

EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA'S VIEWS ON THE CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND THE TEXTS HE USED IN HIS WORKS

EUSEBIUS of Ceasarea is commonly known for his *Historia Ecclesiastica*; but his literary activity was much wider; it included apologetic and biblical commentaries as well. His place in the history of Biblical interpretation is well assured in many ways.

In this short article, which originally formed part of a larger work, we propose to see what Canon of the Sacred Books he did follow and his views on it together with the Old Testament text he used in his works.

A. THE CANON

1. *The Canon in Eusebius' times*

Eusebius preserves for us the Canon of Josephus Flavius,¹ Melito of Sardis² and Origen.³

The canon of Josephus is extracted from his work *Contra Apionem*;⁴ it represents the Jewish Canon in Palestine in the late first century A.D. Eusebius introduces the list in these words: 'He gives the number of the canonical scriptures ἐνδιαθήκων γραφῶν of the so-called Old Testament and showed as follows which are the undisputed among the Hebrews as belonging to ancient tradition ἀρχαίας παραδόσεως.'⁵ Josephus lists the protocanonical books of the Old Testament. Flavius makes it clear that notwithstanding their antiquity no one dared to add or to detract from them. Other books were written after these but were not included in the canon as there was not a true concession of prophets at the time. These books are considered by the Jews as the decrees of God θεῶν δόγματα and are ready to die for them.⁶

This was the Canon in the first Century A.D. The Jewish Canon in Eusebius's time was that found in the Talmud in the tractate *Baba Bathra*, c. A.D. 100.⁷ It included all the protocanonical books; the deutero-canonical were not mentioned; hence one is not so sure as to their reception at any time into the Jewish Canon.

The canon of Melito of Sardis (c. 170), addressed to Bishop Onesimus is incomplete; it includes all the protocanonical books except Esther. Eusebius records that this list includes only those books which were un-⁸animously accepted by all τῶν ὁμολογουμένων τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.⁸

This explains why Esther is excluded: 'because the Jews themselves doubted its canonicity'. This canon agrees with the Palestinian canon except for the omission of Esther.⁹

The third list recorded by Eusebius is the one drawn up by Origen; this we believe must have been the one that Eusebius accepted for his own guidance. Origen introduces his list in these words: 'But it should be known that there are twenty two canonical books according to the Hebrews καθ' Ἑβραίους the same as the number of letters in their alphabet'. Origen then enumerates all the protocanonical books, adding to them explicitly the Letter of Jeremiah and the Books of the Maccabees. He omits the Twelve Minor Prophets, but in view of the fact that he himself had written a commentary on the book, one is justified in believing that Origen accepted it in his canon.

In the first centuries the Christians, following in the footsteps of the Apostles, made large use of the LXX version and indeed they believed in its inspiration, thereby indirectly also in the canonicity of the deutero-canonical books, which were included in it without exception.¹⁰ In the early fourth century there were still doubts, but we note that no one of the Fathers ever denied explicitly the canonicity of the deutero-canonical books.¹¹

Athanasius, contemporary of Eusebius, in Alexandria admits all the protocanonical books; he omits Esther, but accepts the Epistle of Jeremiah and Baruch. Then he adds other non-canonical οὐ κανονιζομένα books but composed by the Fathers to be read to those who would approach the faith, that is: *Wisdom, Ecclesiastici, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Didache, the Shepherd* (of Hermas).¹² He himself however uses all the deutero-canonical books.

Evidence in E's own work shows that *Irenaeus* quotes from the wisdom of Solomon as Holy Scripture¹³ and with regard to Clement of Alexandria he writes: 'and in them (Stromata) he has also made use of testimonies from the disputed ἀντιλεγομένων writings, the book known as the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach*¹⁴ *Dionysius of Alexandria* quotes Tobit in the presence of the persecutors.¹⁵ In a letter to Africanus Origen defends the canonicity of the story of Susanna in the Book of Daniel; Africanus writes to him reporting that some denied or rather doubted its divine origin.¹⁶

This was the position with respect to the Canon in the times of Eusebius: no doubt whatever with regard to the protocanonical books, except perhaps for some wavering with respect to the book of Esther; and doubts with respect to the deutero-canonicals; in actual fact how-

ever they were used and included in the copies of the LXX version.¹⁷

2. Eusebius' View on the Canon

In recording the lists as drawn by others, E. does not pass any judgement on any one of them; hence it is difficult to state clearly what his view really was. Undoubtedly he accepted the canonicity of the proto-canonical books; with respect to the others it must be borne in mind that he used the LXX version as reviewed by Origen in the Hexaplaris; moreover he made use of them in his works although sparingly. We shall take them one by one. *Tobit*, *Judith* and *Esther* are never quoted. *Tobit* is quoted in a citation from Dionysius of Alexandria;¹⁸ *Esther* is inserted in the list of Origen, besides being one of the protocanonical books.¹⁹

Wisdom, *Sapientia*, is quoted, though never under this title, 15 times in PE; once in CM; four times in ETH and thrice in CP. Two texts, Sap 1, 13; 2, 24 are introduced as δόγμα δὲ Ἑβραίων²⁰ Sap 6, 22; 7, 22-26; 8, 1 are quoted together with Prov 8, 22-31: the first text is introduced by these words: ταῦτα Σολομῶν παροιμιῶν καὶ ταῦτα δε ἐξ αὐτοῦ λέγεται τοῦ προσάπτου.²¹ Then E. concludes that the Verbum λογός is presented in various ways in the divine Scriptures ἡ θεία γραφή;²² other texts are introduced preceded by the formula: τάδε λέγεται.²³ In PE I, 1, 4 wisdom is just a reminiscence;²⁵ then concludes²⁶ Sap 13, 5 is cited without any special formula together with Isaiah 40, 26;²⁷ so also Sap 7, 17-21.²⁸ Sap 14, 2 and Sap 14, 12 are introduced by κατὰ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν θεῖον λόγιον τὸ Φασκων²⁹ and καὶ τόδε καλῶς παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνῆρησθαι respectively.³⁰ This hints at the controversies about the authority of this book outside Christian circles. *Wisdom* is quoted against Marcellus, a remarkable fact in view of the controversy. Sap 7, 26 is cited 4 times in CM, once³¹ in conjunction with Gen 5, 3 and three Pauline texts introduced thus: καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις δὲ εἴρηται thrice in ETH: twice without any special formula in combination with Jh 1, 3; Col. 1, 16; 1, 15.³² In ETH Sap 7, 26 is introduced thus: λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου.³³ It is cited in CP three times: Sap 13, 5 twice in combination with or through Rom 1, 20;³⁴ Sap 7, 26 in together with Heb 1, 3.³⁵ The context within which these texts are used shows that Eusebius was considering this book as one of the divine Sacred Scriptures, and the introductory formulas indicate that the book was considered by him as of divine inspiration. We may add here that the book is never referred to by its proper title; the only time that one meets this title is when Eusebius records that Clement of Alexandria

quoted it as well as the other books.³⁶

Ecclesiastici or Ben Sirach is quoted in ETh and PE, without its proper ordinary title; it is mentioned again with reference to Clement of Alexandria who used it.³⁷ It is cited four times in PE in extracts from Clement of Alexandria³⁸ and once in his own text Eccli 11, 28³⁹ in combination with Prov 10, 7. Plato would be an interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures. Eccli 3, 21, 22 is quoted in ETh I, 12⁴⁰ without any special formula; Eccli 3, 20 appears in CP introduced by τὸ Φάσχον λόγιον⁴¹ and τὸ γὰρ.⁴² These last formulae are used by Eusebius to introduce canonical books. In spite of the spare use of this book, the few citations point to Eusebius' belief in its canonicity.

Baruch is quoted in HE, ETh, DE and PE. Bar 3, 24.25 is cited in the Panegyric at Tyre, together with other biblical texts from Old and New Testament;⁴³ Bar 3, 29-38 is one of the extracts in EP under the lemma ἀπὸ τοῦ βαρώχ in between an extract from Threni and another one from Ezekiel.⁴⁴ This same extract is found also in DE⁴⁵ under the lemma from Baruch in between an extract from Zechariah and one from Isaiah: this is followed by the statement: ὠδεν ἐπιλέγειν δεῖ ταῖς θείαις φωναῖς ἐναργως τῷ προβλήματι παρισταμέναις.⁴⁶ Bar 3, 38 is quoted under the name of Jeremiah in ETh II, 7.⁴⁷ The *Two Books of the Maccabees* are cited in the commentary on Psalm 78, 4; 10, 78, 4. 10 1 Macc 1, 21.44.57.65 are introduced by the formula: γεγράφται γουν ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον;⁴⁸ 1, 2 Macc 6, 18 is referred to only without an explicit quotation in these terms: ἢ γραφῆ τῶν καλουμένων Μωυσαβαίων.⁴⁹ The evidence is somewhat scanty for any solid conclusion; taken in its context in conjunction with what we read of Origen's view on the matter coupled with the introductory formulae we would say that Eusebius considered these two books as inspired books.

Fragments from Daniel. The Bel fragment is never mentioned; the Susanna story is mentioned in the letter of Africanus to Origen;⁵¹ obviously E. followed Origen. DE VII, 2, 24⁵¹ probably is a reference to Dan 13, 1ff; but it may be to another text; the quotation in PE VI, 11, 17-19⁵² is a quotation from Origen's version according to Theodotion and introduced by the words: ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν . . . αἱ προφητεῖαι Dan 3, 50 is quoted in DE Frag 2 without any formula.⁵³

This survey leads to this conclusion: Eusebius, following the example of Origen, Clement, and others, considered these books as canonical, but because of the controversies about them and also of the fact that they did not serve him for his set purpose he used them sparingly; Three of them – Tobit, Esther, and Judith – are never used. With res-

pect to Esther, however, at the end of EP I we read: 'This is from the Book of Esdras (that is from 3 Esdras 4, 34-40); there is nothing to the purpose in the Book of Esther'.⁵⁴ This means that Esther was considered by him as canonical. The extract from 3 Esdras is curious; it betrays the wavering of Eusebius on the matter. Athanasius states clearly that they were not canonical, yet he comments upon them.⁵⁵

The order of the Books in EP is that of Origen, with changes suiting his purpose: First the historical books in this order: Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Kings, Paralipomenon, 3 Esdras. After these books the poetical and prophetic ones are taken up⁵⁶ in this order: Psalms, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggi, Zechariah, Malachiah, Jeremiah, Threni, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, Isaiah. This order is similar to that of Origen, with changes suiting the ordering of the oracles; Job follows the Canticle; the Twelve Minor Prophets are at the head of the prophetic oracles, Isaiah at the end of the series in view of his importance.⁵⁷ In the Eclogues there is no attempt for ordering the extracts by subject matter as in DE.

3. *The Criterion of Canonicity*

It is obvious from what we have just said that Eusebius received his Canon from tradition traceable through Christ back to prechristian times to Judaic tradition. If we were to ask what did E. believe about the origin of the Canon, we would never have an adequate answer for lack of substantial evidence. Yet we have some hints which may help us to form an opinion.

In recording the List of the Sacred Books according to Josephus⁵⁸ E. states that the canon was closed, at least provisionally, if not definitely, at the time of Artaxerses because there was no more any prophetic succession. This may mean either that a book to be canonical, that is, to have its inspiration acknowledged by the people, must have been written by a prophet, this fact alone would be sufficient evidence for its authority; or that there was needed a prophet, taking the term in its wide meaning to include any man with special charismatic gifts, to declare its inspiration.

Discussing the criterion for Inspiration above we referred to two important texts which may help us here also to form an opinion on E's views on the matter: EP IV, Pr⁵⁹ and Ps 60, 6. In EP IV he is providing a demonstration for the reliability and divine authority of the sacred books, based on Inspiration. The indications for the divine origin of the books were: the manner of life of the prophets themselves, their

ethical teachings, and the truth of their sayings as proved by later events. These facts led the Jews to preserve their writings and hand them on to posterity. Who were these Jews? One would suppose that they were the official leaders of Israel. Eusebius states that the divine origin of Psalm 60 was discovered by the men gifted with the charism for the discernment of Spirits: David had recited many other ordinary prayers just as we do; this one however was not as the rest; it was divinely inspired and, therefore, it was preserved and inserted in the collection of sacred books by those men who were gifted with the charism of the discernment of the spirits: καὶ θεΐαις βίβλοις ἐγκατέττον οἱ τὸ χάρισμα τῆς διακρισεως τῶν πνευμάτων αἰληφότες.⁶⁰ This is an echo of 1 Cor 12, 10: ἄλλη δὲ διακρισεως πνευμάτων. The psalms after being scattered about for a long time were gathered in the psalter either by Esdras or some other prophet: ὕστερον δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔιτε "Ἐσδραν εἴτε τινὰς ἑτέρως προφήτας περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν ἐσπουδεκεναι, μεθ' ὧν καὶ τὴν βίβλον τῶν ψαλμων ἠγιοκέναι.⁶¹ Therefore E. believes that the Jewish collection or canon of Holy Scriptures was the work of inspired men, who may have been the prophets themselves, the leaders of the nation or Esdras, whom, as we know, both Jewish and Christian tradition held to have been inspired by God to reproduce the Books of the Old Testament after the restoration.⁶² This is not the place to discuss the historical value of this tradition; it suffices to say that this was the view of Eusebius, and most probably of all Fathers at this time.

Whatever was his view as to the actual origin of the canon of the Scriptures Eusebius was inclined, and actually he did, to accept as inspired and canonical only those books handed on down to them by ancient tradition. All of them were found in the LXX version, which E. together with other fathers of the Church starting with Irenaeus believed to be inspired.⁶³ His sparing use of the Deuterocanonical works is explainable by the purpose of his work and also his controversies with the Jews. Moreover in these books there is relatively little material by way of messianic oracles or historical importance, if we were to except the Maccabees, which cover a period in which Eusebius showed himself little interest.

B. THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Eusebius had at his disposal for his works no less than eight texts of the Bible to choose from: the *Hebrew Text*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, the *fifth* and the *sixth* ver-

sions. With the exception of the Samaritan all of them were transcribed in parallel columns in the Hexaplaris of Origen. The Samaritan text was limited to the pentateuch⁶⁴ and the *fifth* and *sixth* to the Psalter.⁶⁵ It is important to examine B's opinion of each of them; we leave his use of them for a later chapter.

1. *The Septuagint*

As to the origin of this translation E. accepted the tradition handed down from early times. He records the story of Irenaeus as to the inspiration of the seventy interpreters of the Scriptures in the time of Ptolemy: '... so that even the heathen who were present knew that the Scriptures had been translated by the inspiration of God κατὰ ἐπίπνοιαν.'⁶⁶ In HE Eusebius does not express his view on this story; in Chr I he relates it in his own words to justify his acceptance of its readings rather than those of the Hebrew text;⁶⁷ it is referred to in DE V Pr⁶⁸ and DE VIII. The Greeks, thanks to this translation, could easily read the Hebrew Scriptures.⁶⁹ It was in universal use throughout the Church;⁷⁰ Origen took special care for its restoration and conservation.⁷¹ Eusebius himself did a lot of work to circulate it in the form of Origen's edition, adding his own corrections.⁷²

That Eusebius attributed to it great authority is only to be expected; his assertions in this respect are quite clear. It is remarkable that while he quotes Irenaeus as to the inspiration of the LXX translators, he himself insists on more self evident facts, or what he believed to be, the real ones. The translators produced their texts in one and the same form word for word: σύμφωνας ἀπὸς ἀπὸς μεταβεβλήκασιν;⁷³ commenting on Is 7, 14, echoing Irenaeus,⁷⁴ E writes: 'In our exemplars of the translation of the 70 men, all of them were Hebrew by birth and trained carefully in the wisdom of their people τῆς πατρίου παιδείας δεδοκιμασμένων we read thus...'⁷⁵ Finally then follows clinching argument: 'the translation was put in the Library of Alexandria and diligently conserved there'.⁷⁶ Hence the translation, considered only from external circumstances of its origin, not to speak of its divine inspiration, has its own recommendation. This is not enough for him, however, he insists also on the fact that it had been used throughout the Church from the beginning: '... and also because it has pleased the Church of Christ to use it',⁷⁷ and 'the more so since the Church of Christ scattered throughout the world sticks to it only; it has been recommended to us by its use by the apostles and the disciples of our saviour.'⁷⁸

Eusebius therefore took the LXX as scientifically the most reliable

and theologically the most authoritative. He used it in the form in which it was edited by Origen in his Hexapla. In EP he mentions the *asterisk* and *obelo* of the Hexaplaris;⁷⁰ 16, 3; the Onomasticon is based on the Hexapla.⁸⁰

The Hexaplaric LXX was used by him not uncritically; Mühle drew the attention to the fact that in CI Eusebius removed all the additions introduced by Origen;⁸¹ neither was he slow to compare the relative value of the LXX when compared with the other texts.⁸²

2. The Hebrew Text

Whether Eusebius knew Hebrew is a moot point; certainly he could read it and understand it with the help of the Aquila translation.⁸³ He refers several times to the true Hebrew readings 'Εβραϊκή λέξις.

The Hebrew text was the work of Esdras who knew the Scripture by heart and was responsible for its restoration after the return from Babylon.⁸⁴ He refers to it in these terms: τὸ 'Εβραϊκόν,⁸⁵ ἢ 'Εβραίων παράστασιν Γραφή,⁸⁶ 'Εβραϊκή λέξις,⁸⁷ ἢ 'Εβραίων Γραφή,⁸⁸ ἢ 'Εβραϊκή ἀνάγνωσις⁸⁹ 'Εβραϊκή Φωνή.⁹⁰ Eusebius charges against the Jews that they had manipulated the text for their own interest with respect to the chronology of ancient times and hence the LXX is to be preferred.⁹¹ Therefore the Hebrew text remains always ancillary to the Greek version:

3. The Samaritan Text

Eusebius makes use of this text only in the Chronicon as a witness of the ancient tradition of the Samaritans with regard to the ancient primitive Chronology; otherwise he does not use it at all.⁹²

The difference between the Hebrew text, the LXX and the Samaritan did not exist before the change of the script: 'The Samaritan text must be considered genuine and primitive (original); not even the heirs of the Jews do attack it. Therefore before the change of the script there was no divergence between them'.⁹³ The LXX is nearer to the Samaritan than to the Hebrew; Hebrew text is erroneous in the series from Adam to Abraham, with the exception of the period from Adam to Jared; the Samaritan is in default only for the period from Adam to the flood; for from the flood to Abraham, it agrees with the LXX series. It is obvious, then, that the Judaic text needs correction.⁹⁴

Eusebius believes that under certain respects the Samaritan is better than the Hebrew; but not superior to the LXX; the latter is the basis of comparison.

4. *Aquila Version*

This translation of the second century was reproduced in the third column of the Hexapla; in view of its servile conformity with the Hebrew text it enjoyed great critical authority amongst the early fathers and the Jews themselves. Aquila was a Jewish proselyte from Pontus; his intention in making this translation was to put before those unable to read the original Hebrew the peculiarities of the latter and thus putting into relief the divergences of the LXX from the Hebrew original.⁹⁵

Eusebius refers to Aquila more than once in HE. First in a quotation from Irenaeus wherein it is stated that Aquila was a Jewish proselyte from Pontus who had translated the Old Testament.⁹⁶ This information is repeated in DE.⁹⁷

Eusebius cites Aquila very frequently in his works though not in all. It is not cited in Chr nor in HE; 168 times in CP, 66 in On, 65 in DE, 27 in CI, and 2 in EP, always second to Symmachus, but more than the latter in DE, where it is engaged in controversy with the Jews. It is already an indication of Eusebius tendency in his work, that is, to be influenced by the particular purpose of a given work. This means that where fidelity to the text, rather than the literary commendation was essential or required, Eusebius went for Aquila.

5. *Symmachus' Version*

This translation was reproduced in the fourth column of the Hexapla. Symmachus published this translation in the last quarter of the second century. He was an Ebionite, therefore, a Christian heretic:⁹⁸ 'As to the translators it should be stated that Symmachus was an Ebionite...' Commentaries of Symmachus are still extant in which he appears to support this heresy by attacking the Gospel of Matthew. St. Jerome praises this translation for its diction based on the sense of the text rather than on the material wording of the Hebrew.⁹⁹

Symmachus is cited several times by E. CP 324 times, On 64, CI 43, DE 42, EP 4. This confirms what we have just said of Aquila: the latter is more frequently used in apologetic works against the Jews, whilst Symmachus in purely exegetical works.

6. *Theodotion's Version*

In the sixth column of the Hexapla Origen inserted the translation of Theodotion, a proselyte from Ephesus.¹⁰⁰ In this translation, also of the late second century, Theodotion attempted to produce a translation nearer to the original than the LXX; indeed it is more a revision of the

latter than a translation properly so called.¹⁰¹

Eusebius uses it to a much lesser extent than he does with the latter: CI 20 times, DE 19, On 10. He describes him as one of the more accurate translators: ἀπὸς τῶν ἐπιμελῶς ἐρμηνευσάντων τυγχάνων.¹⁰² The lesser use is easily explainable; Theodotion's possible help could easily be provided, and in a much better way, by Symmachus.

7. *Anonymous Versions*

In the final column of the Hexapla, Origen edited another two translations which Eusebius describes thus: 'He discovered certain others which had been concealed from remote times – in what out-of-the-way corners I know not – and by his search he brought them to light. Since he did not know the authors, he simply stated that he had found this one in Nicopolis near Actium, and that one in some other place. In the Hexapla of the Psalms, after the four prominent one translations he adds not only a fifth but also a sixth.'¹⁰³

By the nature of the case these translations could not be used but on a relatively small scale; the fifth ones in DE; and 24 in CP; the sixth one thrice in CP. They are termed πέμπτη¹⁰⁴ and ἕκτη ἔκδοσις¹⁰⁵ respectively. They are mostly used to confirm the other translations.

This broad survey shows us that Eusebius makes full use of the textual resources at his disposal; he himself states clearly in a general way the principle at the basis of the way he uses them in DE V, Pr.: 'It is important that one should not overlook that the divine oracles contain marvellous things in the Hebrew tongue and because of their difficult understanding they have been translated into Greek in different ways. But since in time past a number of Hebrew men gathered together translated them in the same manner, to them as turn our mind, and this the more so since it has pleased the Church of Christ to make use of them. Whenever there would be any useful purpose we would not put aside the more recent translations, which even today the Jews like to use: in this way whatever pertains to our demonstration will be strengthened on all sides.'¹⁰⁶ This text confirms the evidence surveyed above: Eusebius is to use the LXX as a basis, the others as confirmation and help for the understanding the text. The Hebrew text is difficult to understand. The individual translations were not used in the same manner or to the same extent in the several works: this depended on the purpose of each individual one. This is confirmed by this table which represent graphically the relative use of each of the texts at his disposal:

WORK	HEBREW	AQUILA	SYMMACHUS	THEODOTON	OTHERS, 5TH & 6TH
Chr	Used	—	—	—	Samaritan
EP	8	2	4	—	—
On	11	66	64	10	—
HE	—	—	—	—	—
PE	—	—	—	—	—
DE	8	65	42	19	5th once
CI	1	27	43	20	—
Eth, CM	4	1	1	1	—
CP	24	168	324	16	5th 24
Theoph	—	—	—	—	6th 3
LC	—	—	—	—	—
VC	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	56+	329	478	66	28+

It is clear from this conspectus that Symmachus is used more in the strictly exegetical works, whilst Aquila in the controversial works with the Jews. In debating with the Greeks he does not use any other version except the LXX. It is enough here to point out the relative importance attached to these several texts by Eusebius and where his inclination lay. It is already a pointer to the fact that in selecting a particular reading he was influenced by the purpose for which he was using the text more than by anything else.

ABBREVIATIONS

- On – *Ōnomasticon*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (GCSE) III, i, Leipzig, 1904.
- Chr – *Chronicon*, ed. J. Karst, GCSE V, Leipzig, 1911.
- HE – *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. E. Schwartz and Th. Mommsen, GCSE II, Leipzig, 1903-1909.
- PE – *Preparatio Evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, GCSE VIII, Leipzig, 1954-56.
- DE – *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. I.A. Heikel, GCSE VI, Leipzig, 1913.
- LC-VC – *Laus Constantini* (LC) and *Vita Constantini* (VC), ed. I.A. Heikel, GCSE I, Leipzig, 1911.
- CM-ETH – *Contra Marcellum* and *Ecclesiastica Theologia* (ETH), ed. E. Klostermann, GCSE IV, Leipzig, 1906.
- TH – *Theophania*, ed. H. Gressmann, GCSE III, ii, Leipzig, 1904.
- EP – *Eclogae Prophetarum*, *Patrologia Graeca* (PG) 22, 1017-1262.
- CH – *Contra Hieroclem*, PG 22, 795-868.
- Can – *Canones*, PG 22, 1275-1292.
- CI – *Commentarium in Isaiam*, PG 24, 77-526.
- CP – *Commentarium in Psalmos*, PG 23 and 24, 9-76.
- CL – *Commentarium in Lucam*, PG 24, 529-606.
- QS – *Quaestiones et Solutiones*, PG 22, 879-1016.
- SP – *De Solemnitate Paschali*, PG 24, 693-706.

¹HE III, 10, 2-5; GCSE II, i, 222, 24-224, 15.

²HE IV, 26, 13-14; GCSE II, i, 386, 20-388, 8.

³HE VI, 25, 1-2; GCSE II, ii, 572, 10-576, 2.

⁴I, 38-42.

⁵HE III, 9, 5; GCSE II, i, 222, 17-21.

⁶HE III, 10, 5; GCSE II, i, 224, 10-15.

⁷P.H. Höpfl, *Introductio generalis in S.S.*, Romae 1950, p. 139.

⁸HE IV, 26, 12; GCSE II, i, 386, 16-19.

⁹A.C. McGiffert, *The Church History of Eusebius*, in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Vol. I, Michigan 1952, p. 206. P.H. Höpfl, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

¹⁰P.H. Höpfl, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

- ¹¹*Institutiones Biblicae*: Vol. I: *De S.S. in Universum, De Canone*, Romae 1951, pp. 130-131.
- ¹²*Ep. fest.* 39; PG 26, 1176. 1436.
- ¹³HE V, 8, 8; GCSE II, i, 446, 7-13.
- ¹⁴HE VI, 13, 6; GCSE II, ii, 548, 6-9.
- ¹⁵HE VII, 11, 1; GCSE II, ii, 654, 1-6.
- ¹⁶HE VI, 31, 1; GCSE II, ii, 584, 21-586, 2.
- ¹⁷L. Diestel affirms that the information of the Canon was deeply influenced by the theological controversies of the second and third centuries against the Gnostics and the Montanists. *Geschichte des A.T. in der christliche Kirche*, Jena 1869, pp. 13-14.
- ¹⁸HE VII, 11, 1; GCSE II, ii, 654, 1-6.
- ¹⁹HE VI, 25, 1-2; GCSE II, i, 572, 1p-576, 2.
- ²⁰PE XIII, 3, 38; GCSE VIII, ii, 174, 27-175, 1.
- ²¹PE VII, 12, 6-9; GCSE VIII, i, 387, 7-17.
- ²²PE CII, 12, 8; GCSE VIII, i, 387, 18-19.
- ²³Another formula used is καὶ. PE XI, 14, 8-10; GCSE VIII, ii, 35, 13-14.
- ²⁴PE I, 1, 4; GCSE VIII, i, 6, 9.
- ²⁶PE XI, 14, 10; GCSE VIII, ii, 35, 25.
- ²⁷PE XII, 52, 34; GCSE VIII, ii, 162, 4.
- ²⁸PE XI, 7, 5; GCSE VIII, ii, 21, 22-22, 6.
- ²⁹PE I, 19; GCSE VIII, i, 39, 2.
- ³⁰PE VII, 2, 4; GCSE VIII, i, 365, 11.
- ³¹CM I, 4; GCSE IV, 25, 24.
- ³²ETH I, 9; GCSE IV, 67, 22.
- ³³ETH I, 12; GCSE IV, 72, 22.
- ³⁴Ps 65, 2; PG 23, 649B. Ps 91, 5; Pg 23, 1176A.
- ³⁵Ps 72, 1-3; PG 23, 863C.
- ³⁶HE VI, 13, 8; GCSE II, ii, 548, 15-19.
- ³⁷HE VI, 13, 8; GCSE II, ii, 548, 15-19.
- ³⁸PE XIV, 25, 14; GCSE VIII, ii, 330, 6-8.
- ³⁹PE XII, 34, 1; GCSE VIII, ii, 128, 12.
- ⁴⁰ETH I, 12; GCSE IV, 70, 28.
- ⁴¹Ps 69, 2-4; PG 23, 969A.
- ⁴²PS 56, 2; PG 23, 505B.
- ⁴³HE X, 4, 8; GCSE II, ii, 865, 2-11.
- ⁴⁴EP III, 39; PG 22, 1168BD.
- ⁴⁵DE VI, 19, 1; GCSE IV, 284, 20.
- ⁴⁶DE VI, 19, 2; GCSE VI, 285, 3.
- ⁴⁷ETH II, 1; GCSE IV, 99, 27.
- ⁴⁸Ps 78, 4; PG 23, 941D-945A.
- ⁴⁹Ps 78, 10; PG 23, 948C.
- ⁵⁰HE VI, 31, i; GCSE II, 586, 1.
- ⁵¹DE VII, 2, 24; GCSE VI, 332, 32.
- ⁵²PE VI, 11, 17-19; GCSE VIII, 1, 347.
- ⁵³GCSE VI, 495, 7.
- ⁵⁴EP I, 25; PG 22, 1085D.

⁵⁵ Cfr. supra

⁵⁶ EP I, 25; P^s 22, 1085D.

⁵⁷ EP III, 32; PG 22, 1160A.

⁵⁸ HE III, 10, 4; GCSE II, i, 224, 9-10.

⁵⁹ EP IV, Pr. PG 22, 1193V.

⁶⁰ P^s 60, 6; PG 23, 580C.

⁶¹ CP, Pr. PG 23, 74C.

⁶² HE V, 8, 15; GCSE II, i, 450, 1-5.

⁶³ HE V, 8, 14; GCSE II, i, 448, 17-22. Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-37.

⁶⁴ A. Vaccari, *De Textu*, in *Institutiones Biblicae*, Lib. III Romae 1951, p. 245.

⁶⁵ *ibid.* p. 284f.

⁶⁶ HE V, 8, 14; GCSE II, i, 448, 17-22.

⁶⁷ Chr. I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-36.

⁶⁸ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 28-210, 4.

⁶⁹ PE X, 8, 18; GCSE VIII, i, 584, 28.

⁷⁰ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 32-33.

⁷¹ Chr. I, 16, 17; GCSE V, 45, 16-19.

⁷² HE VI, 16, 1-4; GCSE II, ii, 552, 26-553, 17.

⁷³ Eusebius himself worked hard for the propagation of the LXX text as corrected and edited by Origen: Pamphilus et Eusebius' columnam

hexaplarum asteristicis obelisque distinctam, seorsim vulgare; quorum editio tanto favore recepta fuit, ut exemplaris omnium usus, saltam intra Palaestinae fines, prorsus antiquaretur... His igitur duum viris praeter caetera eorum egergia in se merita, pro reliquiis Hexaplorum, quas undique corrossas in hanc nostram apothecam condidimus, Ecclesia gratias ministrales debet. F. Field, *Hexapla*, Vol. I, p. XCIX.CI. Also St. Jerome: Praef. in Paral; PL 28, 1324f. MSS evidence: Ms Q, ante Ezechiel Ed. Ziegler, p. 32.

⁷³ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 31-32.

HE VII, 32, 16; GCSE II, ii, 724, 3-5.

⁷⁴ HE V, 8, 10-13; GCSE II, i, 446, 16-448, 13.

⁷⁵ DE VII, 1, 32; GCSE VI, 303, 29-304, 1.

⁷⁶ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-36.

⁷⁷ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 31-33.

⁷⁸ Chr I, 16, 17; GCSE V, 45, 16-19.

⁷⁹ P^s 72, 28; PG 23, 849D.

⁸⁰ E. Klostermann, *Das Onomasticon*, GCSE III, i, p. XV.

⁸¹ Möhle, *Der Jesaja kommentar des Eusebius van Kaisaria*, ZNTW, (1934)88.

⁸³ Is 29, 1; PG 24, 296D. Nestle, ZATW 29(1909) 57-62.

⁸⁴ Chr I, 18, 5; GCSE V, 60, 3-7.

⁸⁵ EP I, 2; PG 22, 1029BC; EP I, 5; PG 22, 1037. DE V, 4, 5; GCSE VI, 224; 26.

⁸⁶ DE IV, 15, 58; GCSE VI, 182, 31-34.

⁸⁷ DE IV, 61-62.

Is 20, 19; Pg 24, 308D; ETh III, 2; GCSE IV, 141, 30. P^s 67, 5; 23, 686D.

P^s 76, 17; PG 23, 897C.

⁸⁸ DE VI, 20, 6; GCSE VI, 286, 101. P^s 64, 6; PG 23, 634D. P^s 71, 12; PG 23, 809C. P^s 71, 18; PG 23, 821B. P^s 77, 15; PG 23, 914B.

- ⁸⁹ DE VIII, 3, 11; GCSE VI, 393, 20. ETh III, 23; GCSE IV, 41, 32. Is 51, 9; PG 24, 448B.
- ⁹⁰ Is 7, 14; PG 24, 136D; PS 77, 22-25; PG 23, 917C.
- ⁹¹ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37-38, 4.
- ⁹² Chr I, 16, 6; GCSE V, 37, 10-14.
- ⁹³ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 17-38, 4.
- ⁹⁴ *ibid.*
- ⁹⁵ P.H. Höpfl, *Introductio Generalis in S. S.*, Romae 1950, p. 303.
- ⁹⁶ HE V, 8, 10; GCSE II, i, 446, 23.
- ⁹⁷ DE VII, 1, 32; GCSE VI, 304, 6.
- ⁹⁸ HE VI, 17, 1; GCSE II, ii, 556, 5.
- ⁹⁹ Comm in Am 3, 11; PL 25, 1019.
- ¹⁰⁰ HE VI, 16, 4; GCSE II, ii, 554, 16.
- ¹⁰¹ St. Jerome, *Comm. in Eccl.* 2; PL 23, 1024.
- ¹⁰² Ps 46, 10; RG.23, 417A.
- ¹⁰³ HE VI, 16, 3; GCSE II, ii, 554, 9-555, 13.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ps 64, PG 23, 637A. Ps 76, 11; PG 23, 893A. Ps 77, 22-25; PG 23, 917C.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ps 83, 8; PG 23, 1012C.
- ¹⁰⁶ DE V, Pr 36; GCSE VI, 209, 33-210, 4.