

Eusebius' Knowledge of Thucydides

David J. DeVore and Scott Kennedy

EUSEBIUS HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED as the most innovative Greek historian of the later Roman Empire, largely on the grounds that his *Chronicle*, *Ecclesiastical History*, and *Life of Constantine* diverge from, and creatively combine, previous historical models.¹ The Caesarean scholar's awareness of his innovations, however, has been disputed: was he consciously generating new paradigms for writing about past events, institutions, and individuals, or obliviously applying Christian forms alien to the Greek historical tradition? This paper addresses this question with a test case: Eusebius' knowl-

¹ Brian Croke writes: "Late antiquity, however defined, witnessed the emergence of two distinct historiographical genres which subsequently exerted enormous influence [viz. ecclesiastical history and the tabular chronicle] ... Both genres were virtually invented by the same person at the same time. Eusebius of Caesarea therefore deserves to be considered in the same breath as Thucydides, or Ranke, in any history of historiography": "Late Antique Historiography, 250–650 CE," in John Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford 2007) 567–581, at 574. On the *Life of Constantine* see Timothy D. Barnes, "Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*," in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge 1989) 62–93. Writing about the *Chronicle*, on the other hand, Richard M. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski view Eusebius more as enhancing earlier Olympic chronicles than as creating a new genre: *Mosaics of Time: The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD I* (Turnhout 2013) 121–123. For an account of late-antique historiographical genres see Peter Van Nuffelen et al. (eds.), *Clavis Historiarum Antiquitatis Posterioris. An Inventory of Late Antique Historiography* (Turnhout 2020) XVII–LIX.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 63 (2023) 27–50

ISSN 2159-3159

Article copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the
Creative Commons Attribution License

CC-BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

edge of Thucydides, one of the two most important historians of the classical tradition.

Eusebius' knowledge of Thucydides has been disputed since at least the late 1970s.² For Robert Grant, Eusebius had Thucydides in mind when he contrasted the *Ecclesiastical History* to "other writers of historical narratives" who described "victories in wars, trophies against enemies, the prizes of generals, the bravery of hoplites stained with blood, and numerous murders" (*HE* 5.praef.3).³ This passage, however, has no specifically Thucydidean allusion, as was swiftly objected by the audience at the colloquium where the remark was first made. One member of that audience, the other giant of Eusebian scholarship from the same generation, Timothy Barnes, went so far as to assert to the contrary: "There is no sign that Eusebius was familiar ... with the classics of Greek historiography such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and Polybius."⁴

Later scholars have generally been reluctant to credit Eusebius with deep familiarity with Thucydides. Andrew Carriker, for example, only grudgingly acknowledged that during his study of Greek rhetoric Eusebius must have become acquainted with the classical historians: "One expects that Eusebius had read at least portions of the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, though he may admittedly have done so only early in his life and he may never have returned to them."⁵ In his trenchant recent examination of Eusebius' *Prae-*

² David M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius* (London 1960) 184–185, had already confidently referred to Eusebius' citation of Thucydides in *Theophany* 2.68, but he failed to notice the citation of Thucydides in the *Chronological Tables* discussed below.

³ Robert M. Grant, "Eusebius and the Martyrs of Gaul," in Jean Rougé et al. (eds.), *Les martyrs de Lyon (177)* (Paris 1978) 129–136, at 133–136.

⁴ Barnes, in *The Making of Orthodoxy* 109, who precedes this statement with references only to the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Chronicle*, missing the key reference in *Chronicle*, Olymp. 87, discussed below, as well as the *Theophany*.

⁵ Andrew Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Leiden 2003) 152.

paratio Evangelica and its myriad quotations of pagan Greek authors, Cristian Mondello likewise noted that the Caesarean scholar “pays no attention to Thucydides in the *PE*.”⁶ One of us, on the other hand, has recently argued that Eusebius was sufficiently familiar with Thucydides to exploit, subtly and adroitly, Thucydides’ plague narrative at *HE* 7.22, albeit at second hand via quotation of the letters of bishop Dionysius of Alexandria.⁷

In this paper we argue that Eusebius must have had first-hand knowledge of at least the first four books of the *Peloponnesian War*. We also maintain that he specifically associated Thucydides with the narration of the Athenian plague. The evidence for these contentions is found in the two passages in which Eusebius mentions Thucydides by name: one in his early historical work, the *Chronological Tables* (at Olymp. 87), the other in his late apologetic, the *Theophany* (2.68).

But before we discuss these two passages it is important to sketch the essential role of Thucydides in Greek rhetorical education, particularly declamation. Contrary to Carriker’s minimalist hypothesis, the Athenian master narrator pervaded the intellectual environment of literati in the Greek-speaking eastern Mediterranean. His presence in the educational curriculum of *pepaideumenoi* like Eusebius is well-trodden ground we need not revisit.⁸ Less understood among modern historians is

⁶ Cristian Mondello, *Eusebio e la storiografia antica. Strategie e tecniche di alterazione nella Praeparatio Evangelica* (Messina 2017) 80: “non riserva nessuna attenzione nella *PE* a Tucidide.”

⁷ David J. DeVore, “The Only Event Mightier Than Everyone’s Hope’: Classical Historiography and Eusebius’ Plague Narrative,” *Histos* 14 (2020) 1–34; and see now Scott Kennedy and David J. DeVore, “The Famine and Plague of Maximinus (311–2): Between Ekphrasis, Polemic, and Historical Reality in Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*,” *JLA* 16 (2023) 27–53.

⁸ Roberto Nicolai, *La storiografia nell’educazione antica* (Pisa 1992) 297–339; Craig Gibson, “Learning Greek History in the Ancient Classroom: The Evidence of the Treatises on *Progymnasmata*,” *CP* 99 (2004) 103–129; Scott

the practice of declamation, that is, speeches that impersonated a stereotypical character or a mythical or historical figure.⁹ Students of rhetoric like Eusebius would have delivered declamations drawing on texts like Thucydides' history. But declamation was also a pastime for the learned elite who flocked to watch their local rhetor or a visiting sophist debate, say, whether the Athenians had committed sacrilege by causing the people of Potidaea to eat each other during the siege of Potidaea (2.69–70); or who was responsible for the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians, the Corinthians, or the Spartans.¹⁰ As a commemorative practice, declamation can be compared to modern reenactments of historical events, which alongside texts and other commemorative practices generate popular (in the case of declamation, popular elite) understandings of past events.¹¹ Sometimes events invented by declaimers could even

Kennedy, *How to Write History: Thucydides and Herodotus in the Ancient Rhetorical Tradition* (diss. Ohio State Univ. 2018) 7–46; Ivan Matijašić, *Shaping the Canons of Ancient Greek Historiography. Imitation, Classicism, and Literary Criticism* (Berlin 2018); cf. J. E. Lendon, “The History the Rhetorically Educated Knew,” in Yoshiyuki Suto (ed.), *Transmission and Organization of Knowledge in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Vienna 2021) 247–260, at 250–251.

⁹ On declamation in general see Stanley Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool 1949); Donald A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge 1983); Jutta Sandstede, “Deklamation,” in G. Üding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik II* (Tübingen 1994) 481–507; Dominic H. Berry and Malcolm Heath, “Oratory and Declamation,” in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C.–A.D. 400)* (Leiden 1997) 393–420; Robert Kaster, “Controlling Reason: Declamation in Rhetorical Education at Rome,” in Yun Lee Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden 2001) 317–337.

¹⁰ For a list of popular declamatory themes from Thucydides see R. Kohl, *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis* (Paderborn 1915) 39–45.

¹¹ T. Schmitz, “Performing History in the Second Sophistic,” in Martin Zimmermann (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1999) 71–92, at 89–92; Lendon, in *Transmission and Organization* 247–260.

find their way into the narratives of later historians, as the conceits of declaimers became part of popular elite consciousness.¹²

This culture of declamation was central to Eusebius' education. In his time Caesarea was home to multiple rhetors and boasted a theater and an odeum that could have hosted such rhetorical displays.¹³ It would have been hard for Eusebius not to know Thucydides.¹⁴ Moreover, as the author of three sophis-

¹² Matthew B. Roller, "Color-Blindness: Cicero's Death, Declamation, and the Production of History," *CP* 92 (1997) 109–130; Sviatoslav Dmitriev, "Killing in Style. Demosthenes, Demades, and Phocion in Later Rhetorical Tradition," *Mnemosyne* 69 (2016) 931–954.

¹³ Three rhetors are attested at the beginning of the fourth century: Eumathes, Eutocius, and Thalassus (cf. Joseph Geiger, *Hellenism in the East: Studies on Greek Intellectuals in Palestine* [Stuttgart 2013] 21–22, 37). On the odeum and theater see Josef Patrich, "Caesarea in the Time of Eusebius," in Sabrina Inowlocki et al. (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius. Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues* (Leiden 2011) 1–24, at 19–20, and "Caesarea Maritima in the Time of Origen," in B. Bitton-Ashkelony et al. (eds.) *Origeniana Duodecima: Origen's Legacy in the Holy Land* (Leuven 2019) 375–341, at 379, 397–398.

¹⁴ That Eusebius was a Christian does not entail his eschewing classical Greek models. There never was a separate Christian educational curriculum in antiquity; all levels of the standard *paideia* resorted to archaic and classical Greek texts as models. Although Christians grappled with the implications of the pagan system, they never tried to change it. See Mary Ann Beavis, "'Pluck the rose but shun the thorns': The Ancient School and Christian Origins," *Studies in Religion* 29 (2000) 411–423, at 417–420; Christoph Markschies, "Lehrer, Schüler, Schule: Zur Bedeutung einer Institution für das antike Christentum," in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser et al. (eds.), *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung* (Tübingen 2002) 97–120; and Jan A. Stenger, *Education in Late Antiquity: Challenges, Dynamism, and Reinterpretation* (Oxford 2022) 57. It is also worth noting that of the 304 ancient school-exercise papyri identified by Raffaella Cribiore with dates between the third century BCE and the seventh century CE, just eleven are biblical: eight from Psalms, three from the New Testament: "Literary School Exercises," *ZPE* 116 (1997) 53–60. No other specifically Christian or Jewish texts are present.

ticated orations across decades of his career (the *Oration for the Building of Churches* in the mid 310s, the *Oration for the Holy Sepulcher* in 335, and the *Tricennial Oration* for Constantine in 336), he exhibits a solid grasp of Greek rhetorical conventions.¹⁵ It is inconceivable that Eusebius could have performed these orations—two of them delivered before the Roman emperor and his entourage—without the benefit of an advanced education replete with references to Thucydides.

In affirming Eusebius' knowledge of Thucydides, however, we can go further than these *a priori* considerations. Eusebius mentions Thucydides twice by name,¹⁶ first in the *Chronological Tables* (written between 306 and 313, and revised around 325) and again in his *Theophany* (from around 337 or 338).¹⁷ Although neither of these texts survives complete in its original Greek,¹⁸ Eusebius' knowledge of Thucydides is unmistakable even in translation. His use of Thucydides' first four books in the *Theophany*, though it echoes a key interpretive tradition on Thucydides, is both independent of any identifiable intermedi-

¹⁵ On Eusebius' exploitation of Greek rhetorical training see Christine Smith, "Christian Rhetoric in Eusebius' Panegyric at Tyre," *VigChr* 43 (1989) 226–247, at 228–234.

¹⁶ In the *Ecclesiastical History*, moreover, in a narrative about the plague of Cyprian quoted by Eusebius, Dionysius of Alexandria invokes Thucydides as "a certain one of their [i.e. pagan Greeks'] historians" before quoting Thuc. 2.64.1 (*HE* 7.22.6). DeVore, *Histos* 14 (2020) 19–26, discusses this reference at length.

¹⁷ For the dates of the *Chronological Tables* see Richard M. Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *JThS* 48 (1997) 471–504, at 472–482; for the date of the *Theophany* see Michael B. Simmons, "Universalism in Eusebius of Caesarea: The Soteriological Use of 'the divine power of the Savior of us all' in Book III of the *Theophany*," *Studia Patristica* 66 (2013) 125–134, at 126–128.

¹⁸ While Greek fragments of the *Theophany* survive, none of these comes from Book 2, which contains the reference to Thucydides. See Hugo Gressman, *Eusebius. Die Theophanie. Die griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der syrischen Überlieferungen* (Leipzig 1904) 3–35.

of them: the war of the Peloponnesians and Athenians which Thucydides wrote up in which Greeks fought with Greeks, how they besieged the Potidaeans, how they came upon the Thebans and Plataeans, how the Thracians and Macedonians at one time helped the Athenians, at another became their enemies, how the Athenians besieged Corinth, how they ravaged the lands of the Epidaurians and Troezenians, how they ravaged the lands of the Spartans, and how they in turn suffered the same at the hands of the Spartans when they came to Attica and ravaged the lands of the Athenians? At another time, the Olynthians fought with the Athenians, and they in turn fought with others, and they with their neighbors, and all kinds of war abounded among them: conflict aboard ships, conflicts on land, and conflicts on horseback.²¹

This passage evinces extensive knowledge of Thucydides' narrative. To prove his point about Greek violence against Greeks, Eusebius catalogues some of the most self-destructive events in the Peloponnesian War, such as the Athenian siege of Potidaea (Thuc. 1.56–67, 2.58, 2.67, 2.70, 3.17),²² the Spartan assault on Plataea (2.2–6, 2.71–79, 3.20–24, 3.52–68), and the Athenian attack on Boeotia culminating in the siege of Delium (4.76–7, 89–98). He also invokes the less-famous Athenian attacks on Corinth (2.30.1, 2.80–94), the devastation of Epidaurian and Troezenian land (2.56.4–5),²³ Olynthians' fighting

²¹ Syriac text: Samuel Lee, *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. On the Theophania, or Divine Manifestation of our Lord Jesus* (Cambridge 1842); compare Lee's translation, *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. On the Theophania* (Cambridge 1843) 128–129, and the German translation of Gressman, *Eusebius. Die Theophanie* 176.

²² Some have doubted the authenticity of 3.17. See Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1991) 400–401. But it was probably in Eusebius' copy, as *P.Oxy.* LVII 3891 (2nd cent.) includes it.

²³ In this chapter Halieis and Hermione are attacked along with Troezen and Epidaurus, but Eusebius likely did not feel the need to augment an already imposing list. He may also have omitted the names of Halieis and Hermione given the fame of the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus, and Troezen's renown as the birthplace of the Athenian hero Theseus.

against Athenians (2.79), and Athenians and Spartans ravaging one another's land, a frequent occurrence in Thucydides (e.g. 2.19.2, 2.23, 2.25.1–2, 2.30–31, 2.56.6, 4.47.2). Further support for his thesis comes via Thracians' and Macedonians' shifting loyalties in the war (2.29, 2.67, 2.80, 2.95–101, 4.78–83, 4.101–107, 4.122–132).

The content of *Theophany* 2.68 implies direct familiarity with at least the first four books of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*.²⁴ Eusebius notes most of these military campaigns in the same sequence in which they first appear in the first two books.²⁵ This alone strongly suggests that he was writing down key events as he read them.

Moreover, whereas all the conflicts referred to by Eusebius other than the Athenian attack on Potidaea begin in Book 2, he refers to two extended events that start in Book 2 and continue in later books.²⁶ The first concerns the fighting between Thebes and Plataea. The war officially begins with the Theban sneak attack on Plataea and Plataean resistance (Thuc. 2.2–6); the Spartans march on Plataea later in Book 2, reject an appeal to

²⁴ Someone might object to our including book 1 in the argument, since the only event from it in *Theophany* 2.68 is the Athenian attack on Potidaea, and most of the siege takes place in Book 2. However, as noted below, Eusebius' beginning his catalogue of intra-Greek conflicts with the Potidaean siege which began in Book 1, rather than with the opening battle of Book 2 between Thebes and Plataea, implies that Book 1 was consulted for this passage. It is interesting that Corcyra—not only its conflicts with Epidamnus and Corinth but also its famous *stasis*—is entirely excluded from Eusebius' list (cf. note 31 below).

²⁵ The exception is the Athenians' attacking the Spartans and vice versa, an occurrence ubiquitous in Thucydides. We write "first appear" because some of the events (the siege of Potidaea, Thebes and Plataea, the Thracian and Macedonian campaigns) are broken up across several sections of Thucydides, whereas the rest occupy only one stretch of text. Eusebius generally names each event in the order of its first occurrence in Thucydides.

²⁶ The attack on Potidaea continues into 3.17, but Eusebius does not refer to the information about Athenian finance specific to this passage.

turn away, and burn much of Plataea (2.71–78). In Book 3 we find the results of the siege of Plataea: a daring Plataean escape from the Peloponnesian and Theban siege (3.20–24), and the Plataean surrender and pleas for Spartan leniency, rebutted by the Thebans and followed by the execution of the men, the sale of the women into slavery, and the dismantling of the city's buildings (3.52–68). While the Syriac *ܥܘܨܪܐ* “they came upon” need not refer to the end of the siege in Book 3, the words “how [the Athenians] came upon the Thebans” clearly show that Eusebius had also read Book 4, which tells of the invitation of Boeotian democrats to invade Boeotia and of the ensuing battle of Delium in 424 (4.76–77, 89–98).

The Thracian and Macedonian narratives, referred to by Eusebius even more securely, further indicate knowledge of Thucydides beyond Book 2.²⁷ The Thracians remain allied with the Athenians but drop out of the war quickly. The Thracian King Sitalces allies himself with the Athenians (2.29), intercepts Spartan envoys attempting to get help from Persia (67), and incompetently attacks Macedon (95–101) before fading from interstate war. Thrace does change loyalties, but only in Book 4, where we read of “those in Thrace who were in revolt from the Athenians” supporting the famous Spartan expedition to the northern Aegean under Brasidas (οἱ τε ἐπὶ Θράκης ἀφεστῶτες Ἀθηναίων, 4.79.2; also 4.102.1–2, 4.122.2). A reference to changing Thracian loyalties makes sense only if Eusebius read Book 4 and read it closely enough to note one of just a few references to Thracian support of Sparta.²⁸

²⁷ Although Eusebius lists them together, in fact Thracians and Macedonians were at war with one another in the Archidamian war that spans Books 1 through 5.24. For precise details and analysis see Michael Zahrt, “Macedonia and Thrace in Thucydides,” in Antonios Rengakos et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden 2006) 612–614.

²⁸ Alternatively, one might argue that Eusebius conflates Thracian and Macedonian loyalties and attributes the Macedonian betrayals in Book 2 to both jointly. But this would be an odd and implausibly sloppy move in an

Macedonian loyalties, on the other hand, change frequently in Thucydides.²⁹ In Book 2 King Perdiccas of Macedon at first supports the Athenians (2.29.6) and then the Spartans without informing the Athenians (2.80.6). Perdiccas also supports the Spartan expedition of Brasidas (4.83, 4.107.3), but, after a defeat at Lyncus, his troops desert the Spartans and he reconciles himself with the Athenians (4.124–128, 132). Perhaps Eusebius intended only a reference to those reversals of Macedonian loyalty to Athens found in Book 2, but it is quite plausible that he also had in mind those in Book 4, with its memorable sequence on Brasidas' capture of Amphipolis and the Thracian betrayal. This is probably the betrayal that motivated Eusebius' reference to a Thracian reversal. Thus, we reasonably conclude that Eusebius knew episodes and vicissitudes throughout the first four books.

Instead of naming all the possible episodes of violence in those books, Eusebius includes events that confirm his theme of Greek-on-Greek violence. Notably absent, for example, are the Athenian plague (which Eusebius associated with Thucydides, see below), deliberations of different poleis, Greek engagements with Persians or other indisputably non-Greek peoples,³⁰ and numerous intratextual orations.³¹ Yet such obscure but per-

argument that seeks to draw attention to Greek-on-Greek violence, since the Greekness of the Macedonians was more secure than that of the Thracians—other writers from the third and fourth centuries distinguished Greeks and Thracians (e.g. Herodian 7.1.2, Julian *Mis.* 40). If Eusebius lacked evidence of a reversal of Thracian loyalty toward the Athenians, for him to mention one would have been an obvious and counterproductive error.

²⁹ As Zahrnt, in *Brill's Companion* 592, points out.

³⁰ Indisputably non-Greek as opposed to peoples on the margins of Hellenicity such as the Macedonians and Thracians.

³¹ The famous Corcyrean *stasis* of Book 3 is also absent, but Eusebius was apparently drawing attention only to interstate conflict, not to internecine violence.

tinient episodes as the attacks on Epidaurus and Troezen and Athens' battle with Olynthus do appear. Although they each occupy only a chapter of Thucydides, Eusebius devotes as much space to them as to the more famous Potidaean, Plataean, and northern Aegean campaigns. The episodes selected fit Eusebius' argument so perfectly that they must reflect deliberate choice and close reading of Thucydides.

Supporting our view of Eusebius' meticulous selection is the uniqueness of the resulting list. No other ancient author compiled quite the same list, whether as a summary of the Peloponnesian War or of Thucydides' narrative.³² The tight correlation between these passages and Eusebius' argument implies either that he must have been intimately acquainted with the first few books of the *History* or that he must have resorted to a copy to refresh his memory of their content. Otherwise, it is hard to see how he could have put minor, transient events front and center in his account.³³ Either way, Eusebius must have had direct and ready access to the narrative in Books 1–4 of the *Peloponnesian War*.

The composite picture created by such detailed knowledge and precise choice of passages closely parallels the reading of Thucydides in late-antique rhetorical schools. A look at the

³² A TLG proximity search for τροιζ-, επιδαυρ-, and ολυνθ- confirms that later authors almost never noted these events of the Peloponnesian War in a rhetorical context. The only hit is Plutarch's mention of Epidaurus in his *Life of Pericles* (35.3). Olynthus in particular was far more famous from Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* than from Thucydides.

³³ Some combination of recollection and consultation is possible too. Perhaps Eusebius owned a copy of the first two books and recalled in detail the events of the first four. The *Theophany* is a late writing and Eusebius could have checked (or had an assistant check) a copy of Thucydides in search of suitable illustrations; but knowledge of the many instances of Greeks fighting against Greeks in this work had to precede any checking. The cogent, chronologically sequenced series of episodes proves that Eusebius had at least Thucydides' first two books at hand and knew the outcome of events that reached beyond Book 2.

way the late-fourth-century rhetor Aphthonius used the classical historian demonstrates this clearly. Aphthonius certainly expected his students to know the first four books of Thucydides—the same books cited by Eusebius—and included a similar catalogue of events: Thebes' attack on Plataea (Thuc. 2.2–6, 2.71–79, 3.20–24, 3.52–68), the Peloponnesian ravaging of Attica (2.19–21, 55, 57), the sea battles near Naupactus and Ambracia (2.80–92, 3.105–114), the Athenian counter-measures against Mytilene's revolt (3.25–50), and the Athenian assault on Sphacteria and Pylos (4.2–41). This is a comparable, but hardly identical, litany of Greek-on-Greek violence. Aphthonius' episodes too come from Books 1 to 4 of Thucydides, with 1 and 2 especially well represented; all are fairly lengthy and (except for Mytilene) all involve Athenians and Peloponnesians. Eusebius, on the other hand, apparently sought to multiply the number of states involved in Greek-on-Greek violence and was willing to adduce brief, obscure Thucydidean episodes to do so.³⁴

Moreover, even beyond its dependence on detailed recall or consultation, the *Theophany* draws on a well-attested tradition of Thucydidean interpretation. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, an author who was well known to Eusebius,³⁵ bemoaned Thucydi-

³⁴ Aphthonius *Progymn.* 23–24 Rabe. Aphthonius proceeds to note some Thucydidean speeches: the Corcyrean and Corinthian speeches at Athens (1.31–44); the Aeginetans'(!), Archidamus', and Sthenelaidas' speeches about declaring war on Athens (1.67, 79–87); and Pericles' speeches on strategy before the war and those during the plague encouraging Athens to fight on (1.39–45, 2.58–65). In contrast to Eusebius' list in the *Theophany*, the only event in Aphthonius' that is either brief or obscure is the Aeginetans' speech to the Spartans, which Thucydides does not report in *oratio recta*.

³⁵ Eusebius cites Dionysius by name, as his *Roman Antiquities* was Eusebius' chief source for Roman society and culture in the monarchy and early Republic (see Mondello, *Eusebio e la storiografia antica* 111–122). Dionysius' comments (7.66.3–5) that Romans solved their problems through words and dialogue, whereas the Corcyreans and other Greeks acted in violent strife, may have reinforced Eusebius' reading of Greek history in Thucydides.

des' choice of subject matter, believing that the Peloponnesian War had been an unedifying civil war among Greeks that "ought not to have happened, but if it did, it ought to have been surrendered to silence and oblivion to be forgotten by posterity."³⁶ As noted above, declamation supported this view with themes that emphasized Greek-on-Greek violence during the war. This interpretative tradition facilitated Eusebius' immediate purpose in the *Theophany* of illustrating the Greek predilection for self-destruction. The *Theophany* not only shows Eusebius' knowledge of Thucydides but also deploys against pagans a prevalent pagan interpretation of Thucydides.

2. *Chronological Tables: The Athenian plague as Thucydides' floruit*

Eusebius' second direct reference to Thucydides implies that he knew Thucydides' plague narrative. It comes in the *Chronological Tables*, in the entries for the 87th and 88th Olympiads (432 to 425 BCE). While Eusebius' text does not survive in the original Greek, we have two translations: Jerome's Latin and an independent Armenian translation. Both versions agree in placing Thucydides' floruit immediately after the famously horrific epidemic that struck Athens in 430. The relevant entry comes within a series of nine chronicle entries.³⁷ In Table I we present side by side the relevant entries from Jerome's *Chronicle*, the Armenian translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (in Josef Karst's

³⁶ Dion. Hal. *Letter to Pompeius* 3.4. Dionysius' view on Thucydides was discussed by students of Thucydides as early as the third century: *P.Oxy.* VI 853 coll. 1–2. See also *Declamation* 13 of Libanius, Eusebius' near-contemporary, in which the Corinthians denounce the Athenians before a war council for the siege of Plataea and for destroying the Greek nation through civil war.

³⁷ On the 87th and 88th Olympiads in the *Chronological Tables* see the caveats of Alden Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg 1979) 154–155, which do not affect this analysis.

German translation), and George Syncellus' early ninth-century *Chronicle* (a witness to Eusebius).³⁸

TABLE I

Jerome	Eusebius (Armenian)	Syncellus
<i>Initium belli Peloponnesiaci.</i>	Der peleponesische Krieg nahm seinen Anfang, dauernd 21 Jahre.	Ἀφρικανοῦ ὀλυμπιάς πζ' ὁ Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων πόλεμος ζ' καὶ εἰκοσαετής, ὃν Θουκυδίδης συνέγραψε, δι' Ἀσπασίας πόρνας β' καὶ στήλας κατὰ Μεγαρέων ἀστυγειτόνων Ἀθηναίοις συνέστη.
<i>Bacchylides carminum scriptor agnoscitur.</i>	Bakchilides der Liederdichter war gekannt.	ὀλυμπιάς πη' Βακχυλίδης μελοποιὸς ἐγνωρίζετο.
<i>Athenienses pestilentia laborant.</i>	Olomios überzeugte die Athener.	Ἀθηναίους ἔπεισεν ὁ λιμός (read Ἀθηναίους ἐπίεσεν ὁ λοιμός)
<i>Thucydides agnoscitur.</i>	Thukidides war gekannt.	Σωκράτης φιλόσοφος καθαρτικός ἦνθει.
<i>Pericles moritur.</i>		
<i>Eupolis et Aristophanes scriptores comoediarum agnoscuntur.</i>	Eupolis und Aristophanes waren als Liederdichter gekannt.	Εὐπολις καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης κωμικοί, Σοφοκλῆς τε ὁ τραγωδοποιὸς ἐγνωρίζετο.
		Γοργίας καὶ Ἰππίας καὶ Πρόδικος, ὡς δὲ τινές, καὶ Ζήνων καὶ Παρμενίδης κατὰ τοῦτους ἤκμαζον.
<i>Ex Aetna monte ignis erupit.</i>		Πῦρ ἐκ τῆς Αἴτνης ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Σικελίαν τόποις ἐρράγη.

³⁸ Jerome *Chronological Tables* LXXXVII–LXXXVIII, pp.114–15 Helm = Eus. *Chron.* (Armenian) 87–88, p.194 Karst = Syncel. *Chron.*, p.309 Moss-hammer. The Armenian translation places the Olympiads one year earlier than Jerome, as Richard M. Burgess notes (*Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography* [Stuttgart 1999] 25). Syncellus does not assign events to specific years.

<i>Terrae motu apud Locros scissa Atalante facta est insula.</i>	Infolge eines Erdbebens bei Lokri ward Atalante abgerissen zu einer Insel.	σεισμῶν γεγονότων ἢ πρὸς Λοκροῖς Ἀταλάντη σχισθεῖσα νῆσος ἐγένετο.
<i>Plato nascitur.</i>	Platon wurde geboren.	

Although the three chronicles differ somewhat in their entries, it is apparent from Jerome and the Armenian translation that Eusebius placed his entry on Thucydides directly after the plague. One might note in passing that both the wording of Syncellus' Greek, Ἀθηναίους ἐπίσεν ὁ λοιμός, and the Greek *Vorlage* of the Armenian translation³⁹ even echo Thucydides' own phrasing: τοιοῦτῳ μὲν πάθει οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι περιπεσόντες ἐπέζοντο (2.54.1). This suggests consultation or accurate recall of Thucydides' account.

It is hardly accidental that Eusebius synchronized Thucydides and the plague. Although ancient chronicles are often compilations of older sources rather than original compositions, chroniclers frequently exercised their authorial agency by omitting or displacing material or by choosing among alternative placements in their sources. For the floruit of Thucydides, Eusebius demonstrably rejected at least one alternative placement (perhaps two) from his sources. One definitely available to him is found in Diodorus Siculus, one of Eusebius' chief sources for Greek events.⁴⁰ Diodorus mentions Thucydides' historical writ-

³⁹ The Armenian text, translated by Karst as "Olomios überzeugte die Athener," compounds metathesis with mistranslation: it reads ΕΠΙΣΕΝ (ἔπεισεν) for ΕΠΙΣΕΝ (ἐπίσεν) and ΟΛΟΜΙΟΣ ("Olomios") for ΟΛΟΙΜΟΣ (ὁ λοιμός).

⁴⁰ Eusebius cites Diodorus in his *Chronography* as a source for Corinthian, Spartan, and Trojan kings (pp.103–108, Karst). In the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Diodorus was "lo storico in assoluto più citato da Eusebio" according to Mondello, *Eusebio e la storiografia antica* 83–100 (quotation at 83). Cf. David J. DeVore, "Extracting the Flowers, Leaving the Meadow: Ordering Miscellany in the Preface of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*," in Olivier Devillers et al. (eds.), *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens* 3 (Bordeaux, forthcoming).

ing at the beginning and end of the Peloponnesian War,⁴¹ but Diodorus does not connect him with the Athenian plague.⁴² Eusebius, then, must have deliberately dismissed Diodorus' floruit for Thucydides.

Another alternative likely appeared in the brilliant third-century Christian chronicler Julius Africanus. His *Chronography* was well known to Eusebius, who must have used it for numerous Greek events.⁴³ Syncellus, who relied on both Eusebius and Africanus, is our best witness to the content of Africanus, himself also one of Eusebius' sources (cf. Table I). It is well known that Syncellus preferred Africanus' narrative to Eusebius',⁴⁴ and when he deviates from Eusebius he is likely following Africanus. Like Diodorus in his first reference, Syncellus invokes Thucydides at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. This is reasonable since Thucydides' narrative proper starts there. Although Syncellus knew Eusebius' *Chronicle* well, he followed another source for Thucydides' floruit, in all likelihood Africanus.⁴⁵ Eusebius, by contrast, deviated from Diodorus and (judging from Syncellus) Africanus by fixing Thucydides' floruit not at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War but (less tra-

⁴¹ Diod. 12.37.2, 13.42.5.

⁴² Diodorus' account of the Athenian plague (12.45.2–12.46.5) differs greatly from Thucydides'.

⁴³ Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius* 138–145; Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* I 345–347.

⁴⁴ See e.g. Patricia Varona, "Chronographical Polemics in Ninth-Century Constantinople. George Synkellos, Iconoclasm and the Greek Chronicle Tradition," *Eranos* 108 (2018) 117–136; Jesse W. Torgerson, *The Chronographia of George the Synkellos and Theophanes: The Ends of Time in Ninth-century Constantinople* (Leiden 2022) 17–30, 234–236, 396–397.

⁴⁵ Thucydides' floruit appears at Syncellus 309.10 Mosshammer = Africanus F81a Wallraff. (Africanus F81b comes from the fifth- or sixth-century *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, also dependent on Africanus and including Thucydides along with many of the same culture heroes as Syncellus (see Mosshammer 305 and 309), though not in Syncellus' sequence.)

ditionally) right after the plague. Accordingly, even if in most other respects Eusebius closely followed Africanus for the 87th and 88th Olympiads,⁴⁶ nevertheless, guided by his own reading of Thucydides, he deliberately displaced Thucydides' floruit from the start of the war.

If Jerome accurately reproduces Eusebius for Olympiad 87, there is one additional indication that Eusebius consulted Thucydides' plague narrative for his *Chronicle*. Jerome's *Chronicle* follows the plague and Thucydides' floruit with the death of Pericles (see Table I), a prominent consequence of the plague that Thucydides trumpets (2.65).⁴⁷ This event is missing from the Armenian translation and Syncellus. It is more likely that Eusebius noted Pericles' demise in the original *Chronological Tables* than that Jerome interpolated it, since Jerome's changes to Eusebius usually come from Latin sources and concern Roman events.⁴⁸ While this consideration alone is not conclusive, it too suggests Eusebius' direct engagement with Thucydides' plague account.⁴⁹ This is the sequence reflected in the *Tables*.

Whether or not Eusebius found the synchronism between Thucydides and the plague in his sources, he certainly dis-

⁴⁶ See the Appendix for discussion of Eusebius' now-lost sources for Greek events that might have included the synchronism between Thucydides' floruit and the Athenian plague.

⁴⁷ To the objection that the Armenian translator's omission of Pericles' death (see Table I) implies Jerome's insertion of it, we reply that the Armenian translator is known for occasionally omitting content from densely packed passages of Eusebius' *Tables*; such are the 87th and 88th Olympiads. See Richard Burgess, "Jerome Explained: An Introduction to his *Chronicle* and a Guide to its Use," *AHB* 16 (2002) 1–32, at 25.

⁴⁸ See Burgess, *AHB* 16 (2002) 28–29.

⁴⁹ The quotation of Thucydides in Eusebius' account of the plague of Cyprian (Thuc. 2.64.1 = *HE* 7.24.6), albeit in an excerpt from Dionysius of Alexandria, comes from Pericles' oration in response to the plague. This suggests that Eusebius was well aware that Thucydides had placed Pericles' death at the conclusion of his plague account,

regarded at least one prominent source (Diodorus), and perhaps a second (Africanus), that placed Thucydides' floruit elsewhere. Eusebius, then, deliberately associated Thucydides closely with the plague. Perhaps this association occurred to him because Thucydides first introduces himself in the plague narrative as a participant in the events, admitting that he contracted the disease himself (2.48.3). Or perhaps Thucydides' narrative was so compelling that Eusebius could not resist placing Thucydides' name under it. As one of us has argued, Eusebius went out of his way to include a plague narrative in the *Ecclesiastical History* (7.21–22), a passage that quotes Thucydides and demonstrates Christian superiority to paganism.⁵⁰ We have elsewhere demonstrated further Eusebian imitation of Thucydides in a plague narrative involving Maximinus Daia (*HE* 9.8).⁵¹ Eusebius returned to Thucydides' plague repeatedly, reworking Greek literary tradition creatively and effectively.⁵² Just as was the case with the *Theophany*'s enumera-

⁵⁰ DeVore, *Histos* 14 (2020) 27. On the plague of Cyprian see now Sabine Huebner, "The 'Plague of Cyprian': A Revised View of the Origin and Spread of a 3rd-c. CE Pandemic," *JRA* 34 (2021) 151–174; and Mark Orsag, Amanda E. McKinney, and DeeAnn M. Reeder, *Interdisciplinary Insights from the Plague of Cyprian. Pathology, Epidemiology, Ecology and History* (Cham 2023).

⁵¹ Kennedy and DeVore, *JLA* 16 (2023) 27–53.

⁵² On Eusebius' reconfiguration of pagan Greek literary topoi in the *History* and his contemporaneous works, see also Aaron P. Johnson, "Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* as a Literary Experiment," in Scott Johnson (ed.), *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity* (Washington 2006) 67–90, and "Eusebius the Educator: The Context of the *General Elementary Introduction*," in *Reconsidering Eusebius* 99–118; Sébastien Morlet, *La 'Démonstration évangélique' d'Eusèbe de Césarée: Étude sur l'apologétique chrétienne à l'époque de Constantin* (Paris 2009) 80–91, "Les chrétiens et l'histoire. De Luc à Eusèbe de Césarée," in Arnaud Perrot (ed.), *Les chrétiens et l'hellénisme. Identités religieuses et culture grecque dans l'Antiquité tardive* (Paris 2012) 123–148, at 138–147, and "Eusèbe le grammairien. Note sur les *Questions évangéliques* (À Marinos, 2) et une scholie sur Pindare," *Studia Patristica* 95 (2017) 43–50; David J. DeVore, "Genre

tion of conflicts from Books 1 through 4, close reading of Thucydides' plague is consistent with Eusebius' habits of textual production.

3. Conclusion

While it is *a priori* likely that Eusebius knew much about Thucydides from his rhetorical education, close analysis of his two explicit mentions of the Athenian historian proves detailed acquaintance with the first four books of the *Peloponnesian War* and explains the link in the *Tables* between Thucydides and the plague of Athens. Eusebius' precise knowledge of Thucydides' first four books and of many episodes in his work that illustrate intra-Hellenic violence parallel Dionysius' and Aphthonius' reading and use of the historian quite closely. This strongly suggests that Eusebius personally read the same sections of the *Peloponnesian War* and drew the same takeaways as these imperial readers.

To be sure, we do not wish to overstate our case. Eusebius imitates Thucydides only occasionally, and two references by name hardly make Thucydides a central model for Eusebius' historical narrative or his understanding of history. We only claim that Eusebius knew the first half of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War* just as well as other *pepaideumenoi*, and that he particularly remembered its portrayal of Greek-on-Greek violence and its narrative of the plague. The fact that Eusebius referred to Thucydides when this served his purposes shows

and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*: Toward a Focused Debate," in Aaron Johnson et al. (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations* (Washington 2013) 19–49, and "Character and Convention in the Letters of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*," *JLA* 7 (2014) 223–252; José Torres Guerra, "Documents, Letters and Canons in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*," in Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz (ed.), *Beginning and End. From Ammianus Marcellinus to Eusebius of Caesarea* (Huelva 2016) 61–83. Mondello, *Eusebio e la storiografia antica*; James Corke-Webster, *Eusebius and Empire. Constructing Church and Rome in the Ecclesiastical History* (Cambridge 2019) 72–76.

that a pagan Greek historian could be a useful resource even for an erudite, committed Christian such as Eusebius, who was acquainted with many repositories of historical knowledge and alternative models of historical narrative.⁵³

Our conclusion also reinforces the view that Eusebius' originality as the creator of the genre of ecclesiastical history and, arguably (n.1 above), pioneer of the Christian world chronicle came not from ignorance of the Greek historiographical tradition but out of familiarity with it. As Eduard Schwartz correctly pronounced, "Eusebius was far too sophisticated and educated not to know the firm stylistic conventions of historiography that had prevailed for centuries."⁵⁴ And Eusebius' knowledge, in turn, underscores elite Christian authors' recourse to the same elite Greek education wielded by their pagan elite Greek-speaking contemporaries, which equipped them to critique that very culture.

⁵³ Sabrina Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Method in an Apologetic Context* (Leiden 2006), shows much the same for Eusebius' use of Jewish authors. On historical narratives known to Eusebius, see in general Carriker, *Library of Eusebius* 139–154, and Mondello, *Eusebio e la storiografia antica*. See also Eusebius' citation by name of Herodotus' narrative of Croesus in *Theophany* 2.69, noted by DeVore, in *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations* 31; and see now Adam Serfass, "Maxentius as Xerxes in Eusebius of Caesarea's Accounts of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge," *CQ* 72 (2022) 822–833.

⁵⁴ Eduard Schwartz, "Über Kirchengeschichte," *Gesammelte Schriften* I (Berlin 1938) 110–130, at 116: "Eusebius war viel zu gebildet und unterrichtet, um die seit Jahrhunderten festen Stilgesetze der Historiographie nicht zu kennen." Cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.," in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1963) 79–99, who declared that "Eusebius, like any other educated man, knew what proper history was" (89). For Eusebius' engagement with the Greek historiographical tradition in the *History* see DeVore, in *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations* 19–49.

APPENDIX:

Possible Sources for Eusebius' Synchronism of the Athenian Plague with Thucydides' Floruit in *Chronological Tables*, Olympiad 87

That Eusebius deliberately chose to juxtapose the Athenian plague and Thucydides' floruit in *Chronological Tables*, Olymp. 87, is not mere speculation. It follows from systematic consideration of possible antecedents for the juxtaposition of these two facts among the sources that he himself cites for the composition of the *Tables*.

Eusebius' list of authorities for Greek events (*Chronographia* p.125 Karst) includes Diodorus, Cassius Longinus, Phlegon of Tralles, Castor of Rhodes, Thallus, and Porphyry. It is *a priori* possible that he followed any of these authors in juxtaposing the plague and the floruit. Of these authorities, however, Eusebius only associates Castor, Diodorus, and Porphyry by name with specific data in his *Chronographia*. These three therefore deserve first consideration as possible sources for Eusebius' synchronism of the plague and the floruit (other than of course the very text of Thucydides). We can eliminate Diodorus, since we know that he did not synchronize Thucydides with the plague.⁵⁵ We also observed above that Africanus' *Chronography* is unlikely to be Eusebius' source, given George Syncellus' likely use of Africanus and Syncellus' different placement of Thucydides' floruit vis-à-vis Eusebius.

(a) Castor is cited by Eusebius only for Greek events from mythical times, before the Classical period. Thus, he is unlikely to be a source for the floruit of Thucydides.⁵⁶

(b) It is possible that Eusebius had first-hand knowledge of Phlegon, whose writing was still available in ninth-century Byzantium.⁵⁷ Phlegon, moreover, wrote an Olympic chronicle that might have included a reference to the Athenian plague and/or to Thucydides.⁵⁸ But Eusebius never cites Phlegon explicitly for items in the *Chronological Tables*, whereas Africanus (in a quotation preserved by Eusebius) does cite Phlegon for specific data.⁵⁹ Therefore, although

⁵⁵ See 42–43 above.

⁵⁶ See Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius* 130–131.

⁵⁷ Photius *Bibl. cod.* 97 (II 63–65 Henry).

⁵⁸ *BNj* 257 T 1, T 3.

⁵⁹ Eus. *PE* 10.10.4 = Africanus F93 Wallraff = *BNj* 257 F 8.

first-hand knowledge is possible, knowledge of Phlegon mediated by Africanus seems more likely; and one must bear in mind that Africanus did not synchronize the plague with Thucydides' floruit.

(c) Eusebius' direct knowledge of the shadowy Thallus seems improbable; he is more likely to have learned about Thallus from Africanus, who cites Thallus by name (F34, F93).

(d) Concerning Porphyry, the once prevalent assumption that he wrote a full-fledged *Chronicle* has been refuted.⁶⁰ Eusebius apparently drew chronological information for the Hellenistic period from Porphyry's *Against the Christians*, and perhaps information about philosophers from his *Philosophical History*. But Thucydides was neither a Hellenistic author nor a philosopher.⁶¹ Porphyry, then, is unlikely as a source.

(f) The identity of the chronicler Longinus cited by Eusebius is disputed. If it was Cassius Longinus, the associate of Plotinus and Porphyry,⁶² who as a skilled philologist surely knew Thucydides well, then he could be Eusebius' source. If with Nikos Kokkinos we identify Longinus with the Christian chronographer Julius Cassius who wrote under Marcus Aurelius,⁶³ then it is also plausible that he might associate Thucydides with the plague.⁶⁴ But both identifi-

⁶⁰ See Brian Croke, "Porphyry's Anti-Christian Chronology," *JThS* 34 (1983) 168–185; Timothy D. Barnes, "Scholarship or Propaganda? Porphyry *Against the Christians* in its Historical Setting," *BICS* 39 (1994) 53–65, at 55–57.

⁶¹ Thucydides does not seem to have been a frequent reference point for Porphyry at all. Although he did write a work *On the Proem of Thucydides* (Porphyry 2T, 412T Smith), nothing else is known of this text, so we cannot know what Porphyry thought of Thucydides. He also refers to Thucydides only once by name in his surviving oeuvre, and there as merely the student of Antiphon: Ἀντιφῶν ὁ Πραμνοῦσιος, ὁ Θουκυδίδου διδάσκαλος, Porph. *Rhetoric* F2a Heath, ap. Sopater *Comm. on Hermogenes* 7.9 (p.7 Walz). We thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing these fragments out.

⁶² For this hypothesis see Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius* 140–145; Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* I 348–349.

⁶³ Nikos Kokkinos, "Julius Cassianus, Pseudo-Thallus, and the Identity of 'Cassius Longinus' in the *Chronographia* of Eusebius," *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 8 (2010) 15–28, at 21–23.

⁶⁴ The Antonine plague that raged in the 160s and 170s could of course

cations are speculative.⁶⁵

In sum, if Eusebius followed a source for his synchronism of Thucydides' floruit and the plague, the most likely candidates are, in roughly descending order: Longinus (whether the third-century philologist or the second-century chronicler), Phlegon, Castor, Thallus, and Africanus—certainly not Porphyry. But none of them presents a compelling case. And Eusebius was perfectly capable of juxtaposing Thucydides and the plague by reason of his own acquaintance with the Athenian historian, whom he imitated elsewhere.⁶⁶ On balance, the evidence strongly favors the conclusion that Eusebius' synchronism was original and not prompted by a source.⁶⁷

April, 2023

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
ddevore@cpp.edu

Bilkent University
scott.kennedy@bilkent.edu.tr

have prompted a contemporary scholar to consider Thucydides' plague account and associate Thucydides closely with narration of an epidemic. The classic study is Richard P. Duncan-Jones, "The Impact of the Antonine Plague," *JRA* 9 (1996) 108–136.

⁶⁵ The two alternative identifications of the chronicler Longinus suggested by Yasmina Benferhat, "Cassius Longinus," *BNJ* 259, would also allow for an identification of Thucydides with the plague.

⁶⁶ DeVore, *Histos* 14 (2020) 1–34; Kennedy and DeVore, *JLA* 16 (2023) 27–53.

⁶⁷ This paper started as a response to an anonymous reviewer of Kennedy and DeVore, "Famine and Plague of Maximinus," who wondered whether it was certain that Eusebius had read Thucydides. We thank that reviewer for provoking this paper and for a favorable response to its original version. The authors also thank the editors and reviewers for helpful communication and a smooth editorial process, Rachel Bruzzone for clarifying key points about the reception of Thucydides, Jared Secord and the Interlibrary Loan staff at Cal Poly Pomona for help in procuring scholarship, and Cristian Mondello and Jesse Torgerson for sharing their own scholarship with us.