emperors.

¹⁶ Nine columns: *Chronological Tables* pp. 106-107 Helm, with Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 45; Romans and Jews: *Tables* p. 163 Helm; birth of Christ: *Tables* p. 169 Helm.

¹⁷ The *Martyrs of Palestine*, a hagiography of martyrs in Palestine during the Domitianic persecution, was likely composed around the same time as the *History*. I accept that the short recension of the *Martyrs*, which survives complete in Greek and only in manuscripts of Eusebius' *History*, was Eusebius' original intended narrative of the Diocletianic persecution; its beginning fits very well after *HE* 8.2.3 and its ending perfect before *HE* 8.17. The longer recension of the *Martyrs*, which survives only in Syriac, seems to have circulated separately. See Richard Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Leipzig, 1929), 6-16; *pace* Valerio Neri, "Les éditions de l' Histoire ecclésiastique (livres VIII-IX): bilan critique et perspectives de la recherche," in Sébastien Morlet and Lorenzo Perrone, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique. Commentaire*, vol 1: *Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, 155-164.

¹⁸ There appear to be two different endings to the *History*, though, in the manuscripts. One manuscript family, represented by manuscripts AER, includes six imperial directives usually published as *History* 10.5-7; the most famous of these directives is a Greek translation of the so-called "Edict of Milan," which bears the names of both Licinius and Constantine (*HE* 10.5.2-14). This manuscript family is also markedly kinder to the emperor Licinius, ruler of the eastern Roman Empire from 313 to 324 CE. The other manuscript family, represented by manuscripts BDM, Rufinus' Latin translation, and an early Syriac translation, lacks these directives, and is also more hostile to Licinius (see the variants in *HE* 8.17.5, 8.13.14, 9.9.12, 9.9a.12, 9.10.2, 9.11.6, noted by Timothy D. Barnes, "The Editions of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 21," 196-197). Both manuscript families end with a narrative of Licinius' descent into evils and persecution of Christians, and Constantine's defeat of Licinius in 324 (*HE* 10.8-9, discussed below). It seems most likely that the text of AER represents the *History* as Eusebius originally wrote it in the 310s, while Eusebius inserted attacks on Licinius, removed the imperial directives of *HE* 10.5-7 as unnecessary, and wrote the last two anti-Licinius, pro-Constantine chapters after Constantine's victory in late 324. See also below at notes 30 and 31.

¹⁹ Lyon: *HE* 5.1-3; India: *HE* 5.10.

²⁰ On Eusebius' successions, see Scott Johnson, "Lists, Originality, and Christian Time: Eusebius' Historiography of Succession," in Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser, eds., *Historiography and Identity I: Ancient and Early Christian Narratives of Community* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2019).

²¹ The first episcopal succession comes in *HE* 2.24 (Linus succeeding Peter in Rome), the last in 7.32.31 (Peter of Alexandria).

Between the successions of Roman emperors from Augustus to Diocletian and those of Christian bishops all events in the *History* take their chronological place.

What kind of events did Eusebius select to flesh out the bones of his successions of bishops and emperors? Eusebius tells us his subjects in the rest of the 167 words of his opening sentence (*HE* 1.1.1-2), after noting the successions of the apostles.²² He promises to discuss important events (ὅσα...πραγματευθῆναι), leaders (ὅσοι...ἡγήσαντό τε καὶ προέστησαν), intellectuals (ὅσοι...ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τὸν θεῖον ἐπρέσβευσαν λόγον),²³ “heretics,” the punishment of the Jews for killing Christ, persecution (πηλίκιοι...τὸν δι’ αἵματος καὶ βασάνων...διεξήλθον ἀγῶνα), martyrdom, and God’s rescue of his people. This was an unusual composite recipe for an ancient Greek history, but I have argued elsewhere that Eusebius’ ingredients fit quite well within the genres of ancient Greek historical writing. For his narratives about the Jews, persecution, martyrdom and Christian deliverance Eusebius drew upon Greek national histories, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ *Roman Antiquities* or Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*. As for leaders, intellectuals, and “heretics,” Eusebius adopted the *topoi* of Greek philosophical biographies, such as Diogenes Laertius’ *Lives and Opinions of the Eminent Philosophers* or Porphyry’s *Philosophical History*.²⁴ By using these two genres to tell the church’s story, Eusebius represented the church as a nation of philosophers.

This representation of the church made the *History* an excellent complement to Eusebius’ 35-book double work, the *Gospel Preparation* and *Gospel Demonstration*, which was also written under Licinius.²⁵ As Aaron Johnson and Sébastien Morlet have shown independently, the *Preparation-Demonstration* was a comprehensive manual for the understanding and practice of Christian intellectuals, particularly in reading pagan Greek history and philosophy (the

²² On Eusebius’ preface see the very recent study of Christoph Riedweg, “Spolien im Neubau: Das Prooimion von Eusebios’ *Kirchengeschichte* im historiographischen Quervergleich” in Claudia Kampmann et al., eds., *Kirchengeschichte: Historisches Spezialgebiet und/oder theologische Disziplin* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2020), a reference I owe to Jan Bremmer.

²³ See LSJ 1.2.b with DeVore, “Genre,” 38 n. 77 on the meaning of πρεσβεύω here as “studying” or “interpreting” texts.

²⁴ See already Eduard Schwartz, “Über Kirchengeschichte.” in Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol 1. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938), 116-117; Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 140-141; DeVore, “Genre and Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*”; DeVore, “Eusebius’ Un-Josephan History: Two Portraits of Philo of Alexandria and the Sources of Ecclesiastical Historiography,” *Studia Patristica* 66 (2013). Endorsing this thesis are Aaron Eusebius (London: Tauris, 2014), and, reluctantly, James Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire: Constructing Church and Rome in the Ecclesiastical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 73-77. Eusebius also drew on philosophical biography for his *Martyrs of Palestine*: see Elizabeth Penland, *Martyrs as Philosophers: The School of Pamphilus and Ascetic Tradition in Eusebius’s Martyrs of Palestine* (Ph.D. Diss., Yale, 2010).

²⁵ See Aaron Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius’ Praeparatio Evangelica* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11-14; Sébastien Morlet, *La “Démonstration évangélique” d’Eusèbe de Césarée: Étude sur l’apologétique chrétienne à l’époque de Constantin* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 80-93; Timothy Barnes, “The Constantinian Settlement,” in Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 649, 656.

Preparation) and Christian scriptures (the *Demonstration*).²⁶ The *Ecclesiastical History* fit into this agenda by offering famous Christians of the past as models for virtuous Christian leadership from the Christian past.²⁷

The dating of Eusebius' composition of the *History* has long been one of the most contentious issues in scholarship on Eusebius. For most of the last generation, scholars had followed Richard Laqueur and Timothy Barnes in dating the first seven books of the *History* to before the persecution of Diocletian began in 303 CE.²⁸ Richard Burgess, however, has shown this dating to be unlikely, since Eusebius' *History* assumes use of the *Chronological Tables* (*HE* 1.1.6) and the *Tables*, Burgess demonstrated, date after 306. Today most scholars date the entire *History* to after 311, the date of the end of book 8. Most follow Burgess in dating books 1-9 of the *History* after 313, *History* 10.1-7 to 315 or 316, and the last two chapters, about Constantine's victory over Licinius, to Fall of 324 or a bit later; there are some, though, who date the entire *History* as late as 324 or 325.²⁹

Almost every compositional hypothesis entails an important conclusion: Eusebius composed almost all of the *History* when Licinius ruled the eastern Roman Empire.³⁰ Contrary to the common representation of the *History* as a manifesto of Constantinian triumphalism, Eusebius' *History* is substantially a pre-Constantinian text.³¹ We misread the *History*, I assert, if, as most

²⁶ Aaron Johnson, "Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* as a Literary Experiment," in Scott Johnson, ed. *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (London: Routledge, 2006); Morlet, *La Demonstration Evangelique*, 50-63.

²⁷ David DeVore, "Character and Convention in the Letters of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*," *JLA* 7.2 (2014), argues this based on the limited evidence of the letters quoted in the *History*. Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, has offered a converging reading of the *History*, though with different contextualization, and I dissent a number of his contentions.

²⁸ Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker*; Timothy D. Barnes, "Editions," 21, with Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 149-162.

²⁹ See Burgess, "Dates and Editions" for the majority hypothesis; Neri, "Les éditions," mostly follows Eduard Schwartz, "Einleitung," to his translation of Eusebius, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909), XLIX-LXIV, in dating 1-8 to after 311, 9 after 313; and Mathieu Cassin, Muriel Debié, and Nicholas Perrin, "La question des éditions de l' *Histoire ecclésiastique* et le livre X," in Morlet and Perrone, *Commentaire*, suggest two versions, of Books 1-10.7 before 324 and a version with 10.8-9 after 324; and Johnson, *Eusebius*, 104-112, asserts that the entire *History* might have originally appeared in just one edition, after late 324.

³⁰ Only the theory of Johnson, *Eusebius*, 104-112, implies that the entire *History* may have been written after 324. Johnson's hypothesis relies on explaining the different representation of Licinius in the manuscripts (see note 18 above) as the work of a post-Eusebian copyist, rather than of Eusebius himself. This strikes me as implausible. Eusebius surely had more to fear from the consequences of a positive portrayal of Constantine's vanquished rival than any later copyist, though he seems to have been unable to control some versions of the *History* that were already in circulation. Moreover, most manuscripts that represent Licinius negatively also lack the imperial directives of 10.5-7, which, it seems, had mostly exhibited Constantine's favor to western Christians for eastern audiences but became superfluous after Constantine's victory. It seems too coincidental for the same copyist both portrayed Licinius negatively and removed the six imperial directives—all six issued in Constantine's name and only one co-signed by Licinius—for the same manuscript.

³¹ "Substantially" because after Constantine's victory over Licinius late in 324 Eusebius added the last two chapters about Constantine's triumph (10.8-9) to the end of the *History*. See note 18 above.

scholars do, we forget that its author remained under a pagan monarch's authority; I discuss some implications of this in Part 5 below.

While the chronology, content, genre, and dating of Eusebius' *History* are well-studied, the perceptions of time underlying the *History* have drawn less scrutiny. This neglect has prevailed despite Eusebius' keen awareness of the passage of time and pinpointing of moments in time. A Thesaurus Linguae Graecae search shows that the word *chronos* (time as duration) appears 141 times in the *HE*, while *kairos* (a moment, usually felicitous) appears another 86 times. *Palai* and cognates (indicating antiquity), moreover, come up another 101 times, not to mention the many signifiers of relative time (such the numerous Greek words meaning "before," "after," "back then," "later"). I am aware of just one article about Eusebius' *History* and its representation of time, by Scott Johnson. Johnson asked whether Eusebius had a view of abstract, continuous time or viewed time as a series of memorable, momentary events. Since, Johnson argues, the *History* modulated Eusebius' chief structuring device, the successions of bishops in major churches, to present a gallery of important personalities, "Time (for Eusebius, at least) happens through a succession of moments, rather than through an abstract understanding of chronological time."³²

Johnson's choice of the two alternative understandings of time is helpful, though I would follow Lucian Hölscher in reformulating "abstract" and "momentary" time.³³ For Hölscher, what Johnson calls "abstract" time is better termed "empty" time: that is, time that advances independent of observers, events, and experiences; "momentary" time, by contrast, is better termed "embodied" time, that is, experienced time.³⁴ Eusebius, for his part, did indeed view time, in part, as a continuous progress: the *Chronological Table* represents a series of equally long, predictable years even when these years lack significant events. For the *Ecclesiastical History*, by contrast, Eusebius changes his authorial voice for the different periods.

I show in this article that Eusebius associates sustained durations of time with individual or collective characters from his *History*. Eusebius' Greek marks these durations with such expressions as *tous chronous* or *ton kairon* [with adjective] ("in such-and-such a time," "at such-and-such a moment"), *kata* with an accusative of person or sometimes *epi* with a genitive ("in the time of"), or occasionally with other adjectives indicating time (such as *pro*, *meta*, *apo*, *eis*, or *mechri*). These associations between people and durations, I suggest, shaped some (but not all) of Eusebius' narration of these periods. Such narrative features as characterization, citation and quotation, choice of protagonist, and narrative opposition diverge from period to period.

It is important, though, that Eusebius did not construct such a simplistic periodization as later historians. To illustrate with a foil raised above: Frend divided his *Rise of Christianity* neatly into periods from Jesus to 193 (titled "Jews and Christians"), from 193 to 330 ("Christianity and the Roman Empire"), 330 to 451 ("Constantine to Chalcedon"), and 451 to 604 ("The Parting of the Ways"). The years 193, 330, and 451 serve as sharp boundaries that bring key themes of the narrative to a close. For such histories as Frend's, as in many modern histories, "the very idea of

³² Johnson, "Lists, Originality, and Christian Time," esp. 199-208; see also DeVore, "Genre," 31-34.

³³ Hölscher, "Time Gardens."

³⁴ Eusebius, in fact, uses exactly this metaphor to describe his insertion of events into the chronological sequence marked by successions of bishops (*HE* 1.1.4)

a period presupposes its substantial internal coherence vis-à-vis the other periods—marked by ‘turning points.’”³⁵

Eusebius’ temporalities are more nuanced than those of such modern narrators. The *Ecclesiastical History* offers three different temporalities, which overlap with one another; I provide a graphic of these temporalities in Table I below. First, he included a cosmic periodization, where the Incarnation of Christ represents a break with God’s previous people and Christians displace Jews as the divinely-privileged nation in the world. Eusebius’ second periodization was of protagonists in the church’s past: after Christ’s ministry, the apostles become the chief protagonists before handing over the church’s reins to a series of successors up through Eusebius’ day. Third, Eusebius periodized epistemologically, by the most important witness to the events that he described: up to the 270s CE he used available texts, mostly Christian, to describe events, but for events of “our own time” he relied more on his own knowledge, oral informants, and his own authority to convince readers of his reliability. For his protagonistic and epistemological temporalities Eusebius offered gradual transitions rather than transformational turning points, and equally importantly he linked those temporalities consciously through an insightful metaphor, that of the historian’s dimly guided but also partially free path, so that time is both continuous but also punctuated by memorable moments of experience.

Book no. in Eus. <i>History</i>	Cosmic Temporality	Protagonistic Temporality	Epistemological Temporality
1	Incarnation: 1.2-1.12 Post-Incarnation	Apostolic Times	Pre-Eusebius’ Times
2		Transition: 2.23-3.31	
3			
4			
5		Post-Apostolic Times	Transition: 7.26.3-7.32
6			
7			
8			Eusebius’ Times
9			
10			

2. A Cosmic Temporality: The Incarnation and Christian Time

The most fundamental temporal division in Eusebius’ *History* comes at the very beginning of his narrative: Christ’s incarnation. The topic of Christ dominates book 1 of the *Ecclesiastical History* (cf. *HE* 2.pref.), so this section will discuss the temporality of this book.

³⁵ Lorenz, “‘Times they are A-Changin,’” 123. This is the case even though Christians interacted with Jews well after 193, the church engaged often with Roman authorities before 193 and after 330, and eastern- and western-Mediterranean Christianities exhibited substantial divides in the third century.

In the second chapter of the *History*, Eusebius draws the incarnation out of eternity into that most vast of timescales, the entire existence of humanity. After several pages explain Christ's preexistence, via the Johannine doctrine of Christ as the preexistent divine Logos (*HE* 1.2.2-16, 1.3),³⁶ Eusebius emphasizes that the fall of humanity had separated humans from divine wisdom and virtue, the qualities embodied in Christ (*HE* 1.2.17-21). The fall, while forfeiting these blessings, had given way to progress: humanity advanced from "a beastly and unlivable manner of life" (θηριώδη τινὰ τρόπον καὶ βίον ἀβίωτον, 1.2.18). In those ancient times (πάλαι πρότερον, 1.2.17), Eusebius says, the Gospel could not be preached. The beginning of the pre-Christian period held no hope for humanity.

Eusebius uses this lament for ancient humanity as a prelude to his rousing, 183-word single-sentence description of Christ's incarnation (1.2.23): humanity was "civilized (ἡμέρωτο) through lawgivers and philosophers... , their wild and cruel savagery transformed to gentleness (τῆς ἀγρίας καὶ ἀπηνούς θηριωδίας ἐπὶ τὸ πρᾶον μεταβεβλημένης), so as to have deep peace and friendship and commingling with one another...at the beginning of the Roman monarchy (ἀρχομένης τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας), when the divine Logos became present on Earth...to teach all peoples (τοῖς πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν)." Eusebius follows this with a citation of Daniel 7.9-14 (= *HE* 1.2.23-26), identifying Christ as the predicted Son of Man and thus the culmination of ancient anticipation.

Again, after this "obligatory introductory section" (προκατασκευὴν, *HE* 1.5.1), Eusebius affirms the importance of Christ's incarnation as a chronological boundary. In this first narrative chapter (1.5) Eusebius begins the journey of his narrative proper (οἷά τινος ὁδοιπορίας, a metaphor to which I return below) at *HE* 1.5 with the birth of Christ. Eusebius marks this moment by synchronizing it with both a year of Augustus' rule and to an eastern Mediterranean benchmark, the twenty-eighth year after the Antony and Cleopatra lost Egypt (1.5.2), and also notes the overlap between the Third Gospel's notice of Quirinius' governorship of Syria and Josephus' mention of Quirinius (*HE* 1.5.3-4=Luke 2.2=Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 18.1). This conjunction of the chronologies of Rome, Egypt, and Syria heightens the emphasis on Christ's birth as a center of gravity for several surrounding nations.

If this first narrative chapter elevates Christ's importance by synchronism with other timelines, the next makes Christ the endpoint of a key temporal continuity. Here Eusebius asserts repeatedly that Herod was the first foreigner (*protos allophulos*, 1.6.1, 2, 7) to rule the Jews, drawing on Josephus to assert at length that Herod the Great was no Jew. The Jewish high-priesthood, Eusebius deduces, was in the hands of a foreigner for the first time. Josephus, Eusebius claims, reports that "the matters of the priesthood, which had proceeded steadfastly, in each generation, from forefather to the nearest heir, were instantly thrown into disarray" (καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐκ προγόνων εὐσταθῶς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔγγιστα διαδόχους κατὰ γενεὰν προϊούσης ἀρχιερωσύνης παραχρῆμα συγχεῖται, *HE* 1.6.8). The proper succession of high priests was disrupted. Herod then "no longer affirmed high priests of the ancient ancestry but apportioned the honor to some obscure men" (οὐκέτι τοὺς ἐξ ἀρχαίου γένους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἀλλὰ τισιν ἀσήμοις τὴν τιμὴν ἀπένεμεν 1.6.9). Eusebius represents this as the fulfillment of Daniel 9.24-27, where Christ

³⁶ A necessary doctrine given that Platonist-inflected Greek philosophy demanded that the highest divinity be eternal: see e.g. George Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy: From the Stoics to Origen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

is to be the ruler (*hēgemōn*; *HE* 1.6.11). Although Eusebius does not say so explicitly, the end of one succession leaves space for the beginning of another, the *diadochē* of Christian rulers.

Eusebius, I emphasize, doubly misrepresented the past in this chapter.³⁷ Eusebius was well aware that Herod was not the first foreigner to rule the Jews or to choose high priests. In 167 BCE the Seleucid king Antiochus IV, famously, had removed the legitimate high priest and replaced him, ultimately, with an ineligible Jew, then converted the temple of Jerusalem into a temple of Zeus Olympios (2 Maccabees 3-6=Josephus, *Antiquities* 12.237-256).³⁸ Josephus, in fact, had recalled this disruption of the priestly succession just a few lines before the passage that Eusebius quoted (*Antiquities* 20.235-239). In both the Septuagint and Josephus, contrary to Eusebius, the high priesthood had not proceeded steadfastly through time. Moreover, while Josephus had described Herod as removing more worthy high priests for less distinguished men, the Jewish historian also reported that Herod's new priests were still of priestly ancestry (Josephus, *Antiquities* 20.247).³⁹ This interference was hardly the disarray that Eusebius claimed.

Eusebius' tendentious, arbitrary positing of a disruption in the Jewish priesthood obviously increased the partition in time that Christ represented. When Christ appoints the apostles toward the end of book 1 of the *History* (*HE* 1.12), the high priests of Jerusalem, though they existed until AD 70, have ceded their role as the focal points of God's relationship with humanity. In the place of the high-priestly succession comes the succession of the holy apostles noted in the very first phrase of the *History*. The succession of the apostles then becomes the chronological spine on which Eusebius fleshes the *History's* narrative out (cf. *HE* 1.1.4-5).

Eusebius has thus created a stark temporal boundary with book 1: the entire book serves as a commentary on the Incarnation of Christ. Eusebius narrates it differently than the rest of the *History*. After Eusebius' dating of Christ's birth and his handwaving about the end of the legitimate high priesthood, Eusebius addresses the discrepancies between Matthew's and Luke's genealogies of Christ by quoting Julius Africanus' solution (1.7); argues from Josephus that Herod's painful death was a punishment for the Slaughter of the infants (*HE* 1.8=Jos.*BJ* 1.656-662); dates the administration of Pontius Pilate and the priesthoods of Annas and Caiaphas (1.9, 1.10); locates Josephus' notices about John the Baptist and Jesus (1.11), and records traditions about the identities of the seventy apostles of Luke 10 (1.12). Book 1, with one important exception, assumes a composite narrative of Christ's life;⁴⁰ it confirms, corroborates, contextualizes, and clarifies the Gospels, but it does not narrate. With the Four Gospels already holding sacred status, Eusebius had no need to rewrite Christ's life. Book 1, then, is a commentary rather than a historical narrative.⁴¹ The sacrality of Christ's life implies that sacred

³⁷ As few scholars have noticed: see DeVore, "Genre," 32 with n. 53.

³⁸ Eusebius' *Chronological Tables* (p. 139 Helm=p. 203 Karst) recorded this event.

³⁹ From Josephus' phrase τισιν ἀσήμεοις καὶ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων οὖσιν Eusebius (1.6.9) reproduces ἀσήμεοις but omits ἐξ ἱερέων οὖσιν.

⁴⁰ Eusebius attempted to iron out the differences between the gospel narratives in a different text, his *Gospel Questions and Answers*. See the edition of Claudio Zamagni, *Eusèbe de Césarée: Questions évangéliques* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2003).

⁴¹ Noting commentary as pervasive in book 1 are Sébastien Morlet, "Entre histoire et exégèse. Réflexions sur la logique narrative du livre I de l'«Histoire ecclésiastique»,» *Adamantius* 14, and Claire Muckensturm-Pouille, "Exégèse et histoire sainte dans l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée

texts should tell his life; the historian's job is merely to note supplementary material to confirm and enrich readers' understanding of this sacred threshold.

The exception to this rule of the first book being a commentary rather than a narrative is important, however: at the end of *HE* 1 Eusebius inserts a narrative about Abgar, the king of Edessa in Jesus' day. Abgar, the story goes, wrote Jesus a letter asking for healing (*HE* 1.13.6-9); Eusebius excerpts what he claims is a translation of a Syriac text from the archives of Edessa. In this text, Jesus writes back to Abgar (!—1.13.10) saying that although he cannot come himself to heal Abgar, he will send a disciple to do so. After his death, the Christ does indeed send a disciple, Thaddaeus, and Thaddaeus journeys to Edessa, heals Abgar, and teaches the people Christ's message (1.13.11-21). This is not only a narrative, but it involves activity both by Jesus before the crucifixion and by apostles after Christ's departure from Earth.⁴² It thus spans both the incarnation and the time after Christ, discussed below. And it includes a lengthy quotation of a narrative, a narrative technique that, as shown below, Eusebius used most often to narrate postapostolic events. Eusebius, then, provided a narrative transition between the incarnation and the period dominated by the apostles. If the incarnation erected a stark temporal threshold, Eusebius as narrator provided a smooth, engrossing transition from this threshold to the times after Jesus.⁴³

All in all, the life of Christ constitutes a clear, unmistakable chronological break for Eusebius. The teaching of Christ enlightens humanity, and the Church emerges from it. Eusebius' other temporal distinctions, though, prove harder to pin down.

3. A Protagonistic Temporality: Apostolic Times

Eusebius twice uses the noun phrase "apostolic times" (τοὺς ἀποστολικούς χρόνους, *HE* 2.14.3, 3.31.6; cf. 3.18.3, 3.29.4) and frequently uses "the apostles" as the object of temporal prepositions (e.g. μετ' οὐ πολὺ τῶν ἀποστόλων, 2.13.2; ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, 4.5.2, 4; κατὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, 4.8.1). After book 1 of Eusebius' *History* is primarily about Christ, books 2 and 3 feature as their major protagonists Christ's major apostles, defined broadly to include James the brother of Christ, Philip the evangelist, and Paul, along with Christ's chosen men Peter and John. The time of the apostles, I argue, is not simply a handy reference for Eusebius but represents a differently colored world than post-apostolic times, though the differences, I suggest, are more of degree than of kind.

Eusebius' different narration for the apostolic as opposed to the post-apostolic time is best illustrated by an example from his post-apostolic books. In chapter 24 of book 4, Eusebius

(livre I),” in M.-R. Guelfucci, ed., *Jeux et enjeux de la mise en forme de l’histoire. Recherches sur le genre historique en Grèce et Rome* (Paris: CNRS, 2010).

⁴² Indeed, Eusebius recapitulates Thaddaeus' mission in the first chapter of book 2 (2.1.6-7), a passage more explicitly to the time of the apostles.

⁴³ Enrico Norelli, “La mémoire des origines chrétiennes: Papias et Hégésippe chez Eusèbe,” in Bernard Pouderon and Yvette-Marie Duval, eds., *L’historiographie de l’Église des premiers siècles* (Paris: Beauchesne, 2001), 4. See also the recent study of James Corke-Webster, “A Man for the Times: Jesus and the Abgar Correspondence in Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Ecclesiastical History*,” *HTR* 110.4 (2017).

introduces the Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, whom he dates to the middle of Marcus' Aurelius' rule over Rome (see *HE* 4.19-20). I provide an abbreviated translation of the chapter:

Of Theophilus, whom we noted as bishop of the Antiochenes' church, three basic volumes dedicated *To Autolytus* are extant (τρία...φέρεται συγγράμματα), and another volume with the title *Against the Heresy of Hermogenes*, in which he has used quotations (κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις) from the *Apocalypse of John*; and some other catechetical books of his are extant (φέρεται). [Here Eusebius digresses about "heretical deviation" and valiant ecclesiastical intervention to correct them.] That Theophilus, for his part, fought (στρατευσάμενος δῆλός) against the "heretics" with the others is clear from a certain not ignobly (οὐκ ἀγεννῶς) produced text by him against Marcion, which itself also with the others we named is still preserved into today (εἰς ἔτι νῦν διασέσωσται.). As leader of the church, he was succeeded by the seventh bishop of the Antiochenes' church, Maximinus.

Six features of this chapter are typical of Eusebius' narration of the postapostolic era up until his time, in the end of book 3 through the end of book 7 of the *History*. (Books 8 through 10 are different again, as I show in the next section.) First, Eusebius isolates Theophilus as an individual, dedicating a chapter to him. Eusebius' usual method between the end of book 3 and the end of book 7 is to dedicate distinct sections to specific individual Christians rather than describe Christians collectively. Second, the passage is synchronic: it describes Theophilus' character, accomplishments, and activities without sequencing it temporally.

Third, Eusebius builds the chapter around a catalogue of Theophilus' individually-written works; as often Eusebius describes some of the content and context of these works.⁴⁴ Eusebius emphasizes the availability of these texts, in case his readers might wish to read them. These descriptions constitute an extended citation of Theophilus' writings: Eusebius clearly depends on them for his knowledge of Theophilus, and by affirming repeatedly that these works are available, he invites readers to check these works for themselves.⁴⁵ Fourth, Eusebius notes a New Testament texts that Theophilus cites,⁴⁶ showing his reverence toward what he believed were the apostles' words.⁴⁷ Fifth, Eusebius includes conflict with "heretics" and emphasizes the fierce

⁴⁴ The *History*'s more than forty literary catalogues remain a dreadfully understudied topic. The best study remains Monique Alexandre. "L'approche des vies d'écrivains dans l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* de Eusèbe de Césarée," in P. Brunet and M-P. Noël, eds., *Actes de la table ronde Vies anciennes d'auteurs grecs: mythe et biographie* (Tours: Rabelais, 1998); see also Robert Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980); DeVore, "Genre," 42-43.

⁴⁵ Notably, Eusebius almost never cites "heretics'" writings in the *History*; the only exception comes in a paraphrase of Agrippa Castor about Basilides' commentary on Matthew in *HE* 4.7.6. The absence of citations of "heretical" writings subtly discouraged Eusebius' readers from seeking their works.

⁴⁶ I note that in this paper "citation" and "quotation" denote intertextual practices. By "citation" I mean the reference by name or by another clear reference to a source Eusebius used for his information. By "quotation" I reference the copying verbatim or nearly verbatim of the *ipsissima verba* of another author's written text.

⁴⁷ "What he believed" because Eusebius was skeptical of the apostolic authorship of Revelation (see esp. *HE* 3.25-2, 4; 3.28.2; 7.25).

battles against them; these battles are ongoing and not instantly resolved.⁴⁸ Sixth, Eusebius concludes the chapter with a notice of Theophilus' successor as Antiochene bishop. The post-apostolic period, for Eusebius, is characterized by successions of bishops in four major cities; in the apostolic period, obviously, those episcopacies had to be established.

Finally, one additional quality of Eusebius' post-apostolic narration demands attention but is not represented in his profile of Theophilus. In books 3 through 7 Eusebius often narrates by quotation. He regularly inserts passages directly from his sources into his text and lets these texts tell the story. The most conspicuous cases of narration by quotation are for persecutions and martyrdoms: Eusebius quotes the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (*HE* 4.15), the *Martyrs of Lyon* (*HE* 5.2), and persecutions under Decius and Valerian (*HE* 6.40-41, 7.11).⁴⁹ Eusebius also relies heavily on quotation in narrating Christian controversies: I have shown elsewhere, for example, how he uses letters to narrate the Easter Controversy of the 190s (*HE* 5.23-25) and the rebaptism controversy of the 250s (*HE* 7.1-9).⁵⁰ Eusebius also often quotes earlier Christians' stories about "heretics" verbatim.⁵¹ In these passages quotation works to narrate Eusebius' text for him: it is not corroboration, as modern historians often use quotation, but the quoted voices become the narrators. We will see that Eusebius uses quotation rather differently in the apostolic period.

For the apostolic times that span most of books 2 and 3 of the *History*, Eusebius' narration differs both from such atomistic, synchronic, text-based profiles and also from the scriptural commentary of book 1. A somewhat-detailed summary of one particular section, chapters 13 to 18 of book 2, illustrates well Eusebius' narration of the apostolic period.

In chapter 13 of book 2, from the reign of Claudius,⁵² Eusebius begins by introducing Satan, the enemy of mankind. Satan is a recurring character in the *History*,⁵³ and here he raises up the arch-heretic, the Samaritan Simon Magus. Eusebius describes Satan as dispatching Satan to Rome capture the capital in a preemptive strike (2.13.1). To corroborate Simon's sorcery, Eusebius then quotes Justin and paraphrases Irenaeus, two earlier Christian authors, who describe Simon's magic, keeping of a Tyrian consort, acceptance of worship, and his followers' frenzy and madness (2.13.2-5). This illustrates well Eusebius' habit of multiply corroborating apostolic events. Although Eusebius already cites his sources more frequently than any previous Greek historian, for apostolic times he frequently cites two sources for the same event.⁵⁴ Multiple attestation, then, supported his agenda.

⁴⁸ For more on Eusebius' representation of "heretics" see the comprehensive Meike Willing, *Eusebius von Cäsarea als Häresiograph* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

⁴⁹ See also *HE* 4.17, 4.18.

⁵⁰ DeVore, "Character and Convention," 235-243.

⁵¹ E.g. *HE* 4.29, 5.13, 5.16-18, 6.38; cf. 6.19.1-14, 7.24. See also *HE* 7.21-23, where Eusebius quotes Dionysius of Alexandria's narratives of Christians becoming caught in urban violence in Alexandria and then a plague in Alexandria, discussed in David DeVore, "'The Only Even Mightier than Everyone's Hope': Classical Historiography and Eusebius' Plague Narrative," *Histos* 13 (2020).

⁵² The narration of this section has been noted by Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*; Sabrina Inowlocki, "Eusebius of Caesarea's 'Interpretatio Christiana' of Philo's *De vita contemplativa*," *Harvard Theological Review* 97.3 (2004), 323-324; and Sébastien Morlet, "Écrire l'Histoire selon Eusèbe de Césarée," *L'Information littéraire* 57 (2005); but to my knowledge not studied at length.

⁵³ See Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe, "Diabolical Motivations: The Devil in Ecclesiastical Histories from Eusebius to Evagrius," in Geoffrey Greatrex, Hugh Elton, and Lucas MacMahan, eds., *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 2015), 120-124.

⁵⁴ See *HE* 2.1.3-5, 2.5, 2.12, 2.23.4-20, 2.25.4-8.

Since Simon is the “father and manufacturer of such evils” (τοιούτων κακῶν πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν, 2.14.1), God counters Satan immediately, for, as Eusebius comments, “Neither Simon’s nor anyone else’s connivance at all among those that sprung up in those very apostolic times (κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς ἀποστολικούς... χρόνους) held up.” Apostolic times were a pristine period, a “heretic”-free time, Eusebius claims (a claim repeated in 3.29.4).

In fact, this assertion of Simon’s failure stands in tension with Eusebius’ own narrative, as a digression forward from book 2 shows. During Trajan’s reign (beginning at 3.21), after the apostolic period is substantially finished, Eusebius relates that another Samaritan sorcerer, Menander, became Simon’s successor (3.26.1). Such a succession of a Trajanic “heretic” after Simon is chronologically problematic. Eusebius knew his chronology well enough to know that Claudius died forty-four years before Trajan became emperor,⁵⁵ which is a long timespan for a disciple to wait to succeed his master.⁵⁶ The implication of this dating of Menander is that Menander was unable to spread his “heresy” while the apostles were active,⁵⁷ yet he did so after they departed the scene.⁵⁸

This unlikely temporal gap between founder and successor, reducing the ecclesiastical deviants from the apostolic period to Simon alone, was implausible even within Eusebius’ selective presentation of the Christian past. Why insert this gap? An answer comes toward the end of book 3, where Eusebius narrates the death of Symeon the son of Clopas, the second bishop of Jerusalem and Eusebius’ last character who knew Christ (3.32). After Symeon’s martyrdom Eusebius paraphrases the late second-century Christian writer Hegesippus, his source for Symeon’s death,⁵⁹ as saying (3.32.7-8):

up through those times, the church remained a virgin, pure and uncorrupted (παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος), for those attempting to corrupt the vigorous standard of salvific preaching (τὸν ὑγιῆ κανόνα τοῦ σωτηρίου κηρύγματος), if any even existed, concealed themselves somewhere in obscure darkness up through then. But when the sacred chorus of the apostles and that generation (ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη) of those who had been deemed worthy to hear the divine wisdom with the apostles’ own utterances had attained their life’s excellent end (διάφορον... τοῦ βίου τέλος), in the ensuing circumstances (τηνικαῦτα) the association of divine error seized a beginning for godless error through the deceit of false teachers.

⁵⁵ The *Chronological Tables* (pp. 179, 181, 193 Helm; pp. 214-215, 218 Karst) in fact put Simon at the beginning of Claudius’ reign, more than fifty years before Trajan!

⁵⁶ While Eusebius’ own voice merely calls Menander Simon’s successor (διαδεξάμενος), where theoretically the position of arch-“heretic” could stay vacant, Eusebius’ quotation of Justin (3.26.3) to confirm his picture of Menander calls Menander a disciple (μαθητὴν) of Simon.

⁵⁷ The two subsequent chapters (3.28-29) are also problematic for separating “heretical” activity from apostolic times: Cerinthus is said to have encountered the apostle John in a bathhouse (3.28.6=Irenaeus, *Against All Heresies* 3.3.4), though John remains alive through 3.31; and 3.30.2-3 represents a heresiarch named Nicolaus as releasing his wife to the apostles, which assumes contemporaneity.

⁵⁸ And Menander’s “heresy” is not extinguished either, as he has two disciples, Saturninus and Basilides (*HE* 4.7.3-4).

⁵⁹ Cf. *HE* 3.29.4, and 4.22.4-6, where Eusebius quotes verbatim the apparent source of this metaphor, a quotation that represents the “deflowering” of the church differently; unfortunately I cannot discuss this discrepancy here. The best study of Hegesippus’ heresiography and Eusebius’ use of it is Cecilia Antonelli, “Hégésippe chez Eusèbe. *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, IV, 21-22: Διαδοχή et origine des hérésies,” *Apocrypha* 22 (2011).

The apostles' voices, Eusebius claims, had silenced the corruption of "heretics." While the story of Simon Magus' status as arch-"heretic" was apparently too widely known for Eusebius to ignore or displace chronologically, it would contravene the sacred power of the apostles to allow Menander to pervert Christianity while the apostles were still active. Eusebius, in sum, minimized the "heresy" of the apostolic period to keep the apostolic past immaculate.

To return to our passage in book 2: the way that God countered Simon's "heresy" was by dispatching Peter to neutralize the sorcerer. After Simon flees across the Mediterranean, Peter pursues him. When Simon reaches Rome, Peter is hot on his heels.⁶⁰ In Rome, Peter, "like a noble general of God locking on his divine armor" (ὅς οἷά τις γενναῖος θεοῦ στρατηγὸς τοῖς θείοις ὅπλοις φραζάμενος) delivers the salvific gospel (*HE* 3.14.6). The episode reads like a hero from a Homeric epic putting on armor in battle to rescue a city.⁶¹ Indeed, Eusebius recalls such language of heroic confrontations and saving journeys frequently in his narrative of the apostolic period.⁶² Such language elevates the apostles' missionary journeys to mythical status. And Simon, like many a mythical monster, quickly perishes before the divinely-authorized hero, as many mythical adversaries do (2.15.1).⁶³

In chapter 15, and still in Rome, Peter commits his preaching about Jesus to writing through Mark; this preaching suggests the beginning of the church of Rome, where Peter will found its apostolic line.⁶⁴ For the apostolic period Eusebius takes special care to note and confirm Christians' authorship of texts. It is significant, though, that the Gospel of Mark is not simply the work of Mark but also the preaching of Peter. Mark is a jointly authored text. Whereas, as the example of Theophilus of Antioch above illustrates, in most of the *Ecclesiastical History* Eusebius credits individual Christians with authoring texts, for the apostolic period Eusebius lumps together several apostles' authorship of texts (*HE* 3.3-4, 3.24-25). The New Testament emerges as a collective product of the circle of apostles rather than distinct books by an individual author. Moreover, unlike with Theophilus of Antioch, Eusebius does not note any scriptural citations in Mark, even though Mark cites numerous texts from the Jewish Bible.⁶⁵ Unlike Theophilus' works, which like other post-apostolic texts must appeal to earlier, sacred texts the Gospel of Mark needs no scriptural authority because it is scriptural itself.

In 2.16, Eusebius leaves Peter in Rome, so that Mark, having absorbed Peter's preaching, becomes the narrative vector. Mark (Eusebius reports in indirect speech) is commissioned to visit Egypt and there he founds a Christian ascetic community. But Eusebius interrupts his discussion of this ascetic community to note a tradition (in Greek φασι, "they say", introduces the notice) that the great Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria met Peter in Rome and they engaged in conversation (*homilia*. 2.17.1); Eusebius calls this tradition "not unreasonable," due to the evidence that he is about to offer us (2.17.1). Such implausibly convenient meetings of famed individuals were again common to Greek mythical and biographical discourse: the meeting of

⁶⁰ Jeremy Schott's delightful new translation of *παρὰ πόδας* in 2.14.6.

⁶¹ On such prep-scenes in Homer, see e.g. Mark Edwards, "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene," *Oral Tradition* (1992), 302.

⁶² E.g. *HE* 2.1, 2.9, 2.10, 2.15, 2.18.9, 2.22, 2.23, 2.25, 3.1; note also 3.27.

⁶³ See also *HE* 2.7 (Pilate), 2.10 (Herod Agrippa), 3.20.10 (Domitian).

⁶⁴ Eusebius focuses here again, as with the character of Simon (2.13.2-5; see above), on multiply attesting this preaching than on its content or performance, citing both Clement of Alexandria and Papias of Hierapolis to confirm Peter's and Mark's collaborative textual composition (2.15.2).

⁶⁵ Eusebius does go out of his way to say which texts Josephus considered scriptural: *HE* 3.10.

Perter and Philo recalls the many encounters of Heracles, or Diogenes the Cynic’s sarcastic encounters with Alexander or Plato.⁶⁶ Such encounters that elevate the less-distinguished individual’s statue by apparent equal engagement with a celebrated personality.⁶⁷

Eusebius wrings further Christian legitimacy out of Philo. To describe the Christian community founded by Mark—the incipient church of Alexandria—Eusebius summarizes Philo’s description in *On the Contemplative Life* of the Therapeutae, an ascetic community of Torah-believers in Egypt. A complex combination of paraphrase, quotation, and selective parallels with Christian practice in the Acts of the Apostles present the Therapeutae as self-denying, studious, contemplative, and worshipful Christians.⁶⁸ Philo, Eusebius claims, “welcomed, regarded as divine, and treated with awe the apostolic men of his time” (ἀποδεχόμενος ἐκθειάζων τε καὶ σεμνύνων τοὺς κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀποστολικούς ἄνδρας). The term “apostolic” explicitly associates the Therapeutae with the apostolic circle. Eusebius’ attribution of its way of life to Mark’s community bestows creates a sense of awe around this Christian community, a community that eventually trained the great philosophers Pantaeus, Clement, and Origen—and Eusebius himself, after Origen’s relocation to Caesarea.⁶⁹ Once again, Eusebius uses a collective image of the Christian life, rather than representing an individual Christian as representing the divine. Apostolic times, Eusebius implies, had seen a unified, harmonious, pure, virtuous church.

Even after 1,175 words of praising the Therapeutae, in 2.18 Eusebius keeps the spotlight on Philo with an effusive profile and catalogue of his works, the first of more than forty individual literary catalogues in the *Ecclesiastical History*.⁷⁰ This catalogue, and the effusive praise that Eusebius uses to present it, cements Philo’s reputation as an authoritative philosopher. Philo’s catalogue is one of just two non-Christians’ literary catalogues constructed by Eusebius, the other being Josephus’ (*HE* 3.9). Both come in Eusebius’ apostolic period. Why insert literary biographies of two Jews into a history of Christians—and in the apostolic period, no less?⁷¹ Philo and Josephus, I suggest, place Eusebius’ Christian intellectuals into an older tradition of literary production from God’s divinely-inspired people, going back to Moses (cf. *HE* 1.2.4, 22). The apostolic period represents a larger transition from the Hebrews to Christians as the focus of

⁶⁶ Heracles: see e.g. Emma Stafford, *Herakles* (London: Routledge, 2012), esp. 39-41, 46-78, 150-151, 156-162; Diogenes of Sinope: see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives and Opinions of the Eminent Philosophers* 6.24-26, 32, 38, 40-41, 44-45, 53, 58, 68.

⁶⁷ Cf. Inowlocki, “Eusebius’ ‘Interpretatio Christiana,’” 324, Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, 104-105.

⁶⁸ On Eusebius’ use of this passage, see in general Inowlocki, “Eusebius’ ‘Interpretatio Christiana,’” and Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, 121-125. Pace Christoph Marksches, “Eusebius liest die Apostelgeschichte. Zur Stellung der Apostelgeschichte in der frühchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung,” *Early Christianity* 4 (2013), 474, Eusebius does not use Acts as “only...one of many sources”: Eusebius assumes the truth of the Acts narrative and cites other sources as supplementary to it (e.g. 2.1.11-14, 2.9-10, 2.12, 2.18.9, 2.19, 2.21).

⁶⁹ See *HE* 5.10, where Eusebius calls Pantaeus the leader of “the education of the faithful there” (τῆς τῶν πιστῶν αὐτόθι διατριβῆς), who headed the “school of sacred ideas of ancient tradition” (ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων).

⁷⁰ See in general DeVore, “Eusebius’ Un-Josephan History.”

⁷¹ Cf. my somewhat different answer in DeVore, “Eusebius’ Un-Josephan History,” 172-173.

God's blessings.⁷² It also reinforces the authority of Philo's approval both of Peter and of Alexandria's purportedly Christian ascetic community founded by Mark.

In these six chapters from the apostolic period, then, Eusebius has planted the churches of Rome and Alexandria, but his narration is far richer than this. He follows the devil to Simon Magus to God to Peter to Mark to Philo to the Therapeutae back to Philo. Eusebius guides readers from Palestine to Rome to Alexandria for these encounters. This circuit recalls again Heracles' travels, or many fantastic travels in Herodotus' *Histories*, where heroes journey across the Mediterranean for encounters with other past celebrities.⁷³ Alexandrian Philo's intellectual authority bookends Palestinian Peter's heroic authority as victor over Satan, with the literary and ascetic figure of Mark as a link between them. This virtuous circle fuses Hebrew and Christian, textual authorship and public combat, and Palestinian, Roman, and Alexandrian. And it plants the important, venerable churches of Rome and Alexandria, whose episcopal lines Eusebius follows throughout the *History*.

Worthwhile is a summary of how the passage exemplifies Eusebius' narration of the apostolic era. Most obviously the passage is a narrative, in contrast to the synchronic representation of Theophilus in *HE* 4.24. In addition, the apostles do not merely oppose, but successfully extinguish the "heretics," backed by Satan, whereas post-apostolic Christians, valiantly as they resist, do not extinguish "heretics" so easily. The narration features the joint authorship of a gospel and the collective community of the Therapeutae, making the apostolic church a homogeneous, collectively holy entity.⁷⁴ While Peter and Mark as church founders each play a major role, neither character is particularly individuated by Eusebius—we see none of the anecdotes that render vivid portraits of such later Christians as Polycarp, Rhodon, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria.⁷⁵ Together Peter and Mark compose Mark's Gospel, as the scriptures are a collective product.⁷⁶

On a related note, characters in Eusebius' apostolic era come off as completely virtuous and infallible. The obvious character flaws of Peter and Mark in the New Testament, particularly Peter's failures before Jesus and both characters' quarrels with Paul, leave no trace in Eusebius' pages,⁷⁷ and the virtuous Therapeutae complement the virtuous apostles. By contrast, a number of Christian characters in later books flirt with "heresy," hesitate to obey God's will, or commit

⁷² Eusebius drew a distinction between divinely-inspired "Hebrews" and more flawed "Jews"; the distinction is implicit in the *History* but explicit in the *Gospel Preparation*. See above all Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument*, esp. 37-45, 94-125; Jeremy Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*, 149-155.

⁷³ E.g. Arion with Periander, Hdt. 1.24-26; Solon with Croesus, Hdt. 1.29-33 (cf. Eusebius' knowledge of the Croesus story, *Theophany* 2.69); Democedes with Darius, Hdt. 3.135-137.

⁷⁴ See similarly the collective presentation of characters of the apostolic era in *HE* 1.12, 2.1, 2.3, 2.25; 3.1, 3.3-4, 3.7.8, 3.8.11, 3.24-25; cf. 2.17, 3.19-20, 3.31.

⁷⁵ Polycarp: *HE* 4.14, 5.20; Origen: see esp. *HE* 6.2-3, 6.36; Dionysius of Alexandria: *HE* 7.24.

⁷⁶ Pace Vincent Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos: the Primacy of Rome as Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-Apologetic Writings of Saint Athanasius the Great* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1982), who argues that Eusebius elevates Peter already as proto-pope.

⁷⁷ Peter, of course, denied Jesus and was rebuked by both Jesus and Paul; and Mark, famously, disagreed sharply with Paul and divided Barnabas from Paul (Acts 15.37-39). In addition, Eusebius suppresses the famous division between Paul and James evidence e.g. from Galatians 2 and Acts 21, as well as the pro-James Hegesippus' apparent criticism of Paul that we know from Photius, *Library*, Codex 232.

other offenses.⁷⁸ Again, in book 2 Eusebius' narration, complete with the epic prep-scene of Peter strapping on armor, is appropriate for a heroic foundation narrative.⁷⁹ By contrast, the description of Theophilus of Antioch quoted above, while laudatory, lacks such epic touches.

Two final contrasts must be noted. First, apostolic Christianity does not involve successions (*diadochai*) of the apostles, as Theophilus' profile above noted his successor as bishop of Antioch. Successions would in themselves imply an end to apostolic agency, so they must remain absent. Second, Eusebius repeatedly chose to cite multiple sources for his narrative of the apostolic period: Justin and Irenaeus on Simon, Papias and Clement on Mark's Gospel, and Philo and Acts on the Therapeutae as living the ideal Christian life. For this primordial foundation narrative, Eusebius exhibited a particular habit of corroborating factual assertions.⁸⁰ By contrast, Eusebius does not usually corroborate his quotations in later books, even as he quotes his sources at far more length.⁸¹

In a number of ways, therefore, that Eusebius narrated the church's apostolic period differently than its post-apostolic period. The modern distinction between the apostolic and post-apostolic periods seems indeed to go back to Eusebius.⁸² It is worth noting, though, that unlike modern scholars, and unlike Eusebius himself with his cosmological temporality (see section 2), Eusebius nowhere specifies one specific moment when this period ends and the next begins.

Indeed, the end of book 2 and much of book 3 include a number of moments that Eusebius could have pinpointed as ending the apostolic era.⁸³ One is the first death of an apostle who led the church of a major community, the death of James in Jerusalem, already in book 2 (2.23). A second moment is the first succession after an apostle, when Annianus succeeds Mark in Alexandria, (2.24). Another is the deaths of Peter and Paul, the two most-emphasized apostles, in Rome (2.25), or again Linus' becoming bishop of Rome after them (3.2). Eusebius devotes a chapter to "The first succession of the apostles" (3.4 title) but the characters in this chapter (Luke, Timothy, Linus, Clement, and Dionysius of Athens) are significant because of associations with apostles, rather than because of their own apostolic title; yet Mark likewise is an apostolic associate rather than an apostle, but Mark is nonetheless discussed with the apostles. This chapter presents no obvious break either. Chapters 24 and 25 of book 3 discuss the Gospels and the rest of Eusebius' New Testament, and so might seem to bring the apostolic age to a close

⁷⁸ E.g. Papias' feeble-mindedness and Irenaeus' acceptance of his errors (*HE* 3.39.12-13), Bardaisan's Valentinian notions (4.30.3), Origen's castration (6.8.1), Beryllus of Bostra's flirtation with "heresy" (6.33).

⁷⁹ Possible parallels appear in Herodotus' foundation narratives of Cyrene by Battus (4.153-165), or of Heracleia by Dorieus (5.41-48), which also both involve divine commands, lengthy voyages with multiple stops, encounters with famous outsiders, and hostilities before the foundations.

⁸⁰ As did other Greek historians: both Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* cite corroborating sources frequently in their earlier books, about the foundations of their subject peoples.

⁸¹ One exception comes at *HE* 5.5, where Eusebius cites Tertullian and Apollinaris to support his version of the "rain miracle," where Christian prayers rescue the Roman military by prompting rain to fall at a critical moment. Competing versions of the rain miracle existed that credited pagan prayers for the rain: see Péter Kovács, *Marcus Aurelius' Rain Miracle and the Marcomannic Wars* (Leiden: Brill, 2009). See also *HE* 4.16, 6.19.4-12.

⁸² But cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.30.3, quoted in *HE* 3.18.3, who distinguishes his generation (*genea*) from that of the apostles.

⁸³ Franz Overbeck, *Die Bischofslisten und die apostolische Nachfolge in der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius* (Basel: Reinhardt, 1898), 32-33 noticed the vague end of the "apostolic period" for Eusebius.

with the legacy of their writings. The first “heretical” successor, Menander (see above), appears immediately after this chapter and could represent a turning point. But so too could the deaths of John and Philip the evangelist, dated to Trajan’s rule and reported in 3.31, seem to conclude apostolic times.⁸⁴

The chapter immediately after this, 3.32, features the most explicit reference to the end of the apostolic age. Here, after the death of Symeon son of Clopas, the hundred-twenty-year-old bishop of Jerusalem and the last living acquaintance of Christ, Eusebius voices the claim quoted above (3.32.7-8), that the church remained pure as long as the apostles and the generation (ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη) of their hearers remained alive, but “heretics” were able to gain footholds afterward. This might seem to mark the end of the period of the apostles, yet Eusebius has apparently contradicted himself on this, as he has described three different “heretics” (Menander, discussed above; Cerinthus, and Nicolaus, 3.27-29).⁸⁵ If “heretics” have sprung up already, can Trajan’s reign still be the apostolic period, Eusebius’ placement of this claim notwithstanding?

The impossibility of identifying a Eusebian boundary between apostolic and post-apostolic times suggests that Eusebius never had a firm, fixed boundary in mind. The passages I cited in the last two paragraphs, which all seem to mark turning points, come over the course of almost an entire book of the *History*, spanning more than thirty years from Nero’s to Trajan’s reigns, rather than all together, in contrast to the long analysis of the clear boundary of Christ’s incarnation throughout book 1. While some apostles remain alive but others have died, some post-apostolic Christians slowly take over until the transition is complete. The apostolic and post-apostolic “periods” are not fixed durations with immediate endpoints; they instead exist on a spectrum, with prolonged transitions between them. Rather than mark a boundary, as modern scholars tend to, Eusebius drew out a transition between apostolic and post-apostolic times.

The transition, in fact, includes much narration more at home in later books of the *History* than in Eusebius’ apostolic narration. For one, as noted above, Eusebius’ synchronic profile of Philo (2.18), with its notice of Philo’s authorship of numerous works, reads more like his description of Theophilus than like his narrative about Peter and Mark. For another, there are several successions of the apostles, as noted in the previous two paragraphs (*HE* 2.24, 3.2, 3.11, 3.13-15, 3.21-22). Eusebius’ first lengthy narrative quotation, where Eusebius lets a source tell his story, comes just before the first succession from an apostle, when Eusebius quotes Hegesippus at length on James the brother of Jesus’ martyrdom (*HE* 2.23.4-18);⁸⁶ Eusebius also quotes Josephus at length about the Jewish War of 66 to 70 (*HE* 3.6). For another, Eusebius begins noting individual Christian writers’ works rather than lumping authors together in *HE* 3.16, when he describes First Clement. For another, Eusebius includes a touching anecdote about John the Apostle bravely rescuing a young apostate Christian from a life of brigandage (*HE* 3.23); this anecdote, incidentally, comes in a form characteristic of Eusebius’ later events, a long quotation from Clement of Alexandria’s *Who is the Rich Man Who is Saved* 42.⁸⁷ Again, Eusebius uses multiple citations to describe the “heretics” Menander (3.27) and Cerinthus (3.28).

⁸⁴ I omit Eusebius’ narrative of the destruction of Jerusalem (*HE* 3.5-8) because this passage is unrelated to the apostles. It is worth noting, though, that Eusebius does quote Jesus’ prophecy in Luke 21.20 as claiming that Jerusalem was to stand as long as it did in order to fulfill “the moments of the Gentiles” (πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἔθνων, *HE* 3.7.6).

⁸⁵ But see note 57 above.

⁸⁶ On this passage see David DeVore, “Opening the Canon of Martyrdoms: Opening the Canon of Martyr Narratives: Pre-Decian Martyrdom Discourse and the *Hypomnēmata* of Hegesippus,” *J ECS* 27.4.

⁸⁷ On this narrative see Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, 199.

Moreover, representatives of the church also are no longer flawless people, as the anecdote about John involves the failure of a bishop to care properly for the apostate from John (*HE* 3.23.13-14), though John is present to correct this bishop's failure.⁸⁸ But the narrative itself illustrates the failures of the successors of the apostles in comparison to the apostles.

Eusebius, then, does represent apostolic and post-apostolic times with numerous differences. Due to their different protagonists, the two eras show different degrees of ecclesiastical unity and moral virtue, different levels of protection for God's people, different relations to Jewish elites, and different narration to match in the usage of quotations and mythical topoi. The apostles, in short, represent a heroic ideal for Eusebius' Christians. Between the two periods, though, is a long transition, lasting from Nero's to Trajan's reign, rather than an immediate turning point. This second, protagonistic temporality is far more graduated than the first. The third temporality will prove graduated as well.

4. An Epistemological Temporality: Eusebius' Times

Attention to Eusebius' temporal markers reveals numerous references to "our times." The very first clause of the *History* promises to follow the successions of the apostles "with the times from our Savior and finishing in our own times" (σὺν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διηυσσμένους χρόνοις), while the last clause of the opening sentence says that Eusebius will tell of martyrdoms "in our time" (καθ' ἡμᾶς). References to "our own times" recur throughout his apostolic and post-apostolic periods. Sometimes Eusebius references the composition of texts in his lifetime (*HE* 1.9.3 with 9.5, 6.33.4); sometimes he notes individuals alive in his time (6.30, 7.11.26); and sometimes he notes texts considered scriptural in his time (3.16, 3.24.17).

One particular individual—the one individual whom Eusebius spotlights more than any other in the *History*—serves as a particular chronological hinge. Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria between 248 and 265 CE,⁸⁹ Eusebius says, was a bishop "in our times" (καθ' ἡμᾶς, 3.28.3), and Dionysius' exit from the scene prompts Eusebius to say, "Anyway, now that we are past their history, come on, let us pass on the generation of our own time—what sort of generation it was—to those afterward" (ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἤδη μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἱστορίαν φέρε, καὶ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῖς μετέπειτα γνωρίζειν γενεὰν ὅποια τις ἦν, παραδῶμεν, 7.26.3). This is a sharper temporal marker—to call it a "boundary" goes too far—than any that Eusebius constructed between apostolic and post-apostolic times—though it is not the only such boundary: the end of book 7 and the beginning of book 8 feature a repeated, almost-identical sentence (7.32.32=8.pref.) that winds down the successions of the apostles and ushers the reader in to events of "our own times" (τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, 8.pref.). Eusebius, I argue, was signaling an important transition (again, not a boundary) from previous times to his own. His narration again changed, so to speak, with the times.

Two differences between Eusebius' narration of his own times and his narration of past times are fairly obvious to the careful reader of the *History*. The first difference between the "postapostolic" books 3 to 7 and the contemporary books 8 to 10 is that Eusebius does not

⁸⁸ One final difference between apostolic and later times is that Jews, especially prominent in books 1 and 2, lose their war against the Romans and their temple in 3.5-8, and rarely appear again in the *History*, though Eusebius does note the Bar-Kochba revolt at *HE* 4.2.

⁸⁹ Although it is commonly believed that Origen is the individual Eusebius devotes the most attention to, in fact Eusebius spends more words quoting or describing Dionysius than quoting or describing Origen. Eusebius' representation of Dionysius is sadly understudied.

continue to follow the successions of bishops in Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch into his narrative of Diocletian's persecution.⁹⁰ This may seem like a deemphasis on bishops as protagonists and an elevation of martyrs as the heroes of Eusebius' persecution narrative. The discarding of episcopal successions, however, is a change more of chronological signposts than of protagonists. Many of the martyrs of books 8 and 9 are also bishops (8.6.9, 8.9.7-8.10, 8.13.1-7, 9.6.1-2),⁹¹ and after the persecution ends, it is bishops who oversee the rebuilding of razed churches and bishops who receive imperial privileges (10.2.2-10.4.1, 10.5.18-10.7). While in books 8 through 10 Eusebius no longer systematically traces bishops' successions, bishops remain the chief ecclesiastical protagonists.

The second, more significant difference between books 3 to 7 and books 8 to 10 is Eusebius' use of quotations. As shown above, Eusebius had frequently quoted previous voices to narrate events for him. In books 8 through 10 on the persecutions under Diocletian, which Eusebius witnessed, Eusebius uses another author as a narrator just once, quoting a letter of Phileas of Thmuis on martyrdoms in his region in *HE* 8.10. All other quotations in these sections are of imperial directives (8.17, 9.1.3-6, 9.7, 9.9, 9.10, 10.5-7), a genre also quoted in previous books (*HE* 4.9, 4.12, 7.13; cf. 2.2, 3.33), and a fundamentally different use of quotation.⁹² Rather than quoting other narrators in books 8 to 10, Eusebius tells the stories himself: his own voice describes martyrdoms in Phoenicia, Egypt, Antioch, Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Arabia, and even Nicomedia and Phrygia (8.5-12). Eusebius tells himself of Maximinus Daia's renewal of persecution and his subsequent failures of governance and defeat at Licinius' hands (*HE* 9.2-6, 9.11). And at the end of the persecution Eusebius celebrates the church's renewed safety by inserting his own *Oration for the Dedication of Churches* as the majority of book 10's text (*HE* 10.4). Instead of relying heavily on citations and on other voices, Eusebius offered either oral traditions or his own recollections.

The other voices of the church make way for Eusebius' own voice gradually, however. At the end of book 7 the references to events and individuals he knew personally become frequent.⁹³ When Diocletian appears as emperor, Eusebius notes his "persecution in our time" (*HE* 7.30.22). In the very last chapter of book 7 before his narrative of the persecution, on Christian luminaries "of our own times" (καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, 7.32 title), Eusebius references bishops of Antioch, Laodicea, and Jerusalem, and Alexandria "in our time" (7.32.2, 5, 29), notes Anatolius of Laodicea's intellectual success in the same period (7.32.6), and praises two acquaintances from Pontus and Alexandria who "proved to be extraordinary in our times" (τοῖς μάλιστα καθ' ἡμᾶς σπανιωτάτους γενομένους, 7.32.6). Along the way Eusebius also asserts his personal knowledge as sufficient proof of veracity, describing several individuals whom "we know" (ἔγνωμεν, 7.32.2, 25; ἴσμεν, 7.32.24, 26) without quotations. Such assertions of personal observation recur throughout Diocletian's persecution in book 8 (8.1.7-8, 8.2.1, 8.7.2, 8.9.4-5; cf. 8.13.7), and book 10 rests almost entirely on Eusebius' own experiences (10.1.4-5; 10.2.1-2; 10.3.1, 10.4.5-7, 9, 12, 14, 27, 31, 53, 58; 10.8.1). Eusebius—having earned historical authority via his thick web of citations for previous times—becomes the historical authority for books 8 through 10.

⁹⁰ Both the end of book 7 (*HE* 7.32.32) and the beginning of book 8 (8.pref.) announce the conclusion of the succession lines, with almost-identical wording (τὴν τῶν διαδοχῶν περιγράψαντες ὑπόθεσιν).

⁹¹ As had been the case in books 2 to 7: e.g. *HE* 2.23, 4.10, 4.15, 4.23.2, 5.1.29-31, 6.39.2-4; cf. 7.11.

⁹² The study of Eusebius' quotations by Erica Carotenuto, *Tradizione e innovazione nella Storia ecclesiastica di Eusebio di Cesarea* (Bologna: Mulino, 2001) rightly distinguishes Eusebius' quotation of literary texts from his reproduction of imperial directives.

⁹³ Some oral traditions had appeared in the *History* before: e.g. *HE* 6.5.1, and note 2.17.1 above.

As with the transition between the apostolic and post-apostolic periods, so between earlier times and Eusebius' time there is no sharp boundary, no single turning point. Although the end of book 7 terminates Eusebius' successions of bishops, there is no such sharp break from Eusebius' narrative quotations to personal knowledge. Even before announcing that he had reached his own time in 7.26.3, Eusebius had begun telling narratives more often on his own authority than on the authority of citations. On his own authority he describes the martyrdom of Marinus, a soldier in Caesarea and a miracle of Astyrius, a senator from Caesarea (*HE* 7.15, 17). Eusebius also describes two monuments from personal observation.⁹⁴ Eusebius' use of oral traditions and insertion of observations of monuments represent begin a transition away from quotation into narrating on his own authority as a historian.

Then, between the two temporal transition statements noted above at 7.26.3 and in the end of book 7/beginning of book 8, Eusebius narrated a coordinated effort to remove a flamboyant "heretic" named Paul of Samosata from the episcopacy of Antioch (7.27-30). Eusebius describes Paul's egomaniacal character by quoting long excerpts from a circular letter denouncing Paul (7.30), rather than narrating the event in his own voice. The next two chapters describe the "heretical" Manichees on Eusebius' own authority rather than with citations, and in 7.32, as noted above, Eusebius describes a number of intellectuals "our own time" (καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, 7.32 title) mostly from personal knowledge—but he also quotes at length a calendrical text by Anatolius of Alexandria that highlights Anatolius' intellectual prowess (7.32.14-19). Between the beginning of Eusebius' time and the persecution, the defining ecclesiastical event of his lifetime theretofore, Eusebius weaned himself from his dependence on earlier Christians' quotations—though he was willing to revert to quotation when, in the bishop Phileas of Thmuis (8.10), he possessed another voice that could tell the story better. Just as Eusebius transitions rather than flips from apostolic and post-apostolic times, so between earlier times and his own times Eusebius gradually shifts his standards of knowledge from the source-dependence for earlier times to his own authority for his own day.

The difference in temporality from the end of book 7 through book 10 is, therefore, epistemological. The source of knowledge shifts from texts to personal observation and oral communication trusted by the historian. Nowhere do the other disparities in narration appear that we saw above, between Eusebius' narration before the incarnation and after the incarnation, and between Eusebius' apostolic and post-apostolic era, when one compares books 1 to 7 on the one hand and the end of 7 to the end of 10 on the other.

It is important to underscore several of the continuities from earlier postapostolic times into Eusebius' day. One continuity is the existence of "heresies." It is true that Eusebius does not refer explicitly to any "heresies" in books 8 to 10. But as the focus of these books is persecution and martyrdom, there was no thematic space for "heretics." This thematic absence was not a time-bounded exclusion, as in apostolic times. Eusebius does note in his rant against the Manichees that this sect's name "comes up commonly still until now" (εἰς ἔτι νῦν ἐπιτολάζει, 7.31.2). And several of his directives quoted at the end of book 10, issued by Constantine, were about the Donatist controversy, a major schism of the 310s centered around north-African Christians (10.5.18-10.7; see esp. 10.6.4). In this schism the Donatists' position mirrored that of Novatus, condemned by Eusebius earlier in the *History* (*HE* 6.43, 6.45, 7.8), as informed readers

⁹⁴ One is a statue in Caesarea Philippi of the Synoptic Gospels' woman with uncontrollable bleeding (Mark 5.25-34 and parallels; *HE* 7.18) and the other is the throne of James in Jerusalem (7.19).

surely recognized.⁹⁵ This is a marginalization of “heresy,” not an exclusion: Eusebius does not replicate his tendentious blanket denials of “heretics” success during apostolic times (esp. 3.32.7-8, discussed above). While Eusebius no longer emphasizes “heresies” while narrating his own times, he also clearly allows for their existence.

Another key continuity from postapostolic times into Eusebius’ day is the fallible character of the postapostolic church. If anything, that fallibility is intensified: Eusebius dwells on the egotistical character of the bishop of a major city, Antioch (7.27-30), acknowledges that another bishop of Antioch, Stephen, apostatized during Diocletian’s persecution (7.32.22), and blames “our” mutual resentments, laziness, arrogance, and impiety for the persecution (8.1.7-8). Eusebius must acknowledge that he omits Christian failures during his narrative of the persecution itself—but in this admission is an acknowledgment that some Christians brought to trial did not become heroic confessors and martyrs (8.2.2-3).⁹⁶ And the directives of Constantine surrounding the Donatist controversy acknowledge divisions among Christian bishops (*HE* 10.5.18, 20-22, 24; 10.6.4). This character of the church shows much continuity from the fallible postapostolic church.

Between the collective representation of apostolic Christians and the more individualized sketches of post-apostolic Christians, Eusebius strikes a balance. After Eusebius announces the beginning of “my own times” in 7.26.3, no more chapters are devoted to just one individual, as for example 4.24, discussed above, had described Theophilus of Antioch. But several chapters are devoted to describing series of famous Christians individually (*HE* 7.32, 8.13, 9.6). The rest of the content of these chapters is about persecution, martyrdom, and imperial favor falling on Christians again, topics in which throughout the *History* Eusebius often retained more collective characterization (e.g. *HE* 3.33, 5.1-2, 5.5, 6.34, 6.40-41, 7.11). Eusebius, then, more or less retained the same focus on individual Christians that previous books had held in contexts where earlier books had held them.

One prominent continuity throughout apostolic and post-apostolic times, and from times before Eusebius into his own, concerns a topic not yet discussed: miracles.⁹⁷ The *History* tells of numerous miracles, a category in which Eusebius included supernatural interventions such as healings, exorcisms, and answered prayers, as well as prophecies within the text that are fulfilled within the text.⁹⁸ Eusebius paces miracles quite evenly throughout the *Ecclesiastical History*. Jesus’ miracles are noted though not narrated, as is fitting in the commentary of book 1 (*HE*

⁹⁵ On convergences between the two movements see W.H.C Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952), 128-129.

⁹⁶ Eusebius himself was accused of apostasy during the persecution: see Epiphanius, *Panarion* 68.8 with Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, 21.

⁹⁷ On Eusebius’ views toward miracles, see e.g. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 151–153; Monika Gödecke, *Geschichte als Mythos. Eusebs “Kirchengeschichte”* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1987), 60–70; Aryeh Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 165-214; *pace* Glenn Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*: (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 47 and Teresa Morgan, “Eusebius of Caesarea and Christian Historiography,” *Athenaeum* 93 (2005) 199-201.

⁹⁸ Eusebius used the word *thauma* and cognates to describe such occurrences. The *History* also narrates numerous prophecies from scripture that Eusebius as narrator describes as fulfilled (e.g. *HE* 1.2-4 *passim*, 3.7.5-6, 8.1.8-8.2.1, 9.9.5-7, 10.4 *passim*), or which narrators quoted by Eusebius say were fulfilled (e.g. *HE* 3.8.10, 5.1.15, 58; 7.10.5-8; 7.21.4-7), but the highly technical and debatable art of recognizing the fulfillment of scripture, which is the main subject of two of Eusebius’ other works (the *Prophetic Extracts* and *Gospel Demonstration*), renders the fulfillments of scripture too debatable to be considered miraculous.

1.13.2, 6). Jesus' apostles heal and travel miraculously (1.13.11-17), and some postapostolic miracles come up in the *History* (4.3.2, 5.7.2-4, 5.18.13; cf. 5.5, 7.18.2). All across the *History*, however, Eusebius describes miracles of vengeance in which persecutors or other enemies of God perish, usually of grotesque illnesses (*HE* 1.8, 2.12, 6.9, 8.16, 9.9, 9.11; cf. 7.17, 7.30.19-21). Several Christians (and the Jew Josephus as well) receive divine revelations (2.1.13; 2.3.3-4; 3.8; 3.31.3-5, 4.15.10, 28; 5.3; cf. 5.16-18, 7.17). Eusebius devotes an entire chapter to quoting Irenaeus' claim that he saw Christians healing, exorcizing, and prophesying in his day (*HE* 5.7), and quotes Irenaeus' casual claim that Polycarp performed miracles (5.20.6). Miracles know no temporal boundaries for Eusebius: the Christian God had enchanted his church since Jesus' time.

One final apparent discontinuity demands attention: the religion of the Roman emperor. Throughout the *History*, since the Incarnation of Christ in 1.5, Eusebius had correlated Christian events and personalities with the reigns of Roman emperors, and whereas the successions of bishops end at the conclusion of book 8, the successions of emperors continue (8.13.12-14, 9.1, 9.9, 9.11, 10.9). Constantine's rule, beginning with his victory at the Milvian Bridge, is often read as an ultimate triumph for the church, a total reversal of Christians' previous subordination in the Roman Empire.⁹⁹ In many scholars' perception, Eusebius wrote the *History* partly to celebrate the new Constantinian order of the Empire.

The importance of Eusebius' Milvian Bridge narrative has now been put into an important new context, however. Raymond van Dam has recently shown that Eusebius almost certainly found his narrative of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in a pro-Constantinian panegyric that circulated to Caesarea from the western Roman Empire. After obtaining this panegyric Eusebius incorporated its narrative into the *History* in 8.13 and 9.9, with some Christianizing modifications.¹⁰⁰ While Eusebius did choose to incorporate this heroization of Constantine, his specific modifications do not so obviously represent the Constantinian ascendance as a deep temporal break. True, Eusebius does describe Constantine as a new Moses, rescuing the people from a tyrant (*HE* 9.9.5-8). But Constantine is not the first emperor through whom God destroyed tyrants, as Vespasian and Gallienus had fulfilled the same role (3.8.10-11, 7.23). Eusebius also quoted six directives of Constantine (one, the "Edict of Milan," with the names of both Constantine and Licinius at the top) toward the end of book 10 in the original version of the *History*,¹⁰¹ but he credits these to both Constantine and Licinius (10.5.1).¹⁰² Constantine's victory did not necessarily reconfigure Eusebius temporal landscape as many assume—particularly as Constantine was ruling the western Empire when Eusebius wrote these words (see section 2 above).

Further diminishing Constantine's significance, for Eusebius Constantine was not the first Christian emperor. Besides Constantine's own father Constantius, who Eusebius believed had

⁹⁹ Gödecke, *Geschichte als Mythos*, is a prominent example; Raymond Van Dam, e.g. in *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 81-100, and Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire*, 280-301, nuance but largely retain the thesis.

¹⁰⁰ See van Dam, "A Lost Panegyric: The Source for Eusebius of Caesarea's Description of Constantine's Victory and Arrival at Rome in 312," *J ECS* 27.2.

¹⁰¹ "Original version": see note 18 above.

¹⁰² And Eusebius removed these for the final edition of the *History*: see notes 18 and 30 above. On the authorship of the so-called "Edict of Milan," see now Noel Lenski, "The significance of the Edict of Milan," in A. Edward Sicienski, *Constantine: Religious Faith and Imperial Policy* (London: Routledge, 2017), who argues, against Timothy Barnes, most recently in *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion, and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2011), that Constantine was in fact behind this directive.

been a monotheist and a protector of Christians if not unquestionably a Christian (8.13.12), Eusebius asserts, tendentiously, that Philip the Arab (emperor from 244 to 249) had been a Christian who corresponded with Origen—and that his successor Decius had persecuted the church as retaliation (*HE* 6.34; cf. 6.36.3, 6.39.1). If the Roman Empire had been ruled by a Christian but had snapped back into pagan rule before,¹⁰³ the Caesarean scholar is unlikely to have inferred that the mere appearance of a Christian emperor, in a region of the Empire that Eusebius did not live in, was a conclusive triumph for the church.

Eusebius' own discussion of Constantine's victory at the very end of the *History* yields insufficient reason to assume that Eusebius saw Constantine's rule as the dawn of a new era.¹⁰⁴ After Licinius becomes a persecutor (10.8), Constantine treats Licinius humanely, and when rebuffed Constantine defeats Licinius (10.9.3-5). After Constantine's victory, the Roman Empire is again unified; subjects celebrate happily with song and dance; Constantine issues just laws; and the whole populace is happy and virtuous (10.9.6-9). This could be read as eschatological, and scholars have done so.¹⁰⁵ But the event is told in the past tense; there is no sense that this triumph is permanent, and Eusebius makes no grand temporal pronouncement that this marks a new era, for Romans or for Christians. The triumph of Constantine remained, as Philip's Christian empire proved, reversible. All that distinguished Constantine's time from earlier times in the *History* was that Eusebius could recount it during "our times."

5. Conclusions

In 1966 the great ancient historian Arnaldo Momigliano published a classic essay about time in ancient Mediterranean historiography; as often, the wide-ranging scholar included Jewish and Christian as well as pagan Greek and Latin historical writing under his umbrella of "ancient historiography." Among many sharp observations, Momigliano argued that Greek and Roman historians based their temporal inclusions and omissions on "qualitative importance and reliability"¹⁰⁶—until Eusebius and Christian historiography, that is. "The Christian accounts offended all the classical notions about Antiquity, memory, evidence.... The modern notion of historical periods selected according to the intrinsic importance of the facts and according to the reliability of the evidence is quite clearly part of our pagan inheritance."¹⁰⁷

Keen a reader of Eusebius as Momigliano was,¹⁰⁸ here he erred. Eusebius clearly distinguished different times according to the qualitative importance of the period and according to the availability of his evidence. As a committed Christian Eusebius represented the Incarnation of Christ as the most significant historical event of human history. Such a break in

¹⁰³ Eusebius had also noted Aurelian's about-face from a protector of Christians to a near-persecutor (*HE* 7.22.19-21).

¹⁰⁴ Before this in *HE* 10.8.19 Eusebius does say that God raised Constantine to oppose Licinius. But God had raised up Apollinarius of Hierapolis previously (5.16.1), so Constantine isn't the only champion of God raised up, and see also *HE* 10.4.15.

¹⁰⁵ E.g. François Bovon. "L'*Histoire Ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée et l'histoire du salut," in F. Christ, ed., *OIKONOMIA. Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie* (Hamburg: Reich, 1967).

¹⁰⁶ Arnaldo Momigliano, "Time in Ancient Historiography," *History and Theory* 6 (1966), 14-18 (quotation from 15).

¹⁰⁷ Momigliano, "Time," 21-22.

¹⁰⁸ See note 24 above.

human history, where the saving activity and teaching burst into humanity, was manifestly significant—and earlier Greek historians had considered divine interventions significant as well.¹⁰⁹ Of lesser significance but nonetheless important is Eusebius' emphasis on apostolic times, where the apostles were especially efficacious and successful Christians who, as group so unified and homogeneously powerful as not to warrant individual profiles, produced Christianity's sacred texts and kept Christian "heretics" at bay. Furthermore, like other ancient historians, Eusebius did draw an evidentiary line between the past, knowable only through research, and the present, transmittable by the historian's personal knowledge.¹¹⁰ Justifications for considering Eusebius' historical temporality different from other Greek historians in his representation of time fall short; as in other areas, Eusebius deserves consideration with other Greek narrators of past events.¹¹¹

This is not to say that Eusebius was a reliable narrator of past times. Like every ancient narrator of past events, Eusebius was not only fallible, but ready to fudge if not outright falsify events.¹¹² We saw that Eusebius overlooked evidence disproving his claims about the Jewish priestly succession's end; whitewashed the shortcomings of the apostles; reported an unlikely encounter between Peter and Philo of Alexandria; misrepresented a Jewish ascetic community described by Philo as Christian; placed an implausibly long chronological gap between Simon Magus and Simon's successor Menander; accepted a Roman emperor before Constantine as a Christian; and he proclaimed that he was omitting the failures of Christian leaders to confess Christ and undergo martyrdom in his own time. Eusebius' multiple temporalities can enrich his past; but they can distort it as well.

We can nonetheless identify other shrewd decisions by Eusebius on the timing of his history. For one, Eusebius hesitated to erect sharp boundaries between time periods. This should perhaps not surprise. The stark periodizations of modern histories are appropriate to a historical discipline that, as Lynn Hunt reminds us, emerged in the nineteenth century with the nation-state, an internally coherent amalgamation of government, people, and territory bounded sharply from its counterparts politically, culturally, and geographically.¹¹³ Eusebius, by contrast, lived in a multi-cultural empire with porous frontiers at its edges.¹¹⁴ No human entity was capable of making a total break with the past; only the divine could enact a complete reversal of temporal circumstances. Hence, the Incarnation is the only complete break for humanity since the Fall.

Furthermore, Eusebius was in at least one way more sophisticated than some of his modern successors as a narrator of ancient ecclesiastical events. As we saw above, historians regularly attempt to narrate the past as though periods are homogenous, self-contained durations. Aside from major structural alterations (such as, for Eusebius, the Incarnation) events do not resolve

¹⁰⁹ See e.g. Jon Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), or Charles Muntz, *Diodorus and the World of the Late Roman Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), on Diodorus.

¹¹⁰ See e.g. Rosalind Thomas, "Herodotus' *Histories* and the 'Floating Gap,'" in Nino Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

¹¹¹ A central contention of DeVore, "'Only Event Mightier.'"

¹¹² For some of Eusebius' means of distorting events in the *History*, see DeVore, "'Only Event Mightier,'" 7-13, with references.

¹¹³ Lynn Hunt, *Writing History in the Global Era* (London: Norton, 2014), chapter 2.

¹¹⁴ See e.g. Hugh Elton, *Frontiers of the Roman Empire* (London: T.D. Basford Ltd., 1996), esp. 1-9.

themselves into such coherent durations. Indeed, the historical theorist Reinhart Koselleck has emphasized in a number of essays, historians must understand past time as multilayered, with different temporal sequences moving at different paces and with different arrays of driving forces. Multiple temporalities run together within the past—and the historian himself must guide the reader through the disparately-advancing movements of the past to consequential events.¹¹⁵

Eusebius understood that multiple layers of time operated in the past, between the cosmological temporality of God’s relation with humanity. While miracles continue to emanate from Christians since the incarnation, the church changes character on its transition from apostolic to the post-apostolic times. The apostles have a uniform character whereas later Christians are more diversified, and “heretics” can deceive only after the apostles leave. Meanwhile, before his own time Eusebius offers an anthology of Christian voices—confirming assertions for apostolic times, narrating events in post-apostolic times—but he narrates his own time almost entirely in his own voice. Apostolic writings are sacred, whereas later Christian writings depend on them. And these multiple temporalities overlap and interweave into a rich journey through the Christian past.

It is often observed that time can only be described through metaphors.¹¹⁶ Appropriately, Eusebius deploys one metaphor that may capture his own multiple temporalities: the metaphor of a path, lit hazily by predecessors.¹¹⁷ Eusebius claims (*HE* 1.1.3) to have been

the first now...to embark and try to go, as it were, on a deserted, untrodden path [in writing a history of the church], praying...to have God as my guide..., while among people, having been able not at all to find bare footprints of earlier trailblazers, except only the small indications, in which some in some ways, others in other ways left behind incomplete narratives to us, stretching their voices like torches from a distance and again, from different directions, murmuring as if from out of sight, in darkness, and urging us in the direction in which we had to trudge and to steer the journey of the text on our path and out of danger.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ This is a stark oversimplification of Koselleck’s theories, but limited space cannot do them justice. See esp. Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985), 92-115; Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History*, trans. Todd S. Presner et al. (Palo Alto: Stanford, 2002), 1-20, 45-83, 100-118, 131-147; Koselleck, *Begriffsgeschichten. Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2006), 32-55. Putting the often dispersed thought of Koselleck together more systematically are Helge Jordheim, “Against Periodization: Koselleck’s Theory of Multiple Temporalities,” *History and Theory* 51 (2012), and Jordheim, “Multiple Times and the Work of Synchronization,” *History and Theory* 53 (2014)

¹¹⁶ E.g. Hölscher, “Time Gardens,” 580; Lorenz, ““Times they are A-Changin,”” 122.

¹¹⁷ Cf. the metaphor of a map, used independently but differently by John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. 1-5, 149-151, and Eitar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

¹¹⁸ πρῶτοι νῦν...ἐπιβάντες οἷά τινα ἐρήμην καὶ ἀτριβῆ ἰέναι ὁδὸν ἐγχειροῦμεν, θεὸν μὲν ὁδηγὸν καὶ...σχῆσιν εὐχόμενοι, ἀνθρώπων γε μὴν οὐδαμῶς εὐρεῖν οἷοί τε ὄντες ἴχνη γυμνὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν προωδευκότων, μὴ ὅτι σμικρὰς αὐτὸ μόνον προφάσεις, δι’ ὧν ἄλλος ἄλλως ὧν διηνύκασι χρόνων μερικὰς ἡμῖν καταλελοίπασι διηγήσεις πόρρωθεν ὥσπερ εἰ πυρσοὺς τὰς ἑαυτῶν προανατείνοντες φωνὰς καὶ

Eusebius used the metaphor to emphasize his need for guidance as he narrated Christian events. He needed a beginning to the path, which begins with the Incarnation; that beginning was the temporal break of the beginning of the *History*, where the narrator first traveled. Beyond this, any path can be walked at the speed of the traveler; she can linger on some sights, hurry past others, and pass as far as possible to avoid contact with those that are most unwelcome. Eusebius obviously lingered some tracks he saw of the Christian past while skipping past others. Moreover, Eusebius avers he had signs on his path, obviously meaning his sources. Eusebius struggled to understand the indications of those sources; and he was surely sometimes misled by some guides, misunderstood others, and we have seen that he outright disregarded their guidance at times, veering from their indications of the truth. But he understood that the relation between the past, his sources' signals, the historian's selection, and his own movement as an author/narrator shaped the retracing of past time. By this he created an affective exploration of that past.

ἄνωθέν ποθεν ὡς ἐξ ἀπόπτου καὶ ἀπὸ σκοπιῆς βοῶντες καὶ διακελευόμενοι, ἢ χρῆ βαδίζειν καὶ τὴν τοῦ λόγου πορείαν ἀπλανῶς καὶ ἀκινδύνως εὐθύνειν. See also *HE* 1.5.1.